

**A Sociolinguistic Perspective in Narrative Analysis:
Educational Backgrounds of Families as Influential Factors
in the Development of Personal Experience Child Narratives¹**

Suhan Akıncı Oktay
Hacettepe Üniversitesi

Summary: This article provides a sociolinguistic framework for the analysis of personal experience narratives in terms of Labovian story structure. The study focuses on the children of two distinct groups of parents; one with higher, the other with lower socio-economic level and educational backgrounds. In this study, written narratives reflecting the personal fright experiences of 9-to-10-year-old children attending two primary schools in Ankara, representing higher parental education group and lower parental education group have been compared on the basis of Labov's Personal Experience Narrative Analysis. The findings indicate that the children of socially and educationally better-level parents display better writing narration skills both mentally and linguistically. This finding denotes the importance of parental and environmental factors.

Key words: *personal experience narratives, child narratives, narrative structure, written narrative*

Özet: Bu makale kişisel deneyim anlatı çözümlemesi konusuyla ilişkili olarak, Labov'un anlatı yapısı bağlamında sosyodilbilimsel bir çerçeve sunmaktadır. Çalışma, biri yüksek, diğeri düşük sosyoekonomik düzeyi ve eğitim geçmişi olan iki farklı ebeveyn grubuna odaklanmıştır. Çalışmada yaşları 9-10 arası değişen Ankara Beytepe İlköğretim okulundan (eğitim seviyesi yüksek aile grubu) ve Ankara Şentepe İlköğretim okulundan (eğitim seviyesi düşük aile grubu) çocukların yazılı kişisel korku anlatıları Labov'un (1972) Kişisel Deneyim anlatı çözümlemesine göre karşılaştırılmıştır. Çalışmanın bulguları sosyal ve eğitimsel açıdan daha iyi seviyede olan ebeveynlerin çocuklarının hem zihinsel hem de dilbilimsel açıdan daha iyi yazılı anlatı yetenekleri olduğunu göstermiştir. Bu bulgu aile ve çevre etmenlerinin önemini vurgulamaktadır.

Anahtar sözcükler: *kişisel deneyim anlatıları, çocuk anlatıları, anlatı yapısı, yazılı anlatı*

1. Introduction

This study aims at analyzing the sociolinguistic structure of the personal fright narratives of 9 to 10 years old Turkish children. It focuses on the narrative skills of Turkish children belonging to high parental education group and low parental education group. The article addresses the following research questions:

1) Do the personal narratives of 9- to 10-year-old children coming from educationally two different parent groups display significant differences in terms of Labov's story structure?

2) If so, in what respects are the high parental education group children distinguishable from low parental education group children?

Language differentiates human beings from other creatures living in the world. The properties of language are so unique that when animal communication and human language are compared from certain aspects such as displacement, cultural transmission, discreteness and duality, it can be observed that displacement principle carries great importance in terms of narrative production. Displacement principle, cultural transmission, discreteness and duality are among the various aspects of language. Displacement is particularly important in terms of narrative production because by using this principle a speaker is able to talk about past, present and future events. Therefore, he can easily retell events he confronted in the past and present. Leeming (1997:4) points out the ability of human being's using discreteness principle by mentioning that all human beings are storytellers while some are more gifted storytellers than others. When communicating people can transfer their narrative experiences to the other people listening to them.

1.1 What is a Narrative?

Narratives have been the concern of such disciplines as history, anthropology, folklore, psychology, sociology, sociolinguistics and psycholinguistics. Not only the disciplines mentioned but also the professions such as law, medicine, psychiatry, psychoanalysis and education deal with narratives (Riessman 1993:1). For example, a psychiatrist can understand the problem of his patient by listening to the narratives that the patient tells. In a courtroom, the judge asks the accused to relay how the event occurred. The accused tells a narrative to explain what happened, how it happened, what he was doing at the moment, where he was at the time of the crime, etc. Then, the accused designs a narrative and tells it in his own way with the aim of reflecting his experience about the event he confronted. Later, for the narrative to become a written record the judge retells the narrative briefly and in a way designs a narrative for the court to be used as a written record. Here, again the accused produces a narrative, then the judge produces a shortened

form of the accused person's narrative. Therefore, the act of producing narratives with the aim of talking about experiences is a universal fact.

Labov (1972:359-360) defines narrative as "a method of recapitulating past experience by matching a verbal sequence of clauses to the sequence of events which actually occurred". He investigates the nature of linguistic devices used to observe verbal skills while evaluating an experience through narrative. Labov developed a theoretical framework to analyze those experiences.

There are basically three types of narratives: Personal experience narratives, fictional narratives and vicarious experience narratives. In personal experience narratives, informants talk about their real life experiences. While Riessman (1993:2) defined everyday experiences as Personal experience narratives, Engel (1995:84) considers them to be the most important narratives that children tell. According to Engel (1995:85) personal experience narratives "are typically told in advance of the experience as a kind of summary reflection on the day's events. The organization of experience (what came first, what happened next, and so on) drives the narrative, as does the mental push to set experience in a time and space framework".

Shiro (2003:176) defines fictional narratives in the following way: In fictional narratives "The child narrates a film that has been seen by a large audience". The child may produce the narrative from a film he has seen or from a comic strip or visual source. In vicarious experience narratives the experience that others have had experienced is reflected. Shiro (2003:175) defines this type of narrative as 'a personal narrative told from third person point of view'.

1.2. Children and narratives

Like adults, children are in need of mentioning their past experiences because they are willing to give information to the people listening to them and also they want to prolong the interaction. Thus, they interact by participating in conversations and they narrate by virtue of the things they see in their environment.

Children prefer to talk about past events that they have experienced within their family or with their friends even when they are very young (Johnstone 2001:641). Research on children shows that even under the age of two children can produce narratives and they have a well-developed sense about what a narrative is, what must be the content and form of the narrative (Toolan 2001:197). Thornborrow and Coates (2005) mention the importance of narratives in the upbringing of children as follows: 'storytelling also has a key role in the development of the human infant who drinks in the stories told by parents and other significant adults These stories bind the child into membership of the culture'. That is, children tell narratives for making sense of the world, problem solving, becoming part of the culture, making and keeping friends, constructing a self and inventing and adapting.

Among the studies that focus on children, Shiro (2003:165-195) studied the effect of age and social class on the development of narratives. In the study, 113 children's 444 narratives were collected orally in 3 private and 3 public schools in Caracas, Venezuela.. The study aimed at understanding whether socioeconomic differences affect narrative development. The sample consisted of monolingual Spanish-speaking children in the first and fourth grades. Two tasks elicited fictional narratives and two elicited personal narratives. Each narrative was analyzed according to evaluative devices such as emotion, cognition, perception, physical state, intention, relation and reported speech in terms of the frequency of evaluative expressions in fictional narratives and personal experience narratives. The analysis revealed an age related increase in fictional narratives of middle class children but none in that of working class children. With respect to the frequency of evaluative expressions in personal experience narrative, no difference was observed in either social class. Furthermore, it was observed that the evaluative categories used in Fictional narrative increased with age in both social groups but not so in Personal experience narrative. Shiro (2003:165-195) pointed out an increase in the length of narratives correlated with children's age and higher socioeconomic status.

In a study carried out by Minami (1995) 20 middle class Japanese preschoolers who are 4 and 5 years old and their mothers were analyzed through high point and stanza analysis. As a result of the study, it was found that 5 year olds produced adult-like narratives in terms of high point and stanza analysis.

Peterson and McCabe (1991) elicited Personal narratives of 96 children in different age groups. The study aimed at analyzing the connective use of children in clauses according to Labov's theoretical framework. In conclusion it was found that the use of certain conjunctions mark the macrostructure of narratives.

1.3. Sociolinguistics and social class concerns

With the rise of sociolinguistics in the second half of the twentieth century class differentiation gained primary importance (Romaine 2004). However, because it is not so easy to define social class it has been a debatable issue ever since. Jones (1999:125) mentions the difficulty in defining the concept by the following words: 'the question of defining what it is that differentiates members of one social class from those of another still remains'. While some researchers hold that there is such a direct relation between language use and social status others claim there is no relation at all. There are two sociological theories which differentiate lower class children from higher class children. The first theory is difference theory put forward by Labov. According to this theory, children who are brought up in different environments differ from each other in terms of the use of language. Thus, Labov concentrates on the differences between higher class children and lower class children's use of language in relation to their living conditions. The second theory is Bernstein's (1986:142) theory according to which

working class and middle classes use different linguistic codes (Masahiko 2002:19). Bernstein claimed that lower class children are limited to a restricted code, thus, are unable to use the elaborated code. Moreover, he states that when lower class children who are lacking the skill to use the elaborated code start school loaded with extensive use of elaborated code at school, they are forced to change their cultural patterns in order to adapt themselves to the medium of instruction at school (Wardhaugh 1990). As Bernstein's theory is seen as a verbal-deficit theory it was misused (Masahiko 2002: 19) especially in America when explaining the academic failure of children who are coming from different social backgrounds.

2. The Sociolinguistic approach to the analysis of narratives

Labov and Waletzky (1967 as cited in Renkema, 1993) analyzed narratives by asking the question 'how do people tell each other narratives in everyday life?' According to Labov (1972:354) in personal experience narratives 'the speaker becomes deeply involved in rehearsing or even reliving events of his past.' In their study Labov and Waletzky asked subjects to relate a dangerous experience.

Labov's story structure is made up of five-components as the following:

(i) Abstract: a brief summary of the narrative, containing signals such as 'Did I ever tell you about.....' that mark the transition to the narrative.

(ii) Orientation: part setting the time, place and characters, situations.

(iii) Complicating Action: section informing the audience about what happened.

(iv) Evaluation- part explaining why the narrative is worth telling. It is the emotional side of the narrative., therefore the most important part of the narration.

(v) Result or Resolution: section informing the audience about how the action was resolved. Consequently, the tension decreases suddenly (Labov 1972:370).

(vi) Coda: a general observation concerning the effects of the events on the narrator, i.e. how he felt after living such an experience such as 'It was funny'. (Georgakopoulou and Goutsos 1997:60)

3. The Study

Many of the studies carried out on narratives have pointed out that little work has been carried out on the effect of social differences like parent's occupation, income level, education, living standards, etc. (Nicolopoulou 1997:179, Johnstone 2001:642, Feagans 1982:105 cited in Shiro 2003:178). Furthermore, from the investigations carried out on narratives it is found that most of the studies analyzed age related differences in producing narratives. Thus, they were developmental studies. Depending

on these facts, it can be said that the narrative skills of Turkish children belonging to high parental education group and low parental education group need to be analyzed. Therefore, this study aims at analyzing the sociolinguistic structure of the personal fright narratives of Turkish children who are 9 to 10 years old. In the sociolinguistic analysis of personal child narratives we will adopt Labov's framework to the structure of child narratives. Furthermore, educational level of the students' parents was taken as the variable in analyzing the linguistic structure of the narratives. A questionnaire was given to the parents of the children. The written questionnaire aimed at obtaining information concerning parental education. The questionnaire is presented in the appendix section of the article.

3.1. Data Collection

(i) Subjects

The data were elicited from two public schools namely Şentepe Primary School and Beytepe Primary School in Ankara, Turkey. The subjects were 200 primary school children, 100 from each school. The children were asked to write about the most frightening experience they have ever had in their lives. and 200 personal experience fright narratives were collected in written form. The structure of the two groups was determined on the basis of the written questionnaire given to the parents of the children. The results of the questionnaire indicated that the children in Şentepe public school represented the lower end of the scale whereas the children in Beytepe public school represented the higher end of the scale. Children in Beytepe Primary school live in an academic environment in the Beytepe Campus at Hacettepe University. In this group most of the children's parents are instructors at Hacettepe University and have a high educational level. On the contrary, in Şentepe Primary School parents have low educational level. Most of them live in the suburbs of Ankara near Karşıyaka graveyard. Thus, Beytepe and Şentepe schools have different characteristics when compared with each other.

(ii) Educational level of the parents in Beytepe and Şentepe Primary Schools

As mentioned previously, the educational level of the children's families was taken as a variable . The results of our analysis regarding the answers of the questions can be observed in the following table:

Table 1: Educational level of the parent (Parent is used in a specific sense as the person who is responsible for the child's education)

			Education Level					
			I did not get any education	I am Primary School graduate	I am High School Educated	I am University graduate	I have Ma or Phd degree	Total
School of the student	Beytepe Primary School	Count	0	0	24	58	18	100
		% within school of the student	,0%	,0%	24.0%	58.0%	18.0%	100.0%
	Şentepe Primary School	Count	4	96	0	0	0	100
		% within school of the student	4.0%	96.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	4	96	24	58	18	200
		% within school of the student	2.0%	48.0%	12.0%	29.0%	9.0%	100.0%

 $X^2 = 200$ $p=0,000$ $p<0.001$

Table 1 indicates that there is a statistical difference between parent's educational level in the two schools ($p=0.000$ $p<0.001$). 4% of the population in Şentepe Primary School did not take any education and 96% of them are primary school graduates. However, 24% of the population in Beytepe Primary school are high school graduates, 58% of them university graduates. Moreover, 18% of them have MA or PHD degrees. The results indicate that Şentepe Primary school can be considered as having Low Parental Education labelled as (LPE). In contrast, Beytepe Primary School has High Parental Education labelled as (HPE).

4. Methodology

To arrive at the sociolinguistic analysis of the study, each of the sentences in the narratives was evaluated in terms of Labovian narrative units. Labov's six narrative units were identified as existent or non-existent within a quantitative analysis framework. The frequencies of the linguistic elements of the two groups of narratives were calculated and presented in tables. For presenting this macro analysis chi-square test was applied. In addition, 20 randomly chosen fright narratives chosen from each of the schools constituting

approximately %20 of the data were coded to test the reliability of the designed coding system.² Through the use of Kappa test inter-observer agreement was assessed. The analysis revealed that there is a significant agreement between two researcher's Abstract section ($\kappa=0.5$), Orientation section ($\kappa=0.6$), Complicating Action section ($\kappa=1$), Result section ($\kappa=0.7$), Coda section ($\kappa=0.8$) and Evaluation section ($\kappa=0.8$). Our results also indicated the abstract section to be the least employed section in inter-observer agreement. The possible reasons of this issue are discussed in the conclusion section of the study. It is possible to state that because of the fact that the narratives are collected in written form, the fright narratives of children do not start with the abstract section . It is probable that the results of the study would have been different if the data were collected orally. As mentioned later in the conclusion, the data collection style of this study may have caused the absence of the section observed in both analyses.

5. Sociolinguistic Analysis of Data

Before explaining the results of the comparisons between Beytepe and Şentepe Primary Schools we will analyze a representative example of a personal experience narrative from Beytepe Primary School. It is necessary to mention the fact that the representative Turkish version of the fright narrative has many spelling mistakes because all the narratives of children are taken as they are written on the paper without any correction. The following example is a representative example:

Spor salonunun arkasındaki yazılar (The graffiti on the walls of the sports hall)

<p>Abstract Birgün Ayhan, Mertcan, Ege ve ben spor salonunun arkasında korkunç yazılar olduğunu duyduk. Düşündük taşındık.</p>	<p>Abstract One day, Ayhan, Mertcan, Ege and I heard that there were fearful graffiti written on the walls of the sports hall. We thought about this.</p>
<p>Orientation Oraya gitmeye karar verdik. Aslında birazda korkuyorduk. Sonra cesaretimizi toplayıp kapıdan içeri girdik. Gerçekte duyduklarımız doğruydu. Mertcan şöyle söyledi: Bence buradan gidelim arkadaşlar! Ama biz hiç aldırış etmeden yürümeye devam ettik. Yazıların bazıları küfürdü. Onlara bakmadık. Korkunç yazılara baktık. Yazılar şöyleydi: "Ceza, nefret". "Çelik tabut açıldı, ölümlüler kaçsın". "Ölüler canlandı". Dün Kerem cinayette öldürüldü. Kaç canını seven kaçsın gibi yazılardı.</p>	<p>Orientation We made up our mind and decided to go there. In fact we were a bit afraid. Then we plucked up courage and entered inside. The things we had heard were really true. Mertcan said: "I think we should go dude! But we kept on walking in spite of his warning. Some of them included swear words. We did not look at them. We looked at the (fearful?) ones. They were like this: "Punishment, hatred". The Steel coffin is opened. Let the mortals escape. The dead are revived. Kerem was murdered yesterday. "Run, if you want to live, run away."</p>

Evaluation Çok korkmuştuk.Aaaaaaa diye çılgık atıp kaçtık.	Evaluation We were very scared. We screamed and escaped.
Complicating Action Sonra Mertcan birkere sarsıldı. Mertcan'a niye sarsıldığını sorduk. Mertcan da: "Ne sarsılması? Ben sarsıldığımı falan hatırlamıyorum, dedi. Mertcan'ı ruhun yönlendirmesi söz konusuydu. Yazıların en korkuncu şöyle: "2.11.2004'da Salı günü bir çocuk yanacak. Kocaman kan izleri vardı. Murat 131 model arabanın ön şoför koltuğundaki adamın yüzünün yarısı kanlıydı. Ağaç rüzgar olmadığı taktirde sallandı.Kapıdan kaçınca ileride durup arkama baktım. Bir odun parçası havada durdu. Hemde kimse tutmuyordu. Aradan çok zaman geçti. Yine oraya gittik. Çelik tabutun üstünde vampir görünümlü bir palyaço gördük.	Complicating Action Later Mertcan was shaking. We asked Mertcan why he was shaking. "What? I don't remember being shaken," he said. It was the spirit directing him. The most scary of the graffiti was like this: "A child will burn on Tuesday, 02.11.2007. There were huge blood stains. Half of the face of the man sitting in the front seat of the car, Murat 131, was covered with blood. The tree was swaying although there was no storm. After escaping through the door I turned and looked back. A piece of wood was standing in the air. Nobody was holding it. A long time passed. We went there again. We saw a clown resembling a vampire on the steel coffin.
Result Bunun da gizemini çözdük.	Result We worked out the mystery of this, too.
Coda Bir daha oraya hiç gitmedik.	Coda We never went there again.

As can be observed from the sample narrative, the six categories of a fully formed narrative can be observed in this narrative. It begins with an abstract section and this section is a brief summary of the whole narrative (Labov 1972:370). Then the narrative proceeds with an orientation section that identifies the time, place and people involved in the event and the situation (Labov 1972:364). Then there is the evaluation part of the narrative that forms the emotional side of the narrative. This part demonstrates why the narrative was told in a particular way and what the narrator's aim is in doing so (Labov 1972:366). The narrator can present this part of the narrative anywhere. In other words, this part is an optional element in a narrative. After the evaluation section comes the complicating action section which is obligatory for the formation of narrative. This part contains the climax or high point of the narrative (Labov 1972:370). After the complicating action part, the result part that answers the question 'What finally happened?'. In this section the tension decreases suddenly (Labov 1972:370). Finally, at the end, the coda section is found marking the end of the narrative.

In order to illustrate the comparison of Beytepe and Şentepe Primary Schools narratives it is necessary to consider the frequency and number of Abstract, Orientation, Complicating Action, Evaluation, Result and coda sections employed by the students of the two schools.

(i) Abstract

Some examples of abstract section are as follows:

- 1) Ben en çok yüzüklerin efendisinden korkarım.
I am most scared of lord of the Rings.
- 2) Benim en çok korktuğum an şu andır.
The most scary time for me is now.
- 3) Benim korktuğum birçok olay vardır. En çok korktuğum olay annem olmuştı.
I am scared of many things. The most scary even for me was my mother's event.
- 4) Ben küçükken hep canavarlar olduğunu sanırdım.
In my childhood, I used to believe that there were monsters.

The following table displays the frequency and number of occurrences of Abstract sections employed at Beytepe and Şentepe Primary schools:

Table 1: Frequency and number of occurrences of Abstract sections employed in Beytepe and Şentepe Primary Schools

		ABSTRACT			
		Non-existent	Existent	Total	
School of the Student	BEYTEPE PRIMARY SCHOOL	Count	92	8	100
		Percentage	92,0%	8,0%	100,0%
	ŞENTEPE PRIMARY SCHOOL	Count	96	4	100
			96,0%	4,0%	100,0%
Total		Count	188	12	200
		Percentage	94,0%	6,0%	100,0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1,418(b)	1	,234		

As observed from the table, 8% of the subjects use abstract section in HPE group while 4% of the population use this section in LP group. This finding means that 92% of the population do not employ abstract section in HPE group while this rate is 96% in LPE group. As a result abstract section does exist at the same rate in both groups.

(ii) Orientation

Some related examples concerning the use of orientation section in the sample are as follows:

5) Ben küçükken Ocak ayında kayboldum.

When I was a child, I was lost in January.

6) Kuzenlerim bizde kalacaktı ve yarın evlerine gideceklerdi.

My cousins were supposed to stay in our house and go back to their house the following day.

The following table displays the frequency and number of occurrences of Orientation sections employed at Beytepe and Şentepe Primary schools:

Table 2 : Frequency and number of occurrences of Orientation sections employed in Beytepe and Şentepe Primary Schools

		ORIENTATION			Total
		Non-existent	Existent		
School of the student	BEYTEPE PRIMARY SCHOOL	Count	5	95	100
		Percentage	5,0%	95,0%	100,0%
	ŞENTEPE PRIMARY SCHOOL	Count	6	94	100
			6,0%	94,0%	100,0%
Total		Count	11	189	200
		Percentage	5,5%	94,5%	100,0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	,096(b)	1	,756		

Table 2 indicates the fact that both Beytepe and Şentepe groups employ similar rate of orientation section. In HPE Group orientation section exists in 95% of the population while in LPE group it exists in 94% of the population. There is no statistical difference between the two numbers ($p>0.05$). In both groups orientation section is used while expressing their narratives.

(iii) Complicating Action

Some examples of the complicating action are as follows:

7) Ben oraya kapaklandım. Sonra bisiklet üstüme düřtü. Diz kapađım kanamaya başladı.

I fell down there. Then the bicycle fell upon me. My knee started to bleed.

8) Teyzem bayıldı. Annemle, babam bayıldıđımı duyunca çok korktular.

My aunt fainted. When my mother and father heard that my aunt fainted they were very worried.

The following table displays the frequency and number of occurrences of Complicating Action sections employed at Beytepe and Şentepe Primary schools:

Table 3: Frequency and number of occurrences of Complicating Action sections employed in Beytepe and Şentepe Primary Schools

		COMPLICATING ACTION		Total	
		Non-existent	Existent		
School of the student	Beytepe PRIMARY SCHOOL	Count	3	97	100
		Percentage	3,0%	97,0%	100,0%
	Şentepe PRIMARY SCHOOL	Count	6	94	100
		Percentage	6,0%	94,0%	100,0%
Total	Count	9	191	200	
	Percentage	4,5%	95,5%	100,0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1,047(b)	1	,306		
Fisher's Exact Test				,498	,249

Table 3 indicates that according to the employment of complicating action, there is no statistical difference in Beytepe and Şentepe Primary Schools ($p>0.005$). The children at Beytepe primary school (97%) and Şentepe primary school (94%) used complicating action part in expressing their fright narratives. This finding shows us that a narrative without complicating action part can not occur.

(iv) Resolution

Some related examples concerning the use of resolution part in the sample are as follows:

9) Ve lağım faresi öldü.

And the rat died.

10) Ondan sonra o anda hırsız yakalandı.

Then, at that moment, the burglar was caught.

11) Annem ve babam beni ve arkadaşımı ararken bizi buldular.

My father and mother found us when they were looking for me and my friend.

12) Kedi fareyi yakalayıp yedi.

The cat caught the mouse and ate it.

The following table displays the frequency and number of occurrences of the Resolution sections employed at Beytepe and Şentepe Primary schools:

Table 4: Frequency and number of occurrences of Resolution sections employed in Beytepe and Şentepe Primary Schools

		RESOLUTION		Total	
		Non-Existent	Existent		
School of the student	BEYTEPE PRIMARY SCHOOL	Count	19	81	100
		Percentage	19,0%	81,0%	100,0%
	ŞENTEPE PRIMARY SCHOOL	Count	40	60	100
		Percentage	40,0%	60,0%	100,0%
Total		Count	59	141	200
		Percentage	29,5%	70,5%	100,0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	10,602(b)	1	,001		

In Table 4 the use of resolution section differs significantly in Beytepe and Şentepe

Primary schools ($p < 0.01$). In Beytepe Primary school %81 of the population employs result part while this rate is %60 in Şentepe Primary school. This finding means that the children in Beytepe Primary school indicate the end of the fright narratives more than the children in Şentepe Primary school, i.e. the children in Şentepe Primary school do not end their narratives.

(v) Coda

Some examples of the coda section are as follows:

13) Artık içimde hiç korku yoktu.

Now there is no fear in me.

14) Ve ben böylece başımdan geçen bir olayı anlatmaya çalıştım. Dinlediğiniz veya okuduğunuz için teşekkür ederim.

I tried to tell an event that I have confronted. I thank to you for listening or reading it.

15) Bu yüzden bu olayı hiç unutamadım.

Because of this I have never forgotten this event.

16) Bir dahada köpeklere karşı dikkatli olmayı öğrendim.

I learned being sensitive towards dogs afterwards.

The following table displays the frequency and number of occurrences of Coda sections employed at Beytepe and Şentepe Primary schools:

Table 5 : Frequency and number of occurrences of Coda sections employed in Beytepe and Şentepe Primary Schools

		CODA		Total	
		Non-existent	Existent		
School of the student	BEYTEPE PRIMARY SCHOOL	Count	60	40	100
		Percentage	60,0%	40,0%	100,0%
	ŞENTEPE PRIMARY SCHOOL	Count	74	26	100
			74,0%	26,0%	100,0%
Total		Count	134	66	200
		Percentage	67,0%	33,0%	100,0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4,432(b)	1	,035		

Table 5 presents us the significant difference between coda sections employed in Beytepe and Şentepe Primary Schools ($p < 0.05$). The children in Beytepe primary school employ %40 of coda section while the children in Şentepe primary school employ %26. This finding shows that Beytepe primary school children use coda section more significantly than Şentepe Primary school children. These children prefer ending their narratives by establishing a relation with the present.

(vi) Evaluation

Some related examples concerning the use of evaluation part in the sample are as follows:

17) Çok heyecanlıydım.

I was very excited.

18) Ödüm patladı.

I was scared out of my wits.

19) Elimin öyle kalacağından yada parmaklarımı keseceklerinden çok korktum.

I was very worried that my hand would remain like that or they might cut my fingers.

The following table displays the frequency and number of occurrences of Evaluation sections employed at Beytepe and Şentepe Primary schools:

Table 6: Frequency and number of occurrences Evaluation sections employed in Beytepe and Şentepe Primary Schools

			EVALUATION		Total
			Non-existent	Existent	
School of the student	Beytepe PRIMARY SCHOOL	Count	19	81	100
		Percentage	19,0%	81,0%	100,0%
	Şentepe PRIMARY SCHOOL	Count	16	84	100
		Percentage	16,0%	84,0%	100,0%
Total		Count	35	165	200
		Percentage	17,5%	82,5%	100,0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	,312(b)	1	,577		

Table 6 shows that subjects at both Beytepe (81%) and řentepe Primary schools (84%) evaluate their fright narratives at relatively the same rate because the number of occurrences of evaluation use is not statistically significant in the two groups ($p>0.05$).

6. Overall Discussion and Conclusion

Table 7: Overall discussion of Labov's story structure

Labov's story structure parts	HPE Group	LPE Group
Result	81%	60%
Coda	40%	26%
Abstract	8%	4 %
Orientation	95%	94%
Complicating Action	97%	94%
Evaluation	81%	84%

According to table 7, there is a statistically significant difference in HPE Group's employment of Labov's story structure elements. Two items in Labov's story structure have a significant difference when the two groups are compared. These are: Result (HPE Group:81%, LPE Group:60%) and Coda (HPE Group:40%, LPE Group:26%). The infrequent use of result and coda section in LPE group demonstrates the fact that these children do not end their narratives with result and coda parts. Therefore, HPE Group children's narratives include more complete and elaborated sentences than LPE Group children's narratives. As a result, HPE group children employ more developed narratives in terms of Labovian categories.

In terms of Labovian analysis, out of six Macro elements four of them have statistically insignificant rates in both HPE Group and LPE group. These elements are Abstract (HPE Group:8% LPE Group:4%), Orientation (HPE Group:95% LPE Group:94%), Complicating Action (HPE Group:97% LPE Group:94% and Evaluation (HPE Group:81% LPE Group:84%). This finding suggests that both of the groups use Labov's story structure elements at the same rate. Lack of Abstract in fright narratives can be due to two reasons. The first can be the difference between oral and written language. In other words, in written language it is not common to start writing with expressions such as 'Look! what am I going to tell you', 'Do you know what happened yesterday?'. In a study carried out by Özyıldırım (2009) Turkish University students'

Personal Experience Narratives are compared in both oral and written forms. In the study Özyıldırım (2009) found that the frequency of abstract and coda sections of Personal Experience narratives were significantly higher in written narratives than oral narratives. This fact demonstrates the well organized nature of written narratives. On the contrary according to the results of our study children and adult narratives differ to a great extent in narrative organization. While adults try to organize their narratives, children do not use abstract section. In other words, they start their narratives immediately by referring to the setting, event and participants. The second reason for this lack can be explained with the fact that the subject of the narrative is determined and given to the students before the experiment. Thus, we must bear in mind that probably rather than the educational status of high and low parental education group it is the research design of this study that may have caused the absence of abstract sections in both groups in the study.

In terms of Labovian sociolinguistic analysis there are differences between high parental education group and low parental education group. The children of the high parental education group are exposed to the standard language. It is possible that because of this they are more advantageous than those of the low parental education group. However, the children in Şentepe Primary School have difficulty in writing about their frightening experiences because they are not familiar with the elaborated code. In this study it is assumed that Şentepe Primary School children have access to both restricted code and elaborated code. However, for Şentepe group writing is not an easy skill in contrast to the Beytepe group. Consequently, this study indicates that Şentepe group children's language can not be considered inadequate or deficient but due to the formality of the writing activity this group had difficulty in expressing their fright narratives. Thus, the differences found between the two social groups are related to the fact that while Beytepe Primary school has the advantage of using standard language, Şentepe Primary school does not. However, this does not lead to the conclusion that students of Şentepe Primary School are inferior or deficient but that limited access to writing in standard form can be a disadvantage.

In conclusion it can be said that parental education is an important factor on the linguistic choices of the 9- to-10- year-old children's personal experience narrative writing.

Ek: Written questionnaire delivered to the parents (Ailelere verilen anket)**ANKET****1. ocuęunuza yakınlıęınız:**

- Anne Baba Dięer (belirtiniz)

2. ocuęunuzun adı ve soyadı:

3. Cinsiyeti: Kız Erkek

4. Doęum Tarihi:

5. Mesleęiniz:

6. Eřinizin Mesleęi:

7. Eęitim durumunuz:

- Hi eęitim almadım.
 İlkokul mezunuyum.
 Lise mezunuyum.
 Yksekokul/niversite mezunuyum
 Yksek Lisans ve doktora mezunuyum.

8. Eęer niversite mezunu iseniz eęitimini aldıęınız alanı belirtiniz

9. Eřinizin Eęitim durumu:

- Hi eęitim almadı.
 İlkokul mezunuyum.
 Lise mezunuyum.
 Yksekokul/niversite mezunuyum
 Yksek Lisans ve doktora mezunuyum.

10. Eęer eřiniz niversite mezunu ise eęitimini aldıęı alanı belirtiniz.

11. ocuęunuzun kardeři var mı?

- Evet Hayır

12. Kardeř sayısı ka?

- a)1 b)2 c) 3 d) 4 ve st

13. ocuęunuzun algılama ve konsantrasyonu engelleyici bir rahatsızlıęı var mı?

- Evet Hayır

14. ocuęunuz bořanmıř bir ailenin ocuęu mu?

- Evet Hayır

Notlar

- 1)“A Sociolinguistic Perspective in Narrative Analysis: Socio-Economic and Educational Backgrounds of families as Influential factors in the Development of Child Written Narratives”, 2nd International IDEA Conference:Studies in English. Ankara:Hacettepe Üniversitesi. 2007
- 2)I would like to thank my colleague Research Assistant Emel Kökpınar Kaya for her help in determining the reliability of the study and my husband Tolga Oktay for his support in coding the data and my friends Yrd. Doç. Dr. Elif Ersözölü and Yrd. Doç. Dr. Yeşim Dinçkan for helping me.

References

- Bernstein, B. (1986). *Direction in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication*. Ed. By J. Gumperz and Dell Hymes. New York: Basil Blackwell.
- Feagans, L. (1982). “The development and importance of narratives for school adaptation”, In L. Feagans& D. Farran (Eds.) . *The language of children in poverty*. New York. Academic Press.
- Engel, S. (1995). *The stories children tell: Making sense of the narratives of childhood*. USA:W.H. Freeman and Company.
- Georgakopoulou, A. And D. Goutsos. (1997). *Discourse Analysis*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Johnstone, B. (2001). *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Ed. by. Schiffrin D., Tannen D. and Hamilton H.. Oxford:Blackwell.
- Jones, J. (1999). An Introduction to Language, Society and Power. ‘Language and Class’. London:Routledge.
- Labov, W. (1972). *Language in the inner City*. Philadelphia:University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Leeming, D. A. (1997). “Once Upon a Time”. *Storytelling Encyclopedia*. Marian Sader (Project editor). Arizona:Oryx Press.
- Labov, William and Joshua Waletzky. (1967). “Narrative analysis”, In J. Helm (ed.), *Essays on the verbal and visual arts*. Seattle: University of Washington Press. Pp. 12-44.
- Masahiko, Minami, (1995). ‘Japanese Preschool Children’s Personal Narratives: A Sociolinguistic Study’. www.eric.ed.gov.
- Masahiko, Minami. (2002). *Culture-specific Language styles. The Development of Oral Narrative and Literary. Child Language and Child Development 1*. <http://www.ebrary.com>.
- Nicolopoulou, A. (1997). “World making and identity formation in children’s narrative play-acting.” In B. Cox & C. Lightfoot (Eds.), *Sociogenetic perspectives on internalization*. (pp. 157-187). Mahwah, NJ:Erlbaum.
- Özyıldırım, I. (2009). “Narrative analysis: An analysis of oral and written strategies in personal experience narratives”, *Journal of Pragmatics*, 41. 1209-1222.
- Peterson, C. and McCabe, A. (1991). “Linking children’s connective use and narrative macrostructure.” In McCabe, A. & Peterson, C. *Developing narrative structure*. Hillsdale:Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Renkema, J. (1993). *Discourse Studies*. Amsterdam:John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Riessman, K. (1993). *Narrative Analysis*. London:Sage publications.

- Romaine, S. (2004). "Language and Social Class". *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences*. 8308-8312. editors in chief. Neil J. Smelser and Paul B. Baltes. www.sciencedirect.com
- Shiro, M. (2003). "Genre and evaluation in narrative development." *Journal of Child Language*. 30. 165-195. United Kingdom:Cambridge University Press.
- Thornborrow, J. and J. Coates. (2005)." The sociolinguistics of narrative." Ed. By J. Thornborrow and J. Coates. *Studies in Narrative 6*. Amsterdam:John Benjamins Company.
- Toolan, M. (2001). *Narrative*. London:Routledge.
- Wardhaugh, R. (1990). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge:Basic Blackwell.

Suhan Akıncı Oktay

Öğretim Görevlisi Dr.

Hacettepe Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi İngiliz Dilbilimi Bölümü

suhanoktay@yahoo.com