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ABSTRACT

Mealtime narratives are a site for constructing a community’s social worlds (e.g., Ochs and Taylor 1995). Extending this research direction, I examine mealtime narratives among Kazakh-speaking Kazakhs, an under-researched community and one of the major ethnic groups residing in post-Soviet Kazakhstan.

I draw on Bamberg’s (1997) model of three levels of narrative positioning – positioning in the story world, in the telling world, and in more macro, ideological worlds – to uncover how residents of a Kazakh village community discursively construct their identities in twenty narratives told in audio- and video-recorded mealtime conversations among family members and friends. I integrate this model with Tannen’s (2007) analysis of involvement strategies in discourse (constructed dialogue, details, and repetition), insights regarding conversational sequencing in narrating (e.g., Sacks 1992b), and research on audience participation (e.g., Goodwin 1986).

My analysis focuses on narratives wherein Kazakh narrators depict interactions with out-group members (i.e., members of other ethnic and national groups), with members of their small village community, and with members of their own extended families. First, I show how Kazakh narrators position Russians and Americans as more advanced in terms of technology and financial resources and depict Vietnamese and Russians in more negative terms in narratives about food and family values, constructing their ethnic identities and reflecting the state nation-
building discourse of Kazakhstan. Second, I analyze the narratives about village residents. Narrators show disalignment with dishonest neighbors in the story world that allows them to create alignment with each other in the storytelling world and construct their identities as village neighbors. These narratives, I argue, reinforce the socio-cultural value of justice and equality in Kazakh neighbors’ relationships, which also reflects Kazakh identity. Finally, Kazakh narrators tell stories wherein older family members (parents and grandparents) exert power, and entertaining stories about the youngest family members (grandchildren) to construct their interactional identities as caregivers. These narratives reflect Kazakh family values of respect for the elderly and of grandchildren as a source of joy for older family members. In addition to constructing various aspects of Kazakh identity, across the three kinds of narratives, other identities emerge, including pertaining to gender and age. Relevant strategies to accomplish positioning, and thereby to construct these Kazakhstani narrators’ identities, include complicating action verbs, constructed dialogue, details, repetition, and various forms of internal and external evaluation. This study extends our understanding of narrative positioning while also illuminating the linguistic and social worlds of an under-researched community.
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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction to the study

In the summer of 2015, I flew to Kazakhstan to collect the data for my dissertation in the small town where I grew up. My ambition was to carry out a comparative study of what Tannen (1984/2005) calls “conversational style” in three communities in a highly-Russified part of Kazakhstan: Kazakh-speaking Kazakhs, Russian-speaking Kazakhs, and Russian-speaking Russians. It had been two years since I had started the PhD program in Georgetown University’s Department of Linguistics, and I had become fascinated by the work of my professors exploring cross-cultural communication and miscommunication. However, many surprises were awaiting me as I pursued my goal of exploring conversational style by recording everyday mealtime conversations among members of these groups. The major surprise was an obvious fear among the locals regarding my desire to audio or video-record their daily conversations. I initially did not realize that this simple request (from my academic point of view) to participate in a study that involved audio- and video-recording would evoke associations with undercover spying and interrogation.

Having knocked on the doors of my mother’s neighbors’ homes house and having heard rejection after rejection, I visited the head of the Education Department that was located at the Office of the Town Governor. This Department is responsible for coordinating the town’s school and college system within the district. Thus, I hoped that I could reach the educational units of the town for participant recruitment. He was welcoming (as it turned out he himself had visited the US several times) and invited me to speak about my research project at the meeting of local school principals the next week. I arrived at that meeting with a lot of hope and excitement,
delivered a passionate speech about my project, distributed handouts to collect contact information from interested people, and quietly sat in the back of the conference room waiting for them to fill in the contact form. And, as a sociolinguist in the field, I started taking notes. In five minutes, the same head of the Education Department, loudly and in front of a hundred of school principals, said the following: “Have you already started spying on us?” I couldn’t believe it! While that moment was over three years ago, I still feel the blood rushing to my face when I recall his reaction, and how discouraged I was to pursue any fieldwork for the next two weeks.

My mother, who saw how concerned I was about my research project after that meeting, suggested that we go to the village (or aul in Kazakh) Kasym-Khan, even smaller than the small town. She motivated me to do this by explaining, “It is more interesting to do research about village people: They are more ‘authentic’!” That was a turning point in my fieldwork that shaped the development of my dissertation. The next day, we took an old public bus and a taxi to the village (whose population is about 450) and talked to its mayor, who helped us recruit the first two families who generously participated in my study, helping contribute to the collection of narratives I analyze in this dissertation.

Later the same day, after meeting with the families, I typed up my first field notes that contained my observations of the lifestyle in the village and interactions with the families. When I was entering them into my computer, I recalled my childhood memories associated with the village. Four times per year, my family had sent a sum of money that we called “horse money” to our relatives there. This meant survival for our family in its literal meaning: We were paying for several horses that were in the village herd (under supervision of local shepherds). We would slaughter one horse at the beginning of November so that we would have enough meat for the
next eight months. For the villagers themselves, horses also meant survival: They exchanged horses for other goods (like hay or gas for tractors) that were necessary for survival.

People exchanging goods and services in this matter, particularly around horses, has been a primary means of survival for the entire Kazakh nation for many thousands of years. A horse, with a little care, can grow and provide food for an entire family for a winter with a minimal investment. This precious resource was taken away from Kazakhs, first by the Imperial Russia in the 18th century and then by the Soviet regime in 1930s, which led to the most horrible tragedy of the Kazakh nation: Within two years of the illegal confiscation by the Soviet military troops, more than one million Kazakhs, making up almost one third of the population in that period, died of starvation. The villagers whose narratives I analyze in this dissertation, like my mother and me, are descendants of the survivors.

In addition to the food confiscation, mass repressions of Kazakh people, including Kazakh elites, occurred over the next several years, resulting in enormous intellectual damage to the nation’s development and decades of dismissing the region: It was only important to Moscow in terms of its raw resources, such as wheat and oil. As a result of Soviet policy, there was a lack of not only education for, but also systematic socio-cultural research on, Kazakhs during this period. This kind of research slowly started developing in the post-Soviet period (i.e., post-1995), but it has mostly been conducted in a top-down manner, focusing on major political players and nation-building state policies. This rather limited focus was criticized by major Central Asian researchers in a 2015 special issue of Nationalities Papers that called on scholars to take a two-fold approach to understanding socio-cultural life in this region (e.g., Isaacs & Polesi 2015). The authors rightfully point out that the predominant top-down approach in the
regional research overlooks the agency of everyday people. As an up-and-coming scholar, I aimed to answer this call by drawing on my training in interactional sociolinguistics to study the everyday talk of villagers.

While listening to and logging the content of my over ten hours of recorded conversations amongst residents of the village, an area of special interest emerged for me: Mealtime conversations, and more specifically, the narratives that were told during those gatherings. I felt this was a fruitful and promising research direction, as it could help to fill the gap in current research on the Central Asia region more generally (i.e., the lack of research on the daily lives of individuals), as well as to learn more about Kazakh villagers and their discourse in particular. Kazakh villagers were mistreated and silenced by the Soviet regime; they persisted, cooperatively trading horses and other goods, as well as services; they remain relatively isolated; and their social lives and language use are almost completely unstudied. As Ochs and Shohet (2006) note, mealtimes function “as cultural sites for the socialization of persons into competent and appropriate members of a society,” and, being defined in this way, mealtimes “can be regarded as pregnant arenas for the production of sociality, morality, and local understandings of the world” (35). The idea that mealtimes talk is a context where “local understandings of the world” emerge was very important for me, as I was determined to better understand the discourse, experiences, and identities of everyday Kazakhs. Ochs and Shohet (2006) further add that storytelling is a crucial component of mealtimes because it is a powerful means of socializing less competent participants into becoming knowledgeable and appropriate members of a society. In line with this, Holmes (1998/2005: 110) points out that “stories can provide a window on cultural and social consciousness,” and they “tend to reflect the preoccupations, the
values, beliefs and attitudes of group members.” She suggests that analyzing narratives “can thus provide interesting insights into the cultural and social preoccupations of society members at a particular point in time” (Holmes 1998/2005: 110).

Not only do narratives serve as windows into community members’ social lives, but they are also a major means of identity construction. Schiffrin (1996) explains the capacity of narratives as an identity construction mechanism; she specifies that “telling a story allows us to create a ‘story world’ in which we can represent ourselves against a backdrop of cultural expectations about a typical course of action; our identities as social beings emerge as we construct our own individual experiences as a way to position ourselves in relation to social and cultural expectations” (168). Thus, as observed by Bamberg and Georgakopoulou (2008), Tannen (2008), and others, narrators construct their diverse identities by positioning themselves vis-à-vis larger social expectations and ideological discourses as they narrate.

In addition, the process of narrating varies across cultural contexts. For instance, Blum-Kulka (1993) shows how narrating during mealtimes differed between the American Jewish and Israeli Jewish families whose discourse she studied. She reveals that the children in the American families were given more authority to present stories, while the Israeli children tended to share telling with the adults. Having exemplified how narrative structure may differ within four cultural groups (Athabaskan, Chinese, Javanese, and Arabic), Scollon (2010) explicitly calls for more research of narrative discourse in different cultural communities. At the same time, research by scholars such as Labov (1963) and Schilling (1997, 2006) shows the importance of carrying out sociolinguistic research in small and isolated communities (such as Ocracoke Island in North Carolina and Smith Island in Maryland), including how language is used to construct
local identities. These studies linking narrative and culture, and demonstrating value in studying small communities, further motivate my study of narratives told during Kazakh villagers’ mealtimes.

To summarize, the association of recording conversational interaction with spying (a holdover from Soviet times) unexpectedly shaped the direction of my dissertation, motivating me to transform my study of Kazakh conversational styles to a study of narrative discourse and identity construction among members of a Kazakh-speaking village community who have been largely overlooked, underestimated, and silenced. I am truly honored to have had the opportunity to collect and analyze the narratives of these Kazakh village residents, who are not only Kazakh family members, neighbors, and friends, but also survivors and preservers of cultural heritage.

1.2 The study

In this study (under IRB number 2015-0117), I examine how Kazakh narrators construct their identity in narratives that naturally occur in daily conversations among friends and families in a small village in northern Kazakhstan. The data collection site was chosen due to its unique situation: This is a Kazakh-speaking community that consists of ethnic Kazakh residents, but it is located in a very Russified area of Kazakhstan. As mentioned, my initial efforts at collecting data in a town in the area were unsuccessful, so I turned to a very small village in the same regions. I expected that these local residents might hold a strong Kazakh identity that allowed them to preserve the Kazakh language and cultural heritage, despite being geographically proximate to Russia and being highly Russified. This Russification is also important to note as there are instances of code-switching (i.e., switching between Kazakh and Russian) in the narratives.
selected for my analysis. However, the residents are still fluent in Kazakh and use it as the major means of communication. I believe that by analyzing the narrative discourse and identity construction in this community (who seem to hold a strong Kazakh identity), we can receive important insights about their language use and social worlds. In other words, a study of this community provides an opportunity to explore Kazakh narrative discourse, which is rarely studied, as well as providing an opportunity to better understand how ethnic and other identities are discursively constructed by means of narratives.

Specifically, I investigate how construction of different types of identity (e.g., ethnic Kazakh, neighbor, caregiver, woman, elderly person) is accomplished in twenty video-recorded narratives that revolve around out-group and in-group relationships. The out-group narratives feature Kazakhs and representatives of other ethnic groups such as Russians, Americans, Koreans, and Vietnamese as main characters. The in-group narratives focus on relationships among the village neighbors, and narratives where the primary characters are extended family members. They cover a range of topics and experiences. In this way, I explore not only how Kazakh narrators construct their own identities vis-à-vis the identities of others, but also how they do so in multiple social realms, and in terms of multiple themes, including finances and economics, food, family values, relationships among neighbors, gossip about neighbors, family hierarchy, and couples’ relationships.

To analyze this set of narratives, I follow Bamberg’s (1997) original approach to narrative analysis along with extensions of it made by Bamberg and Georgakopoulou (2008) and De Fina (2008, 2013). Bamberg (1997) suggests analyzing narratives in terms of levels or worlds. Thus, narratives themselves can be understood as the story world or Level 1. The
immediate interactional context or discourse activity in which a narrative occurs, can be understood as the *storytelling world* or Level 2. Finally, the wider socio-historical context, in which the process of telling the narrative is taken place, can be understood as a *global world* or Level 3. The analysis at all three levels includes discourse analysis of relationships and positions. Thus, at Level 1, I discursively analyze how the characters are positioned vis-a-vis each other in the story world. Similarly, I connect the characters’ positioning in the story world to how the interactants are positioned at Level 2. Next, the findings of analysis of Level 1 and 2 are further related to current circulating ideological discourses that constitute the analysis of the *global level* or Level 3.

In addition, at Level 1 or in the story world, I also draw on Tannen’s (1989/2007) theorizing on involvement strategies (specifically, repetition, constructed dialogue, and details), Schiffrin’s (1996) analysis of self-presentation of identity, and Labov and Waletzky’s (1967; Labov 1972) foundational work on narrative clauses. I integrate Sacks’ (1992b) concept of narrative sequence, Jefferson’s (1978) concepts of the local occasioning of narratives, and Goodwin’s (1984, 1986) work on audience participation, along with Tannen’s (1989/2007) theorizing, to illuminate the processes in the storytelling world, or Level 2. Finally, I also incorporate socio-historical studies of Kazakhstan (e.g., Karibayeva and Kunanbayeva 2015, 2016, 2017) to situate the findings of Level 1 and 2 in bigger cultural contexts, or Level 3.

Along with the narrative discourse analysis toolkit, when it is pertinent, I draw on major concepts from interactional sociolinguistics that explain how shared meanings are constructed in interaction. Particularly, such concepts as *contextualization cues* and *contextualization conventions* as a part of socio-cultural knowledge (as outlined by Gumperz 1977/1982, 1992),
conversational style (Tannen 1984/2005), frame (Bateson 1972; Goffman 1974, 1981; Tannen & Wallat 1987/1993), and footing (Goffman 1981) are employed to examine and better understand how narratives are signaled, interpreted, and function in immediate conversational and macro sociocultural contexts.

Applying this framework to three sets of narratives (i.e., Kazakhs and other ethnic groups, Kazakhs as neighbors, and relationships in Kazakh families) yields the following insights: In general, the Kazakh narrators discursively construct their identities as Kazakhs through positioning characters in the story world, and creating alignment or disalignment with them, which further serves as the basis for (dis)alignment with the audience in the storytelling world. Positioning at these two levels allows the Kazakh narrators take a stand in relation to larger ideological discourses and socio-cultural values (or answer the question “Who am I?” in Bamberg’s words). Specifically, broader ideological discourses include current nation-building ideologies that aim to revive the Kazakh cultural heritage, and state ideologies of orienting towards the West as the center of innovation and investment along with a view of Russia as the center of authority in the post-Soviet region. The socio-cultural values and beliefs include respect for elderly and age, value of traditional family roles, and belief in the sweetness of raising grandchildren (as compared to children). In indexing these beliefs and ideologies, the Kazakh narrators portray themselves as Kazakhs, good neighbors, supportive adult children, and a range of other identities that make up their everyday lives.
1.3 Preview of the chapters

Chapter Two provides the theoretical background to my study. It includes an overview of interactional sociolinguistics (the concepts of contextualization cues, frame, and conversational styles) and narrative discourse analysis (with a focus on narrative structure, functions, and connection between narrative and culture), also introducing relevant concepts from Conversation Analysis. In Chapter Three, I describe my data and methods in detail. Chapters Four, Five, and Six present my analyses of the narratives I collected. In Chapter Four, I examine narratives that involve Kazakhs and out-group members (people from other ethnic/national backgrounds) and that revolve around the themes of economic development and financial resources, as well as themes of food and family. I show how Kazakh narrators construct their ethnic identities through positioning Russian and American characters as more advanced in terms of economic and financial resources in the story worlds. The events in the story world effectively support the narrators’ claims in the storytelling world, while also reflecting larger current ideological discourses of Russia’s and the West’s leading roles in the Central Asian region and world. In contrast, in the stories about food and family values, the narrators construct their ethnic identities by positioning the Kazakh characters as morally positive; these stories receive endorsement from the audience by way of alignment construction, and the themes and identities created mirror current nation-building discourses that value Kazakh traditions. Collectively, the everyday narratives I analyze in this chapter demonstrate how Kazakh identities are constructed in relation to other ethnic identities, and how narrators (re)construct larger ideologies about what it means to be Kazakh.
Chapter Five focuses on relationships among village neighbors. The two Kazakh narrators, Hostess Maira and Neighbor Arystan, construct their identities as neighbors by highlighting the value of justice and equality in the stories they exchange with one another. The narrators construct story worlds in which they (as characters) disalign with their neighbors who act immorally (e.g., by stealing a personal belonging,). And this positioning of the “bad” neighbors, as well as the narrators as good neighbors, is well received in the storytelling world. This allows the two neighbors to create alignment with each other by disaligning with other neighbors and highlighting the value of justice.

In Chapter Six, I analyze how four Kazakh narrators (three women and one man, all elderly) construct their identities as care-givers through telling narratives that revolve around an even more private context: family relationships. In these family-oriented stories, the Kazakh characters in the story world – and the teller and audience in the telling world – reflect the Kazakh cultural value of respect for age. Thus, the characters of older family members (i.e., parents) are foregrounded via use of constructed dialogue and action verbs. However, the tendency is different in the narrative about the grandchildren: It is the youngest family members who are voiced to create a playful frame that seems to echo the broader Kazakh belief that raising grandchildren is a more pleasant process than raising one’s own children. In addition, this chapter offers insight into socio-cultural expectations for a Kazakh’s wife: loyalty and dedication.

In Chapter Seven, I conclude by summarizing and discussing the main findings of this study and how they extend our understanding of positioning, narrative, and identity construction in mealtime interactions, with a special focus on the Kazakh village context. I discuss the overall
findings as they relate to positioning at the three levels in narratives (i.e., the story world, storytelling word, and socio-cultural world), as well as other relevant concepts that shape the analysis, notably narrative sequence, audience participation, and identity construction. Then, I discuss how this study illuminates the links between positioning in narratives and the construction of identities, and especially ethnic identities. I suggest how the theoretical framework of this study, which involves integrating concepts from narrative positioning, interactional sociolinguistics, and Conversation Analysis can be employed in illuminating identity construction in different ethnic communities. Finally, I suggest possible future research directions.

This study contributes to existing knowledge about narrative discourse by combining concepts from narrative and discourse analysis to demonstrate how linguistic strategies enable tellers to create their diverse identities during everyday mealtime conversations. It also provides new insights into Kazakh narratives told by members of a rural and isolated community, which has been, to my knowledge, unstudied. In revealing how diverse types of identities (i.e., ethnic, neighbor, caregiver, family member) are constructed by drawing on existing bigger ideological discourse and socio-cultural values, the dissertation also contributes to our understanding of narrative positioning at different levels.
CHAPTER TWO: THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

In this chapter, I will review the two major research approaches I will draw on, interactional sociolinguistics and narrative discourse analysis (including insights from Conversation Analysis), focusing on selected concepts within these research fields.

2.1 Interactional sociolinguistics

In this section, I describe interactional sociolinguistics as a research approach and review such fundamental concepts as contextualization cues and contextualization conventions (Gumperz 1977/1982), conversational style (Tannen 1984/2005), and frame and footing (Goffman 1974, 1981; Tannen & Wallat 1987/1993) as means to explore how narratives-in-interaction emerge, evolve, and function. These concepts are important to my study because when narrating is what is taking place, or the frame of the interaction, it needs to be signaled and maintained through the use of contextualization cues. In addition, the notions of footing and contextualization cues are essential in understanding how narrator and audience may accomplish positioning vis-à-vis one other. Since I am focusing on a specific cultural group, the concept of conversational styles is relevant in detecting possible cultural patterns in the narrating process.

*Interactional sociolinguistics* (IS) is an interdisciplinary type of inquiry incorporating fundamentals of linguistics, anthropology and sociology. This research approach enables linguists to examine diverse relations between language and social processes such as identity construction, creating solidarity, and negotiating meaning, as well as context (Gordon 2011; Schiffrin 1994). It stems from John Gumperz’s (1977/1982, 1982/2005, 1992) foundational work on interethnic communication with a focus on how speakers use *contextualization cues* (verbal
and nonverbal cues such lexical items, pitch, volume, and so on) to signal and infer what activity is going on. His work points to the importance of sharing expectations or contextualization conventions regarding contextualization cues in order to engage successfully in communication. Thus, Gumperz (1992) points out that “contextualization cues do not function as isolated signs; they co-occur with, are mapped onto or are paradigmatically tied to, lexical signs. In other words, we can speak of systems of contextualization conventions in terms of which individual cues are related” (51). An illustration of this point (how contextualization conventions may vary across cultural groups) is his foundational study of interactions between food servers of South East Asian background who pronounced the word ‘gravy’ with a flat intonational contour and their native English clients at Heathrow airport, who had different expectations for intonation use, resulting in the servers being perceived of as rude. Thus, difference in the use of stress and rhythm can lead to miscommunication when expectations are not shared (Gumperz 1992). These ideas contribute to my study of narratives because how the narrator signals the activity of narrating and how the audience show its participation can be accomplished through contextualization cues that may be culturally specific. In addition, both parties need to possess the shared system of contextualization conventions to appropriately interpret the signals.

Tannen (1984/2005) extends this idea by showing how differences in what she calls conversational style (i.e., a certain way of speaking that can be distinguished in terms of speech pace, voice pitch, listening behaviors, etc.) can lead to miscommunication, whereas shared styles often result in conversational success. While her main focus is conversational style differences between Americans raised in different parts of the country (New York City and California), and she demonstrates how these manifest in an audio-recorded Thanksgiving dinner, the concept of
style is applicable to all speakers. Tannen found that miscommunication can be caused by such differences in conversational style as preferred topics, uses of silence and overlapping talk, and manner of questioning, as well as variation in narrative strategies. Thus, for instance, if and how often the participants can overlap each other is influenced by one’s (sub)-culture and can be the reason for miscommunication (for example, with one speaker but not the other interpreting simultaneous talk as rude). These differences are mostly motivated by the major norms and values of a certain community. They also help explain what Tannen (1993) calls the *relativity of linguistic strategies*: A strategy like simultaneous talk can be a move for power (to seize a turn at talk) or a move for solidarity (to show engaged listenership), meaning it is ambiguous. It can also mean both at once, meaning the strategy is polysemous. Tannen additionally uncovers differences in narration based on style, which I explain in a later section.

Because narrating can be considered what Gumperz (1977/1982) calls a speech activity, there is a need for interlocutors to signal or frame narrating as a speech activity that is different from typical back-and-forth conversation. Therefore, the concept of *frame* can help us better understand how different contextualization cues can be used to specifically show that storytelling is going on: Contextualization cues serve to indicate frames. In addition, frame shifts can happen within the narrating process, such as teasing or heckling (Goodwin 1996), which lends insight into how audience members participate and shape the outcomes of narrating. In this sense, audience participation can also shed light on what aspects of narrating (especially postionings) may be salient to participants from a particular cultural group.

As mentioned, Gumperz’s work incorporates the concept of speech activity, which is closely related to Bateson’s (1972) theorizing on *frame*. Bateson defines *frame* as a set of
interactive (meta)messages that interlocutors use to signal to each other how to interpret what they are doing, such as if an interactional moment is play or dispute. Later, Tannen and Wallat (1987/1993) extend this research and bring it into the field of linguistics by connecting the concept of frame with the concept of schema and showing how these two interact in a video-recorded pediatric encounter involving a child, a pediatrician, and the child’s mother. The authors define frame, or interactive frame, as “what is going on in the interaction, without which no utterance (or movement or gesture) could be interpreted” (Tannen & Wallat 1987:206). They use knowledge schema to refer to “participants’ expectations about people, objects, events, and settings in the world, as distinguished from alignment being negotiated in a particular interaction” (1987:206). Based on these, Tannen and Wallat show “a particular relationship between interactive frames and knowledge schemas by which a mismatch in schemas triggers a shifting of frames” (1987:207).

Storytelling, like the medical encounter examined by Tannen and Wallat (1987/1993), is not a static activity; it may involve shifts in the narrator’s and the audience’s participation in the process of storytelling. Together, these significantly shape the process of narrating and interpretation of a story. To better understand this relation, there is a need to review another concept used in interactional sociolinguistics: footing. Footing is a crucial concept introduced by Goffman (1981). He defines it as “the alignment we take up to ourselves and the others present as expressed in the way we manage the production or reception of an utterance” (Goffman 1981:128). In other words, as participants negotiate frames, they also adjust footings. Footing can shift over the course of conversation as the speakers change their alignments with each other and to what is said.
To fully understand these shifts, it is necessary to understand what Goffman calls the participation framework, which identifies different kinds of participants and explicates their roles in interaction. Hearers may be ratified, i.e., they have an official status in the interaction, or they may be unratified, i.e., they are present in the interaction but do not hold that official status. Ratified participants can be addressed or unaddressed. The concept of participation framework has been successfully employed in several studies on narration by illustrating the existence of gradation among story recipients (e.g., principal, knowing or unknowing ones) as well as changes in participation roles over the course of storytelling that directly impact the interpretation of the story (e.g., Goodwin 1986).

Regarding the speaker role (production format), Goffman (1981) articulates three different roles within it: principal, author, and animator. The principal is the person “whose position is established by the words that are spoken” (144); the author is the person who actually composes the message for further animation by themselves or someone else; and the animator is the person who actually physically produces an utterance. It should be added that speakers may execute three roles simultaneously, but they do not need to do so. A commonly recognized example is that a politician performs a speech (i.e., he is animator) that has been written by his team (which is the author) to represent the major voice of their party (i.e., the principal). Therefore, this concept is particularly helpful for analyzing narratives as it helps to reveal how narrators can distance themselves from certain claims (being just an animator) through incorporating reported speech, or what Tannen (1989/2007) calls constructed dialogue, into their stories. In other words, narrators can attribute the principal role to a character in the story, instead of to themselves.
The work of Goodwin (1996) is of particular relevance to this research project as she builds on Goffman’s (1981) work to examine what she terms shifting frames or frame transformation and relates these to shifting in stance or footing within storytelling processes. In other words, there can be teasing or heckling within the storytelling frame that is managed by the teller and main story recipient. In Goodwin’s study, one participant, Fran, was trying to tell a story from her recent field trip and described a big table in the mansion that she visited. However, the other participants began what Goffman (1981) calls byplay through making humorous comments regarding the table size. Thus, within the storytelling frame there were shifts in footing and stances as the story recipients were issuing additional readings of the narrative told by Fran.

Another relevant concept for my study that has been explored in interactional sociolinguistics is key. Goffman (1974) introduces the concept of keying which he describes as the process of transforming one activity which is already functioning in one frame into something quite different. Thus, the change from play into play fighting can be an example of keying. Tannen (2006:601) further extends this research by showing connection between reframing, which is “a change in what the discussion is about” and rekeying which is “a change in the tone or tenor of an interaction.” Based on her analysis of three examples drawn from an audio-recorded argument between members of a couple, Tannen (2006) shows that resolution of the conflict was achieved via “reframing in a humorous key” (597), which helps create solidarity among members of the couple and reinforce family identities. Storytelling can also be rekeyed, such as when a story that was serious is transformed into play (e.g., Goodwin 1996).
Summary. The overview of major concepts used in interactional sociolinguistics suggests that it provides essential theoretical concepts for the analysis of storytelling in everyday conversations. First, contextualization cues are used by narrators to indicate how what they say should be interpreted, and uses and interpretations of these serve as reflections (and iterations) of cultural norms within a community. Thus, this concept can help in understanding how narratives may be signaled and presented, meaning it is linked to keying and framing. Second, the notions of frame and footing can help explain shifts that may occur within a storytelling frame, including as related to audience participation and how a diversity of voices can be represented in a story world. It also helps us understand how a story may contribute to a more global frame within a certain conversation, such as when a story is used to exemplify the weaknesses and strengths of the Kazakh ethnic group in a conversation that is framed as a data collection opportunity for a research study about Kazakh culture.

2.2 Narrative discourse approach

In this section, I will briefly review key research studies within narrative analysis, specifically those focusing on how the structure of narrative can be defined within the three major approaches that I draw on in my analysis (Labovian, Conversation Analysis, and small stories), and describing what researchers have found regarding the functions of narratives in interaction, in particular pertaining to argumentation, (dis)alignment creation, and identity construction. I also highlight what these approaches indicate about variation in narrating across cultures, which is relevant to my study because I focus on an under-studied cultural group of Kazakh-speaking Kazakhs residing in a small village.
2.2.1 Narrative structure

*Labovian Model*. First, in seminal work in scholarship exploring narrative structure, Labov and Waletzky (1967) and Labov (1972, 1997) define a narrative as “one verbal technique for recapitulating past experience, in particular a technique for constructing narrative units which match the temporal sequence of experience” (Labov & Waletzky, 1967:13). They primarily study narratives drawn from sociolinguistic interviews. Such narratives were found to be verbally constructed via *narrative units* that are temporally organized. The authors suggest examining story structure via narrative units which are independent clauses. Of these, narrative clauses (temporally ordered independent clauses) are of great importance; these constitute the basics of story structure as a change in their temporal order would result in a different story.

Clauses can also be compounded to form bigger sections. These are called *abstract* (a brief summary what the story is about); *orientation* (a narrative section that orients the listener/reader towards the story settings); *complication* (the main story events); *resolution* (how the story problem was resolved); *coda* (a section that connect story and storytelling worlds, in other words, that brings the story back to the telling moment); and *evaluation* (a section that answers a question “So what?”). Labov (1972) extends the model by specifying that *evaluation* can be *external* (when a narrator steps out of the narrating process to make a judgmental statement) and *internal* (or embedded into complicating actions of the narrative through the use of linguistic devices such as intensifiers, comparators, correlatives, and explicatives). While narrative sections such as “abstract” and “evaluation” can be easily identified in many stories, this is not always the case, and furthermore, it is very common for evaluation to be sprinkled throughout a narrative (Labov 1972). Making the model more context-sensitive, Labov (1997)
adds two concepts, reportability and credibility, to capture the diversity of narrative types due to the context of storytelling. Reportability has to do with justification why the story is worth telling and credibility is creating a narrative that is trustworthy.

The Labovian model has many strengths. First, it allows examination of connections between the themes and the narrative structure of oral stories. Second, it provides a framework to conduct fruitful analysis of narrative structure in narratives told by members of different cultural groups. The Labovian approach has been very influential in the field of narrative analysis. Scholars such as Schiffrin (1996), Blum-Kulka (1993), among many others, have drawn on this approach to lend insight into self-presentation in narratives and culture-specific ways of narrating. And these two strengths are of relevance to this project as the narratives under examination are all orally produced and from an understudied culture (a Kazakh speaking community); little is known about the structure of everyday Kazakh narratives, and the Labovian approach offers a means of beginning to uncover it. However, the Labovian model focuses on monological narratives and assumes that they can be detached from the context of their telling, which means the narratives are decontextualized to some extent. Thus, this approach, while providing fundamental insights that are critical to my analysis, does not incorporate interactional processes and bigger cultural aspects into analysis.

Conversation Analysis. In this research tradition, narrative structure can be understood as a sequence in conversation involving the joint collaboration of interlocutors. This includes a story preface issued by a teller, followed by a recipient’s request to hear it and then the actual telling, as well as a follow-up response (Sacks 1970/1992b; Schegloff 1997). In some cases, the first story can be followed by offering a second story from the audience (Sacks 1970/1992a).
Thus, De Fina and Georgakopoulou (2012) note that research on narrative structure has evolved from viewing storytelling as a product to understanding it as the process, i.e., narrative in interaction. In support of this point, a number of studies in Conversation Analysis further emphasize storytelling as an interactive process. For example, Jefferson (1978) reveals that narrative in conversations are *locally occasioned* (i.e., a story develops from what being discussed in an immediate conversational context) and *sequentially implicative* (i.e., told story will influence further development of the conversation). This relates to Sacks’ (1970/1992b) observations about narrative sequence (a teller’s *preface*, an audience’s *response*, the actual *telling*, and a follow-up *response*). Moreover, story *openings* and *closings* are of great importance, as it requires a lot of work on the part of tellers to secure a lengthy turn at talk and to show how a story is relevant to ongoing conversation (e.g., Jefferson 1978; Norrick 1993; Ochs & Capps 2001; Schiffrin 1984). For example, Schiffrin (1984) reveals how the point of a story that is introduced in the story opening significantly influences the rest of a narrating process.

Studies that focus on narratives as interactional highlight the significance of *audience participation*. Drawing on Goffman’s (1981) concept of participation framework, Goodwin (1986) extends this idea by illustrating different kinds of story recipients (e.g., knowing or unknowing, principal, ratified) and changes in participation roles over the course of storytelling. This shows that the story audience is very complex and how this complexity influences co-construction of narratives in interaction in terms of structure and content. Thus, for example, Goodwin (1986) shows how the interpretation of a story suggested by one of the participants in a group of friends is contested by the audience. Thus, the main teller (Mike) presents a story as a
description of a big fight of adult men near one of the local bars, while the two other participants (Curt and Gary) treat the events as a kind of showing off by little school kids.

Story co-construction emerges through a range of reactions the audience can express to show participation. Thus, audience members can react to a story with laughter (e.g., Jefferson 1979; Mandelbaum 1987); empathetic responses such as providing moral support to the victim described in the story (e.g., Branner 2005; Georgakopoulou 1998); offering alternative evaluations (Goodwin 1984; Ochs & Capps 2001); taking up a co-teller role (Goodwin 1979; Gordon 2009; Lerner 1992); offering a second story (Coates 2001; Mulholland 1996; Norrick 2000; Sacks 1970/1992a), or commenting on stories in the digital environment (e.g., De Fina 2016; Page 2012; Vásquez 2011).

Especially important to my study, audience participation can be affected by the participants’ relationships ties (Georgakopoulou 2005a; Gordon 2009; Mandelbaum 1987; Manzoni 2005), such as family or friend ties. In addition, telling rights (the interactional power to take a turn and share in producing a narrative) can be influenced by cultural norms (e.g., Blum-Kulka 1993) and/or publicity of the story events (e.g., Shuman 2005). For instance, Blum-Kulka (1993) reveals how children in American Jewish families have more authority in presenting stories while children in Jewish families in Israel tend to share telling with the adults. Mandelbaum (1987) reveals how co-participants encounter and resolve the problems of having two potential storytellers with a knowing recipient present (i.e., where both the teller and a member of the audience has knowledge of the story). In such contexts, the stories often become co-narrated and have three sequential elements: a remote approach (“I was going crazy today on the- on roads.”), a forwarding (e.g., the co-narrator previews a coming narrative by saying “Well
you know what he did?” that allows another co-narrator to take over telling the story), and a *ratification of forwarding* (e.g., the second narrator picks up the invitation to share an event in the story by saying what he did: “Went out of my mind.”). It can also start with an *aside* by one of the participants and as a *second story*. During co-telling, the two tellers can monitor each other for errors, request for verifications, and do complementary tellings.

In summary, Conversation Analysis and other approaches to interaction are useful in illustrating narrative as an active, emerging, and co-constructed phenomenon tied to interactional processes (e.g., floor holding and audience participation) and the local immediate context. Nonetheless, a very specific focus on turn-by-turn development of narrative may limit the capacity of this approach as there is a need to go beyond a single speech activity and incorporate wider contexts (e.g., culture) as well as possible links to previous conversations (i.e., intertextuality).

**Small stories approach.** Key studies in an approach known as small stories include Bamberg (2004, 2006), Geogakopoulou (2005a, 2005b, 2007), and Bamberg and Geogakopoulou (2008). This is a more recent view on narrative structure that “captures a gamut of under-represented narrative activities, such as tellings of ongoing events, future or hypothetical events, shared (known) events, but also allusions to (previous) tellings, deferrals of tellings and refusals to tell” (Bamberg & Geogakopoulou 2008:381). These narratives can be accounts of recent and/or ongoing small events. This approach allows scholars to analyze non-canonical types of stories, which further extends our understanding of narratives. In addition to this, Bamberg and Geogakopoulou set this approach as distinct by noting:

> it is the action orientation of the participants that forms the basic point of departure for our functionalist-informed approach… We are interested in how people use small stories
in their interactive engagements to construct a sense of who they are, while big stories research analyzes the stories as representation of world and identities (Bamberg & Georgakopoulou 2008:382).

The small stories approach or model (based on Bamberg & Georgakopoulou 2008) aims to illuminate links between narrative and identity construction, i.e., how participants employ narratives to create a sense of who they are via creating characters in displaced space and time, and then creating positions vis-à-vis interlocutors. Thus, the structure of a narrative can be viewed at three levels (following Bamberg 1997). At the first one, talked about, are the characters within the story. Thus, the task is to examine who the characters are and how they are relationally positioned in the story world. At the second level, tellership, we can examine the immediate situations of storytelling, the interactive purpose of narrating, and the impact of participants’ relations on storytelling; this is where positioning in the telling world occurs. Finally, the third level, global situatedness, refers to the social positions and discourses that are above the immediate situations of storytelling and circulated in a certain society. However, the reflection of these global discourses can be traced in the ways how the characters are positioned in the story worlds and how the narrators employ the story world positioning within the interactional situation.

In sum, the benefits of this approach include the affordance to analyze non-canonical types of stories, further extending our understanding of narratives, as well as the possibility to connect micro and macro levels of discourse to explore how bigger discourses are incorporated into interactional processes. A number of studies focused on narrative functions draw on this approach, and are considered in the next section.
2.2.2 Narrative functions

Reviewing the large and growing body of research on narrative discourse, I identified three key functions narratives can fulfill that are of special interest for my study: argumentation, (dis)alignment creation, and identity construction. I will review each of them in turn.

**Argumentation.** Scholars have suggested that one of the functions that narratives can serve in everyday conversations is argumentation (Günthner 1995; Müller & Di Luzio 1995). This means that people employ narratives in everyday interactions as experience-based evidence to defend certain claims or positions, as shown by numerous scholars (e.g., Carranza 1998; De Fina 2000; Günthner 1995; Schiffrin 1990). For instance, Günthner (1995) shows how people use exemplary stories to support moral evaluations, create moral values and make emotional evaluations of someone’s behavior. In this way, narratives serve as testimonials (Müller & Di Luzio 1995). Moreover, narratives allow speakers protect themselves and the opinions they state from the audience’s direct criticism because speakers can attach those opinions to the characters in the story world, rather than to themselves (Ochs & Capps 2001; Schiffrin 1990). For example, Schiffrin (1990) shows how a Jewish mother (Jan) contextualizes her opinion about intermarriage by telling a narrative about her daughter (Beth) who had a date with a non-Jewish man and it did not turn out well. The character of the daughter characterizes the date and this non-Jewish man as “But he’s different!” in the story world. Through this voicing of Beth, Jan is able to express her own opinion about intermarriage.

**(Dis)alignment creation.** Another well-known function of narrative is the creation of alignment and solidarity (though narration can also result in disalignment). As De Fina and Georgakopoulou (2012) point out, “storytelling can enhance a sense of understanding and
cooperation since it provides an occasion for tellers to propose their own values and for others to create and display solidarity” (93). In the same vein, Coates (2001) reveals that male friends use second stories as a way to express solidarity and do friendship. This mutual sharing of second stories can be also found among mixed-gender groups of friends, as revealed in Tannen’s (1984/2005) analysis of what she terms as a story round, i.e., “a particular kind of story cluster, in which speakers exchange stories of personal experiences that illustrate similar points” (126). Mulholland (1996) similarly points out that audience members show their involvement via a complete co-narration as well as by telling second stories. Goodwin and Duranti (1990) shows that narrative can be used to create disalignment. For example, women in her study used a gossip story about an absent party (creating disalignment with her) to align with the present participants.

Identity construction. A final function that emerges in narrative research and is especially important for my study is the role of narratives in identity construction. It should be noted that research on identity faces a major challenge, which is defining the concept of identity, as pointed out by De Fina and Georgakopoulou (2012). They show that identity as a concept can be viewed within the interactionist paradigm (as social and relational constructions), biographical approaches (as narrative identity as well as identity and positioning), and identities-in-interaction (identity as self-presentation, social category, and semiotic resource). These perspectives on processes of identity construction are crucial for understanding how narrative and identity construction intertwine.

One of the major breakthroughs in understanding identity contraction was Bucholtz and Hall’s (2005) model of five principles that was developed based on wider set of social, anthropological, and linguistic theories. The first principle, emergence, suggests viewing identity
as a social and cultural product. The second principle, *positionality*, proposes that identities incorporate macro demographic categories and smaller local ones along with participant role. The third, *indexicality*, reveals that and how the link between the language choices and social identities are indirect and implicit rather than straightforward and explicit. The fourth principle, *relationality*, suggests that “Identities are intersubjectively constructed through several, often overlapping, complementary relations, including similarity/difference, genuineness/artifice, and authority/delegitimacy” (2005:598). In other words, constructed identities are viewed in relation to other identity options. Finally, the principle of *partiality* stresses that identity construction is an unfolding process that changes as interaction goes on and thus identity constitution is never a complete product. Collectively these principles capture and extend sociolinguistic understandings of identity construction as a local conversational process and also a macro cultural one. They are a good match with contemporary narrative scholars’ understandings of identity.

De Fina and Georgakopoulou (2012) explore and explain how narrative links to the process of constructing selves. They suggest that narratives are a rich resource for constructing identity as they allow narrators to do agentive work via story content and presentation as well as through selection of linguistic and paralinguistic elements. Indeed, tellers foreground and present different aspects of their identities by manipulating story structure and content (e.g., Linde 1993; Schiffrin 1996). For example, Schiffrin (1996) examined how, in narratives about accepting a new person in the family, two Jewish women present their agentive selves (i.e., as figures in the story who take action) and epistemic selves (i.e., as figures in the story who state their beliefs, feelings, and wants). She also highlights how these aspects of identity can be at odds with each
other. For example, Zelda offered a narrative when she was asked how one of her daughters-in-law address her. And turns out that her daughter-in-law does not address Zelda in the way Zelda would like. However, in this narrative, the complicating actions were free from this criticism of her daughter-in-law, i.e., they had a discussion about this and they brought it out in the open. It is through evaluations that Zelda expresses her criticism, i.e., she evaluates the situation through the metaphor *a sore spot* and the discussion as *quite a discussion*. Thus, through different kinds of evaluation devices the criticism is expressed. Schiffrin also identifies a range of linguistic devices used in narrative identity construction, including complicating action clauses and evaluative devices (like adverbs and metaphorical expressions).

A prominent *narrative linguistic device* that is successfully used for self-presentation is *reported speech* or what Tannen (1989/2007) calls *constructed dialogue*. Constructing dialogue and putting it into the mouths of story world characters accomplishes evaluation (Labov 1972) broadly, including serving to voice moral statements (Moita-Lopes 2006; Relaño-Pastor & De Fina 2005; Vásquez 2007), and to do agentive work (De Fina 2003; Georgakopoulou 1998; Hamilton 1998; Johnstone 1990; Schiffrin 1990). Focusing more specifically on *agency*, Hamilton (1998) looks at the stories shared on an electronic discussion board devoted to bone marrow transplantation and reveals how certain linguistics choices create the identity of patient as *survivor* not a victim, further socializing the online audience – who were mostly current patients going through the treatment and their families – into those identities. Next, the patients are depicted as fulfilling an amount of initial illocutionary acts equal to the doctors in the narratives, which presents patient-figures as being confident in their dealings with the doctor-figures in the story world. Finally, there was an alternation between the direct and indirect kinds
of reported speech/constructed dialogue with doctor-figures speaking directly more frequently than patient-figures. This choice of quotation helps the narrators to present the doctors as accountable for their negative actions as well as bring more evidence and credibility into the narrative when narrators aimed to present themselves as agentive figures.

While narrative can be used to present individual identities, there is also an attested connection between narrative and group identity. In this case, identity construction includes claiming a belonging to a certain social group; in other words, identity can refer to a social category. Studies taking this perspective look at the connection between membership categorization (Antaki & Widdicombe 1998; Sacks 1989) and narratives, or otherwise show the interplay of the micro level (i.e., the features of a particular interaction) with the macro level (e.g., current ideologies of gender, race, ethnicity in a community).

Numerous scholars have demonstrated how storytellers use narratives to create an alignment with or distance from certain social groups and to express a range of broader ideologies of inclusion/exclusion (e.g., De Fina 2000, 2006; Kiesling 2006; Moita-Lopes 2006). For instance, Kiesling (2006) shows how two white middle-class male students create hard-working and masculine identities by making certain lexical choices (e.g., the slang term ‘bitch boy’) and phonological choices (e.g. deletion of be copula) to appeal to the crowd at their fraternities. De Fina (2006) examines how the group identity of Latino in the USA is constructed in interview narratives. She follows van Dijk’s (1998) concept of cognitive representations that form basic schemata in which people represent social dimensions and social relationships and which allow members of a certain group to formulate who they are, standards of their group membership, and how they relate to the group. Based on this framework, she reveals how the
identity of a *Latino* in the US is constructed within a schema of skin colors and a social hierarchy. Thus, the identity of a *Latino* is created through references to the skin color of the characters in the story, showing how Latino characters are positioned inferior ‘others’ as compared to white Americans.

As mentioned, there have been efforts to understand identity construction via examining and connecting different levels of a narrative speech event, i.e., micro and macro levels. First, Bamberg (1997) examines identity construction in three levels of narrative positioning, i.e., positioning story characters towards each other (who are protagonist and antagonist, perpetrator and victim, agentive and powerless, and linguistics means to create these positions), positioning tellers towards audience (linguistic means employed by the teller to use narrative for certain social actions like instructing or blaming), and positioning tellers towards themselves and making connections to broader cultural ideologies (“Who am I?” claims).

Extending this model, Bamberg and Georgakopoulou (2008) examine identity work and positioning in *small stories* within the context of a research interview and suggest a series of steps that allow analysts to deconstruct how identity is constructed through the levels of positioning. The *small story* they examine was initially offered to be told by boy named Victor but actually was told by his friend Walt; this story was occasioned among a group of ten-year-olds in the presence of a researcher at an elementary school located on the East coast in the US. Their analysis reveals how Walt employs the story to answer the researcher’s question about what they (the boys) like about girls. Walt offers a narrative, in the story world of which, an anonymous friend of Walt looks at the legs of a girl from the same street and evaluates this view as “WHO:AA!” The story world is well-fitted to the interactional purpose that the narrative
serves: It shows that a preadolescent boy appreciates certain physical features of a member of the opposite sex (like long legs). The positioning in the story world is also used to negotiate the identities of these male pre- by engaging into a topic that the physical appearance of girls is something that make the boys in this group attracted to girls of their age. In a more global way, the relational positioning in the story world and storytelling world shed light into how Victor as a pre-teen navigates popular discourses of being interested in girls and being too cool to be interested in them.

In similar manner, De Fina (2008) explores the relations between the personal stories told by Italian Americans during dinners at an Italian American card-playing club. Drawing on theorizing from Bamberg’s (1997) initial model and Bamberg and Georgakopoulou’s (2008) extension of the model, she shows how positioning in the story world is constructed to allow the participants to construct their interactional identities of Italian Americans who joined the club to socialize and maintain their cultural heritage. Selecting the narratives about trips to Italy, about older family members like grandparents, and about stereotypes about Italians in the US, she reveals, for instance, how the characters of ancestors are crafted as hardworking people who overcame many challenges as first-generation immigrants in the story world. This positioning in the story world allows tellers to create alignment among the participants of the dinner in the storytelling world and construct their interactional identities as legitimate members of the club. The positioning at these two levels (the story and storytelling worlds) also speak to ideological discourse about Italians in the US as belonging to a mafia family, allowing the narrators to construct their identities as Italian Americans at the third or more global level.
Georgakopoulou (2008) aims to connect the micro and macro levels of identity construction in narrative event by firstly defining *identity claims* as self- and other assessments, ascriptions, attributions and categorizations, and then by distinguishing *taleworld identity claims* (i.e., claims attributed to story characters that are used to support telling rights) and *telling identity claims* (i.e., claims that are attributed to the conversational level, suspending narration and providing spaces for interlocutors to investigate external moral frames). She shows how *taleworld identity claims* and *telling identity claims* are used to state *evaluative stances* and shed a light on how roles are locally occasioned.

A related framework for connecting micro-level narratives and macro-level ideologies is presented by Tannen (2008); she examines stories told in interviews with women regarding their relationships with their sisters. The analysis she presents reveals the complex interplay of three levels of narrating: Small-n narratives, big-N Narratives and Master Narratives. Small-n narratives are descriptions of particular events or conversations that the narrators had with their sisters. Big-N Narratives are the main point they are making about their relationship with their sisters; these are supported by small-n narratives. And, Master Narratives are bigger cultural ideologies that impact the big-N Narratives. Thus, the participants described events that showed how they had the same tastes or took the same actions as their sisters to support the point that sisters are usually similar, which is a common cultural belief about sisterhood in the US.

Collectively, the studies reviewed in this section clearly reveal that there are strong links between the micro levels (the narrative structure and immediate interaction) and broader ideological discourse. Thus, story worlds are designed in ways that fit the sequence of the ongoing conversation and the audience, and the narrative and its interactional accomplishment
together work to reflect the current ideological discourse, allowing narrators to take their positions in relation to these discourses. In doing this, they portray aspects of their identities.

2.2.3 Narrative and culture

Despite the presumed universality of narrative as a speech event, there is a growing body of studies that shows some peculiarities of narrating across (sub)cultural groups, which is especially important to consider when examining narratives told by members of under-studied groups and in under-studied languages. One of the way to capture this variation is to examine the structural aspects of stories. For example, Gee (1986) points at surface differences, in terms of phonological and discursive elements, in the production of texts in the stories told by a seven-year-old black girl and a retired white teacher. The structure of the narrative from the seven-year-old had more explicit divisions into parts Gee calls lines, stanzas, and sections that were determined based on amount and length of pauses. Such divisions realized via pauses were less evident in the story of the retired teacher; coherence was constructed differently in the two stories. Nonetheless, both narrators exhibit longer pauses at the major breaks in the stories like sections. This analysis points out that narrative as speech activity may vary across the sub-groups who reside in the same country.

Similarly, Shirley Brice Heath (1983) in her book *Ways with Words: Language, Life, and Work in Communities and Classrooms* shows differences in storytelling between two sub-cultural groups resining in the US. She compared the discourse of child-caregiver in two American communities, Roadville (a white community) and Trackton (predominantly African American). She reveals that the young children in Roadville were socialized into the process of
being asked to point out objects and being corrected for giving wrong answers during the
storytelling process with educational books. Differently, the young children in Trackton were
couraged to pay attention to non-verbal clues around them and engage in verbal play and
‘talking junk’ to master their storytelling skills. As a result, Roadville’s children received the
necessary support from adults to better prepare them for school literacy practices. The findings
suggest that differences in storytelling process that involve a child and care-giver may be
culturally shaped and may (inadvertently) affect children’s educational experiences later on.

Scollon (2010) focuses on differences in the structure of storytelling across cultural
groups residing in various countries outside of the US. Due to a frequent and casual use of the
term in public discourse, the questions of what “narrative” is has arisen. Their reflection suggests
that the answer is the Western view of narrative, i.e., Aristotelian kind of narrative, which has
beginning, middle, and end. However, story-making is a social action of certain agents; thus,
there is a need to look at how narratives are told in other cultures. As illustrations, he offers an
analysis of Athabaskan narratives that consist of 4- or 5-pattern structure and Chinese
storytelling that has events and non-events (such as static descriptions and set speeches) in their
content. Javanese Wayang narrating is notable for its coincident and multiple epistemologies,
and cohesion is based on place not time. In Arabic tradition, storytelling is told for the beauty of
language itself and used as moral lesson, while involving excessive repetitions.

Finally, Blum-Kulka (1993) showed differences in several aspects of storytelling events
during mealtime conversations in two different cultural groups (American Jewish and Israeli
Jewish families). Her dataset consists of recorded dinners of 8 Jewish-American and 8 Israeli
families. Understanding dinner-table events “as a three-way intersection of the act of narration,
the textual content and form, and the persons responsible,” Blum-Kulka (1993:363) identifies cultural differences in terms of how multiple participants participate in storytelling, how personal experience is treated in storytelling, and children’s storytelling rights. She found that American families generally locate their narratives outside of the home, and closer in time, while Jewish families locate their stories closer to home but distant in time. Israeli families were more likely to talk about shared experiences. American families claimed primacy to story ownership based on who has the first-hand experience and welcome monological performance, while Israeli realize ownership through polyphonic participation in telling, even in unshared stories. This reveals the subtle and not-so-subtle ways narratives can differ across cultural groups.

Another possible way to capture variation in storytelling across cultures is to consider how narrative linguistic strategies are employed differently. For example, Tannen (1986) analyzes oral stories told by American and Greek women and reveals that Greek women employed more constructed dialogue in their storytelling as a means of creating involvement. This finding went along with previous research such as by Kirshenblatt-Gimblett (1974/1989) and Tannen (1984/2005) on the discourse of East European Jewish Americans, and Labov (1972) on the discourse of African Americans. A more extended overview of differences in narrative strategies is offered in Tannen (1984/2005). First, she points out that narrative is a prototype and that there are (sub)culture-specific expectations regarding how we tell stories. To capture this variation, she suggested looking at story round, which, as previously mentioned, is a term that captures the phenomenon of speakers exchanging personal experience narratives that make similar points. She identifies this “story round device,” or telling stories in a round, as characteristic of high-involvement conversational style. Other narrative strategies that may differ
are length of stories, making evaluations and responses that are expressive (e.g., straightforward statements of judgement) and/or understated (e.g., hedgy expressions in a more monotonous tone), how long it takes to get to the point (that can be seen in reactions such as promoting statements like “Yeah, and?”), meaning in intonation (i.e., expressing the story point via intonation not lexical content), the degree of cooperative prompting (e.g., if prompts help the teller to be more specific and encourage her or him to continue), and how the point of the story can be expressed (e.g., an allegory about a phenomenon that doesn’t need to be explicitly stated, if the conclusion is left to the audience to draw, or the absence of paralinguistic cues to signal the point). Differences in uses of, and interpretation of how these features are used in narrative, can lead to misunderstanding in interaction, such as failure to perceive a narrative point, or misinterpreting an audience member’s reaction to the telling.

More recently, Sicoli (2016) examined the relation between culture and storytelling by looking at the use of place references among Lachixio speakers in joint conversational narration. His analysis reveals how specific place naming “is constructing (and reconstructing within dialogic narratives) a moral geography centered in the positive evaluation of one’s own social group (represented in the village with its dense network of kin and other social relations) and negative evaluation of places outside the village (the forest and other population centers)” (2015:205). Thus, place references become effective linguistic resources employed in narrative sequences to allow the participants to share and contest their cultural community values.

Summing up, the reviewed studies have shown that cultural norms of communities can be one of the factors that can influence the form and content of stories and storytelling processes. These norms can impact the story structure in terms of its rhythms and number of main sections,
what narrative techniques are preferred by the tellers, as well as how telling rights can be distributed among participants.

### 2.3 Summary

In sum, as this chapter has shown, major concepts from interactional sociolinguistics have paved the way to a better understanding of how different interactive frames including narrating are signaled and sustained by means of contextualization cues. Most importantly, they have highlighted how participants’ (un)shared cultural conventions may affect narrative telling and interpretation. I will draw on these insights in many ways throughout the analysis as I examine narrative positioning and how it accomplishes identity construction, in particular to understand how the activity of narrating is signaled and sustained by among the Kazakh-speaking participants of my study, as well as to consider potential culture-specific patterns in accomplishing this interactional task.

The overview of narrative discourse analysis has shown how positioning at multiple levels and identity construction are closely interwoven. Specifically, how narrators position themselves and other characters in the story world is closely linked to the purposes that this narrative serves in the interactional level or storytelling world. This allows the narrator to provide argumentation or create alignment with other participants in an interaction, revealing how narrator and audience are positioned towards each other. Together (positioning in the story world and storytelling world) reflect what position the narrators take towards bigger ideological discourse or socio-cultural values, which in its turn enables the narrator to emphasize certain bigger identities including ethnic identities. This vision of positioning, narrative, and identity is
the heart of the study analyses that I present in Chapter Four, Five, and Six. In Chapter Three, I present the study data and its collection process and describe in more detail the units and procedure of data analysis.
CHAPTER THREE: DATA AND METHODS

In this chapter, I introduce the data and my methodology. I thoroughly describe the study participants and my data, and also present the theoretical framework in detail – in other words, how I have integrated the key concepts and ideas from studies reviewed in the previous chapter, and have used them to identify and analyze the everyday narratives of Kazakh villagers.

3.1 The study data

The dataset that is used for my analysis consists of conversations among family members and friends who are fluent speakers of Kazakh and mostly reside in a small village that is located in the north of Kazakhstan. This village is of particular interest because, while it is populated by ethnic Kazakh people, it is located in the most pro-Russian area of Kazakhstan (only a seven- to eight-hour drive to the border with Russia). Despite this location, the village population mostly speaks the Kazakh language and makes a living by means of herding, which is an ancient Kazakh trade. This suggests that the locals (who are my study’s participants) may have maintained the core values of Kazakh culture that may manifest in how they tell narratives, along with other aspects of what Tannen (1984/2005) calls conversational style.

In addition, this population is equally well acquainted with Russian culture and language. In my conversations with the locals, they show a good comprehension of the Russian language but do not speak it except during moments when they briefly code-switch to incorporate some metaphorical expressions from Russian into their speech in Kazakh. I tried to speak in Kazakh to them, but I often had to switch to Russian due to my lack of recent practice. My mother spoke predominantly in Kazakh, switching to Russian very rarely.
Before introducing these participants, I would like to give some background information regarding Kazakhstan and Kazakh culture. Kazakh culture can be described as a culture that is enormously influenced by the Turkic nomadic lifestyle, so most of the traditions and customs relate to livestock and traditional food, which retain a big symbolic value. Not surprisingly, when relatively traditional Kazakh people greet each other, they first inquire about the health of their livestock and then each other’s health. Nowadays, Kazakh’s lifestyle is a blend that has been influenced by the traditions from Russian, Chinese and Western cultures. In general, Kazakhstani culture is considered a collectivistic one (Ardichvili & Gasparishvili 2001; Conrad 2013; Karibayeva and Kunanbayeva 2015; Matveev & Nelson 2004). Thus, there is an emphasis on interdependency, group harmony, and saving interlocutors’ face in interactions.

Russia has been especially influential in that it colonized Central Asia in the eighteenth century and significantly destroyed the nomadic lifestyle of Kazakhs. This influence became particularly reinforced during the Soviet era when the majority of Kazakh schools were forcefully closed, the stigmatization of the Kazakh language and culture were institutionalized, and mass repression of Kazakh intellectuals was ongoing for decades. This resulted in a dramatic decrease of the Kazakh population, and loss of cultural heritage and proficiency in Kazakh.

In 1991 Kazakhstan received its independence and started a nation-building process that aimed to revive the Kazakh culture and language. The nation-building process has not been straightforward. The Kazakhstani government initially opted for an ethno-centered approach of nation creation, i.e., so-called Kazakification, which aimed to established the dominance of ethnic Kazakhs in the major spheres of life through numerous state planning and recruitment policies, demographic and administrative reforms as well as language polices (e.g., Anceschi
2014; Dave 1996; Isaacs 2015; Jones 2010; Kolstø 1998; Matuszkiewicz 2010). However, this ethno-centered approach led to resistance from the excluded non-Kazakh groups who urged the government to implement a new strategy, i.e., a dual focus on creating the ethnic Kazakh nation and the civic Kazakhstani nation (e.g., Kesici 2011; Rees 2015).

Nowadays, the total population of Kazakhstan is more than 18 million; these people reside on the ninth biggest and biggest landlocked country in the world. Though ethnic Kazakhs are the largest ethnic group (~65.5%), Russians are still a well-represented ethnic minority (~21.5%), along with Germans, Tatars, Ukrainians, Uzbeks, and Uyghurs (13%). It should be noted that the minority ethnic groups are much more proficient in Russian (Jones 2010; Rees 2015) than in Kazakh. There exists noticeable regional variation: The north and north-east of the country are Russian-dominated while the south is more Kazakh-dominated (Verschik 2011).

In 1997, the Kazakhstani government approved the Law About Languages («Қазақстан Республикасындағы Тіл Тураły Заңы» is the name of the Law in Kazakh and «Закон об Языках в Республике Казахстан» is the name of the Law in Russian) that announced Kazakh as the state language and Russian as the language of interethnic communication. According to Pavlenko (2009), Russian can be officially employed in governmental institutions along with Kazakh. In 2007, English was introduced as a language of business communication; thus, trilingualism (Kazakh, Russian, and English) is a current policy in secondary and higher education (Smagulova 2016).

Regarding the language situation, it should be noted that there is variation between the rural and urban population, with latter still being low-proficient in their titular language (i.e., Kazakh) and having a strong interest in Russian culture and literature (e.g., Pavlenko 2008,
Urban elites tend to enroll their children in Russian-instructed schools (Matuszkiewicz 2010). In addition, the other ethnic groups (besides Kazakhs and Russians) residing in Kazakhstan use Russian as a lingua franca due to their low proficiency in Kazakh and better access to Russian-language teaching materials than to Kazakh and English textbooks (Fierman 2006). Unfortunately, Kazakh educators still face such challenges as scarcity of textbooks, shortage of qualified teaching staff, and low achievement among the students (Matuszkiewicz 2010; Smagulova 2008). Finally, the Soviet language ideology that associated Kazakh with backwardness and rural lifestyle and Russian with education and progress resulted in preference among Kazakh people to communicate in Russian with non-Kazakhs in order to avoid stigmatization (Fierman 2006; Matuszkiewicz 2010; Verschik 2010).

Regarding the religious landscape of the country, Islam is gaining its presence (after prosecution in the Soviet era) and is considered the major religion. It is practiced along with Russian Orthodox Christianity, Judaism, Hare Krishnas, and Buddhism. In line with the practices of many Muslims around the world, Kazakh women and men often interact separately at diverse types of gathering including birthday parties, funerals, and weddings, while they do interact with each other in professional spheres. However, the more urbanized and Russified younger population may diverge from these communication norms.

Zooming in to the area where I collected my data, I describe its composition in terms of language proficiency at the level of the county and ethnicity at the level of the district based on the national census of 2009, available at the government’s website (www.stat.gov.kaz). I present the statistics at these levels since I do not have access to the official statistics regarding the village itself. Statistics regarding language proficiency are available only at the level of the
county in which the village is located and includes the respondents older than fifteen years. This county includes two towns in addition to the village and sixteen districts. Kazakh proficiency among the entire population of the county (577,044) ranged from 45.1% to 56.1% in regard to three language skills (listening, reading, and writing). Proficiency in Kazakh ranged from 91.6% to 98.4% among the ethnic Kazakh population (more than 250,000/∼45%), compared to 5.8% to 18.8% among Russians (∼215,000/∼37%), 5% to 17.4% among Ukrainians (∼34,000/∼6%), and 7.1% to 20.2% among Germans (∼21,000/ ∼4%). In contrast, Russian proficiency among county residents ranged from 92.8% to 97.5%; 88% to 95.8% among Kazakhs, 97.3% to 98.8% among Russians, 96.6% to 98.8% among Ukrainians, and 96.1% to 98.9% among Germans.

The statistics reveal that no difference was found between the urban and rural populations regarding language proficiency in Kazakh and Russian. Proficiency in Kazakh ranged from 41.25% to 53.4% among urbanites and 48.6% to 58.6% among inhabitants of rural areas. Proficiency in Russian ranged from 95.5% to 98.5% among urbanites and from 90.1% to 96.5% among inhabitants of rural areas. The population shows low English proficiency, ranging from 5% to 9.6%. Thus, the presence of Russian is very noticeable in this region.

The district, in which the village is located, is notably Russified. According to the national census of 2009, the total population of the district was approximately 74,000. The majority of the district’s population were Russians (more than 35,000/∼48%), followed by Kazakhs (∼29,000/∼39%), Ukrainians (more than 2,000/ ∼3%), and Germans (more than 2,000/∼3%).

Regarding the village/data site, I provide information based on what I received from the village insider who assisted me with data collection, i.e., my mother. The population is about 450
residents who are all ethnic Kazakh, speak mostly Kazakh, and practice Islam. The major means of living is herding, particularly horses. Thus, this is a very important topic of daily conversations. Also, people earn a living by making preserves, by working at the local school, and by finding employment in the nearest town Schuchinsk, which is a half hour drive. The literacy level of the village locals is average: Most of the population graduated from high school and the younger generation (born in 1960s, 70s, and 80s) have a college degree.

Since the community is relatively small, most of the residents know each other quite well. The locals often have gatherings of neighbors and relatives from other parts of the area at their houses. It is a Kazakh custom to invite elderly neighbors over, and serve them a good meal. Thus, age and hospitality are very crucial factors that affect the communication, including the communication of the mealtime narratives I analyze: Elderly individuals and guests have a higher status in conversations. This creates a certain hierarchy among the Kazakh people in general and the locals in particular. The youngest female member of the household usually serves the tables. When it is a gathering of an immediate family, the hierarchy in terms of age may be noticed less, but it seems still exist as the adults mostly hold the floor with less input from the children.

The data were collected within two time periods and conversations took place in the village at the houses of families who agreed to participate. Since my maternal grandparents had friendship and blood connections and my mother spent her childhood there, this allowed me to have more or less easy access to this population. The first period was during July and August 2015; the second was January and February 2016. During July and August 2015, my mother (a local) and I (currently a PhD student, but as mentioned, very familiar to this area) visited two
families and video-recorded mealtime conversations. During January and February 2016, my mother visited four families and video-recorded their meal conversations.

Before the actual video-recording, the purpose of the study was explained to the families and they were asked to sign the consent form. Five families agreed to participate in this study, resulting in the participation of twenty-one family members, as well as fourteen friends who were present. This results in thirty-five participants in total. The total number of video recordings of meal time conversations is ten. I was present in two out of ten video recordings, and my mother was present in all of them. Out of those five families, one family additionally provided thirteen audio recordings of conversations where neither my mother nor I were present, but these were not used in my analysis as I decided to focus on video-recorded data only. In this study, I used the video-recordings of all five families, choosing seven mealtime conversations that contained a high amount of narratives out of the ten video-recorded.

The first mealtime conversation is among five women of different age groups and relations (family, friends, researcher-participants). This recording took place in August 2015 and it was provided by the first family that I contacted through the local state authority. The family consisted of three generations living together in one household: the grandparents, their son Abai with his wife Kamila, and their four children. However, only two women from the family participated in this recording, as the men went to prepare winter hay. Thus, it was mother-in-law Raushan and her daughter-in-law Kamila. Also, they invited their neighbor Aunt Amina who is originally from the south part of Kazakhstan (the area that is the least Russified), but she bought a house in that village a few years ago and thus spent her summers there. She thus had a strong association with a village population. At the time of recording, mother-in-law Raushan was
retired and was in her mid-sixties; daughter-in-law Kamila graduated several years ago with a bachelor’s degree and was thirty years old with four children; and Aunt Amina was also retired and was in her sixties. The other two participants were my mother, who was also retiree and in her early-sixties, and me, at the time a thirty-year-old PhD student. Thus, three of the women held the status of mothers and grandmothers, one held the status of mother, and one (me) was neither. Aunt Amina was invited to the gathering for her company (and as an expert on Kazakh culture), and I was introduced to her ahead of time as a PhD student who was doing research about Kazakh culture. This was the overall frame. The recording took place at a Kazakh traditional round table (with people sitting on the floor) in the living room of this family. The conversation features many narratives on diverse topics (e.g., family, travelling, and culture), which often go along with advice giving. From this conversation, I am analyzing Aunt Amina’s narratives about a Russian wool firm, travelling, and a Russian wife in Chapter Four, and a narrative she tells about her grandchild in Chapter Six.

The second conversation is provided by the second family that I contacted through the local state authority. This family consisted of grandparents whose three children were residing in neighboring towns, and their many grandchildren who would come visit for the summer period. Only the grandmother, who I refer to as Hostess Ulbon, participated in the recording because her husband and three other grandchildren went to a different event. Hostess Ulbon also invited the neighbor’s daughter Aizhan because she was assisting Hostess Ulbon with the meal that she cooked for us. The other two participants were my mother and me. This recording took place right after we video-recorded the meal time at the house of Raushan and Kamila. The recording also took place at a Kazakh traditional round table (with people sitting on the floor) in the living
This conversation also features many narratives on diverse topics (e.g., family, travelling, and culture). I analyze Hostess Ulbon’s two narratives about how she raised her children and grandchild in Chapter Six.

The third conversation also took place among women. This time the talk was among eight elderly Kazakh women who were neighbors residing in the village. This recording was done in February 2016 in the house of my mother’s male cousin. My mother came to record their mealtime conversation on that day, and, as it turned out, her cousin Aibek and his wife Dariya were giving a feast to their elderly neighbors to get their blessings. This is a Kazakh tradition. The women’s ages ranged from forty to seventy years old. Thus, my mother recorded the two-part meal (the main dish and the tea) at the women’s table (the men’s table was next to the table of the women). It was the same round traditional table. I analyze a narrative that occurred between the two women (Aunt Aigul and Aunt Aigerim who are the elderly guests) about Aigul’s grandfather-in-law in Chapter Six.

The fourth conversation was video-recorded in the same family of Aibek and Sandugash. In this daytime meal conversation, Aibek, Dariya, their ten-year old daughter Madina, Madina’s female cousin from a different town, and my mother were present. This conversation covers a good range of narratives starting from modern technology and finishing with food prices. My mother was very active in this conversation. The recording took place in February 2016. I analyze a narrative that Aibek tells about his father in Chapter Six.

The fifth conversation was recorded in the family of another of my mother’s cousins. In this conversation, the cousin (who I refer as Host Bolat), his wife Zhanar, their two sons, a brother of the cousin (who I refer Host’s Brother), and my mother were present. Host Bolat was
in his mid-forties, his wife was of the same age, and his brother was several years younger at the
time of recording. The oldest child was in high school and the younger son was in middle school.
Host Bolat was working as a manual worker in the village, his brother was teaching at a local
community college in a neighboring town, and wife Zhanar was a housewife. The conversation
of interest took place late in the day, and specifically, in Chapter Four I analyze a long narrative
from Host Bolat about his taxiing experience with America tourists who came to explore their
area.

The sixth and seventh conversations were recorded in the house of an elderly widow.
Hostess Maira lived with her two sons, one of whom was married to a local woman and had two
small children at the time of recording. In the sixth recording, Hostess Maira, her unmarried son
Tanybek, her daughter-in-law Zhibek (the wife of Hostess Maira’s other son), and my mother
were present. Hostess Maira was in her late seventies, the son who was present was in his late
thirties, and daughter-in-law Zhibek was in her late thirties as well. After fifteen minutes of
recording, a male neighbor who I refer to as Neighbor Arystan stopped by for a cup of tea. This
conversation featured many narratives on diverse topics (e.g., related to gossip, parenting,
culture, and animals) and was recorded in February 2016. The seventh conversation was
recorded a week later with same participants, except for Neighbor Arystan; Hostess Maira, her
son Tanybek, her daughter-in-law Zhibek, and my mother were all present. This conversation
also contained many narratives, mostly related to gossip about the neighbors. I analyze these
narratives in Chapter Five and Six.

The table below summarizes the narrative data I consider.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family #</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Length of the conversation</th>
<th>Number of narratives</th>
<th>Selected narratives</th>
<th>Chapter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family #1</td>
<td>Mother-in-law Raushan Daughter-in-law Kamila Neighbor Aunt Amina Aisulu’s Mother Aisulu</td>
<td>120 min</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>A Russian firm Food in Vietnam A Russian café A bad Russian wife A grandchild who speaks like an adult</td>
<td>Four</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family #2</td>
<td>Hostess Ulbon Aisulu’s Mother Aisulu</td>
<td>45 min</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Raising children Misunderstood grandchild</td>
<td>Six</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family #3</td>
<td>Eight local women including Aunt Ainur Aunt Aigerim Host Aibek (cousin) Wife Sandugash Daughter Madina A visiting girl cousin Aisulu’s Mother</td>
<td>57 min</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>A powerful uncle-in-law</td>
<td>Six</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family #4</td>
<td>Host Bolat Wife Zhanar Two sons Brother of Host Bolat Aisulu’s Mother</td>
<td>44 min</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>A daughter and computer A powerful and independent father</td>
<td>Six</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family #5</td>
<td>Hostess Maira Son Tanybek Daughter-in-law Zhibek Aisulu’s Mother Neighbor Arystan</td>
<td>45 min</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>A daughter-in-law A stolen half liter of milk A stolen knife Stolen meat Retirement payment Savior Eran</td>
<td>Five</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostess Maira Son Tanybek Daughter-in-law Zhibek Aisulu’s Mother</td>
<td>40 min</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>A village café A neighbor who died young A devoted wife</td>
<td>Five</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>434 min</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Summary of mealtime conversations
The process of selection of narratives for analysis was two main stages. In the first stage, I identified all the narratives that were recounts of past personal experiences. This selection resulted in forty narratives; the remaining forty-two narratives were small stories (as defined in Bamberg and Geogakopoulou 2008), mostly habitual or hypothetical narratives. In the next stage, I categorized the selected forty narratives in terms who the characters were (e.g., strangers, neighbors, friends, etc.) and what main themes were (e.g., family relationships, disagreement between neighbors, etc.). This categorization revealed two major types of relations between the characters: Out-group (Kazakhs and other ethnic groups) and in-group relationships (i.e., relations among villagers and family members). When these two major sets of narratives were identified, I tried to be efficient with time resources (as the process of transcribing in a different language is a time-consuming procedure), so decided that I should select representative examples from each category. For the out-group narratives, the four selected narratives were included characters from different ethnic groups (Russian, Vietnamese, American). Regarding the second set, the narratives about village neighbors and family members’ relationships, I divided these into two subcategories: Neighbors and family members. The thematic descriptions I had created were very helpful in selecting narratives for each subcategory. I focused on the themes of stolen personal items and social inequality among the neighbors, which was a common theme. This resulted in seven narratives. Regarding the narratives that involved family members, I selected narratives that focused on the older family members (parents and grand uncle), younger (children and grandchildren), and equals in terms of age (i.e., a husband and wife). This is so because age differences seemed to be a recurrent theme across these narratives. This totaled in nine narratives. This dissertation thus considers a total of twenty narratives.
Regarding the transcribing process, a native speaker of Kazakh (my mother) and I did the first draft of all twenty narratives in Kazakh using the Cyrillic alphabet. Then, two teachers of Kazakh did proofreading of the transcript first drafts along with listening to the audio-recordings. Their corrections were incorporated into the second, or double-proofread, draft of the transcripts. Then, I transformed the double-proofread draft of the transcript from the Cyrillic into the Latin alphabet, using the International Phonetic Alphabet for transliteration. After this procedure, I added grammatical glossing in a word-by-word manner. Based on this grammatical glossing, I did a more literal translation that was checked by a native speaker of English.

It is important to note that there are instances of code-switching in the data (between Kazakh and Russian, with Russian typically being used only very briefly). The instances of code-switching mostly occurred at a level of a word (often for discourse markers like “so” and “so that”, for example, which would occur in Russian), at a phrase level (e.g., “like on the palm of the hand”), or an utterance (e.g., “How much is the price?”). Due to space limitations, and my interest in analyzing multiple narratives across all three levels of positioning, I did not analyze code-switching as a positioning narrative device in this study (though this is a topic that merits future research).

Another important aspect of the study and data to discuss is the researcher’s role. As I mentioned before, I, along with my mother who is an insider to the village, participated in data collection. I personally participated in the recruitment of the first two families during the summer of 2015. As a result, I was present in two video-recording sessions; the remaining video-recording sessions were done by my mother. The reaction of the participants towards me was very positive as I was introduced by the village main official as a Kazakh PhD student who
conducts research about Kazakh culture. This presentation especially seemed to influence the mealtime conversations in which I participated. First, the two hosting families prepared a very rich table that included traditional food. Next, the first hosting family had invited a neighbor, Aunt Amina, telling her that this video-recording would be about Kazakh culture. As a result, it seems that she came with this research frame in mind, as she tried to share a lot of information about Kazakh culture (and give advice). In the second family, Hostess Ulbon also seemed focused on sharing with me her view of the Kazakh lifestyle. However, in the recordings done by my mother, my mother seemed to be a very natural presence to the participants and, thus, the data collection process seemed to barely impact the conversations, as the participants mostly focused on discussions of their daily routines.

3.2 Unit of and procedure of analysis

My primary unit of analysis is the narrative. In identifying the narratives that I analyze, I followed the definition proposed in Labov and Waletzky’s (1967) original work. They define a narrative as “one verbal technique for recapitulating past experience, in particular a technique for constructing narrative units which match the temporal sequence of experience” (1967:13). In other words, narratives are a way to recapture past experiences that are realized via narrative units which are temporally organized. And narrative units are defined as independent clauses that are “relevant to temporal sequence,” which means that the order of the clauses, if changed, would change “the inferred sequence of events in the original semantic interpretation” (Labov & Waletzky 1967:14). Therefore, I considered as a narrative any recounting of a past experience that has at least two independent clauses that are temporally organized, where changing the order
of these clauses will change the story interpretation. This was the major principal of selecting the data for the analysis.

Narrative themes were another guiding force for my data selection. Thus, based on my consideration of all the narratives I collected, I selected narratives recounting past experiences that involve people of other ethnic/national backgrounds, narratives that involve neighbors, and narratives about family members. These narrative themes allowed me to categorize them into the out-group and in-group categories that then became the basis for the dissertation chapters. This resulted in twenty narratives out of the eighty-two identified at the initial stage.

To analyze the selected narratives in a more holistic manner, in each analysis chapter, I follow Bamberg’s (1997) three-level approach to narrative analysis along with extensions of it made by Bamberg and Georgakopoulou (2008) and De Fina (2008, 2013). I also integrate the concepts from interactional sociolinguistics and Conversational Analysis reviewed in the previous chapter. Specifically, I draw on Labov and Waletzky’s foundational work on narrative clauses (Labov & Waletzky 1967; Labov 1972), Tannen’s (1989/2007) theorizing on involvement strategies (specifically, repetition, constructed dialogue, and details), and Schiffrin’s (1996) analysis of self-presentation of identity in the analysis of how the story worlds (or positioning at Level 1) are constructed. Next, I incorporate research on narrative sequencing (Sacks 1970) and the local occasioning of narratives (Jefferson 1978), as well as the notion of frame (e.g., Tannen & Wallat 1987/1993), to illuminate how story worlds fit the interactional context (or positioning at Level 2). Finally, I situate the findings of Level 1 and 2 in the broader socio-cultural context by drawing on sociological and anthropological studies about Kazakh culture and Soviet and post-Soviet Kazakhstan.
Using this theoretical framework, in each analysis chapter, I first provide a detailed discourse analysis that examines the narratives themselves i.e., their clauses and other structural elements, to better understand how the characters in the story world are constructed and positioned towards each other. Bamberg (1997) and Bamberg and Georgakopoulou (2008) suggest examining the linguistic devices that are employed to construct the characters in terms of their roles such as an antagonist, protagonist, and victim. De Fina (2008, 2013) takes this further by specifying story world analysis with a focus on characters’ actions, motives, and attributes. For instance, she illustrates how African American girls in the story world created by a Latin American immigrant woman are ascribed such actions as attacking, insulting, and hitting her sister, and suggests that these are motivated by prejudices and thus ascribe the characters a quality of violence.

In a more structural approach like Labov and Waletzky (1967) and Labov (1972), actions mostly occur in a narrative’s complicating action (i.e., the series of organized narrative clauses), while assignment of qualities and motives may surface in evaluation segments of a narrative (i.e., syntactic and prosodic alternations that highlight important parts of the story or assess a certain complicating action). In addition, Labov (1972) points out that reported speech, or what Tannen (1989/2007) calls constructed dialogue, functions as evaluation. Labov (1972) also notes that if voicing is done from the perspective of a third party, it brings more credibility and drama. Tannen (1989/2007) specifies regarding constructed dialogue that “even seemingly ‘direct’ quotation is really ‘constructed dialogue’, that is, primarily the creation of the speaker rather than the party quoted” (99). Thus, constructed dialogue serves the narrator’s purposes, including enhancement of the images of story characters and creation of involvement, because “dialogue is
not a general report; it is particular, and the particular enables listeners (or readers) to create their understanding by drawing on their own history of associations” (Tannen 1989/2007).

Besides constructed dialogue, repetition and details are other crucial involvement and evaluation strategies employed in constructing the story world, and I attend to them in my analysis. Tannen (1989/2007) suggests that details help to create images and scenes that are employed to support the story point. Repetition reinforces the created images and scenes, and thus increases the dramatic effect of narratives, which may shape audience reactions and participation. Finally, I also focus on evaluation more generally, as Schiffrin (1996) illustrates that diverse evaluation devices serve as means of presenting narrators’ epistemic selves, i.e., their beliefs and assumption about a certain social issue. Moreover, the presentation of an agentive self (i.e., regarding a character’s actions) and an epistemic self (i.e., regarding beliefs and assumption) may be at odds. She notes that the mismatch between these two types of clause (actions and evaluations) creates a dual position, which helps the narrator to resolve a particular social dilemma. Overall, my analysis of each narrative’s structure, the devices used, and the story’s content, demonstrates how characters are positioned vis-à-vis each other in the story world.

Second, after exploring the story world of each narrative and the positioning that is accomplished there, I examine the storytelling world. I show how the narrator positions him or herself toward his or her audience, and highlight the interactive accomplishment and management of the narrating process (following, e.g., Bamberg & Georgakopoulou 2008). This involves a detailed analysis of the story entrance and exit, integrating Jefferson’s (1978) concepts of stories as locally occasioned and sequentially implicative, and Sacks’ (1970/1992b) work on
narrative sequencing (of a preface, audience response, and narrative). Specifically, I show how each conversational narrative develops from what being discussed in its immediate conversational context and how it influences further development of the conversation. Since narrators seek extended floor-holding, they need to make the narrative relevant to the ongoing conversation; this is co-accomplished in discourse.

I also incorporate C. Goodwin’s (1986) concept of interpretive framework and M. H. Goodwin’s (1996) work of audience participation. Goodwin (1986) suggests that narrators provide their audience with an initial characterization of a story, or an interpretive framework that functions as a frame for the audience to understand the narrative events. Also, during the narrating process, the teller uses diverse means (verbal and nonverbal) that serve as contextualization cues (Gumperz 1977/1982) to suggest how the audience should align to the story. Nonetheless, the audience can offer competing frameworks for interpretation and alignment that may not coincide with the teller’s. Thus, the eventual interpretation of the story being told is a collaborative product of interaction between the teller and their audience.

Third and finally, I connect the findings of my analysis of positioning in Levels 1 and 2 to the socio-economic processes and ideological discourses taking place in post-Soviet Kazakhstan, i.e., the socio-cultural world. This situates the storytelling in a broader context, while also illuminating positioning Level 3. To do so, I will draw on different socio-historical studies regarding value systems in the Soviet and post-Soviet periods and such cultural values as face and respect for elderly. This allows me to explicate what emerges as particularly “Kazakh” about the narratives I collected, and how the narrators construct Kazakh identities.
This is the methodology I use to examine the everyday narratives in the following chapters, which focus on narratives that involve out-group members (non-Kazakhs) (Chapter Four), narratives that feature other village residents (Chapter Five), and narratives that involve family members (Chapter Six). Analyzing the set of twenty personal narratives, I show how the Kazakh narrators construct their identities as Kazakhs, as well as neighbors, caregivers, and other family-related identities.
CHAPTER FOUR: OUT-GROUP RELATIONSHIPS

4.1 Introduction

In this chapter I present an analysis that focuses on out-group relations, or how Kazakh-speaking narrators construct their Kazakh ethnic identities and the identities of other ethnic groups (Russians, Americans, Koreans, and Vietnamese) by means of narrative. I examine four stories that concern relations between Kazakhs and these groups. The first two narratives have a socio-economic theme; the third one addresses food; and the fourth one is within the theme of family values. All of these are meaningful parts of everyday lives and identities. To analyze the narratives, I follow the framework outlined in the last chapter that involves the three-level approach to positioning (Bamberg 1997; Bamberg and Georgakopoulou 2008; De Fina 2008, 2013), integrated with theorizing from narrative analysis, interactional sociolinguistics, and Conversation Analysis.

Within this theoretical framework, I first provide a detailed discourse analysis that examines the narratives themselves (i.e., their clauses and other structural elements) and narrating (i.e., how the participants initiate narratives and how audience members participate). In other words, I investigate Levels 1 and 2 (i.e., story world and storytelling world). To illuminate the construction of actions, motives, and characteristics attributed to the protagonists and other characters in the story world, I show how narrators use singular and plural morphology as well as involvement features identified by Tannen (1989/2007), how narrative clauses are employed to create the story world, and how narrators construct story world characters’ agentive and epistemic selves. In so doing, I show how Russian and American characters are positioned as more advanced in terms of technological development and financial resources while Kazakh
characters are presented as clever and enterprising people who are able to take advantage of the financial resources belonging to the Americans in the story worlds. In a narrative about a wool firm run by Russians, the firm is assigned more actions and its product is evaluated positively (repeatedly, and with phonological reinforcement). In a narrative that involves American tourists, the Americans’ financial advantage is mostly achieved via constructed dialogue (or evaluation in Labov’s terms) that is in the form of more agentive speech acts. However, if the characters of Kazakhs are almost absent in first story world, the Kazakh drivers are active in the story world, outwitting the American tourists. In the narratives that focus on the theme of food and family values, the characters of Kazakhs are positioned as more positive ones through assigning negative qualities (by means of evaluation clauses) to food of other ethnic groups (Vietnamese and Russians) and through the repetition of negative actions of a Russian ex-wife and by assigning her morally negative qualities (again by means of evaluation).

Second, in examining the storytelling world, I show how the narrator positions him or herself towards his or her audience, and highlight the interactive accomplishment and management of the narrating process (following, e.g., Bamberg & Georgakopoulou 2008). This involves a detailed analysis of the story entrance and exit. My analysis of the storytelling world demonstrates that the majority of narratives I examine in this chapter are employed as a means of argumentation, being triggered either by development of discourse topic (e.g., American investments motivates the narrative about the Russians advances in processing technology) or the objects in the immediate context (e.g., the video-recorder or a child playing nearby). Having issued a certain statement, the narrators then strengthen it with a narrative, constructing the story worlds to support their claims. Since the broader frame of the meals was video recording for my
research about Kazakh culture, many aspects of the narratives simultaneously serve to construct ethnic identity.

Third and finally, I connect the findings of my analysis of positioning in Levels 1 and 2 to the socio-economic processes and ideological discourses taking place in post-Soviet Kazakhstan. This situates the storytelling in a broader context, while also illuminating positioning Level 3. I suggest that the positionings at the two levels of the narratives that revolved around an economic theme reflect previous discourse of Soviet times and larger contemporary discourses of Russia in the Central Asian region (i.e., Russia as a more powerful center of economic and financial resources), as well as current ideological discourses that present the Western world as economically superior. The positioning at Levels 1 and 2 of the narratives that focus on food and family values seem to point to the current ideological discourses of nation-building in Kazakhstan; these strive to revive Kazakh traditions and values after Russian and Soviet colonization.

Taken together, my analyses of these narratives at the three positioning levels show that Kazakh narrators construct their identities through creating story worlds in which they depict social relations based on narrators’ ideological assumptions regarding other ethnic groups.

4.2 Constructing out-group relations within a socio-economic theme

In this part of the analysis, I focus on the personal stories that involve Kazakh and other ethnic groups within a socio-economic theme, in other words, with regard to personal finances and broader economies.
4.2.1 Narrative One: The Russian wool firm

4.2.1.1 Summary of the narrative and overview of findings

The first selected narrative revolves around the theme of economics and technology and the Russian ethnic group. There is a Russian firm located in a small town in Kyrgyzstan (another former Republic in the post-Soviet area). This firm collects the fleece of sheep and successfully processes it, resulting in a wool product of high quality. The narrator creates an image of this high quality through providing details of its texture, scent, and popularity among the tourists. The high-quality, technologically-facilitated Russian wool product is positioned in contrast with the wastefulness of the Kazakhs who reside in the village.

Applying the model of three levels of positioning in narrative, I show how the Kazakh narrator discursively foregrounds her ethnic (Kazakh) identity by means of a narrative that involves comparison of two ethnic groups: Kazakhs and Russians. She accomplishes this through positioning herself in alignment with the Russians who efficiently use resources (wool) in the story world, and in disalignment with the local Kazakhs in the storytelling world who waste the same resource. At a more global level, these positionings at the two levels reflect larger contemporary discourses of Russia in the Central Asian region: Russia is still viewed as a superior economic center due to more advanced processing industries that were well-developed during the Soviet era because the other Soviet republics were sources of raw materials. By taking a certain positioning towards bigger ideological discourses, the narrator constructs her Kazakh identity.
4.2.1.2 Data and analysis

The storytelling episode is taken from a mealtime conversation involving five women of different ages and social roles. Two of them are the hosts, who I refer as Host Mother-in-law and Daughter-in-law. Mother-in-law is a local who was born and raised in the village while Daughter-in-law was born and raised in a neighboring small town and moved when she got married (after she finished her undergraduate degree). Mother-in-law was in her sixties and Daughter-in-law was in her thirties at the time of data collection. A village governor introduced this family to me and I asked them if I could come to video-record a mealtime conversation. I explained in general terms that I was researching Kazakh culture and everyday conversations, which is why I wanted to video-record the mealtime conversation. They agreed and also invited their neighbor who I refer as Guest Aunt Amina or Aunt Amina; as they explained later, they felt they were not very talkative and that Aunt Amina was knowledgeable about Kazakh culture. Aunt Amina was a native of the south of Kazakhstan but bought a house in this village in 2010 and has spent summers there since then. She was also in her sixties at the time of data collection. The two other women were my mother and me. As mentioned in Chapter Three, my mother was helping to collect data in this village because she grew up there; she was in her sixties at the time of data collection. I was introduced as a PhD student researching Kazakh culture.

The selected narrative occurs after a brief discussion between my mother and Aunt Amina about Americans as farmers. At that point, Aunt Amina had suggested that this village needs US investments, as the town has many resources that are wasted. After this, the exchange takes place mostly between Aunt Amina and Host Mother-in-law who align in describing how the locals waste sheep fleece; they primarily address this discussion to me. Thus, in line 1 Aunt
Amina provides a specific example of how the local Kazakh are wasteful by picking up sheep fleece. She poses a hypothetical question regarding what the other ethnic groups like Chinese and Turkish would do instead (lines 2-3). Mother-in-law supports Aunt Amina’s sentiment by adding that locals do not even attempt to sell this resource and Aunt Amina supports this statement and then launches into a narrative that portrays the Russian firm that successfully processes sheep fleece. In line 4, Host Mother-in-law uses “we” to mean village locals, and “it” refers to sheep fleece; in line 6, Guest Aunt Amina uses “they” to refer to village locals. I use bold font to highlight lines of particular interest in the narrative. Transcription conventions can be found in Appendix A.

1  Aunt Amina: For example, sheep’s fleece, they are selling it for free, for a penny.
2  So, in this case, Chinese and Turkish people,
3  do you know what they are making?
4  Mother-in-law: We even do not sell. [We simply put it on the land.
5  Aunt Amina: [Wonderful-
6  Having taken it there (outside of the village), they put (it) on the land.
7  Mother-in-law: All the threads.
8  Aunt Amina: It is pure wool, GeNUINE WOOl.
9  Say like this, into America America’s ears /if so/.
10 Aisulu: {laughter}
11 Daughter-in-law: {laughter}
12 Aunt Amina: For example like,
13 When my older daughter got married to a Kyrgyz man-
14 Indeed, you invited me to talk in vain, I’m not letting them eat.
15 {5 lines omitted in which Aunt Amina jokes that she is very talkative and does not let my mother and me eat.}
16 Aunt Amina: In Kyrgyzstan that I mentioned, my older daughter got married to a Kyrgyz man.
17 At the Sunny Lake. There is such a place called the Sunny Lake, you know.
18 In that place, the Star town is,
19 in that place they, Russians, are doing what-, you know,
20 there is one device.
Nice. It is necessary to ask them where they brought it from. They, you know, yes, They are taking sheep fleece and they are processing this fleece. NOW, (the) SCE:NT of that (processed fleece) is wonderful, it does not disappear. Very soft {sof-soft in Kazakh} <Rus>So> so much wool thread, the thread like this-

The scent of that wool is blossoming. Very soft {sof-soft in Kazakh}, it (processed wool) is. [Do you know how much money? {6 lines are omitted in which my mother tries to explain that this is merino fleece that is why it is of good quality}

Aunt Amina: Now, you know, it is very soft {sof-soft in Kazakh}.

Tourists buy these (wool products) ‘like at a war’ {meaning it is very popular and people line up to buy it}.

For example, in your money {meaning in a Kazakhstani currency, tenge} one pack of fleece goes for fifty-sixty thousand.

But, you (Mother-in-law and local Kazakhs) are throwing away this fleece having taken it outside of the village.

4.2.1.3 Level 1 (Story world)

In the story world, there are three characters: Aunt Amina’s (Kazakh) daughter, her son-in-law who is a Kyrgyz man, and the “they” that make up the Russian firm. The first two characters are presented in what Labov (Labov & Waletzky 1967; Labov 1972) calls the orientation section (roughly, lines 20-24). Interestingly, the son-in-law is introduced using an ethnic term (i.e., a Kyrgyz man, line 13 and 20); Kyrgyzstan, like Kazakhstan, is a former Soviet republic that is also located in the region of Central Asia. De Fina (2003, 2006, 2008, 2013) reveals that the use of ethnic terms in the orientation clauses makes ethnicity pertinent to the point of the narrative. In fact, the focus on ethnic relations becomes highlighted as the story unfolds.
Examining the actions and characteristics attributed to the protagonists and other story world characters, the character of the Kazakh daughter performs only one action (i.e., getting married to a Kyrgyz man in line 13 and 20) while the Kyrgyz man who is the son-in-law is not depicted as performing any action. The Russians are presented in the plural (line 23, “in that place they, Russians, are doing what-, you know”). De Fina (2013) shows that the introduction of characters in the plural creates a collective or group character. This collective character of “Russians” is constructed as being much more agentive than the Kazakh-Kyrgyz couple and is associated with positive qualities.

First, the major actions that take place are attributed to the Russians at the firm (i.e., “are doing,” “take wool,” and “process it” lines 23 and 27); this contributes to their positioning as active and productive in the story world. Second, the product produced by Russians at the firm is given, in evaluative clauses, such qualities as being “soft,” “having ‘a scent’” that is “wonderful, it did not disappear,” and having a “scent that is blossoming” (lines 28-32). In addition, the high quality of the Russians’ product is reinforced through repetition, following theorizing by Tannen (1989/2007). The English translation “very soft” (in lines 30 and 32) is achieved in Kazakh through a morphological process of reduplication, which is a repetition of a part of the word root, i.e., sof- which is a part of the root soft is repeated and prefixed to the root soft. Repetition also occurs at the turn level: Aunt Amina repeats “very soft” in lines 30, 32, and 40, and “scent” in lines 28 and 31. In addition, the word “scent” and “soft” receive emphatic stress and the vowels are elongated in both words, which further reinforces these qualities. Finally, the evaluation of the product is strengthened through a metaphor, similar to how the women in Schiffrin’s (1996) study used metaphor to evaluate their relationship with younger women in their families. Thus,
the Russian-processed wool product is so popular that “Tourists buy these (the wool products) ‘like at a war’” (line 41). The metaphor ‘like at a war’ means that the product is so popular that people line up and fight to get it first. Through using this metaphor, Aunt Amina strengthens the image of the high-quality wool produced by the Russian firm.

These linguistic strategies also construct nuanced details. As Tannen (1989/2007, 2008) shows, repetition and details work together to create images that further reinforce a narrative’s point. Thus, the well-crafted image of the wool product produced by Russians reinforces the positive and superior image of them in the story world – they are active and produce a high-quality good. Finally, the attribution of qualities is done in the evaluative clauses. Schiffrin (1996) shows that evaluation clauses can be effectively used to convey the narrator’s epistemic self or the beliefs of the narrator regarding certain social issues. In this case, the narrator effectively shows her beliefs about the economic superiority of the Russians.

To sum up, the character of the Russian firm (“they”) is positioned as an agentive protagonist with positive qualities that are reflected in the many positive qualities attributed to their product.

4.2.1.4 Level 2 (Storytelling world)

In the storytelling world, the narrator Aunt Amina is a guest who the hosts invited as a friend and an expert on Kazakh culture (for the video-recording). This initial interactive frame, or “what is going on in the interaction, without which no utterance (or movement or gesture) could be interpreted” (Tannen & Wallat 1987:206), predisposes her to construct the identity of
an authentic Kazakh. In addition, following Kazakh cultural norms, she has prestigious interactional status as she is elderly and a guest.

Analysis of the interactive accomplishment of narrating (as has been illustrated by Bamberg & Georgakopoulou 2008, among others), the locally occasioned nature of narratives (as shown by Jefferson 1978), and the presence of a story preface (following Sacks 1970/1992b), reveals that the narrative serves as an exemplum (Carranza 1998; De Fina 2000; Günthner 1995; Schiffrin 1990) in the storytelling world. It serves to illustrate how Kazakhs are wasteful with their resources. Specifically, in the story entrance, Host Mother-in-law says that “We even do not sell (sheep fleece). We simply put it on the land.” (line 1). By saying “we,” she means the locals in the village (seemingly herself included) and indicates these locals do not sell this resource but waste it by throwing it away. Aunt Amina reinforces this statement through repetition of the same proposition, explaining the local Kazakh’s treatment of the fleece: “Having taken it there (outside of the village), they put on the land.” (line 3). This allows Aunt Amina to display alignment with Mother-in-law, another Kazakh woman, before she launches into her story. This is shown in lines 1-10, reproduced below.

1 Aunt Amina: For example, sheep’s fleece, they are selling it for free, for a penny.  
2 So, in this case, Chinese and Turkish people,  
3 do you know what they are making?  
4 Mother-in-law: We even do not sell. [We simply put it on the land.  
5 Aunt Amina: [Wonderful-  
6 Having taken it there (outside of the village), they put (it) on the land.  
7 Mother-in-law: All the threads.  
8 Aunt Amina: It is pure wool, GeNUINE WOOl.  
9 Say like this, into America America’s ears /if so/.  
10 Aisulu: {laughter}  
11 Daughter-in-law: {laughter}
Aunt Amina: For example like, when my older daughter got married to a Kyrgyz man-

In these lines, Aunt Amina further emphasizes the waste of fleece as a resource by saying that “It is pure wool, GeNUINE WOOl.” in line 8. Her employment of involvement techniques such as a lexical repetition (i.e., the word “wool”) and empathic stress (i.e., “GeNUINE WOOl”) reinforces her alignment with Mother-in-law and prepares the base for narrating. Lines 9 and 10 clearly indicate that the purpose of the coming narrative is to exemplify how the village locals (i.e., the Kazakhs) are wasteful: Aunt Amina starts by saying “For example like, when my older daughter got married to a Kyrgyz man-.” By using this strategy, the narrator proposes her version of the framework within which the coming events need to be understood (following C. Goodwin 1986). Along the narrating process, this framework is not challenged; thus, the audience displays its agreement with the story point projected by the narrator (a pattern observed by C. Goodwin 1986, M. H. Goodwin 1996), which is the illustration of how Kazakhs are wasteful about natural resources. In addition, the emphasis on the quality of wasted wool (fleece of the village sheep) allows Aunt Amina to position herself as very knowledgeable about wool, which supports the construction of her Kazakh identity because wool was an essential resource for building Kazakh traditional houses, or irts.

As previously mentioned, the narrator achieves the point of Kazakhs being wasteful in her telling through creating the Russian characters in the story world as a collective agentive protagonist, with superior attributes; through the creation of a positive image of the Russians and especially of their high-quality product (wool), the point of the story is achieved. This image is further juxtaposed with the image of wasteful local Kazakhs in the coda of the story.
In the story exit, or the sequential implications of the story (Jefferson 1978), the narrator, Aunt Amina, is doing what Schiffrin (1996) describes as, “replaying and elaborating the point of the story after its resolution” (186). This shown in lines 40-44, reproduced below.

40  Aunt Amina: Now, you know, it is ve:ry soft {sof-soft in Kazakh}.
41        Tourists buy these (wool products) like at a war.
42  For example, in your money {meaning in a Kazakhstani currency, tenge} one pack of fleece goes for fifty-sixty thousand.
44  But, you are throwing away this fleece having taken it outside of the village.

Specifically, Aunt Amina elaborates the story’s point by ‘translating’ the benefits of fleece processing into the local Kazakhstani currency and suggesting how much money Mother-in-law (and presumably, other Kazakhs) would receive from selling the resource in lines 42-43 (“For example, in your money (in Kazakhstani currency), one pack of fleece goes for fifty-sixty thousand.”). In addition, she reprimands Mother-in-law (as the representative of the local Kazakhs) explicitly saying “But, you are throwing away this fleece having taken it outside of the village.” in line 44.

All in all, the narrative offered by Aunt Amina serves as an exemplar that positions Russians as more advanced in terms of technology and economics and juxtaposes their advancement with the wastefulness and lack of motivation of the local Kazakhs. As shown in my examination of the entrance into and exit from the narrative, the point of this narrative is not challenged, but rather reinforced by the audience. In the context of the conversation as part of an opportunity to learn more about Kazakh culture, this seems to signal that this is a more or less widespread view of Kazakhs in relation to Russians.
4.2.1.5 Level 3 (Socio-cultural world)

I now turn to Level 3, or how the narrator positions herself towards bigger ideological discourses or bigger socio-cultural values through the narrative and the narrating process. The narrative is told not only in a conversational context that was video-recorded for research purposes, but also in the larger and more abstract context of post-Soviet Kazakhstan, which received its independence from Russia only twenty-seven years earlier. Kazakhstan went through Russian colonization that started in the 18th century and through a similarly dominant Soviet regime in the 20th century (e.g., Pavlenko 2008). These two major historical processes resulted in the economics of Kazakhstan; Kazakhstan mostly produced raw resources like gas, oil, coal, and wheat (e.g., Yarashevich 2014). Thus, Kazakhstan served as the source of raw materials that were extracted and transported to Russia. This economic dependence on Russia was particularly evident when the Soviet Union collapsed in 1991 (e.g., Ipek 2007). Since then there have been many improvements, but Kazakhstan is still trying to balance out this economic and mostly important political dependence on Russia. Pavlenko (2008) shows these attempts as they have manifested through the development of language polices. Specifically, she points out that nation-building language policies have evolved from nativism (i.e., emphasizing Kazakh as a consolidating force for a multi-ethnic population) and rapid derussification via introducing English as a new lingua franca in the first decade of independence, to recognizing Russian as a local lingua franca. This serves as evidence of the strong presence of Russia as an economic and political force in the Central Asian region (e.g., Ipek 2007; Pavlenko 2008; Yarashevich 2014).

At positioning Level 3 then, the agentive figure of the successful Russian wool business in the narrative of Aunt Amina that is juxtaposed to the wasteful Kazakh village residents in the
storytelling world can be seen as a reflection of, or reaction to, current larger discourses circulating about the lasting and dominant influence of Russia, especially in regards to economics, and technologies that affect economics. This also serves as endorsement of the more advanced character of Russian entrepreneurship. The Kazakhstan-Russia juxtaposition, realized in the story through character positioning, and how the story is collaboratively introduced and exited, helps the teller, who a native Kazakh, construct the ethnic identity of her group as she addresses the narrative to the audience of five Kazakh-speaking women from Kazakhstan, including me, a researcher interested in Kazakh culture and identity. I now turn to another narrative told that constructs Kazakh identity in relation to the identity of another group: American tourists.

4.2.2 Narrative Two: Taxiing for American tourists

4.2.2.1 Summary of narrative and overview of findings

The narrative I examine in this section also revolves around the theme of economics. It involves two major groups of characters: Kazakh taxi drivers and American tourists who had come to a small town located near the village where my data were collected in order to learn more about Kazakhstan. In the narrative, the two Kazakh drivers take advantage of the American tourists by charging an increased hourly rate and taking them to all possible local sightseeing locations. The final scene in the story is the local sightseeing trip one Kazakh driver gave the American tourists. Having taken them to various locations, he also tried to get into as many of their photos as possible, so that his image could travel the US (as he himself could not afford to travel).
Again applying the model of three levels of positioning in narrative (Bamberg 1997, Bamberg & Georgakopoulou, 2008), I demonstrate how in this narrative a Kazakh male narrator discursively constructs his ethnic and gender identities through a dual position (Schiffrin 1996) that portrays him as one who took good advantage of rich American tourists by overcharging them, but who still wanted to take photos with them so that his image could travel with them to the US. This dual positon surfaces through the mismatch of complicating actions and evaluations, i.e., the American characters appear superior in terms of evaluation, but the Kazakh characters perform more actions and are able to get the Americans to overpay them. This dual position helps the narrator to resolve a particular social dilemma: The acknowledgment of and irritation with the Americans’ economic superiority and the demonstration of the Kazakh value of hospitality. The audience aligns towards this interpretive frame (C. Goodwin 1986) through backchannel tokens, laughter, and assessments. Such a dual positon when the characters’ actions do not completely align with the evaluations and alignment of the audience points to the current ideological discourses that present the Western world as economically superior. However, in contrast to the wool firm story, the Kazakh characters do show some resourcefulness when it comes to making a profit.

4.2.2.2 Data and analysis: Creating a dual position

The narrative takes place among members of the family of my mother’s cousin. The narrative is very long, so only relevant parts of it will be used for this analysis. Thus, I analyze three excerpts for Levels 1 and 2 and then provide the summary of each level across the narrative, along with the analysis of Level 3.
During the meal, the family’s mother and father and their two sons, the father’s brother, and my mother were present. My mother had described video-recording as part of a research project about Kazakh culture conducted by me, her daughter, a PhD student. I was not present in this recording. I refer to the father as Host Husband, his brother as Host’s Brother, and two sons as Younger Son and Older Son. Before the narrative, there was a short exchange between my mother and Host’s Brother. My mother asks if he was still working at the local community college. He replies yes. After this exchange, Host Husband turns to the camera and says to Younger Son to look at the camera so that his picture will “walk” in the USA (meaning it will be sent to me there). This moment triggers Host Husband’s narrative about driving around the American tourists in his taxi.

The excerpt below shows the beginning of the narrative. It includes an abstract, orientation, and a few complicating actions (Labov and Waletzky 1967; Labov 1972).

1 Host Husband: **Look like at this, your picture will ‘walk’ in America** {to his → younger son}.
2 Some time ago, I also **did taxiing**. In Fish Town.
3 One day, those, **seven people from ‘not-populated’ Texas state,**
4 Host’s Brother: Mhm.
5 Host Husband: in order to know <Rus>general> information about the Kazakhstan people,
6 they did not **come** by that- by a touristic minivan,
7 Host’s Brother: Mhm.
8 Host Husband: they had **come** by an electro-train, the early-morning one.
9 Host’s Brother: Mhm.
10 Host Husband: Having shouted “Taxi, taxi!” all (taxi drivers) had gone.
11 Only like two taxi drivers stayed (at the railway station).
12 All had gone. Having taken and taken (passengers), all had gone.
13 **I came** a bit late and **stayed** there (at the railway station).
14 Host’s Brother: Mhm.
15 Host Husband: /*?/ **Then I thought,**
16 “Hey, okay, I will stay for a bit, then I will leave.”
17 When I looked, **they were** walking in a relaxed way from that side (of the railway station).
18 <Rus>HU:ge, HU:ge!> Russians’ what- the Americans.
19 One of these Americans had put on, you know, that- a ‘tiimagy’ → {a traditional male’s cap}.
20 <Rus>HU:ge, HU:ge!> {Illustrates the height/body size with → raising shoulders up}
21 Seven people. Oh- with them is <Rus>an interpreter>, a Kazakh girl.
22 Host’s Brother: Mhm.
23 Host Husband: That then (one more time), that “Taxi, taxi, taxi, please take a taxi!” I said.
24 “Taxi <Rus>we take>!” Then they said-
25 One of them said something in English, I really did not understand → (English).
26 Then, that girl (the interpreter) asked, <Rus>“How much will it cost?”→ I said-
27 Well, since (they) were talking in English, I <Rus> upped (the price)> → more.
28 Host’s Brother: {laughter}
29 Host Husband: <laughing>An hour->
30 An hour from what- I think I said two thousand per an hour as a rate.
31 We went with this.

4.2.2.3 Level 1 (Story world)

In the orientation of the narrative, the narrator introduces the major characters: himself in the role of a taxi driver, seven American tourists from the state of Texas, and a Kazakh girl who is serving as an interpreter. Later (in lines not shown here), Host Father introduces another Kazakh taxi driver, whom he suggested to taxi for the American tourists because they needed one more car. The tourists are introduced in ethnic, or more accurately in this case, nationality, terms: American. In line with De Fina’s (2003, 2006, 2008, 2013) finding that the use of ethnic terms in orientation clauses makes ethnicity relevant to the point of the narrative, the ethnicity/nationality of the characters in this story is intertwined with the story’s point. The narrator’s identity as Kazakh is not directly stated, but is also built into the story: He notes the Americans came to learn about Kazakh culture, and he communicates with the Kazakh girl since the Americans don’t speak the language. It is hard to say what language was actually used
(Russian or Kazakh) in reality, but the voicing of Kazakh girl who is the interpreter is done in Russian throughout the narrative.

Regarding the actions and character positioning in this excerpt, the character of the narrator, a protagonist in the status of a taxi driver, is constructed as an agentive figure. He performs such actions captured in phrases such as “did taxiing,” “came,” “stayed,” “thought,” “said,” and “upped the price” (lines 2, 6, 8, 13, 15, and 27). The Americans are more passive in this part of the story because they do not perform any major actions besides “walking in relaxed way” and “one of them said something in English” in lines 17 and 25. The Kazakh girl performs one action, i.e., asking for the price of a taxiing service in line 26, which, while agentive is also relatively non-agentive in comparison with the protagonist in the sense that she asks on behalf of the tourists, and it is the only action she performs. Thus, in terms of actions, the taxi driver has more in relation to the other characters.

Regarding characters’ attributes and positioning, the Americans are introduced not only in ethnic terms but also in terms of their phenotype. This presentation is focused on their height and size. Thus, narrator repeats in Russian “<Rus>HUːge, HUːge!>” (in lines 18 and 20) and uses his upper body to show that the Americans were higher and bigger in size. This physical description is repeated and reinforced through emphatic stress and elongation of the first vowel. This repetition crafts an image of American characters’ physical dominance in terms of height and size. This superiority in terms of size may serve to counterbalance the image of the agentive Kazakh taxi driver. Since the Americans’ size is expressed in evaluation clauses, following Schiffrin (1996), they may help construct the narrator’s epistemic self, specifically his beliefs about how western people should look. It is also possible that this detail may be motivated by
gender of the teller and his audience; all of them are men and physical dominance might be something that concerns them.

Code-switching also plays an evaluative role in the story. The term “huge” is produced in Russian and the narrator almost calls them Russians in line 18 (i.e., “Russians what-the Americans”). In addition, the question from the interpreter (the Kazakh girl) is also voiced in Russian (“<Rus> ‘How much will it cost?’”) in line 26 and the protagonist’s action of increasing the rate is also in Russian (“I <Rus> upped>”) in line 27. This code-switch may signal that the Kazakh narrator seems to associate Americans with Russians in the sense that they tend to be physically larger than Kazakhs, and are countries that are economically superior. This type of code-switch (from Kazakh to Russian) occurs two more times in the narrative when the topic concerns business or financial topics.

Finally, the collective character of the Kazakh taxi driver and the American tourists appears in a complicating action clause “We went with this.” (line 31), which indicates that agreement is achieved. In this way, the richer, taller Americans are in fact bested by the agentive Kazakh narrator, who gets them to pay an inflated rate.

4.2.2.4 Level 2 (Storytelling world)

In the storytelling world, the teller is the head of the family, which makes his interactional status higher relative to the other participants. In addition, there are four men and only two women present in the interaction. It seems that the narrator orients himself more toward the male interactants, which affects his story (see Goodwin [1984] for a similar phenomenon).
Regarding the interactive accomplishment of narrating, the story is in part triggered by the presence of the video-camera. Host Husband says to his son “Look like this, your picture will ‘walk’ in America.” in line 1. By this he means that his younger child should directly look into the video-recording camera. Gordon (2013) reveals that a recording device that is present for a research study can be effectively employed for identity work. Since the recording was framed by my mother as research about Kazakh culture and she indicated that the data would be sent to the United States, I believe the narrator is using this moment to construct his Kazakh identity and to express his beliefs about Americans. Thus, the orientation to the video-camera serves as the story preface (Sacks 1970/1992b). In other words, the video-camera was used as a resource to initiate a narrative. Thus, having said “Look like this, your picture will ‘walk’ in America (to his younger son” in line 1), Host Father beings the story “Some time ago, I also did taxiing. In Fish Town. One day, those, seven people from ‘not-populated’ Texas state,” in lines 2-3. By saying “not-populated,” the narrator seems to mean the state Texas that is not densely populated (I believe this is his knowledge of this state, but I do not know for sure).

Next, the teller seems to suggest an interpretation of the coming story as something related to Americans in how he gives the story orientation in lines 2-3, directly after pointing out that the son’s picture can “travel” to the US.

1 Host Husband: **Look like this, your picture will ‘walk’ in America {to his younger son}.
2 Some time ago, I also did taxiing. In Fish Town.
3 One day, those, seven people from ‘not-populated’ Texas state,**

Host Husband, in indicating that, “Some time ago, I also did taxiing. In Fish Town. One day, those, seven people from ‘not-populated’ Texas state,” orients his audience to a distant time and place where he encounters seven Americans who will serve a key role in the story. Thus, his
story presumably will indicate something about Kazakhs by depicting an encounter with Americans.

The principal recipient (Goodwin 1984) of the narrative is the narrator’s brother who is another adult male participant in the conversation; as mentioned, this seems to motivate the narrator’s use of the telling to construct his gender identity. Host’s Brother actively aligns with the narrator and with the characterization of the story provided by the teller. Thus, he backchannels with “Mhm.” in lines 4, 7, 9, 14, and 22. Through this display of alignment, the audience supports with the interpretive framework of the coming story that is offered by the teller (Goodwin 1986).

An interesting moment relevant to gendered ethnic identity construction occurs in lines 27-31, where Host Husband is describing how he over-charged the American tourists, as shown below.

27  Host Husband: Well, since (they) were talking in English, I <Rus> upped (the price)> → more.
28  Host’s Brother: {laughter}
29  Host Husband: <laughing> An hour ->
30  Host Husband: An hour from what- I think I said two thousand per an hour as a rate.
31  We went with this.

After the narrator mentions in line 27 that he increased the price since he heard the English speech, his brother laughs in line 28. Such audience participation (the primary recipient’s laughter) signals a positive assessment of how the narrator managed to trick the rich Americans into paying extra. The laughter serves as a contextualization cue that seems to motivate the narrator to go into more detail in line 29 about how much extra he charged (“An hour from what- I think I said two thousand per an hour as a rate.”). Using my background knowledge to provide
a comparison, the average price should be between five hundred to a thousand tenge per hour. Also, it would be very rare that someone would hire a taxi driver for a long time; usually, it is a one-way ride. Not only does the teller give details, but he also starts the turn following his brother’s with laughter, which mirrors his brother’s reaction. Following Tannen (1994), who shows that men tend to engage in playful competition for solidarity reasons in their interactions with each other, this moment may be effectively employed not only to construct the narrator’s Kazakh identity but also narrator’s gender identity in the storytelling world: He bested the Americans in the story world, and shows off to his brother in the telling world.

After the scene of meeting the Americans and negotiating the price for driving them around, it turned out that there was a need to have two cars and the narrator describes how he found another young Kazakh man to assist him with driving. I have omitted this part of the narrative to instead highlight the depicted interactions between the tourists and the narrator as a story world character. The next excerpt presents the part of the story about where the narrator drove the Americans and how they negotiated finding a place to eat.

46 Host’s Brother: Mhm.
47 Host Husband: Then, <Rus>I will set up time>. We went. I took them to the Rock Lake. I took them to all places. That- it is necessary to spend the time, indeed. At the rock - you know, locating on that side- it takes one hour to climb it up,
48 I climbed them up there, together.
49 Host’s Brother: {laughter}
50 Host Husband: Having letting them climb up that place. “<Rus>On- like on in the palm of your hand.>” I said.
51 Host Wife: (Many) people go to that place.
52 Host’s Brother: {laughter}
53 Host Husband: We went up there.
54 Then they said,
55 I- the time- when we were passing the area of our village,
56 the time was one o’clock <Rus>already> one.
We said, “There are more places to go,” I said.
“<Rus>Well, then, let’s eat.”> they said.
“Is there <Rus> a ‘normal’ restaurant> in the town?” That time we did not have yet like- ‘like-this like-that’ <Rus> ‘with wishes’> (with table service)
“There is a good restaurant for tourists,” I said.
Then, they said, “In this case, let’s go there.”
Host’s Brother: Mhm.
Host Husband: “You also come to eat (with us).”
“No, <Rus>please>, let us go.
Please, enjoy your food, don’t be in rush with your food,” → having said and-
<laughing> each- two- two-ish- to two drivers one thousand → tenge {a national currency}->
<laughing> having given two thousand to two of us, “Eat something!” → they said>
Host’s Brother: {laughter}
Host Husband: {laughter}
Younger son: For eating meal, really? {smiles}
Host Husband: Yes.
They entered the restaurant.
They sat for one hour and half; they went outside at three-thirty or four.
Host’s Brother: Mhm.
Host Husband: {laughter}
We (two Kazakh drivers) drove to the highway.
At a cheap small canteen on the highway.
<laughing> <Rus> now> we ate two bowls (of soup)>.
<laughter> two- one- one thousand, the half, tenge {a national currency} we <Rus>→ saved> well.
Like this, we did.
Host Husband: {laughter}
Host’s Brother: {laughter}
Younger son: {laughter}
Older son: {smiles}
Host Husband: Please, put more bread on the table {addressing his son in the telling world}.
Then later, again, at eight o’clock in the evening,
there is a late electric train at eight in the evening, I took them to → (get on the train).
Host’s Brother: Really!
Host Husband: I like one hour- what one eight, nine, ten time was until. We were (waiting).
“Okay, <Rus>no questions!>.”
With a helping man, we laid down inside of the car for two hours.
“When will they get off (the train)?” {laughter}
Young man- the young man next to me is laughing.

“Oh, uncle, please, sit down! Why? They are walking → (at the sightseeing).” he said.

Host’s Brother: Money indeed! {laughter}
Host Husband: Money is walking! {laughter}
I think, the rate came to two thousand per hour.

4.2.2.5 Level 1 (Story world)

In this part of the story, the main characters are the Kazakh taxi driver, the American tourists, and a young Kazakh man who is another taxi driver. The narrator constructs his figure as agentive. He performs such actions as “set up time,” “took,” “climb them up,” “let them climb up,” and “said” (which is repeated multiple times). Differently, the American tourists perform fewer actions, which are “said,” “give,” “enter,” “sat,” and “went outside.” It should be noted that the last three actions are more descriptive, because they do not have any influence on the other characters, so do not do much to contribute to them being portrayed as agentive characters. Interestingly, the collective figure of the two drivers performs such actions as “said,” “drove on the highway,” “ate,” “saved,” and “did like this.” This indirectly contributes to strengthen the image of the narrator and thus the image of Kazakhs in the story because agency (or the capacity of characters to take control over the flow of life) of the character is foregrounded through action verbs (they are presented as the ones who performed several actions that allowed them to save money). Such a distribution of actions among the characters seems to create a sort of balance.

Regarding the attributes and characters’ positioning, examining character voicing is very revealing. First, the fact that the narrator/Kazakh driver and the American tourists are voiced already makes them at least somewhat agentive figures (following Schiffrin 1996). However, some dominance of Americans becomes more evident if we look at what type of the speech acts
(Austin 1962, Searle 1969) are done by the two parties. The Kazakh drivers perform speech acts of a suggestion and refusal. Thus, the narrator voices himself in the story world with “‘There are more places to go,’ I said” in line 59 and “‘There is a good restaurant for tourists,’ I said” in line 63. The collective character of the two Kazakh drivers decline the lunch invitation from the American by saying “‘No, <Rus>please>, let us go. Please, enjoy your food, don’t be in rush with your food,’ having said and-” (lines 67-68). In contrast, the American tourists perform agentive speech acts of a directive, request, and invitation. Thus, they direct the action of driving by saying “<Rus> ‘Well, then, let’s eat.’> they said.”, “Then, they said, ‘In this case, let’s go there.’”, “‘Eat something!’ they said.” in lines 59, 64, and 70. They also request information that directs the floor of conversation, i.e., “‘Are here <Rus> a good restaurant> in the town?’” in line 61. Finally, they are the ones to invite the Kazakh drivers to the expensive restaurant by saying “‘You also come to eat (with us).’” in line 66. Through this constructed dialogue (Tannen 1989/2007) in the form of dialogue exchange, the images of both parties (the Kazakh driver and the American tourists) are strengthened. At first, it seems that voicing of the American tourists helps to show that they are in a superior financial positon because they are able (through voicing) to choose the restaurant, invite someone to join the meal, and even provide additional money for lunch at a different place. However, the Kazakh driver/narrator performs one speech act (a suggestion that there are other places to go in line 59) that actually ‘tricks’ the American tourists to continue exploring the local area and thus continue using the service of the Kazakh drivers. As a result, the Kazakh driver/narrator manages to outwit the ‘rich’ American tourists. This is interesting that this ‘smart’ move on the side of the Kazakhs is realized via constructed dialogue because constructed dialogue often functions as evaluation in narratives (Labov 1972), which in
its turn often reveals the narrator’s beliefs or what Schiffrin (1996) calls the epistemic self. In this case, it seems to bring to the surface the Kazakh narrator’s belief that the Americans are wealthier but also reveal the belief in a Kazakh’s ability to be smart enough to use this ‘resource’ to their advantage. However, it should be noted that constructed dialogue may also function as a device to advance narrating; in this analysis, and the dialogue exchange here does help propel the story along.

The attribute of the American tourists’ better financial status can be seen clearly in details provided in the description of the places that the characters eat. First, the American request information about a place to eat that is “<Rus> a ‘normal’ restaurant>” (line 61) meaning a high-quality restaurant (which is often expensive), and the Kazakh driver describes it as the restaurant “<Rus> ‘with wishes’>” in line 62 meaning with table service (i.e., wait staff), and then he takes them to “a good restaurant for tourists” (i.e., an expensive restaurant; line 63). This description is juxtaposed with “a cheap small canteen on the highway” (line 80), where the two Kazakh drivers eat “two bowls (of soup)” (line 80). Mentioning of this detail creates a more vivid image of the disparity between the two groups of characters and further reinforces the American tourists’ economic superiority. Moreover, repetition of the amount of money (“each- two- two-ish- to two drivers one thousand tenge-” and “having given two thousand to two of us,” in lines 69-70) that the American tourists give to the Kazakh drivers to eat reinforces how much money the Americans have to spend. However, the Kazakhs wisely do not waste this money on expensive food.

The comparison of complicating actions and evaluations reveals a mismatch, i.e., the American characters appear more superior in terms of evaluation, but the Kazakh characters
perform more actions and are able to get the Americans to overpay them. This mismatch creates a dual position (Schiffrin 1996), which helps the narrator to resolve a particular social dilemma: To balance acknowledging the economic superiority of the Americans and the Kazakh financial dependency on the American tourists on the one hand, with the Kazakh value of hospitality and the gender of the narrator, i.e., the tendency among men to strive for status, on the other.

4.2.2.6 Level 2 (Storytelling world)

In the storytelling world, the brother of the Host Husband continues to be the primary addressee and shows alignment with the teller’s version of the reported events. This alignment is particularly striking when it comes to the moments in which the narrator-protagonist (the Kazakh taxi driver) portrays how he tricks the American tourists into paying extra. These moments show that the main recipient aligns with the interpretive frame that the storyteller suggests. The next four excerpts will illustrate how this interpretive framework (i.e., understanding the taxi driver’s actions as tricking the rich Americans into paying extra) is sustained over the course of narrating and contributes to positioning of the Americans as superior in financial terms. Below, he explains where he took the Americans.

48  Host Husband:  I took them to all places. That- it is necessary to spend the time, indeed.
49  At the rock hill - you know, locating on that side- it takes one hour to climb it up.
50  I climbed them up there, together.
51  Host’s Brother:  {laughter}

After the narrator describes how he took the tourists up to the top of a rock hill by saying that “That- it is necessary to spend the time, indeed. I climbed them up there, together.” (lines 48-50), Host’s brother shows his alignment through laughter (line 51). Thus, the fact that spending
more time with the tourists means earning more money is evaluated by the audience as a smart move.

Next, after teller narrates that the naïve American tourists not only paid extra because they allowed him to take them to all possible local sightseeing spots, but also paid for the lunch of the Kazakh drivers (“<laughing> each- two- two-ish- to two drivers one thousand tenge- having given two thousand to two of us, “Eat something!” they said>”) in lines 69-70, the audience shows a strong alignment with this interpretation of the events and positioning of the Americans. Thus, Host Brother laughs in line 71 and Younger Son asks clarifying question (“For eating meal, really?”) and smiles in the following line 73.

64 Host Husband: Then, they said, “In this case, let's go there.”
65 Host’s Brother: Mhm.
66 Host Husband: “You also come to eat (with us).”
67 “No, <Rus>please>, let us go.
68 Please, enjoy your food, don’t be in rush with your food,” having said and-
69 <laughing> each- two- two-ish- to two drivers one thousand tenge
{Kazakhstani national currency}
70 <laughing> having given two thousand to two of us, “Eat something!” → they said>
71 Host’s Brother: {laughter}
72 Host Husband: {laughter}
73 Younger son: For eating meal, really? {smiles}
74 Host Husband: Yes.

Interestingly, the teller introduces his talk about getting money from the Americans for the lunch with laughter (line 69), a contextualization cue that is often used to solicit a more heightened response from the story recipients; in fact, he seems to have gotten the desired response.

Similarly, the moment of the story that shows how the narrator and the other Kazakh driver managed to save a half of the money given for their lunch by eating at a highway canteen (“At a cheap small canteen on the highway, <laughing> <Rus> now> we ate two bowls (of
soup). two- one- one thousand, the half, tenge {Kazakhstani national currency} we <Rus> saved> well.”) in lines 80-83 is met with a support from the audience. Thus, the principal recipient, Host’s Brother, as well as Younger Son, laugh in the following lines (i.e., lines 84-85), while Older Son smiles to express his alignment. This can be seen in the excerpt below.

80 Host Husband: At a cheap small canteen on the highway,
81 <laughing> <Rus> now> we ate two bowls (of soup).>
82 two- one- one thousand, the half, tenge {a national currency}, we →
83 <Rus> saved> well.
84 Host Husband: {laughter}
85 Host’s Brother: {laughter}
86 Younger son: {laughter}
87 Older son: {smile}

Thus, the audience supports the narrator’s positioning of the Kazakh drivers as clever and positioning the American tourists as naïve.

After this, Host Husband narrates a new episode when he takes the American tourists to the train station as they wanted to go somewhere else by train and he waits for them at the station (lines 88-93). Then, the next exchange between the narrator and audience takes place (lines 94-100). This segment demonstrates how the primary recipient aligns also through co-narration or offering an assessment of a story event. Here the narrator explains how he worried a bit about when the tourists would be back to their cars, then explains the other taxi driver’s reaction.

94 Host Husband: With a helping man, we laid down inside of the car for two hours.
95 “When will they get off (the train)?” {laughter}
96 Young man- the young man next to me is laughing,
97 “Oh, uncle, please, sit down! Why? They are walking (at the sightseeing).” → he said.
98 Host’s Brother: Money indeed! {laughter}
99 Host Husband: Money is walking! {laughter}
100 I think, the rate came to two thousand per hour.
In line 97, Host Husband voices the other taxi driver explaining how the American tourist are ‘walking’ at the sightseeing, so he should relax (“Oh, uncle, please, sit down! Why? They are walking (at the sightseeing).’ he said”). Then Host Brother provides his assessment of this event with “Money indeed!” framing it with laughter (line 98). This assessment seems to impact the narrator as he takes this positioning up by saying “Money is walking!” and laughing (line 99). Thus, Host Brother replaces the word “Americans” with the word “money” that explicit position them as the source of financial gain. Then the narrator again provides the details of the rate (“I think, the rate came to two thousand per hour.”). Thus, he emphasizes how much money he was able to get from the well-off American tourists.

Based on these instances of audience participation in the storytelling world, we can see that the teller and the audience align in sustaining the narrative in the same interpretive framework, which is to show appreciation that the Kazakh drivers outwit the rich American tourists. This alignment further supports the self-presentation of the narrator as smart.

The final excerpt I show is the end of the narrative. Before the narrative ends, however, the narrator describes a conversation between himself and the American tourists, who explain the purpose of their visit, and a second story (Sacks 1970/1992a, 1970/1992b) is offered by Host’s Brother that describes another American who came to learn Kazakh in a small southern town in Kazakhstan.

158 Host Husband: Now,
159 then this in that that- when we went
160 to the place where all go to take pictures, I am saying,
161 “<Russian>Even though > if we ourselves do not go,
162 let our picture itself ‘walk’ to the state of Texas.”
Having said this, I went and got into a picture next to (American tourists) again and again. An <Rus>interpreter> girl who was with them laughs, “Uncle, you are <Rus>fine fellow>!” {laughter} I said, “Like this, let’s (get your number).” Having taken the phone number, I saved that person’s (interpreter’s) number. If someone like them comes again, let her call me.

Really, not everyone (like these American tourists) is like this. <Rus>So> it was interesting like this.

{After 2 minutes of discussion of household routines involving taking care of hay, animals, and so on the narrator repeats the punch line of the narrative} “May one of my pictures ‘walk’ in overseas,” I said like this, “May it ‘walk’ there.”

Host Husband then concludes his narrative, as shown in the lines below, by describing how he managed to take pictures with the American tourists with the hope that his picture would travel to the US, since he himself could not. He also explains that he asked for the interpreter’s phone number, in case she knew of more tourists coming to town who might need a driver. The description of these actions allows the narrator to present himself as smart and enterprising.

4.2.2.7 Level 1 (Story world)

In the last scene, the narrator who is the Kazakh driver for the American tourists is presented as a very agentive figure, which echoes his self-presentation in earlier parts of the narrative. First, he performs major actions such as saying, doing, getting into a picture, and taking and saving a phone number (lines 159 and 162). His positive image is further reinforced through the constructed dialogue of the interpreter girl who describes him as “Uncle, you are <Rus>fine fellow>!” in line 164. Labov (1972) notes that voicing as evaluation in the third
person is more dramatically effective, so this reinforces his identity while also creating involvement with his audience.

In contrast, the American tourists do not perform any actions in the scene. However, their economic superiority comes in the attributes connected to them. Thus, the narrator voices his desire of posing in pictures with the Americans as “‘I am saying, ‘<Russian>Even though > if we ourselves do not go, let our picture itself ‘walk’ to the state of Texas.’” in lines 159-161. Host Husband’s voicing of himself serves as narrative evaluation and resolution (Labov 1972). This evaluation clause is also reinforced through a tense switch in the quoting verb (I am saying): From past into the habitual historical present (Schiffrin 1981), and its repetition two minutes later (“May one of my pictures ‘walk’ overseas,” I said like this, “May it ‘walk’ there.”) in line 187. Through voicing of his inner speech (Tannen 1989/2007), the Kazakh driver voices his belief that going to the USA is not affordable for him, so he can at least “travel” there in the form of a picture with the Americans, who can afford to travel. An interesting moment is when the complicating actions of asking and saving the number of the interpreter (a Kazakh girl) is evaluated as “Really, not everyone is like this.” (line 168). This is another moment of a dual position (as theorized by Schiffrin 1996): Despite that the previous actions of the Kazakh driver/narrator aimed to get as much money as possible out of the American tourist, he recognizes that it is rare to find such generous and fair clients through this evaluation.

Once again, we notice that the Americans do not perform agentive actions in the last episode, but their image is still presented as superior through the narrator’s constructed dialogue and repetition that occurs in the evaluation clauses, which allows the narrator to express his belief of the Americans as economically powerful.
4.2.2.8 Level 2 (Storytelling world)

The narrator Host Husband ends the story with the same point that he enters it: May one of a picture ‘walk’ in the US (addressing his younger son “Look like at this, your picture will ‘walk’ in America” line 1). Thus, Host Husband re-state this point in 160-161 through constructed dialogue “I am saying, ‘<Russian>Even though > if we ourselves do not go, let our picture itself ‘walk’ to the state of Texas.’). These lines seem to function as the resolution of the narrative. Nonetheless, the narrator repeats this main point two minutes later “May one of my pictures ‘walk’ in overseas,” I said like this, “May it ‘walk’ there.” (line 187 or 167). This triple repetition (Tannen 1989/2007) more vividly expresses the narrator’s pretty naïve but sincere sentiment: If he cannot afford going abroad, at least the picture of him can. Schiffrin (1996) also observes this phenomenon of re-emphasizing the story point in her analysis of narratives used to convey identities. This repetition further contributes to creating the dual position that the narrator pursues: While he takes advantage of the American tourists, he still positions them as superior in terms of economic resources; thus, their land is the land of dreams to visit, but it is something that he could never be able to afford.

4.2.2.9 Summary of Level 1 across Narrative Two

In this story world, there are several major actors: The protagonist who is a taxi driver (and the narrator), the Americans tourists, a Kazakh interpreter girl, and another young Kazakh taxi driver who is helping the protagonist to serve the Americans. The protagonist-narrator and the Americans perform the major depicted actions. Specifically, the Kazakh driver performs eleven different actions (i.e., “did taxiing,” “came,” “upped,” “took to” [3 times,] “climbed up,”
“let” [3 times,] “went,” “got into pictures,” “took number,” “saved number,” and “said” [11 times]) along with four state activities (i.e., “thought” and “understood”). Similarly, the collective character of two Kazakh drivers (the narrator plus the young driver) fulfills six different actions (i.e., “drove,” “ate,” “saved,” “did,” “were waiting,” and “laid down”). By way of comparison, collectively the seven American tourists perform seven major actions (“came,” “were walking,” “put on,” “gave,” “entered,” “sat,” “went outside,” and “said” [9 times]) along with one state activity (i.e., “relaxing”). However, the noticeable difference comes in terms of attributes that surface through constructed dialogue in the evaluation clauses. The American tourists are more agentive in the sense that they perform speech acts via constructed dialogue, including directives, information request, and invitation while the Kazakh drivers performs such speech acts as statements, suggestion, and a refusal of invitation. The speech acts that were assigned to the American tourists mostly control the flow of actions (i.e., determining what places to go and what place and who to eat with). The Kazakh drivers’ speech acts are often second-pair parts of an adjacency pair (Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson 1974) in the dialogues between these two major players in the story world. Nonetheless, the narrator seems to achieve a kind of balance in the constructed dialogue by assigning himself the speech act of suggestion, which would trigger the American tourists to spend more time on sightseeing and thus bring additional income to the Kazakh drivers. In addition, the attribute of financial superiority of the American tourists is constructed through the details provided, which juxtapose the places the characters ate: A sit-down tourist restaurant for the Americans versus a cheap canteen on the highway for the Kazakh drivers. Thus, while the Americans have more money and are depicted
as producing some speech acts that display power, the Kazakh narrator (and the other driver) are able to display that they are smart when it comes to money.

4.2.2.10 Summary of Level 2 across Narrative Two

Considering all the extracts making up this story in the context of the story telling world, the narration takes place among four male and two female participants, and the narrator tends to orient himself more toward the male participants. In addition, this story is triggered by the presence of the video camera, and creates a good opportunity for identity construction (following Gordon 2013). Thus, what Sacks (1970/1992b) calls the story preface is a directive (“Look like this, your picture will ‘walk’ in America.”) that is addressed to the youngest son of Host Husband. Since the camera serves as a reminder that the recording is being done for a study about the Kazakh culture, and will be sent to the US, it makes sense that the narrator uses the narrative to construct his ethnic identity in relation to Americans. Next, the presence of the teller’s brother also seems to motivate him to employ the telling in a way that is somewhat competitive and constructs his gender identity. These are all possible interactive accomplishments of the narrative.

Regarding management of relations among the participants during the telling, the brother of the teller is the principal recipient who backchannels and aligns with the narrator through tokens of mhm (9 instances) and laughter (6 instances). The primary recipient also aligns through offering the assessment of the story events like “really” and “money is walking.” The teller’s youngest son, a non-addressed recipient, laughs once and asks one clarification question, and the older son, also a non-addressed recipient, shows his alignment through a smile. Strikingly,
during the entire process of narrating, the two women mostly were silent and completely did not participate in the interaction except one sequence, in which Hostess discussed weather in the winter at the local lake. This audience alignment helps the narrator to sustain what Goodwin (1986) calls an interpretative frame; in this case, it is how a Kazakh taxi driver successfully triggered rich Americans into paying extra and the narrator provides the audience this interpretive frame from the very beginning of narrating. Collectively, the men’s alignment to the point of the story further supports the idea that Americans are viewed as superior to Kazakhs in the economic sense, at least among some members of this small community.

4.2.2.11 Level 3 (Socio-cultural world)

The dual position created in this narrative, I suggest, speaks to discourses pertaining to money and economic growth in Kazakhstan. Since the Soviet Union collapsed, all the post-Soviet states, including Kazakhstan, turned towards the West (which is mostly represented by English-speaking countries) for new allies (Pavlenko 2008). In addition, a good deal of the foreign investment that came to Kazakhstan after the Union collapsed is from English-speaking countries including the US (e.g., Ipek 2007; Anceschi 2014). A pivot toward the West and English is also evident in the language policies of Kazakhstan. English was pronounced as the language of business communication in 2007 and is currently being introduced at all levels of education. It is hoped that high-tech development and better investment climate can be achieved through increasing proficiency of English among the Kazakhstani population (e.g., Beisenova 2013). For instance, 200 preschools, 29 Kazakh-Turkish Lyceums, 31 schools and 15 President Intellectual Schools offer trilingual education (Kazakh, Russian, and English). The degree of
instruction in English varies from a few science classes to all content classes offered in English (e.g., Smagulova 2016).

In this light, the financial superiority of the American tourists in the story world, an explicit positioning of them as money in the storytelling world, and the desire of the Kazakh protagonist to take pictures with them reflects bigger discourses that promotes orientation towards the English West as the center of prestige and the source of financial resources. It also represents Kazakhstan as striving toward greater economic achievements. In addition, the positioning at Level 1 and 2 may reflect cultural conception of tricking people as a legitimate aspect of someone’s job.

4.3 Constructing out-group relations within the themes of food and family values

In this part of the analysis, I focus on how a Kazakh narrator constructs her ethnic identity by telling personal stories that involve the Kazakh and other ethnic groups (specifically Russian, Korean, and Vietnamese) within the themes of food and family values. In contrast to the economic inferiority of Kazakhs portrayed in the wool and taxi stories, the stories analyzed in this section portray Kazakhs as superior to other groups in terms of food quality and quantity, and in terms of family relations and values.

4.3.1 Narrative Three: Seafood and the Russian Café in Vietnam

4.3.1.1 Summary of the narrative and overview of findings

The data I examine here consist of a sequence of brief narratives (each of which I counted as a separate narrative) that revolve around the theme of food of Kazakh and other ethnic groups.
The first narrative is a short description of teller’s experience in Vietnam. It should be noted that the teller (Aunt Amina) lives in a southern city that used to be the capital and is well supported by her children; thus, she has a lifestyle that differs from the lifestyle of the village residents. The teller finds Vietnamese food hard to eat, because it is mostly seafood, and she also finds the serving portions not matching Kazakh standards (i.e., they are too small). Her second narrative is a brief reference of the teller’s experience of being neighbors with Koreans and learning how to make Korean food. The third narrative is a recounts of dining at a Russian café in Vietnam, where the service and food quality do not live up to her Kazakh standards.

My analysis illuminates how the narrator discursively constructs her ethnic identity through creating disalignment with Russian and Vietnamese ethnic groups by crafting a negative image of their traditional food in the story world. Then, she effectively uses this disalignment in the storytelling world to support her statement of the superiority of Kazakh cuisine, which allows her to create alignment with her Kazakh audience. The others present align towards the narrator’s interpretive frame through backchannel tokens, laughter, and assessments. The positioning at Levels 1 and 2, I suggest, can be viewed as pointing to the current ideological discourses of nation-building in Kazakhstan; these strive to revive Kazakh traditions and values after Russian and Soviet colonization.

4.3.1.2 Data and analysis

This sequence of these brief narratives is taken from the same mealtime conversation as Narrative One (the narrative about the Russian wool firm). This is the mealtime to which my mother (a village insider) and I were invited in summer 2015. The other main participants are
Aunt Amina (as mentioned, a neighbor who is originally from the south of Kazakhstan), and Mother-in-law and Daughter-in-law, who are the hostesses. Mother-in-law is a lifelong resident of the village, while Daughter-in-law moved to the village after her college graduation. Thus, this mealtime conversation involves women of different ages and social statuses. It should also be noted that Aunt Amina was notified before the mealtime that she was invited because I, a PhD student from the US researching Kazakh culture, would come to video-recorded the mealtime conversation. This likely prompted her to view the whole conversation in this frame and show more of her identity of an expert on Kazakh culture.

The stories occur after a short monologue, in which the guest Aunt Amina shares her travelling experiences and her views on the cuisine of different ethnic groups. Specifically, she says that she as a Kazakh always misses good quality meat while travelling. She emphasizes this with the statement that she calls home from the airport on her way back to Kazakhstan and asks her family to quickly cook meat for her. Then, she compliments Turkish cuisine but adds that it still does not match up with Kazakh food. After this she launches a series of narratives that revolve around the theme of food and travelling.

This sequence incorporates two brief narratives each of which has a few complicating actions but a bigger number of evaluation clauses. De Fina (2008) observes that narratives in conversations may be focused more on the evaluative aspect rather than actions, and that applies here.

In the excerpt, I have omitted several lines (lines 3-9) where Aunt Amina says that she likes Turkish cuisine and Russian food looks good as well as the section consisting of a short
discussion in which Aunt Amina struggles to find the name for a seafood dish that she saw in Vietnam (crabs) and the others present assist her (lines 30-53).

1  Aunt Amina: Nothing can match up with our land.
2   I’m telling this to everyone.
   {Lines from 3-9 are omitted, in which where Aunt Amina says that she likes Turkish cuisine and Russian food looks good}
10 Aunt Amina: But, it (Turkish and Russian cuisines) doesn’t match up with our national → ‘lapsha’ {a Kazakh traditional soup}.
12 Aisulu: {nods}
13 Aunt Amina: We were in Vietnam.
14 At the so-called resort center on the island for vacation.
15 Indeed, there was only the seafood that has been mentioned.
16 But when we lived in Summer Town (in Kazakhstan),
17 we were neighbors with Koreans.
18 <Rus>It is good that porridge> they cooked.
19 Having boiled rice, they placed (on the table) and ate it with so many → kinds of spices.
20 Indeed, learning a little bit from them turned to be the right thing to do.
21 And we are eating like this (since then).
22 <Rus>Even> (Vietnamese) breads are tiny.
23 They prepare it for you like this: Little, little, like these buns!
24 But if you see yellow butter,
25 They prepare it for you small like pellets, one-two tiny like this, → like this! {shows the size on her finger}.
26 Mother-in-law: {laughter}
27 Aisulu: {laughter}
28 Aunt Amina: Because, they do not eat like this. Everything is seafood.
29 ~/?/ like this looking: What is this? Red, red.
   {Lines from 30-53 are omitted where participants help come up with the name of a seafood dish}
54 Aunt Amina: Like this, everything is seafood. It- you die being disgusted with it, indeed!
55 But, the young people are eating it saying it is awesome,
56 Aisulu: I well- <Rus>I don’t like seafood.>
57 Aunt Amina: I also don’t like it.
58 It turns out that there was a town in thirty kilometers (in Vietnam).
60 They said if you go to that place, there is a Russian café.
61 [They are making ‘pelmeni’, ‘bliny’ (names of Russian traditional food)
Aisulu’s Mother: [{laughter}

Aunt Amina: All together, we came there.

So, it turned out an old Russian man with a grimace on his face.

If he sees the edge of money- money, he wakes up right away.

Hi:mself is a waiter, Hi:mself is running around, himself is an owner → in that place.

With his family.

TA:STE-LE:SS!

His so-called <Rus>‘pelmeni’(ravioli)>, so-called dough,

they are ‘swimming’ in the broth like stones.

Oh, swearing, I said to my daughter (after tasting and while sitting there),

“Oh, my daughter, please, leave me at this place.

Buy me something like this (a restaurant) and I can do like him too.”

So-called <Rus>‘bliny’ (pancakes) are completely undercooked.

The pocket of this running-around man is full of money.

From Moscow.

He is saying like this, “In winter, we-” he is saying, “We stay in here, → in Vietnam.

But, we go back to Moscow and stay there in summer days,

with money in our pockets.”

Aisulu’s Mother: Why do not he/they stay?

Aunt Amina: Well, it gets <Rus>absolutely> hot there.

It is only good in winter days.

In winter days, we celebrated <Rus> just the New Year> and,

then we left by plane.

4.3.1.3 Level I (Story world)

In the story world of the first brief narrative (16-21), Aunt Amina and her family

(represented through the pronoun ‘we’) and the Korean neighbors are the major characters. The

introduction of the characters in the orientation involves an ethnic term (i.e., Koreans) that

signals that ethnicity is relevant to the point of the narrative.

Regarding the actions and characters’ positioning, the actions of the collective consisting

of Aunt Amina and her family are mostly expressed through stative or continuous verbs: “we
lived,” “we were,” and “we are eating” (lines 16, 17, and 21). The Korean neighbors are portrayed in a more agentive way via action verbs: They “cooked,” “boiled,” “placed it (on the table),” and “ate it” (lines 18, 19, and 20). Next, their actions receive a positive evaluation, which assigns a positive attribute to the Koreans. Specifically, their cooking skills are evaluated positively when Aunt Amina explains that, “learning a little bit from them turned to be the right thing to do” (line 20). It is of interest that the food that the Korean character cooks is named “kasha” (i.e., porridge) and the code is switched to Russian (“<Rus>It is good that kasha>”, line 18). This is interesting because the Korean ethnic group is an Asian one, but their cuisine is described through the food terms of Russian cuisine. The actions and attributes of the Korean neighbors signal an alignment between the two collective characters (i.e., the Koreans and Aunt Amina’s and her family who are Kazakhs), while also putting Korean cooking on par with Kazakh cooking.

In the story world of the second brief narrative (line 13, lines 22-28 and 54-84), a specific Vietnamese character or group of people is not explicitly named, but this could be inferred from the orientation clause, i.e., “We were in Vietnam.” in line 13. Vietnamese people are simply referred as “they” positioning them as “others.” Similar to the example of the Koreans, these Vietnamese people are depicted as cooking: They “prepare” and “leave for you” (lines 23 and 25). However, these two actions are negatively characterized, assigning negative attributes to this ethnic group. Thus, the bread that Vietnamese people prepare at the resort is “Little, little, like these buns!” and the butter is “small like pellets, one-two tiny like this, like this!” (lines 23 and 25). The detail of the size (“little,” “small like pellets”) along with repetition (“little, little”) work together to create vivid image of the food produced by Vietnamese people. Assigning negative
attributes to the Vietnamese food in the evaluation clauses creates a misalignment between the collective Kazakh ‘we’ and the Vietnamese people in the story world and works effectively to construct the narrator’s evaluation of this ethnic group.

In the next scene (lines 54-84), when the narrator and her family visit a Russian café in Vietnam, the character of an old Russian man appears. Again, invoking his ethnicity in the orientation points out its relevance to the story point. The narrator and her family perform the action of “coming to the café” while the narrator herself performs the action of interacting with her daughter (line 63, 72, and 73). The character of the old Russian man performs more actions like “seeing,” “waking up,” “running around,” and “saying.” However, these actions are negatively evaluated. If this old Russian man “sees the edge of money- money, he wakes up right away.” (line 65). Therefore, he sees the money and only this makes him start working, which characterizes him as a greedy person.

Aunt Amina also emphasizes all the roles the man plays at his restaurant: “Himself is a waiter, himself is running around, himself is an owner in that place.” (lines 66). The repetition of ‘himself is X’ (Tannen 1989/2007), along with emphatic tress on ‘himself’, further reinforces his attribute of being greedy as he saves on hiring staff. In other words, the details of his service reinforced through repetition and a phonological modification creates a stronger image of a greedy businessman. In addition, his greediness is reinforced through repetition of the metaphorical phrase “the pockets full of money” in lines 75 and 79 (“The pocket of this running-around man is full of money,” and even in constructed dialogue attributed to him: “But, we go back to Moscow and stay there in summer days, with money in our pockets.”).
Most importantly, the negative image of the Russian man is achieved through negative qualities assigned to the food produced by him. It is firstly summarized as “TA:STE-LE:SS!” in line 68. The adjective tasteless is stressed and each vowel is elongated that reinforces the poor quality of the food served by the Russian man. This negativity of food’s image is further specified as “His so-called <Rus>pelmeni> (ravioli), so-called dough, they are ‘swimming’ in the broth like stones.” in line 69 and “So-called <Rus>bliny (pancakes) are completely undercooked.” in line 70. Thus, such descriptions as “like stones” and “completely undercooked” are used to describe his food. Next, the named food is traditional Russian dishes (‘pelmeni’ that is a Russian equivalent of ravioli and ‘bliny’ that is a Russian equivalent of pancakes) that brings extra negativity because being able to prepare well traditional food is expected.

Therefore, the details of the service and food at the Russian café, reinforced via repetition and emphatic stress, result in a negative impression of the old Russian man. Through this evaluation, disalignment is constructed in the story world between him and Amina and her family.

4.3.1.4 Level 2 (Storytelling world)

In the storytelling world, the narrator Aunt Amina is the guest who had been purposefully invited to keep the conversation going (both hostesses later admitted that they felt they were not good at talking). She was also told that I, a PhD student researching Kazakh culture, would be present. As previously mentioned, this likely predisposed her to construct the identity of an expert on Kazakh culture and talk about Kazakh identity. In addition, Aunt Amina is a Kazakh from the south of Kazakhstan, which is the Kazakh-dominated part because Russian and Soviet
colonization was not very successful in controlling that region of Kazakhstan due to its physical remoteness (Verchuk 2010). Thus, Aunt Amina’s specific background might make her especially likely to take up the position of an expert on all things Kazakh. I reproduce the beginning of the series of brief narratives below.

Before the analysis of the story entrance, recall that this narrative is a part of sequence, in which Aunt Amina shares that that she as a Kazakh always misses good quality meat while travelling. Having complimented Turkish cuisine, Aunt Amina adds that it still does not match up with Kazakh food. After this she launches the series of narratives that revolve around the theme of food and travelling, and the entrance of one of these narratives is presented below.

1 Aunt Amina: Nothing can match up with our land.
2 I’m telling this to everyone.
3 {Lines from 3-9 are omitted where Aunt Amina discuss Turkish and Russian cuisines}
10 Aunt Amina: But, it (Turkish and Russian cuisines) doesn’t match up with our national ‘lapsha’ {a Kazakh traditional soup}.
12 Aisulu: {nods}
13 Aunt Amina: We were in Vietnam.
14 At the so-called resort center on the island for vacation.

In line 10, we see a story preface: “But, it (Turkish and Russian cuisines) doesn’t match up with our national ‘lapsha’.” Earlier, the narrator made another strong statement that “Nothing can match up with our land. I’m telling this to everyone.” (lines 1-2), which is similar to the story preface in its proposition. This positioning of the Kazakh soup ‘lapsha’ among the cuisines of the other ethnic groups in the story preface seems simultaneously to position the Kazakhs as superior to others and to provide the audience with a guide on how the coming narrative needs to be interpreted. It seems that after receiving an appreciative nod from me as the sign of alignment
towards this interpretive framework of the coming story, the teller decides to launch into the story. Next (line 13), the narrator starts the story (“We were in Vietnam.”). Based on being locally occasioned in this manner (Jefferson 1978), this narrative seems to serve as an exemplum (Carranza 1998; De Fina 2000; Günthner 1995; Schiffrin 1990) of the previous statement (i.e., how Kazakhs are superior in terms of their traditional food).

As mentioned, in the story world, the narrator negatively positions the food of the Vietnamese and Russian ethnic groups, which allows her to sustain the interpretive framework that she initially suggests. This further strengthens her construction the identity of an authentic Kazakh: The disalignment between Kazakhs and Vietnamese, and between Kazakhs and Russians, in the story world goes along well with the teller’s guide on how the story events need to be viewed. And, the story point is well received in the storytelling world. Audience members align with Guest Aunt Amina’s interpretive frame through their participation. Specifically, right after the narrator belittles the Vietnamese people’s quantity of bread and butter (which are staples of Kazakh cuisine) (e.g., “They prepare it for you small like pellets, one-two tiny like this, like this!” in line 25), the audience (Mother-in-law and I) meets it with laughter in the following turns (lines 26-27).

24 Aunt Amina: But if you see yellow butter,
25 They prepare it for you small like pellets, one-two tiny like this, like this!
   {shows the size on her finger}.
26 Mother-in-law: {laughter}
27 Aisulu: {laughter}
28 Aunt Amina: Because, they do not eat like this. Everything is seafood.
29 /?/ Like this looking: What is this? Red, red.
   {Lines from 30-53 are omitted where participants help come up with the name of a seafood dish}
54 Aunt Amina: Like this, everything is seafood. It- you die being disgusted with it, indeed!
But, the young people are eating it saying it is awesome,

Aisulu: I well- <Rus>I don’t like seafood.>

Aunt Amina: I also don’t like it.

It turns out that there was a town in thirty kilometers (in Vietnam).

Next, Guest Aunt Amina concludes her first story about the Vietnamese food with the evaluation that “Like this, everything is seafood. It- you die being disgusted with it, indeed! But, the young people are eating it saying it is awesome,” in line 54-55. She positions Kazakh foods as superior (by indicating that Vietnamese seafood is worthy of disgust), which elaborates her initial story point within the interpretive framework she has proposed. Then, Aunt Amina draws a line between the generations of Kazakh people, i.e., “But, the young people are eating it saying it is awesome,” in line 55; thus, the young Kazakh people like seafood (“saying it is awesome”). This allows her to construct her ethnic identity as ‘authentic’ as she juxtaposes her preference for meat with the young Kazakh people’s preference for seafood. This evaluation of young Kazakh people is further reinforced by the audience (me) in the telling world when I make a comment that “I well- <Rus>I don’t like seafood.” in line 56, and the narrator aligns with me by replying that “I also don’t like it.” in line 57. This alignment seems to trigger another story, in which the narrator constructs disalignment between her family and the Russian man by negatively portraying his traditional food and service. Van Dijk (1998) observes that when a certain group or individual attempts to construct their superiority through discourse, they create dis-association with other groups by focusing on their negative actions/qualities of the others and by focusing on positive actions/qualities of their own group(s). It seems that Aunt Amina does something similar: She is able to create a contrast between her statement that nothing reaches the quality of Kazakh cuisine by focusing on the negative aspects of the Russian café in Vietnam. This may
also allow her to construct her identity as an expert of the Kazakh culture since she is able to compare and contrast it with the foods of other ethnic groups.

4.3.1.5 Level 3 (Socio-cultural world)

Positioning Level 3, in terms of cultural ideologies and larger identity claims, is also present in this narrative, as it is meaningful that in post-Soviet Kazakhstan, Kazakh food is a cultural value. We will see in the next narrative that family values are also important. Thus, I save a more detailed discussion of Level 3 positioning for after my analysis of the next narrative, which deals with family relations, and juxtaposes Kazakh identity with Russian. In addition, we can see links to several other larger discourses such as making money in an ethical way and viewing the youth as seeking a new type of food (foreign to Kazakh traditional cuisine).

4.3.2 Narrative Four: The bad Russian wife

4.3.2.1 Summary of the narrative and overview of findings

This narrative, told by Guest Aunt Amina in the same conversation as the food stories, is about the family relationships in an inter-ethnic marriage of a Russian wife and a Kazakh husband. This couple met each other in Moscow. The main complicating action is that the Russian wife, who had a child from a previous relationship, leaves the Kazakh husband after giving birth to their children, three boys and one girl. She leaves this man behind with all five children. The mother of the Kazakh ex-husband helps him to look after the children. One of the scenes involves the child from the Russian woman’s previous relationship acting out when it is revealed that the Kazakh man is not his/her father (it is hard to determine the sex of a child as the
narrator uses the word ‘child’ and Kazakh does not morphologically mark gender). The story finishes with the fact that the Kazakh ex-husband allows the Russian ex-wife to come and see the children on a regular basis and she does it like nothing has happened.

My application of the three levels of positioning illuminates how the narrator creates disalignment with the Russian wife character and alignment with the Kazakh characters and their behaviors in the story world. In the storytelling world, she invites the audience to interpret this story as the example of immoral behavior and the audience shows a strong alignment with this interpretive framework through assessments and non-verbal appreciative gestures. Positioning at these two levels, including via the audience’s participation, place high value on Kazakh morality and commitment to family and speak to ideological discourses of nation-building for post-Soviet Kazakhstan, thereby accomplishing positioning at Level 3.

4.3.2.2 Data and analysis: Nothing can match up with Kazakh food

This storytelling episode is taken from the mealtime conversation that involved the hosts, Mother-in-law and Daughter-in-law; their guest, Aunt Amina; my mother; and me. It occurs after Mother-in-law explains that she might need to leave the meal soon. I then turn to a child, who is the youngest son of Daughter-in-law and was playing next to us, smile, and pronounce several sounds to get his attention. Aunt Amina notices this and comments that it is not ‘extra’ (meaning it is not a burden) to have more than two children, addressing this comment to me. I awkwardly laugh and Aunt Amina launches the narrative about the Kazakh man and his Russian wife.

1 Aunt Amina: It is not extra to have more than two children.
2 Approximate three or four (looks at Aisulu).
3 Aisulu: {laughter}
Aunt Amina: A previously mentioned, our in-laws’ son’s name is Ratmeer. 
A handsome man. WHAT handsome!
He took a Russian girl as a wife. 
A professor’s daughter. (He met) when he was studying in Moscow.
He took her with her child; with her very small child.
Indeed, he gave that child his last name.

Aisulu: Um.
Aunt Amina: <in a blaming/judging/resenting tone> SHE: she, Russian, having given birth to four children from Ratmeer, left.
Having given birth to three boys and one girl, she left.

Mother-in-law: Hm. {laughter}
Aisulu: Oh!
Aunt Amina: Then, when that child became eleven years old, having just learned that he was not his/her real father,
that child completely got out of control.

Mother-in-law: <A surprised tone>Wow!>
Aunt Amina: Like this and the prior mentioned psychologists consider such a child as a difficult child.
A lot of money is going on (raising) such children.

Mother-in-law: {shakes her head as a sign of disproval}
Aunt Amina: That child exhausted them so much=

Mother-in-law: Really! Oi-oi! {An exclamation that expresses a negative/judging attitude}

Aunt Amina: =having made a lot of scandals.

Mother-in-law: {shakes her head as a sign of disproval}
Aunt Amina: My in-law was saying like this, “Ratmeer is suffering SO much from that child!”

Having healed the child, when everything stabilized,
Indeed, Russians do as Russians, prostitutes are doing as prostitutes

Aisulu: Hmm.
Aunt Amina: <Angry tone> Having left ALL children, this wife went away with another man!>

Mother-in-law: Oi! {a particle to express a shock}
Aunt Amina: Now, Sofia (the in-law of Aunt Amina) is sitting at home not because of big achievements,

Mother-in-law: Wow! {as an expression of surprise}
Aunt Amina: She is watching those grandchildren.

You know, the little girl had not become three years old yet, she left her and went away.

Aisulu: <shakes her head> Oi-oi! {as an expression of disproval}

Aunt Amina: Her mother is like this,
having left a daughter to a husband, she left and married to another man.

Aisulu: Hmm.
Mother-in-law: Really!?
Aunt Amina: Well, I am saying.
“Listen, Ratmeer is SUCH a handsome man, SUCH a good professor, really, why does not he take a GOOD girl?”
Mother-in-law: Yes, yes.
Aunt Amina: “He has no desire to marry,” they are saying.
Mother-in-law: {shakes head}
Aisulu: Umm.
Daughter-in-law: He turned his face away (meaning he had no trust in women because of the betrayal).
Aunt Amina: He is all about taking care of children- for children.
Mother-in-law: {clatters}
Aunt Amina: <With an anger> To that wife> he gives (regularly) a permission to see (children), indeed.
Without shame, she comes, sees, and leaves again.
Mother-in-law: <Nods her head> Yes.>
Aunt Amina: In this case, if our Kazakh was there, having made noise and scandals, would not come back again, indeed.
Mother-in-law: Yes.
Please, drink, drink.

4.3.2.3 Level 1 (Story world)

The story world involves five major characters: The Kazakh ex-husband, the Russian ex-wife, Sofia who is the narrator’s in-law, a child, and the mother of the Russian ex-wife. It is interesting that the Kazakh ex-husband is introduced via a personal name while the ex-wife is introduced in terms of her ethnicity (Russian). Indeed, her ethnicity is relevant to the point of the story.

In terms of story world actions, the character of the Kazakh husband, Ratmeer, is constructed as agentive as he fulfills such actions as “took a Russian girl as wife,” “took her with
her child,” “gave that child his last name,” “taking care of children,” and “gives a permission to see.” (lines 9, 10, 55, and 57). These actions not only contribute to his agentive image, but they also contribute to assigning him positive attributes through their positive connotative meaning: He marries a woman who already has a child, he treats the child as his own, he takes care of all the children, and even after the wife leaves him, he allows her to visit the children. Similarly, Sofia (Ratmeer’s mother) performs such actions as “is sitting at home” and “is watching those grandchildren” in lines 36 and 38. If the first action is neutral in its meaning, the second has a positive meaning that contributes to her positive image: This Kazakh grandmother stays home to take care of the children abandoned by her son’s Russian ex-wife.

In contrast, the actions assigned to the Russian ex-wife are “giving birth to children,” “leaving with another man,” and “seeing and leaving children.” (lines 13, 14, and 58). These actions do not contribute to the positive image of the Russian ex-wife: They carry a negative meaning of someone who betrays the family. In addition, these negative actions are reinforced via repetition of actions verbs (“give a birth” and “leave”) in lines 13, 14, 34, and 58. Next, the child who belongs to the Russian ex-wife similarly performs negative actions such as “got out of control,” “exhausted them,” and “made a lot of scandals” in lines 19, 25, and 27. Similarly, the mother of the Russian ex-wife (who is another separate character who also abandoned her family) performs more negative actions like “having left a daughter to a husband, she left and married to another man” (line 44). Thus, she performs the negative actions that are similar to her daughter (“left and married to another man”), i.e., the Russian ex-wife.

Regarding the characters’ attributes, the Kazakh ex-husband is attributed such qualities as “A handsome man. WHO:т handsome!” in line 6 and “SU:CH a handsome man, SU:CH a good
The quality of being handsome is repeated three times. In addition, syntactic and parallel repetition along with phonological modifications (emphatic stress and vowel elongation) occurs in line 40. All these linguistic tactics reinforce and make more vivid the image of the Kazakh ex-husband. In contrast, the Russian ex-wife is compared to prostitutes in line 32 through a cliché, i.e., “Indeed, Russians do as Russians, prostitutes are doing as prostitutes.” In addition, the actions of a hypothetical Kazakh woman in the position of the Russian ex-wife – a Kazakh woman would never behave that way – contribute to the negative image of the Russian ex-wife.

Similarly, the character of the child that the Russian ex-wife brought into her marriage with Ratmeer is not positive: Aunt Amina indicates that “psychologists consider such <Rus>a BO:ld child> as a difficult child.,” “A lot of money is going on (raising) such children” in lines 22-23, “That child exhausted them so much,” and “‘Ratmeer is suffering SO much from that child!’” in line 30. Thus, her child causes emotional and financial problems in the family. Moreover, this child’s qualities are reinforced via constructed dialogue, specifically in the voice of psychologists and in the voice of the narrator’s in-laws. As Labov (1972) points out the evaluation through the third person brings more emphasis to the action that needs to be highlighted. Interestingly, the two other characters who related to the Russian ex-wife by blood (her mother and her child) perform negative actions and are assigned negative qualities. Thus, this seems lead to indirectly indexing a cliché or metaphor to characterize the Russian characters: It is that bad habits run in families, or that the apple does not fall far from the tree. Keller-Cohen and Gordon (2003) show that the use of metaphor is a powerful narrative strategy that allows the
teller to manipulate the narrative content in their favor. The metaphor evoked by Aunt Amina supports her point about the bad Russian mother.

All in all, the characters of the Kazakh ex-husband and his mother perform positive actions and are assigned positive qualities, while the characters of the Russian ex-wife, the child of the Russian ex-wife and the mother of Russian ex-wife perform negative actions and are assigned morally negative qualities. This character construction results in the evident disalignment between the Kazakhs and Russians within the story world.

4.3.2.4 Level 2 (Storytelling world)

In the storytelling world, the teller is Guest Aunt Amina. This narrative takes place later in the conversation and it is triggered by the presence of the youngest son of Daughter-in-law. This story is locally occasioned (Jefferson 1978); the story preface (Sacks 1970/1992b) is a statement that “It is not extra to have more than two children. Approximate three or four” (lines 1-2) that is addressed to me. (Based on the gaze that was simultaneously directed at me, I received an impression that this statement also relates to me in another way i.e., it can be also a hint from Aunt Amina that I should have at least three children). By saying “not extra to have more than two children,” Aunt Amina means that it is not a burden to have more than two children. The story preface seems to hint that family values are crucial and thus this can be the framework that the teller suggests to the audience for interpreting the coming story. In addition, since I have been introduced as a researcher of Kazakh culture, it is very likely that the teller Aunt Amina considers me as the principal recipient of the narrative. This may encourage her to
highlight her expertise on Kazakh culture and thus construct for herself the identity of an authentic Kazakh.

Thus, the narrative is offered after this strong statement, so it may serve as an exemplum for the statement. Even though I laugh awkwardly in the following turn, Aunt Amina begins the story by introducing the main character, a Kazakh husband (“A previously mentioned, our in-laws’ son’s name is Ratmeer.”) in line 4-5, as can be seen in the story beginning shown below.

1 Aunt Amina: It is not extra to have more than two children.
2 Approximate three or four (looks at Aisulu).
3 Aisulu: {laughs awkwardly}
4 Aunt Amina: A previously mentioned, our in-laws’ son’s name is Ratmeer.
5 A handsome man. What handsome!

As this narrative is introduced, the audience is invited to align with the interpretive frame that Aunt Amina offers. Thus, we all align with her presentation of the Russian ex-wife as a counter example of a good wife; her character is further juxtaposed with a hypothetical Kazakh woman in that situation. As seen in previously in positioning at Level 2, this audience alignment takes several forms including non-verbal behaviors and contributions to narrative co-construction that mostly function as assessments of the characters related to the ex-Russian wife.

For example, after Aunt Amina describes how the child of the Russian ex-wife “completely got out of control,” Host Mother-in-law exclaims “Wow!” with surprise in the following turn (line 20). Thus, she evaluates the child’s behavior as unusual or deviating from the norms (very likely Kazakh cultural norms).

19 Aunt Amina: that child completely got out of control.
20 Mother-in-law <A surprised tone>Wow!>
Next, Host Mother-in-law has a similar negative evaluation of the child in the excerpt from the lines 25-28.

25 Aunt Amina: **That child exhausted them so much**
26 Mother-in-law: **Really?! Oi-oi!** {An exclamation that expresses a negative/ judging attitude}
27 Aunt Amina: **=having made a lot of scandals.**
28 Mother-in-law: {shakes her head as a sign of disapproval}

Here, after the narrator explains that “child exhausted them so much having made a lot of scandals.” in lines 25 and 27, Host Mother-in-law exclaims, what Goffman (1978) theorizes as response cry, “Really?! Oi-oi.” and shakes her head as a disapproval sign (lines 26 and 28). Thus, she negatively evaluates the Russian child’s behavior, aligns with the narrator who has portrayed the Russian child in this manner, and supports her interpretive framework.

Regarding the Russian ex-wife, the audience also aligns with the narrator and thus supports the positioning of the Russian characters as antagonists. After Aunt Amina narrates in an angry tone that “Having left ALL CHILDREN, this wife went away with another man!” in line 34, Host Mother-in-law expresses her shock via another instance of response cry (Goffman 1978) – “Oi!” in line 35 – and thus evaluates the behavior of the ex-Russian wife as shocking.

34 Aunt Amina: **<Angry tone> Having left ALL CHILDREN, this wife went away with another man!>**
35 Mother-in-law: **Oi!** {as an expression of shock}

In contrast to the audience’s evaluation of the Russian ex-wife and her child from a previous relationship in negative terms, the audience’s evaluation of the Kazakh husband is an empathic one. Thus, when the narrator voices her in-laws -the Kazakh ex-husband “has no desire to marry,” they are saying.” (line 51)- Host Mother-in-law shakes her head as a sign of sadness in
line 52, I support with a more neutral “Umm.” in line 53, and Host Daughter-in-law co-narrates and provides her assessment by characterizing the emotional state of the Kazakh ex-husband as “He turned his face away” meaning that he has lost trust in women (line 54). Thus, there is strong alignment from almost all of the members of the audience: We collectively positon the Kazakh character as a victim, as shown below.

51 Aunt Amina: “He has no desire to marry,” they are saying.
52 Mother-in-law: {shakes head as a sign of sadness}
53 Aisulu: Umm.
54 Daughter-in-law: He turned his face away (meaning he had no trust in women because of the betrayal).
55 Aunt Amina: He is all about taking care of children- for children.
56 Mother-in-law: {clatters as a sign of sadness}

Aunt Amina continues that “He is all about taking care of children- for children.” (line 55). Mother-in-law only uses her tongue to makes the sounds of clatter to express her sympathy. Once again, the audience shows full alignment with the narrator’s positioning of the Russian characters as harmful and the Kazakh characters as noble victims. This indicates that we all operate within this interpretive frame supporting her point of Kazakh superiority in family values and assist her in constructing her identity as authentic Kazakh.

As the narrator continues, she criticizes the Russian ex-wife.

58 Aunt Amina: Without shame, she comes, sees, and leaves again.
59 Mother-in-law: What a shameless person, huh?
60 Aunt Amina: <Nods her head> Yes.>
61 Mother-in-law: In this case, if our Kazakh was there,
62 having made noise and scandals, would not come back again, indeed.
63 Aisulu: Yes.

Here the narrator brings the narrative to an end with final evaluations: “Without shame, she comes, sees, and leaves again. What a shameless person, huh?” (line 58-59); Host Mother-in-law
shows alignment with Aunt Amina by explicitly saying “Yes.” and nodding her head in line 60. Aunt Amina finishes the story with a coda that “In this case, if our Kazakh was there, having made noise and scandals, would not come back again, indeed.” (lines 61-62). In other words, no Kazakh woman would behave this way. This receives the same explicit alignment from Host Mother-in-law who says “Yes.” in line 63.

We have seen in this section how the audience aligns with the telling, and the evaluation of the Russian wife as behaving inappropriately. They assist Aunt Amina in constructing her identity as a Kazakh, while also aligning with, and co-constructing, what it means to be a good Kazakh in terms of family values. This makes positioning Level 3 worthy of discussion; I discuss the food stories and this story of family together.

4.3.2.5 Level 3 (Including Both Narratives)

Aunt Amina’s narratives, and her audience’s supportive uptake, point to aspects of Kazakh culture and private life in which Kazakhs are evaluated as being superior to members of other ethnic groups: Food and family. Since the collapse of the Soviet Union, the governments of the former Soviet republics strived to upgrade the status of titular nations through reviving the lost cultural heritage and ethnic identity. In Kazakhstan, nation-building was ethno-centered initially and was called ‘Kazakification’ (e.g., Kesici 2011; Sarsembayev 1999). The Kazakhstani state attempted to establish the dominance of Kazakh ethnicity in all spheres of the country. It was attempted through a revitalization of the Kazakh language, re-writing Kazakh history, and revival of the Kazakh traditions and values (e.g., Manasov 2002). For instance, there have been several major cinematic productions (e.g., Nomad) that specifically focus on reviving
old Kazakh epoas and legends as well as productions of public monuments commemorating Kazakh history (e.g., the statues of Zhanybek and Kerey Khans who were the founders of Kazakh state in 14th century) and cultural traditions (e.g., Isaacs 2015).

Taken in this context, creating disalignment with Vietnamese and Russian ethnic groups regarding food in the story world allows the narrator Aunt Amina to support her statement of superiority of Kazakh cuisine in the storytelling world. This can be a reflection and reaction to these major nation-building discourses: Kazakh food is valued and is evaluated as superior. In a similar manner, the disalignment with the Russian characters in the story world regarding family values and the audience support to this disalignment in the storytelling world can reflect the current discourse of emphasizing Kazakh values, one of which is a strong family.

4.4 Conclusion

In this chapter, I have demonstrated how two narrators, a Kazakh woman and a Kazakh man, use narratives to construct Kazakh identities by relating aspects of Kazakh everyday life and culture to those of other groups. These aspects include money, food, and family.

Regarding the aspect of economic resources, the Russian ethnic group is positioned as more advanced in the story world, which allows the narrator to juxtapose this with Kazakh wastefulness in the storytelling world. In the same theme, the American are also positioned as economically more advanced than Kazakhs, but Kazakhs are shown as able to outwit them and take good advantage. And such a positioning is welcomed in the story world among the four male participants. These positionings at the two levels seem to speak to the current ideological
discourse of Russia being more economically advanced among the post-Soviet republics and the view of the West as the source of financial investment.

In the narratives that revolve around food and family values, negative positioning of Vietnamese and Russian food and devaluing the moral behavior of the Russian ex-wife in the story worlds allows the Kazakh narrator to position Kazakhs as superior in storytelling world. This positioning in the story worlds are again well aligned in the storytelling worlds. The positionings at the two levels reflect the narrators’ reaction to the current ideologies that aim to revive the Kazakh culture after Soviet discrimination and allows her to construct ethnic identity. Across these narratives then, the narrators present aspects of their identities as Kazakhs.
CHAPTER FIVE: IN-GROUP RELATIONSHIPS: BEING NEIGHBORS

5.1. Introduction

Whereas the last chapter involved the construction of Kazakh identities in narratives that involved characters from other nationalities and ethnic backgrounds, this chapter concerns narratives that involve other village residents. I examine how Kazakh participants discursively construct their identities as village members (particularly neighbors) and Kazakh through alignment and disalignment with other village members. In seven mealtime narratives (told by two tellers), I draw on Bamberg’s positioning levels (Bamberg 1997, Bamberg & Georgakopoulou 2008) to analyze the characters’ attributes and actions in the narratives’ story worlds (Level 1), then highlight purposes that story worlds serve their tellers in the storytelling worlds (Level 2), and then relate the results to the bigger ideological discourses in post-Soviet Kazakhstan (Level 3).

Like in Chapter Four, I examine positioning of characters in the story world by analyzing their actions, motives, and attributes (Bamberg 1997, Bamberg & Georgakopoulou 2008, De Fina 2008, 2013). In addition, I draw on Tannen’s (1989/2007) involvement strategies (constructed dialogue, details, and repetition), Schiffrin’s (1996) work of agentive and epistemic self-presentation, and Labov and Waletzky’s (1967; Labov 1972) work on narrative clauses to present a more nuanced picture of the story world. The analyses of Level 1 of Chapter Five reveal different tendencies. If alignment and disalignment between the characters in the story world has been constructed through evaluation of product quality (e.g., wool threads, food and service at a café) in the previous Chapter Four, disalignment between the characters is accomplished in terms of the moral behavior of neighbors in Chapter Five. Thus, the Kazakh
narrators disalign themselves with the neighbors who steal personal items, who do not settle debt, and who acquire financial wealth in dishonest ways such as by obtaining property (a former village canteen, or cafeteria) and a higher pension through their personal networks. This disalignment is achieved by positioning themselves as *victims* and the neighbors as *others* and *perpetrators*. The construction of the neighbors as others and perpetrators is done through assigning morally negative action verbs to the neighbors (to construct them as perpetrators) and morally neutral state verbs to narrators themselves (to present them as victims). In addition, constructed dialogue (Tannen 1989/2007) between the narrator and her neighbors is used to expose neighbors’ wrong-doings and different forms of evaluation like adjectives and rhetorical questions (Labov and Waletzky 1967; Labov 1972), along with pronoun choices (I/we vs. they), serve to strengthen the negative images of other neighbors.

At Level 2, the storytelling world, I will continue examining how the narrators position themselves towards their audience members, what interactive purposes the narratives serve, and how the process of narrating is managed to show the connection between positionings in the story world and storytelling world. To do so, I draw on Jefferson’s (1978) concept of narratives as locally occasioned and Sacks’ (1970/1992b) idea of narrative sequencing (i.e., narrative preface, audience response, and narrating). As in the previous chapter, I draw on C. Goodwin’s (1986) concept of interpretive framework and M. H. Goodwin’s (1996) work on audience participation to illuminate how the audience reacts to the ways narrators position characters in the story world. In addition, I incorporate Sacks’ (1970/1992a) concept of *a second story*, and Tannen’s (1984/2005) concept of *story rounds* to show how the narrators who are long-life neighbors employ their narratives to create alignment in the storytelling world. The analyses of
Level 2 are similar to the results of Chapter Four in the sense that these narrators employed narratives to support their statements and answer questions and that audience members display a strong alignment with the tellers’ interpretive frameworks, but they also offer second stories, feeding off each other’s narratives in story rounds. This may be due to the type of topic, i.e., other neighbors, which is shared information and thus may create more opportunities for second stories. In addition, offering second stories can allow the Kazakh narrators to construct their individual identities as neighbors.

Following similar procedures of Chapter Four, I connect the results of Level 1 and 2 to the socio-economic processes and ideological discourses taking place in post-Soviet Kazakhstan to situate the storytelling in a broader context. The results of Level 1 show that Kazakh narrators disalign with the neighbors who steal someone’s belongings (e.g., meat and knife), report their fellow villager’s a petty crime to the public, and acquire wealth (a café or retirement payment) in illegal manner (e.g., through personal networks). In the storytelling world, the audience (the neighbors and my mother) display a strong alignment with this disalignment between the morally good characters of the narrators and morally wrong neighbors in the story world. This allows the narrators to create alignment with their audience and construct their interactional identities as neighbors. In addition, I argue that Kazakh narrators reflect the importance of justice and equality in neighbor relationships through these positionings (at Levels 1 and 2), which seems to be an important socio-cultural value and a social consequence of a Soviet propaganda of egalitarianism (e.g., Grant-Friedman 2014; Papava 1995). Specifically, this very explicit plea for justice and equality can be interpreted as reflecting the reactions of the narrators to the communistic regime of the past, where there was not private property and lines between private
and state properties were blurred. In addition, the stories also reflect the narrators’ positioning towards the corruption that existed during the collapse of the Soviet Union. Therefore, these narratives seem to reflect the plea for justice at the level of state and personal relations. Such positioning towards broader socio-cultural discourses allows the narrators to construct their Kazakh identities.

I present the results outlined above in two parts in Chapter Five. In the first part, I examine narratives told between the two neighbors: Hostess Maira and her male neighbor Arystan who stopped by approximately at the fifteenth minute of recording. It was the first day of video-recording of the family, which consists of Hostess Maira, and her two sons, one of whom is married and has two kids. These three generations are living together. In this recording, Hostess Maira, her unmarried son, her daughter-in-law, and my mother had a mid-day meal together when Neighbor Arystan came by. During this conversation, Hostess Maira and Neighbor Arystan participate in several story rounds and share many narratives about their neighbors.

The second section consists of the narrative taken from the second day of video-recording and involves the same group of participants except for Neighbor Arystan, who was not present. Approximately 20 minutes into the recording, the son and the daughter-in-law left, so the hostess and my mother continued their conversation alone. In this conversation, my mother was asking Hostess Maira a lot of questions about the neighbors as she had not been in communication with them. Thus, the primary teller was Hostess Maira and the primary recipient was my mother.

Regarding narrative sub-themes, the stories examined in the first part of Chapter Five focus on the instances of stealing personal belongings (meat and knife) and unjust behavior of
the neighbors that directly impact the narrators (e.g., tricking one of the into offering a bribe).
The narratives analyzed in the second part focus mainly on the negative actions (e.g., acquiring a communal property in an illegal manner) of the neighbors as a third party with no or little influence on the narrators as storyworld characters.

5.2 Two village neighbors

5.2.1 Narrative One: A half of liter of milk

5.2.1.1 Summary of the narrative and overview of findings

This narrative, like others I examine in this chapter, revolves around the theme of the village community. The events of the narrative took place in the far past when the teller, Hostess Maira, and the narrative recipient, Neighbor Arystan, were young professionals during the Soviet era. Thus, the main characters are the teller herself, who worked at the village farm and was responsible for milking the village cows, and her two male neighbors Saken and Serikbai, who also worked at the village farm and were cutting grass for communal hay. The story starts at the moment when two residents (Altnai and Zhangal) of the village who were responsible for the communal hay storage went on vacation. This gave Saken and Serikbai the opportunity to steal as much hay as they could use the communal truck. Having committed this crime, they gathered with the other villagers for a community meeting and accused Hostess Maira for stealing a half liter of milk every day from the communal farm (which she actually did because the narrator confesses that both she and the antagonists got their punishment in the end). She fought back and exposed their criminal actions at the meeting, and the two men regretted starting the
conversation. The narrative ends with the evaluation that both parties (the neighbors who stole the hay, and Maira who stole the milk) received their due punishment.

My analysis of this narrative illuminates how a Kazakh female narrator discursively constructs her identity as Kazakh through disalignment, in the story world, with the neighbors who accused her of a small crime while they themselves were involved in a much more serious crime. She accomplishes this disalignment by assigning to the two men both qualities and actions that are morally wrong. The principal recipient, Hostess Maira’s current neighbor, Neighbor Arystan, shows his support of the interpretive frame offered by the teller, thus creating alignment between the two neighbors and constructing their identity as neighbors in the storytelling world. Further, these positionings at the two levels reflect the narrator’s reaction to the corrupt system that existed in the village during the Soviet regime, and allow her to express her plea for justice, enabling her to construct her Kazakh identity; as this theme fits across all the stories in this part, I will address Level 3 after analyzing positioning Levels 1 and 2 for all the stories.

5.2.1.2 Data and analysis

This story takes place among four participants: the hostess (Maira), who is in her mid-seventies; her son, who is in his late thirties, unmarried, and works in the village; a male neighbor whose name is Arystan and who stopped by to have a cup of tea (he is also in his mid-seventies), and my mother who is in her sixties and came to video-record the mealtime conversation. Hostess Maira and Neighbor Arystan are neighbors who have known each other more than forty years. They both lived in the era of the Soviet Union and through the collapse of the USSR.
This story was told 22 minutes into the recording, after Neighbor Arystan told the group that he needs to find a horse to slaughter because he needs to offer a meal to the neighbors (mostly his peers) to remember his wife who died a year ago. According to Kazakh traditions, the family offers a meal to the community on the day when their family member passes away. Hostess Maira’s son mentioned that Neighbor Arystan may need to add one more sheep to so that there would be enough meat at the memorial dinner, but Neighbor Arystan disagrees saying that there are not many neighbors of his age left (who are the most important guests to invite). Thus, Neighbor Arystan starts counting who is actually still alive. He mentions an older neighbor, Saken, and stated that Saken is two years older than him and Hostess Maira. This reference to the neighbor seems spark the narrative that Hostess Maira shares next; she directs the narrative primarily to Neighbor Arystan, even though they both know the story well.

1 Neighbor Arystan: Saken (a male neighbor) is older (than) us two years. Two-
2 Hostess Maira: Saken only remained (still alive).
3 Neighbor Arystan: Saken only remained (still alive).
4 Hostess Maira: Saken only remained (still alive).
5 Neighbor Arystan: Saken indeed remained having stolen {from a village communal farm during the Soviet time}.
6 Hostess Maira: Do you know the story?
7 Neighbor Arystan: Yes.
8 Hostess Maira: Because of my half liter of milk, they (Saken and others) gathered →
9 Neighbor Arystan: <Laughing>Oh, Allah,> /?!/ he (Saken) also showed off.
10 Hostess Maira: Ai! Deceased Serikbai (a male neighbor) was.
11 <Rus>At that time> Altynaï (a female neighbor) went on vacation.
12 Altynaï herself with Zhangal (another male neighbor) went on →
13 Neighbor Arystan: /?/
14 Hostess Maira: Did you see? <Rus> Exactly> on that day,
15 the day Zhangal went on the vacation,
16 Saken filled out ten hundred-weight bags, from that milling place,
17 sent an extra car to this house having filled up (the car).
18 One truck with hay,
now-deceased Serikbai sent to his house.

That time-

Ah, one day we went to a (village) community meeting, he (Saken) took and hid it (a truck of hay) <Rus>that> one day.

(He (Saken) also came). Now, “That Maira EveryDay,
is taking one bottle of milk!” he (Saken) said. Ah! Then I gave him → a ‘fire’ (actively fought back).

Serikbai started (accusing me too).

Having said that a male neighbor Serikbai started accusing her, the narrator does not continue voicing him, but switches to the character of herself. Thus, she begins fighting back in line 26 by asking rhetorical questions that are the criminal actions of the two male neighbors but presented in an interrogative form.

26 Hostess Maira: “Hey, wasn’t your older sister having cut, collected, and stacked grass? Zhangal went on vacation yesterday, did not you send a truck of hay to the house having stacked it? Did your parents ask you to do so? Like, they ordered you to stack (the hay). Having stacked, stole it, → they said.”

He said nothing. He just (like this) stayed. Everyone gathered and → moved to the exit.

Oh, my God, is this a human!? “Why did you start?” Saken was lamenting behind.

We all got our punishment.

<In a scornful tone> Therefore, Saken, only remained (alive).>

5.2.1.3 Level 1 (Story world)

In the story world, there are three major characters: The two male neighbors (Saken and Serikbai) and the teller herself (Maira). Besides them, there is a female neighbor (Altynai) and a male neighbor (Zhangal) who mostly perform secondary roles. They are the characters in the orientation to represent the time when the crime took place (when two antagonists steal the truck
of hay), i.e., “Altynai herself with Zhangal (a male neighbor) went on vacation” (line 12). The neighbors Altynai and Zhangal are mentioned in the orientation because they are the people who were in the charge of the hay production unit. Thus, as soon as they left for the vacation, Serikbai and Saken take advantage of a situation (i.e., they steal the village hay). Through mentioning of these characters, the narrator highlights the negativity of Saken and Serikbai’s actions.

Regarding positioning and actions, the two male neighbors (Saken and Serikbai) perform major actions. Specifically, Saken “filled out ten hundred-weight bags,” “sent an extra car (of hay),” “took and hid it (a truck of hay),” “came (to the village community meeting),” and “said” (lines 16, 17, 22, and 24). He also “said nothing,” “stayed (speechless),” and “was lamenting behind” (lines 31 and 33). The other major male character Serikbai had “one truck with hay, sent to his house” and “started (accusing the teller)” (lines 18, 19, and 25). In contrast, the teller Maira performs only one action “I gave him a ‘fire’” in line 24, which means that she replied back in a harsher manner to the accusation by Saken. Based on this distribution of actions, the two men who are the teller’s neighbors are positioned as more agentive as they perform most of the actions, however, their actions have negative connotations. They steal the community’s goods (hay) and send it to their houses. The assigning of such negative actions portrays the two neighbors as antagonists. Thus, their actions are foregrounded but only to position them as negative characters. This finding points out to the nuances of characters’ actions: It is not only important who performs the most of actions, but it is also significant what types of actions these are and how they are evaluated by the narrator.

Pronoun choice is also used as a productive resource for the positioning of the three major characters. Saken and Serikbai are positioned as others through the third person pronoun
“they,” so “Because of my half liter of milk, they (Saken and others) gathered for a community meeting.” in line 8 and this positioning of them as others is sustained through focus on their negative actions in the rest of the narrative. However, in the last complicating action, the two parties – the two men who stole a great deal of hay, and Maira who stole only a half of liter of milk each day – joined through the use of the first person pronoun “we” and “our” as “We all got our punishment.” (line 34.) In doing this, Hostess Maira seems to find a kind of balance: She does not explicitly confess that she has been stealing milk at any point of the story, she does it by saying that “we all got our punishment” giving a hint that she also had something to be punished for.

While pronoun use accomplishes construction of (dis)alignment between the characters in the story world, two other features, constructed dialogue and details (Tannen 1989/2007), accomplish construction of characters’ positioning through their attributes. First, the teller is accused of stealing by Saken through constructed dialogue: “‘That Maira Everyday, is taking one bottle of milk!’ he (Saken) said” (lines 23-24). Following Schiffrin’s (1996) theorizing, this voicing of the character brings agency to him. However, it also helps the narrator to show that it is Saken, not Hostess Maira, who started this conversation, i.e., who accused another person of stealing from the village farm. As a result, the quality of an instigator or someone who throws a fellow neighbor under the bus is assigned through this linguistic strategy. However, the teller replies to this accusation through a very powerful voicing that takes the form of questions and a statement. She fires back stating “Hey, wasn’t your older sister having cut, collected, and stacked grass? Zhangal went on vacation yesterday, did not you send a truck of hay to the house having stacked it? Did your parents ask you to do so? Like, they ordered you to stack (the hay). Having
stacked, stole it, they said” (lines 25-30). This voicing is of a particular importance because it portrays the narrator as agentive in the story climax, when she puts up a fight for justice. Not only does she expose her male neighbors’ criminal deeds (i.e., stealing the hay and sending it home when the boss was on vacation), but she also invokes the image of their parents (i.e., if their parents taught them to do this), which is a very powerful move to bring the morality into play. This voicing reflects greater agency and assigns the quality of being courageous to speak up to the teller. Interestingly, despite that the negative aspects of the two male neighbors are described with precision in the complicating actions, Hostess Maira does not state them as matter-of-fact, but phrases them in the form of questions (i.e., “Hey, wasn’t your older sister having cut, collected, and stacked grass? Zhangal went on vacation yesterday, did not you send a truck of hay to the house having stacked it? Did your parents ask you to do so?”). As noted by Schiffrin (1996), evaluation often serves as the expression of the teller’s beliefs. Therefore, presenting the accusation in an interrogative form may be a cultural value, i.e., Kazakhs seem to be particularly concerned about face (Goffman 1981) in communication (e.g., Karibayeva and Kunanabayeva 2017), or it may be a reflection of gender-related indirectness (e.g., Tannen 1994, 1995). Nonetheless, the constructed dialogue showcases well the teller’s quality of being agentive and brave in the story world.

Finally, details play an important role in showing how her so-called criminal action of stealing milk is a petty one in comparison to the crimes that the male neighbors do. Specifically, measurement terms are juxtaposed to contrast the seriousness of the crimes committed by the protagonist-teller and the male neighbors. The crime of the men is described by using such volume terms as ten bags, each of which weighs 100 kilograms, and a truck full of hay, while the
crime of the teller is described through the amount of a half of liter. These details create the image of how insignificant the crime of the teller is in comparison to male neighbors’ crime. This in turn illustrates the pettiness of the male neighbors’ behavior in reporting her minor crime, which contributes to portraying them in a negative light.

All in all, the characters of the two male neighbors are constructed as agentive in terms of actions they perform (ten in total), but this agency is strategic as all their actions carry negative moral connotation, i.e., committing a crime of stealing a large amount of public property. The assigning of these morally wrong actions positions the male neighbors as the antagonist in the story world. Differently, the teller who is another major figure is constructed less agentive in terms of her actions (i.e., only one action of saying), but her agency and the image of a protagonist is created through powerful constructed dialogue, in which she performs an act of moral judgment of the two male neighbors. These characters’ positioning creates disalignment between a more moral character (the teller with her petty crime) and much more immoral characters (the two male neighbors who commit a more serious crime, and when confronted publicly accuse the teller for a minor infraction).

5.2.1.4 Level 2 (Storytelling world)

In the storytelling world, there are three participants. The teller or Hostess Maira, my mother who came to video record, and the male neighbor Arystan. Hostess Maira and Arystan have known each other for at least 50 years; thus, the information shared in this telling of events that happened years ago is very likely already shared between them.
Regarding the interactive accomplishment of narrating, it seems the story functions as what Günthner (1995) calls an exemplar that was triggered by a stance that Neighbor Arystan takes against a non-present neighbor, Saken. Specifically, there is a repetitive exchange between the Hostess Maira and Neighbor Arystan in lines 1-5, in which he comments that “Saken (a male neighbor) is older than us two years. Two-” in line 1, and she states that “Saken only remained (still alive).” in line 2. The proposition that “Saken only remained (still alive).” is repeated by Neighbor Arystan in next line and by Hostess Maira in line 4, which shows alignment between the two participants. After Neighbor Arystan takes a stance against the neighbor “Saken indeed remained having stolen (from a village communal farm during the Soviet time).” in line 5, Hostess Maira offers a story preface (Sacks 1970/1992b) by constructing the information as possibly unshared (i.e., through constructing what Raymond & Heritage 2006 calls a K- stance) in line 6, “Do you know the story?”. Neighbor Arystan’s negative stance or disalignment with the character of Saken is seen in lines 5 and 6 from her use of “indeed” and “having stolen”; it seems that Hostess Maira aligns with this stance and offers a story to illustrate it.

1 Neighbor Arystan: Saken (a male neighbor) is older than us two years. Two-
2 Hostess Maira: Saken only remained (still alive).
3 Neighbor Arystan: Saken only remained (still alive).
4 Hostess Maira: Saken only remained (still alive).
5 Neighbor Arystan: Saken indeed remained having stolen (from a village communal farm during the Soviet time).
6 Hostess Maira: Do you know the story?
7 Neighbor Arystan: Yes.
8 Hostess Maira: Because of my half liter of milk, they (Saken and others) gathered for a community meeting.
9 Neighbor Arystan: (laughter) Oh, Allah, /*/ he (Saken) also showed off.
10 Hostess Maira: Ai! Deceased Serikbai (a male neighbor) was.
11 <Rus>At that time> Altynai (a female neighbor) went on vacation.
12 Altynai herself with Zhangal (another male neighbor) went on vacation.
13 Neighbor Arystan: /*/
Having heard “Yes” to her question about if he knows the story of Saken from Neighbor Arystan in line 7, Hostess Maira still launches the story with setting up the scene “Because of my half liter of milk, they (Saken and others) gathered for a community meeting.” (line 8). These community meetings often served as institutional arenas, in which many issues were discussed during the Soviet regime. These gatherings had mostly a negative reputation, specifically, the intrusion into the personal lives of people. Thus, starting with this scene, the narrator gradually builds the interpretive framework of the coming narrative, i.e., it will deal with the intrusive bureaucratic system of communal meetings. Showing his recognition of what is to come and his own alignment, Neighbor Arystan laughs and contributes an evaluative comment, “Oh, Allah, (non-audible) he (Saken) also showed off.” in line 9. This evaluative statement positions Saken as a negative figure who “showed off” revealing that the principal recipient of the narrative aligns with the interpretive frame suggested by the teller, i.e., Saken made too much noise for nothing.

Indeed, the findings of the Level 1 or story world positioning discussed in the previous section go along with the suggested characterization of the narrative as an illustration of how Neighbor Saken is greedy. Thus, Saken and is portrayed as antagonist who steals a lot of public goods (10 bags of hay, a truck of hay), but organizes (with another neighbor Serikbai) the village communal meeting to only publicly accuse the teller of a much smaller crime, i.e., stealing a half liter of milk. Thus, this story serves as an exemplar of the narrator’s point and is validated by the primary recipient, which allows both to align and construct their identities as neighbors with a shared history and perspective in the storytelling world. Along the process of narrating, the
primary recipient does not offer an alternative interpretive framework, but instead shows a high degree of alignment.

The next excerpt illustrates how the teller Hostess Maira exits the narrative with the same point that she enters narrating, or in Schiffrin’s (1996) term reinforcing the story point.

34 Hostess Maira: **We all got our punishment.**
35  *<In a scornful tone>* Therefore, Saken, only remained (alive).*>
36 Aisulu’s Mother: How much is the price for a female horse?

In the story exit (lines 34-35), the teller comes back to the initial point that Neighbor Arystan makes, i.e., “<In a scornful tone> Therefore, Saken, only remained (alive).>” (in other words, she expresses her disalignment with this neighbor who manages to live a long life being a morally bad person). Using a scornful tone as a contextualization cue, she matches it to Neighbor Arystan’s stance regarding this neighbor as he previously expressed it in line 5 ("Saken indeed remained having stolen [from a village communal farm during the Soviet time]"). This shows again that the story is used to construct and display alignment towards the neighbors who do not behave as morally just.

In summary, Hostess Maira effectively employs the narrative about the half liter of milk to create alignment with Neighbor Arystan who, like Hostess Maira, takes a negative stance towards neighbor Saken. It should be noted that there is no update afterwards that could signal a stronger degree of alignment between the two neighbors; this may be due to the fact that this is a shared narrative (as Neighbor Arystan replies “Yes” in line 7 to the question from Hostess Maira if he knows the accident). Nonetheless, Hostess Maira offers a narrative, in which she disaligns with the neighbor Saken who stole the public goods at a bigger scale but accuses Hostess Maira of a much smaller crime. Neighbor Arystan shows his support of this interpretive framework (the
neighbors should treat each other in a just manner, which Saken did not do) and thus seems to collaborate with the narrator on promoting the value of justice in neighbors’ relationships. I will address the relations between this bigger socio-cultural value and the two levels at the end of the section, after analyzing the stories of the stolen knife and the stolen meat at Levels 1 and 2.

5.2.2 Narrative Two: A stolen knife

5.2.2.1 Summary of the narrative and overview of findings

This narrative takes place in the distant past and is told by Neighbor Arystan. It involves characters including the teller himself, a male neighbor Kokysh, and Kokysh’s elderly mother. The main point is that the neighbor Kokysh stole the teller’s knife knowing that it belonged to him (he uses expression “looking in my eyes” in Kazakh) at the milking place in the village. First, the teller, Neighbor Arystan, is portrayed as the victim of mystical circumstances, in which he loses his knife. Thus, he searches around the place where the village residents would milk the communal cows. With no success, Neighbor Arystan (the teller) gets so upset that he slowly walks towards the house of neighbor Kokysh. When he enters the house of the neighbor, Kokysh’s elderly mother asks him to fix something and gives the teller a knife to do the fixing. When Arystan recognizes the knife, he does not as a story world character accuse the neighbor Kokysh right away but indirectly asks if the elderly woman fixed the knife and who gave her the knife. Having learned who gave the knife to the elderly woman, he simply looks at the face of the woman and puts it into his pocket, revealing that the neighbor Kokysh had stolen the knife knowing that the knife belonged to the teller at the place where the cows were milked. Thus,
Neighbor Arystan uses expression “looking into my eyes” in Kazakh that shows how baldly neighbor Kokysh did this act of stealing.

Analysis of the three levels of positioning in this narrative illuminates how a Kazakh male narrator discursively constructs his identity as Kazakh through disalignment with the neighbor who purposefully took his knife. The principal recipient, Hostess Maira, shows alignment with the interpretive frame offered by the teller, enabling the teller to create his identity of a neighbor. Thus, this allows alignment to be created between the two neighbors in the storytelling world. At a more global level, these positionings at the two levels reflect the narrator’s positioning to the bigger socio-cultural value of justice that allows the narrator signal his ethnic Kazakh identity.

5.2.2.2 Data and analysis

This story takes place among the same four participants as the story about the stolen milk and hay: Hostess Maira, the son of the hostess who is in his late thirties (and who does not participate in the process of narrating, letting his mother be the principal teller all the time), their male neighbor whose name is Arystan, and my mother who came to video-record. As mentioned, Hostess Maira and Neighbor Arystan have known each other more than forty years; they are in their mid-seventies and both lived in the era of the Soviet Union and the collapse of the USSR, which is relevant for positioning Level 3.

This story takes place 29 minutes into recording when Maira and Arystan start referring to one of their neighbors, Kokysh, and praising him as being a good person. Based on non-verbal and phonological contextualization cues, this seems to be the speech act of praising. This praise
seems to trigger the narrative that Neighbor Arystan offers, which portrays Kokysh in a different light, which is a little bit puzzling. It is hard for me to provide an explanation why the teller would start with a compliment about neighbor Kokysh but offers a negative story about him. Also, I did not have the opportunity to do playback to gain the participant’s perspective.

---

Neighbor Arystan: Kokysh (a male neighbor) was really a good person.
Hostess Maira: A good person. He was like Kulyan’s (the name of his wife) father. → Father.

Neighbor Arystan: There, at the place to milk cows,
1. I left my knife like this {showing how he put it under the table}.
2. A rig- something- Kokysh would not leave others for meat- → without meat,
3. He would be looking for a rib of meat here and there.
Hostess Maira: Yes, having stolen, you ate like this- the meat that I bought.

Neighbor Arystan: So, like this uh- now uh-
4. Kokysh, kagynyr (a bad person), was sitting at that place.
5. So, I searched there, but my knife was not (there).

Hostess Maira: Kokysh?

Neighbor Arystan: No, an old woman (his mother).
Hostess Maira: O:h.

Neighbor Arystan: “Oh, Lord, there is no my knife in my pocket.” I thought.
6. But my knife- oh- uh- that knife was mine.
7. It was like a reflection in the water (meaning looks the same).
8. Well, I said then,

Hostess Maira: She has such a trait. This trait of her is strong. Yuck.

Neighbor Arystan: “Hey, did you fix this knife?” I stood holding it.
9. “Who gave you this knife?”
10. “My Kulyan (Kokysh’s wife and my daughter-in-law) gave → me this.”

Hostess Maira: Ah, I looked at the face (of the old woman) once and put it in my pocket having folded it.
11. Then, I went home having taken it back. “Oh, Allah, Allah,” → she was saying
12. “Oh, this is of Kulyan’s- how is she doing this, how is she doing this?”

Neighbor Arystan: ‘Our eyes will meet one day’ (meaning judgement will reach you → one day).
Hostess Maira: Oh, like this!
Neighbor Arystan: He (Kokysh) swept and took the knife like this ‘looking in my eyes’ there (meaning knowing that the knife belongs to the narrator).

5.2.2.3 Level 1 (Story world)

In story world, there are three major characters: The teller, Kokysh, and Kokysh’s mother. Regarding characters’ positioning in terms of their actions, the teller as a story world character performs the majority of them. He “left (his) knife,” “searched there,” “walked along the fences,” “came to the house,” “said,” “looked at the face,” “put it (the knife) in (his) pocket having folded it,” and “went home having taken it (the knife) back” (lines 4, 10, 11, 19, 24, and 25). He performs around ten different actions. The character of the neighbor Kokysh does such actions as “would not leave others without meat,” “would be looking for a rib of meat,” “was sitting at that place,” and “swept and took the knife” (lines 5, 6, 9, and 30), which totals in five actions. In addition, the first two actions involve modality (i.e., would), which Labov (1972) notices fulfils evaluation functions rather than presents the complicating actions. In addition, Kokysh sitting serves to set the scene and is not a complicating action. Thus, it seems that the male neighbor performs two major actions: he “swept and took the knife.” Based on this, the character of the teller is more agentive.

Looking at the connotation of the action verbs used to describe the characters’ actions reveals that the actions of the male neighbor carry a morally negative meaning, i.e., stealing an object that does not belong to him. Therefore, he seems to fulfil the role of an antagonist in the story world. Differently, the actions verbs used to describe the teller actions are more neutral and they seem work to contribute to the victim role of the teller (as he left a knife, searched for it, and
found it at the house of his male neighbor). Finally, the mother of the neighbor Kokysh does not perform any actions except that she is voiced in three places.

Regarding characters’ positioning in terms of attributes, the character of the teller is constructed through the focus on emotional and internal states. The teller “sadly walked along the fences.” (line 10) and he “‘Oh, Lord, there is no my knife in my pocket.’ I thought.” (line 16). The state of sadness and constructed dialogue in the form of inner speech brings more drama to, and puts more emphasis on, his loss. This further contributes to constructing the teller’s role as a victim.

In addition, the character of Neighbor Arystan is also assigned the quality of avoiding a direct confrontation. Specifically, despite that the teller recognizes the knife that he was given to fix something (“But my knife- oh- uh- that knife was mine. It was like a reflection in the water” lines 17-18), he does not start direct accusation. Instead, he simply asks “‘Hey, did you fix this knife?’” and “‘Who gave you this knife?’” (lines 20-21). Thus, there is no direct aggression on his side. These K- statements (Raymond & Heritage 2006) may also contribute to constructing the character as a victim by portraying him to be not knowledgeable about the situation.

16    Neighbor Arystan:  “Oh, Lord, there is no my knife in my pocket.” I thought.
17    But my knife- oh- uh- that knife was mine.
18    It was like a reflection in the water (meaning looks the same).
19    Well, I said then,
20    “Hey, did you fix this knife?” I stood holding it.
21    “Who gave you this knife?”
22    “My Kulyan (Kokysh’s wife and my daughter-in-law) gave me this.”
23    Hostess Maira:  She has such a trait. This trait of her is strong. Yuck.
24    Neighbor Arystan:  Ah, I looked at the face (of the old woman) once and put it in my pocket having folded it.
25    Then, I went home having taken it back. “Oh, Allah, Allah,” she was saying
“Oh, this is of Kulyan’s- how is she doing this, how is she doing this?”

Next, when Arystan learns the name of the person who gave the elderly mother the knife, (“My Kulyan gave me this.” in line 22), there is no further accusation; he indicates, “I looked at the face (of the old woman) once and put it in my pocket” in line 24. The absence of a follow-up reaction other than “I looked at the face (of the old woman) once” contributes to constructing the quality of peacefulness assigned to the teller.

Finally, the act of judgment (even of a person who has done wrong) is accomplished through voicing the old woman, i.e., “Oh, Allah, Allah,” and “Oh, this is of Kulyan’s- how is she doing this, how is she doing this?”, as shown below in lines 25-26. The voicing through the third person brings extra emphasis in evaluating a certain action (following Labov 1972). Thus, the act of stealing is constructed as morally wrong and this in its turn can contribute to portraying the male neighbor as the antagonist. The voicing of judgement through the third person may also help the teller to avoid attributing himself as a story world character the action of evaluating or criticizing; thus, he appears even more peaceful and emphasizes that while others were unfair to him, he is not aggressive towards them.

If the attributes of the protagonist are more or less straightforward, the attributes of the antagonist are not. The neighbor Kokysh has such qualities as “would not leave others without meat” and “would be looking for a rib of meat” (lines 5-6). Thus, he is assigned qualities of a good person who shares meals with others. At the same time, he is referenced as “kagynyr” in line 9, which means “a bad/filthy person.” When he steals the knife, this action is evaluated as “like this looking in my eyes,” which makes it morally worse as the act of stealing is done so baldly (i.e., knowing that this knife belongs to the teller).
All in all, the character of the teller is portrayed as agentive in terms of actions but as a victim in terms of attributes, while the character of the male neighbor Kokysh is constructed as less agentive in terms of actions, but as the antagonist as in terms of type of actions and attributes. This is achieved through the neutral actions verbs used to describe the actions of the teller and the adverbs and constructed dialogue used to describe the inner emotional states of the teller. Differently, the action verbs and evaluation clauses carry negative moral connotations in the actions of the neighbor Kokysh. In addition, an indirect assigning of negative qualities to Koksyh (and thus constructing him as an antagonist) is achieved through the voicing of the third and powerful figure of his elderly mother who reprimands the act of stealing. This positioning of the characters based on their actions and attributes creates disalignment between the good (the teller-victim) and the bad (the villain male neighbor) regarding the issue of stealing personal belongings.

5.2.2.4 Level 2 (Storytelling world)

In the storytelling world, there are the same four participants: The teller or Hostess Maira, the unmarried son of Maira, Neighbor Arystan (the guest), and my mother who came to video record.

Regarding the interactive accomplishment of narrating, it seems the story functions as exemplar and that was triggered by a stance put forward that Kokysh is a good person in line 1 by Neighbor Arystan, who says, “Kokysh (a male neighbor) was really a good person.” Hostess Maira aligns with this by stating that neighbor Kokysh was “A good person. He was like
Kulyan’s (the name of his wife) father. Father.” She repeats the same proposition “A good person” and then gives a comparison (“like father of X”), thus emphasizing her alignment.

1 Neighbor Arystan: **Kokysh (a male neighbor) was really a good person.**
2 Hostess Maira: **A good person. He was like Kulyan’s (the name of his wife) → father. Father.**
3 Neighbor Arystan: **There, at the place to milk cows,**
4 I left my knife like this {showing how he put it under the table}. **A rig- something- Kokysh would not leave others for meat- → without meat,**
5 He would be looking for a rib of meat here and there.

The statements about the neighbor being a good person seem to function as story preface (Sacks 1974) in that they function as a trigger. Then, Neighbor Arystan seems to offer a story (“There, at the place to milk cows, I left my knife like this. A rig- something- Kokysh would not leave others”) in lines 3-5 that is expected to support his initial point of how good his neighbor was. However, the analysis of the story world in the previous section showed that the neighbor Kokysh is actually positioned as an antagonist through the reference “kagynyr” (a bad person) (line 9), and the evaluative clauses “Our eyes will meet one day.”, “took the knife like this looking in my eyes there.” (lines 28 and 30). Based on this, the pre-narrative positioning of neighbor Kokysh as a good person may be sarcastic to some extent, but without doing playback I cannot be certain.

Regarding audience participation, there seems to be alignment on the side of the primary recipient of the story, i.e., Hostess Maira, as shown in the excerpt below. She shows engagement through clarification questions. For instance, in line 13 after the teller voiced somebody without proper referencing (just verb “said”), the main recipient asks a clarification question “Kokysh?”
When she gets a negative response, she displays a change in information state (Schiffrin 1994) through “O:h” in line 15.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Neighbor Arystan</th>
<th>Hostess Maira</th>
<th>Neighbor Arystan</th>
<th>Hostess Maira</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I sadly walked along the fences. I came to the house of Kokysh.</td>
<td>Kokysh?</td>
<td>No, an old woman (his mother).</td>
<td>O:h.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>“Like- sit down,” (someone) said. “Please, take a look at this,” was saying like this.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Hostess Maira: Kokysh?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Neighbor Arystan: No, an old woman (his mother).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Hostess Maira: O:h.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here Maira makes sure she understands the story, thus demonstrating engagement.

In addition, as the principal recipient she shows alignment with the suggested interpretive framework by providing assessments, but she also shows confusion of the interpretive frame, as is demonstrated in the following excerpt.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Neighbor Arystan</th>
<th>Hostess Maira</th>
<th>Neighbor Arystan</th>
<th>Hostess Maira</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>“Who gave you this knife?”</td>
<td>She has such a trait. This trait of her is strong. Yuck.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>“My Kulyan (Kokysh’s wife and my daughter-in-law) gave me this.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Hostess Maira:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Neighbor Arystan: Ah, I looked at the face (of the old woman) once and put it in my pocket having folded it. Then, I went home having taken it back. “Oh, Allah, Allah,” she was saying</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>“Oh, this is of Kulyan’s- how is she doing this, how is she doing this?”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Our eyes will meet one day’ (meaning judgement will reach you one day).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>Oh, like this!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>He (Kokysh) swept and took the knife like this ‘looking in my eyes’ there (meaning knowing that the knife belongs to the narrator).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First, when the teller voices the mother of neighbor Kokysh who confirms that the daughter-in-law Kulyan gave her the knife (“My Kulyan gave me this.”) in line 22, Hostess Maira provides her assessment of the story development by commenting that “She has such a trait. This trait of
her is strong. Yuck.” in line 23; in other words, this woman (Kulyan) has the tendency to steal things. Thus, the main narrative recipient supports the character’s positioning that the teller offers and displays her alignment.

Interestingly, after the teller provide the evaluation “Our eyes will meet one day.” in line 28, meaning judgement will reach you one day, Hostess Maira displays another change in information state “Oh, like this!” that seems show that the story point does not match the story entrance or story preface. Thus, the narrative recipient does not expect that the actual villain is the praised neighbor Kokysh.

All in all, while it would seem that the expected interactive functioning of this narrative would be to exemplify the stance taken by the two neighbors towards their neighbor Kokysh, which is that “He is a good person,” the story world does not support this as the praised neighbor is positioned as the antagonist. Interestingly, the teller does not give this characterization of the narrative at the narrative entrance so the principal recipient seems to arrive at this interpretative frame only after the final evaluation clause. This is evidenced from a change in information state (Schiffrin 1994) that Hostess Maira displays in “Oh, like this!” (line 29) after the teller evaluate the act of neighbor Koksyh as “‘Our eyes will meet one day’” in line 28 meaning that judgement would eventually reach Kokysh one day. Then, the teller explicitly assigns the criminal act of stealing to Kokysh by saying that “He (Kokysh) swept and took the knife like this ‘looking in my eyes’ there.” (line 30). And by using the metaphorical expression “looking in my eyes” the teller means that Kokysh stole it knowing that the knife belongs to the narrator. However, the primary narrative recipient shows complete alignment with the teller during the narration, supporting the idea that stealing others’ belonging is wrong.
5.2.3 Narrative Three: ‘Shared' meat

5.2.3.1 Summary of the narrative and main findings

The main event of the story I analyze in this section is that village neighbors stole four kilograms of meat that belonged to the teller, Hostess Maira, and decided to have a feast. Having discovered their crime, Hostess Maira as the storyworld character decided to join them and even helped them to prepare the table. Despite this, she got accused of taking advantage of them by joining. The narrative involves two main parties: the teller and the characters who stole her meat. The teller is portrayed as an innocent and giving person. In the story, she had asked her uncle to take four kilograms of meat for her children, left it in the car, and started doing her household chores without suspecting that something would happen to the meat. Even when she noticed through her window that her neighbors were running around nearby, she still did not suspect anything. Later, when she realized the meat was missing, she asked her neighbor Sara if she knew anything. Having guessed that her meat was being cooked, Maira as a character in the story world decided to go and join in the feast. Moreover, she brought salt and flour to make bread. After this, the male neighbor Koksyh, who was featured as the antagonist in the stolen knife story examined in the previous section, and was involved in this crime as well, made an ironic comment regarding why the teller would want to join in on eating the treat as if she had contributed to it. The teller only told him to go away. However, later the neighbor Kokysh brought Maira money for the meat.

My analysis of this narrative at the three levels of narrative positioning illuminates how the narrator discursively constructs her identity as a neighbor and Kazakh identity through creating disalignment in the story world with the neighbor who stole the meat that belonged to
her. The principal recipient, Neighbor Arystan, shows support to the interpretive frame offered by the teller through laughter and evaluative assessments, creating alignment between the two neighbors and strengthening the teller’s presentation herself as a good neighbor. At a more global level, these positionings at the first two levels, as with the previous narratives examined in this part, reflect the narrator’s positioning to a bigger socio-cultural value of justice that enables the teller to portray her ethnic identity.

5.2.3.2 Data and analysis

This story takes place in the conversation that involved Hostess Maira, her adult son, their male neighbor Arystan, and my mother. This narrative is a second story (Sacks 1970); it follows the narrative about the stolen knife told by Neighbor Arystan. Thus, Hostess Maira explicitly matches the story in terms of theme, main characters, and structure. The full text of the narrative is shown below. In line 30, Arystan is recapping the knife story.

30 Neighbor Arystan: He (Kokysh) swept and took the knife like this looking in my eyes there.
31 Hostess Maira: When my Nur grandfather was alive.
32 Neighbor Arystan: He had slaughtered one horse, do you know (this story)?
33 Hostess Maira: A:h.
34 Neighbor Arystan: I took four kilograms from him having said, “I’m taking for children at home.”
35 Hostess Maira: I had no bad thoughts in mind. That time, Kulyan (a female neighbor)-
36 Kokysh (a male neighbor) was a driver, uh: Lyala (a female neighbor) who was an accountant.
37 Then, I milked the cows one-after-one.
38 Hostess Maira: My father (a father-in-law) was annoying me while drinking tea.
39 Neighbor Arystan: Now, when I looked out (of the window) at one time,
40 Hostess Maira: everyone quickly-quickly was running around. Running around.
41 Neighbor Arystan: My meat was still in the car. I was sitting thinking “My meat is in the car.”
Then there was Sara (a female neighbor) near me.

I told to (now)-deceased Sara, “Hey, Sara, what do you know?”

I asked.

“Oh God, the soul of those is ‘slippery’ (not trustworthy), they are cooking my meat.

Whatever, now, if grandfather (goes up there), (I) go together (with him),

they cooked it and sat down (already), I will eat together with them.” I thought.

Neighbor Arystan: {laughter}

Hostess Maira: Then, I brought salt from that- from the storeroom,

after I brought flour, when I was making bread do- look! Then,

Saken (a neighbor) came.

Now, having taken the meat out, we were cutting it, Kokysh said to Saken {first},

Why are you sitting like you are going to eat the meat?” he was saying

“Huh, how I know, since you said sit down for a second, I joined.”

he was saying.

“Maira sits like she is going to join the treat.”

{then to Maira} “Then, will you eat this meat without any shame?” he was saying.

“Go away!” I said. {laughter}

Neighbor Arystan: {laughter}

Hostess Maira: Having divided meat, we ate it. {laughter} /?/

I did not ask for neither money or even meat. What would this change?

But he (Kokysh) is <Rus>a fine fellow> uh gave back the money having collected it.

He brought the money to the house. What would I do?

You have eaten the meat. What is the point of shouting or not shouting (at the neighbors)?

Neighbor Arystan: Don’t bother, that is also an interesting life story.

5.2.3.3 Level 1 (Story world)

There are two main parties: The teller and the neighbors who stole her meat. The crowd of these neighbors is mostly represented by the male neighbor Kokysh, who was featured in the stolen knife story previously told by Neighbor Arystan. Regarding characters’ positioning and
actions, the teller is portrayed as agentive as she fulfils such actions as “took four kilograms (of meat from her grandfather),” “said,” “had no bad thoughts,” “milked the cow,” “looked out (of the window),” “was sitting thinking,” “told,” “asked,” “brought salt,” “brought flour,” “was making bread,” and “did not ask the money” (lines 34, 35, 37, 41, 43, 46, 48, 49, 55, and 58). Thus, she fulfills around twelve different actions; this displays her agency and foregrounds her character. Most of the actions are positive, i.e., she asks some meat from her grandfather feed her children, she milked the cow, and, even when she learns her meat has been taken, she made bread to bring to those who took it. The action verbs that are used do not have negative moral connotations. The amount and kinds of actions assigned to the teller as a character in the story world help to create her figure as a protagonist.

Regarding Kokysh as the representative of the crowd, he performs only four major actions: “said,” “gave back the money having collected it,” and “brought the money to the house” (lines 50, 51, 52, 59, and 60). From these actions, it is evident that Kokysh is, among the antagonists who took the meat, a more positive one because he is the one who gives Maira money for the stolen meat.

What is “said” in the encounter between Kokysh and Maira indicates something about the characters’ positioning and attributes. In general, the teller is assigned such qualities as naïve, giving, and forgiving that contributes to her role as a victim. These qualities are mostly expressed through evaluation accomplished via constructed dialogue. Constructed dialogue in this narrative is represented in the form of inner speech as well as interactions with others. The first instance of constructed dialogue is her explanation of why she takes four kilograms from her grandfather, i.e., “I’m taking for children at home.” in line 34. Thorough this voicing, the quality
of caring and giving mother is shown. The second instances are the protagonist’s inner speech. In line 41, she voices herself, “I was sitting thinking ‘My meat is in the car.’”. In this constructed inner speech, the protagonist reports the thought that she assumed that the meat is in the car, which effectively helps to create the image of a trusting or naïve person. Later in the story, in lines 44-46, Maira again voices herself “‘Oh God, the soul of those is ‘slippery’ (not trustworthy), they are cooking my meat. Whatever, now, if grandfather (goes up there), (I) go together (with him), they cooked it and sat down (already), I will eat together with them,’ I thought.” This instance of inner speech contributes to creating a negative image of the neighbors as “slippery” or not trustworthy, and also firmly states Maira’s realization that “they are cooking my meat.” This evaluation contributes to positioning a collective character of the neighbors as the antagonist and villains/perpetrators. At the same time and through the same evaluation clauses, the teller-protagonist is assigned more agency as she firmly states “they cooked it and sat down (already), I will eat together with them,” which shows her determination. The third case shows how the teller is naïve; she positions herself as a victim because teller is voiced in a K-epistemic stance (Raymond & Heritage 2006) “‘Hey, Sara, what do you know?’ I asked.” (line 43). However, in seeking out this information, she is also showing agency.

Finally, constructed dialogue in the form of interaction among three characters (Maira, Kokysh, and Saken, another neighbor) in lines 50-55 serves both as a kind of resolution and evaluation.

50 Hostess Maira: Now, having taken the meat out, we were cutting it, Kokysh said to Saken {first},
51 Why are you sitting like you are going to eat the meat?” he was saying
“Huh, how I know, since you said sit down for a second, I joined.” he was saying.

“Maira sits like she is going to join the treat.”

{then to Maira} “Then, will you eat this meat without any shame?” he was saying.

“Go away!” I said. {laughter}

Two male neighbors, Kokysh and Saken, are voiced. Kokysh performs agentive speech act of challenge as he says “‘Why are you sitting like you are going to eat the meat?’” to the other male neighbor in line 50, and “‘Maira (the teller) sits like she is going to join the treat. Then, will you eat this meat without any shame?’” to the teller herself in lines 53-54. This constructed dialogue as evaluation contributes to show Kokysh as an agentive figure, but as an antagonist because he challenges the other neighbor and the teller about their decision to join him to eat the meat that he stole from the teller. The teller-protagonist performs a similarly agentive speech act, i.e., directive, when she responds using an imperative form: “‘Go away!’ I said.” (line 55). At the same time laughter produced by the teller during this utterance serves as a contextualization cue, helping to frame this interaction as humorous despite the negative actions of Kokysh. Through this evaluation, the figure of the teller is constructed as one who does not engage into fights with neighbors (trying to prove that they are wrong) and thus maintains neighborly harmony.

Finally, repetition brings drama and creates a scene of unexpectedness that in its turn helps to create the image of the teller as (perhaps too) trusting. Thus, in describing what she sees out the window, she says “everyone quickly-quickly was running around. Running around.” in line 40. As Tannen (1989/2007, 2008) shows, repetition works well to strengthen an image for listeners, which then is used to strengthen the point being made. In this case, it seems work to strengthen the teller’s K-status (Raymond & Heritage 2006) as a story world character; thus, this
positions her as a positive victim-protagonist who does not immediately assume that the neighbors have bad intentions.

In addition to these examples of internal evaluation, there are instances of external evaluation when the teller evaluates her lack of agency. She explains in line 58 that, “I did not ask either money or even meat.” because this would not have helped the situation: “What would this change? What would I do?” and “What is the point of shouting or not shouting (at the neighbors)?” (lines 60-61). This further contributes to constructing Maira as a victim-protagonist and attributing to her the traits of being reasonable and forgiving.

All in all, in the story world, the teller performs the majority of the actions that are positive in their moral connotation. Thus, she is positioned as a protagonist. Evaluation in the form of constructed dialogue assigns her such qualities such as being giving, naïve, and forgiving; this underlines her role as a victim because she did not revolt against other neighbor who stole her meat and even ironically accused her of joining the “treat.” However, this joining also shows that she wanted the neighbors to know that she knew of the crime; she is reasonable in her response. The neighbors who stole the meat do not perform major actions and are positioned as antagonists through evaluation in the form of the adjectives with negative connotations and constructed dialogue. It seems that there is disalignment between Maira and those who stole her meat, but it is not explicit as the teller questions the purpose of direct confrontation through the external evaluation.
5.2.3.4 Level 2 (Storytelling world)

In the storytelling world, this narrating originates as a second story (Sacks 1970/1992a) or a part of a story round (Tannen 1984/2005), thus, it is an interactive accomplishment (Bamberg and Georgakopoulou 2008) and accomplishes the construction of alignment (Tannen 1984/2005). Thus, Hostess Maira follows Neighbor Arystan’s stolen knife story by launching a second story with the orientation (“When my Nur grandfather was alive. He had slaughtered one horse”) in line 31-32, right after he finishes his story in line 30. Interestingly, she interrupts her narrating and prefaces what is to come by asking if the principal recipient knows the story, “do you know (this story)?”. Having received the positive response “A:h.”, the teller introduces the object that has been stolen and the characters.

30 Neighbor Arystan: He (Kokysh) swept and took the knife like this looking in → my eyes there.
31 Hostess Maira: When my Nur grandfather was alive.
32 Hostess Maira: He had slaughtered one horse, do you know (this story)?
33 Neighbor Arystan: A:h.
34 Hostess Maira: I took four kilograms from him having said, “I’m taking for → children at home.”
35 I had no bad thoughts in mind. That time, Kulyan (a female neighbor)-
36 Kokysh (a male neighbor) was a driver, uh: Lyala → (a female neighbor) who was an accountant.

Hostess Maira makes sure that the story she offers matches the narrative of Neighbor Arystan in terms of the presence of a stolen personal property (“four kilograms of meat” in line 34) and the characters (the previously mentioned Kokysh and his wife Kulyan in the narrative of Neighbor Arystan in lines 35-36).

Besides matching the narrative in terms of theme and characters, Hostess match it in terms of structures. Thus, there are instances of what Tannen (1989/2007) calls constructed
dialogue in the form of inner speech. Returning to Neighbor Arystan’s narrative about the stolen knife, we see that he reveals his inner thoughts.

16 Neighbor Arystan: “Oh, Lord, there is no my knife in my pocket.” I thought. But my knife- oh- uh- that knife was mine.

17 Hostess Maira’s narrative also includes inner speech.

41 Hostess Maira: My meat was still in the car. I was sitting thinking “My meat is in the car.”

42 Then- there was Sara (a female neighbor) near me.

In both cases, the narrator-protagonist voices their thoughts to emphasize their emotions and thus show their victimhood. Similarly, both narratives mirror each other in terms how the story climax is presented, i.e., both through constructed dialogue. In Neighbor Arystan’s narrative, he confronts the elderly mother of his neighbor, who had the knife.

19 Neighbor Arystan: Well, I said then,

20 “Hey, did you fix this knife?” I stood holding it.

21 “Who gave you this knife?”

22 “My Kulyan (Kokysh’ wife and a daughter-in-law) gave me this.”

23 Hostess Maira: She has such a trait. This trait of her is strong. Yuck.

24 Neighbor Arystan: Ah, I looked at the face (of the old woman) once and put it in my pocket having folded it.

Similar to how Neighbor Arystan, Hostess Maira also uses constructed dialogue to bring to life a face-to-face interaction where those who stole the meat become aware that she knows what they did. Thus, she similarly uses the discursive strategy of constructed dialogue to present the climax (Labov & Waletzky 1967; Labov 1972) of the narrative.

50 Hostess Maira: Now, having taken the meat out, we were cutting it, Kokysh said to Saken {first},

51 Why are you sitting like you are going to eat the meat?” he →
was saying
“Huh, how I know, since you said sit down for a second, I joined.”
he was saying.
“Maira sits like she is going to join the treat.”
{then to Maira} “Then, will you eat this meat without any
shame?” he was saying.
“Go away!” I said. {laughter}
Neighbor Arystan: {laughter}
Hostess Maira: Having divided meat, we ate it. {laughter} /?/

Thus, the structure of the story world in terms how voicing is used to accomplish characters
positioning and evaluation of the events fits the purposes that narrative serves in the storytelling
world, i.e., creating alignment between the neighbors via matching narratives. One note: Since
constructed dialogue is a common narrative device, there is a chance to call into question if the
tellers actually mirror each other. The important argument can be the sequence of these two
narratives: One of them is offered right after another as a second story (Sacks 1974); thus, there
is a high chance that Hostess Maira constructed her second story that structurally reflects the
preceding one from Neighbor Arystan.

Regarding audience participation, the principal recipient (Neighbor Arystan) shows
alignment with Maira’s suggested interpretive frame as her story unfolds. Specifically, after
Maira voices her intention to indirectly confront the neighbors about the stolen meat through
inner speech in line 46 (“they cooked it and sat down (already), I will eat together with them,’ I
thought.”), the recipient laughs showing he support of interpretive framework that the narrative
is developing along and his engagement.

43 Hostess Maira: I told to (now)-deceased Sara, “Hey, Sara, what do you know?” I asked.
44 “Oh God, the soul of those is ‘slippery’ (not trustworthy), they
are cooking my meat.
45 Whatever, now, if grandfather (goes up there), (I) go together
(with him),
they cooked it and sat down (already), I will eat together with them,” I thought.

Neighbor Arystan: {laughter}

This laughter token as contextualization cue and a display of audience participation may signal that the moment that the teller realizes that her meat has been stolen is about to be enjoyed can be framed as something funny.

Similarly, after the teller presents the story climax in the form of constructed dialogue “‘Go away!’ I said” and uses laughter as a contextualization cue in line 55 to show how this scene of the story needs to be interpreted as something entertaining. The primary recipient uses the same contextualization cue in the next line 56 to show his alignment with the suggested interpretation.

Hostess Maira: “Then, will you eat this meat without any shame?” he was saying (to the teller).

“Go away!” I said. {laughter}

Neighbor Arystan: {laughter}

Having divided meat, we ate it. {laughter} /?/

I did not ask either money or even meat. What would this change? But he (Kokysh) is <Rus>a fine fellow> uh gave back the money → having collected it.

He brought the money to the house. What would I do? You have eaten the meat. What is the point of shouting or not → shouting (at the neighbors)?

Neighbor Arystan: Don’t bother yourself, that is also an interesting life story.

In addition to laughing after the narrator laughs, Neighbor Arystan also shows his sensitivity to the rhetorical questions that the teller steps out of narrating to pose (“What would this change?” in line 58, “What would I do?” in line 60, and “What is the point of shouting or not shouting [at the neighbors]?” in line 61). Specifically, he responds with “Don’t bother yourself, that is also an interesting life story.” in line 62. By proving this interpretation of the narrative, Neighbor
Arystan seems to suggest Hostess Maira accept this negative experience with the neighbors as a part of the life and thus maintain the harmony of relationships with neighbors.

In summary, the narrative from Hostess Maira functions as second story; it matches the previous narrative from Neighbor Arystan in terms of theme, characters, and structure (use of inner speech and presenting story climax in the form of dialogue). It should be added that analysis at Level 2 or the storytelling world (or an interactional context) differs from the previous analysis as this narrative occurs and is examined as second story. Thus, it functions as an interactional response. Next, Hostess Maira presents herself as a morally right and caring neighbor in the storytelling world by positioning herself as a victim in the story world. The principal recipient shows his alignment with the teller’s interpretive framework (that it is wrong to steal others’ property) and her self-presentation through licensing the narrative in the story entrance and using the same contextualization cues as the teller.

5.2.4 Narrative Four: Retirement payment

5.2.4.1 Summary of the narrative and main findings

In the two consecutive narratives I now turn to, the teller Neighbor Arystan juxtaposes himself to a group of other neighbors who used bribes to get better retirement payments. In the first narrative, the “other” neighbors used a box of ribs and a whole horse to bribe local officials and “fix” the retirement payment. Specifically, one of the neighbors, Sharap, bribed the officials in the town in order to receive a higher pension payment for him and his daughter, having collected the necessary information on how to do this. Thus, the other neighbors are portrayed as acting as part of a conspiracy. In the second narrative, the teller himself, Neighbor Arystan, got
involved in giving a bribe for a higher retirement payment. However, it turns out that he is supposed to receive even more. This becomes clear as the teller as a storyworld character accidently comes across a former villager, Eran, who works in a bigger town and looks through Neighbor Arystan’s retirement applications, pointing out an unfair low payment and fixing it by making a call to a local official.

Applying the model of three levels of positioning in narrative, I show how Arystan discursively disaligns with the neighbor who received better retirement payment through a corrupt practice (i.e., making different kinds of bribes) in the story world. The principal recipient, again Hostess Maira, shows alignment with the interpretive framework offered by the teller through assessments and co-narration. Thus, alignment is created between the two neighbors in the storytelling world and the narrator creates his identity as a neighbor. After presenting my findings in positioning Levels 1 and 2, I will situate them in the wider socio-cultural context by focusing on the value of justice and its connection to the corruption that resulted from the Soviet Union. By emphasizing the value of justice and receiving audience’s support for doing this, the narrators seems to discursively construct his Kazakh identity.

5.2.4.2 Data and analysis

This story takes place 43 minutes into the conversation involving Hostess Maira, Neighbor Arystan, and my mother (who was also recording). Neighbor Arystan had just listed the village neighbors with whom he was working as a driver (including Saken, Sekenbek, and Aibek, all of whom are mentioned in the story). After this statement, Hostess Maira asks him
how much his pension is. After giving a response, Neighbor Arystan launches the narrative to explain why the amount is on the low side.

1 Hostess Maira: How much is your pension? Is it sixty-seventy thousand at least?
2 Neighbor Arystan: It hardly-hardly reached sixty thousand.
3 Hardly reached that (amount).
4 Otherwise, ours - (meaning the state agency)
5 It raised something like for five hundred tenge {a national currency}
6 Seksenbai-s {in Kazakh Seksenbai-lar}- too
7 Seksenbai-s {in Kazakh ‘Seksenbai-lar’}- to Seksen <Rus> a box –→ of ribs,
8 “I will give one horse.”
9 the entire village (said) this.
10 For the money of all of the “partners in crime”, you know that-
11 Also, Sekenbek (a male neighbor) did like this too.
12 Bota (a female neighbor), Aibek (a male neighbor), yeah, → Saken (a male neighbor)
13 all of them loaded the car so much, “We will give one-”
14 Hostess Maira: Tell me more! Mariam (a female neighbor and wife) decided to do →
15 Neighbor Arystan: {laughter} No. MoNE:Y, monNE:Y (what the neighbors were →
16 planning to give).
17 Hostess Maira: Yes.
18 Neighbor Arystan: Mariam told me once,
19 “Your mouth is heavy, you are not talking (others’ secretes).
20 I would like to receive my subsidies in this way too.
21 But this- help me a bit.” she said.
22 But I got afraid of consequences.
23 Neighbor Arystan: Shoot {in Kazakh “Kap”}, Sharap-s {in Kazakh ‘Sharap-tar’}, →
24 having gone (to the town), they fixed everything.
25 Hostess Maira: The daughter’s issue too.
26 Neighbor Arystan: It seems Allah (God) is helping them.

5.2.4.2 Level 1 (Story world)

The major characters are a collective figure of the neighbors who bribed the local officials in order to get a better retirement payment. The collective nature of the character is
marked by adding the plural form to a personal name that is shown in lines 6 and 7 of the following excerpt.

4 Neighbor Arystan: Otherwise, **ours**- (meaning the state agency)
5 It raised something like for five hundred tenge {a national currency}
6 **Seksenbai**-s {in Kazakh Seksenbai-lar} - too
7 **Seksenbai**-s {in Kazakh ‘Seksenbai-lar’}- **to Seksen <Rus> a box** → of ribs,
8 “I will give one horse.”

Thus, such plural reference to the characters is found in the lines 6 and 7, i.e., Seksenbai-lar, in which –lar is a marker of plurality, and in the line 23, i.e., Sharap-tar in which –tar is the marker of plurality. This manner of naming creates the collective image of ‘others’.

While a certain character is singled out to perform one particular criminal action, Neighbor Arystan goes back to the same collective image right away. Specifically, the narrator speaks about an individual, explaining, “Sekenbek (a male neighbor) did like this too.” in line 11. Then, there is a listing of the characters who do the same crime, “Mariam (a female neighbor), Aibek (a male neighbor), yeah, Saken (a male neighbor),” in line 12. This listing is followed by a regrouping of the collective ‘others’ again: “all of them loaded the car so much, “‘We will give one-’” (line 13). Similarly, a neighbor whose name is Sharap is also pluralized (in Kazakh ‘Sharap-tar’, which is ‘Sharap-PL), is referred as ‘they’ in the second mentioning, and performs morally wrong action of bribing, “Shoot, Sharap-s, having gone (to the town), they fixed everything.” in line 23.

This collective of neighbors as ‘others’ is further voiced through what Tannen (1989/2007) refers to as choral dialogue, or constructed dialogue in form of chorus, i.e., “‘I will give one horse.’ the entire village (said) this.” (lines 8-9). Despite that this collective character
receives more agency by the fact of being voiced (following Schiffrin 1996), the voiced speech act is a statement of the desire to bribe someone. Similarly, in line 13, separate neighbors are voiced as one collective “all of them” who “loaded the car so much,” and their intentions are collectively expressed as “‘We will give one-’”. This voicing give them more agency but only to highlight their morally wrong action.

Finally, the narrator develops the story further in line 23 by saying “Shoot (in Kazakh “Kap”), Sharap-s (in Kazakh ‘Sharap-tar’), having gone (to the town), they fixed everything.” A response cry “shoot” (or “kap” in Kazakh) functions as internal evaluation. It evaluates the action of going to the town and “fixing” things as morally wrong and thus assigns a negative attribute to the collective ‘other’ neighbors, i.e., the quality of ‘being sneaky about this’.

This collective ‘other’ group of neighbors who bribes the officials to receive better pensions performs major actions and is voiced in their intention to bribe in the story world. This results in the positioning of the collective character as being an antagonist.

5.2.4.3 Level 2 (Storytelling world)

In the storytelling world, as before Hostess Maira, my mother who came to video record, and the male neighbor Arystan are present. This time, however, the narrative originated as a response to a question. Bamberg and Georgakopoulou (2008) show that interactive participants may opt for offering a narrative in response to questions posed to them. Thus, the question from Hostess Maira “How much is your pension? Is it sixty-seventy thousand at least?” in line 1 triggers a series of brief narratives that function as the respond to this question (Georgakopoulou and Bamberg 2008).
Hostess Maira: How much is your pension? Is it sixty-seven thousand at least?

Neighbor Arystan: It hardly-hardly reached sixty thousand.

Hardly reached that (amount).

Otherwise, ours- (meaning the state agency)

It raised something like for five hundred tenge {a national currency}

Seksenbai-s {Seksenbai-lar: Seksen-PL} too

Seksenbai-s {in Kazakh ‘Seksenbai-lar’} to Seksen <Rus> a box \(\rightarrow\)
of ribs,

“I will give one horse.”

the entire village (said) this.

Neighbor Arystan’s brief response “It hardly-hardly reached sixty thousand.” in line 2. His repetition of “hardly-hardly” emphasizes the slowness of the process of raising the retirement payment. This seems serve as the interpretive framework for the following narrative, and in the narrative the teller explains and justifies this amount. Thus, he launches into a brief narrative about how the other neighbors use bribing to get higher retirement payments for themselves, i.e., “‘I will give one horse.’ the entire village (said) this.” (lines 8-9).

The positioning that happens in the story world supports this interpretive frame as the characters of the neighbors who bribe are positioned as a collective antagonist whose negative actions are foregrounded, as is shown in the excerpt below. The principal recipient, Hostess Maira, shows a full alignment with the suggested positioning of the characters and thus displays that she shares Neighbor Arystan’s interpretive framework. Thus, after Arystan narrates that “all of them loaded the car so much, ‘We will give one-’” in line 13, Hostess Maira’s mention of the female neighbor Mariam, provides an assessment of this action by commenting that “Tell me more! Mariam decided what Saken did.” in line 14. In other words, she suggests that it is Mariam controls her husband Saken; despite that this is not the right interpretation (i.e., “No. MoNE:Y, monNE:Y” corrects the teller in line 15). As soon as the recipient updates her information status
(Schffrin 1994), evidenced by the use of “oh” in line 16, she co-narrates by offering an episode that supports the teller’s version of events in lines 19-21.

12 Neighbor Arystan: Mariam (a female neighbor), Aibek (a male neighbor), yeah, → Saken (a male neighbor)
13 all of them loaded the car so much, “We will give one-”
14 Hostess Maira: Tell me more! Mariam decided what Saken did.
15 Neighbor Arystan: {laughter} No. MoNE:Y, monNE:Y (what the neighbors were planning to give)
16 Hostess Maira: Oh, if you said like this.
17 Neighbor Arystan: Yes.
18 Hostess Maira: Mariam told me once,
19 “Your mouth is heavy, you are not talking (others’ secrets).
20 I would like to receive my subsidies in this way too.
21 But this- help me a bit.” she said.
22 But I got afraid of consequences.
23 Neighbor Arystan: Shoot, Sharap-s {in Kazakh ‘Sharap-tar’}, having gone → (to the town), they fixed everything.
24 Hostess Maira: The daughter’s issue too.
25 Neighbor Arystan: It seems Allah (God) is helping them.
26 Hostess Maira: Yes.

In this excerpt, the recipient co-narrates that “Mariam told me once, ‘Your mouth is heavy, you are not talking (others’ secrets). I would like to receive my subsidies in this way too. But this-help me a bit.’ she said. But I got afraid of consequences.’” (lines 20-21). Co-narrating through constructed dialogue creates a more vivid (Tannen 2008) and convincing (Hamilton 1998) image of the female neighbor asking about helping to make a bribe. This in its turn better aligns with the teller’s version of the events.

The final piece of evidence indicating alignment is the recipient’s “Yes.” in line 25 to the event in the narrative that “Sharap-s (in Kazakh ‘Sharap-tar’), having gone (to the town), they fixed everything.” in line 24, which is framed with contextualization cue “Shoot”. 
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In sum, this narrative was triggered by a question, as the teller Neighbor Arystan employed it as part of his response to the question about his pension. The teller’s suggested interpretive frame is that the amount of his retirement is pretty low because he did not bribe like other neighbors did (therefore they were positioned as the antagonist in the story world). The principal recipient aligns with this characterization of the narrative through assessments and co-narration. Thus, the two neighbors align in the storytelling over the disalignment with the corrupt neighbors in the story world. Holmes (2000) shows that alignment between two present parties is often achieved through disalignment with absent third party, and that is what seems to be happening. Thus, the two participants construct their identities as neighbors with a shared history and interpretation of that history. They also index larger more global meanings about justice in post-Soviet Kazakhstan, which I discuss later after I present the analysis of all five narratives that took place between the two neighbors.

5.2.5 Narrative Five: The savior Eran

5.2.5.1 Summary of narrative and overview of findings

This is the second narrative about how Neighbor Arystan was fooled in the story world by the daughter of one of the neighbors (Sharap) to give a small bribe to her so that she could increase his retirement payment. However, Neighbor Arystan was rescued by a former village resident, Eran, who happened to come to village at that time. Thus, the narrative starts with constructing the image of this daughter (i.e., identifying her appearance and workplace). Then comes the description of the constructed dialogue that had taken place in her office. Having given a bribe to the daughter of the neighbor Sharap, the teller comes back to her office again. At
this moment, a former resident of the village, Eran, comes to the same office. Eran works at the state office in the neighboring town and has professional knowledge about this issue. It seems that Neighbor Arystan shows him the document with the amount of retirement payment and Eran notices the discrepancies, i.e., Neighbor Arystan receives less than he is supposed to. Thus, Eran (while sitting in the of the rooms at the village state office) picks up the phone and calls Serikabai who is one of the neighbors and in charge of retirement payments. Eran gives him two options: To resolve and increase the retirement payment of Neighbor Arystan over the phone or he will send an assistant. Thus, he rescues Neighbor Arystan from being abused.

Applying the model of three levels of positioning in narrative (Bamberg 1997, Bamberg & Georgakopoulou, 2008), I highlight how the Kazakh narrator, Arystan, constructs disalignment with the daughter of the neighbor Sharap who tricked him into giving her the bribe and alignment with the state official Eran who actually helped Neighbor Arystan to get the right retirement payment in the story world. Thus, the narrator presents himself as a victim. The principal recipient, again Hostess Maira, aligns with the interpretive frame offered by the teller through assessments she produces and thus aligns with Arystan in the world of the storytelling. This alignment works well for the narrator to also create his identity of a neighbor. Level 3 positioning also occurs, and will be discussed after I present the analysis of Levels 1 and 2 for all five narratives taken place between the neighbors.

5.2.5.2 Data and analysis

As in previous examples, Hostess Maira, Neighbor Arystan, the unmarried son of Hostess Maira, and my mother are the participants in interaction. The teller Neighbor Arystan continues
his narrating after he described how the other neighbors bribed the town state officials to get a better retirement payment.

27 Neighbor Arystan: I was like this {pointing at the other side of the table} Serikbai- →
(a male neighbor)

28 Hostess Maira: That- one- a very pale daughter, do you know?

29 Neighbor Arystan: What happened to her? A boss.

30 Hostess Maira: She /hoz-/

31 Neighbor Arystan: At that time, she was nothing.

32 Hostess Maira: Yes.

33 Neighbor Arystan: Now, she got pleased with sev- seven hundred tenge like (she →
received a bribe) {laughter}.

34 Hostess Maira: From Kazabek (a male neighbor).

35 Neighbor Arystan: Two hundred or seven hundred like, God knows, but with one →
seven in it (in the bribe amount).

36 Hostess Maira: He Sagyndik (a male neighbor) did not know.

37 “Catch this chance!” the daughter of Sharap (a male neighbor) said.

38 Now, let it be, having left (her office), I came back again even →
the deal was done.

39 Before either Kyzybek (a male neighbor) or Kasymbek (a male →
neighbor), let it be.

40 Since “God, will you leave me?”, Eran (a village local) came.

41 Eran worked at the state office in Fish Town.

42 “Oh, child, how Padashbek (a male neighbor) receive three times →
more than you?” he said like this.

43 “Hey, that, Padashbek how he is getting more (for retirement →
payment) without children?”

44 Then, he carefully read the document (of retirement payment).

45 Stretching (his hand to reach the phone),

46 <gesturing picking up the phone> he (Eran) picked up the phone.

47 “Is Serikbai the son of Batyr there?” he said.

48 “Yes, he is here.”

49 “Now, should I send Aigul (a female assistant) who is near?

Or if not, will you fix it during this call?” he said.

50 “Who are you trying to trick?” he said.

51 From that trick, five hundred tenge (meaning the “benefit”)
{laughter}.

52 (laugh) Like this, we reached (the amount of the retirement payment).

53 From that, we reached twenty (thousand).

54 We reached twenty-fifth (thousand).

57 We reached thirty (thousand). I didn’t count.
58  It is added up quarterly.
59  And (the amount) of those (who gave bribe) and these (who did not) \( \rightarrow \)
60  leveled up.
61  And (the pension) of those (who gave bribe) and these (who did not) \( \rightarrow \)
62  shortened up.
63  Baibek (a male neighbor) retired like in ninety. Seksen retired.
64  Then Aitzhan (a female neighbor) retired, then those who- Kazybek \( \rightarrow \)
65  (a male neighbor), Serekpai (a male neighbor)- Altynai (a female \( \rightarrow \)
66  neighbor) like- Altynai- who-
67  Balkiyar (a male neighbor) retired. Balkiyar retired without listening
68  indeed.
69  Allah!
70  Hostess Maira: My labor registration book that-

5.2.5.3 Level 1 (Story world)

In the story world, there are three major characters: the teller himself, the daughter of a
neighbor, and the male local who is a government servant (Eran). The daughter of one of the
neighbors is introduced as “a very pale daughter” in line 28, who eventually becomes a boss
(“What happened to her? A boss,” line 30).

Regarding characters’ actions and positioning, the daughter-boss performs two major
actions: She gets satisfied with a small bribe and instigates the teller to give a bribe. As the
narrator explains, “Now, she got pleased with sev- seven hundred tenge like” in line 34 and
“Catch this chance!’ the daughter of Sharap (a male neighbor) said.” in line 38. The expression
“got pleased” is used to mean that she receives a bribe and is pleased with it. The voicing of the
daughter-boss character displays an agentive figure (Schiffrin 1996), and the speech act of
directive in imperative form (“Catch this chance!”) further strengthens this agency. However, as
in previous narratives told on this occasion about neighbors, this voicing is used to voice a
morally wrong act, i.e., requesting a bribe. This voicing also helps to construct the narrator as the
victim being tricked into bribing.
Next, the teller himself performs actions that can be described as fairly neutral. Thus, he “having left (her office)” “came back again even the deal was done.” in line 39. On other words, he makes a deal with the daughter-boss, leaves her office, but then decides to come back (and at this moment he meets Eran an official from the town). Interestingly, the act of him offering a bribe is omitted as it is simply characterized as “the deal was done.” Brown and Levinson (1978/1987) point out that passive voice is often used to present the action without naming the agent of this action. In this way Arystan, the protagonist-narrator, downplays his own morally questionable actions.

The third major character, Eran, a local of the village who works as government servant in the neighboring town, performs major actions. It is explained that “Eran (one of the village locals) came. Eran worked at the state office in Fish Town.” in line 41. Thus, he arrives, and the narrator provides important background information about him, i.e., that he works at the state office in the town. This detail of his professional background helps to construct the image of someone in power. Then it is indicated of Eran that “he carefully read the document” in line 44. After this complicating action, the actions of Eran is described as follows: “Stretching (his hand to reach the phone), he (Eran) picked up the phone.” (lines 45-46). The description of his physical move “stretching” and “picking up the phone” are realized via action verbs that portray Eran as agentive character. However, this is also a detail (Tannen 1989/2007), which is crucial to express his institutional power because the phone was the major means of communication and a lot of issues were resolved via landline phones in the Soviet and post-Soviet times. Thus, this detail is an important touch in creating the image of Eran as an official with a power.
Constructed dialogue and details are employed in the narrative to assign qualities to the characters who accomplish the depicted actions. First, the daughter-boss is voiced through a directive “‘Catch this chance!’” in line 38, which helps to create her image of the official who abuses her professional privileges. An interesting moment in the story is the provision of the detail of the bribe amount. The first one is “Now, she got pleased with seven hundred tenge like (she received a bribe). Two hundred or seven hundred like, God knows, but with one seven in it (in the bribe amount), lines 34 and 36, and the second one is “from that trick, five hundred tenge (meaning the benefit the daughter-boss received) (laughter)” line 51. It seems the narrator does not remember the exact amount of the bribe; the only thing is that there was a digit seven. Also, it seems that the final amount that the daughter-boss “enjoyed” is “five hundred tenge” that is approximately 3 US dollars. Thus, this detail shows how small the bribe is and contributes to assigning such quality as pettiness to the daughter-boss who instigates the teller to make the bribe.

Next, Neighbor Arystan voices himself in form of an inner thought, i.e., “God will you leave me?” in line 41. By voicing his inner appeal to God, the narrator portrays himself as one who needs help from the superior spiritual authority. This helps him create the sense of desperation of his situation and the image of him being a helpless victim in this situation. Right after this evaluation, the complicating action of Eran coming from the town to the village is introduced. This gives an impression that Eran magically appears to help Neighbor Arystan after he has appealed to the heavens.

Finally, Eran is voiced the most, and how he is voiced shows care for Arystan as a story world character. His first voicing is “‘Oh, child, how Padashbek (a male neighbor) receive three
times more than you?” he said like this. “Hey, that, Padashbek how he is getting more (for retirement payment) without children?” in lines 42-43. In this voicing, Eran addresses the teller in a caring manner (“Oh, child, how”) and he exposes the unjust treatment of the narrator, i.e., that the other neighbor without children receives retirement three times more than he does. Thus, Eran is assigned the quality of a just state official. This also helps to further construct the role of the teller as a victim.

The final instance of constructed dialogue serves as evaluation so the resolution. Thus, Eran explains to Neighbor Arystan that the retirement payment is much lower than it should be. Then, Eran resolves this by making one important call to the local official.

46 Neighbor Arystan: <gesturing picking up the phone> he (Eran) picked up the phone.>
47 “Is Serikbai the son of Batyr there?” he said.
48 “Yes, he is here.”
49 “Now, should I send Aigul (a female assistant) who is near? Or if not, will you fix it during this call?” he said.
50 “Who are you trying to trick?” he said.
51 From that trick, five hundred tenge (meaning the “benefit”) {laughter}.

As we can see from lines 46-47, Eran calls the local representative of the state and gives an order, “‘Now, should I send Aigul (a female assistant) who is near? Or if not, will you fix it during this call?’ he said. ‘Who are you trying to trick?’ he said.” Thus, the resolution of the problem is that he orders the local official to fix the retirement payment of the narrator according to the laws. This further helps to support the quality of this character as just.

After the resolution in lines 46-51, there appears a collective “we” staring line 53-57. This moment is crucial as after introducing individual figures in the story world, now there is a collective one that represents the group of local retirees who are receiving their payment in a
morally right way without bribing (despite that the teller did initially bribe, he presents himself in this group of the villagers).

Neighbor Arystan:  

52 {laughter} Like this, we reached (the amount of the retirement payment).
53 From that, we reached twenty (thousand).
54 We reached twenty-five (thousand).
55 We reached thirty (thousand). I didn’t count.
56 It is added up quarterly.
57 And this (retirement payment) of those (who gave bribe) and these→ (who did not) leveled up.
58 And this (retirement payment)) of those (who gave bribe) and these→ (who did not) shortened up.

This collective “we” repeats the same action “reached amount X” using a parallel construction, i.e., “we reached it, we reached twenty, we reached twenty-five,” and “we reached thirty” (lines 52-57). As Tannen (1989/2007, 2008) shows a repeated parallel construction in the story world contributes to creating an effective image that supports a point the narrator is making. Thus, the repeated phrase “we reached X amount” effectively creates the image of a very slow process of how the retirement payment (of the group of retirees who did not bribe) has increased.

Having built this image of how slowly retirement payment increases, Arystan creates an “us” versus “them” opposition in lines 59-60. Thus, the retirement payment of these who do not bribe and the ones who becomes the same amount over time, i.e., “And this (retirement payment) of those (who gave bribe) and these (who did not) leveled up.” and “And this (retirement payment) of those (who gave bribe) and these (who did not) shortened up.” Interestingly, the collective character of the morally right ones is referred with “these” (in Kazakh bul-lar-dik-i: these-PL-POSS-3rd) while the one who is morally wrong is referred as “those” (in Kazakh analar-dik-i: those-PL-POSS-3rd). As a result, the disalignment between these two parties is created (see Gordon 2007 for similar contrast between “our” and “that”).
All in all, in this story world, the three characters fulfil the role of a victim, savior and antagonist. Specifically, the narrator is positioned as the victim through his neutral actions and inner speech, in which he asks Allah’s help. The daughter-boss is positioned as antagonist through the evaluation clauses, which evaluate her actions as morally wrong and petty, i.e., instigation of bribery and the amount of “benefit” as five hundred, which is equivalent to several dollars. Finally, Eran the local man who works as state official in a neighboring town is a hero who helps the neighbor. This positioning is achieved through positive and agentive actions and evaluation in form of constructed dialogue. Therefore, the disalignment between the morally right neighbors who do not bribe and the ones who does is created in the story world.

5.2.5.4 Level 2 (Storytelling world)

As mentioned, this storytelling involves Hostess Maira, my mother, and the male neighbor Arystan. This is the second brief story in a series that has been triggered by the question from Hostess Maira to Neighbor Arystan about the amount of his retirement payment. The teller employs a narrative to explain why the amount of his retirement pension was always increasing so slowly. He continues with a more specific incident that shows how the teller falls victim to the corrupt system and is rescued. Therefore, he introduces specific characters such as the male neighbor Serikbai who used to be their local boss and the daughter of the other neighbor. This orientation clause provides a good opportunity to create audience involvement, as in it, Neighbor Arystan (the teller) and Hostess Maira (the primary recipient) co-construct the character of the daughter, as shown below.

27 Neighbor Arystan: **I was like this** (pointing at the other side of the table) Serikbai- →
(a male neighbor)

28 Hostess Maira: That-one-a very white daughter, do you know?  
29 Neighbor Arystan: She hoz-  
31 Neighbor Arystan: She is in Blue Mountain town.  
32 Neighbor Arystan: At that time, she was nothing.  
33 Hostess Maira: Yes.  
34 Neighbor Arystan: Now, she got pleased with sev- seven hundred tenge like (she received a bribe) {laughter}.  

Neighbor Arystan’s asking of “That-one-a very white daughter, do you know?” and “What happened to her?” in lines 28 and 29, invites the recipient to participate in narrative co-construction (though in line 30, Arystan answers his own question – the daughter is now a boss). The recipient does by commenting where the daughter lives now, “She is in Blue Mountain town.” in line 31. Finally, Arystan takes a negative stance towards the daughter by evaluating her as “At that time, she was nothing.” in line 32, and Hostess Maira shows her alignment with this positioning by agreeing in line 33 “Yes.” Through this co-construction, the two participants seem to agree on some of the background for the story, specifically regarding this character. As evidence of this, the teller has the floor for the lines 36-64 with no interruption from the recipient.

Regarding the self-presentation of the teller, it seems that Neighbor Arystan strives to present himself as a morally right person and neighbor and he achieves this through disalignent with the neighbors who do not behave morally right in the story world. The primary recipient supports this self-presentation along the entire narration.
5.2.5.5 Level 3 (Socio-cultural world)

All five narratives analyzed in this section so far at positioning Levels 1 and 2 – the stories about the stolen milk and hay, the stolen knife, the stolen meat, and the bribes – also have connections to bigger ideological discourses; the narrators seem to place value on the concept of justice through their narratives as well as through the alignments they take up to each other during narration. By saying the value of justice I mean the value of a morally right behavior among people (e.g., respecting someone’s property, personal privacy, etc.) and a state system that distributes resources among the population (e.g., following the rule of law regarding the access to state financial funds, etc.).

For all of these stories, the two main participants – who served in the roles of both narrator and principal recipient – were in their late seventies and these stories can be viewed as a means of reminiscing about the events of their shared distant past. Specifically, they discuss events that happened when they were working adults and new retirees, which covers the time period from 1960-1990. The other major characters were their neighbors in each case. Based on what was happening at this time period, the narrators’ stories may be seen as in dialogue with, and in reaction to, the then-prominent Soviet ideology of communism, which tried to eradicated the concept of personal property. This resulted in a government monopoly over the all industrial entities including the village farm, a system of equal payment without differentiation of work quality, and the absence of a just system over product distribution and rewards for the employees (e.g., Grant-Friedman 2014; Papava 1999). In addition, since there was an absolute government monopoly and no a proper control over the distribution of public goods, systematic corruption (including stealing goods from communal entities and bribing) was a norm at all levels (state and
everyday people) (e.g., Grant-Friedman 2014; Papava 1999). However, it should be kept in mind that the positioning in the story worlds and storytelling worlds may reflect the reality in which the narrators lived. This caution regarding what bigger ideological discourse the narrators most likely engage with should be kept in mind.

Interpreted in this wider context, the first narrative, in which the narrator positions the neighbors who stole trucks of hay and complained about a stolen half liter of milk as an antagonist party, reflects the Soviet reality. In that time period, the majority of the population was following this corrupt practice as there was no other way to survive. Thus, the value of “justice” seems to play an important role, i.e., “If we all survive by stealing from the state farm, do not turn anyone in.” Not surprisingly, there is a strong alignment between the teller Hostess Maira and the principal recipient Neighbor Arystan regarding the characters positioning in the story world.

Similarly, in the narrative about the bribing and retirement payment, the neighbors who used this “service” are positioned as the antagonist and as ‘others’, which again may serve as the narrator’s reaction to the corrupt system left as legacy from the Soviet Union, and his acknowledgment of the lack of justice at that time, despite its value. The alignment from the principal recipient was seen in the narrating as well, such as when the principal recipient co-narrates and offers constructed dialogue (how a female neighbor asks her to participate in the crime of bribing) that matches the interpretation framework of the narrator. Finally, the narratives on neighbors’ stealing of personal goods such as a knife and meat similarly reflects the narrators’ reaction to the value of justice. In other words, the narrators position themselves as victims in the story world and receive support from the audience to such positioning. However,
the narratives do not involve direct confrontation as it seems maintaining neighborly harmony is crucial as this is the community that the narrators have to live in all their lives. Interestingly, one of the principal recipients even suggests to let it go and frames this stealing is also interesting life experience (or being neighbors). All in all, the major thread across the four narratives is the value of justice. Thus, this value seems to be crucial in order to construct Kazakh identity through the daily narratives among these Kazakh-speaking participants.

Being neighbor in a small village community is a very important social role because the village community is very stable and, in some cases, as intimate as your family. The neighbors in such a small group depend on each other a great deal and get involved in each other’s lives a lot. Thus, the narratives about this aspect of life allow us to understand how the members of a small village community resolve the dilemma of being treated fairly in conflict situation (i.e., when someone steals a personal belonging) and maintain good relationships as these are the people they will rely on all their life.

5.3 Two women (A village resident and Aisulu’s Mother)

In this section, I consider narratives that were taken from the conversation (video-recorded on the second day) between two women. One of them Hostess Maira, some of whose narratives I have analyzed; she is a long-term resident of the village and my mother is a village insider. My mother had not recently been in touch with the majority of the village locals and this mealtime conversation was an opportunity to collect new information about the neighbors. Thus, I will analyze two narratives that specifically focus on the third party, i.e., other neighbors. If in the previous part some of the narratives are shared between the narrator and recipient and the
narrator and recipient have much more shared knowledge, the narratives analyzed in this part are unknown to the primary recipient and there is less shared information between the two parties.

Regarding the narratives in this part, the first narrative is about how a female neighbor Aktorgai and her family illegally took over the village canteen (or cafeteria) that served the general population and turned it into a private café that serve only the interests of Aktorgai’s family. The second narrative is Hostess Maira’s version of why this Aktorgai died very prematurely.

5.3.1 Narrative One: The village café

5.3.1.1 Summary of the narrative and overview of findings

This story is told by Hostess Maira in the conversation that also involved my mother. In this story world, the main characters are a female neighbor (Aktorgai) and her son (Bolat), who later are collapsed into one entity. They take the communal or village canteen (or cafeteria) into possession through manipulation of the laws, which they were able to do because the son was working there and was able to take the physical entity out of the state register during the Soviet Union’s collapse. This mother and son are constructed as negative figures, and their crime is enhanced through the use of what Pomerantz (1986) calls extreme case formulations. Thus, the neighbors (Aktorgai and her son Bolat) use professional ties take the communal cafeteria into personal possession and turn it into a private café. Then, this private café is juxtaposed with what it means to have a public cafeteria. This juxtaposition allows Hostess Maira to express her sentiment that during Soviet time it was a cafeteria that belonged to the community, but after the collapse it became a café and private, and no longer served the needs of the community.
In analyzing the positioning in this narrative, I show how Hostess Maira discursively constructs her identity as a member of her small Kazakh community through disalignment with the neighbor who in the story world took into possession the village cafeteria and turned it into a private café. The principal recipient is a Kazakh woman (my mother); she shows alignment with the interpretive frame offered by the teller through backchannel signals. Thus, this allows alignment creation between the two village insiders in the storytelling world that allows the teller to highlight her identity as a villager. As with the stories examined in the previous analytic section, on a more global level, these positionings at the two levels reflect the narrator’s positioning to the bigger socio-cultural value of justice and the corruption caused by the collapse of the Soviet Union. I address positioning Level 3 at after the examination of Levels 1 and 2 for two selected narratives.

5.3.1.2 Data and analysis

This narrative takes place in the conversation that was the same day as the other stories that I have already analyzed that were told by Hostess Maira (in the previous chapter). In this mealtime interaction Hostess Maira, her unmarried son, her daughter-in-law, and my mother participated. However, only Hostess Maira and my mother took part in this part of conversation as the son and daughter-in-law had left to do household chores. Thus, this interaction takes place between two interlocutors who have much in common. First, both of them have close connections to the village community. One of them is Hostess Maira who has lived in the village for more than forty years, and another (my mother) has very close connections to the village through her parents. My grandparents lived in a neighboring town and enormously helped the
local villagers by allowing them to stay at their house when they used to come to sell their goods at the town market. My mother as a child spent her summers in this village. Second, they are both women and mothers. Since Hostess Maira has a higher epistemic status (Raymond & Heritage 2006) about the village (since she lives there), my mother intensively inquires about life in the village community.

The story occurs at the twenty second minute into the recording and is triggered by my mother’s question about one of the women who lives in the neighborhood, the wife of a person my mother used to know. Her name is Aktorgai. Then, my mother tries to find out the names of her children (two sons Bolat and Bakyt) as she remembers that they were working in the same town in which my mother now lives. Hostess Maira recalls that one of the sons (Bolat) of this neighbor Aktorgai is going to marry off his own son (who is Aktorgai’s grandson). The future daughter-in-law is a village resident. Their wedding is going to be in the village café that the narrative is about. Then my mother asked about the café and if it functions. It turned out that the café belongs to the woman Aktorgai that my mother has been asking about. This leads into the narrative about this family and the local cafeteria.

1 Hostess Maira: So, the two sons are working in Fish Town.
2 One is Bolat, another is Bakyt.
3 Aisulu’s Mother: <Right, right>Rus> Bakyt, Bakyt.
4 Both are in Fish Town, <Rus>yes>?
5 Hostess Maira: Both are in Fish Town.
6 Bolat is planning to marry his son {in Kazakh ‘take a daughter-in-law’}.
7 Aisulu’s Mother: Ah.
8 Hostess Maira: From this village.
9 Aisulu’s Mother: From this village. Mhm.
11 Aisulu’s Mother: Hm. There is a café at this place. There is a café. Is anything happening there?
In the story world, there are two characters who are both village locals. They are the woman whose name is Aktorgai and her son Bolat who works for the police. They are subsequently referred as one collective “they” despite being introduced separately.

Regarding the actions and positioning, these two characters (the local woman Aktorgai and her son Bolat) take over a local former cafeteria in an illegal way when the Soviet Union collapses. Specifically, “She at that time, the time when ‘sovkhos’ fell, their Bolat worked where- at the police, they having written everything off, they did- having put under (their names), they took over it.” in lines 14, 15, and 17. First, they “write off,” which means in the context of post-Soviet times, they filed the property as unprofitable or unsuitable for
exploitation. This allowed to “buy” it from the government for a much lower price. Having done so, Aktorgai and her son Bolat “put under their names” and “took over it.” Thus, their actions are portrayed as morally wrong, which is also supported by the repetition of their morally wrong action in lines 19, 21, and 24, i.e., “They took it into their possession. That was what they did. There was a cafeteria in this village. Having put everythi:ng under their names, this is a café now.” Thus, the action of taking over this property (“took into their possession” and “put under their names”) and pronoun “everythi:ng” are repeated. The syntactic repetition accentuates attention on the negative actions of the neighbors and thus further contributes to their role of antagonist in the story. The repetition of “everythi:ng” is especially interesting because it is repeated with the same phonological modification, i.e., emphatic stress. Tannen (1989/2007, 2008) shows that use of emphatic stress along with repetition helps bring the audience into the story. Thus, the pronoun “everythi:ng” along with its phonological modification emphasizes the action of illegal taking over the local cafeteria.

Details also play important role expressing the juxtaposition of a property that used to serve the needs of the general population and the function of the same property to serve private interests. Therefore, two terms are used for the same object: The cafeteria and the café. Thus, in the lines 21, 23, and 24 the two references are juxtaposed, i.e., “There was a cafeteria in this village. It was newly built. Having put everythi:ng under their names, this is a café now.” Therefore, the newly built “cafeteria” that serves the public has been transformed into “café” that serves a private interest. Though the juxtaposition of the same building serving public needs and private needs, the narrator assigns the party of Aktorgai and her son Bolat the quality of being capitalist; they not only sneakily claimed the building, but in so doing demonstrated care for
personal profit only. After a list of the events taken place in the former cafeteria in lines 26-27 (‘‘<Rus>A wedding> is on one day, an engagement is on other day; a birthday party is on other day.’’), the mother-son party is attributed as having benefited greatly: ‘‘They take money for everything.’’ and it is indicated that they have ‘‘raked (in) money!’’ (line 28). Once again, their action carries some negative meaning, but its evaluation as a greedy act further contributes their image as antagonist.

Finally, the external evaluation directed towards the status of the cafeteria building seems support the negative image. Thus, the narrator’s rhetorical questions such as ‘‘What is it now?’’ in lines 25 and 28 and ‘‘What was it that time?’’ in line 30 function to again highlight the shift of the building from public to private.

In summary, the collective character of neighbor Aktorgai and her son Bolat is constructed as negative through repetition of their negative actions, the narrator’s evaluation of these actions, and details she provides.

5.3.1.4 Level 2 (Storytelling world)

In the storytelling world, narrating takes place between the two interlocutors who, as mentioned, have much in common regarding their membership: Both have strong connections to the village, are women, and are mothers. However, Maira knows more about the village community, since she has long lived there. Thus, my mother inquired about a local woman who she remembers has two sons. Having inquired about the woman and her two sons, my mother moves on to ask ‘‘There is a café. Is anything happening there?’’ in line 11. Hostess Maira
responds that “that is Aktorgais’s (in Kazakh Aktorgai-lar-dyn) (the woman of the two sons) café” in line 12 referencing to this woman in a plural form, as shown below.

11 Aisulu’s Mother:  Hm. There is a café at this place. **There is a café. Is anything → happening there?**
12 Hostess Maira:  That- that is Aktorgais’s {in Kazakh Aktorgai-lar-dyn} (the woman → of the two sons) café.
13 Aisulu’s Mother:  Oh!

It seems that this material object of the café along with the inquiry about the neighbor Aktorgai is what sparks the narrative that Hostess Maira tells. Within the next several lines, she suggests the interpretive framework of the narrative (“She at that time, the time when ‘sovkhoz’ fell, their Bolat worked where- at the police. they having written everythi:ng off, they did- having put under (their names), they took over it.” lines 14-17), which is an understanding that the neighbors took into possession the building of communal cafeteria in a shady manner. Indeed, the findings from the analysis of positioning Level 1 support this interpretive framework; the neighbor and her son are positioned as the antagonist through co-accomplishing morally wrong actions and sharing negative attributes.

The principal recipient aligns with the narrative characterization suggested by the teller through backchannel signals, as demonstrated in the next extract.

19 Hostess Maira:  **They took it into their possession.**
20 Aisulu’s Mother:  **Mhm.**
21 Hostess Maira:  **That was what they did. There was a cafeteria in this village.**
22 Aisulu’s Mother:  **Mhm.**
23 Hostess Maira:  **It was newly built.**

Thus, after the complicating action “They took it into their possession.” in line 19, my mother shows support through “Mhm.” in the next line. Similarly, after the teller narrates that “There
was a cafeteria in this village.” in line 22, my mother expresses her engagement thorough
“Mhm.” in line 22. Thus, there is an alignment or display of support (or at least understanding)
(Schegloff 1981) from the main recipient regarding salient elements of the narrating, specifically
positioning the neighbors as corrupt ones (i.e., they got into possession the building of institution
that was crucial for the proper social life of the community).

Finally, the main recipient shows support after the teller states that the corrupt neighbors
“take money for everything. Having raked (in) money! What is it now?” (line 28). Specifically,
my mother shows her support of this evaluation of the neighbors as corrupt using the word
“Understood.” (line 29).

In uttering “Understood” in line 29, my mother demonstrates that the main point of the story or
the interpretive framework (Goodwin 1986) has been accepted with no alternative reading. Thus,
the positioning in the story world is accepted as it is. Also in this extract, there is a very
interesting contrast between now and then achieved through external evaluation (Labov 1972):
“What is it now?” and “What was it that time?”. Thus, there is a juxtaposition of the same
building that served the community then during the Soviet times and serving the personal
interests now. This evaluation seems to summarize the point of the narrative.

Overall, in the storytelling world, the narrative is employed as a response to the inquiry
about the neighbors and functions to express the teller’s sentiment of those neighbors, as well as
the Soviet past and capitalistic present (which will be addressed in more detail later). The
principal recipient, my mother, aligns with this interpretation, or at least does not provide the
alternative readings of the narrative. Thus, there seems to be alignment between the two participants on their positioning vis-à-vis the neighbors who illegally took into possession the local cafeteria, and therefore vis-à-vis each other.

As mentioned before, the narrative in the first part were shared between the teller and the recipient and tellers were the characters in the story themselves (and were directly impacted by the unjust actions of the neighbors who stole their properties or decreased the retirement payment). The narratives in the second offers a different perspective: The perspective of a neighbor-observer, i.e., the narrator is not the character in the story world. In other words, Hostess Maira observes the behavior of neighbors and provides her evaluation of such behavior. This is also insightful as the narrative captures a very traumatic period of the Soviet Union collapse when the idea of private property was introduced. Thus, it illustrates how this shift to a capitalistic economy could possibly affect the relationships between Kazakh neighbors.

5.3.2 Narrative Two: A neighbor who died too young

5.3.2.1 Summary of the narrative and overview of findings

This narrative is also told in the conversation involving Hostess Maira and my mother. The main point of the narrative is to show how carelessness on the side of Aktorgai (the female neighbor that the teller and recipient know, and the woman who took over the cafeteria) and her husband’s greed led to the death of Aktorgai (who was the mother in the café story); both were village locals. Thus, the major characters are the teller herself (Maira), a female neighbor Aktorgai who died very young, a male neighbor Amangeldi who is the husband, and the doctors at the hospital. In the story, the neighbor Aktorgai was wearing the worn clothes of her children.
while spending all day outside. In the story Maira reprimanded Aktorgai for this behavior, because she had a better financial situation and better husband than this behavior represented. Suddenly, Aktorgai got sick and her husband took her to the hospital for treating lung diseases such as tuberculosis, because this hospital was free of charge. Having heard the doctors’ recommendation to take her to a different hospital as Aktorgai’s problem was not with her lungs, the husband decided not to, as it would cost money. Thus, the wife died fighting with the husband for refusing to take her to the right hospital.

Maira disaligns with the neighbor who sent his wife to death by refusing to take her to the right type of the hospital; in this way, Maira constructs her own identity of a villager. As in the last stories about the café and about horses, the principal recipient, my mother, shows alignment with the interpretive frame offered by the teller through backchannels that validates Hostess Maira’s presentation of herself as a good neighbor. At a more global level, these positionings at the two levels reflect the narrator’s positioning to a bigger socio-cultural value of justice and its absence at the level of family.

### 5.3.2.2 Data and analysis

This story takes place in the end of conversation between my mother and Hostess Maira. My mother refers to one of the village locals and expresses her surprise about her death at a young age. The two women agree on this proposition and Hostess Maira launches into the story that explains what happened.

1. Hostess Maira: She (Aktorgai, a female neighbor) died at fifty-eight.
2. Aisulu’s Mother: Very young {In Kazakh ‘young-young’}.
3. Hostess Maira: She died young.
Aisulu’s Mother: She died young.
Hostess Maira: Nobody cared to shout at (meaning give advice to) Aktorgai.
The (now)-deceased from early morning till late in the evening, in a thin sweatpants, she would put ‘one-on-another’ children’s clothes on and walk around. Then, I would shout at, “Hey, you are really not like me, you have everything.”
Aisulu’s Mother: Mhm.
Hostess Maira: “Your husband does not drink vodka, you have a car, you have a normal life, the doctor (meaning can afford seeing the doctor)”
It <Rus>turned out> she that time- now I am with this diabetes. I’m with what- that- from diabetes with what- diabetes. I’m taking that medication. I’m also ‘badish’ (not feeling well).
Aisulu’s Mother: Mhm.
Hostess Maira: Did you see?
That time her daughter turned three- four.
She got sick <Rus>right away>.
Since she got sick, (now-)deceased Amangeldi (a husband) is like this {shows a feast},
Not wanting to spend extra money on that,
her with disease
he brought and put her in a lung hospital.
The lung hospital used to treat free of charge at that time.
Aisulu’s Mother: Mhm.
Hostess Maira: If someone is sick with lungs (meaning tuberculosis).
Aisulu’s Mother: Mhm.
Hostess Maira: Then, she stayed at the lung hospital one week, doctors checked her,
“There is nothing in the lungs, they are clean,
there is no disease to stay here,
take her to that place (a different type of hospital).” (the doctors) said.
“<Rus>So> money will be wasted on this,” having said, (he) did not take there.
She died from that. Fighting with (the husband that he didn’t take her there).
O:h, what happened, happened!
I’m sitting at home, how I will know this.
5.3.2.3 Level 1 (Story world)

As mentioned, in the story world, there are four major actors: Three are local – the female neighbor Aktorgai, her husband Amangeldi, and the teller – and the others are the doctors at the lung hospital.

Aktorgai is positioned as a victim-protagonist in this story by the actions attributed to her. Thus, she “she would put ‘one-on-another’ children’s clothes on and walk around.” (line 9), “she got sick” (lines 17, 21, 22), “stayed at the lung hospital” (line 30), and “died from that. Fighting with (her husband)” (line 35). The wearing of the children’s clothes is ambiguous in terms of evaluation (it could mean she is thrifty, though in the story Maira evaluates this action as unnecessary); her other actions are more neutral in the sense that they do not have any impact on any other characters and are not her responsibility (one cannot help getting sick and staying in the hospital when one is sick), with the exception the last one when she fights with her husband for not taking her to the right doctor. This results in her positioning as a victim. Regarding Maira, the teller, there is one action of her when she “would shout at” Aktorgai for not taking good care of herself in line 10. This action may contribute to position Maira as a positive character, as Maira suggests that she is the only villager to provide advice to Aktorgai (line 10). Regarding the third character, Aktorgai’s husband Amangeldi, his primary action is as follows: “Not wanting to spend extra money on that, brought and put her in a lung hospital” (lines 23 and 25) and “having said, (he) did not take there (a different hospital).” (line 34). Based on the assigned actions, Amangeldi appears to be more powerful as his actions are expressed through the action verbs that have impact on others (i.e., bring, put, and take), specifically his sick wife. The use of negation (“not wanting” and “did not take”) contributes to creating his image as a negative
character who is the reason of his wife’s death. Finally, the doctors at the hospital perform the action of checking and recommending a different hospital (“doctors checked her” and “said.”) in lines 30 and 33. Thus the overall focus of the story is a husband who disobeys doctors’ recommendations to save money, and his victim-wife who dies because of this.

Regarding character attributes and positioning, the teller herself is voiced, which gives her agency in the story world. In addition, the speech act is powerful as she reprimands the victim Aktorgai for behaving in a way that is contrary to her financial state. Thus, she shouts at her after describing that she would wear old children’s clothes to spend the whole day outside: “‘Hey, you are really not like me, you have everything. Your husband does not drink vodka, you have a car, you have a normal life, the doctor’” in lines 11 and 13, as shown below.

10 Hostess Maira: Then, I would shout at,
11 “Hey, you are really not like me, you have everything.”
12 Aisulu’s Mother: Mhm.
13 Hostess Maira: “Your husband does not drink vodka, you have a car, you have a normal life, the doctor (meaning can afford seeing the doctor)”

This seems contribute to constructing the character of the teller as a positive one because she cared for her neighbor.

It is worth noting that Hostess Maira points out that Aktorgai has a better life condition that allows her to afford having a personal car and a doctor (very likely at the private hospital). This evaluation stands in contrast to actions of the husband, i.e., husband Amangeldi takes his wife to the lung hospital that provides a free service, which is emphasized by the narrator (despite that the family could afford a private hospital). In addition, husband Amangeldi disobeys the doctors’ recommendation to take the wife to the right hospital, not wanting to spend money. Finally, most striking is that this is not explicitly stated by the narrator, Hostess Maira:
She does not provide any explicit evaluation of husband’s behavior: This seems done is very implicitly.

Finally, there is a nice juxtaposition of voicing that explicitly positions the doctors as positive and the husband Amangeldi as a negative character; this serves the story resolution as well. Thus, the doctors witness that “‘There is nothing in the lungs, they are clean, there is no disease to stay here, take her to that place (a different type of hospital).’” in lines 31-33. Their voicing brings more credibility (Hamilton 1998) to the fact that the wife Aktorgai needed to go to a different hospital. Then, the husband “‘<Rus>So> money will be wasted on this,” having said, (he) did not take there.” in line 34, which emphasizes his misguided priorities:

30 Hostess Maira:  Then, she stayed at the lung hospital one week, doctors checked her,
31 “There is nothing in the lungs, they are clean,
32 there is no disease to stay here,
33 take her to that place (a different type of hospital).” (the doctors) said.
34 “<Rus>So> money will be wasted on this,” having said, (he) did →
35 not take there.
36 She died from that. Fighting →
37 with (the husband that he didn’t take her there).
38 O:h, what happened, happened!
39 I’m sitting at home, how I will know this.

As a result of this voicing, the image (Tannen 2008) of advising doctors and refusing husband becomes more convincing and vivid, which helps better to recreate the scene of hospital and the decision that resulted in the death of the victim. As Hamilton (1998) shows that the direct quotation or constructed dialogue of the doctors helps to bring more evidence and credibility into the narrative when narrators aimed to present themselves as agentive figures; this is what happens here. Plus, the directly reported speech of the husband helps to incriminate them in the mind of the listener.
The character of the teller is positioned as positive and quite agentive in the story world through constructed dialogue in which she (unlike others in the village) cares enough to reprimand her neighbor Aktorgai for not taking good care of herself, however this dialogue also serves the purpose of making explicit the neighbor’s financial status (i.e., Aktorgai is part of a relatively well-off family). The character of Aktorgai is constructed as a victim through the actions that focus on her state and absence of voicing. Finally, the husband Amangeldi is positioned as an agentive character through assigning him actions that impact others but his main action involves refusing to take the wife to the right hospital, despite hearing that the doctors’ advice. He is thus positioned as responsible for her death.

5.3.2.4 Level 2 (Story world)

As mentioned, the story is offered after my mother inquiries about this female neighbor (Aktorgai). Thus, Hostess Maira states that “She (Aktorgai, a female neighbor) died at fifty-eight.” in line 1 and my mother assesses the age as very young, “Very young (young-young).” in line 2. Hostess Maira shows her alignment with my mother by repeating the same proposition “She died young.” in line 3. My mother also shows her alignment through mirroring the Hostess Maira’s previous turn, i.e., “She died young.” in line 4, as shown in the following excerpt.

1 Hostess Maira: She (Aktorgai, a female neighbor) died at fifty-eight.
2 Aisulu’s Mother: Very young (young-young).
3 Hostess Maira: She died young.
4 Aisulu’s Mother: She died young.
5 Hostess Maira: Nobody cared to shout at (meaning give advice) Aktorgai.
6 The (now)-deceased
Having established this alignment through use of repetition, it seems Hostess Maira feels the need to further expand on the reason for Aktorgai’s early death. Thus, she gives an account why this happens by taking a strong stance “Nobody cared to shout at (meaning give advice to) Aktorgai.” (line 5). This stance seems to propose an interpretive framework for the narrative: Nobody (as it turns out, not even Aktorgai’s greedy husband) cared enough about Akrtogai.

The findings of my analysis of positioning Level 1 support to this interpretation. Maira self-positions in the story world as positive and relatively agentive through constructed dialogue in which she reprimands, for the purpose of showing caring, the female neighbor Aktorgai for not taking good care of herself. The character of Aktorgai is constructed as a victim through the actions that focus on her state and absence of voicing. Finally, the husband Amangeldi is positioned as an agentive character through assigning him actions, albeit very negative ones that portray him as a negative figure.

During the narrating process, my mother is the principal recipient and she shows alignment with the suggested interpretation of the narrative through backchannel signals. Thus, after Maira voiced herself in the story world talking to Aktorgai, “‘Hey, you are really not like me, you have everything.’” (line 11), my mother shows her listenership via “Mhm” in line 12. Schegloff (1981) calls such vocalization as “mhm” or “uh” as continuers and notes that they can fulfill many function in creating alignment between a speaker and hearer. Thus, one of the functions (besides displaying understanding on the part of listener) can be signaling agreement on the part of a recipient to the speaker’s talk. Therefore, this may show not only attention but also alignment with the point that “if you have a higher social status, you should behave accordingly.”
“Hey, you are really not like me, you have everything.”

Mhm.

Your husband does not drink vodka, you have a car, you have a normal life, the doctor (meaning can afford seeing the doctor)”

Similarly, later in the narrative after the teller evaluates the hospital for treating tuberculosis as free of charge in lines 26 and 28, my mother as a primary recipient shows her engagement and agreement through “Mhm.” in lines 27 and 29.

The lung hospital used to treat free of charge that time.

Mhm.

If someone is sick with lungs (meaning tuberculosis).

Mhm.

Then, she stayed at the lung hospital one week, doctors checked her,

Thus, it seems that the narrative recipient does not challenge the interpretation that the teller suggests regarding the reported events. In this case, a negative quality of being greedy that is implicitly assigned to the husband (for taking his wife to a free hospital despite of the wealthy financial opportunities) is additionally supported through the recipient’s agreements.

Finally, the teller exits the narrative with philosophical external evaluation “O:h, what happened, happened!” in line 36, as shown in the excerpt below, which may be a display of her lamenting about this tragedy.

She died from that. Fighting with (the husband that he didn’t take her there).

O:h, what happened, happened!

I’m sitting at home, how I will know this.

Therefore, the narrative is closed on a very sad note and with a sense of helplessness to change anything.
All in all, in storytelling world, the teller (Hostess Maira) and the principal recipient (my mother) align on the sad fact that the female neighbor Aktorgai died early. This allows Hostess Maira to create her identity as a villager, as someone who has local knowledge and who tried to reach out to her neighbor. The teller offers a narrative to explain why she died young. The suggested interpretive frame of the narrative is that the victim Aktorgai did not put enough efforts into taking care of herself despite of her social status and her husband was too greedy to take her to the right hospital, which would have required payment. The principal recipient aligns with this interpretation along the process of narrating.

5.3.2.5 Level 3 (Socio-cultural world)

Across the two stories examined in this section – about café and a greedy husband – regarding the connection to bigger ideological discourses, the narrators seem to react to the value of justice through their narratives and alignment with during the narrating events.

Recall that the primary teller is Hostess Maira, who is the village insider with a higher epistemic status than my mother, since she was living there. The principal recipient is my mother who is also a village insider but with lower epistemic status as she lives in a neighboring city. As I mentioned before, my mother spent her summers as a child in this village. Thus, the situation consisted largely of inquiries from a participant with a lower epistemic status addressed to the participant of a higher epistemic status, which resulted in stories focused on the other neighbors who were the village residents. These narratives all touch on the topic of justice in the village.

The first narrative in which the narrator presents the neighbor Aktorgai as corrupt because she (and he family) illegally took over the village cafeteria, which was supposed to serve
the needs of the village community, and turned into a café. The principal recipient, my mother, shows alignment or at least does not offer an alternative reading of the narrative, which may signal that this viewpoint is shared one. In wider context, the narrator seems to react to the unjust process of privatization of the properties that used to belong to the state. In other words, it indexes historical events and takes a stance toward them, highlighting the lack of justice in the village legal system. As it has been mentioned, the value of justice is used here meaning governance of rules of morality and law at personal and institutional levels. Similarly, the second narrative illustrates how the wife was “sentenced” to the death by her greedy husband who decided that it would be a waste of money to take his wife to a hospital where he needed to pay. This narrative seems to show the necessity of justice in the family. It should be noted that this accusation is done very indirectly: The teller does not accuse husband explicitly but rather states that the wife died from the fact that husband did not take her to the right hospital, being afraid of wasting money. In addition, this narrative involves social class along with the value of justice. In her evaluation that is presented in the form of constructed dialogue, Hostess Maira explicitly reprimands her neighbor Aktorgai for wearing worn clothes of her children despite her higher social class (e.g., as someone who has both a car and a private doctor). This shows that teller’s sentiment that if someone has financial opportunities, they should use them. This is an interesting moment as the same character Aktorgai was reprimanded by the same narrator for taking the local cafeteria into her possession and thus getting into a higher social class.

In both narratives, the primary recipient shows moments of alignment through backchannels, and she never challenges the teller with alternative readings of the narratives. Thus, the major thread across the two narratives is the value of justice in the village context. This
value seems to be crucial in order to construct Kazakh identity through the daily narratives in the group of Kazakh-speaking participants.

5.4 Conclusion

In this chapter, I first showed how two narrators who are long-life neighbors discursively construct their identities of neighbors and Kazakhs through positionings in narratives that revolve around the topics of neighbors and neighborly relationships. In the conversation between two neighbors, Hostess Maira and Neighbor Arystan, they construct their identities as neighbors, villagers, and Kazakhs by positioning the other neighbors who steal personal property and acquire wealth in an illegal manner as antagonists in the story world; thus, they signal disalignment between them as characters in the story world and those neighbors at Level 1. In the storytelling world, the told narratives mostly developed in story rounds or were offered as second stories that allowed the narrator and recipient construct their interactional identities of neighbors. They also reinforce the alignment between them by positioning other neighbors in a negative manner in the story world. Finally, by disaligning to the other morally wrong neighbors in the story world, and showing support for this disalignment in the storytelling world, Hostess Maira and Neighbor Arystan emphasize a shared socio-cultural value of justice and equality that shapes their identities as neighbors and Kazakhs.

In the narratives that Hostess Maira shared with my mother as the principal recipient, Hostess Maira was not directly impacted by the events in the stories but she offered an insight into how social class may impact neighborly relations. Hostess Maira created the same disalignment with the neighbors who took the village cafeteria into possession through personal
connection during the Soviet collapse; thus, she shows her resentment toward the neighbors who were able to take advantage of a dramatic social change (a shift from the communistic to capitalistic economy) and re-emphasizes the value of justice and equality. Interestingly, in the next narrative, Hostess Maira reprimands the woman from the family who illegally took over the local cafeteria for not dressing according to her social class and implicitly ascribes her death to the greediness of her husband. Despite that the narrator does not explicitly voice that the death was unjust, she laments in the end. Through these positionings, I suggest that Hostess Maira reflects the socio-cultural value of justice that seems to enable her to construct her neighbor and villager identities and to partially reflect her ethnic identity.
CHAPTER SIX: POWER AND SOLIDARITY
IN NARRATIVES ABOUT FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS

6.1 Introduction

In this chapter, I examine how residents of the Kazakh village community discursively construct the social world of the family, including the construction of family identities, in the context of nine narratives told in mealtime conversations among family members and friends. Consistent with the two previous chapters, I follow Bamberg and Georgakopoulou’s (2008) model: I analyze the characters’ attributes and actions in the narratives’ story worlds (Level 1), then highlight purposes that story worlds serve their tellers in the storytelling worlds (Level 2), and then relate the results to the master narratives of nation-building in Kazakhstan (Level 3).

Whereas Chapter 4 highlighted Kazakhs’ relations to other ethnic and national groups, and Chapter 5 illuminated neighborhood relationships, the analysis presented in this chapter turns to a more private domain: Kazakh families. Some of these stories are also told in what Tannen (1984/2005) calls a story round.

Analyses reveal that at the first level, in the story worlds, narrators construct older family members as more agentive through linguistic devices such as action verbs and constructed dialogue. Thus, the older family members, as story world characters, fulfill major actions (e.g., telling someone to do something, going to an event, finding a wife for a son) in comparison to younger members who are backgrounded through uses of stative verbs, passive voice, and an absence of voicing. Next, the older members are voiced in the story world and this voicing occurs in speech acts such as warnings (e.g., a mother screamed at her sons, “If you don’t get married, I will leave the house”), orders (e.g., a father yelled at his son, “Get out of the house, I
will survive without you!”), and advice (e.g., an uncle-in-law said to a newlywed daughter-in-law, “I have words of wisdom to tell you…”). In this way, narrators construct the hierarchy between older family members and their adult children.

A second family relationship that is highlighted in these stories is grandparent-grandchild. In this relational context, constructed dialogue is differently employed: It is used to create a humorous effect. For instance, a seven-year old grandchild is voiced when he comes to propose marriage to a neighbor’s daughter (“I want to marry to your daughter!”) or suggests sharing wealth to the same neighbor (“We should share. My family is bankrupt.”). This is used to create a play frame (Bateson 1972; Tannen and Wallat 1987/1993) in storytelling world, or a situation where several caregivers engaged into a playful discussion of humorous moments, creating bonds with each other. Thus, the same linguistic technique is used to construct power and solidarity, as these relational dimensions are outlined by Tannen (1993), in the narratives. This demonstrates polysemy of linguistic strategies used in construction of the characters.

The third family relationship I examine is between members of couples. The narrator who is an old woman shares a narrative about how she took care of an alcoholic husband during the last months of his life. In the story world, she is constructed as strong and caring wife who keeps her husband clean and safe while he is bedridden due to his alcoholism. Her agency is accomplished through multiple actions fulfilled by her and through the use of constructed dialogue. The use of constructed dialogue is very interesting: The voices of male neighbors are employed to express praise and the voices of the female neighbors to express envy and distrust in the narrator’s actions in the story world. The way narrator constructs the story world is supported by her principal recipient who is another Kazakh woman through co-narration and assessments.
Connecting the analysis of story worlds to storytelling worlds, I show how the tellers participating in the story round effectively align with each other and thus construct their individual identities as proper family members and ‘authentic’ Kazakhs. Thus, they feed off each other’s narratives, and listeners take up positive and supportive evaluative stances during storytelling and afterwards (e.g., “So true!”). At the third, global level, these narratives reflect the state master narratives of Kazakh cultural values of respect for elderly, belief that it is sweeter to raise grandchildren than one’s own children, and socio-cultural expectations for what it means to be a good wife.

In this chapter, I continue to draw on the framework of three levels of positioning (Bamberg 1997; Bamberg and Georgakopoulou 2008; De Fina 2008, 2013). In addition, as before, I draw on concepts from Conversation Analysis, specifically Sacks’ (1970/1992b) concept of narrative sequencing and Jefferson’s (1978) concept of the local occasioning of narratives, as well as Tannen’s (1989/2007) analysis of the involvement strategies of constructed dialogue, repetition, and details, Schffrin’s (1996) work of self-presentation in narrative, and Labov and Waletzky’s (1967; Labov 1972) foundational work on narrative clauses.

After introducing each story, within this theoretical framework, I provide a detailed discourse analysis with a focus on narratives themselves (structure and clauses) and narrating (how the participants initiate narratives and how audience members participate). In other words, I first investigate the positioning levels 1 and 2 (i.e., story and storytelling worlds). As in previous chapters, I focus on discursive strategies found in the story world as what and how actions, motives, and characteristics are attributed to the protagonists and other characters (following Bamberg 1997; Bamberg & Georgakopoulou 2008; De Fina 2008, 2013), and how
narrators use repetition, constructed dialogue, and details (Tannen 1989/2007) to assign the actions and attributes. My analysis of these strategies connects directly to Schiffrin’s (1996) work on presentation of agentive and epistemic selves in the story world. I also draw on C. Goodwin’s (1986) concept of interpretive framework and M. Goodwin’s (1996) analysis of audience participation and its role in sense-making. Because a number of the stories (the ones about grandchildren) are very playful in tone, I draw on the concept of frame (Tannen & Wallat 1987/1993) as well.

Finally, I connect my findings of the narrative analysis of Levels 1 and 2 to socio-cultural values such as the status of age and cultural beliefs regarding the status of children and grandchildren (Level 3).

In what follows, I present the analysis of the stories that focus on family group relations. The first part is the discourse analysis of the stories told by the older family members about themselves and younger family members such as a daughter-in-law, children, and grandchildren. This second part examines stories told by the younger family members about the older family members such as a father and grandfather-in-law. In the third part, I analyze stories told about the family members who are more or less the same in terms of age group, i.e., wife-husband relations.

### 6.2 Older family members narrate about younger family members

I start this part with the analysis of the stories told by the parents about their children and then proceed to the analysis of the stories told by the grandparents about their grandchildren.
6.2.1 Narrative One: Finding a daughter-in-law

6.2.1.1 Summary of the narrative and main findings

This narrative was extracted from a mealtime conversation that included Hostess Maira; her son, who was in his late-thirties; her daughter-in-law, Aigul (the wife of Maira’s other son); and my mother. This was the first day of recording this family and this interaction occurred before the male neighbor, Neighbor Arystan, stopped by to have tea and say hi. Hostess Maira, her two sons (one of whom was not present), the daughter-in-law, and two grandchildren were living together at the time of recording. Hostess Maira complained to my mother that the son who was present at the table, named Damir, hadn’t gotten married yet. After this complaint, she shared the story. In the story, her other son did not have the desire to get married, and this situation led Hostess Maira to take a serious action, i.e., to threaten her sons that she would leave the house. Then, she describes how she went to someone’s engagement party and found a potential wife for her son. The teller offers evaluation of this luck by referencing Allah, and finishes with coda that now life is good as the daughter-in-law was taking good care of her.

Applying the three levels of positioning shows how this Kazakh narrator discursively constructs her identity as a caregiver and as Kazakh through portraying the character of herself as a mother in the story world as agentive (via the narrator’s use of action verbs and constructed dialogue), and through receiving her audience’s alignment, in the storytelling world, to such characters’ positioning. Collectively, the two levels reflect the narrator’s position towards a bigger socio-cultural value, “respect for age,” that enables the teller to construct her ethnic identity.
6.2.1.2 Data and analysis

As mentioned, the first story is taken from a meal conversation in Hostess Maira’s home. This episode starts with the son of Hostess Maira, her second son, introducing the sister-in-law (his brother’s wife). He mentions what village she is from and then asks my mother to introduce herself. However, the hostess picks up this introduction and continues by saying the daughter-in-law’s name and adding that there are also two grandchildren in the house. Then, she comments that the absent son got married late, and shifts her focus to the present (unmarried) one by commenting that “Now, he (the son who is present) has become thirty-seven this year, in August.” in line 1. Following this, narrating takes place.

1 Hostess Maira: Now, he (the son who is present) has become thirty-seven this year, in August.
2 Now, if he does not marry this year, this <Rus>already>
3 So that,
4 What will happen to his ‘black hairs’ (being young)?
5 Aisulu’s Mother: He will stay alone.
6 Hostess Maira: Yes. What will I do with him?
7 Now, that son (the son who is not present) did not want to marry.
8 One day, I shouted at the two of them, “I will leave,
9 Aisulu’s Mother: Mhm.
10 Hostess Maira: if you do not get married!”
11 <Rus> That time,> I went to an engagement party at one place.
12 Aisulu’s Mother: Mhm.
13 Then, I found that Aigul (her daughter-in-law). With this, now-
14 Aisulu’s Mother: Very good, the daughter-in-law who you found yourself!
15 Hostess Maira: Yes, who I found myself.
16 Now, this is probably Allah’s will, now it is good.
17 With this, it is good. She is taking care of me.
18 It has become well. We have lived together since then.
19 Aisulu’s Mother: Mhm.
6.2.1.3 Level 1 (Story World)

In the story world, there are three major characters: The teller herself in the capacity of the mother, her son, and a future daughter-in-law. Regarding the assigned actions and characters’ positioning, the character of teller-mother is a very agentive figure. First, she performed the most and major actions. Second, the actions she performs are realized via action verbs i.e., she says that she “shouted at two of them” (line 8), indicating “I will leave” (line 8), she “went to an engagement party” (line 11), “found that Aigul (her daughter-in-law)” (line 13), and reiterates that she “found” Aigul herself (line 15). All of these verbs entail Maira acting agentively in the story world: She threatens her sons, and finds a wife for her son (and a daughter-in-law for herself). In addition, she is voiced as a story world character in constructed dialogue, which also attributes agency (following Schiffrin 1996). Even though the character of the daughter-in-law performs one action, it is the action of providing assistance to the elderly woman, i.e., “she is taking care of me” (line 17), and further, this is in the present tense, no longer in the world of the story. Finally, the only action that the son performs in the story is that he “did not want to marry” in line 7, which is realized though the verb of state “want” and negation. Thus, his storyworld character does not display a lot of agency. Interestingly, the three separate characters of the teller, her son, and the daughter-in-law are eventually brought together into one unit in the story, i.e., “We have lived together since then.” in line 18, which signals that the daughter-in-law becomes a part of the whole family (and that Maira did a good job finding her). Therefore, the narrator is depicted as very agentive through active verbs and constructed dialogue.

Regarding the assigned attributes and characters’ positioning, the constructed dialogue that the teller-mother performs – “‘I will leave, if you don’t get married!’” (lines 8 and 10) – is a
very agentive speech act: It is a threat. This contributes further to the positioning of the teller’s
storyworld character as agentive in that it assigns her the quality of “being in a powerful enough
position to threaten.” In addition, since this is evaluation, it can also be viewed as reflecting the
narrator’s cultural/social beliefs (following Schiffrin 1996) of privileges and responsibilities of
the mother as a social identity and the impact of age as a social construct (i.e., the elderly have
power in the family).

All in all, the teller’s storyworld character acts in the capacity of a mother, and she is
constructed as very agentive through being assigned major actions (that are realized through
action verbs) and by voicing her (to accomplish the act of threatening).

6.2.1.4 Level 2 (Storytelling world)

In the storytelling world, narrating takes place mainly between the two women who are
similar in age (Hostess Maira who is in her late seventies and my mother who is in her sixties)
and who are both mothers and grandmothers. This shared membership may facilitate alignment
in that the women likely share similar concerns. If we look how the narrative is locally
occasioned (Jefferson 1978), we can see that it starts with a stance that Hostess Maira takes up
towards her son, i.e., “Now, if he does not marry this year, this <Rus>already> What will happen
to his ‘black hairs’?”, (lines 2 and 4). This utterance means that she is very concerned that her
son will miss the opportunity to find a life partner this year, and his chances to do so next year
are even lower. Also, by using expressing “his black hair,” the narrator metaphorically associates
the color of hair with age; thus, he is still young as his hair is black not gray (which is symbol of
aging). Maira’s move can be analyzed using Du Bois’ (2007) stance triangle: Maira’s evaluation
of the son (he seems to be a hopeless case) creates the opportunity for my mother to also evaluate him as a stance object, and thus to align (or disalign) with Maira. We see how this unfolds in the extract below.

1 Hostess Maira: Now, he (the son who is present) has become thirty-seven this year, \( \rightarrow \) in August.
2 Now, if he does not marry this year, this <Rus>already>
3 So that,
4 What will happen to his black hairs?
5 Aisulu’s Mother: He will stay alone.
6 Hostess Maira: Yes. What will I do with him?
7 Now, that son did not want to marry.
8 One day, I shouted at two of them, “I will leave,

In line 5, my mother seems to align with Hostess Maira and takes a similar stance, “He will stay alone.” Having acknowledged my mother’s alignment with “Yes.” in line 6, Host Maira takes another stance towards her son, “What will I do with him?”; this shows her responsibility and power to decide her son’s destiny. Then, Hostess Maira offers an abstract of the upcoming narrative (“Now, that son did not want to marry.” line 7) that predisposes the listener to also align with her as she describes how she dealt with her other son, who put her in a similar situation by not marrying until later in life. She begins by narrating that “One day, I shouted at two of them, “I will leave,” in line 8. The expression “one day” can serves as a generic framing device (Bauman 2004) that sets up expectations that storytelling is coming next.

Based on this pre-narrative sequencing, the primary interactive purpose of the narrative may be exemplifying how Hostess Maira fulfills her motherly duties and privileges in dealing with the issue of unmarried adult sons. What happens in the story world, as analyzed in the previous section, supports this suggestion as Hostess Maira constructs her figure as the mother in
the story world in a very agentive manner: She fulfills all major actions that are mostly presented via actions verbs and her voicing is the speech act of threat.

The interpretive framework that the teller offers to the principal recipient, my mother, is that a mother should take actions regarding unmarried adult children. As the narrative unfolds, my mother aligns towards this interpretation of the narrative through backchannels ("mhm") in lines 9, 12, and 19. In addition, my mother offers an assessment (Goodwin 1996) of the teller’s action in the story world that shows her alignment. Thus, as the teller narrates that “Then, I found that Aigul (her daughter-in-law). With this, now-” in line 13, my mother who is the principal recipient assesses this as “Very good, the daughter-in-law who you found yourself!” in line 14 (shown in the excerpt below). My mother emphasizes the benefit of “yourself” finding a daughter-in-law.

13 Hostess Maira: Then, I found that Aigul (her daughter-in-law). With this, now-
14 Aisulu’s Mother: Very good, the daughter-in-law who you found yourself!
15 Hostess Maira: Yes, who I found myself.

The teller agrees with this assessment in the follow-up line 15 (“Yes, who I found myself.”) through repetition, which further supports alignment between two women.

In summary, the narrative originated as an illustration of the stance that the teller previously displayed (that having unmarried adult children is an issue) and the primary recipient supports this understanding (through taking similar stance). The narrative is thus employed to show how Hostess Maira successfully executes her duties and privileges as a mother (i.e., finding a wife for her son), which is fully supported by the primary narrative recipient along the process of narrating.
6.2.2 Narrative Two: The daughter and a computer

6.2.2.1 Summary of the narrative and overview of findings

This narrative is taken from the mealtime conversation among a different group of people: my mother’s cousin, his daughter (who is nine years old), and his wife. This conversation was recorded in the home of mother’s cousin. Prior to narrating, my mother takes a stance that modern children abuse modern technology, and the father aligns with this stance. Therefore, the story point is that the young generation of children abuses technology. The teller who is the father of the girl recounts the event from the previous night: The father fell asleep (and did not control the child), and when he woke up, she was playing with a phone.

The analysis shows how this Kazakh narrator discursively constructs his identity as a good caregiver through creating the character of himself as a father in the story world who is both agentive (through assigning more actions to himself in comparison to his daughter) and caring (through evaluation of not knowing what to do with daughter’s misuse of technology). The way he portrays himself in the story world fits the statements before the narrative and is received with alignment from his audience in the storytelling world. At a more global level, the results of the two levels may reflect the narrator’s positon towards the wider socio-cultural value of “respect for age”; this helps the teller’s construction of his ethnic identity.

6.2.2.2 Data and analysis

This excerpt is taken from the discussion between my mother and her male cousin (who I will refer as Father Aibek) during the day meal (lunch) conversation, for which his wife and nine-year-old daughter (who I will refer as Daughter Madina) are also present. The discussion is
about the benefit of buying a good quality computer. My mother states that the younger generation spends a lot of time in front of the computer screen and employs this statement to support the idea that it is important to have a good quality computer. Thus, she refers to the modern generations of children as “these” and comments how long they sit in front of computers even during the night. The host father aligns with my mother’s positioning of the younger generation by repeating the same proposition. This two-turn sequence (i.e., my mother takes negative stance towards members of the younger generation and Father Aibek aligns with it) repeats one more time, and then Father Aibek offers the narrative about his personal experience that is the focus of this section. However, before this his daughter Madina offers a summary of what she did, i.e., she was sitting till the morning and watching a tablet with another girl.

1 Aisulu’s Mother: But, these (nowadays children) are <Rus>really> sitting long (in front of a computer).
2 Father Aibek: Indeed, they are sitting (in front of a computer).
3 Aisulu’s Mother: Two- they are sitting (in front of a computer) till two-ish at night, they are sitting (in front of a computer) till one. At the house of those who have a computer.
4 Father Aibek: If I fall asleep, these are continuing sitting (in front of a computer).
5 So-called ‘a bit more’. {Smiles and looks at the daughter}
6 Aisulu’s Mother: They are sitting (in front of a computer).
7 Daughter Madina: {smiles}
8 Father Aibek: {laughs}
9 Daughter Madina: Having hugged with Aidana (a girl cousin), hm: we sat watching a notebook till seven (in the morning).
10 Aisulu’s Mother: {laughs}
11 Father Aibek: I fell asleep yesterday.
12 Daughter Madina: {laughs}
13 Father Aibek: Now, I woke up. A noise is coming from something. Now, when I finally woke up,
14 this (the daughter) is watching something on a cell phone.
15 I do not know (what to do about the daughter’s misuse of technology)
16 Aisulu’s Mother: <Rus> Oh, I don’t know, why all want to buy cars (instead of good computers)>
6.2.2.3 Level 1 (Story world)

In the story world, there are two characters: The teller, Father Aibek, in his role as a father, and his daughter. Regarding the assigned actions and characters’ positioning, the major character performs two main actions: He “fell asleep” (line 14) and “woke up” (lines 16 and 18). The daughter performs only one action of “is watching something on the cell phone,” and this action is evaluated as “I do not know!”, i.e., he does not know how to deal with his daughter’s excessive use of technology, which shows a negative evaluation of action and teller’s belief that children are abusing electronic devices. All in all, the character of teller-father is positioned as a very agentive in that the focus is on his actions and he evaluates his child’s action, but she is also agentive in that she stayed up late using the phone that Father Aibek is helpless to control.

6.2.2.4 Level 2 (Storytelling world)

In the storytelling world, the teller is the father, and the principal recipient is my mother. They are distant cousins, but both of them are parents. This shared membership seems to create an opportunity for them to align through the topic of raising children. In the interactional role of a guest, my mother has a bit more power to make statement. Thus, she takes a stance toward the young generation of kids by stating that “But, these (nowadays children) are <Rus>really> sitting long (in front of a computer)” in line 1 and Father Aibek aligns with this statement “Indeed, they are sitting (in front of a computer).” in line 2 through “indeed” and repetition “they are sitting”, which emphasizes the alignment. These lines are shown in the excerpt below.

1 Aisulu’s Mother: But, these (nowadays children) are <Rus>really> sitting long (in front of a computer).
2 Father Aibek: Indeed, they are sitting (in front of a computer).
In lines 3-4, my mother takes another and similar stance towards the children, “Two- they are sitting (in front of a computer) till two-ish at night, they are sitting (in front of a computer) till one.” Father Aibek again aligns with her through repetition: “If I fall asleep, these are continuing sitting (in front of a computer).” (line 6). Thus, this sequence of alignment between the two parents regarding how to position the children and their addiction to modern gadgets like computers seems serves as the basis for the narrative from Father Aibek. In addition, the child herself offers a short summary of her actions with her girl cousin Aidana in lines 11-12. Thus, Daughter Madina describes how she and her cousin stayed up until seven in the morning watching something on a tablet.

Father Aibek seems to employ this narrative as a testimony to my mother’s point about the younger generation as he starts “I fell asleep yesterday.” in line 14; it also builds on his daughter’s description of staying up late but framing that event as a narrative from his perspective. The analysis of Level 1 supports this, as Father Aibek focuses on his annoyance when he found his daughter late in the night playing with a cell phone (that he evaluates as “I don’t know!”, meaning he does not know what to do about this habit). It should be noted that narrating is also framed as playful through contextualization cues such as Daughter Madina’s
All in all, the narrative originated as the illustration of the stance that the teller previously took up in the conversation (that modern children spend too much time in front of electronic devices). And the positioning in the story world serves to provide evidence for this stance. Thus, the interactive accomplishment of narrating serves to further construct alignment with the primary recipient by offering it as illustration of the stances taken prior to narrating and construct his identity as caregiver.

6.2.3 Narrative Three: Children versus grandchildren

6.2.3.1 Summary of the narrative and overview of findings

This narrative was taken from a different mealtime conversation. This conversation involved three Kazakh women of different ages: Hostess Ulbon (who is in her seventies and is a retired teacher), my mother (who is in her sixties), and me (I was thirty years old at the time of recording). It was triggered by a question from me asking Hostess Ulbon if it was harder to raise children or grandchildren. Thus, the narrative illustrates how Hostess Ulbon differently treated her children and her grandchildren. Specifically, she explains that when her children were young, she told them that if they got into troubles with other children, they would be on their own, and if they were able to avoid fights with other children, they should be friends. This was all the upbringing that she used with her own children. Then, she juxtaposes this with how she is contributing to raising her grandchildren.
Analysis of this narrative illuminates how a Kazakh female narrator discursively constructs her identity of a caregiver through constructing herself as a mother in the story world as a more agentive character (her character is attributed with constructed dialogue in form of a warning) and through receiving her audience’s alignment in storytelling world. At a more global level, the narrative and its telling create the narrator’s positon toward the socio-cultural value of respect for age. This value is highlighted as something important and thus allows the narrators to show that by appreciating this value she is signaling her Kazakh identity.

6.2.3.2 Data and analysis

Hostess Ulbon is a retired school teacher who welcomed my mother and me to video-record our conversation. My mother is another older woman who is also an insider in the village. Both women are also mothers and grandmothers. I was introduced as a PhD student who was doing research about Kazakh culture. This chain of discussion started from my question to Hostess Ulbon if it is more difficult to raise children or grandchildren. She replied that she looks after the grandchildren until they go to school and the reason for taking care of them until school age is that the grandparents tend to spoil them. Then, she exemplifies this by giving an example of being over-protective of her grandchildren (screaming at other kids not to touch them). This exaggeration presented though constructed dialogue directs the conversation into a playful frame; Hostess Ulbon and I both laugh. After this introduction, Hostess Ulbon goes into a narrative reference of how she differently raised her own children. Thus, she juxtaposes the upbringing approaches by stating that she did not pay so much attention to her own children when they were young.
Hostess Ulbon: Now, we are spoiling them (grandchildren) to some extent. On my side, I’m shouting “Don’t touch my <Rus>grandchild>!” “Look, their grandmother is coming!” Here again, their grandmother is coming!” having said (the local children) all children run away.

Aisulu: {laughter} Hostess Ulbon: {laughter} But, I did not “run after” for my own children like this. “You know yourself, (it is up to you to decide)” I said “if you get into troubles (with other kids), <Rus> defend> yourself” Aisulu: Mhm. Hostess Ulbon: “But if you do not get into troubles, <Rus> be friends (with other kids)>.” Aisulu: Mhm. Hostess Ulbon: The work was finished. None of them, I looked after with so much ‘shouting’.

6.2.3.3 Level 1 (Story world)

In the story world (lines 10-17), the teller herself is in the role of mother who interacts with her children. She performs all the actions including she “did not “run after” for my own children” (line 10), “said” (line 11), and “looked after” with the negation “none of them” (line 17). In addition, the character of teller-mother is voiced, which constructs the character’s agency. On the contrary, there are no actions and voices attributed to her children as story world characters, which makes them almost invisible. The story thus highlights the teller’s identity.

Regarding how attributes are attributed to characters and characters are positioned, the voicing of Hostess Ulbon is performed through the speech act of warning or formulaic expression (Tannen and Özték 1977) in form of ‘if you do action X, then face consequence Y’ (lines 12 and 14). As Tannen and Özték (1977) note, formulaic expressions are a cultural phenomenon. In this case, it may help to construct the character of mother in a culturally
expected way. In addition, this is very agentive speech act that assigns power to the character of the teller-mother in the story world. Finally, the constructed dialogue as evaluation (Labov and Waletzky 1967, Labov 1972) also expresses the teller’s beliefs about her status as a mother. Specifically, Schiffrin (1996) reveals that through evaluation clauses, Jewish mothers in her study express their beliefs of how incoming family members should socialize within a new family.

Thus, overall, the figure of the teller in her role as a mother is positioned as very agentive and powerful in how her character is assigned major actions, especially in how she is voiced as issuing a warning and directive.

6.2.3.4 Level 2 (Storytelling world)

In the storytelling world, the major participants are the three women of different ages. Two of them are older women in their sixties and both are mothers and grandmothers, which means they have shared membership. The third woman (me) was presented as a PhD student researching Kazakh culture (and I have no children). Thus, Kazakh ethnicity is my shared membership with the other participants. The storytelling episode was triggered by my question if it is harder to raise children or grandchildren. Therefore, the teller Hostess Ulbon responses with a more general statement about her view on raising grandchildren, i.e., “Now, we are spoiling them (grandchildren) to some extent. On my side, I’m shouting ‘Don’t touch my <Rus>grandchild>!’” in lines 1-3. Then she voices the reaction of the village kids who see her approaching them (“‘Look, their grandmother is coming! Here again, their grandmother is coming!’ having said (the local children) all children run away.”) in lines 4-6. Based on this,
Hostess Ulbon’s main point is that she is overprotecting her grandchildren. The constructed dialogue makes two of the participants (Hostess Ulbon and me) laugh in lines 8 and 9; this seems to shift the conversation into a more playful frame. The beginning of the excerpt is re-presented below.

1 Hostess Ulbon: Now, we are spoiling them (grandchildren) from one side.  
From one side, I’m shouting  
“Don’t touch my <Rus>grandchild>!”  
“Look, their grandmother is coming!”  
Here again, their grandmother is coming!” having said (the ➔ local children)  
all children run away.
2 Aisulu: {laughter}  
9 Hostess Ulbon: {laughter}  
10 Hostess Ulbon: But, I did not “run after” for my own children like this.  
11 “You know yourself, (it is up to you to decide)” I said

The laughter shared between Hostess Ulbon and me demonstrates our shared alignment to the humorous nature of having neighborhood children recognize her as someone who is perhaps over-involved in her grandchildren’s interactions with other children (and their running away from her).

This talk, in addition to helping align the teller and a member of her audience, also needs to be examined in its sequential context: It allows Hostess Ulbon to provide her perspective on raising her own children, as compared to her grandchildren. Thus, she starts “But, I did not ‘run after’ for my own children like this.” in line 10, which serves as story abstract (Labov & Waletzky 1967) and provides the principal recipient (me) with the interpretive framework of the narrative (i.e., Hostess Ulbon as a mother did not overprotect her children). In what follows, Hostess Ulbon explains that she gave one piece of advice, i.e., to deal themselves with their challenges with other kids, that is very different from the way she deals with the grandchildren.
Based on this, interactive accomplishment of the narrative seems to provide a more specific illustration of how Hostess Ulbon fulfills her duties and privileges as a grandmother, and in comparison to how she did so as a mother. The analysis of Level 1 supports this characterization of the narrative as the teller construct her figure as a mother very agentive and powerful through, in constructed dialogue, producing the speech act of warning; interestingly, she positons her children as being fully responsible for the troubles they may get into. In addition, the interpretive framework (i.e., a way of how a coming narrative should interpreted that is suggested by a narrator) that the teller provides is met with alignment from the primary recipient (as I display my agreement through backchannel in lines 13 and 15).

All in all, in storytelling world, the narrative originated as a response to a question I asked. I am then treated as the principal recipient of the talk that illustrates how the teller took a different approach to raising her own children in comparison to her grandchildren. Thus, she is able to signal her identity as a caregiver.

6.2.4 Narrative Four: Misinterpretation of a grandchild’s behavior

6.2.4.1 Summary of narrative and overview of findings

The narrative was taken from the same mealtime as the previous example; it is continuous with that example. Thus, the narrative I examine in this section also seems to have been triggered by my question asking Hostess Ulbon it was harder to raise children or grandchildren. The narrative illustrates how her overthinking as a grandmother could lead to misinterpretation of her grandchildren’s actions. Specifically, when a granddaughter arrived during dinner and started kissing Hostess Ulbon’s cheeks, she mistakenly thought that her
granddaughter wanted to ask permission to go out. However, it turned out that her brother (and the grandson of Hostess Ulbon) called and asked her to give kisses.

In this narrative, Hostess Ulbon discursively constructs her identity as a caregiver (specifically a grandmother) and a Kazakh through constructing the character of her grandchild as more agentive (though constructed dialogue) and herself as a less agentive in the story world and receiving her audience’s alignment to such characters’ positioning in the storytelling world. As with the example in the previous section, this creates a playful frame in storytelling world. At a more global level, Levels 1 and 2 together help create the narrator’s positon towards a bigger socio-cultural belief that is prevalent in Kazakhstan: being a grandparent is a more enjoyable type of caregiving than being a parent. The narrator signals an ethnic aspect of her identity by highlighting this value through positioning in story world and storytelling world.

6.2.4.2 Data and analysis

The narrative also occurred in the conversation that involved Hostess Ulbon, my mother, and me; it is continuation of the discussion about raising children versus grandchildren. Having offered the narrative about how she raised her own children, she switches to recount a funny miscommunication she had with her granddaughter Gulfaat. Prior to this, Hostess Ulbon expresses how she is over-protective of her grandchildren (while she didn’t look after her own children this way, she is a loud protector of her grandchildren) (lines 17-18, 20-21), and my mother aligns with this by saying that Hostess Ulbon overprotects her grandchildren because they are not her own children (line 22). Then, the narrative is launched.

17 Hostess Ulbon: None of them, I looked after with so much ‘shouting’.
But, I’m ‘making noise’ for the sake of these (her grandchildren).

Aisulu’s Mother: {laughter}

If their heads get broken,

if their eyes get hurt, I am (thinking) like.

Of course, it is someone’s child.

Of course, how else it can be.

The other day,

Gulfaat (a granddaughter), having come in and hugged, started kissing my face.

When grandfather, Aigerim (another granddaughter), we all were sitting.

Then, I said,

“Oh, this girl is asking to let her to go to somewhere.”

“Ah, grandma, why are you saying like this!
I did not come to ask to let me go.

Aibek (her brother) called

and said to kiss everyone in the face.”

Aisulu: {laughter}

Hostess Ulbon: “Ah, grandma, why are you saying like this!
I did not come to ask to let me go.

Aibek (her brother) called

and said to kiss everyone in the face.”

Hostess Ulbon: {laughter}

6.2.4.3 Level 1 (Story world)

In the story world, there are two major characters: The teller in the capacity of grandmother and the granddaughter whose name is Gulfaat. There are also the characters of the grandfather and another granddaughter Aigerim but they are mostly employed to create the background in the orientation, i.e., “When grandfather, Aigerim (another granddaughter), we all were sitting” line 26. There is also a character who is not present at the table, Gulfaat’s brother (who she had talked to on the phone).

Regarding actions and characters’ positioning, the granddaughter performs the actions of hugging and kissing her grandmother’s face, and the grandmother performs the act of saying. Both characters are agentive, but the purpose seems not to display agency or power, but to demonstrate the family bonds that exist between the grandmother and her granddaughter.
Thus, the grandmother makes a statement, in which she assumes that the granddaughter’s “sweet” behavior is the way to curry favor, specifically to get permission to go somewhere (“Oh, this girl is asking to let her to go to somewhere.” line 28). The constructed dialogue of the granddaughter is her denial of her grandmother’s assumption and explanation, which is fulfilling a request from her brother who is in a different city (“Ah, grandma, why are you saying like this! I did not come to ask to let me go. Aibek (her brother) called and said to kiss everyone in the face.” lines 30-33). It seems that despite being fairly equally voiced, the grandmother and granddaughter perform different speech acts in their constructed dialogue (critical evaluation vs. explanation). Further, constructed dialogue of the granddaughter provides the story’s resolution while also creating a playful frame – Hostess Ulbon jumped to the wrong conclusion about her granddaughter’s actions. All together the assigned actions and constructed dialogue work well to position Hostess Ulbon as a concerned caregiver and her granddaughter Gulfaat as source of trouble and joy that serves as the base for creating a playful frame in storytelling world.

6.2.4.4 Level 2 (Storytelling world)

In the storytelling world, the recounting of this incident is a sequential continuation of the previous short narrative about how Hostess Ulbon raised her children. Thus, as soon the teller finishes this small story “None of them (own children), I looked after with so much ‘shouting’.” (line 17), she switches back to the present time and makes a statement about her grandchildren, i.e., “But, I’m ‘making noise’ for the sake of these (her grandchildren).” (line 18). This points out that the teller is still in the frame of comparing grandchildren versus children.

17 Hostess Ulbon: None of them, I looked after with so much ‘shouting’.
But, I’m ‘making noise’ for the sake of these (her grandchildren).

Aisulu’s Mother: \{laughter\}

Hostess Ulbon: If their heads get broken,
if their eyes get hurt, I am (thinking) like.

Aisulu’s Mother: Of course, it is someone’s child.

Hostess Ulbon: Of course, how else it can be.

The other day,
Gulfaat (a granddaughter), having come in and hugged, started → kissing my face.

When grandfather, Aigerim (another granddaughter), we all were sitting.

Then, I said,
“Oh, this girl is asking to let her to go to somewhere.”

In line 19, my mother reacts with laughter to how Hostess Ulbon describes looking after her grandchildren, which contributes more playfulness into conversation. However, right after this, Hostess Ulbon voices her daily concerns as a caregiver (“If their heads get broken, if their eyes get hurt, I am (thinking) like.”, lines 20-21), and my mother aligns by stating that “Of course, it is someone’s child.” in line 23. This comment seems to create an alignment between the two women as mothers and grandmothers, as Hostess Ulbon responds back “Of course, how else it can be.” in line 24. Thus, she repeats the same discourse marker “of course” that shows her solidarity with the previous statement. Then, she opens the narrative “The other day, Gulfaat (the granddaughter), having come in and hugged, started kissing my face.” (lines 24-25). The expression “The other day” serves as a generic framing device (Bauman 2004) that sets up expectations that storytelling is coming next. This pre-narrative sequential development (Jefferson 1978) and narrative framing device seems to signal that the coming narrative is an example that will illustrate the pressure of taking care of someone’s children.

Indeed, after indicating what Gulfaat did (hugged and kissed all the family members around the table), Hostess Ulbon and indicates that as a story world character she evaluated her granddaughter’s actions as “‘Oh, this girl is asking to let her to go to somewhere.’” (line 28) This
evaluation not only questions the intention behind the child behavior but also shows a pressure of trying to guess them that leads to over-thinking and misinterpretation of the grandchildren’s actions. Indeed, in the story world, the grandchild is the major figure who explains to the teller that this affective behavior is because her brother called and asked her to kiss everyone. Therefore, Hostess Ulbon through framing device and evaluations provides me as the principal recipient with guidance that shows that this narrative about the granddaughter is a serious topic but it is still can be framed as a funny and entertaining incident.

If we look at the participation of the narrative’s audience members, I as primary recipient display my listenership and support the narrator’s suggestion how the story needs to be interpreted via laughter in lines 29 and 34, right after two evaluations, as shown in the extract below.

28 Hostess Ulbon:  “Oh, this girl is asking to let her to go to somewhere.”
29 Aisulu:  {laughter}
30 Hostess Ulbon:  “Ah, grandma, why are you saying like this!
31 I did not come to ask to let me go.
32 Aibek (her brother) called
33 and said to kiss everyone in the face.”
34 Aisulu:  {laughter}

The audience participation shows alignment with the story characterization offered by the teller, and functions as a contextualization cue that helps keep the narration lighthearted and playful.

All in all, in storytelling world, the narrative occurs sequentially as part of a response to a question from the principal recipient (me) about differences between raising children and grandchildren. The narrator effectively employs the narrative to illustrate the burden of how being responsible for someone’s child can result in misinterpretation of child’s actions. Despite
this pressure, the telling is also framed as a playful one, which may signal that there is a positive aspect of being a grandparent.

6.2.5 Narrative Five: Speaking like an adult

6.2.5.1 Summary of the narrative and overview of findings

The narrative I analyze in this section is taken from the mealtime conversation among five Kazakh women of different ages. Narratives from this mealtime conversation was also examined in Chapter Four. Specifically, the story from Aunt Amina about the Russian firm, her travelling adventures, and a Russian wife. Four of the participants are mothers and three of them are grandmothers. Thus, they all share membership in serving in the capacity of caregiver. This narrative is a second story and revolves around the theme of grandchildren. My mother first told a small story about her grandson who she jokingly describes as a hooligan, then Aunt Amina offers her narrative about her grandson, which will be co-narrated with Daughter-in-law (one of the hostesses) after Aunt Amina introduces the orientation part of the narrative. In the co-narrated story, the grandson, who is seven years old, came to visit Aunt Amina and Daughter-in-law, inspected their animals (cows, horses, etc.), and suggested that Daughter-in-law’s husband share this wealth because his family was bankrupt. The child tries several times, but failed to achieve his goal and left the house calling the family greedy. He also questioned how the children live in a family (i.e., the family of Daughter-in-law and her husband Abzal) that does not treat them kindly. Voicing the grandchild in the story using an adult register makes the audience laugh and creates a playful frame.
Applying the three levels of positioning model (Bamberg 1997; Bamberg & Georgakopoulou, 2008), I show how in this narrative, two Kazakh women discursively construct their identities as caregivers and Kazakh via the portrayal of the character of the seven-year-old grandchild as highly agentive though constructed dialogue (in which he is voiced in an adult register) in the story world. I also show how the audience responds, in the storytelling world, to the positioning of the grandson character; their responses contribute to the playful nature of the conversation. At a more global level, these two levels of positioning create and display the position of two narrators toward a shared socio-cultural belief that grandchildren are a source of joy, thus helping the tellers to display this culturally-shaped aspect of their family role identity.

6.2.5.2 Data and analysis

In the storytelling world, narrating takes place among five women: Mother-in-law, who is an older hostess and her husband is the head of this household; Daughter-in-law who married the son of this house after she finished her undergraduate degree in a bigger town in the same region; Aunt Amina who resides in the south of Kazakhstan for a winter period is a neighbor and friend of this household and was invited to join the recorded interaction; and my mother and me, who are the guests.

As mentioned, four of these participants have children (Aunt Amina, Aisulu’s mother, Mother-in-law, and Daughter-in-law) and three have grandchildren (Aunt Amina, Aisulu’s mother, Mother-in-law). Due to the women’s shared membership to the category of caregivers, conversation about the children/grandchildren is very pertinent.
This narrative is a second story and revolves around the theme of grandchildren. When my mother told small story about her grandson (my nephew) who she considers a hooligan, Aunt Amina offers her narrative about her grandson, which comes to be co-told with Daughter-in-law. I had previously asked Daughter-in-law if it was more difficult to raise boys or girls and Daughter-in-law answered that it did not matter to her. Then, my mother offered the small story about her grandson whom three adults (my mother, my father, and my sister) were trying to raise and teach good manners, but were seeming to fail in these efforts. This small story is framed as a playful one through audience laughter and display of similar stances toward the modern generation of kids. As soon as my mother finishes her small story, Aunt Amina begins a narrative about her grandchild. Thus, she does an introduction of her grandchild in terms of age and physical features that triggers laughter in the audience. Then she tries to recruit Daughter-in-law to be the primary teller but fails to achieve this. Thus, Aunt Amina continues narrating and frames the story as something entertaining, though Daughter-in-law also joins in.

1 Aisulu’s Mother: We our grandchild-- I, grandfather, my little daughter-
2 three of us raised him.
3 <Rus> I think we did not manage to raise him properly.>
4 Daughter-in-law: {laughter}
5 Mother-in-law: {laughter}
6 Aisulu: {laughter}
7 Aisulu’s Mother: <Rus> Hooligan, hooligan.>
8 Daughter-in-law <Rus> Nowadays children are ‘atomic’ (meaning bold).>
9 Aisulu’s Mother: We said so many good words, we taught words of wisdom,
10 <Rus> nothing>. 
11 Aunt Amina: I have a seven- not seven yet
12 an about-becoming-seven grandchild.
13 He is (chubby like) <Rus> a donut>.
14 Daughter-in-law [{laughter}
15 Aisulu: [{laughter}
16 Aunt Amina: (He) having wanted to marry a girl (one of the children) of this house-
17 Daughter-in-law [{laughter}
Mother-in-law [{laughter}]

Aisulu: [{laughter}]

Aunt Amina: {Addressing this to Daughter-in-law}

Please, tell how he came to the father (the husband of Daughter-in-law).

Let this be also something entertaining.

Mother-in-law {laughter}

Aisulu: {laughter}

Aunt Amina: Recently, he came to (the house) of these (i.e., the house of the hostesses).

Mother-in-law Yes, in the first year (of his stay in the village), he came.

Aunt Amina: then he went to Abzal (the husband of Daughter-in-law and father → of the girl).

"Abzal how many animal do you have?"

He asked everything. "How many cows do you have?"

<Rus> "Let’s us share?"> having said, he started (annoying Abzal).

Aisulu: {laughter}

Daughter-in-law: Actually, he said it this year.

Aunt Amina: Yes, tell please. It is different when it comes from you

Daughter-in-law: As she said what he did, <Rus> he came like this,>

<Rus> “Uncle Abzal, what are you doing?”

“I’m working.”> he said.

Aunt Amina: {laughter}

Daughter-in-law: He (the grandchild) came in.

<Rus> “I see.”> he was saying,

<Rus> “Well, if you are sitting, then continue sitting!”> (laughter)

Then, <Rus> he says,

“I see,” he says,

“(you have) three horses, many cows.”>

Aunt Amina: {laughter}

Daughter-in-law: <Rus> “It is necessary to share- di- let us share this (wealth)?”>

Abzal said, “No, this this for my own children.” he was like.

<Rus> “I have my own children, and I need for them- there more things that are necessary to buy.”> he said.

<Rus> “We have crisis at our home.

Very- we are in bankruptcy.> he (the grandchild) said.

Aisulu: {laughter}

Daughter-in-law: <Rus> “We are in bankrupt.” he says.

“We need to share.”> he was saying like.

<Rus> Abzal says,

“You give me money.” he says.

“II will give you the half (of the animals) later on.”> he say- he said.

“I’m bankrupt.”<Rus>he (the grandchild) says>.

Aunt Amina: [{laughter}]

Aisulu [{laughter}]
Daughter-in-law: <Rus> “A lot of money.”> he (Abzal) said.

<Rus> “Horrible!”> he said like this.

Okay, he left.

<A> “What a family you are?” he says, “Greedy!

How children could possibly live with you!?”>

Aunt Amina: [{laughter}]

Aisulu [{laughter}]

6.2.5.3 Level 1 (Story world)

In story world, the figure of Aunt Amina’s grandchild is constructed as the major one. First, the grandchild fulfills such actions as deciding to marry the little girl at the house (16), coming to the house (lines 21, 15, and 35), watching the animals (line 27), going to Abzal (line 28), asking a lot of questions (line 30), leaving (line 64), and, many times, saying (lines 31, 19, 41, 42, 52, 54, 55, 59, 63, and 65). These actions are realized via action verbs, foregrounding the character of the grandchild and his agency as a character. Abzal, the husband of Daughter-in-law and the father of a girl that the grandchild “wanted to marry,” is also a character. This character performs only one action, saying, which also occurs multiple times (lines 37, 47, 49, 56, 57, 58, and 62). Based on this distribution of the assigned actions, the figure of the grandchild is positioned as very agentive in interaction with the adult.

Regarding the assigned attributes and characters’ positioning, the teller notes that the child is “an about-becoming-seven grandchild” and “He himself is <Rus>a donut>.” (lines 12-13). Through the detail of his age and the metaphorical reference to “donut” (an endearment term), the grandchild is assigned the attribute of “carefree” (because children start going to school at the age of seven, so this age is associated with entering a very early stage moving toward adulthood) and “sweetness” (as a donut is sweet and fluffy). This may set the expectation
of him being naïve and sweet in his behavior, as any child of this age would likely be. However, we see that the child voicing does not fit this expectation. The grandchild is voiced a great deal in his interaction with Abzal, in fact, his voicing resembles the register of an adult. He uses economic terms such as “crisis” and “bankrupt” (lines 51, 52, 54, and 59). He also performs the speech act of suggestion such as “<Rus> ‘It is necessary to share- di- let us share this (wealth)?’” (line 45) and “‘We need to share.’” he was saying like.” (line 55). In addition, he uses bold evaluative statements such as “<Rus> ‘What a family you are?’ he says, ‘Greedy! How children could possibly live with you!’” (lines 64-65). In other words, the character of the grandchild who has not reached seven years old speaks like an adult.

By way of comparison, the character of Abzal mostly performs the speech act of explanation. For example, when the grandchild suggests sharing the “wealth” that Abzal possesses in line 45, Abzal explains that “‘No, this this for my own children.’ he was like. <Rus> “I have my own children, and I need for them- there more that is necessary to buy.”’ he said.” in lines 47-49. By performing the speech act of explanation, Abzal is assigned the attribute of “reasonable adult” who fulfils the function of guiding children. At the same time, he is also positioned as being indulgent of the child’s behavior as he engaged into a long conversation with a little boy.

All in all, the attributes that are assigned to the character of the grandchild are “sweet,” “naïve,” and “talking like an adult,” while Abzal is assigned the quality of “an adult” by providing explanations. While both characters are constructed as having a significant amount of agency by being voiced (following Schiffrin 1996), in general, the character of the grandchild is positioned as the central one because he performs major actions, is extensively voiced, and it is
his behavior that is of interest to the story’s purpose, which is to reveal humorous behavior of “kids these days.” This point links directly into positioning at Level 2.

6.2.5.4 Level 2 (Storytelling world)

In the storytelling world, narrating takes place among five women among whom, as mentioned, four have children and three of those four also have grandchildren. This shared group membership facilitates conversation about children and grandchildren, which sets the stage for tellers’ self-presentations in their roles as care-givers. As shown in the reproduced excerpt below, my mother shares a small story about how they tried to raise their grandchild “We our grandchild-- I, grandfather, my little daughter- three of us raised him” (lines 1-2) and she humorously evaluates this as “<Rus> I think we did not manage to raise him properly.>” (line 3). This evaluation triggers laughter among the audience (lines 4-6), shifting the conversation into a playful frame wherein she refers to my nephew as a “hooligan,” and opening up the space for others to talk about their own experiences in this realm.

1 Aisulu’s Mother: We our grandchild-- I, grandfather, my little daughter-
2 three of us raised him.
3 <Rus> I think we did not manage to raise him properly.>
4 Daughter-in-law {laughter}
5 Mother-in-law {laughter}
6 Aisulu: {laughter}
7 Aisulu’s Mother: <Rus> Hooligan, hooligan.>
8 Daughter-in-law <Rus> Nowadays children are “atomic” (meaning bold).>
9 Aisulu’s Mother: We said so many good words, we taught words of wisdom,
10 <Rus> nothing>. 
11 Aunt Amina: I have a seven- not seven yet
12 an about-becoming-seven grandchild.
13 He himself is <Rus>a donut>. 
14 Daughter-in-law: [{laughter}
15 Aisulu: [{laughter}
Aunt Amina: (He) having wanted to marry a girl (one of the children) of this house-

Daughter-in-law: [{laughter}]

Mother-in-law: [{laughter}]

Aisulu: [{laughter}]

Aunt Amina: (Addressing this to Daughter-in-law)

Please, tell how he came to the father (the husband of Daughter-in-law).

Let this be also something entertaining.

Mother-in-law: {laughter}

Aisulu: {laughter}

Aunt Amina: Recently, he came to (house) of these (the house of hostesses).

After my mother offers another evaluation “<Rus> Hooligan, hooligan.>” in line 7, Daughter-in-

law gives a broad assessment of children, “<Rus> Nowadays children are ‘atomic’ (meaning bold).>” (line 8). This sequence seems to trigger the topic of raising and caring for grandchildren, as well as a playful frame, and indeed, Aunt Amina starts a narrative about her
grandchild, “I have a seven- not seven yet an about-becoming-seven grandchild. He himself is
<Rus>a donut>.” (lines 11-13). The evaluation “a donut” triggers another round of laughter in
the audience (lines 14-15), which further shows that the group interaction is in a playful frame.

Finally, Aunt Amina is about to provide the story abstract that she begins as “He having wanted
to marry a girl (one of the children) of this house-” in line 16 that is met with the third round of
laughter in the audience (lines 17-19, sustaining the playful frame. She finishes by inviting
Daughter-in-law to tell the story, “Please, tell how he came to the father. Let this be also
something entertaining” (lines 21-22), which also helps set the interpretive framework of the
coming narrative: The upcoming narrative is framed as “something entertaining.” Based on this
pre-narrative sequence (Jefferson 1978), it seems that the coming narrative is occasioned as a
second story (Sacks 1970/1992a) designed to entertain the crowd.

The audience participation sustains the interpretive framework suggested by the teller;
audience members participate via laughing in lines 32, 44, 53, 60, 61, 67, and 68. This
interpretive framework is also supported by what happens in the story world, where the grandchild is the primary figure and is constructed as talking in an adult register. This juxtaposition of the grandchild’s age and talk creates the humorous effect that is picked up on in the storytelling world.

In addition, the audience shows its alignment through co-narration. We saw above that Aunt Amina invited Daughter-in-law to tell the story, though she at first declined. However, Mother-in-law participates by confirming that the grandchild came to “inspect” their house and by adding the detail of when exactly he came, i.e., “in the first year (of his stay in the village), he came” in line 26. She does after Aunt Amina has narrated that “Recently, he came to (house) of these” in line 25, as shown below.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Aunt Amina:</td>
<td>Recently, he came to (house) of these (the house of hostesses).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Mother-in-law:</td>
<td>Yes, in the first year (of his stay in the village), he came.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Aunt Amina:</td>
<td>He had watched all your animals,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to Mother-in-law’s participation, Daughter-in-law eventually joins in the telling as well; she points out that “Actually, he said it this year” (line 33), meaning that the child said this in the first year of their residency in the village, and Aunt Amina again invites Daughter-in-law into co-telling by stating that “Yes, tell please. It is different when it comes from you.” In line 34.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Aunt Amina:</td>
<td>&lt;Rus&gt; “Let’s us share?”&gt; having said, he started (annoing Abzal).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Aisulu:</td>
<td>{laughter}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Daughter-in-law:</td>
<td>Actually, he said it this year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Aunt Amina:</td>
<td>Yes, tell please. It is different when it comes from you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Daughter-in-law:</td>
<td>As she said what he did, &lt;Rus&gt; he came like this,&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Previous research has shown that audience participation often can happen through taking up a co-teller role (Goodwin 1979; Lerner 1992), and that occurs here.

All in all, the narrative emerges as a second story and is framed as entertaining by the first teller Aunt Amina; this interpretive framework is supported by the audience through its alignment in form of laughter and co-narration, which allows all the women to display their appreciation of (grand)children and create their identity of a caregiver.

6.2.5.4 Level 3 (Socio-cultural world)

In the story world of the narratives I have examined in this section, these Kazakh-speaking narrators generally construct older family members (i.e., parents) as more agentive characters in the stories they tell about their children through linguistic devices, specifically by attributing action verbs and constructed dialogue (in which they perform agentive speech acts of threatening and warning) to themselves as characters. In contrast, the younger family members (children) are backgrounded through such linguistic device as stative verbs, passive voice, and absence of voicing. Connecting the results of Level 1 and 2 to Level 3, I suggest that the construction of agentive older family members in comparison to the younger ones, specifically towards the children, in story worlds and audience support of this in storytelling worlds reflects the Kazakh cultural value of respect for age. Recent sociological research (Karibayeva and Kunanbayeva 2015, 2016, 2017) reveals that ‘age’ as a cultural value is found in business discourse in modern Kazakhstan; specifically, older colleagues are treated with more attention in interactions. In addition, Uzakbayeva and Beisenbayeva (2015) notes that commemoration of ancestors, respect for elderly, and maintaining family heritage are the basic cultural values of the
Kazakh ethnicity. In a psychological experiment study of role plays, Erznkyan et al (2012) shows that Kazakh couples residing in the central Kazakhstan preferred a traditional distribution of family roles (keeping the age hierarchy) while Russian couples tended towards more equal relationships among family members. Kabuldinov et al (2016) found the value of respect for elderly being very pervasive among Kazakh communities residing in Omsk area in Russia (that used to be a part of the Kazakh State until the Russian colonization in 18\textsuperscript{th} century).

Therefore, in constructing the agentive figures of older family members, the narrators align with this macro-level socio-cultural value or ideological discourse. In doing so, they construct their ethnic Kazakh identity by highlight the importance of this value through positioning at two levels.

Differently, the narratives that revolve around the theme of grandchildren show the opposite tendency: The character of grandchildren is foregrounded with the same linguistic devices, and grandparents are more indulgent and protective of grandchildren. Also, in the grandchildren stories, audience alignment is displayed in the form of laughter and co-narration, thus helping situate these narratives in a playful frame. Based on my personal cultural knowledge, there is a belief that \emph{to raise grandchildren is sweeter} because the caregivers take the best part of this and have more time as retirees. Thus, this may be the reflection of this belief and by reflecting this value, the narrators seem to highlight the ethnic aspect of their identity, i.e., the Kazakh identity. However, I leave an option that this is due to existing intergenerational practice when the grandmother takes over caregiving to help young couples to become more financially stable. As a result, they may accumulate anecdotal situations that involve grandchildren to share.
6.3 Younger family members narrate about older family members

In this part of the chapter, I focus on two stories told by younger family members about older ones and compare the positionings created in this set of narratives with the ones in the narratives told by the older family members. The first story told by a man, who is in his forties and who I refer as Father Aibek, in his role of a son. He recounts how his father used to say that he would survive without the son (i.e., the narrator Father Aibek). The second story is told by an elderly woman, who I refer Aunt Aiderim, about her uncle-in-law who gave her an introductory speech when she got married.

6.3.1 Narrative One: An independent father

6.3.1.1 Summary of the narrative and main findings

This narrative takes place in the mealtime conversation for which my mother, my mother’s cousin (Father Aibek), his wife, and his nine-year-old daughter are present. Prior to narrating, my mother makes the statement that an individual should be strong and parents should not be dependent on their children. This strong opinion seems trigger in Father Aibek a personal memory. Thus, he offers a short narrative, in which his now-deceased father used to order him to leave the house when he got angry, saying that he would be able to survive in old age without his son (i.e., the narrator). The narrator also projects his inner states (like being upset) about his father’s orders.

My analysis of the positioning involved in the telling of this narrative illuminates how a Kazakh man discursively constructs his identity as a family member (a son) and Kazakh identity through constructing the character of his father as agentive (via action verbs and constructed
dialogue) and receiving his audience’s alignment to such character positioning through assessments in the storytelling world. This story reflects the larger Kazakh cultural value of *respect for age*.

### 6.3.1.2 Data and Analysis

The first story occurred at the same mealtime as the story about the daughter and her misuse of technology. Therefore, the conversation took place at the house of Father Aibek, his wife, and their nine-year-old daughter. My mother had come to video-record my mother. Prior to the telling of this narrative, my mother very actively tried to convince Father Aibek to buy a good computer for his daughter as a preparation for a better future. This conversation actually evolved from the discussion of how young children are addicted to modern technology. Father Aibek aligns with this idea by saying that they need to support the daughter now so that when she is financially stable (and the parents are old) she will not ‘throw them out’ to the street. My mother says that this is not a solution and every person should be independent and able to support him/herself in old age. After this statement, she uses her own children (my younger sister and me) as examples, i.e., despite the fact that we are good, it is better not to be dependent on us. This statement about strong individuals and independent parents seems to spark a personal memory for Father Aibek, who offers a narrative about his own father.

1  Aisulu’s Mother: Thus, a person <Rus> must be strong in life>.  
2  A person <Rus> must be strong in life>.  
3  That- even our children are growing up.  
4  Even our children grew up, <Rus> yes,  
5  they might be like not bad children, yes,  
6  but (we) must not hope for them (to help us).>  
7  What- even our children are growing up.
Oh God, my now-deceased father used to say, “Hey, go, go away. In the night, I will ‘see the sun’ (being able to survive) without you!”

{laughter}

Father Aibek: Oh God, my now-deceased father used to say, “Hey, go, go away. In the night, I will ‘see the sun’ (being able to survive) without you!”

{laughter}

Aisulu’s Mother: <Rus> Right, right.>

Father Aibek: (laughter) That time, he had reached seventy.

Aisulu’s Mother: <Rus> Well, you see this is how.

Father Aibek: “Go, go away! Even without you, I ‘will see the sun’! My pension itself will be enough for myself!”

Aisulu’s Mother: That person is saying the right things.

Father Aibek: (laughter)

Aisulu’s Mother: A person on their own self/?/ I got upset a bit.

Father Aibek: “<Rus>Shoot,> he is telling me like go away!” I thought. When he (father) got angry about something, “Go away!” he used to say like, “go, go away, even without you, I will be able to ‘see the sun’!”

{laughter}

6.3.1.3 Level 1 (Story world)

In the story world, there are two characters: The character of a retired man who is the father of the narrator and the narrator himself in the role of son. Regarding actions and characters’ positioning, the figure of his father is very agentive. First, the character of the father “used to say” (lines 6 and 23) and “got angry” (line 22). Regarding the action “used to say,” the habitual nature (Kiesling 2006) of this action emphasizes its frequent occurrence and contributes to the agency of the father. In addition to these actions, it is mentioned that the father “had reached seventy” which highlights his age; as mentioned previously elderly people are generally given a lot of respect in Kazakhstan. In contrast, the character of the son is less agentive. He performs two actions (“got upset” in line 20 and “thought” in line 21) and these actions are done in reaction to his father’s order to leave house. Interestingly, the son’s actions do not have any impact on the other characters as they are about inner emotional states or reactions. Therefore,
the character of the father is positioned as more central based on the assigned actions: his action of speaking, and the narrator’s use of the habitual aspect “used to,” highlights his centrality in the story.

Regarding attributes and characters’ positioning, the character of the father is voiced, which helps make him a more agentive figure (Schiffrin 1996), but it also makes his character more concrete and vivid (Tannen 1989/2007) that creates more drama. In addition, the speech act of an order is voiced. Thus, the retired father orders his son “‘Hey, go, go away. In the night, I will ‘see the sun’ (being able to survive) without you!’” (lines 9-10), “‘Go, go away! Even without you, I will see the sun!’” (line 15), and “‘Go away!’ he used to say like, ‘go, go away, even without you, I will be able to see the sun!’” (lines 23-24). His major order is to leave the house, as the father will be able to live without son’s help. In addition, this order is repeated, which emphasizes the order and makes the image of the father more vivid (and more agentive). As a result, the figure of the father is strengthened through the son’s portrayal of the order as repeated multiple times. In contrast, the character of the son is constructed as less agentive: His voicing is done in the form of inner speech (Tannen 1989/2007), i.e., “‘<Rus>Shoot,> he is telling me like go away!’ I thought.” (line 21), which does not affect his father’s character the way his father’s words affected him as a character. Finally, the constructed dialogue serves to evaluate the father, indicating his powerful status, which can be viewed as reflecting the teller’s beliefs or goals in the telling.

All in all, the character of the father is positioned as more agentive that the narrator-son, who reacts to his father’s repeated orders by experiencing thoughts and feelings.
6.3.1.4 Level 2 (Storytelling world)

In the storytelling world, the teller is a father and the principal recipient is my mother. While they are distant cousins, they are both parents, so have something important in common. This helps to create opportunity for them to align through discussion of the topic of family relationships. In the interactional role of a guest, my mother has a bit more power to make a statement. Thus, she makes a repeated statement that “a person <Rus> must be strong in a life>.” in lines 1 and 2 and suggests that parents should not depend on their children “Even our children grew up, <Rus> yes, they might be like not bad children, yes, but (we) must not hope for them (to help us).>” in lines 3-6. These lines appear in the extract below.

1 Aisulu’s Mother: Thus, a person <Rus> must be strong in a life>.
2 A person <Rus> must be strong in a life>.
3 That- even our children are growing up.
4 Even our children grew up, <Rus> yes,
5 they might be like not bad children, yes,
6 but (we) must not hope for them (to help us).>
7 What- even our children are growing up.
8 Father Aibek: Oh God, my diseased father used to say,

It seems that the mentioning of being independent parents triggers a personal memory for Father Aibek; he suddenly starts narrating by recounting that “Oh God, my now-deceased father used to say,” in line 8. Following Schiffrin (1987) “oh” can be understood as a discourse marker that demonstrates a change in information state of the speaker. Thus, Father Aibek may signal that he remembers something. “Oh God” can also be interpreted as a response cry, following Goffman (1978), which means this utterance may be a display of some kind of reaction or realization. Thus, the narrative is locally occasioned (Jefferson 1978) in reaction to my mother’s statement of adults needing to be independent and not expect support from their adult children. Father
Aibek’s talk seems to foreshadow that the narrative will illustrate my mother’s point, and thus create alignment between the two of them. As shown in the previous section, the positioning at level 1 indeed situates Father Aibek’s father is one such independent older person (who does not depend on his son).

Since the narrative has been triggered by my mother’s statement that parents should not be dependent on the children, the narrator Father Aibek offers the narrative that supports this point. Thus, the interpretive framework of the narrative (i.e., how it should be understood) receives a strong alignment from my mother. She offers three assessments (Goodwin and Goodwin 1992; M. Goodwin 1996), shown in bold below.

10 Father Aibek: go, go away. In the night, I will “see the sun” without you!”
11 {laughter}
12 Aisulu’s Mother: <Rus> Right, right.>
13 Father Aibek: {laughter} That time, he had reached seventy.
14 Aisulu’s Mother: <Rus> Well, you see this is how.>
15 Father Aibek: “Go, go away! Even without you, I will see the sun!
16 My pension itself will be enough for myself!”
17 Aisulu’s Mother: That person is saying the right things.

When Father Aibek voices his father, who not only sent him out of the house, but did so while claiming he didn’t need him, my mother aligns with “<Rus> Right, right.>”. Similarly, when Father Aibek explains that when this happened, his father was seventy years old, she aligns with similar voicing through “<Rus> Well, you see this is how.>” in line 14 and “That person is saying the right things.” in line 17. Both of these assessments indicate that the narrator’s father is indeed a good example of how to be independent in old age.

All in all, the narrative serves to illustrate the statement that parents should not be dependent on their adult children, while also reinforcing that they are powerful figures over the
children. This helps create alignment between the teller and the narrative recipient and allows the teller to surface his identity of a family member.

6.3.2 Narrative Two: A wise grandfather-in-law

6.3.2.1 Summary of narrative and overview of findings

The narrative I analyze in this section occurred during the meal that my mother’s cousin and his wife hosted and to which they invited the neighbors. There are seven Kazakh women present who are all residents of the village and neighbors to each other (my mother’s male cousin is not present). The hostess Dariya does not sit at the table as she is serving people, so she comes and leaves the room quite often. The narrative is triggered by the absence of a scarf on the head of the young hostess. One of the elderly women thanks her for the food and points out this fact. After this short exchange, another elderly woman, Aunt Aigerim, starts reminiscing. Thus, she recalls that when young women got married, they were invited for an introductory conversation with the oldest family member. And Aunt Aigerim was also invited for such a conversation by Grandfather Arman (who was her grandfather-in-law). After this, she steps aside within the narrative and gives an extensive description of their blood kinship. Then, Grandfather Arman is voiced by the teller, and his voicing is advice to her on how to behave in a new house; he indicates that she should dress like others at work and dress very modestly in the house. She followed his advice and behaved accordingly.

Applying Bamberg’s (1997, Bamberg & Georgakopoulou, 2008) model of three levels of positioning in narrative, I show how the Kazakh female narrator discursively constructs her identity as a young member of a family and a Kazakh. Specifically, she uses action verbs and
constructed dialogue (in the form of advice-giving) to construct the character of her grandfather-in-law as a more agentive, and audience members show their alignment to this character positioning through assessments in the storytelling world. At a more global level, the collective findings of the positioning at the two levels reflect the narrator’s positon towards a bigger socio-cultural value we have already seen in this chapter – *respect for age* – that enables the teller to construct her ethnic identity as Kazakh.

### 6.3.2.2 Data and analysis

As mentioned, this story takes place among seven women who were invited to the house of my mother’s male cousin. It happened that my mother came to video record on the same day. It is an old Kazakh tradition to invite elderly neighbors and friends for a meal at the house to get their good wishes and blessings. The narrative occurred the end of the first half of the meal when the meat was being served. The young hostess, who is the wife of my mother’s cousin and who I refer to as Young Hostess, was cleaning the table to re-set it for tea. One of the women who I refer to as Aunt Aigul thanks Young Hostess for such good food and suggests that she wear a scarf to be a perfect hostess, indicating that is advice she got from her mother. This remark seems to trigger a narrative. Thus, another woman who I refer Aunt Aigerim and who sat next to Aunt Aigul offers her personal story. She recounts how a young daughter-in-law was expected to be dressed in her youth.

1. Aunt Aigul: Everything is tasty, everything is good, everything is rich.
2. May it be blessed, dear.
3. Be like this.
4. <Rus> Though>, you know, Dariya, put a flowery scarf on a head.
Hostess Dariya: \{laughter\}
Aunt Aigul: “When you are invited to some places, do not come without scarf.”
My mother told me.
Hostess Dariya: \{laughter\} Sure, sure.
Aunt Aigerim: In the old days, when girls got married,
they invite (them for an introductory talk) indeed.
So, I was invited to that house (for an introductory talk).
Grandfather Arman
he is a maternal uncle by blood of my uncle.
A maternal uncle by blood of my uncle.
/\ that- brother by blood.
Yeah. Then, my Grandfather Arman he also- he also invited (me).
Then he told me,
“My little foal,
I have my words of wisdom to tell you.
How you interpret them, it is up to you.” he said.
“I have something to tell.” he said.
“There are grandmother and grandfather in the house,” he said.
“when you are doing your job,
when are outside, at work,
dress like others are dressing.” he said
“If they wear new head caps, you do the same.”
“But now,” he said,
“when grandmother and grandfather are at the house,
the sock should not fall down from the feet’s head,
a flowery scarf should not fall down from the head.” (meaning \(\rightarrow\) that your scarf should be fixed tight not loose)
Aunt Aigul: True. Indeed we did like this in the old times.
Aunt Aigerim: Yeah.
Yeah. We did like the grandfather Arman told (us).

6.3.2.3 Level 1 (Story world)

In the story world, there are two characters: The character of the narrator who is a just-married young wife and the character of the older grandfather-in-law (Grandfather Arman). The character of the grandfather-in-law is constructed as very agentive. First, he performs the major actions. He “invited” Aunt Aigerim to the house (line 17) and “told” her what she should do (lines 18 and 34). In contrast, the character of a young wife “was invited” to the house (line 12),
but takes no explicit actions of her own. Also, her individual reaction to the advice is not heard, as her voice becomes a part of one collective entity, i.e., “We did like the grandfather Arman told.” in line 34. Thus, following traditional Kazakh family roles, the younger female family member is given advice from an older family member, and it is explicitly pertaining to the value of modesty.

Regarding attributes and characters’ positioning, the character of Grandfather Arman is voiced, and his voicing produces the act of advice-giving regarding how the young wife should behave outside and inside of the house. Thus, he advises “‘I have words of wisdom to tell you. How you interpret them, it is up to you. I have something to tell. There are grandmother and grandfather in the house, when you are doing your job, when are outside, at work, dress like others are dressing. But now, when grandmother and grandfather are at the house, the sock should not fall down from the feet’s head, a flowery scarf should not fall down from the head.’” (lines 19-31). Thus, the expectations of the new young wife are to dress like others when she is at work, i.e., paid employment, (“when are outside, at work, dress like others are dressing”), and dress very modestly when she is at home (“But now, when grandmother and grandfather are at the house, a flowery scarf should not fall down from the head”). Interestingly, he constructs two separate worlds in his advising: Work and home. The speech act of advice positions Grandfather Arman as higher up in the family hierarchy, and/or aiming to help a younger family member (following Tannen’s 1993 theorizing on the ambiguity and polysemy of linguistic strategies in terms of power and solidarity). In addition, then, this constructed dialogue functions as evaluation, asserting the status of the elderly in the family hierarchy (that this relational identity is very powerful).
All in all, the character of Grandfather Arman is positioned as more agentive through assigning more actions realized via actions verbs and voicing him in the form of advice giving, while the narrator positions herself as less active.

6.3.2.4 Level 2 (Storytelling world)

This narrating episode begins to unfold as shown in the following extract when Aunt Aigul thanks Hostess Dariya for the delicious food and wishes her “Be like this.” in line 3, meaning that Hostess Dariya should remain the same good hostess, but then Aunt Aigul makes one suggestion, i.e., “<Rus> Though>, you know, Aigul, put a flowery scarf on your head.” in lines 4-5 that she supports this suggestion by voicing her mother “‘When you are invited to some places, do not come without scarf.’ My mother told me.” in lines 7-8. This suggestion seems to remind Aunt Aigerim how things used to be done in her youth, and she tells a story starting in line 10.

1 Aunt Aigul Everything is tasty, everything is good, everything is rich.
2 May it be blessed, dear.
3 Be like this.
4 <Rus> Though>, you know, Aigul,
5 put a flowery scarf on a head.
6 Young Hostess {laughter}
7 Aunt Aigul “When you are invited to some places, do not come without scarf.”
8 My mother told me.
9 Young Hostess {laughter}Sure, sure.
10 Aunt Aigerim In the old days, when girls got married,
11 they invite (them for an introductory talk) indeed.
12 So, I was invited to that house (for an introductory talk).

Thus, Aunt Aigerim starts recounting that “In old days, when girls got married, they invite (them for an introductory talk) indeed. So, I was invited to that house (for an introductory talk).” in 242
Therefore, the narrative is locally occasioned (Jefferson 1978) as the reaction to an object, i.e., the absence of a scarf on Young Hostess and Aunt Aigul’s having called attention to this absence in her talk. It seems “In the old days” serves as a generic framing device (Bauman 2004) that sets up expectations that storytelling will continue to develop. Also, “So, I was invited to that house (for an introductory talk).” seems to function as the narrative abstract and orientation (Labov and Waletzky 1967; Labov 1972). It provides orienting information to the story and a general abstract – the story will have to do with what happened during this introductory conversation, which may serve as what Goodwin (1986) calls interpretive framework or the narrator’s suggestion how the story needs to be read. Thus, this is the personal account of how Aunt Aigerim was socialized into the rules of her new house, i.e., to be humble in her dress. And, at positioning Level 1, as seen in the section above, this story reading is supported as through voicing of Grandfather-in-law, these rules are presented (i.e., dress like others at work, and be well-covered at home).

The primary narrative recipient, Aunt Aigul, shows an alignment with the suggested story interpretation through producing an assessment: “True. Indeed we did like this in the old times.” in line 32. Through use of the word “true” and the use of “we” Aunt Aigul seems to align with Aunt Aigerim, and in turn Aunt Aigerim agrees with Aigul. The inclusive pronoun “we” allows Aunt Aigul to create a juxtaposition, i.e., the women of an older generation as compared to the women of Hostess Dariya’s generation. This narrative is not addressed to the young hostess as she was serving the table and was in-between of the living room (where all the guests were sitting) and kitchen. Thus, there was no response from her regarding this narrative.

Aunt Aigerim: a flowery scarf should not fall down from the head.”
Aunt Aigul: True. Indeed we did like this in the old times.
Aunt Aigerim: Yeah.
Aunt Aigerim: Yeah. We did like the grandfather Arman told (us).

Here the two aunts express a shared perspective. This also indicates that the narrative may be a shared cultural, and not only family, norm: elderly men have a powerful position and young women in the family are less powerful, including pertaining to who decides what they should wear.

As demonstrated, the narrative that unfolds is triggered by a comment about the absence the young hostess not wearing a head scarf; it is offered by an elderly woman after her peer noted the absence. Thus, the narrative seems to serve as an opportunity for alignment creation between the two women of the same age. The teller recounted the dress code for young women in her youth, suggesting that young women who join a new family are expected to be dressed very modestly, and that this has long been the case. This story interpretation was supported by the principal recipient in her assessments, which suggest that this is a shared norm. Interestingly, the rest of the women did not participate in this narrating process, but they also did not initiate their own conversation as byplay (Goffman1981), instead following the main floor of the meal conversation.

6.3.2.5 Level 3 (Socio-cultural world)

In the story worlds of the two narratives, the Kazakh-speaking narrators, in their capacity of younger family members relative to some others, construct the older family members (i.e., parents) as more agentive characters through such linguistic devices as action verbs and constructed dialogue (in which the older family members perform agentive speech acts of
ordering and advising). Differently, the younger family members are backgrounded as actors through such linguistic device as stative verbs, passive voice, and absence of voicing. I suggest that the construction of agentive older family members in comparison to the younger ones in story worlds, and the audience’s support of this in storytelling worlds, reflects the Kazakh cultural value of respect for age. Recent sociological research (Karibayeva and Kunanbayeva 2015, 2016, 2017) reveals that age as a cultural value influences hierarchy as it is constructed in business interactions. Therefore, constructing agentive figures of older family members helps the narrators position themselves towards bigger socio-cultural values or bigger ideological discourses regarding age. And this is a supportive position: They seem reflect this respect for elderly and thus construct their Kazakh identity.

6.4 A couple’s relationships

In this part, I focus on a story told by family equals, at least in terms of age group (the individuals differ in terms of gender, however). This story is about how a wife was taking care of her husband, who was an alcoholic. It is taken from a mealtime conversation that involved an elderly mother (Hostess Maira), her son, her daughter-in-law, and my mother.

6.4.1 Narrative One: A devoted wife

6.4.1.1 Summary of the narrative and overview of findings

This narrative telling primarily involves two Kazakh women: Hostess Maira and my mother. The sequence started from the moment when my mother inquired about one of the neighbors, neighbor Kokysh and his sons. Hostess Maira said that one of his sons died because
of drug abuse. This news made mother express her sympathy to neighbor Kokysh. This act of sympathy triggers a story from Hostess Maira about her hardships in life. Thus, she narrates that her husband, now deceased, had been an alcoholic and became sick. Having taken him to a doctor who happened to come to the village, Hostess Maira learned that there were only few months left for her husband. While surviving those few months, she took a very proper care of her husband by washing and cleaning him and being tolerant to his moments of desperation.

When he passed away, she was so poor that she did not have money to make traditional bread, but she was able to convince a shop assistant to give her oil saying that her daughter would pay it off. Then, she and her family managed to organize a proper funeral with food and a slaughtering of a horse, despite the fact that the neighbors questioned the wisdom of this, given the family’s financial situation.

In this narrative, the narrator constructs her identity of a good wife by reflecting through her narrative how she met the expectations of the village community. In doing so, she also constructs her ethnic identity. Thus, she portrays herself as a wife of an ill husband: She is presented as very agentive through action verbs and constructed dialogue. This is in contrast to the just-shown head scarf narrative, in which older men in the family are constructed as most powerful, but the narrator’s taking care of her husband could reflect her own power, or his power over her (in that she is obligated to take care of him), as well as solidarity. The narrator receives her audience’s alignment in the story world, as evident through assessments. At a more global level, this positioning echoes the bigger socio-cultural expectation of what it means to be a good Kazakh wife, which enables the teller to construct her ethnic identity.
6.4.1.2 Data and analysis

This story is preceded by the discussion of a neighbor and the destiny of his son who died early due to drug abuse. Then, Hostess Maira reflects “Well, this is like this” (line 1), and adds a narrative reference, the point of which is that she has experienced everything since coming to this village (“I also, after done /?/, when I came [here] I saw everything [meaning experienced good and bad].” line 3-4). She then goes into more detail by saying that she has been an alien as in her native village, and is so in this village too (“I was myself an alien orphan in my village. I came here, an alien again.” lines 5-6). She sums this up again as she has experienced everything (“I have seen everything.” line 7). My mother tries to support her by saying that she should move on from these feelings, as she has children and grandchildren (“Let it go, you have children. You have grandchildren.” lines 8 and 10), and Hostess Maira agrees by repeating one of the propositions (“I have children.” line 9). Despite this, she continues to tell of the very painful, and labor-intensive, part of her life when she took care of her husband in his dying weeks.

1 Hostess Maira: Well, this is like this,
2 Well, that-like.
3 I also, after I had done /?/, when I came (here),
4 I ‘saw everything’ (meaning experienced good and bad).
5 I was myself an alien orphan in my village.
6 I came here, an alien gain.
7 I ‘have seen everything’.
8 Aisulu’s Mother: Let it go, you have children.
9 Hostess Maira: I have children.
10 Aisulu’s Mother: You have grandchildren.
11 Hostess Maira: My husband really “showed” (made her life difficult) to me!
12 Hostess Maira: <Rus>Only> he was driking vodka, drinking vodka, drinking vodka.
13 That vodka killed him.
14 He did not listen to my words.
15 I told, it did not work.
16 Because of that (drinking), well, he became ill later on.
17 <Rus> at that time> a doctor came to the village from far away.
Aisulu's Mother: Mhm.

Hostess Maira: If I say that I will take (him) to the doctor, he will not go.

Then, look all they will gossip now really, you know, women’s words.

Aisulu's Mother: Really, they will make up gossips.

“She did not take (him) to the doctor who came from- to the village.”

Hostess Maira: Really they will say like this.

Aisulu's Mother: Mhm.

Hostess Maira: Giving (him) my shoulder, I took him there (to the doctor’s office)

Having X-rayed him, this doctor, “Oh, well, nothing (good) will happen.” he said.

“Nothing left of the liver, everything has decayed.” he said.

“One month- one month of life is, having taken (him) home, wait.” → he said.

Aisulu's Mother: Mhm.

Hostess Maira: So, we waited.

Indeed, he laid down for two months, just he looked at the floor.

Having lifted, I am taking (him) out, having lifted, I am putting → (him) back (in the bed.)

O:h! Then that

It is really bad when the liver decayed.

He pooped with stuff black like cart’s oil.

It turns out to be like this.

Now, if I dry (that place) after washing (him),

oh, there is not enough of cloth.

There were so many torn apart clothes because of this black mass.

Eventually, I put pampers on him since there was nothing else (to do).

If I come in front of (him), if I leave (him) as he is, he falls down indeed.

Aisulu's Mother: Oh, even do not mention this. Oh himself-

Hostess Maira: Yes. Oh, I really have seen a lot!

Aisulu's Mother: <Rus> of course> they (others) will make up gossips, they will.

“She is not caring for, she is not watching, she killed (him).”

Hostess Maira: Yes. Indeed they will say like this.

Then, I put pampers on him.

What will I do?

Then, when he died, there was Kokysh (a male neighbor),

then there was that- so-called Darhan (another male neighbor).

But they told me before,

“Maira, thank you, I did not think you are like this.

Very clean. <Rus> Even> now while burying there is nothing to wash (on his body), everything is clean. → Thank you.”

That, with this, I waited two months.
What, he was not letting me rest one day.

We were really in that time this-a bit

We were a bit poor.

Oh, if I came closer (to him), we were done (started arguing).

If I came closer, /he started/.

“Your neck will ‘get nude’ (your head would ache from thinking).

They will not let you live in peace!

No money, no animals. They will gossip about you!”

One day I myself was much-

my head was full of lice, I was angry, my sleep was coming

I was not sleeping all night.

Children were little. That’s why I became very angry.

One day, I screamed (at him).

“You learn how to die, I will learn how to bury!”

<laughing> The deceased, then->

Aisulu's Mother: Don’t you regret of what you said?

Hostess Maira: <smiling>No.>

Aisulu's Mother: Don’t you regret?

Hostess Maira: Then, (he) realized, “Now, now, good, thank you.

Now, I understood the words.

Really, you will not leave (me) in the street (you will bury me well).”

Okay, now.

How people bury, I did.

Then, just after (his) death,

having put (him) in the grave, I called (to people).

Now bread cook-

If I am thinking about making bread, there is no oil.

If I am thinking about buying oil, there is no money.

They are not giving it on credit.

Then, I bought oil for four thousand and came back (home).

“Today, my daughter will come and bring (money), I pay off.”

I took (oil) for four thousand and, having cooked bread, put it out
(on the table).

People came. A full car.

Lines 96-109 are omitted that include the conversation between Hostess Maira and her daughter. In this dialogue, the daughter asks her mother not to seek help outside of their family and that she would provide necessary food for the funerals.

Then, new that when (we) were burying (him) in a grave,

Women- women who saw (this) hit their cheeks,

“Who paid off this all?” Did you see how?

“Akamal (daughter’s name) is taking out and taking out (food out of a car),
“Her daughter <Rus>only> she is putting on ground, taking out, and putting on ground.”

Aisulu's Mother: Mhm.

Hostess Maira: Then two (of those women), “Her mother is drinking, this crazy woman will eat (funeral’s food)” She will eat the bought animal (like horse or sheep) with her own hand.”

Aisulu's Mother: {laughter}

Hostess Maira: They were like this. Oh. It was like this.

Then, we also bought horse, and we bought everything.

Having <Rus>properly> done, we buried (him).

Aisulu's Mother: What age did he die?

Hostess Maira: He died in sixty-sixty-eight.

Aisulu's Mother: Youngish, <Rus>right>? Young. So that- vodka really killed (him).

Seventy /right/. Sixty-two.

That one (the doctor) that (I) mentioned so

He (her husband) himself heard,

‘in his eyes’ (in the presence of the husband) he (the doctor) told me,

Mhm.

“Take (to home) and wait”.

We did not take him anywhere (any hospital) indeed.

“(Husband’s life has been) finished and, one month of life left.” he said.

His (husband’s) liver all had decayed. He (the doctor) really screened (the husband).

We understood.

6.4.1.3 Level 1 (Story world)

In the story world, there several major characters: The teller in her role as a wife, her husband, the doctor, and the voices of male neighbors and female neighbors. Regarding actions and characters’ positioning, the character of the teller-wife is constructed as very agentive, completing a range of actions from telling her husband what he needs to do to diapering him near the end of his life.
Thus, Hostess Maira performed such actions as told her husband to stop drinking (line 15), said husband that she would take him to the doctor (line 19), gave him her shoulder and took him to the doctor’s office (line 25), washed and dried his body (line 38), put him into pampers (lines 41 and 49), come and try to check on him (lines 42, 43, 62, and 63), screamed at her husband (line 76), did the funeral like other people (line 86) and informed everyone by phone (line 88), and finally she bought the oil, came back home, cooked a traditional bread, and served it to the people (lines 93 and 95). In addition, she experienced such difficult inner states as being angry (lines 68 and 75), not sleeping (line 69), and thinking a lot (lines 90 and 91). Among these actions, 19 are expressed through action verbs and 4 are expressed through stative verbs that foreground her as a leading figure in the story world.

The character of husband fulfills such actions as drinking vodka a lot (line 12), laying down for two months and just looking at the floor (line 32), and dying (line 51). He also does not fulfill what he is expected, i.e., he did not listen to the wife’s words (line 14), would not go to see doctor (line 19), and was not letting his wife have peace (line 59). Regarding the inner states, he eventually became ill from drinking (16) and realized that his wife would not throw him on the street (line 82). He also is in the position of object, i.e., the wife took him the doctor’s office (line 25), the doctor screened or X-rayed him (line 26), and he was put into pampers (lines 41 and 49). As a result, only three actions are expressed through action verbs (e.g., drink, lay, look, and die) and two stative verbs (e.g., become, realize). Interestingly, the verbs listen and look do not influence the other characters and give the impression of focusing on the process downgrading the agency of the husband. Such distribution of actions shows that the character teller-wife does majority of actions and most of them are action verbs while the character of her husband does
lower amount of actions and only three of them are realized via action verbs. In the case of husband, focus is on his physical state rather his actions.

The character of the doctor performs only three actions: “came to the village” (line 17), “having X-rayed him (the sick husband)” (line 26), and “said” (lines 27-29). However, he is voiced, which brings his figure more authority (following Schiffrin 1996). As a result, the character of the teller-wife is constructed as much more agentive figure in terms of actions.

Finally, the voices of the female and male neighbors are used for evaluation of the teller-wife’s actions; this narrative says something about family relationships but also wider village relationships. Interestingly, the male neighbors are used as a positive reinforcement of her properly fulfilling her wife’s duties, and the female figures are used as an antagonistic force that questions her ability to do her job. Thus, they (the male neighbors) “told me before, ‘Maira, thank you, I did not think you are like this. Very clean. <Rus> Even> now while burying, There is nothing to wash (on his body), everything is clean. Thank you.’” (lines 53-57). In addition, these men are referred to by their personal names (“Then, when he died, there was Kokysh (a male neighbor), then there was that- so-called Darhan (another male neighbor).”) in lines 51-52. Differently, the female neighbors “who saw (this funeral process) hit their cheeks,” in line 111 express the following judgement regarding the teller-wife “Who paid off this all? Akamal (daughter’s name) is taking out and taking out (food out of a car), Her daughter <Rus>only> she is putting on ground, taking out, and putting on ground.” (lines 112-115). Then, two of them evaluate her as “‘Her mother is drinking, this crazy woman will eat (funeral’s food) She will eat the bought animal (like horse or sheep) with her own hand.’” in lines 118-119.
Constructed dialogue between the wife and husband is also very telling and is used well to foreground the character of wife. Thus, the husband is annoying the wife by questioning her ability to continue taking care of him and living well after his death. He says “Your neck will ‘get nude’ (your head would ache from thinking). They will not let you live in peace! No money, no animals. They will gossip about you!”, which depicts a very sad scenario for his wife.

63 Hostess Maira: If I came closer, /he started/. 
64 “Your neck will ‘get nude’ (you head would ache from thinking). 
65 They will not let you live in peace! 
66 No money, no animals. They will gossip about you!”
67 One day I myself was much-
68 my head was full of lice, I was angry, my sleep was coming. 
69 I was not sleeping all night. 
70 Children were little. That’s why I became very angry. 
71 One day, I screamed (at him), 
72 “You learn how to die, I will learn how to bury!”
73 <laughing> The deceased, then-> 
74 Aisulu’s Mother: Don’t you regret of what you said? 
75 Hostess Maira: <smiling>No.>
76 Aisulu’s Mother Don’t you regret? 
77 Hostess Maira: Then, (he) realized, “Now, now, good, thank you. 
78 Now, I understood the words. 
79 Really, you will not leave (me) in the street (you will bury me well).”
80 Okay, now.

Hostess Maira in the role of the wife effectively dealt with her husband’s constant attacks by ordering her husband “You learn how to die, I will learn how to bury!” in line 77. As a result of this agentive move, the husband calms down and felt relieved, “Now, now, good, thank you. Now, I understood the words. Really, you will not leave (me) in the street (you will bury me well).” in lines 82-84. Through the voice of her husband, the narrator effectively built her character as the one who fulfill her marital duties properly and up to the end of her husband’s life.
Also of note, she does very sophisticated facework that justifies her agentive screaming at the husband. Thus, she explains that “One day I myself was much- my head was full of lice, I was angry, my sleep was coming. I was not sleeping all night. Children were little. That’s why I became very angry.” in lines 67-75. It seems she comes up with such justification to show that she would not do in any other circumstances. As Schffrin (1996) notes that in constructing the story world, the narrator often weighs it against the cultural expectation of behavior. This is what seems to be happening her: She is trying to battle with the cultural expectations of being a caring wife or that she does not meet them.

6.4.1.4 Level 2 (Storytelling world)

In the storytelling, the conversation primarily involves two Kazakh women: Hostess Maira and my mother (the son and daughter-in-law of Hostess Maira have left by the time of this interaction). They have known each other for more than a decade. Both of them are mothers and know about the hardship of having an abusive husband. Therefore, this is shared membership may serve as a strong foundation for their alignment as the narrative unfolds. Right before the narrative occurs, my mother inquired about the children of one of the mutual friend who was the resident of the village. It turned to be that one of the children died because of drug abuse and my mother evaluated this as a very sad situation. This evaluation seems to be a major trigger because after Hostesses Maira finishes updating my mother “Well, this is like this, well, that-like.” in line 1-2, she shifts focus on herself and states that “I also, after I had done (non-audible), when I came (here), I experienced everything (meaning good and bad).” In lines 3-4. Then she specifies
this by a metaphor “an alien orphan”: “I was myself an alien orphan in my village. I came here,
an alien is again. I have seen everything.”, lines 5-8. These opening lines are reproduced below.

1 Hostess Maira: Well, this is like this,
2 well, that-like.
3 I also, after I had done /?/, when I came (here),
4 I experienced everything (meaning good and bad).
5 I was myself an alien orphan in my village.
6 I came here, an alien is again.
7 I have seen everything.
8 Aisulu’s Mother: Let it go, you have children.
9 Hostess Maira: I have children.
10 Aisulu’s Mother: You have grandchildren.
11 Hostess Maira: **My husband really “showed” (made a life difficult) to me!**

Already mentioned in this extract, following Hostess Maira’s overview of her hard life, my
mother tries to express her support by uttering “Let it go, you have children.” and “You have
grandchildren.” (lines 8 and 10). This support may also come across as a slight disalignment that
my mother displays towards the self-presentation that Hostess Maira is doing. Nonetheless, the
Hostess Maira then launches into a story from her life with an abstract “My husband really
‘showed’ (made a life difficult) to me!” in line 11. This abstract provides an interpretive
framework for the coming story: The audience response is hoped to be one of sympathy with,
and appreciation of, what the teller experienced due to her husband’s situation.

The primary narrative recipient, my mother, indeed does not challenge this framework
and displays her alignment through producing assessments during the telling. Specifically, the
teller and recipient align with each other by voicing, and reacting to, the gossip that would come
from other women or just “others” in the village. Therefore, after Hostess Maira narrates that she
tried to take her sick husband to a doctor who happened to come to the village, and the husband
refuses (“If I say that I will take [him] to the doctor, he will not go.”) in line 19, the teller
evaluates this as “Then, look all they will gossip now, really, you know, women’s words.” in lines 20-21. This “they” are women neighbors (“you know, women’s words”), and the recipient, my mother, aligns with this, as is shown in the lines below.

19 Hostess Maira: If I say that I will take (him) to the doctor, he will not go.
20 Then, look all they will gossip now,
21 really, you know, women’s words.
21 Aisulu’s Mother: Really, they will make up gossips.
22 “She did not take (him) to the doctor who came from- to the village.”
23 Hostess Maira: Really they will say like this.

My mother aligns with this external evaluation, (i.e., when the narrator steps out of the story world and make a comments, as per Labov 1972) by agreeing with Hostess Maira and voicing these hypothetical women: “Really, they will make up gossips. “She did not take (him) to the doctor who came from- to the village.”” (lines 21-22). Hostess Maira in turn displays her alignment with this voicing of other women “Really they will say like this.” (line 23). The teller and narrator are thus in agreement, and evidence a shared perspective.

Similarly, as shown in the next extract, after Hostess Maira makes the point that she could not leave her husband because he would physically fall to the floor (“if I leave [him] as he is, he falls down indeed.”) in line 43. Right after this my mother assesses this complicating action as “Oh, even do not mention this. Oh himself-<Rus> of course> they (others) will make up gossips, they will. ‘She is not caring for, she is not watching, she killed (him).’” in lines 44, 46, and 47. Thus, my mother, the primary narrative recipient, again voices the hypothetical “others” that they would accuse Hostess Miara for killing husband (i.e., “She is not caring for, she is not watching, she killed (him)”).

43 Hostess Maira: if I leave (him) as he is, he falls down indeed.
Aisulu's Mother: Oh, even do not mention this. Oh himself-
Hostess Maira: Yes. Oh, I really have seen a lot!
Aisulu's Mother: <Rus> of course> they (others) will make up gossips, they will. “She is not caring for, she is not watching, she killed (him).”
Hostess Maira: Yes. Indeed they will say like this.

The teller displays her alignment with such voicing of “others”, i.e., “Yes. Indeed they will say like this.” in line 48. This shows a support from the principal recipient that she understands Hostess Maira’s fear of leaving her husband by himself, and this fear is the way how other would judge and gossip. This is very interesting moment as the two Kazakh women show a complete alignment on the moment of the narrative, in which the safety of a sick husband is a direct responsibility. This may surface the socio-cultural expectation for a wife in the Kazakh-speaking society. In addition, this is realized via constructed dialogue, which often serves as evaluation (Labov & Waletzky 1967; Labov 1972), which in its turn often discursively constructs the narrator’s belief about a certain issue.

At one point later in the telling, the primary recipient seems to challenge the teller’s characterization of the narrative. After the teller summarizes the fight with her husband as “‘You learn how to die, I will learn how to bury!’”, my mother inquires “Don’t you regret of what you said?” in line 79 repeating it again in line 81 (“Don’t you regret?”).

Hostess Maira: “You learn how to die, I will learn how to bury!”
<laughing> The deceased, then>
Aisulu's Mother: Don’t you regret of what you said?
Hostess Maira: <smile>No.>
Aisulu's Mother: Don’t you regret?
Hostess Maira: Then, (he) realized, “Now, now, good, thank you.

This asks for greater reflection from Hostess Maira while also suggesting that her behavior was in some way inappropriate. This is very notable because my mother asks this despite that Hostess
Maira provides a very long justification of why she said what she said. This might suggest that what Hostess Maira said to her husband does not meet the expectations of my mother as an individual regarding how a wife should talk to her husband.

In addition, display of alignment is seen in various places throughout the telling, with tokens of “Mhm” from my mother in lines 18, 24, 30, and 116 along with laughter in line 120. Thus, in general, there is continued alignment across the telling between teller and primary recipient.

In the end, the teller exits narrating very smoothly, but it goes along with my mother’s question about the age of the deceased husband and repetition of the doctor’s constructed dialogue. This moment might be another moment when the principal recipient displays some challenge the interpretive framework (Goodwin 1986) suggested by Hostess Maira. In other words, my mother put into a question if the teller did a good job of taking a proper care of her husband because she asks the age and evaluates it as young.

123 Having <Rus>properly> done, we buried (him).
124 Aisulu's Mother: What age did he die?
125 Hostess Maira: He died in sixty- sixty-eight.
126 Aisulu's Mother: Youngish, <Rus>right>?  
127 Hostess Maira: Young. So that- vodka really killed (him).
128 Seventy /right/. Sixty-two.
129 That one (the doctor) that (I) mentioned so
130 He (her husband) himself heard,
131 ‘in his eyes’ (in the presence of the husband) he (the doctor) told me,
132 Mhm.
133 “Take (to home) and wait.”
134 We did not take him anywhere (any hospital) indeed.
135 “(Husband’s life has been) finished and, one month of life left.”→ he said.
136 His (husband’s) liver all had decayed. He (the doctor) really → screened (the husband).
137 Aisulu's Mother: We understood.
Thus, my mother starts with a question “What age did he die?” (line 124), and Hostess Maira answers that “He died in sixty-sixty-eight.” (line 125), which my mother in third turn evaluates as “Youngish, <Rus>right>?” (line 126). This evaluation as youngish can be a face threat to Hostess Maira as a wife saying that she did not take a good care of him and this could be read as a competing interpretive framework (Goodwin 1986), suggesting that perhaps Hostess Maira did not convince my mother that she indeed did her best in caring for her husband. It seems Hostess Maira reads it as a threat because she offers a long justification. Thus, she says that “Young. So that- vodka really killed (him).” In line 127 and she reaches back to the character of the doctor again, i.e., “That one (the doctor) that (I) mentioned so in his eyes’ (in the presence of the husband) he (the doctor) told me,” (lines 129-131) and even voice him again “‘Take (to home) and wait. (Husband’s life has been) finished and, one month of life left.” he said.’” (lines 133 and 135). Finally, my mother displays her alignment by saying “We understood” that signals her support through the inclusive first plural pronoun “we.”

All in all, the narrative is triggered by my mother’s display of compassion towards one of the neighbors regarding the fate of his son. Having heard this, Hostess Maira states that she has also seen a lot of inhuman challenges and offers the narrative to support this statement. She offers the story abstract that her husband really challenged her by his drinking and becoming ill so this provides the orientation to the principal recipient my mother how to interpret the narrative. Thus, the positioning in the story world (Hostess Maira being agentive and caring wife) fits well the interactive purpose. This also provides Hostess Maira with an opportunity to present herself as some who deserves compassion because she also went through hard tests and suffered a lot.
In addition, the principal recipient shows a strong alignment with this story world positioning, presenting potential challenges only twice (i.e., questing the harshness of the order Hostess Maira gave to husband and how young the husband was when died). My mother also joined the narrator (and this shows a strong alignment) in voicing the other women and others against whom the action of Hostess Maira in the story world are evaluated. In voicing these other women, the teller and the primary recipient are able align together against absent other(s).

6.4.1.5 Level 3 (Socio-cultural world)

In the story world, the Kazakh-speaking narrator, Hostess Maira constructs for herself an agentive character by using such linguistic devices as action verbs and constructed dialogue, while the character of her sick husband is less agentive, as reflected through the use of stative verbs. In addition, the teller and the primary recipient take on the voices of female neighbors to reveal what would be considered a failure as a wife (e.g., like letting a sick husband fall down) and take on the voices of male neighbors reveal what would be considered a success as a wife (e.g., keeping the body of a sick husband clean). This seems to uncover the gender imbalance in the society: Since men are a prestigious social group, their praise is crucial for determining how well someone meets the expectation of being a good wife. Using the female voices for voicing gossip and backtalk may reveal a lower status of women in this Kazakh community.

The voices of the village neighbors are very telling here. Schiffrin (1996) notes that narrative serves not only as a presentation of self as an individual, but also “as someone located within a social and cultural world” (169). Specifically, in the story world, “we can represent ourselves against a backdrop of cultural expectations about a typical course of action; our
identities as social beings emerge as we construct our own individual experiences as a way to position ourselves in relation to social and cultural expectations” (1996:168). Thus, the voices of “others” (especially the voices of other women) seem to bring to the surface the socio-cultural expectations of the wife’s duties.

In addition, this expectation appears to be relatively widely shared, in that the recipient was able to take over co-narrating by voicing the women and how they would gossip. I find this voicing of women’s gossips by the recipient of the narrative pretty interesting. This voicing seems a salient socio-cultural moment because the recipient joins co-narrating of the event that is unknown to her. If we connect the results of Level 1 and 2, it is possible to suggest that the agentive figure of a wife who takes a proper care of her alcoholic husband speaks to the socio-cultural expectations for a wife in this Kazakh village community. By reflecting these expectations, Hostess Maira indirectly also signal her Kazakh identity (as she reflecting the expectations circulated in a Kazakh community and present the narrative to a Kazakh audience).

6.5 Conclusion

The analysis of this chapter has shown that the characters of the older family members are constructed as more agentive through assignment of more action verbs and, most important, through constructed dialogue. They fulfil agentive speech acts like threat, order, advice in this voicing. Such a positioning of older family members reflects the Kazakh socio-cultural value of respect for age or elderly. However, in the narratives about the grandchildren the tendency is the opposite: The characters of the kids are more foregrounded and voice to create the entertainment and playfulness. This story world positioning and audience alignment with it seems to reflect the
cultural belief that it is sweeter to raise grandchildren. Thus, by emphasizing these cultural values, the narrators discursively construct their ethnic identity of a caregiver and Kazakh.

The narrative of Hostess Maira’s care of her dying husband is an insightful window into the Kazakh socio-cultural expectations of a good wife. Thus, the character of the wife is very agentive in fulfilling morally good actions and it is evaluated as such through the voice of male neighbors. Through this positioning in the story world, the narrator shows that she did meet the requirements and thus constructs her Kazakh identity.
CHAPTER SEVEN: CONCLUSION

In this chapter, I summarize the findings of this study and discuss how they contribute to improving our understanding of relationships among positioning, narratives, and identity construction in daily interactions. Section 7.1 covers the main findings of the study; in Section 7.2, I show how they contribute to our understanding of levels of positioning and identity construction. In Section 7.3, I discuss how my findings lend insight into Kazakh sociocultural values and ideologies and how these are realized in narrative discourse. Section 7.4 covers the limitation of the study and Section 7.5 outlines the major conclusion and suggests future research directions.

7.1 Findings of the study

In my analysis chapters, I applied the model of three levels of positioning in narrative (Bamberg 1997; Bamberg & Georgakopoulou 2008; De Fina 2013) to explore how Kazakh narrators discursively construct their various identities as they tell mealtime narratives that they knew were being recorded as part of their participation in my study, which I described as being about Kazakh culture. The stories I analyze highlight how these narrators who reside in a small Kazakh village construct themselves as Kazakhs, neighbors, and caregivers by juxtaposing themselves vis-à-vis people from other ethnic and national backgrounds (Chapter Four), their neighbors (Chapter Five), and members of their own families (Chapter Six).

I demonstrated how analysis of characters’ positionings in the story world create (dis)alignments among characters, and how these further serve as the basis for the construction of (dis)alignments between the audience and the teller in the storytelling world. I also showed
how the positionings at these two levels allowed the Kazakh narrators take a stand in relation to larger ideological discourses and some Kazakh socio-cultural values.

In Chapter Four, where the narratives involved non-Kazakh characters, the stories revolved around the themes of economic development, financial resources, food discourse, and family values. The analysis of this set of narratives reveals that the Kazakh narrators construct their ethnic identities by reflecting (or taking positions towards) wider ideological discourses of Russia as an economic power in the Central Asia, of the Western world as economically superior, and of nation-building discourse involving reviving Kazakh cultural heritage. Thus, the Russian and American characters are depicted as superior to Kazakh characters in the story worlds of the narratives about economic advancement and financial resources, while the superiority of Kazakhs is discursively realized via negative evaluation of Vietnamese and Russian food and the moral behavior of a Russian wife. Such positionings received strong alignment from the Kazakh audience in the storytelling world, which allowed the narrators further reinforce their ethnic identities.

In Chapter Five, the narratives focused on the relations among the neighbors in the village. In these narratives about neighbors, the Kazakh narrators seem to discursively construct their ethnic identities by emphasizing the socio-cultural values of justice and equality in neighborly relationships. Thus, they negatively depict the neighbors who steal personal belongings (like a knife and meat); portray neighbors turning them in for a small crime, even those same neighbors committed a larger crime (reporting theft of a half of a liter milk at a communal meeting); and depict neighbors receiving wealth in illegal way (through personal connections and by bribing the state authorities). The tellers disalign with the neighbors whose
moral behavior violates these values in the story world, which allows the tellers to create alignment with their principal recipients in the storytelling world. As in the previous chapter, the audience supports such depictions of characters, giving assurance to the tellers that they emphasize the ‘right’ socio-cultural values in their narratives.

Finally, in Chapter Six, the stories revolved around the topic of family relationships. In this set of narratives, the narrators discursively showed their Kazakh selves through highlighting the socio-cultural value of respect for age/elderly, a cultural belief regarding grandchildren, and cultural expectations for being a good wife. In reflecting these values, the characters of the older family members, such as parents and a grandfather-in-law, are constructed as more agentive through voicing their agentive speech acts (e.g., a threat, an order) in the story world. This voicing serves a different purpose (to create an entertainment) in the narratives about the grandchildren, seeming to reflect a Kazakh belief that raising grandchildren is sweeter than raising children because grandparents can enjoy the entertaining part of this process. The character of a Kazakh widow telling about her husband’s death portrays herself as a strong figure in the story world in her role as wife; she fulfills actions that present her as loyal and caring, and thus portrays herself as meeting cultural expectations. In all tellings, the audience shows a strong alignment with how the story worlds are constructed and the narrators’ evaluations and thus reinforce the identities that the narrators try to present.

7.2 Positioning, narrative, and identity construction

In this study, I drew on the insights from the model of three levels of positioning in narrative that initially was developed in Bamberg (1997) and was then extended in Bamberg and
Georgakopoulou (2008) and De Fina (2013). Following the model, we can understand discursive process of identity construction through positionings at three major levels: The story world, the storytelling world, and a global level.

At Level 1 or in the story world, the main focus of my analysis was how the characters’ actions and attributes resulted in their positioning in relation to each other. Specifically, I was interested in which characters were positioned as protagonist, antagonist, victim, and so on. In so doing, I also incorporated Labov and Waletzky’s (1967; Labov 1972) concept of complicating actions and evaluation. The integration of these concepts extends our understanding of positioning in the story world by focusing on smaller details of how actions and attributes are discursively created. Thus, it reveals that not only quantity but also quality of action verbs in complicating actions is important in understanding characters’ positioning at Level 1.

Specifically, in the narrative *Half a Liter of Milk*, the male neighbors Saken and Serikabi are assigned a bigger number of actions (seven) through actions verbs that result in their higher agency as compared to the teller Hostess Maira who does only two as a character in the story world. However, the quality or connotations of the actions verbs linked to the men are morally negative (i.e., actions of stealing communal hay in noticeable amounts), which results in assignment of morally wrong actions to Saken and Serikbai, and thus contributing to their role in the story as antagonist.

Next, I focused on evaluation and evaluative devices to better understand how attributes are discursively assigned to the characters, and then how they impact characters’ positioning in the story world. Following Labov’s (1972) finding that reporting speech of people is a strong evaluative device, I drew on Tannen’s (1989/2007) conceptualization of reported speech as
constructed dialogue (i.e., an involvement strategy that acknowledges that speakers “construct” dialogue for characters they animate) and connected this conceptualization to Schiffrin’s (1996) work of presenting epistemic self (relating to narrator’s beliefs) through evaluative devices including constructed dialogue. Connecting these concepts help us to better detect the process of constructing the characters’ qualities and connecting these to the beliefs of narrators. For example, I showed how the older family members, such as parents and grandfather-in-law, are voiced in the story world and how they voiced a range of agentive speech acts, such as a threat, order, or advice. Constructed dialogue not only contributes to assigning the quality of being in power to these characters, but it also helps display and construct the narrators’ beliefs about the status of older family members. Not surprisingly, sociological and anthropological studies about Kazakh culture have confirmed that respect for the elderly is strong among members of this ethnic group. Therefore, the inclusion of these concepts has allowed for a more nuanced understanding of how attributes are constructed and influence the characters’ positioning, and how these link to larger cultural ideologies and beliefs.

In addition, I integrated Tannen’s (1989/2007) work on details and repetition, demonstrating how these function as evaluative devices and are used to assign and reinforce the characters’ attributes. Specifically, in the narrative Taxiing for American Tourists, the narrator includes such detail as the height of the American tourists (i.e., “huge”), which helps to recreate an image for his audience and contributes to the attribute of physical superiority of American tourists in the story world. In addition, this detail of a physical appearance is reinforced through repetition (“huge huge”). Similarly, the quality of a disloyal and morally corrupt wife is constructed through the repetition of one proposition in the narrative A Bad Russian Wife. Thus,
the expression “she, Russian, having given birth to four children from Ratmeer, left.” in line 13 is repeated in the next line 14, “Having given birth to three boys and one girl, she left.” This reinforces the importance of this action in the story and in characterizing the wife.

Therefore, an integration of the Labovian concept of evaluation along with Schiffrin’s (1996) understanding of it as a mechanism for belief construction, and Tannen’s (1989/2007, 2008) work on involvement strategies and narrative, offers a more nuanced understanding of deconstructing the characters’ qualities at Level 1 and relating it to the process of identity construction at Level 2.

At Level 2 or in the storytelling world, my main analytical focus was on how the narrators position themselves towards the audience through a telling, which reveals how the narrators tried to come across with audience, what purpose the telling is serving in the immediate interactional context, and how this positioning is sustained by the audience through its participation. To bring these insights from the studies that employed the levels of positioning model, I draw on CA examinations of narrative sequence (Jefferson 1978; Sacks 1970/1992b) and Goodwin’s (1984, 1986) classic work on audience participation through his concept of the interpretive framework of narratives. The inclusion of these concepts helped to bring more precision in identifying narrators’ positioning towards the audience, or if the narrative is offered in (dis)alignment with audience; the purpose of the narrative, or to explain or exemplify the point; and how the audience reacts to the narrators’ positioning, or if they align with the narrator’s interpretation. In seeking greater precision in understanding positioning at Level 2, I also hope to have illuminated the links between Levels 1 and 2 (the story world and the
storytelling world), or how the positioning in the story world fits the immediate interactional context.

Specifically, following Jefferson’s (1978) work on local occasioning of narratives, I showed how the narrative *Taxiing for American Tourists* is triggered by the presence of the video-camera, which represents the frame of research about Kazakh culture. Drawing further on Gordon (2013) who showed that the recording device can be a moment for constructing certain types of identities, I was able to make more interpretations of what kinds of identities were more likely to be created through the narratives.

Applying Goodwin’s concept of interpretive framework (i.e., the narrator’s way of showing how the narrative needs to be interpreted), I revealed, across the stories, a general tendency of the audience to avoid offering a competing story interpretation (as in Goodwin 1996). This allowed me to make the suggestion that one possible interpretation is that the audience agrees on the values that are emphasized in the narrative through co-narration and assessments (thus they are shared cultural values). Another possible interpretation relates to conversational style (Tannen 1984/2005) presumably shared by members of this community; there seems to be an orientation to harmony, though this requires further research (as does how the recorder might have affected the display of harmony). Examining interpretive frameworks and how they are reaffirmed in the storytelling world in turn allowed me to speculate how Level 2 can relate to Level 3, or the global level that I refer as socio-cultural world. In addition, the CA concept of second story (Sacks 1970/1992a) and the interactional sociolinguistic concept of story rounds (Tannen 1984/2005) further strengthen the analysis at Level 2 by revealing how narrators position themselves in alignment with audience and vice-versa.
At Level 3 or the socio-cultural world, the study contributed to knowledge by drawing on the socio-historical and socio-cultural studies of the under-research community of Kazakh-speaking Kazakhs and demonstrating how these are realized in discourse. I will discuss this further in Section 7.3.

In general, I found that the integration of concepts from the Labovian narrative tradition, CA, and interactional sociolinguistics strengthens the model of three levels of positioning in narratives by facilitating nuance in exploring how positioning is constructed at each level. By understanding the details of creating positioning, we also come away with a better understanding of how different identities are constructed.

Connecting the study findings to broader research on the identity construction process, this study has further shown how the *relationality principle* proposed by Bucholtz and Hall (2005) can be found in narrative discourse. They suggest that “identities are intersubjectively constructed through several, often overlapping, complementary relations, including similarity/difference, genuineness/artifice, and authority/delegitimacy” (598). In other words, identities are not created in a vacuum but rather they become socially salient “in relation to other available identity positons and other social actors” (2005:598). Thus, there is a division of ‘us’ and ‘them’, or *distinction* in Bucholtz and Hall’s terms, in the story worlds that involves out-group relations and neighbors’ relations, and even family relations (regarding differences such as age and gender). However, it seems *adequation*, or the idea of ‘similar enough’, guided the identity construction the storytelling world as there seems a strong alignment between the narrators and audience in the majority of the narratives I analyzed.
Finally, the majority of studies that apply the three-level model focus primary on interview-like settings (e.g., Bamberg and Georgakopolou 2008; De Fina 2013) or more institutional settings (De Fina 2008). For instance, Bamberg and Georgakopoulou (2008) focuses on small stories and teenager identity in the group interviews conducted at a high school. De Fina (2013) examines narratives in interviews with migrant Latino women residing in Washington D.D. area. Finally, De Fina (2008) examines how a social identity of American Italian is constructed in narratives that occur in dinner conversation at the Italian Club. Therefore, this study extends the application of the model by primarily focusing on daily conversations in home settings.

7.3 Positioning, narratives, and Kazakh socio-cultural values and ideologies

In this section, I discuss how this study contributes to knowledge by specifically exploring Kazakh narratives. To better contextualize the contribution, I would like to reach back to the socio-political situation in post-Soviet Kazakhstan. The major characteristic of this historical stage is that the country has been overcoming the heritage of Soviet dictatorship. In light of this, the majority of social science research that exists on post-Soviet Kazakhstan is focused on the macro level, including the major political players and parties, as well as more publicly available data like arts and literature. Not surprisingly, everyday Kazakhs’ narratives have, to my knowledge, not been studied before.

It should be noted that major nation-building policies, including those regarding language, have been implemented in a top-down manner in Kazakhstan. As such, it is necessary to examine if and how local populations have followed, re-negotiated, or contested the
nationhood that has been projected onto them. A 2015 special issue of Nationalities Papers cautions against a top-down manner of research in the Central Asian region, calling on scholars to take a two-fold approach to understanding socio-cultural and political processes in Central Asian countries. This special issue suggests that although the top-down approach to studying nation-building is justified by the presence of authoritarian regimes in the region, this focus overlooks the agency of everyday people. Thus, this study follows this call and makes the first attempt to bring in unheard voices, give them agency, and study them through the analysis of narratives.

Next, in the era of globalization, smaller communities have overcome many transformational processes, including identity transformation, all around the world (not to mention the possible challenging process of nation-building). In this light, this study is very pertinent in its focus on a homogeneous rural population of Kazakh-speaking Kazakhs in a part of Kazakhstan that is highly Russified. In addition, its focus on narrative and positioning provides a unique opportunity to better understand the social world of an isolated and small community which is difficult to access in terms of research opportunities.

By organizing the narratives, I examined into those that focus on out-group and in-group relations, I hope to have provided a more comprehensive view of socio-cultural values and ideological discourses with regards to different aspects of social life of this rural community. Moreover, the study shows the discursive mechanisms of how these values and ideologies are constructed in interpersonal discourse of this Kazakh community. Specifically, the study has helped us to better understand how the individuals who reside in the village community view themselves as ethnic Kazakh in relation to other ethnic groups. The analysis revealed a perceived
superiority of Russians and Americans in economic and financial spheres, while the Kazakh participants portrayed their own superiority in food and family-related spheres; this pattern very well reflects and (re)creates the current ideological discourses. Regarding the in-group relationships, this study revealed how the socio-cultural values of justice and equality prevail, echoing the hidden inequalities caused by the Soviet dictatorship system and the social inequality resulting from the shift to the capitalist economic system. Finally, the well-attested value of respect for the elderly in sociological and anthropological studies about Kazakhstan has been illuminated by this study by showing how this respect is created through discursive narrative strategies like constructed dialogue.

7.4 Limitations

In this section, I give a brief overview of and explain the study’s limitations. Since the study incorporates interactional sociolinguistics as a major methodological tool, an obvious limitation is the absence of that membership checking that is usually achieved through playback sessions with the study participants. I decided not to attempt conduct playback interviews due to the difficulty involved in accessing this small community, and due to community members’ association of research with the Soviet interrogation. Instead, I focused on the narratives themselves, bringing in sociological and anthropological research on Kazakhstan, while also at times relying on the knowledge I brought to the study as a relative insider to this community. However, my claims of identity construction and my attempts to relate the findings at Level 1 and 2 to Level 3 could be strengthened with meta data from interviews with the participants.
In addition, the number of participants in my study and narratives in my dataset is relatively small. While this was necessary to conduct in-depth analysis of the data, it leaves open questions regarding the generalizability of my findings that merit further attention. Finally, since I was working with data in a language other than English, and my analysis primarily focused on translations, it is possible that some information was lost in the process of translation.

7.5 Conclusions and future directions

Despite the above outlined limitations, the findings of this study advance our understanding of narrative and identity and open possible future research directions. As I mention in section 7.2, it would be fruitful to explore in more depth audience alignment and if it is shaped primarily by shared knowledge and values, a shared conversational style among the Kazakh-speaking population that values harmony, or both. Another interesting direction can be research into how aligned or disaligned positioning of characters can occur through use of an object (e.g., sheep fleece or foods) in the story world. For instance, rigorous application of Du Bois’ (2007) stance triangle, where the storyworld characters, the teller, and the audience all evaluate the same object, could be interesting. Finally, a comparative dataset of narratives collected among urban and socially upper Kazakh and Russian families could be another promising direction, and help uncover diversity in Kazakhstani values and narrative strategies.

All in all, this study has contributed to our understanding of how diverse identities (i.e., ethnic, a neighbor, and a family member) is discursively accomplished through positioning at several levels in narratives among an under-researched rural community of Kazakh-speaking individuals. In addition, I have shown that integration of the three-level model of narrative
positioning with concepts from discourse analysis more broadly contributes in meaningful ways to the investigation of narrative and identity.
APPENDIX A: TRANSCRIPT CONVENTIONS

.. indicates a noticeable pause or break in rhythm

… indicates a significant pause or break in rhythm

. indicates sentence-final falling intonation

? indicates sentence-final rising intonation

, indicates phrasal-final intonation (more to come)

/?/ indicates an unaudible part/ transcription impossible

/words/ indicates uncertain transcription

[a word indicates an overlapping speech

[a word word= indicates latching (second voice begins without perceptible pause)

= word CAPS indicates emphatic stress

: indicates a lengthened vowel sound

- indicates an abrupt stop in speech; a truncated word or syllable

(word) indicates additional word(s) in translation to present a more comprehensive meaning

{comment} indicates transcriber’s comments on the quality of speech and nonverbal actions

<laughter>word> is used to indicate simultaneously occurring actions like laughter, code switching, etc.

→ arrow on the right indicates the speaker continues

bolded indicates the segments of the transcript relevant to the analysis

‘expression’ indicates a metaphorical or stable expression
Narrative One: A Russian Firm

1 Aisulu’s Mother: Biz Amerika-ni bil-mei-di-k, Amerika-lar ondy fermer-lar. We America-ACC know-not-PastSimp.-1st.pl., America-pl. good farmer-pl. We did not know America, Americans are good farmers.

2 Guest Aunt Amina: Ondi goi fermer-ler. Bir-eki fermer-ler kel-ip, Good indeed farmer-pl. Two-three farmer-pl. come-PastPartic. Indeed they are good farmers. One or two farmers had come

3 myna zher-di net-se= this land-AccCase what-Cond.Mood with this land if do what=

4 Aisulu’s Mother = Au, investiciya. = Oh, investment. = Oh, investment.

5 Guest Aunt Amina: Zhanagy investisiya ash-sa, Mentioned investment open-Cond.Mood If they open these mentioned investments,

6 halyk-lar zhumys tau-yp kal-ar e-di. nation-pl. job find-PastPartic. stay-Fut. do-PastSimp, 3rd.per. people would be likely to find and keep jobs.

8 Guest Aunt Amina: Mysaly, koi-dyn teri-ler-in For example, sheep-PossCase fleece-Pl.-AccCase For example, sheep’s fleece

9 ashein kopeik-ke otkiz-ip zhatyr-0. for free penny-DatCase sell-VerbMark lay-3rd.pl.,PresSim. they are selling for free, for a penny.

10 Al ondai Kitai men Turk-ter o dan bile-sin-der me? And this-like China and Turkey-pl. this-SourseCase know-Ger-2nd.pl. Ques.Part So, in this case, Chinese and Turkish people, do you know ne zhasa-j-dy? what make-Ger.-3rd.pl what they are making?

12 Host Mother-in-law: Otkiz-ip ber-me-j-ymyz da. [Tor-ge sal-a-myz da. Sell-PastPartic.-Not-1st.pl.-just [Land-Dat.Case put-PresSimple, 1st.pl-just We even don’t sell.] We simply put it on the land.

13 Guest Aunt Amina: [Keremet-, [Wonderful- [Wonderful-

14 Tor-ge sal-a-dy apar-yp. Land-Dat.Case put-3rdper take-PastPartic
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Having taken there, they put on the land.

15 Host Mother-in-law: Zhun-in bari.
Threads-PossCase all.
All the threads.

16 Guest Aunt Amina: <Rus> Sherst' bari, <Rus> natURAL 'N-II SHE.rs't'>.
<Rus> Wool all, <Rus> natURAL WOOL>

It is pure wool, GENUINE WOOL.

17 Soityp ait-sh, Amerika Amerika kulak-yna (bol-sa).
Like-this say-PoliteParticle America, America ear-Pl.-DatCase (be-CondMood)
Like this, say this into America America’s ears ((if so)).

18 Aisulu: (laughter)

19 Host Daughter-in-law: (laughter)

20 Guest Aunt Amina: Mysaly she, (a colloquial particle)
For example (a colloquial particle)
For example like,

21 Men-nin ulken kyz-yym Kyrgyz-ga shyk-kan-da-
I-PossCase big daughter-1sing, Kyrgyz-DatCase exit-PastPartic-when
When my older daughter got married to a Kyrgyz man-

22 (Men-i mynasy angime ait, dym zhe-gez-be-i goi, beker shakyr-dyn-0 goi
I-AccCase this words tell, really eat-let-not-Ger in wane call-PastSimp-2sing. indeed

Indeed, in wane you called me to talk, I’m not letting them eat.

Just mentioned Kyrgyzstan-LOC I-PossCase big daughter-1sing Kyrgyz-DatCase exit-PastPartic
Just mentioned, my older daughter married to a Kyrgyz man.

Lake’s name-LocalCase. Lake’s name so-called land-PossCase exist indeed.
At lake’s name. There is a place so-called lake’s name, you know.

31 Sol zher-de, Sholpan-Ata,
That land-LocalCase, resort’s name
In that place, town name is,

32 sol zher-de ne kyl-a-dyn- Orys-tar-dyn, bar goi
that land-LocalCase, what do-Ger-3Pl Russian-Pl.-PossCase exist indeed,
in that place they are doing what- Russians’, you know,

33 bir aparaty bar.
one device exist.
there is one device.

Nice. They-SourceCase colloq. part. ask-Inf. necessary where-SourceCase take-PastSim,3per

Nice. It is necessary to ask from them from where they took it.

35 So-lar, bar goi iya,
This-pl. exist indeed yes,
Those, you know yes,
They are taking sheep’s fleece this fleece and are processing it.

Now, SCENT of so-called is wonderful, it did not disappear/

Zhu:p-zhumsak. <Rus>Vo> kansha zhun mynan-dai- zhun-ni-
Soft-soft. <Rus>So> how much thread this-like thread-AccCase
Ve:ry soft. <Rus>So> so much wool thread, the thread like this-
Sol zhun-nin <Rus>pryam> eei-y burkyra-p tur.
That thread-PossCase <Russian>straight> smell-3rd blossom-VerbMark. stay.
The SCENT of that wool is blossoming.

Zhu:p-zhumsak ana-lar-y.
So:ft-soft they-pl-3rd per.
Ve:ry soft they are.

[Know-2nd PL, polite question particle how much money-
[Do you know how much money?

Aisulu’s Mother: [Ol ne meRE:NOS koi! Ol <Rus> zhe> mereenos-tin goi kushti! [It what meRI:no indeed! It <Rus> indeed> merino-PossCase indeed wonderful
[It- what is meRI:no indeed! It <Rus> really> is merino’s wonderful

Guest Aunt Amina: [Kansha aksha goi-
[How much money indeed-
[How much money indeed-

Guest Aunt Amina: Endi goi, mereenos bol-syn,
Now indeed, merino exist-ImperMood, 2nd sing.
In this case, let it be merino,

biyak-tin da <Rus>luboi> ters-in solai ule-se,
this-PossCase and <Rus>any> fleece-AccCase,3rd this-like weave-CondMood
of this too, if <Rus> any> fleece is woven like this,

son-dai bola-dy goi.
this-like exist-3rd per indeed.
it becomes like this, indeed.

Host Mother-in-law: Goi! (an exclamation of surprise)
Wow!
Wow!

Guest Aunt Amina: Endi, bar goi, zhu:p-zhumsak goi.
Now, exist indeed, so:ft-soft indeed.
Now, you know, it is very soft.

Zhanagy-lar turis-ter kyrgyn ala-dy.
New-pl. tourist-pl. war take-PresSimp,3rd per.
Tourists buy these mentioned like at a war.

Mysaly, sen-in aksha-n-men
For example, you-PossCase,2nd money-2nd-InstCase
Narrative Two: Taxiing for American Tourists

1 Host Husband: Kara-p koi bi-lai (pointing at the camera), Amerika-da suret-nin zhur-e-di. Look put this-like pointing at the camera. America-LocalCase photo-2nd/pl walk-Ger-3rd/per
2 Host’s Brother: Bayagda, men de <Rus>‘taksovat’> et-ki-m. Shortan-da. Sometime ago, I too <Rus>taxi-Infin.> do-PastSimp.1per. Town’s-name-LocalCase
3 Host Husband: Bir kun topas Texas shtat-nan, ne-ler-i, zheti adam. One day empty Texas state-SourseCase what-pl-3rd seven people.
4 Host’s Brother: Mhm.
5 Host Husband: Adeyi Kazakstan-nyn halky-nyn <Rus>obshii> nes-in bileu-shin Intentionally Kazakhstan-POSS nation- POSS <Rus>general> what-AccCase know-Purpose in order to know that of general about the Kazakh people,
6 Host’s Brother: Mhm.
7 Host Husband: Elektrichka-men ke-p tanerten-gi. Electric train-InstrCase come-PastPartic. early morning-AdjMark. they had come by a electro-train, early-morning one.
8 Host’s Brother: Mhm.
10 Host Husband: Having shouted “Taxi, taxi!”, all had gone. Only twoish taxi drivers stayed. Bari ket-ip kal, bari al-yp-al-yp ket-ip kal-dy (Having taken the passengers)
11 Aisulu: All leave-PST stay, all village-DAT leave-PSP.PTCP. stay
All had gone, everyone from village had gone.

Men kesh-teu kel-ip kal-di-m.
I late-ish come-PastPartic. stay-PastSimple-1sing.
I came and stayed there later-ish.

Host’s Brother:
Mhm.

Host Husband:
Tanerten elektrichka-dan ne-ge- <Rus>selsko-hozyastvenii> ne-ge katys-kan.
Morning electro-train-SOUR what-DAT station-M-SG what-DAT get-off-PST.
They got off the electric-train at this- at railway X name in the morning.

Seitkalinin ujne bar-yp

Sosyn oila-ym, After think-PastSimple-1per, sing.
Then I thought

“Ai, meily, kishkene tur-a tur-ajen, ket-e-im,” de-p

“I, I-1sing a little bit stay-Ger stay-Fut -1sing go-Fut-1sing,” say-PastPartic.

“Hey, okay, I’ll be staying for a bit, then I will leave.”

Kar-ap tur-sa-m: anau zhak-tan zhur-yp zhoyat-ip zhatyr-0.
Look-PST.PTCP stay-CondMood-1SG: that side-SOURCE go-PastPartic. free-walk-PastPartic lay.
when I looked: from that side, they were coming relaxing.

<Rus> zdorO:vi, zdorOvii> Orys-tin ne-ler-i- Amerikanys-tar.
<Rus> HU:ge, HU:ge> Russian’s what- the Americans.

Amerikan- Kazak-tyn onau ‘tiimagy, bargoi, son-y ki-ip al-dy bireu.
American- Kazakh-POSS that ‘tiimag’, indeed, that-ACC put-on-PST take-3SG one.
Americans. One of them had put, you know, that- a ‘tiimagy’ (a traditional male’s cap).

<Rus>zdorO:vi, zdorOvii!> (Illustrates the height/body size with raising shoulders up)
<Rus> HU:ge-Masc,sing, HU:ge- Masc,sing>

<Rus>HU:ge, HU:ge!> (Illustrates the height/body size with raising shoulders up)

Zhetti adam, Ah- ne-men <Rus>perevodchitsya>, kazak-tyn kyz-y.
Seven people. Oh- what-InstCase <Rus>translator> Kazakh-PossCase girl-3rdper.
Seven people. Oh- with them, an interpreter, a Kazakh girl.

Host’s Brother:
Mhm.

Host Husband:
Sol e-ti (bir raz-da-) sol "Taxi, taxi, taxi- taxi, ala-nyz-dar!” dep.
That go-3rdper (one time-LOC), that “Taxi, taxi- taxi take-2ndpl,polite!” say-PastPartic.
That went (one more time), that “Taxi, taxi- you please take a taxi!” said.

"Taxi <Rus>bere-m!” Ona-lar sosyn ait-ty,
"Taxi <Rus>take-1pl.!" They-pl. than say-PastSimple.

“Taxi <Rus>we take!” They then said-
anau bireu birdene dep angl-sha soile-di, men tsum-be-j-dy-m goi.
that one something say-PastPartic. English-in talk-3rdper, I understand-not-Ger-1sing. indeed.
that one something said in English, I really did not understand.

Sosyn anau kzyz ait-ty, “<Rus>A skol’ko budet?” Men ait-ty-m,
Than that girl-3SG say-PastPartic.,“<Rus>But how much will-be?” I say-PastSimple-1per.
Then, that girl asked, <Rus>“How much will it cost?” I said.

Endi angi-shi soile-gosyn, tagy arzan/baga-nin <Rus>nakrut-il>
Now English- talk-since, again expensive <Rus>wind-up-PastSimp, 1sing>
Well, since talking in English, I <Rus> upped more above.

Host’s Brother:
(laughter)

Host Husband:
<laughing>Sagat- S:->
<laughing>Hour- S:->
An hour- H:>

Sagat-y neshe-den eki myn tenge de-di-m ba aksha-ga. 
Hour-3rdper what-SOUR two thousand tenge say-PastSimp-1SG ques. money-DatCase
An hour from what- I think I said two thousands per an hour as a rate.

Soslai/davai, ket-tik. 
This-like go-PastSimple, 1stpl.
We went with this.

"Kazyr mynau bir zher-den tamak ish-ip al-aiyk," de-t. 
"Now this one land-SourCase food eat-PastPartic. take-ImperMood, 1stpl." say-PastSim, 3rdper.
"Now let us have a meal from some place," they said.

Tanerten zhetti-den shyk-kan, tamak ish-u kerek goi. 
Early-morning seven-SourCase exit-PastPartic., meal drink-Infin. necessary indeed.
They left at seven-ish early in the morning, it is really necessary to eat.

Host’s Brother: 
Mhm.

Host Husband: 
Anau ishindegi kane ne-ge al-yp apar-dy-m anau-
That inside what-DatCase take-PastPartic. take-to-PstSimple-1st sing that-
I took them to that inside to that like that-

Um, railway station-PossCase inside-3rdper
Um, inside of the railway station.

Host’s Brother: 
<Rus>Aha>, iya. 
<Rus>Aha>, yes.

Aha, yes.

Host Husband: 
(Non-audible)

"Bir mashina-ga si-ma-i-myz, eki mashina kerek." de-t 
“One car-DatCase fit-not-Ger-1stpl, two car necessary,” say-3rdper
“We are not fitting in one car, two cars are necessary,” they said.

Zhigit-ter-im bari ket-ip kol-gan. Bari-
Man-pl.-1st sing all go-away-PastPartic stay-PastPartic. All-
My men all had gone. All-

Ozi-m zvanda-sa-m ait-ty goi, "Men onda zhur-myn, mynda zhur-myn.”
Self-1SG call-CondMood-1st sing say-3rdper indeed,”1st there walk-PresSimple,1st sing, here walk-PresSimple,
If I call myself, they really say, “I’m driving there, I’m driving here.”

Sosyn bol-ma-j-dy.
Than exis-not-Ger-3rdper.
Then, it did not work out.

Bir kezde bir zhigit (kel-dy).
One time one young man come-3rdper
At one moment, one young man came.

Kazyr Zhasyl-din directori bol-yip iste-i-di.
Now village’s name-PossCase director-3rdper exist-PastPartic. work-Ger-3rdper.
Now, he is working as a director of village’s (a neighbor village)

Shkol-dy-nan.
School-AccCase-SourceCase
At a school.

O-yny bukil tany-ma-j-dy-m, sosyn tanys-ty-m.
It-PossCase completely know-not-Ger-PastPartic.-1st sin, then get-know-PastSimple-1st per
I had not known him absolutely, then I got to know.
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Then, I said, “Will you go with two working cars.” “Well, I will go.”

Host’s Brother: Mhm.
Host Husband: Sosyn <Rus>vremya zasek-u>. Ket-ti-k. Buravoi-ga appar-dy-m. Then <Rus>time set-up-Fut.>Leave-PST-1PL. Lake’name-DatCase take-PastSimp-1st-sing <Rus>Then, I will set up time. We went. I took them to lake’s name.

Host’s Brother: Host Husband: Host’s Brother: Host Husband: Host’s Brother:

Then say
Then say
Durstak turist/Osy zhakta restauran bar.” de-di-m. “Good touristic restaurant exist.” say-PastSimple-1st-sing “There is a good restaurant for tourists,” I said. “Good touristic restaurant exist.” say-PastSimple-1st-sing “Durstak turist/Osy zhakta restauran bar.” de-di-m. “Good touristic restaurant exist.” say-PastSimple-1st-sing

We don’t have what yet like-this—like-that

We waited for them for half- one hour. They came out.

We don’t have what yet like-this—like-that

At the rock - you know, staying on that side- one-hour climbing up,

I climbed them up there, together.

(Many) people go to that place.

I climbed them up there, together.

(Many) people go to that place.

We said, “There are more places to go,” I said.

We said, “There are more places to go,” I said.

So-gan-shen koter-ip kez-di-m birge.
that-AccCase-even climb-up-PastPartic. wander-PastSimple-1st-sing. together

I climbed them up there, together.

I climbed them up there, together.

(Many) people go to that place.

I climbed them up there, together.

(Many) people go to that place.

I climbed them up there, together.

(Many) people go to that place.

I climbed them up there, together.

(Many) people go to that place.
Then, they said, “In this case, let’s go there.”

Host’s Brother: (non-audible) Yuktam-p kala-gan-byz. Vzdremnulli

Host Husband: Mhm.

Host Husband: “Sizder tamak ish-ip kel-er zhat.” ish-pe-nizder

Younger son: Food drink-Ger-DatCase indeed?

For eating meal, really? (smiles)

Iya.

Yes.

Younger son: Tamak ish-in-ge goi? (smiles) Sizge me?

Food drink-Ger-DatCase indeed?

Yes.


They <Rus>restaurant> enter-PastPartic. go-3rd per.

They entered the restaurant.

They sat for one hour and half; they went outside at three-thirty-four.

Host’s Brother: (laughter)

Host Husband: (laughter)

Host Husband: Mhm.

Host Husband: “No. <Rus>Please> let us go. Please, don’t be in rush with your food,” said, and

<laughing> Each- two- to two drivers one thousand tenge->

“Tamak isheniz.” dep ber-di-0

<laughing> eki-miz-ge eki myn tenge ber-ip ta- tamak ish-u-ge.>

<laughing> two-DatCase two thousand tenge give-PastPartic. fo- food drink-Inf.-DatCase.>

<laughing> had given two thousands to two to eat meal.>

Host’s Brother: (laughter)

Host Husband: (laughter)

Host Husband: (laughter)

Host Husband: (non-audible) We quick-quick think-PastSimple-1st sing. “These exit-PastPartic leave-Ger-3rd indeed!”

We quickly, quickly I thought, “These will come out soon, really!”

Quick-quick one cheap come-PastPartic (laughter) (non-audible)

Quickly, quickly from one cheap that came- (non-audible)

(Eki kesse ishi-p al-dyk)

<laughing>Endi,> eki ish-ip al-dyk (non-audible)

<laughing>Now,> two drink-PastPartic. take-PastSimple,1stpl. (non-audible)

<laughing>Now,> we two had eaten, (non-audible)

(?) eki- ber- bir myn tenge zhaksys/zhartysys ekonomival-di-k (polovinu Suitip ed-di-k. Tak bylo) (?) two- one- one thousand tenge good economize-PastSimple,1stpl.

two- one- one thousand tenge, we saved well.
Younger son: (laughter)

Older son: (smiles)

Host Husband: I think the rate came to two thousands per hour.

Younger son: They what (?) Why they (?)

Host Husband: Money is walking! (laughter)

Sagaty eki myn-ga kel-di de-i-m goi. I think, the rate came to two thousands per hour.

Younger son: Solar nege (?) They what (?)

Host Husband: Money is walking! (laughter)

Sagaty eki myn-ga kel-di de-i-m goi. I think, the rate came to two thousands per hour.
“May one of my picture ‘walk’ in the oversees,” I said like this, “May it ‘walk’.

Oversees

Zhetel (after 2 minutes the narrator repeats)

So like this.

So>

Russian Vot> seit

Really, not everyone is like this.

All this

Bari ondai emes koi.

If someone like these come again, she calls me.

Again birey

Tagy birey having taken the phone number, I saved that person’s number.

Telephone

Telefon-din al-yp kal-gan-myn goi ol kisi-ni.

Telephone-PossCase take-PastPartic leave-PastPartic. indeed that person-AccCase having taken the phone number, I saved that person’s number.

Tagy birey-mirey kel-se, ma-gan zvanda-syn.

Again birey-mireu come-CondMood, I-DatCase call-ImprMood.

If someone like these come again, she calls me.

Bari ondai emes koi.

All this-like not indeed.

Really, not everyone is like this.

<Vot> seit-ip kzyyk bol-gan.

<So> like-this-PastPartic.

<So> like this.

(after 2 minutes the narrator repeats)

"Zhetel-de bir foto-min zhur-sin," solai atti-m, "shur-sin."

“Oversees-LocalCase one foto-1sing walk-ImprMood,” this-like say-PST-1sing, “walk-ImprMood,”

“May one of my picture ‘walk’ in the oversees,” I said like this, “May it ‘walk’.”
Narrative Three: Vietnamese Food and A Russian Café

1. Guest Aunt Amina: Oz-im-nin eli-ne eshtene zhet-pe-i-di
   Self-PossCase land-DatCase nothing reach-not-Ger-3rdper.
   Nothing can match up with our land.

2. Bari-ne ait-yp sal-a-myn.
   Everyone-DatCase say-VebrMark tell-1st sing
   I’m telling this to everyone.

   Turkey what good exist-CondMood and, I CP meat-AccCase beginning start-2ndpl.
   Even though Turkey is so good, you start missing meat right away.

4. <Rus>Uzhe> zhy-kan-da zvondai-syn,
   <Rus>Already> exit-PastPart.-LocalCase call-2ndpl.
   <Rus> Already> when you are about to leave, you call,
   "Et asyp koin-dar-she."
   “Please, cook meat quickly!”

5. Biz otyra-miz, orys-tar osderi-nin borsh-tar-in aita bastai-dy.
   We sit-1stpl, Russain-pl their-PossCase borsh-pl-AccCase again start-3rdpl.
   We sit down, Russians start again with their ‘borsh’ (Russian traditional soup)

6. Ar adam-nyr sui-gen tamagy goi.
   Each person-PossCase love-PastPartic. food indeed
   Each person’s favorite food, really.

7. Olar-din tamak-tl-i zhaksy, kozi-nin zhau-yn ala-dy.
   Their-PossCase food-pl.3rdper. good, eye-PossCase enemy take-3rdper.
   Their food is good, pleasant for the eyes.
   (Maybe Russian or other travelling. Vglyad tepleet)


9. Guest Aunt Amina: Birak
   But,
   But,

    Self-1stpl. land-1st-PossCase soup-DatCase reach-not-PRG-3rdper.
    It doesn’t match up with our land’s ‘lapsha’ (a Kazakh traditional soup).

11. Aisulu (nods)

    Vietnam-LocalCase stay-PastSimp.-1stpl.
    We were in Vietnam.

    One guesthouse so-called island-LocalCase rest-PastSimpl.-1stpl-at
    At one so-called resort center on the island for resting.

    Seafood indeed, just mentioned.
    There is only the seafood that has been mentioned.
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Guest Aunt Amina:

We only July-LOC stay-PastPart-LOC Koren-PL-INST neighbor exist-PastPart-1st-pl.
When we stayed in July only, we were neighbors with Koreans.

Guest Aunt Amina:

Aisulu:

Host Mother-in-law -

ann-ydi deji-0.

Good what porridge do-PRG-PAST-pl.3rd

It is good that porridge they cooked.

Krush-


Rice-AccCase boil-VerbMark. put-3rd-pl-and, how kinds spice-pl.-InstrCase eat-3rd-per.

Having boiled rice and they eat it with so many kinds of spices.

Sol kishkene uiren kal-gan-ymyz durys bol-gan eken.

That little learn-PasyPart. Stay-PastPart-1st-pl. right stay-PastPart. indeed.

Indeed, it turned to be right thing that we learned this a little bit.

Sondai zhe-j-miz-de.

Like this eat-Ger-1st-pl. and

And we are eating like this.

Even breads are tiny.

Mynan-dai kishkentai, kishkentai mynan-dai bulochka-lar dajynd-ap koiy-a-dy.

This-like little little this-like breads prepare-PastPart. leave-3PL.

They prepare and leave like this little, little like these breads for you.

A sary majy kor-se-n she:

But yellow butter see-if-2nd sing a colloquial particle:

But if you see yellow butter,

kumarak-tai, bir-eki Tl:eken mynan-dai mynan-dai koi-yp koiy-a-dy.

Pellet-like, one-two SMA:ll this-like this-like make-PastPart. leave-3rd-per.

They prepare and leave for you small like pellets, one-two tiny like this, like this (shows the size on her finger).

Host Mother-in-law (laughter)

Aisulu (laughter)

Guest Aunt Amina (laughter)

Oitkene, olar on-dai zhe-me-j-dy goi. Bari moreprodukty. Nemene, mynandai

Because, they this-like eat-not-Ger-3rd-per. indeed. All seafood. What that-like

Because, they do not eat like this. Everything is seafood.

ByLAI ormekshi siyak-ty kalaj nemeci? Kyp-kyzyl.

THis whiskers this-LocalCase look what? Red-red.

(X) Like this looking: What is this? Red, red.

Guest Aunt Amina:

Sonda goi, ol moreprodukty. On-anany zherken-ip ak ole-sin goi!

Like this indeed, it seafood. It- this disgust-PastPartic. white die-2nd sing indeed

Like this, everything is seafood. It- being disgusted with that you die indeed!

Al, bal-dar zhe-p zhatyr, ol keremet de-p.

But, kid-pl. eat-VerMark lay-3rd-per., it wonderful say-PastPartic.

But, having said it is awesome, the young people are eating.

Guest Aunt Amina:

Men zhaksy- <Rus>Mne ne nrayat-sya moreprodukty (switches to Russian)

I good- <Rus>I-PossCase not like-pl seafood-pl.>

I well- <Rus>I don’t like seafood.>

Guest Aunt Amina: Magan-da una-ma-i-dy.
It turns out that there is a town in thirty kilometers. I also don’t like it.

They said if you go to that place, there is a Russian café.

They are making ‘pelmeni’, ‘bliny’ (names of Russian traditional food)

They are being completely not filled ‘swimming’ in the broth.

They are making ‘pelmeni’, ‘bliny’ (names of Russian traditional food)
<Rus>Blin-y> de-gen sheik-sheki.
<Rus>Blin-pl> call-PastPartic. undercooked-uncdercooked
So-called ‘bliny’ are completely undercooked.

Sin-and-pa kalta-sy toli aksha.
The pocket is full of money of that a just-mentioned running around man.

Moskva-niki.
From Moscow.
Bylai de-i-di, "Biz kys-ta" de-i-di,
Like this say-Ger-3rdper, “We winter-LocalCase,” say-Ger-3rdper,
He is saying like this, “We in winter,” he is saying,
"osy zher-de bo-la-myz, Vietnam-da."
“this land-LocalCase exist-Ger-1stper, Vitnam-LocalCase
“we stay in here, in Vietnam.”

“Al zhaz-din kyni Moskva-ga bar-yp zhat-a-myz,
“So summer-PossCase day-3rdper Moscow-DatCase go-VerbMark lay-Ger-1stpl.
“Then, we go back to Moscow and stay there in summer days,
kalta-myz-da aksha bar.”
Pocket-1stpl-LocalCase money exist.”
with money in our pockets.”

Aisulu’s Mother:
A nege kal-ma-i-di?
But why stay-not-Ger-3rdper?
Why do not he/they stay?

Guest Aunt Amina:
Al, ol zhak-ta <Rus>voobshe> ystyk bol-yp ket-e-di.
But, it side-LocalCase <Rus>completely hot exist-PastPartic. go-Ger-3rdper.
Well, it gets <Rus>absolutely> hot there.

Ol tek kyst-i kun-i.
It only fall-PossCase day-3rdper
It is only good in the fall days.

Kust-i kuni, biz <Rus>raz Nov-ii God> kars-yp al-dyk ta,
fall-PossCase day-3rdper we <Rus>how one New Year> celebrate-VM take-1stpl and,
Winter days, we celebrated <Rus>just the New Year> and,
samolet-pen ush-yt ket-tik.
Plain-Instr.Case fly-PastPartic. leave-1stpl
then left by plane.

Narrative Four: A Bad Russian Wife

1 Guest Aunt Amina: Bal-dar ekeu-nen artyk bol-ma-i-di.
Kid-pl. two-SourceCase extra exist-not-Ger-3rd per.
It is not extra to have more than two children.

2 Tort-eu- ush-eu. (looks at Aisulu)
Four-approximate-three- approximate
Approximate three or four (looks at Aisulu).

3 Aisulu: (laughter)
Guest Aunt Amina: Zhanagy, Just-mentioned,
A just-mentioned,
biz-din kuda bala-myz goi Ruslan goi endi at-y. 
we-PossCase in-laws son-1st pl indeed Name indeed now name-PossCase 
our in-laws’ son’s name is Name, indeed.

Ademy zhigit. SO:n-dai ademy!
Handsome man. THA:T-like handsome!
A handsome man. WHA:t handsome!

Orys-tyn kyz-yn akel-di.
Russian-PossCase girl-AccCase bring-3rd per.
He took a Russian girl as a wife.
Bir professor-dyn kyz-yn, Moskva-da ok-ip zhur-gen-de.
One professor-PossCase girl-AccCase, Moscow-LocalCase study-VerbMark. walk-PastPart-when
A professor’s daughter. (He met) when he was studying in Moscow.
Bir BALA-sy-men al-gan goi; kishketai bala-sy-men
One KID-3rd per-InstrCase al-PastPartic. indeed; small kid-3rd per-InstrCase
He took her with one her CHI:ld; very small her child.
Sol bala-syn ozi-nin aty-na zhazdyr-yyp al-gan goi.
That child-3rd AccC self-Poss name-DAT write-PST-PTCP. take-PastPartic. indeed.
Indeed, he gave that child his last name.

Aisulu: Um.
Guest Aunt Amina: <in a blaming/judging/resenting tone>O:l->
<in a blaming/judging/resenting tone>SHE:->
<in a blaming/judging/resenting tone>SHE:->
Ol Orys she mynau Ruslan-nan she torteu-in tu-yyp tasta-dy.
she Russian coll.part. this Name-SourseCase coll.part. four-AccCase birth-PastPart leave-3rd per
she, Russian, having given birth to four children from Name, left.
Ush ul, bir kyz tu-yyp tasta-dy.
three son, one girl birth-PastPart leave-3rd per.
Having given birth to three boys and one girl, she left.

Host Mother-in-law: Hm. (laughter)

Aisulu: Oh!
Guest Aunt Amina: Sony-men anau bala she oneki-ge kel-gen-de,
That-InstrCase that child coll.part. eleven-DatCase come-PastPart-when,
With this, when that child became eleven years old,
an-a-nin ake-si emes eke-nin bil-ip,
That-PossCase father-Poss,3rd per. not that-AccCase know-PastPartic.
having known that was not his father,
anau bala katty buzul-ip ket-ip-ti.
that child hard crack-PastPartic. go-Ger-3rd per.
that child completely got out of control.
Host Mother-in-law: <With a shock> Oi!>
<With a shock> Wow!>
Guest Aunt Amina: <With a shock> Wow!>

Host Mother-in-law: Son-dai de- zhanagy.
This-like and- just mentioned
Like this and- just mentioned

Guest Aunt Amina: psiholok-tar son-dai NA:gl-i ol bala-sy, kiyn bala de-p,
Psychologist-pl. this-like BO:Id that child-NomCase, difficult child say-PastPart
Psychologists have called like this child as a BO:Id child, as a difficult child.

Guest Aunt Amina: o-gan kyrgyz aksha ket-e-di eken.
it-DatCase war money go-Ger-3rd\textperplnr instead
A lot of money turn out to be going for such children.

Guest Aunt Amina: (shakes her head as a sign of disproval)

Guest Aunt Amina: That child very exhaust-3rd\textperplnr. they-pl.-AccCase
That children exhausted them so much,

Host Mother-in-law: Iya! Oi-io! (An exclamation that expresses a negative/judging attitude)
Yes! oi-io!

Guest Aunt Amina: Really! Oi-io! (An exclamation that expresses a negative/judging attitude)
Abden kigylyk sal-yp.
Very scandal put-PastPartic.
having made a lot of scandals.

Host Mother-in-law: (shakes her head as a sign of disproval)

Guest Aunt Amina: So-lai, men-nin kudaga-im ait-yp zhur-e-tyn,
This-like, I-PossCase in-law-1st\textperplnr say-PastPartic. walk-Ger-3rd\textperplnr.
My in-law was saying like this,

Guest Aunt Amina: “Ruslan, SO:N-dai kinal-ip zhur ana bala-dan.”
“Name, THI:S-like suffer-PastPart walk that child-SourceCase.”

Guest Aunt Amina: “Name is suffering from that child SO much.”

Guest Aunt Amina: So-nin balas-yn barin emdet-ip, <Rus:normal’no> kel-gen-de,
That-Poss child-ACC, 3rd\textperplnr per all help-PastPartic.,<Rus:normally> come-PastPart-when,
Having healed his child, when everything came to normal,

Orys-tar orys-ty-nyn iste-i-di goi, zheleb-ter zheleb-ti-gin iste-id,
Russian-pl. Russian-Acc-PossCase search-Ger-3rd\textperplnr indeed, liar-pl fake excuse- Acc-PossCase search-Ger-3rd\textperplnr

Indeed, Russians are looking for Russians, liars are looking for lies/excuses.
Indeed, Russians do as Russians, prostitutes are doing as prostitutes

Guest Aunt Amina: Hmm.

Guest Aunt Amina: <In an angry tone> BA:LA::SHA:ga-syn tasta-p bai-ga tu-ip ket-ti goi, zhana kelin!>
<In an angry tone> HOU:SE:HO:Id-ACC-3 leave-PastPartic. man-DAT birth-PastPartic leave-3rd\textperplnr indeed,
<Angry tone> Having left A:LL CHI:ldren, this mentioned wife went away with another man!>

Host Mother-in-law: Oi! (As an expression of a shock)

Guest Aunt Amina: Endi Sofia zhetis-ken-i-nen bar-yp otyr-gan zhok,
Now Name reach-with-PastPartic-Ger-SourceCase go-PastPartic. sit-PastPartic not
Now, Name of in-law had not sat for one minute, achieve-PST-3-LOC
She is not sitting at home not because of big achievements

Host Mother-in-law: Wow! (as an expression of surprise)
38 Guest Aunt Amina: anau neme-ler-in kara-p otyr.
those grandkid-pl.3rd per watch-VerbMark. sit.
She is watching those grandchildren.

39 Eni, kishkentai kyz-y, bar-go, ali ush-ke tol-gan zkok,
Now, little girl-NomCase, exist indeed, yet three-DatCase reach-PastPartic. not,
You know, the little girl had not become three years old yet,
soni tasta-p ket-ken goi.
that leave-PastPartic. go-PastPartic. indeed.
she left her and went away.

41 Host Mother-in-law: <shakes her head>Oi-<io!> (as an expression of disproval)
42 Aisulu: (shakes head as a disapproval sign)
43 Guest Aunt Amina: Onyn sheshe son-dai,
O-PossCase mother-NomCase,3rd per this-like,
Her mother is like this,

44 <Rus>neusheli> bir ZHA:ksy kyz-dy al-yp ma-i-dy?
<Rus>really> one GOO:d girl-AccCase take-PastPartic take-not-Ger-3rd per?
really, why does not he take a GOO:d girl?"’

45 Host Mother-in-law: Iya, iya.
Yes, yes.

46 Host Mother-in-law: Aide!??
Really?!?
Really?!?

47 Guest Aunt Amina: Endi, men ait-a-myn da,
Now, I say-1"per and
Well, I ask and,

48 "Ai, Ruslan degen KA:ndai ademi zhigit, ozi KA:ndai <Rus>professor>,
“Hey, Name call-PastPartic. WHA:t handsome man, self WHA:T <Rus>professor>,
“Listen, Name is WHA:t a handsome man, WHA:t a professor himself,
<Rus>really> one GOO:d girl-AccCase take-PastPartic take-not-Ger-3rd per?"

49 Host Mother-in-law: Iya, iya.
Yes, yes.

50 Host Mother-in-law: (shakes head)

51 Guest Aunt Amina: "Ulen-gysy kel-me-i-dy onyn," de-i-dy.
“marry-AccCase come-not-Ger-3rd per it-PossCase.” say-ger-3rd per.
“He has not desire to marry,” they are saying.

52 Host Mother-in-law: (shakes head)

53 Aisulu: Umm.

54 Host Daughter-in-law: Bet-i kait-kan-0 goi, betti-
Face-NomCase turn away-PastPartic. indeed face-NomCase
Trust died, trust- (He has burned out/ He turned his face)

Those kid-pl.-AccCase die-PastPartic. die-PastPartic. sit.
He is dyeing but is taking care of those children.
Love till death. Vseobemlemo

56 Host Mother-in-law: 

57 Guest Aunt Amina: (clatters)  


59 Guest Aunt Amina: <With an anger> That wife-DatCase> look-Infin-DatCase. permission give-3rdper indeed.  

60 Guest Aunt Amina: <With an anger> To that wife> he gives a permission to see, indeed.  

61 Guest Aunt Amina: Bal-lar-dy? Detei?  


63 Host Mother-in-law: <shakes head> Iya.>  

64 Host Mother-in-law: <shakes head> Yes>  

65 Host Mother-in-law: <shakes her head> Yes.>  

66 Guest Aunt Amina: Mynau endi bajgus-tar (neschastnie)  

67 Guest Aunt Amina: Onda, oyak-ta biz-din Kazak bol-sa,  

68 Guest Aunt Amina: Then, there-LocalCase our—PossCase Kazakh exist-CondMood,  

69 Guest Aunt Amina: In this case, if our Kazakh was there  

70 Guest Aunt Amina: tasyldat-yp salastr-ip kaityp kel-me-i-di goi.  

71 Guest Aunt Amina: Make-noise-PastPartic., quarrel-PastPartic. again come-not-Ger-3rd per indeed.  

72 Guest Aunt Amina: having made noise and scandals, would not come back again, indeed  

73 Guest Aunt Amina: (Rastalkivya loktem)  

74 Guest Aunt Amina:  

75 Guest Aunt Amina: Iya.  

76 Guest Aunt Amina: Yes.  

77 Host Mother-in-law:  

78 Host Mother-in-law: Iya.  

79 Host Mother-in-law: Yes.  

80 Host Mother-in-law:  

81 Host Mother-in-law: Ish-i-nizder, ish-i-nizder.  

82 Host Mother-in-law: Drink-Ger-2ndpl.polite, Drink-Ger-2ndpl.polite,  

83 Host Mother-in-law: Please, drink, drink.
APPENDIX C: FULL TRANSCRIPTS OF NARRATIVES FOR CHAPTER FIVE

Narrative One: Half a liter of milk

1 Male Neighbor  Saken biz-den eki zhyl ulken. Eki-Neighbor’s name we-SOR two year big. Two-Saken is older us two years. Two-

2 Female Hostess Saken kal-dy goi. Neighbor’s name leave-PST-3 indeed. Neighbor’s name only left.

3 Male Neighbor Saken kal-dy goi. Neighbor’s name leave-PST-3 indeed. Neighbor’s name only left.

4 Saken kal-dy goi. Neighbor’s name leave-PST-3 indeed. Neighbor’s name only left.

5 Saken, zhe-p zhe-p kal-dy goi. Neighbor’s name eat-PTCL eat-PTCL leave-PST-3 indeed Neighbor’s name indeed left having eaten.

7 Female Hostess Bil-e-sin ba balye? Know-PRG-2 ques. particle story? Do you know the story?

9 Male Neighbor Iya (?) Yes. Yes.

10 Female Hostess Meny-m zharty litr syt-ym ushin zhynal-yp katal-gan. My-I half liter milk-POSS-1 for gather-PTCP hungry-PST Because of my half litter of milk, they gathered being “hungry”.

11 Male Neighbor (laughing) Ai, Alai, (?) ol da korset-ken (goi). Oh, Allah, (?) he too show-PST indeed. (laughing) Oh, Allah, (non-audible) he also showed.

12 Female Hostess Ai! Serikbai markym bar. Ai! Neighbor’s name died exist. Ai! Dead Neighbor’s name was.

13 <Kak raz>Rus> Altai otpusk-e ket-ken. Altai ozin de zhangal.<That time>Rus> Name vacation-LOC go-PST. Name herself too scandalous.<At that time>Rus> Name went to vacation. Name herself is very scandalous.

14 Male Neighbor (non-audible)

15 Female Hostess <Kor-din ba? > <Kak raz>Rus> sol kun-e, (See-2 QP?) <That time>Rus> that day-DAT (Did you see?) <That time>Rus> on that day,

16 Saken, Neighbor’s name Neighbor’s name
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(?-ten)zhok kap-ken onga-p byz onay zharmal-aytn zher-den,
(?-INST) no bag-INST fill-PTCP we that crush grain-PTCP land-SOR
With (?)- no having filled with bags from that milling place
artyk mashinye mynau ui-ne zhiber-di-0.
extra car this house-DAT send-PST-3
sent an extra car to this house.
Bir teleshke shopti,
One truck hay-3,
One truck with hay,
Serikpai markym yi-ne zheber-gen.
Neighbor’s name deceased house-DAT send-PST.
he sent to the house of deceased Neighbor’s name.
Ol kezde.
That time-LOC
That time.
Oi, bir kini zhinalyk-ka tart-tik goi.
Ah, one day-3 meeting-DAT go-PAST-1PL indeed.
Ah, one day we went to the (village) meeting.
(Old de shynadi?). Endi, "Anau Maira ku:n-e:
(He too gather-PST-3). Now, “That Maira day-each
(He also gathered). Now, “That Maira every day
bir (zharyn) sut-ti al-a-dy goi!” de-di-0.
one (half) milk-ACC take-PRG-3 indeed!” say-PST-3.
is taking one bottle of milk!” he said.
Ah! Sosyn (beedon zharyn) Serikpai bast-a-dy.
Ah! Then (jar half) Neighbor’s name begin-PRG-3.
Ah! Than Neighbor’s name started because of half of a jar.
"Ai, apke-n Kazybek shaup (ui-ge) ket-pe-di.
“Hey, older sister-2 Name cut-PTCP (home-DAT) go-not-PST-3.
“Hey, your older sister did not go (home) having cut grass.
(Zhangal) kesh reti bir teleshka shopti apar-yt ui-ge
(Scandalous) late time-3 one truck hay take-PTSP house-DAT be-PST no-2SIG QP?
(Scandalous) did not you take a truck of hay to the house in the late time?
Al, zhangal (kais_pen) onga-p mashina zhem sen (you) bol-gan zhok-sin ba?"
Now, (scandalous) (relative-INST) fill-PTCP car grain you (house) be-PST no-2SIG QP?
Now, (scandalous) weren' t you who had filled a car with grains with (relatives)?
Sondai apke-ler-in tastr-yp ket-pe-di?"
Likethis older sister-PL-2SG task-PTSP leave-not-PST-3?
Didn’t your older sisters send you having given this order?
(Uip) tastryp-ty. "
(??-PTCP) task- PST-3.”
(Having ?-) they gave you this order.
Lay de-gen zhok. Zhai (taganda-p, "Barin shygardin, ot!”)
Nothing say-PST no. Just (stay still-PTCP, “All exit-PTC-2SG, pass by!)
He said nothing. Just (he stood still, “You said everything, now pass by!)

Ai, Kudai-m, adam ba!
Oh, God-1SIG, person QP!
Oh, my God, is this a human!?

"Kajdan basta-di-n ba?" Saken artynan okinip-ti goi.
"Where-SOUR start-PST-2SIG QP?" Neighbor’s name behind offend-PTS-3 indeed.
"Where did you start?" Neighbor’s name got offended afterwards.

Sybaga myz al-dy k ta.
Half 1PL take-PST-1PL too.
We all got our punishment.

Soitken Saken ali kal-di.
Therefore Neighbor’s name only leave-PST-3.
Therefore Neighbor’s name only left.

Aisulu’s Mother
Kazir bajtal-din bagasy kansha-dan?
Now female horse-ACC price-3 how-SOURCE?
How much is the price for a female horse?

Narrative Two: A stolen knife

(Neighbor X) not. Neighbor X that time-DAT that. Good person-3 be-PST-3 indeed.
Neighbor’s name was really a good person.

Good person-3. That Female Neighbor’s name father-3 like. Father-3 oh.
A good person. He was like a female neighbor’s father. Father.

3 Male Neighbor Nede doika-da,
Where milking-LOC,
Where at the milking,

4 bak-im-di osylai tasta-p sal-dy-m (showing that put like under the table)
knife-1SIG-ACC like this leave-PTCP put-PST-1SIG ()
I left my knife like this (showing that put it like under the table).

5 Serle-mi birdeme- Kokysh et-ke- et-siz kyl-ma-j-dy:
Rib-ACC something- Name meat-DAT meat-LESS work-not-PRG-PST-3
A rig- something- Neighbor’s name could not work for meat- without meat:
anda-sonda bir serlerine kar-a-dy.
here-where one rib look-PRG-PST-3
He was looking for a rib here and there.

Yes, that time I (like this) buy-PST meat-1SIG-ACC steal-PTCP eat-PST-2PL.
Yes, having stolen, you ate like this the meat that I bought.

8 Male Neighbor Sol, bylai ah- endi ah-
So, like this uh- now uh-
So, like this uh- now uh-

9 Kokysh (karyndash-ip) otyr-gan-da sol zher-de.
Neighbor’s name hungry- PTCP sit-PST-too that place-LOC
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Being hungry, Neighbor’s name was sitting at that place.

10 Ai (men aina-da) izde-i-im, bak-im zhok.
Ai (men outside-LOC) search-PRG-1SIG, kniefe-1SIG not. 
Oh, I was searching (outside there), there was not my knife.

11 (Oger) akry:n zhagal-ap otyr-yp
(With lost) carefully: walk long-PTCP sit down-PTCP
(With this loss) carefully: having walked along and sat down,

12 Sokyshtin yuj-ne kel-di-m.
Neighbor-POSS house-DAT come-PST-1SIG.
I came to the house of neighbor’s name.

13 Sosyn, birdene (aur-ip) tur dep. 
Then, something (sick-PTCP) stay say-PTCP.
Then, something (blanket) like this say-PST-3 only.

14 Female Hostess
Koksyi?
Husband’s name?
Husband’s name?

15 Male Neighbor
Zhok, kempir.
No, old woman.
No, old woman (meaning his wife).

16 Female Hostess
Ah:
Oh:
Oh:

17 Male Neighbor
"Oi, bai, kalta-m-da bak-im zhok," de-di-m.
“Oh, Lord, pocket-1SIG-LOC knife-1SIG no,” say-PST-1SIG
“Oh, Lord, there is no my knife in my pocket.” I said.

18 Algi bak-im-di ah- uh- bak-i meniki.
But knife-1SIG-ACC oh- uh- knife-3 my.
But my knife- oh- uh- that knife is mine.

19 (Sol birt-pe-i-di/Su ket-pe-j-di)
(Water go-not-PRG-3)
The water does not go away (meaning this is true)

20 Endi, men sosyn ajt-ty-m.
Now I then say-PST-1SIG
Well, I said then,

21 "A ist-ep ber-di-n ba bak-i-ni?" ysta-p tur-dy-m.
“Hey, fix-PTCP give-PST-2SIG QP knife-3-ACC?” hold-PTCP stand-PST-1SIG
“Hey, did you fix this knife?” I stood holding it.

22 "Mynau bak-i-ni kim ber-di-0 (sen-ge)?"
“This knife-3-ACC who give-PST-3 (you-DAT)?"
“Who gave you this knife?”

23 "Mynau, Kulyani ber-di-0."
“This, wife’s name give-PST-3.”
“My wife gave me this.”

24 Female Hostess
Onyn ondaj-lar-i bar goi. 
Ondaj-lar-gi mol. 
Yh:
Her this-PL-3 exist indeed. This-PL-ACC a lot. Yak.
She is notorious for such things. She has many such habits. Yak.

25 Male Neighbor
Ai, bit-i-ne bir kar-a-dy-m da kalta-ma beh (laugh) sal-y p sal-dy-m da.
Oh, face-3-DAT one look-PRG-PST-1SIG and pocket-DAT ha put-PTS put-PST-1SIG and.
Oh, I looked at the face once and put in the pocket having folded it.

26 Male Neighbor
Now (steal-PTS sit-PST-1SIG). "Oh, Allah, Allah," say-PRG-3SIG
Then, I sat having stolen it. "Oh, Allah, Allah," he is saying
"Ai, Kulyan-nin, kalai iste-j-di, kalai iste-j-di?"
“Oh, wife’s name-POSS, how do-PRG-3, how do-PRG-3?"
“Oh, this is of wife’s name, how is she doing this, how is she doing this?”

29 (non-audible)
"Nege (kasyn) birdink-i ma, keler bas-yn bir ozin.”
“What (near) someone-POSS QP, future head-2SIG one long.”
“If there is nearby someone’s thing, your head is long.”

30 Female Hostess
Oi, sondai!
Oh, this like!
Oh, this is like!

31 Male Neighbor
/Bylai kozbe-koz, sonda, bylai zhurip cypyryp alyp ketken./
/“Allai, (kozbe-ge cy), bylai zhur sypyrl-ap ket-e-dy.”/
“Allah, (vagrant-DAT water), this-like walk sweep-PTCP go-PRG-3SIG.”
“Allah, (like a water for a vagrant), she walk like this and go away having swept/stolen things.”

Narrative Three: ‘Shared’ meat

32 Female Hostess
Nur ata-m makym tiri.
Name grandfather-1SIG deceased alive.
My grandfather was alive.

33 Male Neighbor
Sol bir zhylky soj-y, bel-e-sin ba?
That one horse slaughter-PTCP know-PRG-2SIG QP?
He had slaughtered one horse, do you know?

34 Female Hostess
Ol-dan tort kele al-dy-m "Men uyj-ge bal-lar-ga.”
He-INS four kilogram take-PST-1SIG “I home-DAT child-PL-DAT.” say-PTCP
I took four kilograms from him having said, “I take for children for home.”

35 Female Hostess
Kokysh shopyr, uh: Lajlya ushetchik.
Neighbor’s name driver, uh: female neighbor’s name accountant.
Neighbor’s name is driver, uh: female neighbor’s name is accountant.

36 Male Neighbor
Sodan kejynn siyr sau-y p ber-dy-m, katar-katar.
Then later cow milk give-PST-1SIG, row-row.
Then, later, I milked the cow, one-after-one.

37 (Akemi ylga-dy-m/ Akeli yza kyla tugyn) shaj iship.
/?/ tea drink-PTCP.
"?/ drank tea.

Endi, kara-dy-m bir uakyt-ta,
Now, look-PST-1SIG ne time-LOC
Now, I looked one time (through the window)

bari (zhurnan-zhurnan) zhugir-ip zhur. Zhugir-ip zhur.
all (quickly-quickly) run-PTCP walk. Run-PTCP walk.
everyone (quickly-quickly) was running around. Running around.

But, I-POSS meat-1SIG car-LOC. I car-LOC stay-PTCP sit-1SIG.
But, my meat is in the car. I sit thinking that my meat is in the car.

Sosyn- kasynda onda Sara goi. Sara markym-ga ajt-ty-m,
Then- near- that time female name indeed. Female name deceased-DAT say-PST-1SIG.
Then- near me that time was female’s name. I told to deceased female’s name.

"Ai, Sara, sen ne bil-e-sin?" de-di-m.
“Hey, Sara, you what know-PRG-2SIG?” say-PST-1SIG
“Hey, Sara, do you know anything?” I asked.

God itself that two-ACC horse (time) bad, I- POSS meat-1SIG-ACC cook-PTCP sit.
God, themselves two of that horse meat (at bad time), my meat was cooking.

"Bari bir, endi, ata-m zhogary (shyk-sa-n),
“All one, now, father-1SIG high (exit-if-2SIG),
“Whatever, now, if grandfather (goes up)

birge shyg-ip pisiri-p otyr-dy, birge zhe-j-min,” de-di-m.
together exit-PTCP cook-PTCP sit-PST-3, together eat-PRG-1SIG” say-PST-1SIG
they exited and cooked together, together I will eat,” I said.

Male Neighbor

("laugh")

Female Hostess

Sodan, anau ne-gen korash-tan bar-yp tuz-i akel-gen,
Then, that that-SOR storeroom-SOR go-PTCP salt-3 bring-PST,
Then, I brought salt from that- from the storeroom,

sodan bar-yp un-i akel-gen, nan zhaj-gan (eke pi-) ma!
that-SOUR go-PTCP flour-3 bring-PST, bread make-PST (about do-) look!
after I brought flour, I made bread (about do-) look!

Sodan Saken kel-di goi.
Then, neighbor’s name come-PST-3 indeed.
Then, neighbor’s name came.

Endi et-ti al-yp zhana tur-ap zhat-kan-da, Kokysh ait-a-dy Saken-ge
Now, meat-ACC take-PTCP mentioned cut-PTCP do-PTS-when, neighbor 1 say-PRG-3 neighbor 2-DAT.

Now, having taken the meat, we were cutting it, the neighbor 1 said to neighbor 2

"Ol et-ti nege zhe-jyn de-p otyr-syn?" de-j-dy.
“This meat-ACC why eat-let think-PTCP sit-2SIG?” say-PRG-3
“Why do you sitting like let’s eat this meat?” he was saying.

"Iya. Kaj-dan bile-j-myn kishkene otyr de-gen-sin otyr-dy-m." de-j-dy. Now-
“Yes, where-SOUR know-1SIG a bit sit say-PST-2SIG sit-PST-1SIG.” say-PRG-3.
“Yes. How do I know since you said sit down I sat.” he was answering.

"Maira sagaundryk-ka kosl-ajyn de-p otyr.”
“Teller’s name treat-DAT join-let like think-PTCP sit.”
“Teller’s name sits like letting her join to the treat.”

55
“That meat-ACC like this shame-not-PRG eat-PRG-2PL QP?” say-PRG-3
“Will you eat this meat without any shame?” he was saying.

56
"Ket!" de-dim. (laugh)
“Go away!” say-PST-1SIG
“Go away!” I said.

57  Male Neighbor (laugh)
58  Female Hostess  Et ta bol-ip zhe-p al-dik (laughing). (?)
Meat too divide-PTCP eat-PTCP take-PST-1PL
Having divided meat, we ate it. (laughing) (non-audible).

Money too ask-PST-1SIG no-1SIG, even meat-ACC ask-PST-1SIG no-1SIG, what happen-PRG-3SIG.
I did not ask either money or even meat. What will this change?

60  Birak <molodec>Rus> eh aksh-syn zhina-p ber-di.
But <good person>Rus> uh money-ACC collect-PTCP give-PST-3.
But he is <a fine fellow>Rus> uh gave the money having collected it.

61  Uj-ge al-yp apar-dy aksh-syn. Ne iste-j-myn?
Home-DAT take-PTCP take-PST-3 money-ACC. What do-PRG-1SIG?
He brought the monwy to the house. What would I do?

62  Et-ti zhe-p al-gan-syn onin ursys- ne ursys-pa-dyn ne?
Meat-ACC eat-PTCP take-PST-2SIG that-GEN fight what fight-not-PTCP what?
Why did not you fight that you took the meat?

63  Neighbor: Kaite-sin ol daur /Kazak or kyzyk dunie goi.
Leave-2SIG that dispute, Kazakh world indeed.
Leave that dispute, this is /Kazakh or interesting/ life/world.

**Narrative Four and Five: Retirement Payment and Savior Eran**

1  Female Hostess  Pensiya-n kansha? Bir uh alyps-zhetyps myn bol-a ma?
Pension-2SIG how much? One uh sixty-seventy thousands exist-PRG QP?
How much is your pension? Is it sixty-seventy thousands at least?

2  Male Neighbor  Alpys-ka tol- tol- zorga tol-di-0 goi.
Sixty-DAT reach- reach- hardly reach-PST-3 indeed.
It hardly reached sixty thousands.

3  Ah, (kyr-gin) nesi tolu-
Oh, (with fight) that reach-
Oh, reach- that with a fight.

4  Ajtpese bizdiki
Otherwise, ours
Otherwise, ours-

5  Ne (zhyrta) zhur-di-k.
What (specially/purposefully/for site) walk-PST-1PL.
That we (specially/purposefully/for site) went (?) Seksen bar de-m.

Eighty exit think-1SIG.
I think/hope it is eighty.

Seksenbai  myna-nin- Seksanbai-ga- kyrykpau-din kazy berdin ba kim-

Neighbor’s name this-GEN Neighbor’s name-DAT ka- sheep-GEN rib give-PST-2SIG who-

Neighbor 1 this- Neighbor 1 sheep’s ribs gave to who-

bir tai ber-e-m.
one horse give-PRG-1SIG.
I will give one horse

kule anau zhandagy entire that nearby
for all of that nearby

iste-gen-der-din kule akshas-na anau- anau- bar goi
Work-PST-PL-GEN entire money-DAT that- that be indeed.
for all earned money (of co-workers), you know.

Al, Seken da solai isteptti goi.
Also, neighbor’s name too that-like make-PST-3 indeed.
Also, Neighbor 2 did like this too.

Maira, Sagyndik, yeah- Sharik, bari mashina aina-p/ajda-p tugil. "Biz birney ber- "
Neighbor X, eighbor Y, yes- male neighbor, all car drive-PST even “We one give-“
Female neighbor, male neighbor, yes, all of them even drove a car together “We will give one-“

Female Hostess Ait- Ait- Seken istei-gen-nin Maira goi.
Say- Say- Neighbor do-PST-GEN wife’s name indeed.
Tell- tell- his wife is behind what he did.

Male Neighbor (laugh) Zhok. (?) akshan-y-.
(laugh) No. (?) money-ACC
(laugh) No. (?) regarding money.

Male Hostess: Oh, aitkan-sa-n.
Oh, say-PST-COND-2SIG
Oh, if you said this.

Male Neighbor Yeah.
Yes.

Male Hostess: Maira ma-gan bir ait-ty.
Female neighbor’s name me-DAT one say-PST-3.
Female neighbor once told me.

"Siz-din auzy-ny-z aur goi, kop eshteme ait-pa-syz.
“Your-GEN mouth-GEN-2POL heavy indeed, a lot nothing say-NEG-2POL.
“Your mouth is heavy, you do not talk much.

Men alem-di/alym-dy solai al-yp otyr-myn."
I money-ACC that-like take-PTCP sit-1SIG.”
I’m receiving money in this way too.”

"Toka ma- ana- bir negli-niz." De-p
“But this- that- one do-2POL.” Say-PTCP.
“But this- that one do not say.” she said.

21 Sol, men artnin ne sem-be-di-m.
That, I inside what understand-NEG-PST-1SIG.
That, I did not understand what was behind.

(look-PTCP, listen-PTCP, they everything load-PTCP walk-PTCP come back-PST-3
Having looked and listened, they fixed everything there and came back.

23 Kyz-ini-kin barin.
Daughter-ACC-GEN everything.
A daughter’s all matters.

24 Female Hostess Iya.
Yes.
Yes.

25 Male Neighbor Alai, (keltir-ip) bol-dy-r goi.
Allah, make invite-PTCP be-PST-3 indeed.
Allah, he made me come to his place.

26 Me-nin oslai ah: (pointing at the other side of the table) Serikpai-lar
I-GEN that-like uh neighbor’s name-PL
I was sitting like this (pointing at the other side of the table) neighbor’s name

28 Anau- bir ap-pak kyzy bil-e-sin goj?
That- one white-white daughter-3 know-PRG-2SIG indeed?
That- one very white daughter, do you know?

29 Female Hostess Ol hoz-
She hoz-
She hoz-

30 Male Neighbor Sogan ne boldy goj, (?)
That-DAT what happen-PST-3 indeed, (?)
What happened to her? (non-audible)

31 Female Hostess Kokeshtau-da bol-a-dy kazir.
Town’s name-LOC be-PRG-3 now.
She is now in town’s name

32 Male Neighbor Sol kez-de (tup-tubeijn) ma?
That time-LOC (double check) QP?
At that time (double check) ?

33 Female Hostess Iya.
Yes.
Yes.

34 Male Neighbor Endi zheti- zhetpis zhes- tenge shygar-ti goi. (laugh)
Now seven- seventy seven- tenge raise-PST-3 indeed
Now, it raised up to seven- seventy seven- tenge.

35 Zhety-ge ma zhetpis-tyk Kudain bir zhetisti-ne goi.
Seven-DAT QP seventy-like God one sevenish-DAT indeed.
Oh God, up to seven- or seventy-like something up seventy.

36 Ol sagyn-dik bil-me-j-di. “Myne, kel” dep, "Zhakyr-ti-n ma?"
He (missing-ACC) know-NEG-PRG-3. “This, come.” say-PTCP, “Call-PST-2SIG QP?”
He doesn’t know missing. “This, come over.” He said, “Did you call?”

Endi, zharaidy, zhyk-ka kun-ga tar-pa-j-min, bol-sa-da.
Now, let it be, exit-DAT day-DAT go-NEG-PRG-1SIG, be-COND-too.
Now, let it be, I will not go to the retirement party even it is going to be.

Boyag-da kirsi bokpyl, kirsi bokpyl min?
Previously-LOC greedy be-PST, greedy be-PST, I?
Previously, I was greedy, was greedy?

Oitkene "Oi, Kudai, men-i ultre ma?” Eran kel-di.
Because of “Oh, God, I-ACC kill QP?” Name come-PST-3
Daughter’s name “Oh, God, will he kill me? Came because of this.

Boyag-da kirsi bokpyl, kirsi bokpyl min?
Previously-LOC greedy be-PST, greedy be-PST, I?
Previously, I was greedy, was greedy?

Oitkene "Oi, Kudai, men-i ultre ma?” Eran kel-di.
Because of “Oh, God, I-ACC kill QP?” Name come-PST-3
Daughter’s name “Oh, God, will he kill me? Came because of this.

Boyag-da kirsi bokpyl, kirsi bokpyl min?
Previously-LOC greedy be-PST, greedy be-PST, I?
Previously, I was greedy, was greedy?

Oitkene "Oi, Kudai, men-i ultre ma?” Eran kel-di.
Because of “Oh, God, I-ACC kill QP?” Name come-PST-3
Daughter’s name “Oh, God, will he kill me? Came because of this.

Boyag-da kirsi bokpyl, kirsi bokpyl min?
Previously-LOC greedy be-PST, greedy be-PST, I?
Previously, I was greedy, was greedy?

Oitkene "Oi, Kudai, men-i ultre ma?” Eran kel-di.
Because of “Oh, God, I-ACC kill QP?” Name come-PST-3
Daughter’s name “Oh, God, will he kill me? Came because of this.

Boyag-da kirsi bokpyl, kirsi bokpyl min?
Previously-LOC greedy be-PST, greedy be-PST, I?
Previously, I was greedy, was greedy?

Oitkene "Oi, Kudai, men-i ultre ma?” Eran kel-di.
Because of “Oh, God, I-ACC kill QP?” Name come-PST-3
Daughter’s name “Oh, God, will he kill me? Came because of this.

Boyag-da kirsi bokpyl, kirsi bokpyl min?
Previously-LOC greedy be-PST, greedy be-PST, I?
Previously, I was greedy, was greedy?

Oitkene "Oi, Kudai, men-i ultre ma?” Eran kel-di.
Because of “Oh, God, I-ACC kill QP?” Name come-PST-3
Daughter’s name “Oh, God, will he kill me? Came because of this.

Boyag-da kirsi bokpyl, kirsi bokpyl min?
Previously-LOC greedy be-PST, greedy be-PST, I?
Previously, I was greedy, was greedy?

Oitkene "Oi, Kudai, men-i ultre ma?” Eran kel-di.
Because of “Oh, God, I-ACC kill QP?” Name come-PST-3
Daughter’s name “Oh, God, will he kill me? Came because of this.
So-nyn kozi-ne bes zhuz tog-gen-min (laugh)
That-GEN eye-DAT five hundreds pour-PST-1SIG
To his eyes, I “poured/wasted/added” five hundreds.
(laughter) Sorgai-ga lek-ti-k goi.
(laughter) That-DAT move forward-PST-1PL indeed.
(laugh) For that, we collected/threw off money.
So-da:n (ajt-tym) zhyrma-ga lek-ti-k ah:
That-SOUR (say-1SIG) twenty-DAT
From that time, we collected/threw off money for twentieth anniversary
Zhyirma-bes-ke lek-ti-k, otyz-ga lek-ti-k.
Twenty-five-DAT move forward-PST-1PL, thirty-DAT move forward-PST-1PL.
We collected for the twenty-fifth, we collected for thirtieth anniversaries.
Sana-ma-di-m.
Count-NEG-PST-1SIG
I didn’t count.
Koskarta-ip kosyl-yip otyr.
Make openly attack-PTCP join-PTCP sit-3.
Having openly pushed to join, they sit.
A: olar-di bular-din-i-ki sal-di-m.
O: they-ACC those-GEN-ACC put-PST-1SIG
O: I contributed for some of their events. (pointing at the window)
Neighbor’s name nine year QP exit-PST-3. Neighbor’s name exit-PST-3
Neighbor 1 retired sometime in ninth year. Neighbor 2 retired.
Sosyn Aitzhan shykty, sosyn analar kim-
Then, female neighbor’s name exit-PST-3, then those who-
Then, female neighbor retired, then those how-
kazir- kur- kazir- Serekpai- Alynai she- Altnai- kim-
now- that- now- male neighbor’s name, female neighbor’s name, who-
wait- that- wait male neighbor’s name, female neighbor’s name, who-
Balkiyar shyk-ty.
Male neighbor’s name exit-PST-3
Male neighbor 3 retired.
Balkiyar tokeme shyk-ty goi.
Male neighbor’s name directly exit-PST-3
Male neighbor 3 directly retired.
Allai.
Allah.
Allah.
Female Hostess Menin trudovoj endi anau-
I-GEN labor book now that-
My labor registration book that-
Narrative Six: A local café

1 Female Hostess Ol shortan-da eki bala iste-j-di: Bir Bolat, bir Bakyty.
That town-LOC two kid work-PRG-3. One male name, another male name.
So, the two kid are working in the town’s name. One is a name, another is a name.

2 <Vot, vot>Rus> Bakyt, Bakyty.
<Right, right>Rus> second male name, second male name,
<Right, right>Rus> second male name, second male name,
3 Sol ekeuda shortan-da <da>Rus>?
That two town-LOC <yes>Rus?
Both are in the town’s name, <yes>Rus?

4 Ekeuda Shportanda.
Two-too town-LOC.
Both are in the town’s name.

5 Aisulu’s mother Aktorgai ademi bol-a-tin goi da?Ademi da.
Female name beautiful exist-PRG-
Female is beautiful.

6 Female Hostess Bolaty kelin al-ajyn dep otyr.
Son’s name daughter-in-law take-let think-PTCP sit-3.
Son’s name is planning to take a daughter-in-law.

7 Aisulu’s mother Ah.

8 Female Hostess Osy auldan
This village-SOUR
From this village.

9 Osy auldan
This village-SOUR
From this village.

10 Aisulu’s mother Mhm.

11 Female Hostess Zhyirma ushime? Bil-me-j-min. <Svad’basy>Rus>.
Twenty-third? Know-Not-PRG-1SIG.<Wedding>Rus>.
Twenty-third? I don’t know. <Wedding>Rus>.

12 Aisulu’s mother Mhm.

13 Female Hostess Mynau zher-de kafe tur-a-dy. Kafe bar. Sonda birdeme ot-e me?
This place-LOC café stand-PRG-3. Café exist. Where something go-PRG QP?
There is a café at this place. There is a café. Is anything happening there?

14 Sol- sol Aktorgaj-lar-dyn kafe.
That- that female name-PL-GEN café.
That- that is female name their café.

15 Aisulu’s mother Ah!

16 Female Hostess Ol sol kezin-de-gi (points towards window)
She that time-LOC-GEN
She at that time,

17 sovhoz kula-gan kez-de solardi Bolat-i nede iste-di goi
sovhoz fall-PST time-LOC their son where- work-PST-3 indeed.
The time when sovhoz fell, their son’s name work where-

Sonda sol-
That time that-
That time that

Everythi:ng <write off-PTS, everything what do-PTS let go-PST take. That this.
They having written off everythin:ng, they having let it go, they took over it (cafe).That is it.

Sony ozderi-ne tusur-ip,
That them-DAT take in possession-PTCP
They took it into their possession.

Aisulu’s mother
Mhm.

Female Hostess
That what do-PTCP. This village-LOC canteen be-PST-3 indeed.
This what they did. There was a canteen in this village.

Aisulu’s mother
Mhm.

Female Hostess
Zhana-dan sal-gan.
New-SOUR build-PST.
It was newly built.

Sony barin at-tar-ya-na tusirip al-yp kazir kafe.
That all name-PL-DAT take-PTS now cafe.
Having put it all under their names, this is a cafe now.

Kazir nemene?
Now what?
Now what matters?

Bir kun svad’ba bol-a-dy,
One day <Wedding>Rus> be-PRG-3
Edward>Rus> is one day,

bir kuni (duga) bol-a-di, bir kuni tugan kun bol-a-dy.
one day (arrangement) be-PRG-3, one day birthday be-PRG-3.
arrangement is another day, birthday is another day.

Son-yn barine aksha al-a-dy. Okirt-ip! Kazir ne?
That-ACC everything money take-PRG-3. Rake-PTCT! Now what?
They take money for everything. Having raked money! Now what matters?

Tzinik-ti.
Understand-PST-3.
Understood.

Ol kez-de nemene?
That time-LOC what?
What mattered that time?

Narrative Seven: A neighbor who died young

Female Hostess
Elu-segizin-de kajt-ty-3.
Fifty-eight-LOC die-PST-3
He died at fifty eight.
Aisulu’s Mother
Zhapanzas.
Young-young.
Very young.

Female Hostess
Zhakty.
Young die-PST.
He died young.

Aisulu’s Mother
Zhakty.
Young die-PST.
He died young.

Female Hostess
Kanshataj-ge bir (urusty) eshkim kerek kyl-3.
Name-DAT one (shouted) nobody necessary make-NEG-PST.
Nobody cared/find it necessary to say to Neighbor/him.

Tanerten-tennyshke dejen, au-na bir eski treko:,
Early SOUR late-DAT till, air-LOC thin sweat pants,
From early morning till late in the evening, outside, in a thin sweatpants,
Balala-ravyn pesin soy koktepe-kokeyke-ete zhure-3.
Child-PL-GEN what that (one-on-another) wear-PRG-AND walk-PRG-3.SG.
He would put (one-on-another) children’s clothes on and walk around.

Sosyn men urs-a-myn,
Then, I shout-PRG-1.SG.
Then, I would shout at,
“Ai, sen men siyakty mes-syn goi, bar-syn goi.
“Hey, you I like no-2.SG indeed, exist-2.SG indeed.
Hey, you are really not like me, you are better.

Male Hostess
Mhm.

Female Hostess
Kujeu arak ish-pe-j-di, mashin-nan bar, turmys-yn bar.”
Husband vodka drink-NEG-PRG-3, car-GEN exist, life-GEN exist.”
Your husband does not drink vodka, you have a car, you have a life.”

(Ilek-ty-m)
(Follow-PST-1.SG)
(I followed.)

Sonda <okazvyetsya>Rus> ol kazir men myne saharnyj-myn.
That time <turned out>Rus she- now I this diabetes- INST
It <turned out>Rus that time she- now, I am with this diabetes.
Saharnyj-dan bar pesin sol sa saharnyj pesim-men otyr-a-m.
Diabetes-SOUR exist what that diabetes what-SOUR sit-PRG-1.SG.
I’m with what- that- from diabetes with what- diabetes.
Son daras-yn men ish-e-min. Men-de zhaman-day.
That medication-ACC I drink-PRG-1.SG. I-too bad-like.
I’m taking that medication. I’m also badish.
Sonda ol sol saharny-men aur-gan eke:n. Kor-di-n ba?
That time she that diabetes-INST sick-PST seems. See-PST-2.SG QP?
It seems she got sick with diabetes that time. Did you see?

Mhm.
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18 Sonda algynyz net-e-t ush zhyl ma to-torte. That time (still) do-PRG-3 three years or fo-four. From that time, three or four years were gone (still).
19 Ol <srazu>Rus> aur-dy-0. She <immediately>Rus> sick-PST-3. She got sick right away.
20 Sonyn aur-gan-syn Amangeldi, markym bylai goi (shows a feast), That-GEN sick-PST-GEN neighbor’s name, deceased this-like indded Since she got sick neighbor’s name, the deceased one who was like this (shows a feast), sony aksha-ny shygyn syn-yp auyrsy-men o-ny that-ACC money-ACC expenses break-PTCP sickness-INST she-ACC having broken with expenses, her with a disease, dispanser-ga apar-yp salip-ti. hospital-DAT take-PTCP put-PST-3. He brought and put her in the hospital. Dispanser <besplatno>Rus kara-j-dy goi ol kez-de. Hospital <free>Rus> watch-PRG-3 indeed that time-DAT Hospital used to treat free of charge that time. Aisulu’s mother Mhm. Aisulu’s Mother Mhm.
27 Female Hostess So-dan dispenser-ga bir zhumadaj zhat-yp, ony loktir-ler tekserip, That time hospital-DAT one week- lay-PTCP, her doctor-PL check-PTCP She stayed one week at the hospital that time, doctors had checked her, “Sol ishkandai okpesi taza, myn-de zhat-a-tyn auyr zhok, “That nothing lungs clean, this-LOC lay-PRG-GEN disease no, “There is nothing in the lungs, they are clean, there is no disease to stay here, sondai zher-ge sogan apar.” de-di. that place-DAT that take.” Say-PST-3. take her to that place.” said. 
APPENDIX D: FULL TRANSCRIPTS OF NARRATIVES FOR CHAPTER SIX

Narrative One: Finding a daughter-in-law

1 Elderly woman: Kelin Zhanar.
Daughter-in-law Name
The daughter-in-law is daughter-in-law’s name.

2 Aisulu's Mother: Mhm

3 Woman’s Son: Kelin Zhanar.
Daughter-in-law Name
The daughter-in-law is daughter-in-law’s name.

4 Elderly woman: Uh, eki-eki neme-bar.
Uh, two-two grandchild-PL-1SG exist.
There are my two-two grandchildren.

5 Woman’s Son: Oz-iniz kim bol-a-syz.
Self-2SG,POL who exist-2SG,POL
Who you are

6 Oziniz kim bola-syz, sony ait-ynyz.
Self-2SG,POL who exist-2SG,POL that tell-IMP,2SG,POL
Please, tell yourself who you are.

7 Elderly woman: Ol kesh uilen-di goi. (About the other son who is absent)
He late marry-PST,3SG indeed.
He really married late.

8 Aisulu’s Mother: Hm.

9 Elderly Woman: Ol otyz-segizin-de uilen-di.
He thirty-eight-LOC marry-PST,3SG
He got married at thirty-eight.

10 Elderly Woman: Endi, mynau da otyz-segiz-ge kel-ip otyr.
Now, this too thirty-eight-DAT come-PTCP sit-3
Now, this also has reached thirty-eight.

11 Woman’s Son: Men alide uilen-gen zhok.
I still marry-PTCP no.
I did not marry yet.

12 Elderly Woman: Endi, kalai uilen-di ret-tin bil-me-j-min.
Now how marry-3 matter-GEN know-NEG-FUT-1SG
Now, I do not know how he gets married.

13 Woman’s Son: Endi, erten uilen-e-miz.
Now, tomorrow marry-FUT-1PL
Well, we will marry tomorrow.

14 Asiulu’s Mother: Sondai zhas-kiyndau azyrak.
That age-LOC hard a bit
It is a bit hard to do this in this age.

15 Elderly Woman: Iya, kiyn bol-gan-da. Ait-pa!
Yes, hard exis-PTCP-and. Say-NEG
Yes, and it was hard. Even do not say!

16 Aisulu’s Mother:  
Oi, ondai zhas-ta kisi ozi uiren-ip kal-a-dy. Sol osylai-
Oh, that age-LOC person self learn-PTCP stay-FUT-3 That so
Oh, a person self becomes too ‘experienced’ in that age. So that-

17 Elderly Woman:  
Ol endi mynau biyl otyz zheti-ge kel-di, (Avgusta) apta-da.
He now this thirty-seven-DAT come-3, (?) week-LOC
Now, he has become thirty-seven this year, (non-audible) week.

18 Elderly Woman:  
Endi, biyl ujlen-be-ce, bul <Rus>uzhe>
Now this marry-NEG-COND this <Rus>already>
Now, if he does not marry this year, this <Rus>already>

19 sol anau,
So that,

20 kara bas-yn zhur-gen-in tur-i-ne ne kyl-a-dy?
black head-GEN walk-PTCP-GEN appearance-3SG-DAT what happen-FUT-3
What will happen to his black hairs? What will he do.

21 Aisulu’s Mother:  
Kal-a-dy.
Leave-FUT-3

22 Elderly Woman:  
Iya. So-dan ne kyl-a-m?
Yes. That-INS what happen-FUT-1SG?
Yes, what will I do with this?

23 Elderly Woman:  
Endi, anau uilen-gi-si kel-gen zhok.
Now, that son marry-WANT-3SG come-NEG no.
Now, that son did not want to marry.

24 Aisulus’ Mother:  
Mhm.

25 Aisulus’ Mother:  
uilen-be-sinder!”
marry-NEG-2PL!”
f if you do not marry!”

26 Elderly Woman:  
Iya, oz-im tap-kan.
Yes, self-1SG find-PTCP

27 <Rus> Kak raz > bir zher-ge kudalyk-ka bar-dy-m.
<Rus> how one> one place-DAT engagement party-DAT go-PST-1SG
<Rus> On time,> I went to an engagement party at one place.

28 Aisulus’ Mother:  
Mhm.

29 Aisulus’ Mother:  
Sosyn anau Zhanar-dy tap-ty-m. Sony-mne endi-
Then, that Name-ACC find-PST-1SG That-IST, now-
Then, I found that Name. With this, now-

30 Aisulus’ Mother:  
Ozi-niz tap-kan kelin goi!
Self-2POL find-PTCP daughter-in-law indeed
Indeed, a daughter-in-law who you found yourself.

31 Elderly Woman:  
Iya, oz-im tap-kan.
Yes, self-1SG find-PST
Yes, who I found myself.

Endi, Alla ozi ne kyl-gan shygar, kazir ondy.
Now, Allah self what do-PTCP probably, now good
Now, this is probably Allah’s will, now it is good.

Next-IST good. Care-FUT-3.
With this, it is good. She is taking care.

Zhaksy bol-di.- Eki katar tur-di-k.
Good become-PST-3. Two rows stay-PST-1PL
It became well. We have lived together closely.

Aisulu’s Mother: Mhm.

Endi, Kudai-ga shukip kut-di.
Now, God-DAT thank you, care-FUT-3
Now, thanks to God, she is taking care of me.

Uin-de tuk-te iste-me-i-min,
House-LOC nothing do-NEG-FUT-1SG,
I’m doing nothing inside the house,

barin ozi iste-i-di, kut-e-di.
everything self do-FUT-3, care-FUT-3
she is doing everything herself, taking care of me.
ADD one more

**Narrative Two: The daughter and the computer**

1 Aisulu’s Mother: A, bu-lar <Rus>zhe> otyr-a-dy.
   But, this-PL <Rus.>indeed> sit-FUT-3
   But, these are <Rus>really> sitting long (in front of a computer).

2 Host Father: Otyr-a-di goi.
   Sit-FUT-3 indeed
   Indeed, they are sitting (in front of a computer).

3 Aisulu’s Mother: Eki- tun-de eke-sheken otyr-a-dy,
   Two- night-LOC two-until sit-FUT-3,
   Two- they are sitting (in front of a computer) till two at night,

4 birge-sheken otyr-a-dy.
   one-until sit-FUT-3.
   they are sitting (in front of a computer) till one.

5 Kim-nin uj-din komputer bar.
   Who-POSS house-POSS computer exist-3
   At the house of those who have a computer.

6 Father: Uakta-p kal-sa-m, otyr-ap ber-e-di myna-lar.
   Sleep-PTCP stay-if-1SG, sit-PTCP give-FUT-3 this-PL
   If I fall asleep, these are continuing sitting (in front of a computer).

7 Azyrak de-gen she. (Smiles and looks at the daughter)
A bit call-PTCP colloquial particle
So-called ‘a bit more’. (Smiles and looks at the daughter)

8 Asiulu’s Mother: Otyr-a-di.
Sit-FUT-3.
They are sitting (in front of a computer).

9 Daughter: (smiles)

10 Father: (laughs)

11 Daughter: (Name) ekeu-miz tanys-ap, hm:
Name two-1PL hug-PTCP, hm:
Having hugged with Name, hm:

12 zheti-ge dein otyr-di-k goi noutbuk-pen.
Seven-DAT till sit-PST-1PL indeed notebook-IST.
we sat watching a notebook till seven.

13 Asiulu’s Mother: (laughter)

14 Father: Uyakta-p ket-ti-m keshe.
Sleep-PTCPgo-PST-1SG yesterday.
I fell asleep yesterday.

15 Daughter: (laughter)

16 Father: Endi, oyan-di-m. Birde-nen dybys shyg-a-di.
Now, wake-PST-1SG. Something-SOURCE noise exit-FUT-3
Now, I woke up. A noise is coming from something.

17 Endi oyan-sa-m,
Now, wake-COND-1SG
Now, when I finally woke up,

18 Mynau kaidan sotka-men birdeme endi kor-ip otyr ma.
This where cell phone-IST something now watch-V sit-3 ques. part.
this is watching something on a cell phone?

19 Bil-me-j-min!
Know-NEG-FUT-1SG.
I do not know!

20 Asiulu’s Mother: <Rus> Oi, ne zna-u, ee chto vse za eti mashin-y.>
<Rus> Oh, not know-1SG, and what all for these car-PL.>
<Rus> Oh, I don’t know, why all are about cars.>

**Narrative Three and Four: Children versus grandchildren and Misinterpretation**

1 Elderly Woman Biz endi bir zhagy-nan erkelet-e-miz olar-dy.
We now one side-SOURCE spoil-FUT-1PL they-ACC
Now, we are spoiling them from one side.

2 Bir zhak-tan men gana aigaila-i-myn,
One side-SOURCE I only shout-FUT-1SG
From one side, I’m shouting,

3 "Men-in <Rus> vnug>-ma tees-pe-nder!" de-p.
“I-POSS <Rus>grandchild-DAT touch-NEG-2PL!” say-PTCP
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“Don’t touch my <Rus>grandchild>!” having said/ like this.

4  "Ane, apas-y kel-e zhatyr!
“Look, grandmother-3 come-FUT lay!
“Look, their grandmother is coming!

5  Mine apas-y kel-e zhatyr!” de-p,
Here, grandmother-3 come-FUT lay!” say-PTCP
Here, their grandmother is coming!” having said,

6  bala-lar bari kash-a-di.
child-PL all run-FUT-3.
all children run away.

7  Aisulu (laughter)
8  Elderly Woman: (laughter)
9  A, oz bala-ma olai zhugir-gan zhok-py-n.
But, own child-DAT this-like run-PTCP no-PST-1SG
But, I did not run for my children like this.

10  "Oz-der-in bil-e-sinder," de-di-m,
"Self-PL-GEN know-FUT-2PL," say-PST-1SG
“You know yourself,” I said

11  "taek zhe-i-sinder-ma, oz-der-in <Rus> zashisha-i-tes'>."
“stick eat-FUT-2PL-COND, you-PL-GEN <Rus> protect-PRS-2PL
“if you get into troubles, yourself <Rus> protect>”

12  Aisulu Mhm.
13  "Ah, tayak zhe-me-j-sinder-ma, <Rus> druzh-i-te>."
“But, stick eat-NEG-FUT-2PL-COND, <Rus> friend- PRS-2PL
“But if you do not get into troubles, <Rus> be friends>.”

14  Aisulu Mhm.
15  Bit-ti-0 zhumys.
Finish-PST-3 work
The work finished.

16  Olar-dyn bireu-ne de bakyр-yp kor-gen-min zhok-py-m.
They-GEN one-DAT and watch-PTCP-1SG no-PST-1SG
None of them I looked after so intensively. I did not shout at anyone

17  A kazir myna-lar u shin men dirilde-j-min.
But now this-PL for 1 noise-FUT-1SG
But, I’m ‘making noise’ for the sake of these.

18  Aisulu’s Mother: (laughter)
19  Elderly Woman: Bas-yn zhar-yp tasta-j ma,
Head-ACC break-PTCP leave-FUT ques. part.,
If their heads gets broken,

20  koz-in zhygar-yp tasta-j-ma de-p.
eyes-GEN take-PTCP leave-FUT ques. part., say-PTCP
if their eyes get hurt, I am like.

21  Aisulu’s Mother: Bereu-din bala-sy goi.
Someone-GEN child-3 indeed.
Of course, it is someone’s child.

Elderly Woman: Meelya, endi kalai.
Of course, now how.
Of course, how else.

Anau, al-dyn kun-i,
That, front day-3
The other day,

Name come-PTCP face-1SG-SOURCE kiss-V lay-3 hug-PTCP
Grandchild’s Name, having come in and hugged, was kissing my face.

Grandfather-GEN, Name-GEN, our-GEN all-1PL sit-PTCP-LOC
When grandfather, another grandchild’s Name, we all were sitting.

Sosyn men ait-a-myn,
Then, I say-FUT-1SG,
The, I am saying,

"Ai, mynau kyz bir zher-ge suran-ajyn dep tur."
“Oh, this girl one place-DAT ask-IMP/LET say-PTCP stay.”
“Oh, this girl is asking to let her to go to some place.”

Sanzhar zvonda-dy-0
Name call-PST-3:
Brother’s Name called

bari-nin bet-i-nen suj de-p ait-ty-0."
all-GEN face-3-SOURCE kiss say-PTCP say-PST-3
and said to kiss everyone in the face.

Narrative Five: Speaking like an adult

Aisulu’s Mother: Biz nemeler-imiz-di men, shal, eshe kishkentai kyz-im,
We grandchild-1PL-ACC I, grandfather also little girl-1SG
We our grandchild-- I, grandfather, my little daughter--

Aisulu: (laughter)
Po-moemu my tak ee ne vospita-li.
On-my we so and no raise-PST,PL.
I think we did not manage to raise him properly.

Daughter-in-law (laughter)
Mother-in-law (laughter)
Aisulu: (laughter)
Aisulu’s Mother: Huligan, huligan.
Hooligan, hooligan.
Hooligan, hooligan.

Daughter-in-law Seichas deti atomn-ie.
Now children atomic-3,PL.
Nowadays children are atomic.

Aisulu’s Mother: Kansha zhaksy soz ait-ti-k, uire-ti-k bakyl,
How many good word say-PST-1PL, teach-PST-1SG wisdom
We said so many good words, we taught words of wisdom,
ne, ne.
no, no.
nothing.

Aunt Amina: Men-nin- zhet-te- zheti-ge tol-gan zhok,
I-GEN seven-LOC seven-DAT become-PTCP no
I have a seven- not seven yet
endi zheti-ge tol-atyn nemeler bar.
now seven-DAT become-GER grandchild exist
about-becoming seven grandchild.
Oz-i <Rus> ponchik>.
Self-3 <Rus> donut>.
He himself is a donut.

Daughter-in-law [(laughter)
Aisulu: [(laughter)
Aunt Amina: Osy ui-din kyz-y-na shyk-ka bol-ip,
This house-GEN girl-3-DAT marry-DAT exist-PTCP
(He) having wanted to marry the girl of this house,

Daughter-in-law [(laughter)
Mother-in-law [(laughter)
Aisulu: [(laughter)
Aunt Amina: (Addressing this to the daughter-in-law)
Son-y ait-ip ber she, kalai akis-i-ne kel-di-0.
This-ACC say-PTCP give please, how father-3-DAT come-PST-3.
Please, tell this, how he came to the father.
Ol da bir kyzyk bol-syn.
This also one interesting exist-3.
Let this be also something interesting.

Mother-in-law (laughter)
Aisulu: (laughter)
24 Aunt Amina: Aldy-men bu-lar-din goi kel-di-0 goi. Beginning-IST this-PL-GEN indeed come-PST-3 indeed At the beginning, he came to (house) of these.

25 Mother-in-law Bir-inshi zhyl-di, iya, kel-di-0. First-ORD year-ACC, yes, come-PST-3 Yes, in the first year, he came.

26 Aunt Amina: Mal-dar-iniz kor-ip-ti-0, Animal-PL-2PL see-PTCP-PST-3, He had watched all your animals, sosyn Abzal-ga kel-ip-ti-0. then name of daughter’s father come-PTCP-PST-3 then he went to name of daughter’s father.

27 "Abzal, sen neshe mal bar?" "Name of daughter’s father, you how many animal have?" "Name of daughter’s father, how many animal do you have?"

28 Barin suran-dy-0 goi. "Neshe seeyr bar?" Everything ask-PST-3 indeed. “How many cow have? He asked everything. “How many cow do you have?”


30 Aisulu: (laughter)

31 Daughter-in-law: Biyl ait-ti goi. This year say-PST-3 indeed. Actually, he said this year.

32 Aunt Amina: Iya, ait she. Sen-nen arkarai. Yes say please. You-SOURCE differently Yes, please say. It is different when comes from you.

33 Daughter-in-law: (?) iste-p ait-kan goi. <Rus> Pri-sh-el tak, (?) do-PTCP say-PTCP indeed, <Rus> to-come-M,PST so (?) as said what he did, <Rus> so he came in,>

34 <Rus>"Dyadya Abzal, che delae-te?" <Rus> “Uncle Name, what do-2SG,PRS?” <Rus> “Uncle Name, what are you doing?”

35 "Rabota-u."> de-p-ti-0. “Work-1SG,PRS.> say-PTCP-PST-3 “I’m working.”> he had said.

36 Aunt Amina: Ol kel-di-0. He come-PST-3 He came in.

37 Daughter-in-law: <Rus>"Vizh-u."> de-j-ti. <Rus> “See-1SG,PRS.”> say-FUT-3, <Rus> “I see.”> he was saying,

38 <Rus>"Nu i sid-ish’, sid-i dal'she!"> (laughter)
“Well and sit-2SG,PRS, sit-IMP far”>

“Well, if you are sitting, then continue sitting!” (laughter)

Sosyn <Rus> govor-it,
Then, <Rus> say-3SG
Then, <Rus> he says

"A ya smotr-u," govor-it,
“And I watch-1SG,PRS,” say-3SG
“I see,” he says,

"tree loshad-i, monog korov.”>
“three horse-PL, many cow-ACC.”>
“(you have) three horses, many cows.”>

Aunt Amina:
(laughter)

Daughter-in-law: <Rus> "Nado delit' pa- davai-te podel-im-sya?"
<Rus> “Need divide di- let-1PL divide-1PL-PRF?”
<Rus> “Need to share- di- let us share this?”

Abzal ait-0, "Zhoka, oz bala-lar-ma." de-p.
Name say-PST-3, “No, own child-PL-DAT.” say-PTCP
Father’s name said. “No, this this for my own children.” he was like.

"U men-ya svoi det-i, nado i im."
"At I-GEN own child-PL, need and I-DAT”
"I have my own children, and I need for them.”

"Eshe nado mnogo chto kupit'.” say-PTCP
“More need many what buy.” say-PTCP indeed.
“There more that need to buy.” he had said.

"U nas seichas dom-a krizes.
"At we-ACC now home-LOC crisis.

"We have crisis at our home.

ochen'- my v bankrot.” say-PTCP
Very- we in bankrupt.” he said.

Aisulu:
(laughter)

<Rus> “We in bankrupt-LOC.” say-3SG,PRS
<Rus> “We are in bankrupt.” he says.

"Nam nado delit-sya.” de-p ait-a-dy.
“We-DAT need divide-PRF.” say-PTCP say-FUT-3
“We need to share.” he was saying like.

Abzal govor-it,
Father’s Name say-3SG,PRS,
Father’s name says,

"Ty davai mne den'g-i." govorit,
“You give-IMP I-DAT money-ACC.” say-3SG,PRS
“You give me money.” he says.

"Ya potom teb-e polovin-u da-m,” de-p- dep.
“I then you-DAT half-ACC give-1SG, FUT,” say-PTCP
“I will give you the half later on.” he said- he said.

"Bankr-it." <Rus>govor-it>.
“Bankrupt-1SG.” <Rus>say-3SG,PRS>.
“I’m bankrupt.”<Rus>he says>.

Aunt Amina: [laughter]
Aisulu [laughter]
Daughter-in-law: <Rus> "Ochen' mnogo deneg." de-p-ti-0.
<Rus> “Very much money.” say-PCP-PST-3
<Rus> “A lot of money.”> he had said.

<Rus> "Uzhas!"> de-p koy-a-ti.
<Rus> “Scary!”> say-PTCP put-FUT-3
<Rus> “Horrible!”> he is saying like this.

Zhara-i-dy, ket-ti-0.
Like-FUT-3, leave-PST-3
Okay, he left.

<Rus> "Vy kakay sem'ya," govor-it, "zhadn-aya.
<Rus> “You what family,” say-3SG,PRS “greedy-FSG.
<Rus> “What family you are,” says, “greedy.

Kak s Vam-i det-i <laughter> zhiv-ut!"> How with you-IST child-PL <laughter> live-3PL,PRS!”> How only children live with you!”>

Aisulu [laughter]

Narrative Six: An Independent Father

1 Aisulu’s Mother Solai, kis-i <Rus>UIUdolzhen-0 byt’ v zhizn-i sil’n-ym>. Thus, person-3 <Rus> must-M,SG be in life-LOC strong-M,SG> Thus, a person <Rus> must be strong in a life>.

2 Kis-i <Rus>dolzhen byt’ v zhizni sil’nym.> Person-3 <Rus> must-M,SG be in life-LOC strong-M,SG> A person <Rus> must be strong in a life>.

3 Ne- bala-lar os-e-di goi. What- kid-PL grow-FUT-3 indeed
What- even our children are growing up.

4 Biz-din bala-lar os-ti goi <Rus>da, We-GEN kid-PL grow-PST-3 indeed <Rus>yes, Even our children grew up, <Rus>yes, vrode by ne-ploh-ie det-i, da, Like maybe NEG-average-3,PL child-PL yes,> they might be like not bad children, yes,
6 but on them not must hope for.>
but (we) must not hope for them (to help).>

7 Host Father: Kudai, ake-m papa-m markum ait-a-tyn da,
God, father-1SG dad-1SG dead say-PST,REG-too
God, my passed away father also used to say,

8 <Changing a seat> “Ai,
<Changing a seat> “Hey,
<Changing a seat> “Hey,
bar,> ket. Ai-da sen-siz kun-de kor-e-m!”
go,> go away. Moon-LOC you-without sun-too see-FUT-1SG!”
go,> go away. In the night, I will see sun without you!”

9 (laughter)

11 Aisulu’s Mother: <Rus> vot, vot.>
<Rus> here, here.>
<Rus> Right, right.>

12 Host Father: (laughter) Sonda zhettis-ke kel-ip kal-gan-da
(laughter) Then seventy-DAT come-PTCP stay-PTCP-LOC
(laughter) Then, when he had reached seventy.

13 Aisulu’s Mother <Rus> Nu, vot vid-ish kak.>
<Rus> Well, here see-2SG how.>
<Rus> Well, you see this is how.>

14 Host Father: “Bar, ket! Sen-siz ba kun kor-e-m!”
“Go, go away! You-without ques. part. sun see-FUT-1SG!
“Go, go away! Even without you, I will see the sun!

15 Pensiya-m ozi-me ozi zhett-e-te!”
Pension-1SG self-DAT self surface-FUT-too!”
My pension itself will surface for myself!”

16 Aisulu’s Mother: Ol kis-i durys ait-a-dy.
That person-3 right say-FUT-3.
That person is saying the right things.

17 Host Father: (laughter)

18 Aisulu’s Mother: Kis-i oz-in ozi (?).
Person-3 self-GEN self (?)
A person its own self (?)

19 Host Father: Men kishkene renzhit-ti-m-da.
I a bit upset-PST-1SG-too.
I also got a bit upset.

20 “<Rus>Blin,> ket dep ait-a-dy ma-gan” de-p.
“<Rus>Crape,> go away say-PTCP say-FUT-3 I-DAT” say-PTCP
“<Rus>Shoot,> he is telling me like ‘go away’” I thought.

21 Birdene ashulan-gan-da.
Something angry-PTCP-LOC.
When he got angry about something.
“Ket!” dep, "bar, ket, “Go away!” say-PTCP, “go, go away, “Go away!” he was like, “go, go away.

sen-siz-da kun-i kor-ip al-a-m!.” you-without-too sun-3 see-PTCP take-FUT-1SG!” even without you, I will be able to see the sun!”

Narrative Seven: A wise grandfather-in-law

1 Elderly woman #1 Bary taty, bary ondy, bary semiz. Everything tasty, everything good, everything fat.

2 Kairly bol-syn, karagym (an address form to younger ones). Blessed exit-3SG, dear.

3 Osy-lai bol. This-like be. Be like this.

4 <Rus>Tol'ko>, bar goi, Gulzhan, <Rus>Only>, exist indeed, hostess’s name, <Rus> Though>, you know, hostess’s name,

5 basy-na bir zhapirak oramal sal. head-DAT one flowery scarf put. put a flowery scarf on a head.

6 Hostess (laughter)

7 Elderly woman #1 “Onau, zhakyr-gan-da bir zhak-ka, salamat ait-pa” “That, invite-PTCP-LOC one side-DAT, “When you are invited to some places, do not come without scarf”

8 ma-gan mama-m ai-ty-0. I-DAT mother-1SG say-PST-3 My mother told me.


10 Elderly woman #2 Bayagy-da kyz-dar tymphs-ka zhyk-gan-da, (?) Old days-LOC,girl-PL marry-DAT exit-PTCP-LOC In old days, when girls got married,

11 shakyr-a-di goi. invite-FUT-3 goi. they invite them.

12 Sosyn men-i ol ui-ge shakyr-di-0. Then I-GEN that house-DAT invite-PST-0
So, I was invited to that house (for an introductory talk).

Kabin atam,
Name grandfather,
Grandfather Name

14 zhesde-m-in necy nagash-i bol-a-di tu-gan.
son-in-law-1SG-GEN what maternal uncle-3 exist-FUT-3 birth-PTCP
he is a maternal uncle by blood of my son-the in-law.

15 Zhezde-m-in tu-gan nagash-y,
A maternal uncle by blood of my son-the in-law.

17 Iya. Sosyn Kabyn atam ol-da ol-da shakyr-dy-0.
Yes. Then Name grandfather he-too he-too invite-PST-3
Yeah. Then, Grandfather Name he also he also invited.

18 Sosyn ma-gan ait-ty-3.
Then I-DAT say-PST-3
Then he told me,

19 "Kulyn-ym,
Little foal-1SG,
“My little foal,
men sa-gan at-atyn bir akylim soz bar.
“I you-DAT say-GER one wise-1SG word exist.
I have my word of wisdom for you to tell.

21 Kalai kabylda-i-syn, osyn bil.” de-di-0.
How you interpret it, it is up to you,” he said.

22 “Ait-atyn bar.” de-di.
“Say-GER exist.” say-PST-3.
“i have for you to tell.” he said.

23 "Uj-de kempir men shal bar,” de-di-0.
“House-LOC grandmother and grandfather exist.” say-PST-3.
“There are grandmother and grandfather in house,” he said.

24 "Osyn kyzmet iste-i-sin be,
“yourself job do-FUT-2SG quest. part.,
“When you are doing your job,

25 kyzmet-te zhur-gen-de,
work-LOC walk-PTCP-LOC,
when are outside at work,

26 Katar-yn kalai kieen-e-di, solai kieen.” de-di-0.
Female-GEN how dress-FUT-3, that-like dress.” say-PST-3.
dress like others are dressing,” he said

27 "Bas keemder-i kar-ap ter-se, sen-de so-lai.”
"Head cloth-3, you-too that-like
"If wear new head caps, you do the same."

"Al endi" de-di-0
"Well now," say-PST-3
"But now," he said,

"uj-de bol-gan-da kimper men shal-dyn,
home-LOC exist-PTCP-LOC grandmother and grandfather,
"when grandmother and grandfather are at the house,
ayag-n-in bas-nan <Rus> nosk-i> tus-pe-sin,
Feet-2SG-GEN head-SOURCE <Rus> sock-PL fall-NEG-3PL
the sock should not fall down from the feet’s head,
Bas-nan bir zhapyrak oramal-syn tus-pe-sin. "
Head-SOURCE one flowery scarf fall-NEG-3PL.”
flowery scarf should not fall down from a head.”

Elderly woman #1 Raz. Bayagy-da so-lai iste-di-k goi.
Truth. Old day-LOC that-like do-PST-1PL indeed.
True. Indeed we did like this in the old times.

Elderly woman #2 Iya.
Yes.
Yeah.
Yes. That name grandfather say-PTCP-ACC that-like do-PST-1PL
Yeah. We did like the grandfather Name told.

**Narrative Eight: A devoted wife**

1 Elderly Woman: Aw, solai.
   Well, that-like.
   Well, this is like this,

2 Men-de korki bos-a-gan kel-gen-de kor-me-gen-im kop.
   I-too come-PTCP-LOC see-NEG-PTCP-1SG a lot
   I also, after done X, when I came I ‘saw’ everything.

3 Oz-im aul-da zhetim bol-dy-m ogoi.
   Self-1SG village-LOC orphan exist-PST-1SG alien,
   I was myself an alien orphan in my village.

4 Mun-da kel-di-m, tagy ogoi.
   Here-DAT come-PST-1SG, again alien.
   I came here, an alien is again.

5 Kor-me-gen-im kop goi.
   see-NEG-PTCP-1SG a lot
   I have seen everything.

6 Aisulu’s Mother: Zhara-i-dy. bala-lar-ynyz bar.
   Like-FUT-3, child-PL-2POL exist.
   Let it go, you have children.
7 Elderly Woman: Bala-lar bar. child-PL exist. I have children.
8 Aisulu’s Mother: Neme-ler-iniz bar. grandchild-PL-2POL exist. You have grandchildren.
9 Elderly Woman: Aga-m kezin-de ma-gan korset-ti-0 goi. Husband-1SG kezin-LOC I-DAT show-PST-3 indeed. My husband really ‘showed’ to me!
10 Elderly Woman: <Rus> Toka> arak ish-e-di, arak ish-e-di, arak ish-e-di. <Rus> Only> vodka drink-FUT-3, vodka drink-FUT-3, vodka drink-FUT-3 <Rus>Only> he was drinking vodka, drinking vodka, drinking vodka.
12 Elderly Woman: Til-im-di al-ma-dy. Language-1SG-ACC take-NEG-PST-3 He did not listen to my words.
13 Elderly Woman: Ait-ty-m, bol-ma-dy. Say-PST-1SG, exist-NEG-PST-3 I told, it did not work.
14 Elderly Woman: So-dan kein endi auyr-dy-0. That-SOURCE later now ill-PST-3 From that, well, he became ill later on.
15 Elderly Woman: <Rus> Kak raz> aul-ga bir alys zher-den lokter kel-di-0. <Rus> How time> village-DAT one far land-SOU doctor come-PST-3 <Rus> at that time> a doctor came to the village from far away.
16 Aisulu's Mother: Mhm.
17 Elderly Woman: Loktir-ge apar-a-m de-se-m, bar-ma-j-dy. Doctor-DAT take-FUT-1SG say-COND-1SG, go-NEG-FUT-3 If I say that I will take (him) to the doctor, he will not go.
18 Elderly Woman: Sosyn ane bari osek-tijdi kazir Then, look all gossip- now Then, look all gossip- now
19 Elderly Woman: bel-e-sin goi ajel-der soz-i. know-FUT-2SG indeed woman-PL word-3 really, you know women’s words.
20 Elderly Woman: Bari soz kyl-a-dy goi. All word make-FUT-3 indeed. Really, they will make up gossips.
21 Elderly Woman: "Aul-dan-aul-ga kel-gen lokter-ge apar-ma-dy." "Village-SOUR village-DAT come-PTCP doctor-DAT take-NEG-PST-3 “She did not take (him) to the doctor coming from- to the village.”
22 Elderly Woman: de-p ait-a-dy goi.
say-PTCP say-FUT-3 indeed.
Really they will say like this.

23 Aisulu's Mother: Mhm.
24 Elderly Woman: Koltykt-ap bol-ma-i apar-dy-m.
Armpit-PTCP exist-NEG-FUT take-PST-1SG
Podstaviv plecho, I took him there under armpits.

This doctor this-like glass-DAT project-PST-3 see-PTCP
Having X-rayed him, this doctor

"Oi, endi tukte bol-ma-i." de-di-0.
“Oh, now, nothing exist-NEG-FUT.” say-PST-3
“Oh, well, nothing will expect.” he said.

26 "Bauyry-nan tukte zhok, bari ozil-ip ket-ken." de-di-0.
“Liver-SOUR nothing no, all decay-PTCP go-PTCP.” say-PST-3
“Nothing left of the liver, everything has decayed.” he said.

27 "Bir ailyk- bir ailyk omir-i bar, apar-yp kut-e ber." de-di-0.
“One month- one month life-3 exist, take-PTCP wait-FUT give.” say-PST-3
“One month- one month of life is, wait having taken him back.” he said.

28 Aisulu's Mother: Mhm.
30 Elderly Woman: Endi kut-ti-k.
Now wait-PST-1PL.
Now, we waited.

31 Elderly Woman: Eki ai zhat-ty-0 goi, auteuir pol-ga kara-dy.
Two month lay-PST-3 indeed, in general floor-DAT watch-PST-3
Indeed, he laid down for two months, just he looked at the floor.

32 Koter-ip al-a-myn, koter-ip sal-a-myn.
Lift-PTCP take-FUT-1SG, lift-PTCP put-FUT-1SG
Having lifted, I am taking (him) out, having lifted, I am putting back in the bed.

33 O:h! Sonda onay,
O:h! Then that,
O:h! Then that

34 bauyr ezil-gen zhaman eken.
liver decay-PTCP bad indeed
It is really bad when the liver decayed.

35 Kake-ti-0, bari arba-nin kara maj kaid.
Poke-PST-3, all cart-GEN black oil where
He poked with stuff black like cart’s oil.

36 Sol siyakty bol-a-dy eken.
That like exist-FUT-3 indeed.
It turns out to be like this.

37 Kazir zhu-ip kurgat-yp sal-sa-m,
Now wash-PTCP dry-PTCP put-COND-1SG
Now, if I dry (that place) after washing (him),

38 ai shuberek shak kel-me-j-di.
oh cloth enough come-NEG-FUT-3
oh, it is not enough of cloth.
Kansha kap-kara zhyrty agyl-tugil surt-e-di.
How many black-black torn apart a lot dry-FUT-3
There were so many torn apart clothes because of this black mass.
Ayag-y-nda pampers kuigiz-ip koi-dy-m bol-ma-ga-syn.
Foot-3-DAT pampers dress-PTCP put-PST-1SG
V konce, I put pampers on the him since there was nothing else.
Endi onyn alda-na ets-e-m,
Now his front-LOC do-FUT-1SG
If I come in front of (him),
kalai bol-sa solai tasta-sa-m, kila-j-di goi.
how exist-COND that-like leave-COND-1SG, fall-FUT-3 indeed
if I leave (him) as he is, he falls down indeed.
Aisulu's Mother: Oi, ait-pa-nyz. Oi ozi-
Oh, say-NEG-2POL. Oh self-
Oh, even do not mention this. Oh self-
Elderly Woman: Iya. Oi, kor-di-m goi!
Yes. Oh, see-PST-1SG indeed!
Yes. Oh, I really have seen a lot!
Aisulu's Mother: <Rus>konechno> ony ne kyl-a-dy soz kyl-a-dy.
<Rus> of course> that what put-FUT-3 word put-FUT-3
<Rus> of course> that what they will make up gossips, they will.
“Care-NEG-FUT-3, watch-NEG-FUT-3, kill-PST-0”
“She is not caring for, she is not watching, she killed (him).”
Elderly Woman: Iya. Solai ait-a-di goi.
Yes. That-like say-FUT-3 indeed.
Yes. Indeed they will say like this.
Ayagynda, sosyn pampers kegiz-ip koi-dy-m.
Foot-DAT, then pampers dress-PTCP leave-PST-1SG
Then, I put pampers on him.
Ne iste-j-myn?
What do-FUT-1SG?
What will I do?
Elderly Woman: Sosyn anau kajt-kan-da Kokysh bol-dy-0,
Then that die-PTCP-LOC neighbor’s Name exist-PST-3
Then, when he died, there was male neighbor’s Name,
sosyn anau Darhan de-gen bol-dy.
then that-neighbor’s Name call-PTCP exist-PST-3.
then there was that-so-called male neighbor’s Name.
Olar birak aldyn-da ma-gan ait-ty-0,
They but before-LOC I-DAT say-PST-3
But they told me before,
"Maira, rahmet, men sen-i so-lai ojla-ma-di-m.
“Woman’s name, thank you, I you-ACC that-like think-NEG-PST-1SG.
“Woman’s name, thank you, I did not think you are like this.

Tap-taza. <Rus>Dazhe> kazir onzhak-ka sal-atyn.
Clean-clean. <Rus>Even> now that said-DAT put-GER
Very clean. <Rus> Even> now while burring,

Darte al-atyn-da nesi zhok, bari tap-taza eken. Rahmet.”
Take-GER-too what no, all clean-clean indeed. Thank you.”
There is nothing to wash (on his body), everything is clean. Thank you.”

Elderly Woman: Sol, sony-men eki ai kut-ti-m goi.
That, that-IST two month wait-PST-1SG indeed.
That, with this, I waited two months.

Ol ne bir kun tynshtyk ber-me-j-di.
He what one day peace give-NEG-FUT-3.
What, he was not letting me rest one day.

Ol kez-de biz neley bol-di-k goi
That time-LOC one this exist-PST-1PL indeed.
We were really in that time this- nemnogo
kishkine zhukalau bol-dy-k.
a bit thin exist-PST-1PL
We were a bit exhausted/poor.

Eh, bar-sa-m, bol-dy-k.
Oh, come-COND-1SG, exist-PST-1SG.
Oh, if I came closer (to him), we were done.

Kasyn-na zhakynda-sa-m (?)
Near-DAT close—COND-1SG
If I came closer, (non-audible).

“Se-nin miyn ashi-j-dy goi,
“You-2SG neck open-FUT-3 indeed,
Your neck will ‘get open’. (Your head would be aching from thinking)

Sa-gan kun korcet-pe-j-di goi!
you-DAT sun show-NEG-FUT-3 indeed!
They will not let you live in peace!

Aksha zhok, mal zhok. Sen-i ne kyl-a-dy goi!”
Money no, animals no. You-ACC what put-FUT-3 indeed!”
No money, no animals. What will happen to you?” (Budut obsuzhdat’)

Bir kun-i sosyn oz-im abd-en,
One day-3 then self-1SG much
One day I myself was much-bas-ym bitt-ep, uza bol-dy-m, uiyk-y-m kel-e-di.
Head-1SG exist-PST-1SG, sleep-1SG come-FUT-3
my head was ZAVSHIVELA, BYLA ZLAYA, my sleep was coming.

Tun bojy ujkt-a-ma-j.
Night long sleep-NEG-FUT,
I was not sleeping all night.
Bala-lar zhas. Sosyn abden uza bol-dy-m. Child-PL young. Then much angry exist-PST-1SG, Children were little. That’s why I was very angry. (RAZOZLILAS’)

Bir kun-i ajgaj sal-dy-m, One day-3 shout put-PST-1SG, One day I screamed, "Sen olui-di bil, men koiy-di bile-j-im!" “You die-INF know, I put-INF know-FUT-1SG!” “You know how to die, I will know how to bury!” YOU LEARN TO DIE, I WILL LEARN HOW TO BURY YOU

Child-PL young. Then much angry exist-PST-1SG, Children were little. That’s why I was very angry. (RAZOZLILAS’)

One day-3 shout put-PST-1SG, One day I screamed,

"Sen olui-di bil, men koiy-di bile-j-im!"
“You die-INF know, I put-INF know-FUT-1SG!”
“You know how to die, I will know how to bury!”
YOU LEARN TO DIE, I WILL LEARN HOW TO BURY YOU

Child-PL young. Then much angry exist-PST-1SG, Children were little. That’s why I was very angry. (RAZOZLILAS’)

One day I screamed,

"Sen olui-di bil, men koiy-di bile-j-im!"
“You die-INF know, I put-INF know-FUT-1SG!”
“You know how to die, I will know how to bury!”
YOU LEARN TO DIE, I WILL LEARN HOW TO BURY YOU

Child-PL young. Then much angry exist-PST-1SG, Children were little. That’s why I was very angry. (RAZOZLILAS’)

One day I screamed,

"Sen olui-di bil, men koiy-di bile-j-im!"
“You die-INF know, I put-INF know-FUT-1SG!”
“You know how to die, I will know how to bury!”
YOU LEARN TO DIE, I WILL LEARN HOW TO BURY YOU

Child-PL young. Then much angry exist-PST-1SG, Children were little. That’s why I was very angry. (RAZOZLILAS’)

One day I screamed,

"Sen olui-di bil, men koiy-di bile-j-im!"
“You die-INF know, I put-INF know-FUT-1SG!”
“You know how to die, I will know how to bury!”
YOU LEARN TO DIE, I WILL LEARN HOW TO BURY YOU

Child-PL young. Then much angry exist-PST-1SG, Children were little. That’s why I was very angry. (RAZOZLILAS’)

One day I screamed,

"Sen olui-di bil, men koiy-di bile-j-im!"
“You die-INF know, I put-INF know-FUT-1SG!”
“You know how to die, I will know how to bury!”
YOU LEARN TO DIE, I WILL LEARN HOW TO BURY YOU

Child-PL young. Then much angry exist-PST-1SG, Children were little. That’s why I was very angry. (RAZOZLILAS’)

One day I screamed,

"Sen olui-di bil, men koiy-di bile-j-im!"
“You die-INF know, I put-INF know-FUT-1SG!”
“You know how to die, I will know how to bury!”
YOU LEARN TO DIE, I WILL LEARN HOW TO BURY YOU

Child-PL young. Then much angry exist-PST-1SG, Children were little. That’s why I was very angry. (RAZOZLILAS’)

One day I screamed,

"Sen olui-di bil, men koiy-di bile-j-im!"
“You die-INF know, I put-INF know-FUT-1SG!”
“You know how to die, I will know how to bury!”
YOU LEARN TO DIE, I WILL LEARN HOW TO BURY YOU

Child-PL young. Then much angry exist-PST-1SG, Children were little. That’s why I was very angry. (RAZOZLILAS’)

One day I screamed,

"Sen olui-di bil, men koiy-di bile-j-im!"
“You die-INF know, I put-INF know-FUT-1SG!”
“You know how to die, I will know how to bury!”
YOU LEARN TO DIE, I WILL LEARN HOW TO BURY YOU

Child-PL young. Then much angry exist-PST-1SG, Children were little. That’s why I was very angry. (RAZOZLILAS’)

One day I screamed,

"Sen olui-di bil, men koiy-di bile-j-im!"
“You die-INF know, I put-INF know-FUT-1SG!”
“You know how to die, I will know how to bury!”
YOU LEARN TO DIE, I WILL LEARN HOW TO BURY YOU

Child-PL young. Then much angry exist-PST-1SG, Children were little. That’s why I was very angry. (RAZOZLILAS’)

One day I screamed,

"Sen olui-di bil, men koiy-di bile-j-im!"
“You die-INF know, I put-INF know-FUT-1SG!”
“You know how to die, I will know how to bury!”
YOU LEARN TO DIE, I WILL LEARN HOW TO BURY YOU

Child-PL young. Then much angry exist-PST-1SG, Children were little. That’s why I was very angry. (RAZOZLILAS’)

One day I screamed,
Endi baursak pisi- (laughter)
Now bread cook-
Now bread cook-
baursak pisirit-e bere-j-im de-se-m, mai zhok.
Bread cook-FUT give-FUT-1SG say-COND-1SG, oil no
If I am thinking about making bread, there is no oil.
Mai al-aj-yym de-se-m, aksha zhok.
Oil buy-FUT-1SG say-COND-1SG, money no
If I am thinking about buying oil, there is no money.
Karyz-ga ber-me-j-di.
Debt-DAT give-NEG-FUT-3.
They are not giving it in credit.
Sosyn bir tort myn-na maj-dy al-yp kel-di-m da,
Then one four thousand-DAT oil-ACC take-PTCP come-PST-1SG and,
Then, I bought oil for four thousands and came back (home).
"Bugin kyz-ym kel-e-di, akel-e-di, ber-e-min."
“today girl-1SG come-FUT-3, bring-FUT-3, give-FUT-1SG.”
“Today, ny daughter will come and bring (money), I pay off.”
Tort myn-na al-dy-m da,
Four thousand-DAT take-PST-1SG and,
I took for four thousands and,
bau rsak pisir-ip zhiber-di-m.
bread cook-PTCP send-PST-1SG.
having cooked bread, put it out.
Zhurt kel-di-0. Dauyn <Rus> mashina.
People come-PST-3 <Rus> car.
People came. A full car.
Elderly Woman Sonda shana-anau kishkentai uj kirgz-ip zhat-kan-da,
Then new- that little house-DAT enter-V lay-PTCP-LOC
Then, new that when (we) were burring (him) into a grave,
ajel-der-i- kor-gen ajel-der-i sondai zhak-ka ura-dy-0,
Woman-PL-3 see-PTCP woman-PL-3 that-like cheek-DAT hit-PST-3
Women- women who saw hit their cheeks,
"Onyn barin nemene otejt-ip?" Kor-di-n ba? Uh.
That-GEN all what pay off-PTCP?" See-PST-2SG ques. part.?
“Who paid off this all?” Did you see how?
“Akamal mynau al-yp al-yp,
Daughter’s name this take-PTCP, take-PTCP (out of a car)
“Her daughter is only taking out and taking out (food out of a car),
<Rus> toka> tusir-ip ake-p tusir-ip zhatyr goi.”
<Rus> only> move down-PTCP bring-PTCP move down-PTCP lay indeed.”
<Rus>Only> she is putting on ground, taking out, putting on ground.”
Aisulu's Mother Mhm.
Elderly Woman Sonda eki,
Then two (of those women),
"Ol shushes-i ish-e-di, zhe-i-di kutyr-gan ajel-i,
“That mother-3 drink-FUT-3, eat-FUT-3 crazy-PTCP woman-3,
“Her mother is drinking (alcohol), this crazy woman will eat,
kolma-kol mal-yen zhe-p gusta-j-di.”
hand-to-hand animal-ACC eat-PTCP leave-FUT-3.”
She will have eaten animal (bought for food) with her own hand.”

Aisulu's Mother (laughter)

Elderly Woman: Sosyn zhylyk da al-dy-k, barin da al-di-k.
Then, horse too take-PST-1PL, everything too take-PST-1PL
They were like this. Oh. It was like this.

Elderly Woman: Zhas-tay, <Rus>da>?
What age-LOC die-PST-3
What age did he die?

Elderly Woman: Zhas. Sol anau goi anau arak bitir- bitir-ip tur goi.
Young. So that indeed that vodka finish- finish-PTCP stay indeed.
Young. So that vodka really killed (him).

Elderly Woman: Bagana anay sol
Recently that so
The mentioned that so

Elderly Woman: Mhm.

He said, “Take to hospital and wait”. We didn’t take him anywhere.

"Bit-ip-te, bir ai omir kal-dy-0." De-ti-0.
“Finish-PTCP-and, one month life leave-PST-3.” Say-PsT-3
“Finished, one month of life left.” he said.

His liver decayed all. He was X-rayed.

Aisulu's Mother Tucinik-ti-O.
Understand-PST-3
We understood.
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