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ABSTRACT

As the boom in the older adult population continues to grow, so too grows the number of persons suffering from cognitive diseases, such as dementia of the Alzheimer’s type (DAT). Older Latinos diagnosed with the disease make up 4 percent (200,000) of the current population; however, little research on bilinguals with DAT has been carried out (Gollan, et al. 2010, 2011; Bialystok, 2007), and even less on the presentation of self as mediated through narrative production. Current literature in the area has found that even though there is an internal (neuropathological and neuropsychological) decline that affects those diagnosed with DAT, individuals with DAT continue to display an external or social self. That is, individuals with DAT demonstrate a sense of personhood, or the “standing or status that is bestowed upon one human being by others, in the context of relationship and social being” (Kitwood, 1997, p. 7).

As my work is situated in the discursive perspective of selfhood, the current study sought to answer questions regarding the presentation of self as mediated through narrative production in three cognitively healthy and three cognitively impaired older bilingual Latinos. While using a tri-partite framework from which to analyze bilingual data in studies of linguistic nature—including repeated tellings, reported speech, and speaker roles—I analyzed in both of the speakers’ languages (1) the content of the participants’ twice-told narratives, (2) the enactment of self and others, and (3) the shifts in speaker roles. The findings demonstrated that participants with DAT continued to display their sense of self in first and second tellings, making a variety of lexical choices to index the self and their subjectivity. Retellings, however, were more favorable for the participants with DAT as twice-told stories seemed to enhance these speakers’ overall access to memory, language, and narrative ability. The findings present evidence that the notion
of the sense of self is grounded in discursive and interactional contexts, can be publicly manifested via narratives of personal experience, and is enhanced through the act of narrative retellings.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Growing old is a natural part of the human condition and lifespan. As advances in the fields of medicine and technology increase, the average life expectancy of the human race has expanded, with the National Institute of Aging (2011) and the World Health Organization (2016) reporting the average lifespan of Americans at 78.74 years and Latinos—one of the fastest growing populations in the U.S.—at 81.8 years. As the boom in the older adult population continues to grow and eventually surpasses the birth of children, many issues arise. One current pressing issue is the increase in the number of persons suffering from cognitive diseases, such as Dementia of the Alzheimer’s type (DAT). Currently, DAT, one out of seven other types of dementia, is classified as a progressive degenerative brain disease having major consequences and implications on a person’s communicative aptitudes (as DAT affects language), the ability to carry out daily routine, and the ability to interact successfully with others (especially to engage in sociocultural contexts and interactions).

1.1 Dementia of the Alzheimer’s Type (DAT)

DAT, the most common type of dementia, accounts for 50 to 70 percent of cases resulting in cognitive deficits such as memory limitations, deficits in language, reasoning, orientation, among others (Hamilton, 1994; Sabat & Harré, 2000; J. Small, Geldart, Gutman, & Clarke Scott, 1998; J. Small, Gutman, Makela, & Hillhouse, 2003). The causes of the disease remain unknown; there is currently no treatment for delaying or stopping the disease. Some
clinical symptoms associated with DAT are gradually worsening difficulty remembering new information, confusion and disorganized thinking (Alzheimer's Association, 2016).

According to the Alzheimer’s Association (2016), more than 5 million persons in the United States live with DAT. It is estimated that by the year 2030, 7.7 million persons in the United States will have Alzheimer’s disease and that this number will more than double by the year 2050 (16 million). According to the Alzheimer’s Association1, older Latinos diagnosed with the disease make up 4 percent (200,000) of the current population. When compared to other cultural/ethnic groups, Latinos have higher risk factors (i.e., other comorbid conditions such as diabetes, cardiovascular disease, obesity, etc.) and higher prevalence of developing DAT, partly due to low income and educational levels. Moreover, older Latinos tend to be diagnosed with the disease at a later stage due to financial and language barriers, further impacting their quality of life and affecting their caregivers. As the number of Latinos age 65 and older in the United States continues to grow2, DAT will continue to impact the quality of life of Latino communities across the United States3.

DAT is typically assessed via different cognitive batteries, with the Mini Mental State Examination4 (MMSE; Folstein, Folstein, & McHugh, 1975) being the most prominently used. It serves as a cognitive impairment assessment tool, but does not consider measures of the self.

---

1 Alzheimer’s Disease Facts and Figures, 2016.
2 According to the U.S. Census Bureau (2010), the number of Latinos living in the USA is 50.5 million. According to the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Administration on Aging (henceforth AOA), the number of those aged 65 and older is 2.8 million. AOA estimates that by 2050, this figure will grow to 17 million.
3 According to the Alzheimer’s Association, the number of Latinos estimated to have DAT by 2050 is 1.3 million.
4 The MMSE is a commonly used tool to assess mental status and cognitive impairment in older adults. The examination is a short (5-10 minute), 12-question measure that assesses five areas of cognitive function: orientation, registration, attention and calculation, repetition/recall, and language (Folstein, et al., 1975). The maximum score an individual can attain is 30 points and a score of 25 or lower indicates cognitive impairment. Additional cut-off scores are categorized as follows: 26–29 for questionable cognitive impairment; 21–25 for mild cognitive impairment; 11–20 for moderate cognitive impairment; and 0–10 for severe dementia (Perneczky et al., 2006).
Hence, instrumentation of the MMSE-type is insufficient in order to gather quantitative or qualitative data demonstrating the variety of ways self and personae can be revealed, or indexed.

1.2 Problematizing the Discourse on Memory: Narrating the Self When DAT is present

Many studies have focused on the narrative abilities of those with DAT, examining the various ways persons with DAT communicate selfhood or the sense of self. Some have argued that the sense of self in persons with DAT greatly diminishes as the disease progresses. Others have posited that within the cognitive deficits that are characteristically linked to the disease, the sense of self is maintained and seen in the retained conversational abilities of persons with DAT. However, when cognitive function, memory, and communication are impacted by a severe disease, such as DAT, what happens to the storyteller’s construction of the self? This is further problematized when a person with DAT speaks two languages. How do these speakers experience their sense of self through their two languages? What strategies do persons with DAT use to tell their story in their two languages? What linguistic choices do they make and which do they neglect to make? These questions form the basis of this study.

Clinical research on DAT has traditionally focused on the neurological, cognitive, and functional declines and deficits that accompany dementia. It is undeniable that DAT involves progressive cognitive degeneration over time, and leads to deficits in language, reasoning, and eventual loss of face. It is also undeniable that persons with DAT have preserved abilities even in late stages of the disease. Emergent theories of communication, pragmatics, language use, and the self in dementia, personhood and dementia, and brain aging have demonstrated the preserved abilities in persons with DAT in different stages as well as have shattered the notion that the person with DAT has no sense of self (Davis, 2011; Davis & Guendouzi, 2013; Davis &

Within the scholarship in the areas of applied linguistics, clinical sociolinguistics, and other interdisciplinary studies within linguistics, I propose to explore the narratives of self in bilingual Hispanics/Latinos with or without DAT.

### 1.3 Bilingualism, Aging, and DAT

Because this study focuses on the narratives of the self presented in bilingual Latinos, I will address the concept of bilingualism as it is related to aging and DAT. Bilinguals, or people who use two or more languages on a regular basis, make up at least half of the world’s population (Ardila, 2007; Grosjean, 2010). In the United States alone, 58 million people (or 20.4% of the current population accounted for in the latest Census) are estimated to speak another language ‘well’ besides English (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010). This trend will continue growing as the number of migrants to the United States and the number of children growing up with parents speaking another language in the home besides English increase. Although these numbers are not in close proximity to the number of bilinguals in other continents, it can be assumed that a great extent of these people will reach old age and will undoubtedly require more resources from their communities and other governmental and/or private agencies. From a health perspective, even more resources will be needed to address the needs of bilinguals and limited English proficiency speakers. From a research perspective, the continued development of a
robust research tradition in the area of bilingualism, cognitive aging, and health will be further needed, particularly from the perspective of a successful and dignified bilingual aging process. This will be more evident because the number of cases where a bilingual or multilingual older adult is diagnosed and/or affected with a condition such as dementia will continue to grow. When it comes to language and cognitive aging, however, bilinguals have been and continue to be an understudied group in North America. Although many studies in cognitive aging have been published in the United States, most studies have heavily relied on findings and research methods that address cognitive aging from the monolingual majority; that is, topics in this area of research have rarely addressed the bilingual perspective. Moreover, studies which have revolved around cognitive aging in the monolingual populations might not have accounted for persons who are fluent in an L2 or the inclusion of participants that speak more than one language (Gomez-Ruiz & Aguilar-Alonso, 2011). Still others have limited their studies of language and cognition to early childhood with a focus on normative standards as to what “normal” language performance is (de Bot & Schrauf, 2009; Hyltenstam & Obler, 1989; Schrauf, 2008). Notwithstanding this, some hypotheses on the L1 and L2 patterns of cognitive decline and preservation (to a lesser degree) of aging bilinguals/multilinguals have been suggested.

1.3.1 Bilingual Aging and Language Processing

In everyday communication, older adults may often complain about difficulties they have in language processing, such as difficulty remembering words or names or understanding others’ speech. Independent of the varied issues that arise in cognitive aging, these problems can have negative effects on an older adult’s psychological well being and his/her daily social interactions with others, which can lead to marginalization, isolation, or worse (Hummert & Nussbaum, 2001; Nussbaum & Coupland, 2004). In bilinguals, there are specific factors that affect language
processing as they age. First, a bilingual’s two (or more) language systems interact with each other and affect each other constantly (Bialystok, Craik, & Luk, 2012; Grosjean, 1989, 2010). These are jointly activated and in some circumstances may lead to language interference and other language errors in language production and comprehension (Bialystok et al., 2012; Craik & Bialystok, 2006; Schmid & Keijzer, 2009). Second, a bilingual’s use of his/her two or more languages is subject to growth, reversion, and/or attrition due to increased/decreased frequency of use, language proficiency, or the language environment where the bilingual is found (de Bot & Clyne, 1989; Schmid & Keijzer, 2009; Schrauf, 2008). Third, a bilingual’s two languages can vary depending on other factors, such as whether both languages were developed simultaneously or later on in life, whether both languages were needed and used during the lifespan, or whether the languages were learned in a formal setting such as a classroom or an informal setting, such as work. In the case of older bilinguals, these factors are not any different from younger bilinguals, and although contested (see Clyne 2011 and Schmid and Keijzer 2009 for more on the ‘myth of attrition’), specific factors have been hypothesized as primary factors in bilingual aging, such as language attrition and language reversion. Closely tied into these two factors are the speaker’s language environment, the speaker’s communicative language ability in his/her languages, and the speaker’s frequency of use of his/her L1 and L2. Because the current study’s participants are first generation migrants, the discussion focuses on this particular group within the broader spectrum of the bilingual aging population.

1.3.1.1 Language attrition

When a bilingual loses language knowledge over time in one of his/her languages, this is known as language attrition (de Bot, 2001; Schmid, 2009). Language attrition can occur in various settings and can be due to various environmental situations. According to Van Els
(1986), four phenomena are associated with language attrition: (1) L1 attrition in an L1 environment, (2) L1 attrition in an L2 environment, (3) L2 attrition in an L1 environment, and (4) L2 attrition in an L2 environment. The first phenomenon, L1 attrition in an L1 environment is mostly due to pathological factors such as aphasia, dementia, or other brain-related diseases/conditions. The second phenomenon, L1 attrition in an L2 environment, can be due to little or negligible language support for the L1 and strong cross-linguistic influences of the L2. This is particularly evident when the L2 is the language that is predominantly used in daily life or when there are no accommodations made to those who can communicate in the L2, such as the case of bilingual elderly in nursing homes (Müller, 2009). The third phenomenon, L2 attrition in an L1 environment, is primarily due to the loss of a learned foreign language when living in a monolingual society that happens to be the speaker’s L1. This is commonly observed in students or people who learn a foreign language yet never use it in the target country or do not have support for the L2 in their native country. The fourth phenomenon, or L2 attrition in an L2 environment, is mostly observed in individuals who live in a linguistically concentrated ethnic neighborhood (Schrauf, 2009) or elderly immigrants who have had a reduction in the context where the L2 is spoken (e.g., retirement, unemployment, disability) and/or no longer may find the need or use for the L2 (Ardila & Ramos, 2010; Schmid & Keijzer, 2009). All four of these phenomena can affect a bilingual’s ability to communicate with others in his/her L1 or L2.

1.3.1.2 Language reversion

Unlike language attrition, language reversion refers to a speaker’s return to the L1 (Schmid, 2009; Schmid & Keijzer, 2009). In the literature, this phenomenon is apparently seen most in migrants who have moved to another country which operates under a different language and culture than the migrant’s L1 and culture. Because of the change in surroundings and living
environment, migrants are forced to learn the L2 and use it in daily life. Anecdotal cases have been reported whereby some older adults experience a reversal or ‘reversion’ to their L1 after retirement. Thus their L1 becomes dominant again (partly due to their social/ethnic enclave, or perhaps a return to their country of origin, among other factors) whereas the L2 recedes to some degree. Although no empirical data to date suggests that this phenomenon is an accurate description\(^5\) of language change, it has been and currently is studied as a phenomenon in bilingual aging.

### 1.3.2 DAT and Bilingualism

Much like the study of language patterns in healthy bilingual older adults, the study of bilingual older adults with dementia is also scarce. Based on the literature on DAT in monolinguals, it is well known that the disease affects not only memory, but other cognitive domains such as language, executive function (Albert, Moss, Tanzi, & Jones, 2001; Chen et al., 2001), information processing speed (Aggarwal, Wilson, Beck, Bienias, & Bennett, 2005; Tabert et al., 2006), attention (Nielsen, Lolk, Andersen, Andersen, & Kragh-Sørensen, 1999), and visuospatial perception (Almkvist & Bäckman, 1993; Kempler & Goral, 2008). This is true for both monolingual and bilingual populations. With respect to language, most studies in monolingual populations have focused on semantic decline (see Weintraub, 2012 for a more comprehensive review) and decline in idea density (Butler, Ashford, & Snowdon, 1996; Snowdon et al., 1996). In bilinguals, however, other issues have been commonly observed. These issues range from semantic fluency difficulties and declines in one of the speaker’s languages (i.e., one language is affected to a greater extent than the other), to difficulties in other

---

\(^5\) Schmid and Keijzer (2009) have called it a convenient and ubiquitous myth which “relieves the participants of responsibility…” to their elders (p. 85).
domains, such as pragmatic deficits in conversation (e.g., language separation, language intrusion, and involuntary code switching). These deficits can appear throughout the course of the disease (Cuetos, Arango-Lasprilla, Uribe, Valencia, & Lopera, 2007), but from these different ranges, the most commonly observed difficulty in language production is seen in semantic retrieval. In fact, semantic difficulty has been observed to deteriorate early on, and to some extent, it can be observed much earlier from the time the diagnosis of the disease is made (Cuetos et al., 2007; de Jager & Budge, 2005; Jacobs et al., 1995; B. J. Small, Herlitz, Fratiglioni, Almkvist, & Bäckman, 1997).

Semantic verbal fluency was studied by de Piccioto and Friedland (2001) in a group of 30 cognitively healthy older English-Afrikaans speakers and a smaller group of English-Afrikaans speakers with DAT. All participants were asked to complete three 1-minute semantic fluency tasks based on semantic clusters of animals (e.g., farm animals, sea animals, etc.). Participants were asked to find animal names based on these clusters three times: once in English, once in Afrikaans, and once in either of their two languages (bilingual mode). The results indicated that there was no significant difference between the three tasks/two language modes in the healthy bilingual group. The researchers also found that this group made use of semantic clustering strategies, particularly when the task at hand was conducted using the bilingual mode. Although this group made use of code switching as a strategy when completing the bilingual fluency task, it did not improve their overall verbal fluency scores. The DAT group, unlike the healthy bilingual group, scored poorly in semantic retrieval (particularly in English—the L2), did not make use of code switching as a strategy in the bilingual mode, and did not use semantic clustering to their advantage. Although the results cannot be generalizable, the researchers
hypothesized that in the DAT group, age of acquisition and patterns of language use might be factors which account for the group’s overall poor scores in the L2.

Another study that looked at verbal fluency was Salvatierra, Roselli, Acevedo, and Duara (2007). The researchers interviewed 11 cognitively healthy Spanish-English bilinguals and 11 Spanish-English bilinguals with mild to moderate DAT. They asked all participants to complete a semantic verbal fluency task and the phonemic verbal fluency task with the letters F, A, S with the purpose of testing whether semantic fluency declines more precipitously in the early stages of DAT than phonemic fluency. Both tasks were conducted in Spanish and English. The researchers found that bilingual speakers with DAT performed poorly in both tasks when compared to the cognitively healthy control group. They found that the DAT group produced less overall words in L2 (English) in both tasks and less words in the semantic than the phonemic task when compared to cognitively healthy bilinguals. They also produced less semantic clusters and made more intrusion errors in L2 when compared to the control group. These findings resonate with de Piccioto and Friedland’s earlier findings on semantic fluency in bilinguals with DAT.

In studies looking at code switching and language mixing, a multiplicity of results have been found. For example, in Hyltenstam and Stroud (1989), their case study participants had difficulty using the appropriate language with monolingual interlocutors, generating many instances of code-switching throughout their interactions, particularly in their non-dominant language. In De Santi, Obler, Sabo-Abramson and Goldberger’s (1990) study with four bilingual persons with DAT, the researchers found that as severity of DAT increased, so did the instances of inappropriate code-switching with their monolingual interlocutors. They also found that in the sole participant who learned both languages simultaneously in childhood, code switching did not
occur inappropriately even though the participant was in a more advanced stage than others who did inappropriately code switch.

In another example of a study observing code-switching and language mixing (Friedland & Miller, 1999), language mixing was analyzed through a conversation analytic approach in four English-Afrikaans speakers with DAT. The participants were interviewed twice for a period of 10 minutes on natural conversational topics during various intervals in a year. They were interviewed once in their two languages by a monolingual interlocutor (i.e., once in English and once in Afrikaans). The researchers then transcribed the 10 minute interviews using conversation analysis to observe how frequently inappropriate language mixing occurred and in which language. Additionally, the researchers looked at trouble spots and how they were handled conversationally. The results showed that although not all participants performed inappropriate code switching, there was more interference from L1 in L2 talk and less interference from the L2 in L1 talk in those participants who did code-switch. This was more evident in those speakers who were less proficient in their L2, not more advanced in DAT. Additionally, more trouble spots in conversation arose in those speakers who used code switching to a higher extent in conversation.

In a study observing language decline and regression in four Japanese-Portuguese bilinguals (Meguro et al., 2003), language skill declines were found in the L1, among other findings. The researchers performed confrontation naming tasks, oral reading ability task, vocabulary comprehension task (matching words and drawings), written lexical decision task, and the Western Aphasia Battery. All four participants had difficulty in naming in both their languages and had difficulty reading aloud irregular words in Portuguese and Japanese Kanji. As stated previously, these participants showed greater deterioration in their L1 (Japanese) than their
L2 (Portuguese). This was partly because all four participants were living in Brazil for an extended number of years, and their environment was predominantly Portuguese. Therefore, their use of Japanese was greatly reduced to private spaces, if at all. Although these findings cannot be generalizable, it is one of a few studies that does not seem to support Paradis’ (2004) Activation Threshold Hypothesis. It also implies that in bilinguals with DAT, language deterioration or attrition does not necessarily affect the L2, but differential patterns in language deterioration, much like those seen in bilingual aphasics.

Similarly, in a case study conducted with a German-English bilingual diagnosed with DAT and living in the United States since age 18, Nold (2005) found that the less dominant language (L1) of a speaker diagnosed with DAT is affected and substantially declines. In this case, the less dominant language of the participant was German. Using an ethnographic approach, Nold interacted with this participant on three occasions during a two-year period. During these interactions, the researcher used both languages, but mostly German. He found that the participant understood more German than she was able to use, resulting in increased use of code switching and mixing when spoken to in German. This was not the case however in her dominant language (English). In English, Nold found that the participant’s spoken utterances tended to be more similar to that of other monolinguals with DAT. When the participant was at a loss for words, the amount of empty or unfinished discourse increased, similar to what can be
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Paradis’ (2004) Activation Threshold Hypothesis explains the effects of controlled processes on second language acquisition to a greater extent. According to Paradis’ model, ease of lexical, phonological, or grammatical access in L1 or L2 is dependent on frequency of activation (i.e., how frequently or infrequently an item is used or activated) and time of activation (i.e., how recently an item has been used or activated). Ease is also dependent on a speaker’s inhibition mechanism, or how well a speaker can suppress initial interference from their strongest language. The combination of these two processes found in this model could then possibly offer a better explanation as to why language attrition may affect to a greater extent those migrants who do not frequently or recently access lexical items in one of their languages (e.g., L1 if the migrant hardly uses this language in domestic and public spaces or L2 if the migrant resides and works in spaces where L1 is the norm). Thus, the less activation a speaker has in a given language, the higher the threshold in accessing the information; alternatively, the more frequent or recent the activation in a given language, the lower the threshold.
observed in monolinguals diagnosed with the disease. Also, the use of formulaic speech in the dominant language was noticeable in the informal interviews conducted with the participant. Based on these findings, Nold concluded that when spoken to in the L1 (German), this particular DAT speaker was able to access some of her L1. When she had difficulty accessing the L1 lexicon, she made appropriate use of code switching and mixing in her L2 (English) as a strategy to accommodate and co-construct meaning with the interlocutor (the researcher). As is seen in previously discussed studies regarding decline and regression in the nondominant language, Nold’s findings are consistent with others’ findings discussed above (Hyltenstam & Stroud, 1989; Meguro et al., 2003).

Unlike the findings in the Meguro, et al. and Nold studies discussed above, in another case study observing language regression, McMurray, Saito, and Nakamoto (2009) found reversion to the L1. In this study, two Japanese-English bilinguals with DAT were given a series of tests on attention, mental control, memory, visuospatial constructions, calculations, abstract reasoning, and frontal/executive control functions. The men did not show much impairment in calculations, abstract reasoning, and frontal-executive control functions, but they showed decline in memory, particularly in tasks that required them to recognize word lists recall. Additionally, the regression to the primary language, or Japanese, was observed before the dementia symptomology.

Similar findings regarding language regression are discussed in Mendez, Perryman, Pontón, and Cummings (1999). In their study, they tested 51 participants for memory problems. All of these participants reportedly used another language besides English and were all exposed to English by or before age 13. All were reported to have language interference when using their L2 (English), and all were reported as regressing to the L1 or primary language. However,
participants were not tested for language per se, but researchers interviewed caregivers, who in turn, provided the information anecdotally.

In a study conducted by Gollan et al. (2010), the effects of language dominance are also observed. Unlike the previous findings discussed in the above-mentioned studies regarding language dominance, Gollan et al. found that the common assumptions of language use held in bilinguals with DAT (i.e., that there is a regression to the dominant/first-learned language, word retrieval becomes overall more difficult, keeping languages apart is reduced, etc.) is not as predictable as had been observed. The researchers conducted a study with 29 Spanish-English bilinguals diagnosed with DAT and 42 healthy Spanish-English bilinguals. These individuals were further classified into groups of language dominance (i.e., English dominant, Spanish dominant). The study participants were given the Boston Naming Test in their dominant language first, followed by their nondominant language. Additionally, participants were given the option of naming pictures in either of their two languages, as previous research has demonstrated that giving this option increases the overall score a participant would obtain in naming tasks. All groups benefited from either-language testing. Although all groups benefited from this mode of testing, both groups of bilinguals with DAT demonstrated similar declines in naming abilities in their dominant languages when compared to their healthy counterparts. However, the English dominant group with DAT demonstrated significant declines in picture naming in their dominant language when compared to the cognitively healthy English dominant group and the Spanish dominant DAT group. With regards to nondominant language retrieval, both English and Spanish dominant groups demonstrated decline, but not at the rate and to the extent demonstrated in their dominant languages. That is, the ability to access or retrieve information in the dominant language seems to decline to a greater extent in bilinguals with DAT.
than in those without DAT. This finding suggests that previously held assumptions about language regression to the dominant language are not necessarily the case. Gollan et al. (2010) suggest that although the dominant language has stronger and more prevalent neurological connections in the cortex, this same strength is the weakness. Although both languages decline in DAT, the nature of the dominant’s language richer and copious semantic connections are continuously more susceptible to decline (because there are more of them) than those for a nondominant language (even though they are both found in the same shared region in the cortex).

As seen above, various patterns of language decline, regression, separation, and retrieval have been reported and observed in bilinguals diagnosed with DAT. Moreover, various factors regarding education, literacy levels, age of acquisition, and proficiency, among others have also been considered and reported to affect bilingualism in DAT. The results of all these patterns point to a mixed and incomplete picture of how language processing is affected in bilinguals diagnosed with DAT. As can be seen from this discussion, the question of how languages are affected or which language is affected first is complex and unresolved. Missing from this discussion, however, are questions of preserved abilities in persons with DAT as well as factors associated with these bilinguals’ sense of self, self-representations, and self-perceptions in their two languages. With the advent of more studies within the field of applied linguistics and other interdisciplinary areas, and in conjunction with naturalistic (ecological) type studies, more light can be shed on these questions. Also missing in this extensive literature is any attention to issues of how language attrition due to the disease might affect the sense of self. The current study aims to both articulate that question and answer it via an empirical study of persons with DAT and their unaffected, cognitively healthy counterparts.
1.4 Aims of the Study

This study proposes to explore the impact DAT has on the narrative expression of the sense of self in bilingual Latinos diagnosed with the disease. Little research on this issue has been carried out on bilinguals with DAT (Bialystok, 2007; Gollan et al., 2010; Gollan, Salmon, Montoya, & Galasko, 2011). Most research on self in individuals diagnosed with DAT has primarily focused on monolingual English speakers, the majority being of white or African American background. Of these studies, multiple have focused on monolingual individuals’ loss of cognitive function, memory loss, and declines in communication. Current literature in the area has found that even though there is an internal (neuropathological and neuropsychological) decline that affects those diagnosed with DAT, individuals with DAT continue to display an external or social self. That is, individuals with DAT demonstrate a sense of personhood, or the “standing or status that is bestowed upon one human being by others, in the context of relationship and social being” (Kitwood, 1997, p. 7). As my work is situated in the discursive perspective of selfhood, I will argue that the notion of the sense of self is grounded in discursive and interactional contexts and can be publicly manifested via narratives of personal experience. I will argue that speakers diagnosed with DAT can make use of multiple ways of displaying their sense of self besides the use of personal pronouns, attributive language, and personal references discussed in social constructivists studies relating to language and the self in DAT. That is, speakers express their sense of self and subjectivity through the medium of language, but even more so through the act of narrating.
1.5 Research Questions

In light of previous and current research of the impact DAT has on the sense of self and language, and in light of the existing gap in the literature regarding older bilingual Latinos, this study will focus on the following questions:

1. How do stories told by bilingual individuals with DAT differ from those told by bilingual individuals without DAT?
2. What strategies do individuals with DAT use while telling their stories versus those used by individuals without DAT?
3. How is reported speech used by both groups and to what extent is reported speech used differently/similarly in each group?
4. How do the speakers perform their own self or the selves of others through reported speech? Do speakers quote themselves as extensively as they quote others?

Based on these questions, I formulated the following hypotheses regarding the narrative expression of the sense of self in older bilingual Latinos with DAT: (1) participants with DAT will display a preserved sense of self in their twice-told stories; (2) participants with DAT will show fewer instances of reported speech and character speaker role than normal controls in both tellings, and (3) participants with DAT will show lower complexity of reported speech than normal controls in both tellings.

By understanding how the bilingual sense of self could be presented, impacted, or maintained in bilingual Latinos with DAT, I add to the literature in the area of applied linguistics as well as suggest comparative narrative data that the current literature rarely approaches regarding the self, bilingualism, and Alzheimer’s disease. This research will thus focus on how
bilingual Latinos with or without DAT use their two languages to construct, enact, maintain, or present the self in narrative accounts of personal experience.

1.6 Organization of the Dissertation

In chapter 2, I provide a broad overview of the three overarching topics discussed in this study: (1) narrating the self, (2) the bilingual dimensions of the self in narrative, and (3) narrating the self when DAT is present. In the first segment of the chapter, I discuss theories of the self, followed by the self as mediated via discursive acts (e.g., narrative). I then explore literature on the narrated self from an applied linguistics perspective, with some discussion on the narrated bilingual self. I then discuss the self in relation to DAT, the concept of personhood in DAT, and social constructivist theories regarding the self in DAT. I finalize the chapter with a discussion on emergent literature in the area of self and DAT, reviewing other social constructivist and psychosocial approaches. This is then followed by a discussion on the emergent and most relevant studies in the area of applied linguistics, clinical sociolinguistics, and other interdisciplinary approaches.

In chapter 3, I lay out various conceptual frameworks regarding repeated tellings of the ‘same’ stories, reported speech, and speaker roles—the main lenses used in the analysis of the data presented in this study. I explore research in the area of sociolinguistics and interactional linguistics to conceptualize a working framework that encompasses the different characteristics observed in repeated tellings. I also include a detailed discussion on reported speech, including the different modes and examples of these taken from data not included in the data chapters. I then discuss the concept of speaker roles, borrowing from Koven’s work on bilingual French-
Portuguese speakers (Koven, 2002, 2007). This chapter, thus, establishes the groundwork for the qualitative analysis carried out in chapters 5 and 6.

In chapter 4, I discuss the research methodology and design used in this study, describing the context of the research sites and bringing light to the historical dispersion and migration patterns of Latinos in the sites visited. This is followed by a detailed explanation of the recruitment process and the different sites visited for recruiting participants. I include and list thorough background information for each participant recruited, along with the instruments used with the cognitively healthy group and the group of persons with DAT. Lastly, I discuss the coding scheme used for the analysis of the data as well as the transcription criteria.

In chapter 5, I present the data used in this study. First, I present the three cognitively healthy participants, providing a brief background with details of the context of the interviews. I also present (in table format) information regarding each participant’s age, time in the United States, and the MMSE scores as these three data points were used to match the cognitively healthy group with the experimental group. I then discuss the narrative choices made by cognitively healthy bilingual speakers, analyzing the data using the categories and framework discussed in chapter 3. I then offer a summary of the most critical findings for this group of participants.

Chapter 6 focuses on the narrative data of bilinguals with DAT, presenting the data as was done in chapter 5.

In chapter 7, I discuss the goals and objectives of this study, comparing the differences found between the group of participants diagnosed with DAT and the cognitively healthy one. I also offer some concluding remarks on the significance of this study highlighting key findings.
Limitations and implications of my work will be presented, along with possible next steps to be carried out for future research in this area.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Narrating the Self with or without DAT

In this chapter, I explore two major areas relevant to the current study: (1) narrating the self and (2) narrating the self when DAT is present. In the first section of this chapter, I explore the current scholarly literature related to theories of the self and narratives of the self in order to highlight the manner in which speakers express the self and display identity.\(^7\) I focus on studies that address the discursive construction of the self and identity in order to reach a better understanding of what speakers do when they perform and display self and identity. Because the current study investigates how bilingual Latinos with or without DAT perform the self in narratives, I finalize this section by discussing current studies on the construction and presentation of the bilingual or multilingual self.\(^8\) In the next section (2.2), I discuss literature on narratives of self in persons with DAT, focusing first on different perspectives of selfhood in DAT and briefly discussing personhood. I then discuss emergent literature resulting from these studies, finalizing the chapter with emergent literature on the self, DAT, and preserved abilities in discourse and narrative in the areas of applied linguistics, clinical linguistics, and sociolinguistics. This review thus has the following purposes: (1) offering a summary of theories of the self, (2) discussing current findings related to narrating the self, (3) discussing relevant
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\(^7\) Because the scope of this study is mostly on the notion of the self and narrating the self, a separate construct of identity will not be included in this literature review. These two concepts will be used interchangeably.

\(^8\) The term bilingual in this study refers to a person’s ability to control two languages, regardless of their level of competence in each skill (speaking, listening, reading, and writing); because bilinguals use their languages differently (based on the domain and whom they use it with), proficiency levels in their L1 and L2 vary (Dewaele, 2015).
literature regarding the bilingual self and narration, and (4) discussing the narration of the self when DAT is present. This review will help better understand not only what linguistic choices and devices may be present or persist in the narratives of self of bilingual persons with or without DAT but also how speakers with or without DAT express the self via narrative.

2.1 Narrating the Self

People tell stories for multiple purposes, among them as a way to construct and reconstruct the self, and as a way to internalize and make sense of prior experiences. Narrative in essence is a uniquely human way of making sense of experience; it allows us and others to understand what would otherwise be random events (Polkinghorne, 1988, 1991), imbuing our life experiences with meaning and significance. Moreover, the process of telling our stories offers a space for us to share our story with an audience. The way we tell our stories and the underlying textual structures found in these episodes or events are rooted in our past, our present, and even our imagined future. Because of this, our stories cannot help but be interwoven with our social and cultural context (Schiffrin, 1996). That is, our stories are situated in our local and even global socio-cultural surroundings. But what does it mean to narrate the self and how are these ideas relevant to the self? In what follows, I will broadly define the self, including definitions in the field of psychology as well as applied linguistics. I will then discuss the link between self and narrative, and finally focus on narrative studies in scholarship in the area of applied linguistics.

2.1.1 Defining the Self and its Connection to Narrative

From the time of Aristotle and Plato to the post-modern times of Derrida and Foucault, the question of “what is the self?” has been posed from multiple perspectives and philosophies in
Western culture. Defining the self is not a straightforward task. Many researchers use the term interchangeably with identity. Yet others do not distinguish their defining frameworks from other frameworks, leading to more ambiguity and confusion. Although a plethora of concepts and ideas abound the concept of the self (Harter, 1999), two early scholars are influential in the scholarship in the area of psychology of the self—George Mead and William James. In *Mind, Self and Society* (1934), Mead distinguishes between the self of consciousness (that which focuses its attention outward) and the self of self-awareness (that which focuses its attention to the inward). In his seminal work, *The Principles of Psychology*, James (1950) distinguished between two concepts, particularly the ‘categorical self’ or the ‘me’ composed of specific traits, characteristics, and emotions, among others, and the ‘subjective self’ or the ‘I’. Both concepts establish a difference between an outward and inward ‘self’, each adding other sublayers of the sense of self to these two notions. Others have continued using these two distinct notions of the self, elaborating on these to include other components of the self (c.f., Morin, 2006).

Another important yet divergent perspective regarding the notion of the self emerged from the scholarship in discursive psychology. Rom Harré (1987) and later Harré and Gillett (1994) suggested that self is distinct from the person. That is, person referred to the idea of a “publicly recognized human individual who is the focus of overt practices of social life” (Harré, 1987, p. 110), whereas the self referred to the idea of a ‘still centre of experience’ (p. 99) containing various conscious states. They argued that the sense of self and concepts of selfhood are intricately linked to personal identity (p. 104). They further added, “to have a sense of self is to have a sense of being quadruply located, of having a place in four coordinated manifolds” (p. 104). They referred to these manifolds as “systems of location” consisting of location in space, location in time, social location, and responsibility (agency). Based on these distinctions, they
argue that the sense of self or selfhood can be observed through discursive production, in particular, through indexical system of a language, as these point to “each individual’s structure of consciousness” (1994, p. 108). Thus, the self is constructed through discourse.

Bruner (1986) and later Polkinghorne (1988) elaborated further the concept of discourse and the self as it relates to cognition. Bruner posited that there are two models of cognitive functioning or modes: the paradigmatic (or logico-scientific) mode and the narrative mode (the mode of action and consciousness). The paradigmatic mode verifies arguments using procedures to test for empirical truth and then establish formal proof of said arguments. The narrative mode establishes verisimilitude, the vicissitudes of intention. Speaking of self and narrative, Polkinghorne (1988) stated the following:

…we achieve our personal identities and self concept through the use of the narrative configuration, and make our existence into a whole by understanding it as an expression of a single unfolding and developing story. We are in the middle of our stories and cannot be sure how they will end; we are constantly having to review the plot as new events are added to our lives. Self, then, is not a static thing or a substance, but a configuring of personal events into an historical unity which includes not only what one has been but also anticipations of what one will be. (p. 150)

Hence, the self is brought to conscious awareness through narrative, and as such, is a process of meaning-construction. It is also recipient-designed and thus subject to editing and revision. The self takes its meaning from “the historical circumstances that gave shape to the culture of which it is an expression” (Bruner, 1990, p. 138).

In the field of linguistics, studies on self are also comprised of varied theoretical approaches and perspectives. One commonality in these, however, is that the self as separate
from others is linked to verbalization of experience—or the way we verbally recapitulate past, present, and/or future hypothetical experience. In the article, *Narrating the self*, Ochs and Capps (1996) posited that the self is “an unfolding reflective awareness of being-in-the-world, including a sense of one’s past and future” (1996, p. 21). They argue that narrative and the self are intricately linked as narrative is born out of experience, and in turn it works as a medium to shape the self, with temporality and point of view as basic dimensions that afford coherence to the narrative. For these reasons, narratives represent part of our views at a particular point in time, revealing the self partially while generating multiple, fragmented and partial selves during our life spans. Hence, revisiting an account previously narrated may result in an alteration of “one’s sense of being-in-the-world” (p. 23) and a new narrative reading. For Ochs and Capps, narrative is a tool that allows us to “…actualize our selves…probing and forging connections between our unstable, situated selves…[as well as] recognizing and integrating repressed and alienated selves” (pp. 29-30). It also serves as an interface for the self and society, “constituting a crucial resource for socializing emotions, attitudes, and identities, developing interpersonal relationships, and constituting membership in a community (p. 19).

In an effort to challenge the field of linguistics to take on a more social constructivist approach towards the analysis of identity, Ochs (1993) provided a theoretical framework for the concept of ‘social identity’. She defined social identity as that which is constructed via verbally performed social acts and verbally displayed stances. Although she did not explicitly connect this to the sense of self, one’s social identity points to or indexes human actions, beliefs,
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9 For Ochs, the term *social act* refers to any goal-directed behavior that is socially recognized, such as praising, disagreeing, protesting, etc. *Stance* is defined by Ochs as a socially recognized point of view or attitude which is displayed, including epistemic stance (the level of certainty or authority a speaker has about a given proposition) and affective stance (feelings, moods, dispositions, or attitudes about some proposition or referent; Ochs & Schieffelin, 1989).
thoughts, or feelings, and as such provides a means through which we can better analyze how people construct a sense of self as well as a sense of reality via discourse. One’s social identity, then, affects what we do when we perform a particular type of verbal act, such as narratives. Our social identities also embed a range of social personae (e.g., roles, statuses, gender, positions, etc.) which are constructed actively via linguistic signs and symbols. However, Ochs explained that social identity is not encoded explicitly via language, but rather it is inferred by interlocutors’ understanding of the sometimes-complex social acts and stances encoded in the linguistic constructions a speaker performs/displays via discourse. That is, “the relation of language to social identity is not direct but rather mediated by the interlocutors’ understandings of conventions for doing particular social acts and stances and the interlocutor’s understanding of how acts and stances are resources of structuring particular social identities” (p. 289). Social acts and stances, furthermore, can allow us to understand and examine how different reactions to these can reveal or give rise to yet other social identities (e.g., family vs. professional identities). They can also reveal certain cultural universals or cross-cultural differences observed in language. For instance, affective stance can be marked by the use of certain emotion words in different cultures, such as anger, fear, surprise, etc. (Ochs & Schieffelin, 1989); epistemic stance is marked through the use of ‘oh-prefaced’ utterances to establish certainty and authority in discourse (Heritage, 2005) while tag questions, modals, and other interrogatives mark uncertainty in discourse (Lakoff, 1973). These ways of producing social identity, according to Ochs, highlight cross-cultural differences and similarities. The commonalities, thus, allow us understand that to certain degree, we share ‘elements of a universal culture’ (p. 300), which in turn allows us to make sense of others (and make sense to others) in intercultural and cross-cultural interactions.
Accepting the social constructivist challenge, Schiffrin (1996) studied the sociolinguistic constructions of identity, focusing on the displays of self and social identities observed in narrative of two Jewish-American women, Jan and Zelda. Her analysis of mother-daughter stories revealed how language is used by the speakers to (1) reveal and resolve family trouble as well as (2) highlight solidarity and distance in these relationships. She demonstrated that through linguistic choices, syntax, contextual cues, among others, speakers displayed two aspects of the self that were at odds with themselves: the epistemic self and the agentive self (à la Bruner, 1990). Through the epistemic self, the speakers demonstrated their knowledge and beliefs about their family trouble (i.e., the metaphorical view that the family trouble could be ‘cured’ or remain ‘a sore spot’ in the relationships with their respective daughter/daughter-in-law). Through the agentive self, the speakers demonstrated their goal-directed action (in this case, verbal action) when they stated, “I don’t care” or “That’s okay!” to their respective family members. At a textual level, Schiffrin found that the displays of epistemic and agentive selves help “to build a connection between our linguistic displays of self and the construction of positions…[providing] a sensitive index to our ongoing relationships with others in that story world” (p. 196). Through this study, she offered other alternative means through which to carry out sociolinguistic analyses of language. Much like Ochs, Schiffrin stated the following about identity in light of predetermined categories found in sociolinguistic analyses:

…identity is neither categorical nor fixed… [it depends] on what we are doing and with whom. This view forces us to attend to speech activities, and to the interactions in which they are situated, as a frame in which our social roles are realized and our identities are displayed—and even further, as a potential resource for the display (and possible creation) of identity. Our transformation of experience into stories, and the way we carry
it out, is thus a way to show our interlocutors the salience of particular aspects of our
identities.

Via her analysis of these two women’s narratives, Schiffrin not only contributed to the
scholarship on identity and language, but also provided empirical evidence linking identity to
locally and globally situated contexts, making identity dynamic.

Building on the construct of positioning theory, Michael Bamberg (1997) added another
layer to the analysis of self and identity in narrative. He proposed applying the notion of
positioning to the act of storytelling (or narrative). Positioning takes place at three different
levels in narrative: (1) positioning in the tale world (how are characters are positioned vis-à-vis
others in the story world), (2) positioning in the interactional process (how the narrator positions
him/herself toward interlocutors and in turn is positioned by them), and (3) positioning of the self
to the self (how one positions oneself with regards to one’s own subjectivity, and through this,
answers the question ‘Who am I?’). He used this framework to analyze three different stories,
finding in each, one of the three positioning levels standing out. He argued that through this
alternative approach to analyzing narratives, a different purpose can be found to a story besides
Labov & Waletzky’s (1967) ‘so what’s the point’ question. That is, a story can have other
purposes, such as answering the question ‘who I really am’ (p. 342), as well as serving to
entertain, give advice, align with the audience, etc.

In a later article, Bamberg, De Fina, and Schiffrin (2011) discuss the construction of the
self and identity via discourse, following Gee’s (1999) definition of capital-D discourses
(discourse containing societal/institutional norms and traditions) and small-d discourses (those
discourses of the everyday activities). They asserted that identity is negotiated among speakers in
a social context, and as such, emerges in the form of subjectivity and a sense of self. Looking at
identity constructed through discourse, they also argued that speakers navigate through a series of identity dilemmas. These are (1) the dilemma of sameness and change across a speaker’s entire or partial biography (2) the dilemma of sameness vs. difference in the speaker’s social context (*ipse* vs. *idem*); and (3) the dilemma of agency and control. When it relates to narrative, speakers are able to “construct a sense of continuous self—one that fuses past and future orientation together into one’s present identity” (p. 180).

Interactional positioning theory and the Bakhtinian concept of voicing have also been approaches taken to study the phenomenon of the self in narratives. Using these two approaches, Wortham (2001) found that Jane, a 57-year old American woman participating in scientific research, positioned herself and others interactionally in her narrative. While analyzing her narratives, Wortham found that at the level of the narrated event, a connection between Jane’s developmental process (i.e., from childhood to adulthood) and her positioning in the narrated event was present. That is, during her childhood, she enacted a more passive self, victimized due to a series of bad decisions made by strangers or other adults in her family on her behalf. While narrating about her teenage and young adult years, she positioned herself as more active and assertive. At the level of the narration world, however, Jane continued to shift between passive and active persona, leading Wortham to argue that the transformation enacted by Jane is her recourse toward establishing and maintaining her sense of self. In order for the self to be narrated, thus, various mechanisms of narrative self-construction help transform, enact, or establish the self. Wortham argued that when analyzing the self in narrative, analyst should observe various aspects: (1) the emergence of patterns of narrated voices of self and others; (2) the voicing (ventriloquating; Bakhtin, 1986) of self and others; (3) the positioning of self vis-à-vis interlocutors in the narrating space; and (4) parallelism between representation and
enactment. In order to reach what Wortham describes as “an adequate account of the self” (p. 156), then, the analyst must weigh in the various levels of explanation of the self at once, not focus solely on one favored level of analysis. The interactions of these various levels, hence, explain how the self may be partially produced.

2.1.2 The Self in L2 Narratives

Within the field of applied linguistics, another aspect that has been studied more widely during the last two decades is the self in relation to language and bi/multilingualism. Many accounts have shown how bilingual/multilingual writers have felt about their sense of self when using their L2 or L1 (Besemer, 2004; Pavlenko & Lantolf, 2013). Some writers, such as Eva Hoffman (1989), noted a loss of part of who they were, yet via the new language, a reinvention of the self came into play. The writer, Julia Alvarez (1991) also attested to a similar experience when she came to terms with her L2 identity: “a woman who writes books in the language of Emily Dickinson and Walt Whitman, and also of the rude shopper in the grocery store and of the boys throwing stones in the schoolyard, their language, which is now my language” (Alvarez, 1991, p. 72). Other studies have shown how speakers feel differently when they speak/write in another language (L2, L3, etc.) (Dewaele, 2016; Pavlenko, 2006) or express a different personality (or personality changes) when speaking another language (Ożańska-Ponikwia, 2012; Ramírez-Esparza, Gosling, Benet-Martínez, Potter, & Pennebaker, 2006). Yet other studies have examined the different presentations of the self (directly or indirectly) in contexts, such as second language learning and the L2 identity (Dewaele, 2011; Kanno, 2000; Pavlenko, 1998; Pavlenko & Lantolf, 2013; Wolf, 2006), or study abroad (Kinginger, 2004, 2008). Yet what exactly does feeling different or expressing a different personality mean in L2 narratives of the
self? Recent studies on bilingualism and the narrative expression of the self can shed light on these inquiries.

In search for answers to questions such as the ones posed above, Pavlenko (2006) studied bilingualism and emotions via the answers participants gave to a web questionnaire. Her study included the responses of 1,039 bi- and multilinguals, most of whom were women and/or were highly educated. She found that different respondents arrived at different explanations as to why they perceived themselves differently in their L2, L3, etc. She compared the respondents’ affirmative responses with reflections written by translingual writers, and studies in the fields of psychology and psychoanalysis. Through the combination of these three different perspectives, she suggested that the age when a speaker learned their L2 or LX influences how s/he may experience emotionality and subjectivity in that other language. ¹⁰ That is, a speaker’s perceived self and experienced emotionality in the L1 and L2 may differ depending on whether the L2 was acquired earlier or later in life. She also added that other reasons, such as differences between language and culture, levels of proficiency, and/or living in a monolingual nation-state, may also explain some of the variance in respondents’ answers. When explaining this variance, she stated, “…languages may create different, and sometimes incommensurable, worlds for their speakers who feel that their selves change with the shift in language…[which] may be linked to different linguistic repertoires, cultural scripts, frames of expectation, autobiographic memories, and levels of proficiency and emotionality” (p. 27). She concluded by stating that the differences in identity and self of bilinguals is not a trivial pursuit or a trivial matter. Unlike monolingual register shifts, shifts between two languages are more pronounced and marked in a bilingual’s experience and lifeworlds.

¹⁰ LX, a term that refers to foreign language (Dewaele, 2015), is a language that is not the language spoken in the current geographical location where the speaker resides.
Koven (2007), whose work has influenced the current study’s analytical framework, has also examined issues of bilingualism and the sense of self. In her research work on French-Portuguese bilinguals, she defined the self as “embedded in and emergent from discursive context and is variable for the same person across such contexts” (2007, p. 11). Koven argued that bilingual speakers index or point to different selves or different others in and across their two languages in the sociolinguistic contexts where these speakers have learned and used their two languages. A speech event, such as narrative, can serve as the medium through which speakers present their there-and-then narrated selves in relation to their current, here-and-now selves. The context in which the bilingual self is presented is also important as a speaker’s language choice (and language ideology) in a given context indexes, or points to, the speaker’s subjective sense of self as well as the speaker’s positioning in a larger sociodemographic and socioeconomic order. Given these three concepts (self, language, context), Koven sought to systematically operationalize the relationship among language, identity, and context. Through Bakhtin’s notion of voicing (1981, 1986), the concept of indexicality (Ochs, 1990; Silverstein, 1976), speakers’ self-reported intuitions of their sense of self in two languages, and listeners’ perceptions of said speakers, Koven created a framework where the bilingual self could be ‘measured’. That is, through multiple tellings of the same events by the same speaker, Koven analyzed how speakers make lexical choices, quote themselves and others, use register and different speaker roles. She argued that speakers do not “merely describe a series of past events…but perform and interpret the events they recount...[involving] performance of and commentary upon multiple socially and spatiotemporally locatable voices of selves and others” (pp. 241-242).
2.1.3 Summary

From the results of these studies on the monolingual/bilingual self and narrative, I demonstrated that most studies discussing the concept of the self point to a consciousness, or awareness, which through the act of narration, becomes verbalized, and as such locally situated in our socio-cultural surroundings. The conceptualization of the self that I use in the current study, much like that of Ochs and Capps (1996), emphasizes an awareness of being-in-the-world, connected through time and space to one’s past, present, and future, and mediated through language. The act of narrating the self (i.e., using narrative mode) affords the speaker a way to make sense of experience as well as serves a vehicle to perform the voices of self and others (à la Koven, 2007 and Wortham, 2001). Through narrative, speakers not only express their stories, describing past events and vicissitudes, but also can be transformed (à la Wortham, 2001).

Because narrators in the current study tell their stories in both English and Spanish, I draw particularly on Koven’s notion of the bilingual self. That is, the bilingual self refers to the conscious awareness of being-in-the-world “embedded in and emergent from discursive context…[which] is variable for the same person across such contexts” (2007, p. 11). A bilingual’s discursive context, in turn, is linked to his/her social identities, affecting how a speaker performs their stories. However, the studies highlighted above do not discuss the sense of self in older bilinguals or the sense of self in persons with DAT. In the next section, I discuss some of the principal studies with regards to the self and Alzheimer’s disease.

2.2 Narrating the Self When DAT is present

As I stated previously, many studies have looked at the narrative abilities in those with DAT. These have examined the various ways persons with DAT can communicate selfhood,
with some arguing that sense of self in persons with DAT greatly diminishes as the disease progresses, while others arguing that the sense of self is maintained and observed in the preserved abilities displayed in the speech of persons with DAT. When a person with DAT speaks two or more languages, this is further problematized. Below, I will discuss what sense of self means when a diagnosis of DAT is present, reviewing the literature on the sense of self and DAT. I then discuss the emergent literature that has resulted from these initial studies, focusing mostly on studies in the scholarship of clinical linguistics and applied linguistics.

2.2.1 Sense of Self in DAT

As I have shown, defining the self has been a heavily contested and debated topic across multiple perspectives and fields; equally disputed is defining the self in DAT. This section of this chapter reviews the literature of self in DAT with special focus on the self and language as a meaning-making medium. Traditionally, literature on the self and DAT has focused on the neurological, cognitive, and functional declines and deficits that accompany dementia. In particular, the recurrent focus on the decline in language and memory is salient in popular health care literature and has lead to the internalization of socially constructed ideas of ‘loss of self’ (i.e., the Alzheimer’s construct, as per Herskovits, 1995). However, emergent theories of self in dementia suggest that the DAT sufferer can display preserved sense of self.

The topic analyzed in this section concerns the emergent theories and methodological approaches that have reported the preserved abilities and preserved ‘self’ in persons diagnosed with DAT. A review of the contributions of key figures in the field of self in DAT is provided, as these contributors discarded old paradigms based on the areas of experimental psychology and cognitivism—a view of the mind as an internal information processing center separate from the external (Harré & Gillett, 1994)—and promoted alternative, more inclusive views of the self.
Because of these contributions, additional studies emphasized the maintenance and/or preservation of abilities and self in DAT. I also discuss and review the emergent studies that arose as a result of the work of Kitwood (1993, 1997), Sabat (1991a, 1991b, 1994), and Sabat & Harré (1992, 1994). In particular, the literature summarized is classified according to existing models and/or perspectives used currently by scholars studying DAT which demonstrate preserved abilities in persons with DAT.

2.2.2 Emergence of the Study of Self in DAT

As I stated previously in this chapter, defining the self is not a simple task. Restating the working definition of self, self can be understood broadly to mean a reflexive awareness of being-in-the-world, a conscious awakening of sorts, inextricably linked to a person’s social identity. When the label DAT is added, the task of defining what ‘the self’ is becomes weightier as a diagnosis of DAT brings into question other often-unquestioned expressions of the self: its existence, persistence, and duration. These are all tied up with the idea that meaning-making, or the construction of meaning, is often observed via language, particularly through narrative practices which emerge early on in communicative development (Ochs & Capps, 1996). The emergence of the study of self in DAT is a confluence of traditions: the social construction of communication and discursive psychology. The notion behind the tradition of social construction of communication lies in the idea that language as a means of communication is the primary means of constructing meaning, and emerges from cultural practices, social context, and human interactions (Snyder, 2007). Discursive psychology\textsuperscript{11}, on the other hand, arises from the merger of three traditions/models: (1) the philosophical tradition of conceptual analysis, “which analyzes meanings by reference to how words are ordinarily used” (Edwards, 1997, p. 6); (2) Sacks and

\textsuperscript{11} For a more extensive review of discursive psychology, see Edwards (1997).
Heritage’s conversation analysis; and (3) Garfinkel’s ethnomethodology. The central assumption of discursive psychology is that psychological phenomena may be observed and become clear through the analysis of discursive practices, or discourse (i.e., the study of actual utterances, not of grammatical rules or structure). Meaning is therefore placed in the space of the public realm.

From the traditions of discursive psychology and social constructivism emerged several case studies and theories illuminating preserved social and cognitive abilities in persons with dementia. As stated above, the most widely referenced researchers in the field of dementia and self in North America are Sabat and Harré. Additionally, a third researcher whose work has been merged into studies related to self in DAT is Tom Kitwood. All three researchers have focused on preserved abilities in DAT sufferers, and their contributions to the theories of self in DAT are recurrent in the current literature of self in DAT. Key distinguishing factors between Kitwood’s work and that of Sabat and Harré lie not only in their theoretical underpinnings, but also in their approach; that is, the former focuses on the states of the person diagnosed with DAT (i.e., personhood) while the latter focus on concepts of self and their preservation throughout the different stages of the disease (i.e., selfhood). These key differences are summarized below.

2.2.3 Defining Personhood

In the search for a new paradigm to explain the reasons that lead a person suffering from dementia to experience ‘social death’, Kitwood’s (1990, 1993, 1997) and also Kitwood and Bredin’s (1992) theory on the dementing process in old age places special emphasis on aspects of the social-psychological factors which deprive a neurologically impaired individual of his or her personhood, or “…the standing or status that is bestowed upon one human being, by others, in the context of relationship and social being…[which also] implies recognition, respect, and
trust” (1997, p. 8). That is, personhood is social, interpersonal, and intersubjective; it “is provided or guaranteed by the presence of others” (Kitwood & Bredin, 1992, p. 275). He therefore notes that humans are deeply affected by the presence of processes and interactions that depersonalize a person—“a malignant social psychology” (Kitwood, 1990) and in DAT sufferers, this leads to deterioration or a worsening of the condition and could be damaging to nerve tissue. Hence, the experience of what the popular health literature claims is “loss of self” is in actuality a withdrawal on behalf of the caregiver, the family member, etc. Moreover, Kitwood found that this withdrawal is effected by one or several of the following ten aspects of the malignancy: (1) treachery; (2) disempowerment; (3) infantilization; (4) intimidation; (5) labeling; (6) stigmatization; (7) outpacing the sufferer; (8) invalidation; (9) banishment; and (10) objectification. In light of these findings, he advocates for a new theory of dementia care where interdependence is openly acknowledged and positive and personal philosophy of care is prioritized.

Hence, supporting the whole self is vital in the maintenance of personhood. This means that the self and the person are embodied, and personhood goes beyond Cartesian dualism between immaterial mind and material body. It takes in a new reality: that of psychology and neurology. It is through this new reality and the questioning of assumptions held about the sufferer and his/her abilities, the quality of care of an organization (or more likely what constitutes quality of care), the experience of dementia, the psychiatric category, and the institutions/organizations that reproduce and maintain a malignant social psychology that allow the core characteristics of an individual to remain.
2.2.4 Defining Selfhood and Preserved Abilities in DAT

From the conflicting perspectives of the persistence of self in DAT, versus ideas that DAT sufferers experience a ‘loss of self’, there emerged studies on the self and the sense of self in individuals from social constructivist theory. In social constructivism, the self is defined as being a continuity of one’s point of view in the world of space and time, along with being an agent capable of action. The existence of this self is displayed through public discourse (e.g., the performance of certain types of speech acts or via narration). Key proponents of these studies are Sabat and Harré (1992), who observed preserved abilities in DAT sufferers. Sabat’s work focused on case studies which stressed preserved abilities in individuals who were considered to have moderate to severe dementia. His two initial case studies on preserved abilities (Sabat, 1991a, 1991b) examined conversational exchanges with an Alzheimer’s disease sufferer. Sabat found that modifications to the systematics of turn-taking theory (i.e., the allowance of extended turns at talking without intervening, allowance of long pauses or gaps), accommodation to one’s conversation partner, and indirect mechanisms of repair are helpful in facilitating conversation with a DAT sufferer. As a result of these initial studies, Sabat noted that through high involvement and cooperation on behalf of the conversation partner, the DAT sufferer can construct and project a public sense of self (i.e., public personae).

These initial findings of preserved abilities in DAT inspired Sabat in conjunction with Harré (1992, 1994) to examine the popularized concept of loss of self in DAT vis-à-vis the social constructivist view of the nature of self, or the notion that selfhood may be expressed in a variety of ways in public discourse (Sabat 2000), and positioning theory. They argued that although DAT can lead to language impairment, memory recall disruptions, and information processing difficulties, the disease does not cause the sufferer to lose the concept of the self. Expressions of
self remain and are displayed in the tellings of autobiographical stories or speech acts, such as decrying the lack of fairness, taking responsibility for one’s actions, or expressing doubt (Sabat & Harré, 1992). They state that “autobiographical stories, taking on the responsibility for one’s actions, expressing doubt, declaring an interest in care, decrying the lack of fairness in a situation, and so on” (p. 445) are all expressions of selfhood (ibid.). By interviewing three persons with DAT on a regular basis, they tested their hypothesis and found two types of self demonstrated by persons with DAT. They named these Self 1 and Self 2. ‘Self 1’ or the self of personal identity is reflected via the use of personal pronouns, indexicals, and deictic tokens, among others. ‘Self 2’ is defined as the display of the public personae of the every day. According to their findings, Self 1 persists into the end stage of the disease. Self 2 however can be lost as it depends on the social context and from the cooperation of others. They found that Self 2 can be manifested in later stages, but that these manifestations depend on the joint productions of particular selves in the social sphere. The authors argued then that the disappearance of self in individuals with Alzheimer’s disease is not “directly linked to the progress of the disease… [but to the] behavior of those who are regularly involved in the social life of the sufferer” (p. 459). These finding further demonstrate that self is grounded and dependent on discursive contexts. According to the authors, positioning the sufferer as helpless and confused, a view commonly held by and (re)produced by current and past biomedical discourses (Davis, 2004; Leibing, 2008; Whitehouse, 2008), further indicates that we (i.e., the non-sufferers) are part of the problem (Kitwood and Bredin, 1992).

In a later study, Sabat and Harré (1994) examined the self in DAT as semiotic or meaning-driven by adopting philosopher David Dennett’s theory on intentional stance, or the attributions (feelings, consciousness) we give to people and/or things. By being a semiotic
subject, the authors argued that they must be able to “act intentionally in the light of their interpretations of the situation in which they find themselves, and… capable of evaluating their actions and those of others according to the public standards of propriety and rationality” (p. 147). In order to test their hypothesis, the discourse of two persons with DAT was analyzed. The two participants chosen for this study were at moderate to severe stages of the disease and both held Ph.D.s. The researchers found that the participants demonstrated intact semiotic abilities. That is, these participants were able to (1) demonstrate intentionality, (2) give and construct meaning, and (3) engage in ongoing relationships. From these findings, the authors concluded that “meanings are jointly constituted by participants in conversation” (p. 145), but not without noting that caregivers should not (1) give up intentionality prematurely and (2) cast an intentionality on the person with DAT which is not there (e.g. Dr. M’s husband attributing an annoying behavior to his wife, an AD sufferer, when she did not intend to annoy her husband, but share her needs).

Reflecting further on Sabat and Harré’s initial hypothesis of Self 1 and Self 2, Sabat and Collins (1999) later expanded these concepts to tease apart further the concept of Self 2 and Self 3. After revisiting an in-depth case study (that of Mrs. F), the authors distinguished between three different types of manifestations of selfhood: (1) Self 1, or that of personal identity; (2) Self 2, or that of one’s attributes, beliefs, and beliefs about one’s attributes; and (3) Self 3, or that of the public personae manifested with the help of others. In this particular case, the authors observed that although Mrs. F had severe problems in word-finding tasks, pronunciation, syntax, and memory, among others, she was able to demonstrate the three aspects of selfhood. The authors linked the findings to possible brain mechanisms and found that certain areas of the brain
which remain intact in DAT might be responsible (at least in the case of this participant) for the social and cognitive abilities that some persons with DAT display.

These three concepts were later expanded even further. Sabat (2002) posited that Self 1 corresponds to the unique point of view in the world that each person has and which provides him or her with the continuous experience that grounds their life narrative. Through the use of indexical devices, personal pronouns, and proper names (Self 1), a “self” takes responsibility for his or her actions and indexes feelings and experiences as being their own. Self 2 consists of beliefs and personal attributes—that is, one’s height, weight, eye color, education, and vocation, among others. As in the previous study, Sabat sustained that Self 3 is constructed depending on the person’s situations in life (or how we present the aspects of Self 2 to others), and as such, is socially dependent on others to support and maintain it.

Although these studies repeatedly demonstrate the intact abilities DAT sufferers possess, some limitations in the methodology exist. One of the limitations of Sabat and Harré (1992, 1994) and Sabat and Collins (1999) is the lack of longer transcripts showing the interactions between DAT sufferer and other people in the public sphere. Their other studies (with the exception of those focusing on facilitating conversation with DAT sufferers) also lack quantitative data showing how Self 1 is instantiated in the different interactions and encounters. Moreover, as others have stated (J. Small et al., 1998), the self as measured through personal pronoun use or attributive language is not a sufficient method to ascertain the self’s integrity. These studies do not fully account for a DAT speaker’s word-finding difficulty, which could result in linguistic perseveration, or the repetition of words or chunks of speech without the appropriate stimulus (Buckingham, Whitaker, & Whitaker, 1979). They also fail to account for a
speaker’s verbal habit or ‘anomia’ (J. Small et al., 1998). Furthermore, these studies do not consider additional discursive means speakers use to index the self.

Another limitation is the fact that the participants held higher levels of education. This can lead to different results since persons that possess higher levels of education may have higher cognitive reserve or increased resilience to neuropathology such as dementia (Bialystok, Craik, & Freedman, 2007; Le Carret, Auriacombe, Letenneur, Bergua, Dartigues, & Fabrigoule, 2004; Manly, et al. 2003; Mortimer, 1988). Hence, a highly educated participant may be afforded better access to language and a greater sense of preserved abilities, as can be observed in their exchanges with others, and hence can display and perform a greater preserved sense of self as opposed to populations with lower levels of education.

Finally, the data for the majority of these studies relied heavily on participation of Caucasian or White Americans in research. While these studies may have been designed to interview participants that were willing to complete the study to its entirety, these inadvertently engaged in sampling bias. This can lead to differences in the results given Whites are more likely than other minority groups in the U.S. to have higher education, higher access to health care and are more likely than other minority groups to experience early socialization with the health care system in the U.S. (Corbie-Smith, Thomas, & St. George, 2002; Fisher & Kalbaugh, 2011). As I stated above, this would result in better data outcomes for the different studies carried out with DAT speakers, which is not representative of the entire population of DAT speakers in the United States. In the next section, I will go over more recent approaches to the study of self in DAT. Although not all of the limitations I discussed above are addressed in these emergent studies, a more varied population sample is noted, along with more discursive-based analyses.
2.2.5 Recent Literature Resulting from Selfhood and Personhood Studies in DAT

While studying politeness retention in the speech of persons with DAT, Temple, Sabat, and Koger (1999) found that “traditional clinical methods and psychometric testing techniques…may produce an incomplete and perhaps distorted, picture of the Alzheimer’s disease sufferer.” They recommended “enhanced social contexts and specialized communication techniques… [in order to] increase their level of social functioning and communication” (p. 164). As a result of this recommendation, and Sabat and Harré’s (1992, 1994) prior work, the object of selfhood and the self has been further developed by other researchers in different fields of study, ranging from anthropology to different subfields in linguistics (e.g., clinical linguistics, clinical sociolinguistics, and applied linguistics). Researchers in these studies have focused on similar concerns on selfhood and discourse, and other means through which persons with DAT use language to communicate a competent and skilled storyteller (independent of issues of veracity). The approaches taken in these studies vary in field of study and merge different forms of analysis. These will be discussed below, with a focus on selfhood and/or identity maintenance when possible.

Other social constructivist approaches

Tappen, et al. (1999) studied the persistence of self in a group of residents with moderate to severe staging of DAT using conversation analysis as their framework. These investigators analyzed 45 conversation sessions of approximately 30 minutes of duration as part of a larger study. Similar to previous studies, Tappen et al. looked for instances of first person indexicals, self-reference of different types, and personal identity indicators (i.e., response to their name or discussion of any changes of cognitive functioning). Although the researchers did not provide quantitative data on the instances or frequency of searched categories, they suggested
participants use self-reference to refer to life events, past experiences, recent activities, among others, frequently and coherently. The researchers added that participants were aware of their change in cognitive functioning (i.e., decline in memory).

Small, Geldart, Gutman, and Clarke Scott (1998) examined features of discourse that index the preservation of self and personae. In expanding Sabat and Harré’s findings for preservation of self and personae, the researchers conducted a quantitative study with residents at a nursing home. The researchers posited that the presentation of self can be accomplished by other ways besides first person singular indexicals (e.g., lexical categories, agency, positioning as dependent/independent, etc.). They also argued that material collected in discourse can be analyzed quantitatively and qualitatively. Through videotaped observations of nursing staff and residents, the researchers’ findings suggested that self and personae are not only indexed via the exclusive use of first person pronouns, but via verbal/linguistic and nonverbal/nonlinguistic behaviors. In particular, the researchers found that (1) residents made frequent use of first person pronouns and (2) residents expressed an intact sense of self when involved in conflicts with staff. The researchers also found that staff could reinforce the self and personae of residents by addressing them by their name. However, the researchers also found that the participants in the study exhibited low type-token ratios for other lexical categories (i.e., verbs, nouns, adjectives, adverbs). This suggested that these participants not only exhibited a more restricted use of vocabulary in general when compared to cognitively healthy adults, but also that their limited vocabulary resulted in higher use of the first person pronoun. Hence, their overreliance of the first person pronoun is a mechanism to cope with limited vocabulary, not a mechanism to exhibit the preservation of self. These results lend support to Sabat and Harré’s (1994, 2000) finding in that both Self 1 and Self 3 (personae) are susceptible to decline.
**Socio-biographical approach: Merge of personhood and selfhood**

In light of studies from an alternative biopsychosocial perspective, Surr (2006) explored the association of maintenance of self to socio-biographical factors. That is, “relationships with others, the broader social context in which individuals are situated, and narrative and storytelling have a crucial role in the undermining or maintenance of self” (p. 1720). In order to observe these dynamics, Surr conducted a study where unstructured interviews were recorded from 14 participants living in four different residential homes. Although she stated that as a researcher, she posed open-ended questions to the participants, she explained that the interview topics and agenda were set by them. In order to examine the relevance of a socio-biographical theory of self, she stated that participants were not asked questions regarding aspect of the self. Biographical data related to health, medication, activities of daily living, occupation, levels of well-being, spiritual well-being, social relationships, and communication abilities of each participant were collected from the staff or the participant’s records, not from the participants themselves. After the data was transcribed, Surr used an interpretative biographical method, which “claims to give insight into how individuals construct their lives and how they are influenced by and influence life events” (p. 1724). The approach looked closely at (1) the creation of a biography, (2) thematic textual analysis, (3) micro-analysis of the text in light of the biography, and (5) comparison of the stories of self. Resonating with the above-mentioned theory of social constructivism and the self, her findings supported the notion that quality of interpersonal relationships correlated to maintenance of self and that a socio-biographical theory of self is relevant in the study of patients that live in residential care homes.
Psychological perspectives of persistence of self in language and visual recognition tasks

From the area of cognitive psychology, Fazio and Mitchell (2009) utilized language based tasks (resonating with those used by Sabat, 2002) in order to measure persistence of self in individuals with DAT. In addition to the language-based tasks, the authors incorporated a visual recognition task in order to assess knowledge of self prior to the interview. The study, of qualitative and quantitative nature, hypothesized that persons with mild to moderate stages of DAT would show persistence of self via more subtle linguistic and visual indicators of self-knowledge (i.e., underlying self-awareness). In their study, the authors interviewed 76 participants with different staging (control group=26; mild cognitive impairment= 26; moderate cognitive impairment=26). Via a series of questionnaires during the interview process, the authors measured persistence of self via usage of pronouns and attributes, such as physical traits, habits, beliefs, etc. They found that in spite of declines in word usage, participants in the different groups did not differ in their production/usage rates of pronouns or attributes (i.e., participants produced similar numbers of pronouns and attributes per minute). This suggests that even at moderate staging, participants’ concept of personal and social self persisted. Based on these findings, the authors suggested that lower frequency of pronoun/attribute usage is not the factor that determines loss of self, but a mere result of “a decreased ability to initiate conversation”. In pari with other researchers in the area of self and DAT, the authors concluded that in order for persons with DAT to outwardly manifest a clearer external sense of self, support from others (i.e., conversation partners, caregivers, care staff, etc.) is clearly essential for the persistence of self.
Linguistic and interdisciplinary approaches to the self in DAT

Thus far, I have presented scholarship on the self and discourse in DAT mostly from emergent texts influenced by the social constructivist perspective. For purposes of this study, this section focuses on aspects of the self that are linked to language (particularly narrative) from approaches of applied linguistics, clinical sociolinguistics, and interdisciplinary linguistics. In the last ten years, the study of the self and DAT have yielded quite a few interesting and varied approaches from a linguistics perspective. Various edited volumes on dementia and language have also emerged, including Davis’ (2005) Alzheimer talk, text and context: Enhancing communication, Guendouzi and Müller’s (2006) Approaches to discourse in dementia, Davis and Guendouzi’s (2013) Pragmatics in dementia discourse, and Schrauf and Müller’s (2013) Dialogue and dementia: Cognitive and communicative resources for engagement. Most studies seen in these different areas of linguistics (with the exclusion of psycholinguistics and neurolinguistics) have sought out and applied a range of theoretical frameworks to the phenomenon of language, communication, and dementia. Many of these studies, as I will show, point to preserved abilities in the discourse of persons with DAT. Some have connected these approaches with theories of the self and narrative, and have made some interesting findings regarding the self in DAT. These will be discussed below.

Hamilton (1994) was one of the earliest proponents of the preserved abilities model in persons with DAT. Her influential work on interactional sociolinguistics and DAT with Elsie, an older woman living in a nursing home, opened the door to new approaches in the study of language, DAT, and the self. Studying the language and interactional patterns of Elsie, she found that even in the moderate to late stages of the disease, Elsie preserved certain abilities. For instance, she made use of ready-made language, consisting of idiosyncratic language, formulaic
phrases, and repetition, giving others the illusion that she was a normal interlocutor. In the severe stages, she found that Elsie’s ready-made language would wane, using idiosyncratic utterances at lucid moments, yet grunting and/or backchanneling (e.g., mhm hmm) to acknowledge her interlocutor at others. Her findings demonstrated that even in later stages, Elsie presented preserved abilities, even if these were more limited in range to what she had previously been able to produce. Although Hamilton did not explicitly study the presentation of self in Elsie, her findings help shed light on the interactional abilities of persons with DAT.

Vai Ramanathan also studied language use in persons with DAT. Influenced by Sabat’s work (1991a, 1991b), Ramanathan (1994, 1997) observed and collected life stories of individuals diagnosed with DAT. In her 1994 and 1997 work, she provided sociolinguistic dimensions to the deteriorating linguistic abilities of individuals diagnosed with DAT. Although her studies do not focus on theories of self but on the dimensions of narrative discourse in individuals suffering from DAT, her work provides valuable insight to memory processes (i.e., recall, reminding, and recognition) and their connection to preservation of sense of self and identity. From a sociolinguistic perspective, Ramanathan concluded that a person diagnosed with DAT might have inability to talk or use incoherent speech (in cognitive terms), but these observations are partly tied to the interlocutors in the interactional space and the patient’s social world (1994). In other words, a person with DAT can experience accelerated deterioration (in language) due to her social surroundings and interactional processes with others (in particular when involved in narrative production). Her research, then, lends support to Sabat’s findings related to facilitating conversation with DAT sufferers. It also calls into question assumptions about social rules that guide ‘meaningful talk’ between speakers. DAT talk then has to be accommodating to the DAT speaker.
In a later study, Ramanathan (2009) analyzed the autobiographies of six different persons with DAT, written by their caregivers. Although she did not focus on preserved abilities, she offered a different approach and reading on the notions of self in biographies of persons with DAT. Via the journal writing of persons with DAT and their caregivers, she contested poststructuralist views of the self as changeable, fluid, and performed. In order to demonstrate her hypothesis, she analyzed notions of the self that emerged from the biographies of these persons on two levels. On the surface level, ‘sure signs’, or signs of what the future holds for these persons, were analyzed in these texts. On a secondary level, traces and intentionality observed in these persons (as reported in caregivers’ journals) were analyzed as a means to establish some attribution of agency and intentionality to the person with DAT. Going back to the concept of ‘sure signs’, this represents the idea that in DAT those tasks which one was once able to do (and successfully repeat) slowly decline as the disease progresses. In other words, routine habits and abilities—dressing oneself, using a typewriter, sewing, or writing—eventually fade. Hence, the memory of that repetition is what persons with DAT try to fix via their written texts. As for traces and intentionality, Ramanathan demonstrated that caregivers continue to see traces of consciousness in their loved ones. Via traces and intentionality, caregivers attribute agency to the acts of their family members with DAT. Ramanathan argued that writing these texts afforded caregivers and loved ones with DAT a means to stabilize the self—fixing in time and space language and memories while providing them with a way to cope with the disease.

Focusing on analyzing sense of self via different texts, Makoni, Ridge, and Ridge (2001) researched the social and clinical constructions of identity of DB, a 79 year-old South African woman diagnosed with severe DAT, via three different texts: letters, notes, and a video-recording. The authors explained that before her diagnosis, she had obtained a Ph.D. in chemical
engineering, had written multiple scholarly articles and an acclaimed book in her field. In order to analyze DB’s projections of identity, the researchers analyzed her letter writing during different points in her life before her diagnosis, letters after her diagnosis, and a video recording that was done as part of a battery of cognitive tests. Not surprisingly, her writing pre and post-diagnosis differed substantially, demonstrating the lexical retrieval difficulties she had during the severe stages of the disease. However, she continued to keep a scientific mode of writing, demonstrating her retained abilities (as seen in her projection of herself). Other texts, however, did not seem as clear as previous ones, as her writing was repetitive. Nevertheless, her continued use of a scientific mode of writing demonstrated her underlying desire to make sense of herself, placing systematic order over her lived experiences. The authors also analyzed a video recording that demonstrated her resilience in conversational interactions, demonstrating preserved pragmatic functions. The images of a self that demonstrates continuity yet some disruption, preserved abilities, and intentionality, however, is disregarded and overridden by the medical staff, and concretized by the medical record. The authors conclude by making a call to find ways to help patients communicate or reveal their competencies, allowing them to have a say in their daily living and care.

Davis has conducted a number of studies on language and DAT, focusing on preserved or retained abilities in language and working on sustaining or maintaining these communicative abilities for as long as possible (Davis, 2005). Two studies in particular address the phenomenon of communicative resources available to persons with DAT and their impact on the self, or identity of those suffering from it. In a 2011 study on stories told by Lucinda Greystone, an 85-year old woman from North Carolina with some degree of dementia, Davis analyzed various unelicited multiply-told stories Lucinda told to different interlocutors during a 15-month period.
By adopting the intentional stance theory to Lucinda’s repeated stories, Davis argued that her repeated stories have some intentional purpose in the interaction. That is, these provided Lucinda with the ability to make meaning to others as well as make sense of her world. When these multiply-told stories were told to a listening and engaged audience, Davis found that Lucinda’s performance was fuller and more expansive than when the engagement was not as strong. Based on the intentional stance theory, then, Lucinda’s performances were interpreted as those of a person who wants to be “regarded as a real person, a competent conversationalist who still has a story or two worth sharing” (p. 96). Her multiply-told tales, argued Davis, were her way of “embodying her thoughts, those parts of memory she can access, those ways she can still retain of self-presentation as an interesting person…and a competent person who can still tell a good story” (p. 97).

In another study, Davis and Maclagan (2013) analyzed small story and canonical narratives told by Maureen Littlejohn, an 84-year old woman also living in a nursing home in North Carolina. Analyzing Littlejohn’s stories, the authors focused on the different ways Mrs. Littlejohn and her interlocutors would make use of alignment and/or affiliation strategies to continue or end conversational stories. The authors observed that Mrs. Littlejohn made frequent use of formulaic language, extenders (i.e., nonreferential lexical items that can accomplish multiple functions in conversation—‘and so on’, ‘and all that stuff’, etc.), and idiomatic or colloquial phrases, among others, as a conversation management tool. In particular, they found that extenders “provide a way for the speaker with DAT to have little islands in the stream of discourse, upon which she can perch while planning the next part of an utterance, and to create or simulate shared understandings with the conversation partner” (p. 108). Although these particular findings do not explicitly reveal much about the sense of self or identity in narrative,
Davis and Maclagan suggest that the alignments and affiliations observed in the interactions Mrs. Littlejohn had with others are revelatory of an underlying self-representation or identity maintenance. That is, they reveal Mrs. Littlejohn’s sense of agency—someone who is an amusing and fluent conversationalist, able to embody those memories that are still accessible to her.

In the area of discourse and pragmatics, Guendouzi and Müller (2006) studied narratives and talk-in-interaction of persons with DAT. These studies were based on different repetitive verbal behaviors observed in conversational interactions between three persons with DAT living in a nursing home and other peers or other conversationalists. The authors found that repetition in the speech of persons with Dementia is a useful tool for managing conversational turn-taking and continuing conversation even when the speaker has trouble with turn-taking and there is a “potential danger of discontinuation or breakdown [in the conversation]” (p. 185). Although this kind of repetition is commonplace in the discourse of people with DAT, it has to be viewed in terms of what these conversationalists are achieving—conversation-based rehearsal and active learning management in order to appear as interesting conversationalists.

Müller and Mok (2013) studied the conversational interactions between two women with probable DAT and two graduate students in a nursing home in hopes to understand how one of the participants (Ms. Beatrice) uses language and conversation to establish common ground with one of the graduate students. Using systemic functional linguistics as a theoretical and analytical framework, the authors found that Ms. Beatrice repeatedly engaged in a process of using cultural schemata to make sense and situate that which is unknown (in this case understand the relationship between the two young graduate students and Ms. Frances, their backgrounds, etc.). They posited that through Ms. Beatrice’s repeated attempts to learn more about her conversation
partners, she engaged in active learning and conversation-based rehearsal management, showing “…clear signs of integrating given and new, pre-existing and contextually available multi-modal information” (p. 83). The authors further argued that “listening to the questions a person with dementia asks, as a hypothesis-tester, as a meaning-maker in the moment of interaction, may provide greater insight into how they make sense of their environment, and, in turn, how the environment helps or hinders sensemaking” (p. 83).

Hydén and Örulv (2009, 2010) studied the self and identity in spontaneous narratives told by persons with DAT living in nursing homes in Sweden. They observed patients telling the ‘same’ story to different interlocutors, demonstrating that when the storytellers were afforded scaffolding via small questions, their stories contained richer presentations of the self. Furthermore, the retellings of these stories often allow the speakers to make sense of the actual moment even if a clear connection between story topic and context is not present. The telling of the stories, according to the authors, not only helps the speakers appear as competent storytellers, but allows them to present and negotiate their identity.

2.3 Summary

In this chapter, several types of issues regarding the self, narration of the self, and narration of the self in DAT have been presented. I have explored how the self has been studied within the field of psychology, and later, discursive psychology. These views have greatly influenced how the self has been defined and analyzed. Within applied linguistics and linguistic anthropology, the study of the narrated self has yielded interesting findings, among them, the integration of the social constructivist approach to language. It has also established important
links to the concept of social identities, positioning, and indexicality— all demonstrating that the self is mediated through language.

Given that the main focus of this dissertation is to look at the abilities still preserved in bilinguals with DAT and compare those to bilingual older adults who are cognitively healthy, it is important to look at how the current studies in both areas discussed in this chapter can shed light to the bilingual self of a person with DAT, something that has not been studied in the field of applied linguistics.

In the next chapter, I will discuss the conceptual framework used to analyze the data presented in this study. I will discuss research on repeated or twice-told tellings in narrative, borrowing from some studies in the area of conversation analysis (narratives in talk-in interaction). I will also discuss reported speech, and its link to the enactment and/or performance of the self in narrative. Finally, I will borrow from Koven (2002, 2007) the concept of speaker roles, suggesting a few changes for purposes of the current study.
CHAPTER 3

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK:

REPEATED TELLINGS, REPORTED SPEECH, AND SPEAKER ROLES

3.1 Introduction

The aim of this dissertation is to analyze repeated tellings, reported speech, and speaker roles in narratives of personal experience. The analysis is based on data comprised of a series of interviews conducted on a population of older Latino adults, half of whom are cognitively healthy and half with mild to moderate dementia of the Alzheimer’s type. In this chapter, I define three linguistic phenomena which will serve as the key conceptual lenses employed in this study: repeated tellings, reported speech, and speaker roles. Next, I review the relevant literature from each of these areas, including available studies focusing on populations with DAT. Then, for each phenomenon discussed in this chapter (i.e., sections 3.2, 3.3, and 3.4), I present individual tables summarizing key findings and characteristics and use these as the operating framework to analyze the data collected for this dissertation. Finally, I discuss special considerations for the analysis of repeated tellings, reported speech, and speaker roles in the narratives of older adults with dementia of the Alzheimer’s type (DAT).

3.2 Repeated Tellings

The organization of this section is as follows: first, I will define repeated tellings, followed by a discussion of the different features observed. Next, I will discuss repeated tellings in narratives of personal experience generated by persons with DAT, along with a brief
discussion of repetition found in the speech of those with DAT. Finally, I will present commonly observed features (Table 3.1) in repeated tellings by both cognitively healthy and cognitively impaired adults. The discussion on repeated tellings that will follow here as well as in the data and concluding chapters aim: (1) to reach a better understanding of (a) features commonly found in the speech of cognitively healthy persons and (b) features retained in the speech of persons with DAT (in this case, persons with DAT that speak and are surrounded by two languages, Spanish and English); (2) to list commonalities and variance observed between these two groups; and (3) to better grasp how persons with DAT present sense of self in their repeated stories and their two languages.

3.2.1 Defining Repeated Tellings

Repeating, retelling, or recounting\textsuperscript{12} stories of personal experience is a ubiquitous practice in which a speaker has “the opportunity to rehearse and reshape a story” (Ervin-Tripp & Küntay, 1997, p. 161). Oft-times, speakers retell experiences they judge to be important or critical in their lives. Other times speakers simply retell these experiences because these are deemed interesting enough to be retold to others (Chafe, 1998, p. 90). But what does it mean to tell ‘the same’ story again? Is it a phonetic, word-for-word rendition? Retelling or repeating ‘the same’ story refers here to any stretch of talk that has been told before and that an audience or recipient can duly recognize as having occurred before. This repetition need not be a phonetic repetition, but is at least a sequence of words that are treated as though they were identical by a given speaker and audience. In the field of linguistics, the study of repeated tellings of personal experience has yielded a small yet dense body of literature that has clarified the conditions for

\textsuperscript{12} For purposes of this dissertation, the terms ‘repeated’, ‘recounted’, and ‘retold’ stories will be used interchangeably.
the occurrence of repeated tellings, as well as made clear its nature, function, and importance.\footnote{A search for the terms ‘repeated tellings’, ‘retold stories’, ‘twice-told stories’ in the article title or abstract via the Linguistics and Language Behavior Abstracts (LLBA) and MLA database yielded 108 peer-reviewed articles, out of which 29 met the inclusion criteria.}

In the area of linguistics, the study of repeated tellings has provided invaluable insight to the process of storytelling and has led to a better understanding of why and how tellers recount their stories of personal experience. The following section will provide a review of the most important and relevant studies on repeated tellings in the discipline of linguistics.

3.2.2 Findings on Repeated Tellings of Personal Experience

3.2.2.1 Reorganization, stability, and consolidation

In repeated tellings, some of the most commonly observed features are those of reorganization of the narrative, content stability, and consolidation of previously given information. Wallace Chafe, one of the precursors of the study of repeated tellings, proposed the study of repeated tellings from the perspective of language and cognition. He first studied the nature of repeated tellings through the analysis of story retelling elicited from a film scene in his work, *The Pear Stories* (Chafe, 1980). He later focused on narrative retellings of personal experience (1998), this time focusing on storytelling in natural contexts. He was interested in better understanding the underlying conscious process involved in repeated tellings. Chafe compared two dinner table conversation excerpts told by the same person to different audience members, with the exception of one of the participants. The data were recorded 15 months apart. The excerpts revealed that in repeated tellings the hierarchy of topic was relatively stable (unchanged). He also found that the teller repeated important ideas, representing the essential building blocks of the narrative. Less important ideas were repeated as well. He labeled these
instances as ‘preoccupations’ of the speaker, not a strategy of talk-in-interaction\textsuperscript{14}. Moreover, Chafe observed that the teller employed consolidation or omission while retelling the narrative. That is, particular ‘foci’ (aspects) in the initial narrative were consolidated or omitted in the retelling, leading Chafe to hypothesize that retellings are condensed versions of the original account\textsuperscript{15}. He also observed that unlike the stability observed in ideas, events, and organization of the teller’s repeated tellings, orientation of space and time was highly variable in the retelling.

Based on these findings, Chafe hypothesized that when people repeat ‘the same’ story, the audience can catch glimpses of the speaker’s life experience, and the story can serve as evidence for an underlying level of organization of the speaker’s experience. He called this process ‘the outward manifestation of underlying experience’ (1998). Through verbalizations of experience, the teller retrieves information from the mental storehouse of the conscious mind, where information is organized into different foci of consciousness, and verbalizes key topics. In repeated tellings, these key topics (or foci) remain the same. In essence, his observations led him to believe that retellings were stable reorganizations of previously told information, with less salient or less important information consolidated.

Polanyi (1981) also emphasized the ideas of reorganization, stability, and consolidation in retellings. Although she studied a single telling about eating at the plazas at the New York Thruway\textsuperscript{16}, she argued that telling the same story multiple times is a possible feat. Similar to

\textsuperscript{14} Other scholars addressed repetition in talk-in-interaction (not repetition as a result of a multiply-told story) and held that repetition could be a type of evaluative technique (Labov, 1972), an instance of ready-made language to help transition from one idea to the next (Tannen, 1980), or a cohesive device to shape a story in a more straightforward manner (Halliday & Hasan, 2014).

\textsuperscript{15} Many other researchers have contended that consolidation is solely based on the narrator. Many have found expansion in retellings. For instance, Hymes’ (1985) analysis of a recounted Chinook myth by the same narrator three years later demonstrated expansion in the retelling. The same is true for Bauman’s (1986) study of a Texas storyteller who not only expands his recounted story but includes reported speech. Schiffrin (2006) also showed expansion in the narratives of Mrs. Susan Beer.

\textsuperscript{16} Unlike what is suggested by the title of her well-known article “Telling the same story twice”, Polanyi only analyzed a single telling in her work. She wanted to (1) answer the underlying questions “What is a story?” and
Chafe’s concept of the speaker’s underlying experience, she suggested “multiple tellings may reduce to the same underlying semantic structure in which the same events, set in a similarly constructed storyworld communicate the same global ‘point’” (p. 315).

3.2.2.2 From Consolidation to Revealing New Information

Another feature observed in repeated tellings is the addition of new information, especially when the audience is the same. In his seminal work, *Discourse, Consciousness, and Time* (1994), Chafe found that salient events in a storyteller’s life often motivate rehearsal or repetition. Because of their very nature, they are not only more worthy of being retold, but are more richly experienced and narrated. However, if stories have been previously shared with the same audience members, these will not require an unpacking of corollary information (Chafe, 1994, 1998). Instead of repeating ‘the same’ given information a second time, a speaker can opt to reveal new information (Chafe, 1994).

3.2.2.3 From consolidation to structural stability

Norrick researched repeated or twice-told stories (1997, 1998a, 1998b) from an interactional perspective. He focused on those stories told and retold in natural conversation and storytelling contexts, where most participants had previous knowledge of the stories. Within this context, Norrick focused on (1) the purpose of repeated stories and (2) the structure observed in them. For the former, he found that speakers tend to repeat their stories for other reasons beyond those commonly observed in this type of speech act: people tend to retell their stories because they desire to (1) foster group rapport, (2) ratify membership within a group, (3) share group

---

“*What does it mean to tell the same story more than once?”* and (2) counterargue Sacks’, *et al.* (1974), Jefferson’s (1978), and others’ claim that retelling the same story would be impossible due to the social constraints in conversational storytelling.

17 Commonly observed features of repeated speech acts were repetition for purposes of exchanging information or for problem solving.
values, and/or (4) clarify stories in the teller as well as the audience’s mind. Regarding the structure of repeated stories, Norrick argued that these narratives display strong consistency from one telling to the next. Therefore, while retelling their stories, speakers not only repeat chunks almost verbatim, but tend to recycle these stories “as fairly intact units…with moveable subsections, tailoring them just as much as necessary to fit the current context” (1998b, p. 90). This is even more constant in evaluative aspects of the retelling than in the referential aspects of them. Although discrepancies between two versions of the ‘same’ story have been observed in retellings (e.g., longer retellings), these discrepancies occur as a result of the speaker’s necessity or desire to reshape and reorganize what had already been said to the audience (Ervin-Tripp & Küntay, 1997; Norrick, 1997, 1998a, 1998b). Nevertheless, Norrick argued that “Despite the contextual differences between separate versions of the stories…the number and close similarity of the parallel clauses identified was quite substantial (1998b, p. 94).”

3.2.2.4 Repeated Verbatim and Increased Dialogic Quality

Norrick also observed dialogue in repeated tellings (i.e., reported speech), often times appearing as repeated verbatim from one telling to the next (1998b). However, it should be noted that in a previous commentary (1998a), he had also demonstrated that in some cases reported speech may expand in repeated tellings as a result of a need for a teller to bring in variation in order “to match the story with diverse topics and audience responses (p. 94).” Therefore, the result is a more creative, constructed dialogic production (Tannen, 2007). Hence, in recounted stories, critical reported speech may remain stable—recurring verbatim from one telling to the next—but it may also expand from one telling to the next to fit the particular context (i.e., repeated stories are recipient designed).

---

18 Evaluative aspects refer to clauses that present information about the time, cause, conditions, and results, while referential aspects refer to the recounting of past actions directly.
Likewise, Bauman (1986) contributed to the study of repeated tellings while studying Texan oral literature as a form of verbal art. Although the analysis of repeated tellings was not the focus of his study, his research indirectly displayed the type of variation commonly observed in repeated tellings. The twice-told stories, narrated by a West Texan rancher, displayed two important characteristics which contributed to the overall discussion of repeated stories. The excerpts showed that in retellings, the recounts were increasingly dialogic in nature (i.e., the speaker made more use of direct reported speech in retellings). Direct reported speech was used at the end of the recounts more often times than not. Bauman explained that the purpose of these instances of reported speech at the end of the anecdotes was to serve as the gist or punch line of the anecdote, similar to structures found in joke telling in his research, a point that I will revisit in the discussion of reported speech. The variation and the purpose found in these twice-told narratives not only contribute to the discussion, but demonstrate that narration styles in retellings can vary.

3.2.2.5 From consolidation to expansion

While Norrick and Chafe’s findings stress consistency and consolidation in the act of retelling a story evoked by and embedded in its interactional context, Schiffrin’s work shows the opposite. Schiffrin’s (2006) analysis of four tellings of a Holocaust survivor, Mrs. Susan Beer, collected over a period of 13 years, outlines consistencies and variations seen in repeated tellings. Interviewed four times about her experience of being captured by the Germans in Budapest during the Holocaust, Mrs. Beer kept the story’s content (i.e., what happened during her and her family’s capture) mostly unchanged, consistent with findings held by Bauman (1986), Chafe (1998), and Norrick (1998a, 1998b). However, other significant differences between each retelling can be observed. Not only did Mrs. Beer increase the complexity and
length of her story over time, she made significant changes to word choice, clause structure, character roles, and language. These changes provided Mrs. Beer the opportunity for changes in evaluation as well, making her narrative more appealing, exciting, and suspenseful to audience members while enhancing its point. Schiffrin explained that the variation seen in her narrative changed its role from an *explanatory* narrative (*i.e.*, a narrative that provides sequences of temporally and causally linked events, explaining a transition from one time to another; p. 273) to a *performative* narrative (*i.e.*, an often-told story designed for a broader audience). For Schiffrin, retelling narratives is more than just a replication of temporal order—it is “*itself* a next-event, a replaying of experience that is discursively constructed by an evolving set of differently layered components of ‘self’ that combine and recombine numerous experiences, *including the experience of having told the story*” (p. 275, italics in original).

Other researchers have also found variation in the structure of the narrative retellings and the strategies used by the tellers. Bamberg (2008), for instance, found that storytellers often times abbreviate parts of a previously told story to make other parts more relevant to the actual context or to self presentation. This is more prevalent when the audience and/or context are different in the retelling. Ferrara (1994) also found that the structure of the retellings varies. That is, as a speaker more frequently retells a story, the story tends to expand from a very basic narrative kernel to a more elaborate and vivid recount, adding to it more reported speech and thought. Schiff, *et al.* (2006) found that although critical aspects of identity of the narratives of eight Holocaust survivors maintained “strong continuities with previous self renditions” (p. 373), variation was found in the style of the narrative (how it was told) or its interpretation (why it was told), confirming structural changes seen by others in retellings. Stockburger (2008) found that in retelling written life stories, change in context affects and shapes the way the story and any
embedded story is retold, resonating with Schiffrin’s findings. She also argued that details and story openings and closings within the story changed, while facts remained constant.

3.2.2.6 Changes in self-presentation

Other linguistic examinations on the topic of repeated tellings have examined the way identity or the self has been co-constructed in narrative retellings. In particular, these studies have looked at narrative repetition as a site for identity work. Ferrara (1994), for example, also found that in retellings, storytellers’ display of self varies, as was the case of the woman who displayed a more assertive and confident sense of self within each of her retellings. Likewise, Bamberg (2008) found that in two versions of the ‘same’ story, the storyteller, Betty, displayed two different versions of her ‘self’—the first being more involved and vivid; the other more insightful and introspective. Similarly, after interviewing a former hooligan from Belgium twice (interview 6 years apart), Van De Mieroop (2009) found that although the interviewee’s two tellings of a potential ‘big story’ (Bamberg, 2006) reflects stability of the self, the messy, ‘small stories’ reflect how he “discursively constructs himself in two different ways…” (p. 738). Koven (1998) found that her participants displayed not only socio-culturally different selves but also made use of different expressions of the self in their repeated tellings in two languages (i.e., French-Portuguese). Prior (2011) suggested that narrative retellings offer tellers multiple ways to represent not only different self presentations, but different emotions by showing how in two tellings, the participant reaches a critical point—“from powerless to empowered, fearful to angry” (p. 74). These different studies suggest that identity work is not a one-off event but a proposed analysis of one’s current situation, which is continuously changing and under

---

19 The concept of ‘big stories’ refers to the autobiographical or life story model of narrative research prevalent in the social sciences (Bamberg, 2006). This model of narrative analysis is used as a tool to reflect on “chunks” of a person’s life experience. Small stories, on the other hand, refer to narratives that emerge in talk-in-interaction, or what Bamberg and Georgakopoulou (2008) argue is “how people actually use stories in every-day, mundane situations in order to create (and perpetuate) a sense of who they are” (p. 379).
construction throughout life. Hence, the recounting of personal experience should not be seen as a means to get closer to a “real, true, or one and only story [version of the self]” (Bamberg, 2008, p. 203), but a way to understand the ever changing and ever expanding concept of self.

3.2.2.7 Summary

These studies demonstrate that the act of recounting or retelling stories of personal experience is one that emphasizes the significance and uniqueness of the narrative experience. These studies have also demonstrated that a systematic examination of variance and uniqueness of retellings reveals a foundational similarity. However, studies of the act of retellings of personal experience have rarely included individuals with cognitive impairment or memory loss. In light of this, retelling of narratives necessitates a broader examination. The next section will discuss findings of retellings in the context of impaired cognition, as is the case of persons diagnosed with DAT.

3.2.3 DAT, Repetition, and Repeated Tellings: Deficit vs. Preserved Abilities

If the linguistic study of repeated tellings in cognitively healthy populations yields a small body of research, the study of DAT and repeated tellings from an applied or sociolinguistic perspective yields even fewer. Before addressing the findings in studies of participants with DAT, a few points must be stated regarding narrative and repetition in the discourse of persons with cognitive diseases such as DAT.

First, it has been found that speakers with DAT may not have the ability to monitor their own speech/talk-in-interaction and may not have the ability to distance themselves from the space and time context of the immediate present (Obler & Albert, 1981). This may cause speakers to repeat words, chunks of speech, or even entire accounts without the appropriate stimulus or context. In the psycholinguistics literature, this phenomenon is known as
perseveration\textsuperscript{20}, or the “persistent repetition or continuation of an activity once started” (Buckingham et al., 1979, p. 329). In the field of linguistics, Hamilton describes this phenomenon as “inappropriate self-repetition” (1994, p. 75). While this kind of recurrence in talk can be observed in the speech of anyone—particularly when a person is fatigued or overwhelmed with cognitive tasks that require a rapid response—it is more marked and pervasive in the speech of persons with some sort of neurologic disorder or impairment (e.g., Aphasia, Parkinson’s, Traumatic Brain Injury, Alzheimer’s) (Buckingham et al., 1979; Pekkala, Albert, Spiro III, & Erkinjuntti, 2008).

Second, many times these repetitions in the speech of persons with DAT are self-primed, or are repetitions of what they have previously said, given that short-term memory declines due to the progressively debilitating nature of the disease. Hence, the more advanced the decline in cognition in a person, the more she will repeat chunks of discourse. This is viewed as empty speech (De Santi et al., 1990; Obler & Albert, 1981; Obler & Albert, 1984) and mostly seen as a marker of progressive decline in the overall cognitive health of the person with DAT. On the other hand, researchers focusing on the preserved abilities model in the discourse of persons with DAT have argued and emphasized that repetition produced in naturally occurring talk (i.e., perseverance) is in reality a speaker’s manner of communicating self or ‘selfness’ (Davis, 2011; Hyden & Antelius, 2011; Hydén & Örulv, 2009, 2010; Ramanathan, 1994, 1997). This view will be teased out further in the next section (3.2.3.1).

\textsuperscript{20} Most literature on the use of storytelling/narrative in persons with DAT is from the clinical perspective equating perseveration in this population as a deficit in discourse and one of the hallmarks of cognitive decline. The use of the word ‘deficit’, although stigmatizing to the person with DAT, is used in this literature to label this and other types of cognitive decline observed in the discourse of persons with dementia. From this, the term ‘deficit model’ has stemmed as an umbrella term to describe any literature focusing on cognitive decline as opposed to the retained skills and cognitive functions remaining in speech production. This term, along with the alternate ‘preserved abilities’ model, will be used in the discussion of this literature.
Although these views on perseveration are important when analyzing the discourse of persons with DAT, this is not to be confused with the focus and design of the current study, which involved the task of collecting twice-told stories of personal experience. Throughout the analysis of the data, I will focus on the deliberate act of repeating a story previously told to me, the interviewer, in an environment/space that is well known to the participant. Even though the excerpts analyzed in this dissertation are of deliberately repeated stories, any instance of perseveration present in the excerpts will be discussed. Additionally, I will analyze whether these instances have the function of communicating a more complete and complex picture of the self. Because my hypothesis is aligned with the preserved abilities model, below I will review the most relevant studies on DAT and repeated tellings of personal experience from this perspective.

3.2.3.1 Precursors to the Study of Narrative and Repeated Tellings in DAT Population

Departing from the dominant paradigms of the deficit model, Heidi Hamilton was one of the early proponents of the preserved abilities model. Studying conversational language use at discourse-level in persons with DAT, Hamilton argued for and opened the door to the study of discourse abilities retained in persons with DAT. Although she did not focus explicitly on twice-told stories by her interlocutor, she was one of the first to study and observe repetition and perseveration from a sociolinguistic lens in the discourse and talk-in-interaction between herself and Elsie, a woman diagnosed with DAT, for a period of over four years. In her 1994 work, *Conversations with an Alzheimer’s Patient*, she analyzed how Elsie’s use of questions and responses in talk-in-interaction declined over time, leaving Hamilton to sustain a greater portion of interactional work in talk. She also observed Elsie’s use of repetition and perseveration in talk-in-interaction. She noted that at times Elsie would repeat portions of what her conversational partners had previously said. At other times, Elsie would repeat verbatim (i.e., carbon copy, as
per Hamilton) what she herself had previously uttered to a conversational partner (labeled as echolalia in the literature; cf. Larner, 2011). Hamilton argued that these two phenomena would afford Elsie a ready-made source of language that would offer her conversation partners “the illusion that she is a ‘normal’ interlocutor” (p. 75). As the progression of the disease continued, Hamilton found that Elsie’s ready-made language began to wane, with idiosyncratic and formulaic language disappearing first. Hamilton argued that although portions of her ready-made language were lost, Elsie would continue to repeat ephemeral utterances made by her conversation partners as well as her own utterances (i.e., echolalia) late in the course of the disease. This change in Elsie’s discourse had the unintended consequence of portraying her as undergoing a change in personality. Hamilton contended that this so called ‘change in personality’ observed by family members of persons with DAT was in reality a change in language, demonstrating that it is not that the person “is ‘not the person I used to know’…[but that] she or he is not using the language that ‘I used to know’” (p. 77). This observation paved the way to more research from an interactional perspective and opened the door to the study of repeated tellings in this population.

Another early proponent of the study of language use in the discourse of persons with DAT is Vai Ramanathan. In her 1997 work, *Alzheimer discourse: Some sociolinguistic dimensions*, she studied the discourse of 16 persons diagnosed with DAT. In her work, she analyzed the life stories told by two participants, Ellie and Tina, while using the remaining data of the other participants for quantitative analysis. She carried out unstructured interviews of all participants, collecting and conducting in-depth analyses of their life story narratives. Like Hamilton, Ramanathan focused on the importance of interactive features within interviews held with persons with DAT, using narrative as her method of analysis. Although she discussed the
use of repetition (e.g., chunks and whole narratives) via schema theory, her analytical focus was not explicitly on the function of repeated tellings but on particular interactive features found in these repetitions and how these can inhibit or facilitate extensive and meaningful talk on behalf of persons with DAT. Through the analysis of interactional features observed in the narratives of her participants, Ramanathan argued that the well- or ill-formedness of narratives is usually the result of contextual and interactive practices in which the person with DAT is situated.

In the case of Tina, she found that differences in setting (home vs. adult day care center), conversation partners (interviewer vs. husband), and interactional practices carried out by these different interlocutors drastically changed the way Tina told and retold her life story. In the case of Ellie, whom she interviewed twice at an 18-month interval, she found that the span of time from the first to the second interview changed the way she told her life story, with the first interview replete of details, background information, and reported speech while the second only retained husks of her repeated narratives.

In Ellie’s case, time and context contributed to her progressive decline. In particular, the nonfacilitative social world surrounding her (i.e., an inner city adult daycare center bereft of necessities for aiding and engaging persons with DAT) exacerbated to a greater extent her condition. Ramanathan argued that facilitating meaningful talk not only required that interlocutors be better listeners and interactants, but that the social surroundings where a person with DAT is found be more facilitative.

As shown above, both Hamilton and Ramanathan focused on discourse on behalf of persons with DAT, not only focusing on retained skills and abilities in talk-in-interaction and narrative but also giving a voice and legitimacy to those who are disempowered and disenfranchised due to their progressive cognitive decline. Missing in these studies, however, is
the analysis of repetition of ‘the same’ stories told more than once. Although Ramanathan discussed narrative repetition via schema theory, she does not go into detail as to what was being repeated, how it was organized, and how it was said. Neither does she focus on linguistic devices or roles found in the narrative production of persons with DAT. The next group of studies included in the section below focus to a greater extent on narrative repetition, and these open the path towards the analysis that will be carried out in this dissertation—the narrative analysis of self in repeated tellings.

3.2.3.2 Emergent scholarship on DAT, repetition, and repeated tellings

As a result of Hamilton’s (1994) and Ramanathan’s (1997) longitudinal work on the speech of persons with DAT, an emergence of studies on the preserved skills and abilities in the discourse of those with DAT has surged. Although research on the repetition of narratives of personal experience is scarce, several tantalizing studies offer important clues.

Boyd Davis has collected and studied the discourse of people with DAT, focusing not only on the interactional and pragmatic features found in the “small stories” (Bamberg & Georgakopoulou, 2008) told by most of her interviewees, but also on the repeated instances of unelicited multiply-told narratives of personal experience. In the case studies featuring Lucinda Greystone (2011) and Maureen Littlejohn (Davis & Maclagan, 2014), Davis and then Davis & Maclagan analyzed interviews collected over a 15-month period by students who had matriculated in their Introductory Gerontology course. The authors found that these women tended to repeat stories from their childhood. Davis and Davis & Maclagan also found that repetition in the narratives of these two women with DAT shared certain characteristics.

According to the authors, repetition by both Lucinda and Maureen was not a source of ideational

---

21This is in line with findings on the remaining intactness of long-term memory in DAT and the decline in access to short-term memory as the course of the disease progresses.
perseveration or stepping into a rehearsed self. Sometimes, these women would provide a full canonical story, but at other times, a bare-bones story would suffice for their interactional need. The researchers also observed that in the repeated versions of these two women’s stories, they would change details (i.e., by adding or removing details from their stories), change background information, or provide different evaluations to their oft-told stories. They argued that the repetitions of their stories or story fragments were strategically used to (1) embody parts of the memories that they could still access, (2) retain their self presentation as competent and interesting persons and good storytellers, and (3) hold the conversational floor. These interactional strategies, while allowing these women to remain part of the conversation, shed more light on the interactional strategies that may be found in Alzheimer’s discourse, keeping in mind that these cannot be generalized as DAT may affect people in different ways.

Hyden and Örulv (2009, 2010) studied spontaneously produced narratives told by persons with DAT in the context of nursing homes in Sweden. Focusing mostly on the interactional nature of stories told in these natural conversational contexts, Hyden and Örulv argued that through narrative collaboration and scaffolding, persons with DAT can be afforded the support necessary to tell their stories and assert their narrative identity. This support lends important practical and clinical aid to a person with less cognitive and linguistic resources. Although they did not focus specifically on twice-told stories as a framework for analyzing the narrative speech of persons with DAT, they found instances of ‘the same’ story repeated. Martha, one of the participants in the studies with an early to moderate staging of DAT, retold ‘the same’ story multiple times in different contexts—sometimes with nurses while engaged in group activities.

\(^{22}\) In the case of Lucinda Greystone, Davis noted that almost identical instances of reported speech were used as a strategy to make Greystone’s story more of a performance. Davis also noted that these repeated reported speech instances delivered the punchline of her story, consistent with Bauman’s (1986) findings regarding the function of reported speech in repeated tellings.
other times with other peers in her social world (i.e., the nursing home). They found that in her retellings, similarities between the retellings were present with some differences in the chronological order. Moreover, they found that Martha’s retellings had “instances of almost identical linguistic phrases” (Hydén & Örulv, 2010, p. 158), demonstrating that even in early to mid stages of DAT, verbatim accounts of ‘the same’ story are evident. They maintained that these stories were not always retold for interactional purposes, but because the speaker may have had limited access to “cognitive themes”, opting therefore to those that were most accessible to him/her. The found that these stories help the speakers convey social morals and norms which help present their sense of self and their identity in a more positive manner.

### 3.2.4 Summary: Characteristics of Repeated Tellings in Both Populations

As these studies have shown, repeated tellings share some commonalities while demonstrating variance. In Table 3.1, I review the key findings of these studies (conducted among both cognitively healthy and cognitively impaired individuals) for the field of narrative research and inquiry. The observations concerning repeated tellings are ordered from most to least common in both groups.
Table 3.1. Common Features Found in Repeated Tellings According to Cognitive State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Cognitively Healthy</th>
<th>Cognitively Impaired</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reorganization of experience</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Repeated stories serve the purpose of organizing previous life experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability/topic maintenance</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unchanging events, participants, and critical represented/reported speech in repeated tellings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidation*</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Retellings can often be consolidated or substantially expanded, especially when the retelling is directed at same audience member(s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expansion</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronological changes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Chronological order varies across versions of the telling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbatim repetition</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased dialogic quality</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Retellings can be heavily dialogic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in self-presentation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There is disagreement among scholars on this assessment; see footnote 15 of this chapter for discussion on consolidation.

As the table above highlights, many of the features seen in cognitively healthy tellers can also be seen in the cognitively impaired tellers, albeit not factoring age, level of education, stage of dementia, or other aspects. One surprisingly consistent aspect between these two groups is the fact that people with DAT not only have the ability to retell their stories, but also have the ability to reshape their narratives according to their context and/or audience, similar to those observations made in cognitively healthy tellers. That is, repeated stories in those with DAT demonstrate changes in details, background, and evaluation. On the other hand, stories repeated by persons with DAT (as previously noted in section 3.2.3 and subsections) tend to be shorter in subsequent tellings—not perhaps because of the need to consolidate information or reveal new information, but rather because of the cognitive toll the disease has on persons with DAT. As individuals with dementia experience progressive loss of cognitive and linguistic abilities, their abilities to initiate and tell their stories decline as well, with smaller chunks of their stories being...
repeated in lieu of the full stories. Hence, unimpaired caregivers, peers, healthcare providers, or others view their narratives as less coherent, and consequently view them as less able to make sense of their experience (McCabe & Bliss, 2006). This phenomenon may differ in populations with mild or early DAT, as is to be expected in the case of the population studied in this dissertation, where equal length or some expansion is plausible. Nevertheless, retelling holds an extremely strong social and cultural function, without which society and culture would not function in a similar manner. It is an expected and a much-needed component of daily interaction. It is argued that people’s every day-to-day interactions depend and thrive on repetition (Guendouzi & Müller, 2006). That said, persons with DAT may not have the same interactional needs or make use of the same interactional strategies as persons without DAT, but they use those interactional strategies that are still available to them in fruitful social interaction as competent and interesting persons, good storytellers, and persons who can still access their memories.

Without a doubt, the differences observed between these two groups and the dearth of research in this area (particularly on DAT retellings) justifies their study. The act of repeated tellings is one of the linguistic phenomena that I will analyze and further discuss in the data chapters that follow.

3.3 Reported Speech

In the process of telling or retelling stories, storytellers often represent speech uttered in some context outside of the current one. Known as reported speech, represented speech, or speech presentation\(^{23}\), this device can be found in many discourse genres, ranging from literary texts to spoken discourse. In spoken discourse, it is ubiquitous, being particularly prevalent in

\(^{23}\) These are common terms found in the literature and scholarly work on the topic. For purposes of this dissertation, the term reported speech will be the preferred form although these will be used interchangeably.
storytelling (Haakana, 2007; Holt, 1996, 2000; Lampropoulou, 2011; Van De Mieroop & Clifton, 2013). Its use is an important aspect of human communication, making a teller’s stories more captivating, entertaining, appealing, authoritative, truthful, interesting, and/or empowering. In its most common form, direct reporting of speech, speakers can “quote” themselves and/or others, both as speaker and as spoken about. In indirect reporting, speakers provide a gist or a recount of what was said. Regardless of its form, reported speech (re)creates a link to what was said in a speaker’s there-and-then past (recent or remote) to a speaker’s here-and-now present, bringing with these words “the contexts where they have lived” (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 293).

The organization of this section of the chapter is as follows: first, I will define reported speech (3.3.1), followed by a discussion of the different forms and functions of reported speech that can be observed in speech (in English and Spanish) along with some samples taken from the interview data not included in the analysis chapters (3.3.2). These different categories will be presented in Table 3.224. Next, I will discuss what reported speech does in narrative, focusing primarily on reported speech and its relationship/link to the presentation and/or construction of identity, self, and other from a sociolinguistics perspective (3.3.3). Within this same section, I will restate findings on reported speech in retellings, followed by a brief discussion of the function of reported speech in bilingual narratives. Finally, I discuss previous studies on RS in persons with DAT and reflect on special considerations for this population (3.3.4).

3.3.1 Defining Reported Speech

From a philosophical language perspective, reported speech is defined as the formulation of verbal statements about verbal activities (Lucy, 1993). From a metalinguistics perspective,
reported speech can be viewed as a message about a message (Jakobson, 1960), a speech about speech, or an utterance about the utterance, hence, having a reflexive nature. In linguistics, reported speech is viewed as a type of demonstration whereby others (i.e., the audience, interlocutor, listener) can experience “what it is like to perceive the things depicted” (Clark & Gerrig, 1990, p. 765), without necessarily assuming that the report was a verbatim reproduction of what was said. But what qualifies as reported speech and what distinctions should be made between the different types of reported speech? Below I answer these questions.

3.3.2 Forms and Functions of Reported Speech

While most often reported speech can be easily recognized as the stretch of talk which is surrounded by quotations, much more needs to be included in order to clearly distinguish its surrounding text. A combination of linguistic and paralinguistic features—prosody, voice, deictics, and pronouns, among others—comprise this feature commonly observed in speech. Once speech is transferred to text on a page, other features make these utterances distinguishable from the surrounding text. These can range from the use of ‘reporting’ verbs (i.e., say, go, like, etc.) to the use of subordinate clauses (i.e., ‘that + noun phrase’). To make these features more clearly distinguishable, many scholars have classified the different types of reported speech found in speech and writing. Although the exact number of forms/types of reported speech varies and at times have blurry boundaries which make them increasingly difficult to tease apart, many scholars have agreed upon the use of three distinct categories (Chafe, 1994; Holt & Clift, 2007; Leech & Short, 2007), with a few subcategories covering other distinctive types of reported

---

25 Reflexivity in this context is best defined by Banfield’s work, which analyzed reported speech in literary works (Banfield, 1982). She states that reported speech reveals that it is “not merely the transparent vehicle of expression and communication, but the object of a self-conscious attention on the part of language turned back upon itself.”(p. 23). Furthermore, on the reflexive capacity of ordinary, everyday language, Lucy asserts that it is “the capacity of language to represent its own structure and use, including the everyday metalinguistic activities of reporting, characterizing, and commenting on speech” that makes it a powerful tool (1993, p. 1).
speech. Direct reported speech, indirect reported speech, and the quasi forms of speech (i.e., free
direct, free indirect speech) are the three umbrella categories, while narrative report of speech
acts and narrative representation of voice are subcategories. A more comprehensive explanation
of the different classes of reported speech including examples taken from the interview data not
included in the analyses follow this section. Table 3.2 summarizes key features found in the
different types of reported speech discussed below.

For purposes of the latter chapters in this dissertation, however, I will take a functional
rather than formal approach when discussing reported speech. That is, the data I analyzed is
classified into one of the six different types, but the data I discuss in the analysis chapters will
mostly focus on two major categories of reported speech—direct and indirect reported speech—
along with discussion on subcategories found in the excerpts. The discussion focuses on the two
major categories of direct and indirect speech for two reasons: (1) speakers construct, display,
and/or negotiate the presentation of the self through said categories and (2) speakers make use of
these two categories to a greater extent when narrating their life experiences, making these
categories more prevalent in the data. In the following sections, I will discuss direct speech, free
direct speech, free indirect speech, indirect speech, narrative report of speech acts, and narrator’s
representation of voice.

3.3.2.1 Direct speech

Direct speech/quotation, or oratio recta (Lucy, 1993), refers to the explicit presentation
of a speech act that was originally verbalized by another speaker, such as (1):

(1) … he says to me, “Here’s a hundred dollars so you can go shopping for those kids.”
The quotation, although appearing factual in nature, is actually a doubling or a facsimile of the original utterance spoken in anterior discourse (Tannen, 1995). It rather is a demonstration or a depiction “of selected aspects of the referent” (Clark & Gerrig, 1990, p. 795) which allows the listener to experience and perceive that which is depicted while communicating a stronger affective stance. Many scholars have commented on the peculiarity of this particular stylistic representation of speech (c.f., Bakhtin, 1981; Banfield, 1982; Bauman, 1986; Leech & Short, 2007; Lucy, 1993; Semino & Short, 2004; Tannen, 1995), agreeing on its clear distinguishing linguistic and structural features. In (1), the quoted utterance is framed within a reporting verb or a *verbum dicendi* (verb of saying; Banfield, 1982, p. 23)—also referred to as a *quotative*. The utterance presents the reported speech in the voice of the speaker—anchored in the reporting world. The instance of direct speech—indexically fixed in a then-and-there story-world time—is from the perspective of an ‘other’ quoted speaker or the enunciator. The speaker or locutor (the actual person narrating the story) constructs her utterance from the spatial and temporal viewpoint of the enunciator or the character’s ‘original’ words through shifts in deictics. In the case of (1), the pronoun ‘you’/2nd person referred to in the noun phrase is used to point out that the enunciator’s words were directed at the speaker. At times, the speaker may expressively convey the quotation shifting her intonation, pitch, loudness, voice quality, etc. Other times, the speaker may incorporate “incomplete sentences, subjectless imperatives,”

26 Tannen (1989) established that direct speech is constructed dialogue wherein the speaker represents the words of another. She argued that constructed dialogue is an “active, creative, transforming move which expresses the relationship not between the quoted party and the topic of talk but rather the quoting party and the audience to whom the quotation is delivered” (p. 111). Hence, reported speech is not an authentic or genuine report of what was previously stated but merely an interpretation, a (re)creation of that which was previously uttered in some distal context.

27 The tense used in the reporting verb or *verbum dicendi* may vary. In the case that the speaker uses the historical present, it is important to note that this tense serves the purpose of bringing forward a sense of immediacy to the narrated past (Chafe, 1980, 1994). Its use would indicate a higher involvement in the narrative on behalf of the speaker.

28 Deictics can be categorized into three principal types: (1) spatial deictics (adverbs such as here, there); (2) temporal deictics (adverbs, shifts in tense); and (3) personal deictics (pronouns). These grammatical constructions rely on the context for meaning.
vocative noun phrases, sentences of different dialect or language, etc.” (Lucy, 1993, p.18), incorporate specific language used by the enunciator (i.e., expletives), or incorporate quotation without propositional content (e.g., blah, blah, blah) (Clark & Gerrig, 1990). Moreover, when the speaker presents the reported speech of an ‘other’, she is positioned as having less personal responsibility for the anterior discourse as she is solely taking the role of the reporter (Clark & Gerrig, 1990; Goffman, 1974)\(^\text{29}\). The incorporation of the above-mentioned features marks direct speech apart from other forms of reported speech as these rarely occur in other forms (with the exception of free direct speech; see next section).

In Spanish, similar features as those observed in English can be found. The speaker anchors her report using the reporting verb ‘decir’ (say in English), conjugated according to the there-and-then story world time, as can be seen in the following example:

\(\text{(2) Mi hermano le dijo, "Esta me la debo."}\)

My brother told him, “You owe me this one.”

Other reporting verbs are also present in Spanish direct speech, albeit to a lesser degree (Cameron, 1998), including action verbs (i.e., ‘hacer’/do or make), motion verbs (i.e., ‘dar’/hit), thinking verbs (i.e., ‘pensar’/think), among others. In the data collected for this dissertation, many of these variants can be found, with the verb ‘hacer’ (do, make in English) following the verb ‘decir’ (say)\(^\text{30}\). The former verb is usually followed by some sound effect or gesture, as is the case in the example below:

\(\text{(3) Él hacía, "Psst. Psst."}\)

He would do, “Psst. psst.”

---

\(^{29}\) Clark and Gerrig also argue that direct speech allows the narrator to (1) deflect any responsibility or disassociate from the anterior discourse, (2) create solidarity with the listeners, or (3) provide a more direct experience to the listener.

\(^{30}\) The English equivalent for this is the verb ‘go’, as in “The fire engine went neenar as it raced down the street.”
Unlike examples (1) and (2) above, the quotation observed in (3) does not share the typical structure seen in direct speech, given that it is not syntactically comprised of a noun phrase that makes it clear to the listener that the quotation comes from some ‘other’ speaker. In such cases, the listener must rely on other cues, such as the independent clause that comes before the instance, the sound effects that follow it, and the ensuing utterances. Regardless of structure that follows the independent clause, the use of this kind of linguistic device is not uncommon in narratives of personal experience (Labov, 1972). As other examples of direct speech, this construction shares the same quality—a polyphonic nature integrating not only the speech of others, but also the sound effects and/or gestures of an ‘other’ with that of the speaker/locutor (Bakhtin, 1986). In the scale of reported speech featured in Table 3.2, direct speech—although overwhelmingly found in narrative and storytelling and indicative of high character presence—follows free direct speech, which is defined below.

3.3.2.2 Free direct speech

Free direct speech is a looser form of direct speech where the narrator reports a character’s words without the introductory reporting clause:

(4) …it happened again with my daughter, Lisa. “Mami, I don’t know what to do because I don’t want to be with this guy anymore.”

In (4), the speaker’s utterance floats free of the narrator as if it were a line from a play, a theatrical rendition of sorts. Unlike direct speech, the utterance is not framed with a verbum dicendi. The quotation comes from the perspective of the speaker’s daughter. Although this particular category could be coded as an instance of direct speech, it reflects a distinct way in which speakers communicate and reenact their subjective perspective. Free direct speech displays a higher degree of involvement than direct speech and is typical of informal, casual
speech (Guerini, 2009). It would seem then that the speaker’s high level of involvement works two-fold. On the one hand, it does not interfere with the process of the telling in order to remind the audience as to the origin of the anterior discourse while lessening the likelihood of facing an interruption to her story or losing the floor. On the other, it works to intensify the dramatic quality and affect of her story. For these reasons, free direct speech is presented at an extreme end of the scales of reported speech.

3.3.2.3 Free indirect speech

Free indirect speech, or quasi-direct discourse (Bakhtin, 1981) is a combination of direct and indirect speech. One important difference between free indirect speech and indirect speech is the lack of a framing device (the subordinator ‘that + noun phrase’ in English; subordinator ‘que + noun phrase’ in Spanish)—hence the term ‘free’ (Leech & Short, 2007; Semino & Short, 2004; Wolf, 2006). Unlike indirect speech, free indirect speech has more of an “emotional structure” (Bakhtin, 1981) or expressive features associated with direct speech while displaying a grammatical construction more commonly seen in indirect speech and typically associated with the speech of the speaker/locutor, not the character. Given its atypical syntactical construction, Adamson (1994) named it the “WAS-NOW paradox”. That is, its ability to cut across two different variants (direct speech and indirect speech) and the combination of proximal and non-proximal forms (e.g., the combination of here-and-now spatial and personal deictics with there-and-then temporal deictics) give this type of reported speech an illusory, yet tangible sense of speech—hence its paradoxical nature. It is this central defining feature which creates “an image of selfhood or the illusion of events as experienced rather than reported” (Adamson, 1994, p. 57).

It should be noted, however, that the inclusion of other features in the classification of free indirect speech associated with the speech of the enunciator/character have widened the
definition so that even the slightest mix of any direct and indirect speech feature in an utterance can classify it as free indirect speech (Leech & Short, 2007; Semino & Short, 2004). Essentially, any form of reported speech that “has indications of an intervening narrator but also the flavour of the original speech” (Leech & Short, 2007, p. 262) can be defined as free indirect speech. The following example, taken from the corpus of interviews collected for this dissertation, demonstrates a very loose example of free indirect speech in Spanish (with translation following):

(5) Ajá, si pueden seguir trabajando porque *era en el verano* y necesitan el dinero para ir a la escuela. (bold emphasis mine)

Aha, yes you all can continue working because it was in the summer and you all need the money to go to school.

In (5), an utterance which possesses more direct speech features than indirect ones, it can be easy to overlook the shift in tense, yet it clearly possesses the defining features necessary to classify it as free indirect speech: (1) the evident omission of the reporting clause (i.e., the subordinate clause “*que* + noun phrase”) and (2) the combination of direct and indirect speech features. The latter can be observed in the use of affective-emotive discourse markers (‘aha’), the shift in tense (‘*era*’/was instead of ‘*es*’/is), and the use of the prepositional phrase (‘*en el verano*’/‘in the summer’ instead of ‘*es verano*’/‘it is summer’). This particular type of RS embodies that illusory (i.e., not really there) mix, wherein the listener/audience is the recipient of a dual voice or dual perspectives of the events—that of the character’s here-and-now view of the storyworld and that of the narrator’s there-and-then distant view. Because of its proximity in form to direct speech, this category appears before that of indirect speech in the scale of RS.
3.3.2.4 *Indirect speech*

Indirect speech/quotation, or *oratio obliqua* (i.e., not straight forward) (Lucy, 1993), refers to the use of information that is introduced into the narrative via subordinators (i.e., ‘that + noun phrase’ in English; ‘que + noun phrase’ in Spanish), as can be seen in the two examples that follow (taken from data):

(6) He said that I was selling myself in Puerto Rico to everybody and everyone.

(7) *...los italianos le decían a los puertorros que porque no se iban a otro lugar a otro lugar y le dejaban esa mesa de billar. Que que hacían jugando ahí. Que ellos no pertenecían allí.*

…the Italians would say to the Puerto Ricans that why wouldn’t they go to another place to play and leave them the billiard table. That what were they doing playing there. That they did not belong there.

Deictics, pronouns, and verb tenses observed in these instances are in agreement with the spatial/temporal framework and referential content of the narrator/speaker (rather than the person whose speech is being represented). When used, motion verbs (i.e., “coming” in place of “going”) also establish agreement with the referential content of the narrator’s utterance.

Bakhtin (1981) labels indirect discourse as a ‘hybrid’ (or an internally-persuasive discourse) in the sense that the utterance is composed of a linguistic order (i.e., the ‘original’ quote) and stylistic order (i.e., the narrator’s retelling of the utterance with his/her own words, accent, gestures, and modifications). Unlike direct speech, this mode of reported speech is “more focused on the referential content of the quoted utterance and more oriented toward the narrator’s frame” (Koven, 2001, p. 527). Hence, its use is more subjective and less ‘authoritative’ than direct given that via indirect speech speakers convey an interpretation of the anterior discourse.
This can result in representations of anterior discourse that not only are less faithful to the original utterance but also deemphasize or even hide some aspects of the original utterance (Wolf, 2006) from the audience/listener. In the case of retellings, the use of indirect speech acquires a different function—that of abbreviating a previously narrated experience, even if it was previously reported via direct speech. Other features, such as the expressive nature of the original utterance (i.e., exclamations, interjections, gasps, the inclusion of another language, etc.), can also become lost in the report.

As is shown in (6) and (7), indirect speech is more oriented to the narrator’s frame. It involves different deictics and verb tenses than those used in direct speech. In (6), the speaker used the personal pronoun “I” which agrees with the referential content instead of second person singular “you”. The speaker also used first person reflexive pronoun “myself” instead of second person reflexive “yourself”. The agreement of verb tense also shifts (i.e., ‘was’ instead of ‘are’). In terms of its expressive nature, in (6) the listener is only given a paraphrase of the accusation made by the original enunciator. Entirely absent are the ‘original’ words used by the enunciator and the way the utterance was originally said to the narrator, deemphasizing the gravity and forcefulness of this kind of accusatory statement. In (7), the speaker tried to convey a closer report of what might have been said in the exchange between the Italians and the Puerto Ricans as can be observed in the list of claims/grievances offered by the narrator (e.g., what were they doing playing there; the claim that they did not belong there). However, similar to (6), the expressive elements of the original utterance are not preserved—including the narrator’s choice to report the claims in Spanish instead of code switching to English given that the conversation took place in English. Perhaps this was the speaker’s mean to bracket out an onslaught of racially charged speech that might have occurred in the exchange or to deemphasize the possibly hostile
nature of that exchange. Indirect speech hence paraphrases that which happened—be it as a means to downplay or deemphasize an event or as a method to abbreviate that which had already happened—and takes the viewpoint of the narrator.

3.3.2.5 Narrative report of speech acts

The category “narrative report of speech acts” refers to the speaker/narrator’s interpretation of a speech act. Also known as referred-to speech (Chafe, 1994)31, it takes place and comes from the perspective of the narrator. When used, the utterance is not presented within a clausal structure as seen in indirect speech. The examples below can demonstrate this:

(8) …a pesar de las suplicas y los ruegos, ella no cedió y siempre lo denunció.
…despite the requests and pleas, she did not budge and denounced him anyway.

(9) He accused me as stealing money and I- I- I never stole money…

In (8) and (9), the illocutionary force in the statements presented by the different narrators (i.e., the act of asking for forgiveness in 8; the act of accusing someone of stealing in 9) were initially performed by the different enunciators, but represented by each respective narrator as indicated by the content referential pronouns. No additional content (e.g., the ‘original’ words uttered by each enunciator) is included in (8) and (9), although in (9) some additional information was provided regarding the locutor’s claim of innocence. Hence, if indirect speech is catalogued as a ‘paraphrase’ of anterior discourse, narrative report of speech acts for the most part serves the purpose of summarizing less important information to the audience (c.f., Semino & Short, 2004). In this regard, this mode of speech provides a more distant and one-sided

---

31 Chafe used this term to refer to any language that represents distal language that makes reference to anterior discourse. Narrative report of speech acts and the category that follows (narrator’s representation of voice) can both be categorized as “referred-to speech”. According to Chafe, these forms “recognize the constraints inherent in the ordinary remembering of an earlier experience or the imagining of an anticipated experience” (1994, p. 215).
argument than indirect speech, making the narrator presence in speech stronger than the previous categories.

3.3.2.6 Narrator’s representation of voice

Narrator’s representation of voice (Semino & Short, 2004) refers to the speaker’s report of verbal activity without the disclosure of any anterior discourse or speech act. The most minimal of the different RS types previously discussed, it does not require an introductory clause or the subordinator ‘that’+ noun phrase combination. It typically requires the use of the verb ‘talk’ or ‘speak’, and similar to narrative report of speech acts, the speaker typically does not reveal the topic of the ‘original’ speech. The following examples from the data illustrate this:

(10) …tengo una (hermana) que... me llama- a la doña mía y están horas muertas allá hablando y eso

I have a sister that she calls me- my wife and they spend a great deal of time there talking and such

(11) My ex would talk against (me) ah indisponerme con- con ellos

My ex would talk against (me) ah setting them [the children] against me

In these examples, the different speakers represent the activity of speech by using the verb ‘talk’ (‘hablar’ in Spanish), without revealing the ‘original’ utterance, establishing more distance between the there-and-then speech event and the here-and-now narrative, making the narrator’s control more palpable to the listener. However trite these examples may seem when compared to other forms of RS, they also produce a variety of effects in the context. In (10), narrator’s representation of voice is used to underscore the kind of relationship his wife and sister have—one of bonding and mutual trust—through the use of the intensifier ‘horas muertas’, literally meaning ‘dead hours’. It could also be interpreted that his comment stresses the
importance of cementing these relationships or could be a critique of the perhaps inordinate amount of time the two women spend talking on the phone. Neither of these statements is shared, nor are the actual utterances reported. Nevertheless, the statement communicates that the women engaged in extensive verbal activity, however minimal that activity might have been.

In (11), this mode is used to vilify the character of the ex-spouse while casting the character of the speaker as a victim. The listener is not explicitly told what negative ‘talk’ the ex-spouse would engage in with her children, but the listener may assume that the speaker’s parent-child relationship suffered and possibly became strained as a result of the ex-spouse’s alienating and destructive discourse. Because of this mode’s high narrator involvement, this form is placed opposite of the free direct speech category on the scale.

3.3.2.7 Summary

In an effort to summarize this section, I revisit the questions asked at the beginning of this section: (1) what qualifies as reported speech and (2) what distinctions should be made between the different types of reported speech. Any utterance can qualify as reported speech if it observes any of the abovementioned features. These can be summarized as any stretch of talk (a) possessing an independent clause coupled with a speech verb (e.g., say, tell, go, like, etc.) which may be followed by a quotation or dependent clause paraphrasing what had been previously said (as is the case of direct or indirect speech), (b) surrounded by quotation marks and containing deictics which come from the perspective of a character yet stripped of an introductory clause (as seen in free direct speech), (c) representing speech acts as evidenced by the use of speech act verbs also qualifying as reported speech (as is the case of narrative report of speech act), (d) reporting referred-to speech which does not reveal the actual words uttered in the exchange (narrator’s representation of voice). Table 3.2 demonstrates said qualities in a more
abbreviated manner, accompanied by samples for each of the aforementioned categories. Table 3.2 also lists the different modes, providing clear distinctions for each individual form. I ordered and listed these forms on the scale according to their level of character/narrator control or presence.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Modes</th>
<th>Features*</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High character control/presence</td>
<td>Free direct speech</td>
<td>+ Speech occurred</td>
<td>She “Please close the door.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– Introductory clause</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Deictics from the perspective of character</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct speech</td>
<td></td>
<td>+ Speech occurred</td>
<td>She said, “Please close the door.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+ Introductory clause</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– Subordinator present (that/que +NP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Deictics from the perspective of character</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free indirect speech</td>
<td></td>
<td>+ Speech occurred</td>
<td>She looked as he walked in. Why didn’t he just close the door?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– Subordinator present (that/que +NP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Spatial/Personal deictics from the perspective of character**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Temporal deictics from the perspective of the narrator**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect speech</td>
<td></td>
<td>+ Speech occurred</td>
<td>She said that he should close the door.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+ Subordinator present (that/que + NP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Deictics from the perspective of narrator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrative reporting of</td>
<td></td>
<td>+ Speech occurred</td>
<td>She ordered him to close the door.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>speech acts</td>
<td></td>
<td>– Subordinator present (that/que + NP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Deictics from the perspective of narrator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High narrator control/presence</td>
<td>Narrator’s representation of</td>
<td>+ Speech occurred</td>
<td>She spoke to him about closing the door.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>voice</td>
<td>– Subordinator present (that/que + NP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Deictics from the perspective of narrator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Note that defining characteristics, marked by (+) and (−) signs, diminish in number as narrator control/presence increases.
** The defining characteristics for FIS are wider than other categories. Deictics could come from the perspective of narrator or character.
The above table demonstrates that any stretch of talk or text *about speech* that took place in the past would qualify as reported speech. The distinctions between the different forms found in talk and storytelling can be teased apart by observing closely the different features listed in the table above and addressed in the section above. As previously mentioned, the direct and indirect forms are relatively easy to tease apart, yet quasi-forms are more blurry, requiring analysis that is more extensive. Regardless of these distinctions, it is clear that RS is made up of a polyphony of voices (Bakhtin, 1981)—integrated in speech across different genres. Next, I will address other functions of RS found in narrative.

### 3.3.3 Discursive Functions of Reported Speech in Narrative

Numerous studies in sociolinguistics and discourse analysis have affirmed that RS is a powerful discursive resource in narrative. Through it, a speaker can perform and construct her and others’ identity and sense of self (De Fina, 2003; Johnstone, 1996; Schiffrin, 1996, 2002, 2006), track status differentials (Hamilton, 1998; Johnstone, 1987), construct and enact power relations as a means of interactional positioning (Van De Mieroop & Clifton, 2013; Wortham, 2000, 2001), perform code displacements as a means to contest or align themselves with socially locatable identities (Alvarez-Caccamo, 1996; Frick & Riionheimo, 2013; Guerini, 2009), and perform and construct multilingual socio-culturally locatable identities (Koven, 1999, 2001, 2007), among others. Because of the frequency of its occurrence in narratives (Haakana, 2007; Labov, 1972; Vincent & Perrin, 1999), the analysis and examination of RS can serve to better understand what was said as well as how it was said. It also helps to grasp the relationship

---

32 Whenever possible, I will focus the discussion on RS found in autobiographical interviews (i.e., the sociolinguistic interview as per Labov, 1972) as this dissertation involved recording life experiences of participants told in the context of interviews—a type of institutional talk. Although the research interview (or in this case the autobiographical interview) forms part of institutional talk, it is situated in a local, social, and cultural context, and as such is a social interaction. However, the sequential organization of talk in the interview will not be the principal lens through which the sense of self is analyzed.
between the speaker and the construction and/or presentation of the self—the focus of this dissertation.

3.3.3.1 RS and the construction/display of self and identity

A great deal of scholarship has focused on the construction/presentation of self in narrative inquiry, with some scholars addressing the link between RS and the display of the self and identity. In Schiffrin’s study (1996) on narrative and the sociolinguistic construction of self and identity, Schiffrin held that RS is intertwined with the presentation and the construction of identity of oneself and others in narrative. Her study on the narratives of two Jewish-American women, Jan and Zelda, show that in their troubles tellings of family issues, the speakers’ selves and social identities were constructed and indexed through a variety of choices made on different discourse planes. Both women used reported speech not only to reveal the family troubles and its resolution through brief interchanges, but also to construct the other story characters’ identities (i.e., responsible vs. irresponsible) meanwhile constructing their own self identities (e.g., being accommodating, flexible, and ultimately disengaged persons).

In a later study of Holocaust survivor, Ilse, Schiffrin (2002) observed that the referents and reported speech used by Ilse in the telling of her life story were revelatory of her own presentation/construction of self/identity and that of others in the context of her stories. Schiffrin also posited that the referents and type of RS used by the speaker express information about the emotional relationship between (1) the speaker and her mother and (2) the speaker and her friends. In the case of the relationship between the speaker and her mother, Schiffrin argues that the lower instances of direct/indirect speech used by the speaker/the mother and higher uses of narrative report of speech acts and narrator’s representation of voice attributed to the mother are revelatory of a distant and almost void/nonexistent mother-daughter relationship. In the case of
the relationship between the speaker and her “camp sisters” or female friends made during her
time in concentration camps in Germany, Schiffrin finds higher use of direct speech (even
unspoken speech) within Ilse’s stories. In these instances, Ilse makes use of more direct speech
as well as more first person plural pronouns, suggesting a more involved and emotionally
supportive relationship between her and her “camp sisters”. Through these instances of reported
speech and referents in Ilse’s discourse, Schiffrin argues that at a basic level, Ilse constructs the
identity of ‘us’ vs. ‘them’, where ‘us’ represents a collective group composed of Ilse and her
friends (first as victims and later as survivors) and ‘them’ represent her mother as a bystander
and the German camp guards as perpetrators. These different and shifting identities are
consonant with oral Holocaust stories.

3.3.3.2 RS as a cue for agency

Reported speech has also been found to serve as a cue not only for speaker identity, but
also for a speaker’s agency and self presentation in relation to social experiences. De Fina
(2003), for instance, studied agency and identity in illegal border crossing narratives offered by
Mexican immigrants. She found that the Mexican speakers would quote the speech of authority
figures (i.e., coyotes or smugglers, border police, state police) more so than that of themselves—
demonstrating the authority figures’ role as “gatekeeper” and the immigrants’ role of
dependence. When a speaker quoted herself, she would either quote her own voice during a
moment of internal evaluation in the storyworld or quote her voice along with that of other
immigrants as part of a collective. In the case of the latter, the choral voice was usually projected
as making decisions—demonstrating a stronger sense of agency as well as solidarity and
strength. In both cases, speakers often constructed a positive and resourceful self in the face of
the possible danger of deportation or arrest. However, the more agentive displays of self rested in
the collectivity—therein lay their source of strength.

3.3.3.3 RS as a cue for tracking status

In her exploration of verb alternation in instances of RS, Johnstone (1987) argued that speakers alternate verb tenses when introducing instances of reported speech to mark the power and status of the enunciatior. Her data demonstrated that speakers used past tense when introducing the direct speech of the nonauthority figure in the storyworld (e.g., he said) while using the historical present to introduce the direct speech of authority figures in the narrative world (e.g., he says). Building upon previous findings on the historical present tense in narrative (c.f. Schiffrin, 1981), Johnstone hypothesized that speakers would alternate between said tenses for three reasons. Speakers would alternate tenses to (1) draw attention to key characters and events in the story, making the story more worth telling and more worth listening to, (2) manage footing on various levels (i.e., footing in the there-and-then storyworld vis-à-vis that in the here-and-now narrating space), (3) capture the timelessness and universality of the language of authority figures. Upon closer examination of the actual content of the quoted speech by nonauthority figures in the stories, Johnstone found that even though speakers generally position themselves as “having been far cheekier than they probably actually were” (p. 45), they still (and perhaps inadvertently) alternated the tense of the RS dialogue introducer—tracking the actual difference in status/authority between speakers.

Building upon Johnstone’s findings on verb alternation in RS, Hamilton (1998) posited that the type of reported speech used by speakers can also be alternated. In this case, contributors to an online support forum for bone marrow transplant recipients alternated between direct and

33 Exceptions to the latter pattern happen, in which case the authority figure is then presented as an individual author of her/his words.
indirect reported speech in narratives of doctor-patient interactions. Focusing on conflict narratives that surfaced in these interactions, Hamilton found that contributors’ use of direct speech to quote what the doctor said was higher than that of indirect speech. The patient, in contrast, was attributed more indirect speech in said conflictive doctor-patient interactions. When patients were attributed direct speech, they presented themselves in a more active stance in terms of their health. Their use of direct speech served as a means to construct their identity as survivors in face of a life-threatening illness. Much like Johnstone’s findings, Hamilton posited that these alternations were due to status difference between the doctors and patients. However, when doctors were quoted, these were portrayed as being callous, inept, not forthcoming, and unhelpful. À la Clark and Gerrig (1990), Hamilton argued that doctors were attributed direct speech in order to demonstrate the doctor’s faults more explicitly while providing the audience with a perception of that direct experience. Her findings lend further support to Johnstone’s claim that “people very often choose to talk about interactions with people of higher status precisely to show that the initial, socially-defined status differential is in fact unfair or wrong” (1987, p. 37).

3.3.3.4 RS as a strategy for interactional positioning

Exploring the power of narrative in the field of pedagogy, Wortham (2000, 2001) also explored RS in autobiographical narrative and has posited that speakers use RS (along with other cues in narrative) as a method for interactional positioning within the narrating and narrated world. In his narrative analysis of Jane, a middle-aged American woman, he found that through her narrative, she positioned and repositioned herself interactionally within the narrated space and narrating world. That is, as she narrated her story of being institutionalized twice during her formative years, growing up in different cities, and having to cope with her ‘failed caregivers’,
she enacted and reenacted her ‘self’ in different ways. In the course of the narrative, her self-presentation ranged from passive and victimized to assertive and active. Although in the 2000 study Wortham did not focus to a great extent on the use of RS in her narrative, he posited that quoted speech as well as the choice of metapragmatic verbs of speech (i.e., narrative report of speech acts or narrator’s representation of voice), among three other cues, were important for analysts so that these could better interpret interactional positioning in autobiographical narratives.

3.3.3.5 RS and code switching in multilingual contexts

In bilingual/multilingual contexts, reported speech and code switching within the RS utterance has generated some dispute. In essence, the argument revolves around two questions: do speakers quote in the language in which the original event occurred or do they quote in the language in which they are narrating? Some scholars argue that speakers choose to code switch to the event language when they report speech thereby producing a more ‘faithful’ report of the speech (Gal, 1979; Myers-Scotton, 1993). Others claim that when speakers code switch (or choose not to), they are ensuing in creative dialogue construction (Gumperz, 1982; Koven, 2007). Still others believe that speakers switch from one language/code to another when reporting speech in order to communicate and convey the language ideology of an individual or group (Alvarez-Caccamo, 1996; Frick & Riionheiro, 2013; Guerini, 2009).

Taking the last two points as points of departure for this dissertation, it will be assumed here that code switching within instances of quoted speech serve as a discursive strategy in conversation and narrative (à la Gumperz, 1982). Gumperz articulates that code switching within these instances of RS serve as contextual cues (Gumperz, 1977, 1982). Through context cues, “speakers signal and listeners interpret what the activity is, how semantic content is to be
understood and how each sentence relates to what precedes or follows” (Gumperz, 1982, p. 131). In essence, speakers communicate a range of socio-culturally locatable and identifiable information. In the case where the speaker chooses not to switch to the language of the original event, s/he can shift the speech register to make the characters “talk” in a more iconic, socially indexical manner. In either case, the language choice made by the speaker conveying the RS utterance is more creative and not restricted to being “faithful” to the original language use.

Language ideology can also be conveyed when a speaker switches. Álvarez-Cáccamo (1996), for instance, illustrates examples of switches based on language ideology and the power of code choices. Studying code switching (or what he named ‘code displacement’) in instances of reported speech in Galician-Portuguese conversation in social and political conversational contexts, he held that that speakers code switched to show or display their language ideology. These would be either in the form of (1) resistance or assimilation, (2) alliance or counter-alliance, or (3) affiliation or disaffiliation to a given view or ideology that remained unstated in social groups. Code displacement in instances of RS then serves as a site where the powers of code choice and language ideologies are enacted to either establish relationships of appropriateness / inappropriateness, genuineness/ artifice, or authority/ delegitimacy in light of the social and cultural contexts of the speech event.

Along similar lines, Guerini (2009) studied identity and code switching within quoted speech by Ghanaian immigrants in Bergamo, Italy. She argued that in their narratives and conversations, Ghanaians would switch languages or dialects as a means to mark off the quoted speech from the rest of the discourse and set the instance apart from the surrounding narrative episode. Guerini argued that speakers creatively resorted to the power of code choices “to construct socially interpretable identities which convey both personal and group identity” (2009,
p. 62). Frick and Riionheimo (2013) studied the use of code switching in instances of RS/voicing in the life stories of Ingrian Finnish immigrants in Estonia. The authors found that when speakers switched to Estonian, it helped invoke a voice-persona for the instance of RS. Moreover, when the voice persona is invoked, the speaker can tactically distance herself from the voiced persona for the purpose of negatively assessing the behavior of that person. Koven (2007) studied creative dialogic constructions of RS in French-Portuguese narrative retellings. Unlike the previous studies where code switching was the norm, speakers in this group did not code switch when reporting speech. Rather, speakers quoted speech in French in an overwhelmingly more vivid form than in Portuguese, showing that through RS the social and the cultural intersect with language to perform and construct iconically and indexically socially recognizable identities.

3.3.3.6 RS in repeated tellings

As was discussed earlier in this chapter, RS is also present in repeated tellings, although the scholarship in this area is limited to very few findings. Nevertheless, these findings demonstrate another layer of the underlying meaning of RS in narrative. The most common finding with regards to RS and retellings is regarding its apparent quality of lexical similarity. That is, in most cases, RS appears as repeated verbatim from one telling to the next (Chafe, 1998; Norrick, 1998b). Others have found that at times RS serves as a means to deliver important information to the audience (Labov, 1972; Schiffrin, 2003, 2006) or as a means to deliver a story’s punch line (Bauman, 1986). In some studies focusing on identity and self, scholars have presented evidence of different self presentations embedded in RS in retellings (Bamberg, 2008; Schiffrin, 2006) while others have illustrated examples of expansion of quoted speech in retellings (Ferrara, 1994; Norrick, 1998a, 1998b; Schiffrin, 2006)—further lending empirical support to the argument that RS is “constructed dialogue” (Tannen, 1995). Yet others have
argued that speakers quote themselves and others in strikingly different ways in bilingual retellings (Koven, 2007) and in different storytelling genres (Stockburger, 2008). These studies demonstrate, and make clear, that RS in retellings is a rich and powerful resource for speakers. Through it, speakers not only have the opportunity to reshare/reshape lived experiences, but they have the ability to creatively construct (and reconstruct) in the here-and-now the words spoken by themselves and others in some there-and-then moment, demonstrating “the identities they are ABLE to perform [as well as] the social identities they are ENTITLED to perform” (Koven, 2001, p. 548; emphasis in the original).

3.3.3.7 RS in DAT narratives

While the scholarship on RS in narratives delivered by cognitively healthy persons is more comprehensive (as I demonstrated above), the same cannot be said of RS in narratives delivered by persons with DAT. Some researchers have found that persons with DAT report what others have said in previous conversations or in stories remembered from earlier memories in life, yet not much in the way of analysis of the performative aspect of these utterances is given. Hyden and Örulv (2009) are an exception to this as the study of Martha—a woman diagnosed with DAT—showed how she performed and replayed her voice and that of her late husband even though she struggled with the temporal organization of the narrative and had difficulty tracking referents in her story. Hyden and Örulv furthermore illustrate that in voicing herself or replaying the voices of others, she engages in embedded evaluation allowing her to forgo other linguistic features of narrative. RS then is a way for speakers with DAT to “minimize their effort as it economically expresses not only the content of the utterance, but also the way it was originally told and what feelings and attitudes were embraced” (p. 212). More importantly, Hyden and Örulv posit that the use of RS in the narratives of persons with DAT can be “an
effective and economic way of establishing and negotiating narrative identity, even as linguistic and cognitive competence has begun to falter. A skilled and creative storyteller, especially one who throughout his or her life has adopted this dramatic narrative style, may very well be able to maintain the use of these resources when other capacities fade as a result of a disease such as AD” (p. 213). This last point indeed demonstrates that the narrative abilities in persons with DAT remain intact, although readjusted to reflect the needs of the speaker.

3.3.3.8 Summary

As I stated previously in the section on retellings, speakers make use of many interactional strategies to communicate or come across as interesting or engaging storytellers. In the case of speakers with DAT, they make use of those interactional strategies over which they still have control to come across as competent and interesting persons, good storytellers, and persons who can still access their memories. The dearth of research in RS in this population further justifies its study. The use of reported speech and the act of repeated tellings are two linguistic phenomena that I will analyze and further discuss in the data chapters that follow.

3.4 Speaker Roles

The last linguistic device presented in this chapter (and used for analysis in the subsequent chapters) is that of speaker roles—a framework borrowed from Koven’s (2002, 2007) empirical findings regarding speaker role inhabitance in the narratives of French-Portuguese bilinguals. The organization of this section is as follows: first, I discuss the background to Koven’s tripartite system of speaker roles, a combination of different theories.

---

34 I use Koven’s tripartite system to better elucidate the analysis of the construction or presentation of the self in the narratives of persons with or without DAT. This system links the variety of linguistic repertoires and devices which bilinguals use in order to construct, perform, and reproduce experiences of self. Some of the discussion of said roles will overlap with the discussion on reported speech.
related to language. Then, I discuss the different roles included in Koven’s work. Each role will be defined and sample excerpts from the data not included within the analysis chapters will be included to illustrate these points. Finally, I summarize these three roles discussing their importance in this study.

3.4.1 Background

The concept of speaker roles in narrative is grounded in sociopragmatic approaches to language, particularly that which is encompassed in the study of narrative. Sociopragmatics, a merger of the scholarly tradition of sociology with that of pragmatics, is a term coined by Leech (1983) to describe the ways in which pragmatic meanings reflect locally situated conditions on the language use of a speaker. Within this approach, the concept of speaker roles is embedded. It links the concepts of evaluation, footing, conversation analysis, heteroglossia, and voicing to create a more comprehensive understanding of the speaker and the roles which s/he subscribe to in narrative production. Speaker roles are a confluence of the work of various scholars: Labov (1972, 1997; Labov & Waletzky, 1967), Goffman (1981, 1986), and Bakhtin (1981). Ducrot’s (1980) concept of polyphony was later added to the framework of speaker roles. These roles found in first person narratives of personal experience are categorized into three: narrator, interlocutor, and character role. This tripartite system better captures the locally and socially ‘situatedness’ of the production (and reception) of narrative.

3.4.1.1 Narrator role

The first role where the speaker takes an extended turn at talk (i.e., the floor) is that of the narrator during which time the event of narrating takes place. While the speaker takes on this

---

35Pragmatics here refers to “the study of language from the point of view of users, especially of the choices they make, the constraints they encounter in using language in social interaction and the effects their use of language has on other participants in the act of communication” (Crystal, 2008, p. 379)
role, s/he uses a variety of indexical devices situating him/her in the here-and-now of the narrating events in combination with the there-and-then of the narrated events. Furthermore, speakers may use different grammatical combinations of person and verb form that index his/her voice simultaneously in a here-and-now and there-and-then space. Among the possible combinations speakers may use, first-person pronoun (‘I’/ ‘yo’) or verb form may be combined with a past tense or historical present verb. In English, verb forms used in narrating may alternate from past tense (Labov & Waletzky, 1997) to historical present tense (Chafe, 1994; Hamilton, 1998; Johnstone, 1987; Schiffrin, 1981). Table 3.3 illustrates the role of narrator being enacted in both Spanish and English. The different grammatical tenses observed in first-person narratives of personal experience are underlined and in italics.

Table 3.3: Tenses Observed in Narrator Role

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simple past (e.g., my son...he <strong>called</strong> me every day.)</td>
<td>Preterit (e.g., <em>En casa le- hicimos almuerzo y hablamos un rato.</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(At home we- made lunch and talked a while.)</td>
<td>(And we would come to visit.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past progressive (e.g., and he <strong>was always singing</strong> in the small pubs.)</td>
<td>Imperfect (e.g., <em>Y nosotros veníamos a visitar.</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical present (e.g., My grandma came out of the kitchen because my grandma let nobody use the kitchen, only she <strong>cooks</strong>)</td>
<td>Pluperfect (e.g., <em>a las tres de la tarde aún no habían despertado.</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(imperfect + participle)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(At three o’clock, they had not yet awoken.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the table demonstrates, the tenses observed in narrator role vary according to the involvement or distancing of the narrator to the narrated events. This characteristic is similarly found in reported speech, where alternation of verb tenses (e.g., alternation from past to historical past) indicate a higher involvement on behalf of the speaker. The past and past progressive tenses, however, are overwhelmingly used by the speaker when taking on the perspective of narrator. These frame the events as having occurred at a place and time distinct
from the here-and-now act of narrating—in a sense demonstrating a speaker’s detachment from these events.

3.4.1.2 *Interlocutor role*

Drawing on previous narrative scholarship (i.e., Bauman 1986; Labov 1972 b; Labov & Waletzky, 1997), interlocutor role is defined as a shift which takes place during the course of the interaction. A few shifts that are commonly observed in the course of telling a story are changing roles to comment on something already stated in the narrative, commenting on the interaction, or even interrupting the narrative in order to clarify a situation. Said shift actually entails a rupture from the there-and-then advancement of the plot to convey further here-and-now interactional and attitudinal information to the listener. Such rupture may also serve as an exchange wherein the speaker recognizes and ratifies the listener (Telles Ribeiro & de Souza Pinto, 2006). Thus, it is via the incarnation of this role that speakers connect to the “larger context…where the stories are told” (Koven, 2002, p. 178).

What distinguishes this role from the narrator role is the speaker’s marking of current stance. This is established via different forms of language-specific indexical devices where the speaker displays interpersonal rapport and affect. These various linguistic forms are referred to as *nonreferential* indexicals because, beyond and often in the absence of semantic reference, they link to aspects of the speakers’ contexts (Silverstein, 1976). These devices include:

1. parenthetical remarks that break the narrative frame to make a comment to the listener;
2. marked register usage; (3) intensifiers that index speaker affect; (4) discourse markers or interactional particles that mark interpersonal or affective stance rather than logical, propositional relations between referential components; (5) shifts to a second-person pronoun to invite the audience to identify with the teller; (6) laughter; (7) gasps; (8) interjections that index
speaker affect; and (9) sighs. Excerpt 3.1 illustrates different rates of interlocutory devices in two versions of the same story narrated by a person with DAT. The devices have been underlined and boldened in both versions. The letters ‘P’ and ‘I’ found in the excerpt below refer to “participant” and “interviewer”, respectively. An English translation of the Spanish telling appears below.

**Excerpt 3.1. Two Versions of the ‘Same’ Story with Different Interlocutory Devices**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P: Well he had uh <strong>a lot</strong> of rooster. <strong>No?</strong> Eh. To fight</td>
<td>P: <em>Yo era malo. Yo hacía muchas cosas. Me buscaba los problemas <strong>yo mismo</strong>. Él tenía gallos de pelea entonces me decía, “a este le das esto.”</em> **Se ve que le gustaba tenerlos en condición *<em>y eso. Cuando llegaba por le- por la tarde los encontraba unos dos o tres gallos muertos. Yo se los echaba a pelear unos cuantos. <strong>Y ay bendito!</strong> Me daban con- con- Me trataban <strong>bien</strong> fuerte porque yo era malo. Era yo q- tenía la culpa.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I: aha</td>
<td>I:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P: prepare for fighting and <strong>you know</strong> I had to take care of all of them. They got <strong>about sometime about</strong> fifteen or twenty or ten. He said, “you have to give it this this food to this eh rooster. And the other one you have to do <strong>that.</strong> and you supposed to no giving no no food to this one.” But <strong>you know.</strong> And <strong>you know</strong> I was <strong>real skinny</strong> and I had to (.). bring water to the house we don’t have. I had to bring <strong>you know</strong> shi- stick with uh- to burn fire and everything.</td>
<td>I: <strong>uh huh</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I: because we were <strong>real</strong> poor</td>
<td>P: and <strong>you know</strong> and I had to tak- take lunch for him from one town to another. Then to go to school. I was <strong>real mad you know</strong> that time. And I remember when I get home make put two two the- ru- ru- to fight.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I: <strong>uh huh</strong></td>
<td>I: <strong>uh huh</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P: And when we come back both of them died and he (.). he hit me <strong>you know so bad you know</strong> that <strong>almost</strong> killed me at that time. And I do it <strong>every time.</strong> I do it <strong>every time</strong> because I got <strong>mad.</strong></td>
<td>P: And I was bad. I did many things. I would look for trouble on my own. He had fighting roosters and then he would say, “give this one this.” It was obvious that he liked to have them in good condition and such. When he would get from- home in the afternoon, he would find two or three roosters dead. I would have a few of them fight. And oh my goodness. They would hit me with- with- They would discipline me very severely because I was bad. I was guilty.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Noticeably different are the rates of interlocutory devices in these two versions of the ‘same’ story. The speaker tends to use more interlocutory devices in English than in Spanish,
with the discourse marker ‘you know’ predominantly present in the English telling, followed by
the intensifiers ‘real’, ‘so’, and ‘every’. These devices could serve referential functions
(particularly intensifiers), but they do not communicate any propositional content. The speaker
clearly uses these to communicate his current stance toward what he was narrating at that given
time—further conveying here-and-now interactional and attitudinal information to me, the
listener.

3.4.1.3 Character role

*Character* role is the last role distinction. As the name suggests, speakers take on this role
via the representation of prior speech in the there-and-then narrated event. Speakers enact or
“replay the thoughts, feelings, words, and deeds of characters” (Koven, p. 99, 2007) using any of
the various forms of reported speech discussed earlier in this chapter (see Table 3.2 for
examples). The character role of the speaker functions as a vehicle for voicing and positioning
themselves as persons in that there-and-then storyworld or other iconically and indexically
socially-recognizable identities.

3.4.1.4 Double voicing

Borrowing from Bakhtin’s notion of double voicing36, Koven (2007) suggested that the
inhabitation of the three speaker roles discussed above may be performed simultaneously with
the following possible combinations: (1) narrator-interlocutor; (2) character-narrator; and
(3) character-interlocutor. Narrator-interlocutor double voicing may be found in a narration
where interlocutory commentary/devices are embedded in the advancement of the plot (i.e.,
narrator’s voice). In character-narrator double voicing one can find instances of indirect speech

---

36 Double voicing refers to Bakhtin’s (1981) description of the two voices or speakers that “at the same time [are
expressing] simultaneously two different intentions: the direct intention of the character who is speaking and the
refracted intention of the author” (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 324),
where the speaker frames the discourse of a quoted character through the narrator’s perspective (i.e., indirect speech or free indirect speech). Lastly, character-interlocutor voicing is described as the simultaneous use of direct quotation/speech collapsed with the current interlocutory stance of the speaker, such as when a speaker uses direct speech to incorporate quotation without propositional content (e.g., blah, blah, blah) (Clark & Gerrig, 1990).

3.4.1.5 Summary of roles

As stated previously, this framework of speaker roles identifies not only how speakers use reference, interaction, and performance in narratives, but also how these devices present, perform, and enact multiple and local constructions of the self. Via these different roles, speakers connect to the larger context and establish alignment with their audiences in both the here-and-now and the there-and-then.

3.5 Summary

The literature reviewed above is testament to the discursive resourcefulness and power of these different linguistic devices or strategies present in narrative. As I have shown above, repeated tellings allow speakers with or without DAT to add, consolidate, highlight, and/or revise information while RS allows a speaker not only to give voice to others, but to integrate context and the voice of others into her own voice in order to communicate her subjective perspective. Both repeated tellings and RS have the power to recreate in a here-and-now space a story or conversation that was held in a there-and-then time. Concerning RS, it remains clear that said device, as many other scholars have demonstrated, is a site where speaker and context interact to construct dialogue creatively. Speaker roles, on the other hand, allow a speaker to present, perform, and enact multiple and local constructions of the self.
Given the different concepts discussed herein, the aims of this dissertation are as follows: (1) explore the impact DAT may have on narrative expression of the sense of self, (2) apply an alternative approach to the analysis of the sense of self in persons diagnosed with DAT, and (3) add to the literature of repeated tellings, reported speech, and speaker roles in bilingual older adults. In order to carry out these aims, this study (1) analyzes instances of RS in the personal experience narratives of cognitively healthy older bilingual Latinos and older bilingual Latinos with DAT, (2) analyzes how older bilingual adults discursively construct a sense of self via RS, and (3) studies RS variance in the narratives of personal experience across groups (i.e., experimental and control). These different devices or pieces of information, which were woven into the story world through the use of direct, indirect, and embedded reported speech, construct a storyworld where the self is made and revealed.
CHAPTER 4

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

4.1 Introduction

As previously mentioned in Chapter 1, in this dissertation, I aim to explore how older bilingual Latinos diagnosed with DAT present the self in their two languages through narrative inquiry. More importantly, I aim to discuss and answer the following questions:

(1) Content: What do the participants narrate in each telling and how are these two tellings similar and/or different?

(2) Strategies: What strategies do the speakers use while telling the stories? What strategies do the speakers employ while using reported speech?

(3) Reported Speech: How do the speakers use reported speech and to what extent is reported speech used differently/similarly in the narratives of each participant?

(4) Self-Presentation: How is the self of the speaker and of others ‘performed’ through reported speech? Do the speakers quote themselves or others as extensively or in the same amount?

Based on these questions, I begin the current chapter by first discussing the purpose and scope of the current study (4.1) and then focus on the context of the study (4.2) with regards to DAT and the Latino population in the U.S. while addressing the current and historic patterns of migration of U.S. Latinos and Puerto Rican Latinos, the study’s principal ethnic group addressed. Since the participants interviewed for this study were from Puerto Rico, I offer a detailed account of the Puerto Rican Diaspora (4.2.2) and the historical migration patterns of this
group of migrants (4.2.3) in hopes of providing a careful and in-depth portrait of the persons interviewed for this study. Furthermore, by focusing to a greater extent on the migration patterns of this group of first generation Puerto Ricans to Pennsylvania, I offer a rationale for how their life experiences, assimilation, and acculturation might impact their world view, language choices, and their sense of self. These factors are key in the study’s objective as acculturation and assimilation further impact world views and sense of self.

In section 4.3, I discuss the recruitment process of participants, including the centers where the majority of participant recruitment was conducted. In section 4.5, I introduce the participants of this study. In this section, I offer a more detailed account of their migration experiences and language background, as well as include a table with information relevant to their migration, their language, and the results of the MMSE battery. Next, I discuss the methodology (4.6) used to address the research questions posed above and pursued in this study. In section 4.7, I introduce the research design and present the instruments and materials used, followed by a brief discussion on the interview sessions and coding scheme used for the analysis of the narratives collected. The summary (4.8) provides a link from this chapter to the data analyses and discussion followed in chapters 5, 6, and 7.

4.2 Context of the Study

4.2.1 Alzheimer’s Figures for the Latino Community

According to the Alzheimer’s Association\(^\text{37}\), 1 out of 9 older adults in the United States live with dementia of the Alzheimer’s type. Older Latinos diagnosed with the disease make up 11.5 percent of the current population. When compared to other cultural/ethnic groups, Latinos have higher risk factors (i.e., other comorbid conditions such as diabetes, cardiovascular disease,

\(^{37}\) Alzheimer’s Disease Facts and Figures, 2016.
and obesity, among others) and higher prevalence of developing Alzheimer’s disease, partly due to lower income, lack of adequate access to health care, lower rate of educational attainment, and language barriers, among others. In fact, when compared to whites and African Americans, Latinos are 1.5 times more likely to get DAT. Since most older adults in the Latino community live with their family members (i.e., their adult children), caregiving would very likely be done by one of the adult children. This translates to an increased rate of burden on a caregiver system that is already plagued by other pressures, such as unemployment, financial instability, high mortality rates, etc. Hence, it is undeniable that the continued growth of the number of Latinos with DAT will lead to an incremental deterioration in the quality of life of the Latino communities across the United States\textsuperscript{38}, \textsuperscript{39} as well as the quality of life of the person with DAT.

\textbf{4.2.2 The Latino Population in Pennsylvania: 2000 and 2010}

The number of Latinos in the state of Pennsylvania has increased and continues to increase. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, Pennsylvania holds the second largest population of Latinos in the Northeast. In 2000, Latinos made up 3.2 percent (394,088) of the state’s population. In 2010, the number of Latinos in the state of Pennsylvania increased to 5.7 percent (719,660; U.S. Census Bureau, 2010) of the population. Puerto Ricans make up the first largest Latino group in the state. In 2000 and 2010, the number of Puerto Ricans in Pennsylvania was 1.9 percent (288,557) and 2.9 percent (366,082), respectively. This current increase in the Latino population is most noticeable in different parts of metropolitan areas (i.e., the city centers or pre-established communities, such as North Philadelphia), and mostly it has been generated by the urge to migrate to places where economic opportunity, family, and/or a better quality of life

\textsuperscript{38}According to the U.S. Census Bureau (2010), the number of Latinos living in the USA is 50.5 million. According to the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Administration on Aging (henceforth AOA), the number of those aged 65 and older is 2.8 million. AOA estimates that by 2050, this figure will grow to 17 million.

\textsuperscript{39}According to the Alzheimer’s Association Facts and Figures on Hispanics/Latinos and Alzheimer’s Disease (2004), the number of Latinos estimated to have AD by 2050 is 1.3 million.
exist. In the case of Pennsylvania, the City of Philadelphia has historically been the host city to many Latino groups since the late 1800s. Migration patterns of Latinos to metropolitan cities across the U.S. were mostly fueled by the need of unskilled low-wage labor in agriculture and manufacturing plants and later on in the service industries (Vázquez-Hernández, 2005; Whalen, 2001). Today, the current lack of jobs and the economic crisis that has impacted the U.S. continue to contribute even further to chain migration and other internal migratory changes in the state (Johnson & Lichter, 2008).

More recently, U.S. Census data has shown a change in inner city migration patterns. More Latinos have migrated to rural areas and have thus helped stem population loss or decline in traditionally non-Latino white areas of the country. In Pennsylvania, Latinos have moved to other counties in the state that offer work opportunities in the agriculture, manufacturing, and service industries (Acosta-Belén & Santiago, 2006). This is reflected and most prevalent in the counties of Berks, Lehigh, and Lancaster (see Table 4-1). As in other regions of the U.S., the surge in Latinos in these counties in Pennsylvania has contributed to an increase in population in these zones. In addition to the previously stated reasons for migration, the increase in the Latino population in these areas is more likely to be related to the current need to replace laborers who were once part of the existing low-wage laborers in agriculture (Escobar-Haskins, 2001).
Table 4.1: Change in Latino Population: 2000 to 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State/City/Groups</th>
<th>2000 Population</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>2010 Population</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Percentage Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pennsylvania</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>12,281,054</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>12,702,379</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>421,325</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanics/Latinos</td>
<td>394,088</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>719,660</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>325,572</td>
<td>82.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Ricans</td>
<td>288,557</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>366,082</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>77,525</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Philadelphia</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>1,517,550</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1,526,006</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>8,456</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanics/Latinos</td>
<td>128,928</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>187,611</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>58,683</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Ricans</td>
<td>91,527</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>121,643</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>30,116</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Berks County</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>373,638</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>411,442</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>37,804</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanics/Latinos</td>
<td>36,357</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>67,355</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>30,998</td>
<td>85.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Ricans</td>
<td>22,038</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>36,333</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>14,295</td>
<td>64.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lehigh County</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>312,090</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>349,497</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>37,407</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanics/Latinos</td>
<td>31,881</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>65,615</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>33,734</td>
<td>105.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Ricans</td>
<td>21,066</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>37,980</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>16,914</td>
<td>80.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lancaster County</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>470,658</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>519,445</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>48,787</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanics/Latinos</td>
<td>26,742</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>44,930</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>18,188</td>
<td>68.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Ricans</td>
<td>19,341</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>30,403</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>11,062</td>
<td>57.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The figures presented in Table 4.1 indicate a reconfiguration of the traditional metropolitan area, accompanied by a decentralization and dispersion of the manufacturing and service industries that once were central to the development and growth of the metropolis and its population\textsuperscript{40}. These changes in population signify the continued need of linguistically and culturally appropriate services in the community.

### 4.2.3 The Puerto Rican Diaspora in the U.S.: Historical Patterns of Migration

Puerto Rican migration patterns and rationales for migrating are not much different than those found in many other ethnic groups. Puerto Ricans began migrating to the U.S. before Puerto Rico became occupied by the U.S. in 1898 in search of political asylum and better opportunities (Acosta-Belén & Santiago, 2006; Whalen, 2001; Whalen & Vázquez-Hernández, 2005). After 1898, migration to the U.S. and other Latin American countries was widely promoted by both the U.S. Department of Labor and the Puerto Rican government to solve what was then thought of as the Puerto Rican ‘surplus population’ and massive Island-wide unemployment (\textit{ibid.}). The first wave of migrations was carried out to fulfill the increasing need of low-wage workers in other U.S. industries throughout Latin America and Hawaii (Acosta-Belén & Santiago, 2006)\textsuperscript{41}. To further aggravate the lack of labor in Puerto Rico in the early to mid 1900s, a rapid industrialization strategy was employed by the U.S. and local governments. The local agricultural way of life, which was the main labor generator in the Island prior to U.S. annexation, was quickly transformed into a U.S. controlled plantation system of sugar cane.

\textsuperscript{40} According to Katz, etal.(2010), the dispersion of industry has come as a result of economically-viable towns and cities throughout the U.S. In This is prevalent in the meat packing industry

\textsuperscript{41} Due to the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882, the Hawaii Sugar Planters Association (HSPA) could no longer hire Chinese contractual workers. Because Hawaii and Puerto Rico were annexed in the same year (1898), it made it easier for the HSPA to hire Puerto Ricans which were considered ‘domestic’ workers. Additionally, the U.S. Department of Labor and the local government commercialized Puerto Rico as “prime territory for cheap, non-Asian labor” (López, 2005, p. 44). By 1910, the number of Puerto Ricans sent to Hawaii to work the sugar cane plantations was 3,500 (Whalen, 2005).
Smaller farmers along with minor crops were mostly displaced. Workers and day laborers were left without jobs. When the profits of the U.S. controlled agricultural plantation system were in decline, U.S. industry and manufacturing rapidly took its place. At first most industries were located in the greater metropolitan areas, leading to a high surge of internal migration and high unemployment in some municipalities (Whalen, 2001); as a result, years later more industries were located in some municipalities throughout the Island. However, these industries did not solve the problem of high unemployment in the Island. Forced to look for a better life and better opportunities elsewhere, displaced Puerto Ricans slowly started to migrate from the Island to the mainland by the 1920s (Acosta-Belén and Santiago, 2006; Grosfoguel, 2003; López, 2005; Rodríguez & Sánchez Korrol, 1996; Whalen, 2001, 2005). Many of these migrants were hired as seasonal laborers or domestics in different parts of the U.S. By the mid 1930s, the number of Puerto Ricans in the U.S. had risen to 45,000. This number continued escalating during the postwar era (1950s) and thereafter (Acosta-Belén and Santiago, 2006; Grosfoguel, 2003; Rodríguez, Sánchez Korrol, and Alers, 1996; Vázquez-Hernández, 2005; Whalen, 2001). Currently, the number of Puerto Ricans in continental U.S. and territories is about 3.5 million (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010).

As with many other past and current migrant groups, many Puerto Ricans who migrated to states in the 1920s to the 1940s were looking for low-wage labor in agriculture and manufacturing. Many of those states included New York, New Jersey, Illinois, Pennsylvania, California, and Florida, among others. Those who worked in agriculture were contracted as seasonal workers. At the end of the season, these workers were expected to return to Puerto Rico, but many stayed behind looking for work elsewhere—particularly city centers. Some seasonal workers who completed their contractual labor returned to the Island to work during the Puerto
Rican harvest time, which coincided with winter in parts of the U.S. which hired Puerto Ricans heavily. A ‘va y ven’ or back-and-forth migration pattern was established with these seasonal workers (Acosta-Belen & Santiago, 2006; Whalen, 2001).

Towards the 1950s, most Puerto Ricans started migrating to city centers. In the cities, they would locate family members or friends and live with them until they settled. In the cities, most would work in the garment, metal, and railroad industries. Others worked as dishwashers or busboys in hotels and restaurants in major cities. Still others continued working as seasonal workers in farms but were bused in to the farms (Whalen, 2001, 2005).

In both research sites visited for this study, Reading and Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, Puerto Ricans were and continue to be the predominant Latino group, as can be seen in Table 4-1. The majority of participants interviewed for this study were immigrants from Puerto Rico, the majority from rural areas of the Island. Most of those interviewed had previously worked as low-wage laborers in either the manufacturing (particularly fabrics and textile industries) and service (hotels, domestics) industries, or agriculture upon arriving to the U.S. Currently, most of these participants are either retired or semi-retired.

4.3 Recruitment Sites

4.3.1 Casa de la Amistad Senior Center

La Casa de la Amistad Senior Center (La Casa) is a community-based organization located in the heart of Reading, Pennsylvania. La Casa is housed on the second floor of Reading’s Hispanic/Latino community center, El Centro Hispano (El Centro), which provides social services to the broader Latino population in the County and has been operating in the Berks County for over 40 years. La Casa was established in 1988 to accommodate the needs of Latino Seniors in Berks County. According to the web site dedicated to La Casa is a program for
Latinos who live in the city of Reading and are at least 58 years old or older five days a week. According to a study regarding the Latino population in Reading and the services offered by El Centro, the services provided by La Casa include:

“social, cultural, recreational, and educational activities, which include weekly English classes, health check-ups, and low impact exercises, among others. Seniors are also provided with meals that are culturally appropriate and consistent with their lifelong diet.” (Escobar-Haskins, 2001, p. 61)

On a daily basis, La Casa receives about 80 older adults who participate in activities held by La Casa. La Casa also provides the Latino older adult community social services, such as case managers, interpreters, and transportation. Some of the caseworkers help older Latinos with filling out forms. These older adults also receive a reduced-price or free lunch every day.

4.3.2 Mann Older Adult Center

The Mann Older Adult Community Center (the Center) is located in the heart of the Puerto Rican community in Northern Philadelphia. The Center is sponsored by the city of Philadelphia and receives funding from other state agencies. It is opened from Monday to Friday from 8 am to 4 pm, and similar to La Casa, the Center offers the older adult community in the area breakfast and lunch, recreational activities, counseling, legal services, health services and fairs, transportation, and other informal resources. The Center also hosts Memories in the Making Workshop, an art therapy and painting workshop for older adults who have memory loss or dementia, every Friday of the year. On a daily basis, the Center receives about 100 older adults from the North Philadelphia region. The majority of the Latinos are from Puerto Rico, but many other Latino nationalities are found in the Center.
4.4 Recruiting Participants

Participants for this study were recruited through several senior centers in the cities of Reading and Philadelphia, PA during Fall 2008 through Spring 2010. Prior to posting or sharing information about the study with possible participants, I met with the directors of the centers were most of the recruitment took place. After meeting with directors, I posted flyers about the study in the different sites. I asked directors to share these flyers with potential participants. In one of the centers in Philadelphia, I gave a brief presentation on the study. It was pointed out that the study aimed to (1) explore the impact AD had on bilingual Latinos living in the USA more than 10 years, (2) compare the language use of bilinguals diagnosed with AD with that of cognitively healthy bilinguals. It was also clarified that potential participants had to be 60 years or older and would be accepted on a first-come, first-serve basis. Interested participants were asked to complete a form with their name, telephone number, and answer a series of basic demographic and language use related questions. I received twenty-two forms from interested adults. Other participants in Philadelphia were recruited through word of mouth. All participants were consented. They were also given documentation of the study’s purpose. All participants (or caregivers) were compensated for their participation (payment varied according to session).

4.5 Participants

Thirty participants were recruited from two research sites: Reading, Pennsylvania (Site 1) and Philadelphia, Pennsylvania (Site 2). Spanish and English speaking adults over the age of 60 were recruited to participate in this study (Mean age 73.4) (9 from Site 1; 21 from site 2). Eleven participants had no cognitive impairment (Mean age=75.1) as assessed by the MMSE (Mean MMSE=27.1). Nineteen participants had cognitive impairment, of which twelve had mild

---

42 IRB approval was obtained from the university’s Office for Research Protections.
cognitive impairment (Mean Age= 71.0, Mean MMSE=23.7), four had moderate impairment (Mean Age=75.0, Mean MMSE=16.0), and three had severe impairment (Mean Age=74.7, Mean MMSE=7.0).

Of the thirty participants recruited for this study, only fourteen successfully completed the entire study. Twelve participants did not meet the study’s criteria and four did not complete the study (or were not called for the remainder sessions). Of the fourteen participants, six attended their local older adult community center, and one attended a local nursing home. The remainder did not attend local community centers or nursing homes. These were recruited through word of mouth. Additionally, eight participants resided in their local communities, five lived in older adult residential facilities, and one lived in a nursing home. The participants’ pseudonyms and their background information are presented in Table 4-2.
### Table 4.2: Biographical Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>Country of origin</th>
<th>Time in USA</th>
<th>Age of migration</th>
<th>MMSE scores*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Enrique</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Daniel</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. José</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sandra</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>27**</td>
<td>18***</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Sonia</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. María</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Lucy</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>33**</td>
<td>28***</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Ricardo</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>48**</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Manuel</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Minerva</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>26**</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Rosa</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>25**</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Juan</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Miguel</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>39**</td>
<td>5***</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Migdalia</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*MMSE categories. 30=no presence, 26-29 = questionable, 21–25= mild, 11–20= moderate, 0-10= severe

**Time in the USA for these participants was not continuous.

*** Age of first migration

Note. L1= first language
The following paragraphs describe all of the participants in greater detail. The information presented for each participant is based on the information gathered from the demographic and language history questionnaire (see Appendix A).

Enrique was a Puerto Rican living at Reading, Pennsylvania at the time of our interview. When Enrique was 12 years old, he and his family (mother and siblings) moved to Hoboken, New Jersey in search of a better life and more opportunities. Before migrating, Enrique and his family lived in Utuado, Puerto Rico. His father passed away when he was 8 years old. His mother could not sustain her household, so she migrated to the States alone. Soon after his mother moved to the U.S., she sent for all her children (10 in total). Enrique completed 4th grade while he was living in Puerto Rico. Although he went to a public school to complete fifth grade while living in New Jersey, he did not continue going to school. He helped his mother with house chores until he was old enough to get a job outside the house. He learned some English in school, but he mostly picked it up on the streets of Hoboken. When he was 18 years old, Enrique got his first job as a machine operator for a mattress company. He worked there 23 years. After that job, he had a few other jobs performing similar tasks. His common law wife and her children lived with him in New Jersey. Because his wife’s family lived in Pennsylvania, they used to travel regularly to see them. Eventually, they moved to Reading, Pennsylvania in the late 1990s. While living in Reading, he was medically diagnosed with early onset Alzheimer’s disease. His late mother and his sister both had it and died of it. Another sister has also been diagnosed with the disease.

Daniel moved to Doylestown, Pennsylvania when he was 21 years old. Before moving to Pennsylvania, he lived in Barranquitas, Puerto Rico. Because he lived in a rural part of the Island, where schooling was not so readily accessible or attended, he only finished third grade.
He did not learn English, and although he spoke Spanish well, he self-reported that his understanding of Spanish was average. When he was old enough to do tasks around the home, he started doing minor tasks in the farm where his parents worked. As a young adult, he worked as a laborer in tobacco production and other minor crops. While working as a laborer, he met his wife. During this time, the working conditions in Barranquitas were declining, and he soon found himself unemployed. He looked for a job in other areas of the island, but did not find any. He heard that it was easier to find a job in the U.S., and he knew someone in Doylestown that could find him a job in the service industry. Although he did not know any English, he decided to move and worked in an inn as a dishwasher and busboy. He started learning English while working in the kitchen. In the meantime, his fiancée stayed on the Island. A year later, she moved to Doylestown, and they married. In 1952, they moved to Philadelphia where he worked for a well-known hotel. His English improved, and he was well liked. He worked there 17 years, and eventually he was ascended to banquet manager. His former boss offered him better pay in a different hotel, so he decided to change jobs. He worked in this hotel seven years. While working there, he suffered a seizure and retired. Although he has other comorbid conditions, he is cognitively healthy.

José was born in Bayamón, Puerto Rico and lived in Puerto Rico until the early 1990s. He completed high school, although he described the process as a painstaking one: walking barefoot every day to a school that was located in another town. He rated himself as a good speaker of Spanish and rated himself as an average speaker of English. Although he learned English in school, he stated that he did not really use it much until he was in the Army. He also lived in different states in the south and northeast of the U.S. before the 1990s on account of serving in the U.S. Army, but José never considered those experiences as official migrations by
choice, but work-related relocations. After he finished high school, he was recruited by the U.S. Army to fight in the Korean War. After having fought in the war, he was stationed in Germany. He later returned to Puerto Rico and took some courses in a vocational school on the Island. He got a job working as a shift manager in a reinforced rubber-making factory in Bayamón, P.R. He worked there 34 years. He retired and moved to Philadelphia in the early 1990s because his only daughter and granddaughters were living there. He was medically diagnosed with Alzheimer’s disease one year before our interview.

Sandra, a cognitively healthy bilingual Puerto Rican living in Philadelphia, was born in Guayama, Puerto Rico. Before moving permanently to Philadelphia, she experienced the back-and-forth migration patterns that many other Puerto Ricans experienced postwar. In 1959, she moved to New York City. She was 19 years old and had recently gotten married in Puerto Rico. All of her husband’s immediate family had migrated to New York and New Jersey, so they hoped to find work through them. A year later, she became pregnant and chose to return to Puerto Rico to give birth to her children there. They stayed in Puerto Rico until the mid 1960s, when she moved to New Jersey with her husband and children. A year later, she moved to California with her husband and children. They lived there until the 1970s. After having a stillbirth, she returned to Puerto Rico and got divorced. While living in Puerto Rico, she got her GED certificate and had the opportunity to study in a private university for a year. She remarried in the early 1980s, but a year later, she divorced her second husband. She moved to the U.S. again, but this time she moved to Philadelphia, where her children lived, and found work as a laborer in a metal manufacturing company. After some months of working in the metal manufacturing company, she became very sick. This led her to become disabled. Although she has been unemployed for many years, she has remained in Philadelphia collecting disability
payments. She rated herself as an average speaker and listener of English. In Spanish, she self-rated her understanding as very good and her speaking as average.

Sonia was a Puerto Rican living in Philadelphia since the early 1980s. She married when she was 15 years old and immediately moved to New Brunswick, New Jersey with her husband in the early 1960s. Although she attained a 6th grade education in Puerto Rico, she self-rated her understanding of Spanish as average. In her understanding of English, she rated herself very good. She also rated herself as a very good speaker of English although she did not know English when she first moved to New Jersey. She explained that she had seven children and no time to go back to school. She learned some English on the street but mostly through her children. As her relationship with her then husband deteriorated and became abusive, she decided to move to Philadelphia with her sister and brother-in-law. Once there, she worked in various factories, but she eventually could not keep working as she had to raise her children by herself. Because she was living below the poverty level at the time, she qualified for state assistance. At the time of our interview, she was living in public senior housing.

María was from Coamo, Puerto Rico, but her family moved to Philadelphia in 1954. She was 16 years old at the time of migration and went to high school in Philadelphia while working in the evenings. She learned some English in Puerto Rico, but she improved her spoken English while living in Philadelphia. She rated her knowledge and spoken English and Spanish as very good. When she finished her junior year of high school, her mother made her and her sisters work full-time in department stores and at garment industries. Once the school year started again, her mother did not allow her to return to school to finish her senior year. She made María work full time in the garment industry and work night hours in a department store. After three years of working in the garment industry and different department stores in the city, her mother allowed
her to leave her job in the department stores. During that same time, she met a Puerto Rican man and decided to get married to go back to school. She got married against her mother’s wishes, and soon started studying for the GED certificate. She passed the GED and went on to a vocational school where she studied medical assistance. After finishing school, she worked in different hospitals in the Philadelphia area, and later on, she worked as a home care assistant. At the time of our interview, she was no longer working as an in-home care assistant, but she mentioned several times that she was looking for a new patient to care for.

Lucy was a resident of a senior housing apartment building in Reading, Pennsylvania, at the time of our interview. Born in Orocovis, Puerto Rico, Lucy worked as a family domestic and later migrated to the States to work as a domestic when she was in her twenties. She had only attained up to fourth grade education and did not know or speak English. She learned English at age 22 while working for a family in Miami, Florida. She lived in Miami for about three years and then went back to Puerto Rico. While living in Puerto Rico, she got married, and later moved to New York City where she worked in the garment industry for about 20 years. She remained living in New York City until her husband died. After that time, she moved to Reading, Pennsylvania, where her older brother resided and some of her adult children. At the time of our interview, she had been living in Reading 15 years and was medically diagnosed with Alzheimer’s disease.

Ricardo, a cognitively healthy bilingual, was born in Vega Baja, Puerto Rico, and moved to New York in the early 1960s. Previous to moving to the U.S., he lived in Vega Baja with his family. He received some schooling, but he did not finish high school because he was drafted to serve in the U.S. Army during World War II. He received training in one of the Army camps in Puerto Rico and was sent to Panamá a few months later. After that, he was posted in Germany
for some time during and after the war. While in Germany, he became more fluent in his spoken English. Not too long after he was sent to Germany, he was discharged and returned to Puerto Rico. Once in Puerto Rico, he decided to use the G.I. Bill to receive engine and mechanical training in a vocational college. Although he completed his studies, he could not find a job and decided to migrate to the U.S at the age of 26. He spent some time in California, where he had some German friends. Some months later, he moved to Chicago, where one of his brothers lived, but decided to move again to Detroit. From Detroit, he moved to New York City. In New York, he found a job as a truck driver where he had to drive merchandise from New York to Pennsylvania. Some years later, he was transferred to work out of Reading, Pennsylvania. He has continued living there since the 1970s. When asked about his knowledge of his two languages, he rated his understanding of Spanish as very well and his understanding of English average. He rated his spoken Spanish as average and his spoken English as very well.

Manuel moved from San Juan, Puerto Rico to New York City in the early 1950s. He was 25 years old and had not studied beyond eighth grade. He knew enough spoken English to get by and get a job in a cheesecake bakery. Before moving to New York, he lived in Old San Juan with his family. When he was a teenager, he worked cleaning barracks and cooking food for the Army soldiers who were stationed in a fort in Old San Juan during World War II. However, after the war, he had a hard time finding a job. He moved to Manhattan and after some time, he got a job in a cheesecake bakery in Brooklyn and would travel there every day. He moved closer to his daughter when he started having memory problems. In 2009, he was placed in a nursing home in Reading, Pennsylvania when his daughter could no longer take care of him in the home. At the time of our first interview, he was at the moderate stage of Alzheimer’s disease. He rated his
understanding of Spanish and English as average. His spoken Spanish self-rating was very well, and his spoken English self-rating was average.

Minerva was an older Puerto Rican who also experienced the back-and-forth migration patterns as a young adult. She completed high school on the Island and learned English. She first went to Washington, DC as a teenager with her father and lived there for two years. When she was in her mid thirties, she moved to New York City with her husband and children. Her husband got a job in New York in the entertainment industry. She moved to Philadelphia in the 1980s to live closer to her son. She rated her understanding of both Spanish and English as very well. She also rated her spoken English and Spanish as very well. At the time of our interview, she was living in Philadelphia and was medically diagnosed with Alzheimer’s disease.

Rosa was a cognitively healthy bilingual from Naranjito, Puerto Rico. Born in the late 1920s, she went to school during the time that English was reinstated as the official language of the Island. She learned it, but she never really spoke it until she moved to the U.S. When she was a young child, her mother left to work in San Juan, Puerto Rico. She was raised by her grandmother, and she helped out by doing laundry at the local stream. Since she lived with her grandmother, she had the opportunity to go to elementary school during the time that she was not doing work around the house. However, when she was 13, her grandmother passed away, and she moved to San Juan to live with her mother. There she completed high school and worked in theaters selling movie tickets. She married at the age of 19 and left the Island. She lived in New York City some months and returned to Puerto Rico. In the mid 1980s, she left Puerto Rico and lived in New York again for a few years. In the late 1980s, she got a cosmetology license in Puerto Rico and worked in a salon until the mid 1990s. Again, she returned to Philadelphia with her husband and worked in a hair salon for some years before retiring. Her rating of her spoken
Spanish and English were very well and average, respectively. Her rating of her ability to understand Spanish and English were very well and average, respectively.

Juan moved to Philadelphia in the 1950s. Born in the late 1930s in Quebradillas, Puerto Rico, he helped his parents with household chores and with the cattle. In the 1940s, his parents moved to San Juan to find work because they did not have enough money for their children. He moved to San Juan a year later. There he went to school and completed eighth grade. When he was 17 years old, he moved to Philadelphia and lived with his older brother who worked in a fruit farm outside of the city of Philadelphia. Juan found work at the poultry plant that was outside of the city and worked there for some years. Tired of working on his feet for long hours and the low wages, he decided to look for work elsewhere. At first, he worked in a lighting manufacturing factory in Philadelphia for some years. After that, he decided to look for work in the service industry. By this time, his older brother had already been working in the kitchen of a cafeteria in Philadelphia. Through his older brother’s contacts, Juan found work in another restaurant in the area. He first worked as a dishwasher and eventually worked as a cook for 10 years. Later on, he had the opportunity to receive a commercial driver’s license and became a truck driver until he retired in his mid 60s. He learned how to speak English when he moved to Philadelphia. His self-rating of his spoken English and Spanish was average. His self-rating of his ability to understand both English and Spanish was also average. At the time of our first interview, he was medically diagnosed with Alzheimer’s disease.

Miguel was born in the early 1940s in Yauco, Puerto Rico. When he was 5 years old, his parents moved to Cleveland, Ohio to work. He stated that it was there where he first learned how to speak English well. He and his parents lived there for 12 years. After his father had saved up money, they decided to return to the Island to open a small sandwich and beer shop in the east of
the Island. During Miguel’s early twenties, he worked for his father. When his father accused him of stealing money from the family business, he decided to work for his father-in-law. He did not make enough money to live, so he left to find work in the U.S. He first moved to Florida, and later moved to Philadelphia where he had family. He had lived there 34 years by the time of our first interview. In Philadelphia, he got a job as a dispatch clerk in a shipping company. He worked there 30 years. He studied until ninth grade. At the time of our first interview, he was medically diagnosed with Alzheimer’s disease. His self-rating of his spoken English and Spanish was very well and average, respectively His self-rating of his ability to understand both English and Spanish was also very well and average, respectively.

Migdalia, a cognitively healthy bilingual, was born in Naranjito, Puerto Rico. Before leaving Puerto Rico, she had gotten her GED certificate and went on to study cosmetology. She could not find a good job in Puerto Rico and had three children. When she was in her early 30s, she decided to move to the U.S. She left her children with her mother until she had the ability to send for them. At first, she lived in New York City for some months. After having a hard time getting a job and living without family, she decided to move to Philadelphia where she had a cousin who worked for a candy factory. She lived with her cousin for a year before moving to her own apartment in North Philadelphia. She got a job in the garment industry and worked there for 10 years. On the side, she would style women’s hair from her home. She finally set up her own business as a hairstylist in the mid 1970s. She retired from styling hair and decided to study naturopathy. She went to a vocational school for a year, but she never practiced it. Although she learned some English in Puerto Rico, she felt that she became proficient in speaking English when she moved to Philadelphia. She rated her knowledge of English and Spanish as average.
and very good, respectively. She rated her ability to speak English and Spanish as very well in both languages.

4.6 Methodology

This study implements a qualitative research methodology and is cross-sectional in nature. Cognitively healthy bilingual Latinos and bilingual Latinos with different stages (mild to moderate) of AD were recruited. The data analyzed is comprised of narratives of personal experience of bilingual Latinos diagnosed with DAT (experimental data) and narratives of personal experience of cognitively healthy bilingual Latinos (control data). The experimental data is compared to control data. Applying a narrative analysis to life stories of Latino participants, photographs were solicited in the interview sessions. These were used to elicit oral narratives of self (Harrison, 2002; Shadden, 1998). All of the stories told in participants’ two languages were analyzed. These were collected in two sites in Pennsylvania. The interviews were collected over a period of one year and a half. Each participant was interviewed for a total of three one-hour sessions for a total of three hours. The independent variables are group (DAT, control) and language of session (English, Spanish). The dependent variables are instances of reported speech and shifts in speaker roles (shift from narrator, character, interlocutor roles via verb tenses; adaptation of Koven, 2007). Based on the nature of the data collected, the results presented are of qualitative nature.

4.7 Research Design

4.7.1 Instruments and Materials

All participants were given the following assessments: (1) the Spanish version of the 15-item Geriatric Depression Scale (GDS; Martinez de la Iglesia et al., 2002) or the English version
of the GDS (Sheikh & Yesavage, 1986); (2) the Spanish Mini Mental State Examination (MMSE; Bird, Canino, Stipec, & Shrout, 1987) or the English version of the MMSE (Folstein et al., 1975); and (3) the Bilingual Verbal Ability Test (BVAT; Muñoz-Sandoval, Cummins, Alvarado, & Ruef, 2005).

**The Mini Mental State Examination (MMSE)**

The Mini Mental State Examination is a commonly used tool to assess mental status and cognitive impairment in older adults. The examination is a short (5-10 minute), 11-question measure that assesses five areas of cognitive function: orientation, registration, attention and calculation, repetition/recall, and language (Bird, et al., 1987; Folstein, et al., 1975). The maximum score an individual can attain is 30 points. Individuals who attain a score of 26 or lower are categorized with cognitive impairment. Cognitive impairment, also, is categorized into three classifications: mild impairment (characterized by a score ranging between 21 and 26), moderate impairment (characterized by a score ranging from 11 to 20), and severe impairment (characterized by a score of 10 or below).

The Mini Mental State Examination was adapted and validated into multiple languages resulting in a more culturally sensitive assessment of the original version. Current adaptations of the MMSE account for any potential bias in informal translations of the instrument and to demographic criteria, such as years of formal education and literacy. For purposes of this study, the MMSE instrument used in all interviews accounted for these differences in language and culture.

The MMSE was used to measure a participant’s cognitive impairment. Participants who scored 10 or below were not invited to participate in subsequent sessions as the criteria of inclusion was the admission of participants with mild to moderate AD.
The Geriatric Depression Scale

The 15-item Geriatric Depression Scale is a 15-question scale that measures depression. It was adapted from the 30-item Geriatric Depression Scale for purposes of greater brevity in the older adult population. The 15-item GDS takes 5 to 7 minutes to administer and is made up of 15 questions with yes/no answers. Scores ranging from 0-4 indicated normal mood (depending on age, education, complaints). Scores below 5 indicated depression. Depression was categorized into three classifications: mild (characterized by a score of 5 to 8), moderate (characterized by a score of 8 to 11), and severe (characterized by a score of 12 to 15).

Much like the MMSE, the 15-item GDS was adapted and validated in Spanish by Martinez de la Iglesia, M.C. Onis Vilches, C. Albert Colomer, R. Duenas Herrero, and R. Luque, in 2002. The cut-off scores for the 15-item GDS was 5 or above (Sheikh and Yesavage, 1986). Participants who scored 5 or above on this assessment were not invited to participate in subsequent study sessions. According to the original instrument, the cut-off point for depression is a score of 5 or above. In order to ensure detailed narratives in the current study’s sessions, participants who scored five or above were not invited to the remainder of the study sessions as indication of depression as can be seen reflected via the GDS scores could indicate possible lack of detailed narratives (Williams & Broadbent, 1986).

The Bilingual Verbal Ability Test (BVAT)

The BVAT was used to measure a participant’s knowledge of English and Spanish. The battery is based on three tests from the Woodcock-Johnson Psychological Educational Battery. It is commonly used to test bilingual verbal ability (i.e., cognitive and academic language abilities) in children and adults, while also providing a measure of English language proficiency. Participants’ verbal cognitive abilities are measured via three tests: picture vocabulary, oral
vocabulary, and verbal analogies. Participants are first tested in English and then tested in Spanish solely on the items that were failed in English. Results are attained by scoring an English raw score and a Spanish gain score. Since participants observed in this study were diagnosed with AD, only two of the three subtests (picture vocabulary and oral vocabulary) of the BVAT were used\(^4\). The results of this battery were not included for two reasons: (1) participants seemed very fatigued towards the end of the interview (which was when this was administered) and (2) its use was limited for purposes of verification of participants’ spoken ability in both English and Spanish.

Demographic and language history questionnaire

An adaptation of the Bicultural identity integration (BII) questionnaire (Benet-Martínez & Haritatos, 2005) was used in the first interview session to gather demographic information from the participants. The questionnaire consists of 26 questions about demographics, language use, language choice, and language knowledge (Appendix A).

The open-ended bilingual history interview was given in the second interview. It consists of six open-ended questions about living in Puerto Rico and migration to the U.S. (Appendix B). This second questionnaire was given to receive more detailed background information about the participant’s history of second language acquisition.

4.7.2 Interview Sessions

Each participant was asked to participate in an initial interview session to assess whether she/he met the assessment criteria established above. Each participant was first given the 15-item GDS, followed by the MMSE. Once the participant completed these two assessments, he/she was

\(^4\)The verbal analogies subtest was not used with this population as the administration of this section would have proven to be onerous to potential participants. Additionally, its administration would have required participants to spend more time in the first session.
given the BVAT. At the end of the session, they were given a demographic and language history questionnaire (adaptation of Benet-Martinez, et al., 2002 questionnaire on language background; see Appendix A). Once the participant met the criteria, she/he was invited to participate in the second and third sessions of the study. The invitation was communicated to the participant and/or their legally authorized representative (henceforth LAR) or next-of-kin within 24 hours after the initial session. Additionally, the participant and/or the LAR or next-of-kin was asked to bring at least five family photographs where the participant was present along with different family members. Participants and/or their LAR or next-of-kin were informed that this could be accomplished by a review of a family collage or a picture album that they owned.

During the second session, an open-ended bilingual history interview (see Appendix B) was given to each participant. Some participants required the help of the LAR or next-of-kin to complete these questionnaires. After the participant and/or the LAR completed the questionnaires, he/she then was asked to share the photographs he/she wanted to use in the second and third sessions. Photographs chosen by the majority of participants represented different stages of their lives (i.e., their 20s, 30s, 40s, 50s, etc.). Although a scripted guide of interview/discussion questions was used (see Appendix C), all participants were first asked to give a brief description of the photographs and the people who appeared in the photographs. I then asked participants to share stories of good and bad times shared with the persons portrayed in the photographs. In particular, participants were asked questions such as: “Can you tell me of a time you had a discussion or a disagreement with the person in this photo?” or “Can you tell me of a good time or a bad time you had with the person in this picture?” These questions were modeled on Koven’s (2007) narrative elicitation framework. Because these questions at times did not generate extended narrative in all participants, some participants were also asked, “Can
you tell me how you met this person?” Some other questions that were used to provoke even more participation were “Can you remember saying something you wish you hadn’t said to this person?” and “Can you tell me of a time that you did something that really embarrassed you?” Although some of these questions were not related directly with the picture elicitation, they were used to provoke extended accounts of past experiences.

In order to avoid order effect, the language used in each of the interviews varied (Spanish then English; English then Spanish) for each participant. On the third session, the same stories were elicited in the other language. Since the stories were being retold to the same person, the participants were asked to retell their stories because the quality of the initial recording was not very clear.

4.7.3 Coding and Transcription of Narratives

All narrative interviews were digitally recorded and saved under an unidentifiable code in various computers. Verbatim transcriptions of narratives were first carried out using a word processing program (MS Word). A second, more detailed transcription focusing on pauses in the interview was conducted in order to best mark features necessary for analysis (see Transcription Conventions Appendix D). Once the narrative interviews were transcribed, they were exported to MS Excel to be coded. Each narrative interview was then divided into clauses (defined as a segment that contains a conjugated verb or infinitive). Each clause was coded on four levels: (1) instances of reported speech, (2) type or mode of reported speech, (3) complexity of reported speech (i.e., was the report voiced by the speaker or by another voice in the storyworld context?), and (4) speaker roles (adaptation from Koven 2007). These instances were tabulated and analyzed via MS Excel. More detailed analyses were done using a statistical software package (SPSS).
Based on the framework discussed in Chapter 3, I coded each narrative clause for each of the four different characteristics addressed above. As the goal of this study is to code not only for reported speech, but also to observe the different ways speakers express the self and subjectivity in narrative, a more extensive coding scheme was necessary. Hence, six different categories were included, which were discussed in Chapter 3. Moreover, because reported speech can be combined with other modes of representation, such as reported writing or thought, some clauses can be interpreted to fall under more than one category (e.g., reported thought and direct reported speech); hence, some clauses were coded twice (once for each category).

Furthermore, the content of the reported speech, the complexity of reported speech, and the employment of speaker roles were coded and analyzed via a combination of different theories. That is, I employed sociolinguistic constructivist theory (Alzheimer's Association, 2016; Schiffrin, 1996) and discourse analytical theory (Koven 2002, 2007) to qualitatively analyze the data, while borrowing some concepts from the conversation analytic tradition (Heritage, 2005; Jefferson, 1978, 1979; Pomerantz, 1986; Sacks et al., 1974). The coding, thus, served to demonstrate the significance of these devices and choices in actual narratives of older bilinguals with DAT as well as cognitively healthy older bilinguals. The transcripts for the current study provide (1) bilingual data, (2) longer transcripts of narratives of individuals with DAT; and (3) an analysis of linguistic nature in two languages in a population historically understudied and underrepresented in the literature.

Reported thought or “something that was not said in the reported conversation…[but] only in their [the speaker’s] mind” (italics in original; Haakana, 2007, p. 153), is considered internal narration—a representation very distant from speech. Because it is not as common and distant from speech, it was not included as part of the framework of reported speech in chapter 3. However, this will be discussed later in chapter 6.

Some aspects of conversation analysis theory were included in the analysis of the excerpts to provide a more in-depth observation of the conversational interactions that take place in narrative. At times, a participant designs his/her utterances in a manner to save face, particularly if the speaker senses that the audience may be suspicious, unsympathetic, or skeptical to what he/she is narrating/saying. For instance, extreme case formulations (Pomerantz, 1986) may be used by a speaker to legitimize claims made in the narrative.
4.8 Summary

In this chapter, I discussed the data collected for the analysis of narratives of bilingual older adults with or without DAT, as well as provided the rationale for the study of this topic. I included the context of the study, the migration patterns of Latinos, along with a detailed presentation of the historical migration patterns of Latinos, in particular Puerto Ricans, and the rationale behind the migration to the U.S. This was discussed in light of current population growth in the sites where this study was conducted.

A presentation of the participants recruited and the participants who completed the study followed. An in-depth presentation of fourteen participants was also included, which also echoed the migration trends and reasons for migrating previously discussed in section 4.2.3.

The instruments used for the purpose of this study and the rationale for using said instruments were discussed along with the procedures followed in the interview sessions. Lastly, the design along with the coding scheme used for the data collection was explained. In the next chapter, the narratives of three cognitively healthy older bilingual Latinos will be analyzed and discussed.
CHAPTER 5

CONTROL GROUP AND

INDIVIDUAL SPEAKERS’ RESULTS

5.1 Introduction

In the last chapter, I discussed the methodology and design of the narratives collected in older bilingual Latino adults diagnosed with Alzheimer’s disease as well as those of cognitively healthy older bilingual Latinos. In this chapter, I will discuss how the self is constructed and presented in the excerpts included for analysis in this chapter. I will also discuss how the construction and presentation of the self in the cognitively healthy bilingual group (i.e., control group) may vary, focusing on differences in the usage of reported speech and enactment of speaker roles and how these vary in the group and individually. The analysis will further include discussion of the following questions:

(1) Content: What personal experiences do the participants narrate in each telling and how are these two tellings similar and/or different?

(2) Strategies: What strategies do the speakers use while telling their stories of personal experience? What strategies do they use while using reported speech or speaker roles?

(3) Reported Speech: How do the speakers use reported speech and to what extent is reported speech used differently/similarly in the narratives of each participant?

(4) Self-Presentation: How do speakers perform their own selves or the selves of others through reported speech? Do speakers quote themselves as extensively or in the same amount as others?
5.2 Cognitively Healthy Bilinguals Speaker Results

The analyses will focus on three individual participants from the control group. The individuals in the cognitively healthy bilingual group were matched to the experimental group based on age and time of residency in the United States as can be seen in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cognitively Healthy Bilinguals</th>
<th>Bilinguals with DAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maríá</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ricardo</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additionally, in this chapter, the discussion for each participant will first include relevant details about the context of each of the interview sessions. This will be followed by a side-by-side presentation of two versions of the same story told by each participant, followed by a translation of these. That is, for each participant, a complete version and translation (where necessary) of a particular story told twice will be presented and further analyzed.

5.2.1 Speaker #1 – Maria

Maria was living in a predominantly Latino, Spanish speaking neighborhood when she took part in this study. She spoke both languages and learned Spanish and English in Catholic school in Puerto Rico. She commented that when she moved to the U.S. at age 16, she continued learning English and going to catholic school, but only for a year as her mother pulled her out of school and into the labor force in order to have more income in the home. Due to this, her use of Spanish was mostly constrained to her household and work settings where other Spanish
speakers were present (e.g., at the factory she used to work in during the weekends). After getting married to another Latino, she continued speaking Spanish in the house with him and with their children. Sometime after getting married, she went back to school to work on a degree. This reinforced her spoken English. Due to marital conflict and pressure, she decided to drop out of college, and she applied for a job as a medical assistant in her neighborhood and subsequently received the job. English was the language she spoke daily while she worked as a medical assistant. At the time of the interview, she was retired and reported speaking mostly Spanish when around other Latinos who also spoke Spanish, particularly when she attended the local Latino senior center or her church. While at home or taking the bus, she reported speaking a mix of both English and Spanish. At home, her language usage situation was different. Because her eldest daughter and grandchildren were living with her in her home, Maria felt obligated to use English in the home as it was the primary language used by her grandchildren and to some extent, her daughter. She reported that although her daughter understood Maria when she spoke Spanish to her, her daughter chose to reply in English.

In the context of the interviews, Maria seemed very friendly and happy. She expressed her enthusiasm to share her life stories and to help anyone in need. She brought many pictures and two photo albums. On the second interview, she was asked to tell her stories in Spanish. On the third interview, she retold those stories in English. During each of these sessions, Maria seemed quite motivated to share her life story, so much so that on the first storytelling interview, she spoke for over an hour and a half. She told a total of 42 stories in this interview, some with more detail than others. On the third interview session, she retold 27 of the stories she had told during the previous session. Additionally, she told four new stories in the second storytelling session. All of these were transcribed verbatim (Powers, 2005) and coded for reported speech
and other linguistic device(s). One of the stories she chose to tell offered rich examples of reported speech and performance of the self. This excerpt will be discussed below.

In Excerpt 1, Maria was asked to think of a time she gave some advice to a family member. She decided to tell a story of some advice she gave her mother upon discovering that Elsa, Maria’s younger sister, had an abortion in her home. Before narrating the event, Maria explained that Elsa had already had many children, and presumably, she was not financially or emotionally prepared to have another child. Since abortions in parts of the country were illegal and costly for families who did not have the financial resources to afford them, Elsa chose to do it herself at home. Maria added that at that time her sister did not share the information with her husband or her mother. When her mother, a staunch and conservative Catholic, visited her unannounced and found blood in her daughter’s bathroom, she reacted strongly to the point of nearly involving her son-in-law and inciting a domestic violence dispute. The excerpt below illustrates how Maria’s mother reacted to the event. It culminates in María’s ‘advice’. The first telling was done in Spanish.
**Excerpt 5.1: Maria’s Two Tellings of the Same Story**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Telling (Version B)</th>
<th>Spanish Telling (Version A)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oh yes this the xxx my oldest sister (points to woman in picture)</td>
<td>I:...Eh. quizás algún momento que usted le dio con algún consejo o le dieron usted algún consejo. Alguna hermana a usted. De- de- oh a su mamá.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At that time she had about four kids</td>
<td><em>My mother. I gave her some advice.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think.</td>
<td><em>I: aha. Cuénteme.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And then she didn’t want to have the fifth kid</td>
<td><em>I: Uh huh. Tell me.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t know if she drink some pills</td>
<td><em>my mom is a person who we love a lot.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or she got a needle</td>
<td><em>La quisimos.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or I don’t know</td>
<td><em>We loved her.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>what happened to her.</td>
<td><em>y la queremos, pero era una señora que era débil de mente.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t want to have that baby</td>
<td><em>and we love her, but she is a lady who is weak of the mind (feeble-minded)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and she got an abortion.</td>
<td><em>I: okay, que usted quiere decir con débil de mente?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Then my mother didn’t know</td>
<td><em>I: ok, what do you mean by weak minded?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>because we can’t tell my mother about these things</td>
<td><em>que era débil de mente</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She don’t believe in that.</td>
<td><em>that she was weak of the mind</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She got mad.</td>
<td><em>que no- no pensaba las cosas dos veces para hacerlas o para decirlas.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So she went to see my sister to visit her</td>
<td><em>she would not think things more than</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and when she see blood in the floor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Then my sister got blood all over.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And then she got mad.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I don’t uh- I- I gonna leave.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’m gonna leave.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I knew that you got this, I don’t come here.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My sister- all the time my sister was telling about telling that she don’t like that</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
25. so she left.  
26. When she came to my house, she said—...  
27. “I’m going to tell her husband  
28. so he can take of her.  
29. I’m going to tell her husband.”  
30. And he used to abuse my sister  
31. He used to abuse her a lot.  
32. Beat her up a lot.  
33. And then I said, “Don’t do that. Mama-.”  
34. I sit down and said,  
35. “Mama. Sit down.  
36. Let’s talk.  
37. Don’t do that because you brought her to this world.  
38. You carried her for nine months.  
39. You brought her to this world.  
40. She’s your daughter.  
41. He’s not your son.  
42. He’s somebody else’s son.  
43. And you know that he beats her up all of the time.  
44. If you tell him what she did, he might kill her.  
45. So you— you don’t send somebody to beat your daughter.  
46. Uhn Uhn.  
47. That’s your daughter.  
48. That’s my sister.  
49. You don’t do that.””  
50. But if I— I didn’t talk to my mother about that,  
51. she might tell him  
52. and he might beat her up because he used to beat her up a lot.  

once before doing them or saying something  
7. Era bien rápida así  
8. she was really fast like that.  
9. Esto una vez mi hermana mayor  
Well one time my older sister  
10. eh- se tomó una medicina  
 uh- took a medicine  
11. o algo le pasó  
or something happened to her  
12. porque ella estaba encinta  
because she was pregnant  
13. y no quería tener más hijos  
and she didn’t want to have more kids  
14. y se tomó esa medicina  
and she took that medicine  
15. y abortó...  
and aborted  
16. pues cuá- mi mamá no lo sabía.  
 Well whe- my mother didn’t know it  
17. Porque mi mamá era una persona bien estricta  
Because my mom was a very strict person  
18. y cuando fuimos a parar allá que la vió  
and when we got there that she saw that  
que estaba sangrando.  
she was bleeding  
19. Y dice ella,  
She says  
20. “pero porque estás sangrando tanto?  
"but why are you bleeding so much?  
21. Vamos al hospital.”
Let’s go to the hospital.”

22. Y le dijo,
   And she said,
23. “yo no puedo
   “I can’t
24. porque fue que yo aborte.”
   because I aborted.”
25. Y entonces dijo,
   And then I said,
26. “qué hiciste?”
   “what did you do?”
27. “Ah que fulana-
   “Oh that so and so-
28. le puso una inyección
   gave her an injection
29. le dio una pastilla
   gave her a pill
30. o algo paso.
   or something happened.
31. Ella tenía como tres nenes o cuatro.
   She had like three or four kids.
32. Entonces mi mamá me dice,
   Then my mom said to me,
33. “yo me voy de aquí
   “I’m leaving this place
34. porque yo sé esto,
   because if I had known this,
35. aquí yo no vengo”
   I wouldn’t have come here”
36. Y eso le dolió a mi hermana.
   And that hurt my sister
37. Y dice,
   And she says,
38. “En vez de ponerme,
Instead of putting me, llevarme a la bañera
  taking me to the tub
tyientos o ayudarme a bañarme
  or help me bathe myself
1lpiar la sangre del piso,
  or clean the blood off the floor
4i no,
  no then,
ella y que no quería saber de eso
  she didn’t want to know about that
4. y cogió y se fue.”
  and she went and left.”
5. Y entonces cuando llegó a casa,
  And then when she got home,
a casa mía, me dice,
  to my home, she says,
4. “mira
  “look
yo fui a ver a tu hermana
  I went to see your sister
y está sangrando
  and she’s bleeding
el piso embarrado en sangre.”
  And the floor is covered in blood
“Y mamá no lo limpiaste?”
  “And mom you didn’t clean it?”
“No yo no voy a limpiar eso.
  “No, I’m not going to clean that.”
Allá que lo limpia ella.
  Let her clean it.
4. Y entonces
  and so
voy a llamar el marido de ella ahora
  and so
I’m going to call her husband now
56. y se lo voy a decir
   and I’m going to tell him
57. para que le meta una pela.”
   “so he can beat her up.”
58. Yo dije,
   I said,
   “Look, mom,
60. yo- no te atrevas llamarlo a él.”
   “I- don’t you dare call him.”
61. Yo la aconseje a ella.
   I gave her advice.
62. “Tú no te atre-”
   “Don’t you da-
63. Siempre recuerdo por toda mi vida.
   I always remember that all of my life
64. “Tú no te atrevas a llamarlo a él
   Don’t you dare call him
65. porque esa es tu hija
   because that is your daughter
66. que tú pariste.
   that you gave birth to
67. Que tú cargaste en el vientre por nueve meses.
   That you carried in your belly for 9 months
68. Cómo tu vas a llamar a un hombre
   How are you going to call a man
69. le de una pela a tu hija en las condiciones que está
   to give a beating to your daughter in the condition that she’s in
70. con el derrame que ella está?”
144

with the hemorraghe that she has?

71. “No que tiene que saberlo él
   No, he has to know it
72. para que le meta una pela.”
   so that he could give her a beating
73. Le digo,
   I tell her,
74. “tú no vas a llamarlo a él.
   "you’re not going to call him
75. Algo le pasa a mi hermana,
   If something happens to my sister
76. tú eres la que lo vas a pagar.
   you are the one who’s going to pay
77. Tú no te atrevas a llamarlo a él
   Don’t you dare call him
78. porque esa es tu hija.
   because that is your daughter.
79. Y siente amor por tu hija.
   And feel love for your daughter.
80. Siente cariño por tu yerno,
   Feel fondness for your son-in-law
81. pero amor por tu hija
   but love for your daughter
82. porque tú la pariste a ella.
   because you gave birth to her.
83. No te atrevas a darle la queja a ella.”
   Don’t you dare complain to him.”
84. Pero entonces yo. Estuve aconsejando a
   mi mamá
   But then I- I was giving her advice
85. y hablando con ella por mucho rato
   and was talking to her for a long time
86. para que no fuera nunca a darle la
   queja a mi cuñado.
so that she would never go complain to my brother-in-law.

87. Pero si no, mi cuñado hubiera matado a mi hermana.
Because if not, my brother-in-law would have killed my sister.


_Telling and the Retelling the Story: The What_

The events that Maria chose to tell and retell seem to be mostly similar. In both versions, and through her role as narrator, María unfolds the subtopic (Chafe, 1980, 1994) of the story: giving a mother ‘advice’ about a rash decision. In both versions, María unfolds the main subtopics: the abortion, the reasons for the abortion, the exchange between mother and daughter, the portrayal of her mother as the antagonist of the story, and the ‘advice’ that led to saving her sister’s life. In both versions, María narrated the same principal chain of events that lead to the delivery of what María refers to as ‘advice’: (1) the mother arrives at the daughter’s home, presumably unannounced; (2) the mother discovers blood in bathroom; (3) the mother reacts angrily; (4) the mother abandons daughter; (5) the mother visits María; (6) the mother complains about Elsa’s actions and threatens to call son-in-law; and (7) María gives the mother ‘advice’ which resulted in saving her sister’s life. In both versions, María’s mother threatened to tell Elsa’s husband about the abortion as a form of reprisal and discipline while María reminded her mother about her duty and role as a mother. In both versions, she commented that she did what she did not only as a means to offer advice to her mother (and hence tell a story about advice), but also as a way to protect her sister from further violence. Finally, in both versions, María narrated and evaluated the events and actions that occurred at that there-and-then moment in the story world in combination with the here-and-now time (Koven, 2002, 2007) as well as personified her mother’s voice and her own voice.

Although the content of these two tellings seem consistent and stable, it is clear that her two tellings are different. These two tellings, then, possessed the characteristics commonly found in narrative retellings: (1) revisions to what was previously said, (2) reorganization of the plot, (3) abbreviation of previously given information, and (4) highlighting of relevant or important
information (Norrick, 1998a, 1998b). These plot differences between the two versions are discussed below.

In the first telling (Spanish), María does not immediately frame the storyworld events around the time she gave her mom some advice. Before she narrated her ‘advice’ story, María presented information about her mother (lines 2-7), revealing her feelings about her mother yet criticizing her mother’s mental capacity to make decisions. Through her metacommentary, she offered an explanation as to why she would give advice to her mother (a reversal of the parent-child role) while using this information to project a possible trajectory or interpretation of what was to come next in the narrative. Furthermore, not only did she strategically deliver this metacommentary to explain her choice of the plural noun ‘consejos’ (noncount noun ‘advice’ in English showing that she gave her mother more than one piece of advice), but she used this metacommentary to implicitly reveal (and even excuse) the mother’s inadequacy as a mother.

In this brief backdrop to the actual story, María’s explanation for the mother’s behaviors was two-fold. First, she positioned the mother as an inadequate and unfit caregiver as seen in her qualification of the mother (‘era debil de mente’/ she was weak of the mind, lines 4 and 5) and later use of an intensifier (‘era bien rapida’/ she was very fast; line 7). Second, she implicitly positioned herself as the more rational person in the storyworld as she gave her mother ‘several pieces of advice’, further placing her in a superior position vis-à-vis the mother.

In the talk leading up to the main part of her ‘advice’ story, she then oriented the narrative around the facts: her sister took a medicine or performed some other unknown action to end an unwanted pregnancy (lines 8-14). María continued the narration by again framing the mother’s persona, this time as strict (line 10)—further justifying and implicitly excusing the actions that the mother would later carry out. As she recounted their arrival at her sister’s house

---

46 María’s characterization of her mother as unfit and rash was a consistent theme in her various stories.
(“y cuando fuimos...”, line 11)\(^47\), the place where the crux of the matter took place, the mother’s voice is replayed. Via reported speech, María first portrayed her mother as being caring as she asked her daughter about her hemorrhage and then suggested going to the hospital with her. However, this portrayal quickly shifted to a cold and uncaring mother once the source of her excessive bleeding is revealed in their conversational exchange (lines 20-27). The mother then hastily abandoned her hemorrhaging daughter—all revealed using reported speech.

As María continued her story, she again replayed most if not all of her exchanges with her mother via reported speech. In this segment, the mother recounted what she had just seen in the daughter’s house via reported speech (without explicitly mentioning the abortion). In disbelief, María in turn quickly retorted her mother’s complaint via reported speech, which resulted in the mother’s hasty decision to call the son-in-law and María’s ‘advice’. Using her character voice, María seemed to take on the role of an authoritarian parent as seen in her repetitive threats (‘no te atrevas’/ don’t you dare; lines 60, 62, 64, 77, 83) followed by the consequences of committing this transgression (“If something happens to my sister, you are the one who’s going to pay”; lines 75-76). Similar to a parent chastising a small child for a possible future transgression, her repetitive threats were not really advice. The only section of this verbal exchange (and narrative) that seemed even remotely similar to the act of giving advice was the series of reasons she listed among the repeated threats (lines 65-67, 78-82). Even with these threats and María’s questioning of the mother’s behavior, the mother maintained her firm stance, demonstrating María’s initial characterization of her mother—that of not thinking things through. Towards the end, María’s narrative coda delivered the outcome of the story, but not before stressing the great lengths it took her to ‘convince’ her mother to make the right decision. Using

\(^{47}\) Upon further reading of the transcript, it is evident that the speaker was not a participant in this segment of the events. The speaker’s choice of the plural ‘we’ seemed to be an error in reference.
an *irrealis* conditional (line 87), she summarized her story by offering an evaluative point (Polanyi, 1981), which led to saving her sister from being killed.

In English (the second telling), Maria recounts her story slightly differently. María commenced the narration describing her sister’s family situation as a means to later on explain or justify what happened to her (line 9). She also recounted on multiple occasions that her sister was physically abused by her husband (lines 30–32 and 45), something that she never explicitly mentioned in the Spanish version. She repeated this information at the end of her story (line 52), suggesting that Elsa was a victim of domestic violence on behalf of the husband as well as a victim of psychological abuse and violence on behalf of her mother who used her status as a mother-in-law to indirectly discipline or “take care” of her daughter (line 28).

Unlike the first version, the English telling contained much less reported speech, along with portions of speech that were completely omitted. Additionally, the English telling portrayed María as a firm yet somewhat gentle parent-like figure who at first seemed to give her own mother advice in a seemingly more accommodating manner by telling her to join her in sitting down (line 35), promptly followed by the suggestion “let’s talk” (line 35). By doing this, María seems to soften the ‘advice’ she was about to deliver. She used this tactic as a less confrontational approach to address her own mother’s misguided method of disciplining an adult and already independent daughter. In the end, she summarized her story by using an *irrealis* conditional (line 50) again, yet in this telling, she framed the conditional using a modal of low certainty, as she stated that had she not given the mother advice, her sister’s husband “might beat her up”⁴⁸ (line 52), portraying herself as her sister’s keeper.

---

⁴⁸ When used in an *irrealis* clause, ‘might’ is known as a modal of certainty and represents low certainty or probability of an action taking place (50% or less) (Celce-Murcia & Larsen-Freeman, 1999).
In this sense, the two tellings reveal not only different information being narrated, but different modes of delivering “the same” story. Although the storyline seems to be very similar in both languages, the omission and addition of information in the telling and the retelling made María’s two stories rich and highly involved, showing that at that moment of telling these two stories, Maria continued to be affected by these events that took place in the past.

**Reported Speech and Speaker Roles: the How**

While telling the two versions of a ‘same’ story, Maria not only gives us information about herself and her life story, but also reveals more information about her sense of self. As already discussed in Chapter 3, reported speech, or the use of quotation in speech, and speaker roles reveal a deeper understanding about the narrative process Maria is engaged in. Before analyzing the use of reported speech and speaker roles in these two tellings, I show below María’s overall usage of reported speech throughout her narrative of ‘advice’ in both of her two languages (Table 5.2).

**Table 5.2. Frequency of Indirect vs. Direct Reported Speech Use in ‘Advice Story’**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frequency per 1000 words

As can be seen in this table, the amount of reported speech in the first telling (Spanish) exceeds that of the second telling (English). Although these differences are not statistically significant, it is clear that María’s characters play a more vivid and animated role in the Spanish version than in the English. The decrease of reported speech in one telling over another could be due to many possible factors (i.e., language dominance, language of experience, abbreviation of previously shared information, etc.), but of importance is what the instances of reported speech are doing in the narrative and how María made use of these instances in her two tellings.
In the first telling (Spanish), Maria used reported speech to give life to the character of her mother, sister, and herself. Before voicing these characters, she used her voice as an interlocutor to position the character of the mother: a rash and impetuous decision-maker. She used the voice of narrator to provide background information about Elsa’s abortion and the mother’s lack of knowledge regarding the abortion—suggesting that María might have known about Elsa’s unwanted pregnancy. She also used the voice of narrator to reveal the outcome of her story.

While enacting the role of character, María was quite engrossed in telling her story, and in doing so, provided very elaborate and rich details. She used both direct and indirect reported speech extensively and thoroughly, and in a very elaborate and elongated manner. She gave all the characters in this telling a very active role. She used direct reported speech as a means to represent the verbal exchange between the mother and Elsa (e.g., lines 19-27) and later on, the verbal exchange between Elsa and Maria (lines 37-44) and that of Maria and her mother (lines 47-60). Her use of quotes within quotes in this telling not only make the story more dialogic but also suggest that at the moment of telling her story, Maria was still affected by the incidents and events in this story—which is clearly demonstrated when Maria shifts to interlocutor voice to say “Siempre recuerdo por toda mi vida”49 (“I always remember for all my life”; line 63). That is, at the moment when María narrated this story, it was still a ‘hot’ topic for her and not entirely resolved.

---

49 According to scholarship on cognition and discourse, her claim to ‘always remember’ this event for all her life (line 63) served another purpose: communicating her affect by using an extreme case formulation as well as giving closure to transition to a new story (Norrick, 2005). The use of utterances that evoke memory (e.g., I remember, I forget) will be discussed again in more detail in the next chapter on the narratives of persons with DAT.
As she told her story, María used reported speech and narrator voice to position the characters, particularly that of the mother, in continuously different ways. In the case of the mother, at the beginning she is framed as irrational, hasty, and strict. From that initial portrayal, her mother then seemed to be portrayed in a more compassionate manner at the very beginning of the verbal exchange with her daughter. Soon after the daughter revealed the reason for her excessive bleeding, the mother is portrayed as stern and judgmental. Through her question “¿Qué hicistes?” (“what did you do”; line 26), she not only assigned blame by moral defect for the daughter’s actions but also positioned herself on a moral high ground when she said “yo me voy de aquí porque yo sé esto, aquí yo no vengo.” (“I’m leaving this place because if I had known this, I wouldn’t have come here”; lines 27-29). Later in the story, the mother is portrayed as a disciplinarian when she threatened to call her son-in-law in order to ask him to physically assault Elsa. In fact, her choice of words, ‘dar una pela’ (give someone a whooping), is marked, and revelatory of her harsh style of disciplining. In the end, María’s enactment of the mother served as a means to construct and later contest a world where views about women’s reproductive rights were not only dehumanizing but outright violent. This contrasts sharply with María and her sister’s more modern and flexible roles of women in the storyworld.

Just as the mother was given an active role, Elsa was also characterized as more active. At first, Elsa’s character appeared in a mere conversational exchange with the mother. Their exchange made the telling more dynamic and dialogic in nature. Half way through this exchange, Elsa’s character voice shifted from direct to indirect speech. This shift could be interpreted as either (1) a lapse in Maria’s memory in the storyline, (2) a way to abbreviate that which had been said in the first telling, or (3) a strategy to deemphasize the possibly risky method her sister used to perform an in-home abortion. Given María’s alignment with her sister, it seems likely that
Mariá shifted to indirect to cast the character of the sister in a positive light—contrasting with the mother’s conservative and disciplinarian persona. When Maria quoted her sister again, she quoted her sister’s complaint regarding the mother’s lack of empathy toward her—more in line with troubles talk (Tannen, 1990) and further positioning Elsa as a victim. The process of quoting her sister’s complaint and Elsa’s quote of her mother’s reaction (i.e., quote of a quote of a quote) rendered that then-and-there moment more authentic as well as demonstrated María’s level of involvement in sharing her sister’s plight. María also demonstrated what sisters do: they listen to each other and offer support and protection.

**Version B**

In the English rendition of this same story, the use of reported speech and speaker roles is quite different. María used reported speech to give life to the character of her mother and sister, and then later on, herself. Before voicing these characters in her story, she used her voice as a narrator and interlocutor to orient the story around the actions that took place before the actual delivery of ‘advice’. Her shift from narrator to interlocutor to character and back is a means to make here-and-now comments and judgments about a there-and-then storyworld.

As narrator, she gave the same background information—her sister had an abortion, and the mother did not know about it. As an interlocutor, she switched to present tense to not only explain the problem with the abortion (i.e., the mother’s strict views), but to reveal an ‘us’ versus ‘them’ type of evaluation when she said “we can’t tell my mother about these things…” (line 11). Additionally, her choice of pronoun suggests Maria’s intention of positioning herself with that of her audience, a young graduate student researcher.

As a character, she quoted the voices of her mother, sister, and herself. However, it isn’t until line 16 when María made use of reported speech to indirectly quote her mother and Elsa’s
first encounter soon after discovering blood all over the floor (lines 16 and 17). María quickly shifted their exchange from indirect speech to direct speech, partly to demonstrate how mad the mother was at Elsa (while providing the listener with a perception of that direct experience) and partly to demonstrate the different self presentations being negotiated and built up, in particular, that of the mother versus those of the daughters. Similar to the first telling, in the retelling, she presented herself and her sister in a more liberal and flexible manner while presenting her mother as a more conservative, rigid, and perhaps old fashioned persona. This shift additionally lends the narrative more authority and conviction while also providing a clearer gauge of her mother’s feelings about abortion: opposition to the point of leaving her daughter behind (line 21) and not coming to her aid. As she continues the narrative, María again voices her mother’s disapproval highlighted by the mother’s repeated resolution: telling her son-in-law of Elsa’s actions so that he “can take care of her” (line 27) presumably in a way she would have liked but could not have done so. At this moment in the storytelling, María interrupts the narrative frame to provide more background information about Elsa’s husband, who remained unnamed throughout the first telling and the retelling. Through the interruption in reported speech, María offered clarification. She explained why the mother would call the daughter’s husband to ‘take care’ of Elsa—“he used to abuse my sister… beat her up a lot” (lines 29-30). Up to this point in the narrative, María has not delivered any advice but has laid out the who, the what, the when, and the place that would then result in the actual delivery of advice. Similar to the first telling, in the retelling María constructed a storyworld where mother-daughter identities are built up, contested, and negotiated. Reported speech, when used, is limited to a few instances and the actual advice.

In the remainder of the story, however, reported speech is plentiful and vivid. In fact, twenty lines of this latter part of María’s story are delivered using direct reported speech. It is in
this part of the story that Maria chose to offer her mother some ‘advice’. In the process, Maria seemingly changed her role of deferent daughter to that of ‘mother’ when she quoted herself saying to her mother, “Sit down. Let’s talk. Don’t do that…” (lines 32-34). Whereas the mother was characterized as acting impulsively and perhaps irrationally to her younger daughter’s plight in the first part of the story, Maria seemed to characterize herself as more rational and in control of the situation in these few lines—possessing the moral high ground by reminding her mother of her parental duties/responsibilities—that of protecting one’s children. The last lines in this version, however, change somewhat in tone. Whereas in lines 36-44 she used a more logical approach with her mother, in lines 45-50, she switched to a more authoritarian tone as noted by her use of the imperative voice with repetitive negatives (don’t send somebody, don’t do that, uhn uhn). In the end, María ‘teaches’ her mother (and the listener) those characteristics mothers should possess—compassion yet firmness when faced with a difficult situation.

In sum, María achieved the primary purpose of the narrative (i.e., tell of a time she gave someone in her family a piece of advice), this time using reported speech moderately. The use of reported speech and shifts in speaker roles in these two tellings show, however, that retellings do not necessarily add more details. Consistent with some findings on retellings, this retelling opted to abbreviate and at times omit information that had been previously delivered.

The way characters are presented also demonstrate how tellings and retellings aid in a storytellers’ display of the multiple senses of self. That is, characters perform and enact multiple and diverse selves across different tellings and different languages. It is clear in the case of María’s advice stories. She represents herself and constructs a storytelling world where she positions herself as an assertive, agentive character in the storyworld vis-à-vis the mother—agentive in her own way, but positioned as a more traditional parent, a ‘good’ Catholic woman—
and Elsa—a more passive and somewhat agentiveless character taking on the role of victim. Although María is agentive and assertive in the first telling, the way she engages in ‘doing sisterhood’ in the first telling contrasts greatly with ‘doing motherhood’ in the retelling. In displaying an aggressive persona the first time, she comes off as less rational as she engages in critiquing, resisting, and later threatening her mother. At the same time, she takes on the role of being a protective older sister. In displaying a more rational and in control persona the second time around, she demonstrates that she has the moral high ground and the more modern worldview of what it is to be a parent. In the end, María’s twice told stories demonstrate the multiple ways the self is constructed and presented.

5.2.2 Speaker #2 – Ricardo

As previously stated in Chapter 4, Ricardo was a veteran of World War II and the Korean War. He learned English in school as a young child during the era when most public schools in Puerto Rico were English only. He learned Spanish at home and school, and although he knew basic English, he used Spanish more on a daily basis. Ricardo didn’t finish high school, but he joined the U.S. Army and became a soldier during World War II. He reported being stationed mostly with other Americans, but that there was always a group of Spanish speakers, which afforded him greater use of Spanish. He reported migrating to the U.S. at the age of 26. At the time of our initial interview, he lived in a mostly Latino community. The people who lived in his subsidized senior housing apartment building were also mostly Latino and used Spanish more than English. He explained that he used Spanish more than English on a daily basis, but that if he needed to use English in other contexts, he would not have a problem speaking it.

During our first interview, he explained that he had few photographs to share during our sessions. Because his job required him to move from place to place, he didn’t have a fixed home
for many years and hardly kept photographs of himself or his family. The few pictures he had were scattered around the walls in his apartment in an older adult residency. He used these to tell his stories, which were also few when compared with other cognitively healthy participants interviewed.

During the interviews, he spoke for a little under an hour during each session telling a total of 14 stories in his first language, Spanish, which was also the language used in the first of the narrative interviews (second session of the study). In the third session, he told a total of 13 stories in English. Of these thirteen stories, nine were repeated while four were told for the first time. Because he was fatigued towards the end of the third session, I did not ask him to retell the five stories he told in the second session. The unifying thread in most if not all of his stories was that of a person who uses deception to get out of uncomfortable or dangerous situations.

In the following story (Excerpt 5.2), I asked Ricardo to tell a story of one of the worst moments in his life. He chose to tell a story of a bad experience he had while he was serving abroad in the U.S. Army. The context concerns the Second World War, when many men were placed in military training camps in different countries before being stationed to a base. In his case, he was stationed in a training base in Germany. He was working as a guard in the base’s main entrance when leaving his post to go to the restroom, carelessly leaving his gun behind. This story was first told in his first language, Spanish.
**Excerpt 5.2. Ricardo’s Two Tellings of the Same Story**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English telling (Version B)</th>
<th>Spanish Telling (Version A)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I:</strong> And how about the story you told me when you left your gun somewhere. I think you left your gun alone and somebody else found it. I don’t remember whether this was in Germany.</td>
<td><strong>I:</strong> Y malos momentos, ¿se recuerda de malos momentos? ¿Cuáles fueron los peores momentos de su vida?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Yea, in Germany</td>
<td>1. ¿Peores? Worst?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Yes, I went to the ah,</td>
<td>2. Bueno, una vez en- en- en Alemania Well, one time in- in- in Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. to the school in Germany. You know uhm-</td>
<td>3. me mandaron a estudiar a- a- a Munich, they sent me to study at- at- at Munich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I was a sergeant.</td>
<td>4. verdad, right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. But when you go to that school</td>
<td>5. entonces, allí, yo era sargento, and then, there, I was a sergeant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. you are like a private.</td>
<td>6. pero allí tenía que hacer guardia but there I had to do guard duty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. You have to pull guard igual- the same like a private.</td>
<td>7. estaba en la- en la- en el Main Gate haciendo guardia everybody the same as if they were private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. So I went-</td>
<td>8. estábamos en la- en la- en el Main Gate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I was on guard on the main gate,</td>
<td>haciendo guardia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. you know.</td>
<td>we were in the- in the- in the Main Gate doing guard duty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Then I want to go the bathroom,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. but I was not in a hurry.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. But I left the rifle there.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. And then the officer of the day come</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. and pick up the rifle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. and took to his- company,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. you know.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. When I came back</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. the guy told me,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. “Oh the officers there took your gun.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. So I went to the cook</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. and I borrowed a rifle from them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. And I keep that rifle for the whole month there</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. So, when it was time to go back to the company, to my battery,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. so I had to tell the captain about my rifle.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. So he knew already.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. So he- I told him a lie too</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. and I, “I we- I left the rifle there</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. was in- in a hurry.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. He told me,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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15. “you know,
16. you are not supposed to do that.”
17. “Yeah, I know,
18. but the- I was in such a hurry that I had to go.”
19. So he said,
20. “Go to- to- to company C and
21. they ha- there the man that took your rifle there.”
22. And when I went there,
23. I go see
24. okay. (Laughter)
25. He was mad at me.
26. I told-
27. I told him the same thing. A lie,
28. I told him a lie too.
29. Because nothing-
30. I was not in a hurry to that
31. but I did eh.

look
15. y cuando yo vengo pacá
and when I come here
16. y me dijo,
and he said,
17. “%No, si el oficial del día se llevó
“No, that the day’s officer took
%se llevó el rifle tuyo”
took your rifle.”
18. entonces yo dije,
then I said,
19. “Ave María”
“Oh My God”
20. fui
I went
21. and took a cook’s rifle
22. y cogí un rifle de los cocineros,
23. they lent it to me while I was there
24. we were there two months
25. I think
26. y estuve con él pero a lo último tenía que ir
and I was with it but at the end I had to go
27. a %buscar% el rifle
to get the rifle
28. y ya el capitán mío lo sabía,
and my captain already knew it
29. pero no me había dicho na.
but he hadn’t said anything
30. Cuando voy
When I go
31. y le digo,
and I said,
32. “Capitán, mire,
“Captain, look,
33. me pasó esto que yo”,
this thing happened to me that I”,
34. le eché un embusté
I lied to him
porque el que hecha un embuste
Because a person who lies
lo saca de-
\textit{can get out of- of-
}y le dije,
\textit{and I said,}
“Tuve que ir,
\textit{I had to go,}
tenía diarrea
\textit{I had diarrhea}
y fui al baño y-
\textit{and I went to the bathroom and-
y dejé el rifle allí
\textit{and I left the rifle there}
y me lo llevó el el oficial del día”.
\textit{and the- the officer of the day took it.}
Y- y me dijo,
\textit{And- and he said,}
“Ah pero usted no podía de-
\textit{de leave the rifle.”}
y yo, “Sí,
\textit{and I, “Yes,}
pero es que no me daba tiempo
\textit{but it was that I didn’t have time}
porque si no…”
\textit{because if not…”}
y me dijo,
\textit{and he said,}
“Pues vaya a buscar el rifle a la compañía tal
\textit{Well go get the rifle at that company}
que lo tiene eh- eh- eh- un oficial allá”
\textit{that an officer over there has it.”}
el que se llevó el rifle.
\textit{the one that took the rifle.}
Y cuando voy pa’ allá
\textit{and when I go over there
Ave María,
\textit{Oh my God,}
por poco me da (laughs).
\textit{He almost hit me}
De verdad?
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I:</strong> Really?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 56. Y (.) pero me dió el rifle  
*And (.) but he gave me the rifle* |   |
| 57. y si esa gente llega a- a- a mandar ese eh eso a la compañía mia,  
*and if those people had sent the- the-the that uh that to my company,* |   |
| 58. a la batería, me hu- me hubiera% declarao%,  
*to the battery, he wo- he would have declared me* |   |
| 59. pero no,  
*but no,* |   |
| 60. no me hicieron na,  
*they didn’t do anything* |   |
| 61. porque era un embuste,  
*because it was a lie,* |   |
| 62. ell- yo digo un embuste  
*he-I say a lie.* |   |
| 63. le saca a uno de- de- de  
*it gets one out of- of- of* |   |
| 64. I: De apuro  
*I: a bind* |   |
| 65. Sí, sí  
*Yes, yes.* |   |
**Telling and Retelling the Story: the What**

The events that Ricardo chose to tell and retell are comparable in information narrated and length of narration. In both narratives, he narrated the principal chain of events that led him to have one of the worst moments of his life: that of being reprimanded by a superior officer, presumably in an extremely violent and face threatening manner, due to his lack of responsibility with a weapon while on duty and during the completion of his military training. Although the actions narrated by Ricardo appear to be extremely face threatening under any normal circumstance, in his narrative he devised a cunning and clever strategy to avoid harsh disciplinary measures due to his carelessness.

In both versions, he unfolded the principal actions that lead to this embarrassing and face threatening moment in his military career: (1) doing guard duty in Germany, (2) going to the bathroom while on duty, (3) leaving rifle behind, (4) having his rifle confiscated by a senior officer, (5) being told by another peer about an officer taking his rifle, (6) borrowing a rifle from the cooks, (7) talking to the captain about his lost rifle at a much later time in the storyworld, (8) lying to the captain about leaving rifle behind, (9) being reprimanded by the captain and told where to find the rifle, (10) going to the other company to get the rifle back, and (11) being reprimanded by the other company’s officer about his serious offense. In both versions, Ricardo also performed the character voices of the captain, the other guardsman doing duty with him at the gate, and himself. In both versions, Ricardo narrated the reaction of the officer who took his gun and revealed his use of deception to lessen the threat to face. Finally, in both versions, Ricardo concluded his narratives by reiterating that he came out of this situation relatively unscathed.
Despite these similarities highlighted in the plot of Ricardo’s story, some discrepancies in the storyline are worth pursuing. In the first telling (Spanish), Ricardo first provided the background setting, adding such details as the precise location of the base he was stationed in (Munich, Germany), the amount of time (two months vs. one month in the second telling), and the rationale for being stationed on that base (to study or train for the war). He explained, via the use of passive voice, that he was sent to study at that base in Munich, presumably as part of the standard operating procedures used during the time of war. As he continued to provide information relevant to the setting, he highlighted the fact he was a sergeant (lines 5-7), which in the hierarchical system in the Army meant that he was positioned a couple of ranks higher than that of a private, the lowest rank in the Army. He added that he was accompanied by another soldier in training while he was on duty (“¡estábamos en la-... en el Main Gate haciendo guardia...” (“we were in the- in the- in the Main Gate doing guard duty”), lines 8-9). Using the pronoun ‘we’, he shifts his focus to other characters in his story besides himself. After this brief background introduction, Ricardo narrated the complicating action that lead to the crux of the matter: leaving his assigned post and his weapon behind to go to the bathroom (line 10) during a time of war. By using modality of necessity [“¡Yo tuve que ir ah-... al toilet...” (“and I had to go to the-... toilet), line 10], he justified his action of leaving his rifle behind. He not only indicated necessity in his actions, but also invoked a sense of urgency, which was followed by an evaluation of his actions, “y dejé el rifle ahi, que se supone que no lo dejara...” (“and I left the rifle there which I was not supposed to do...”, lines 11-12). He then narrated his reaction to what had happened to his weapon (line 21), and later on, told the outcome of his actions—having to face his actions and justify them to his superiors by ‘bending reality’ (Drew, 2005) or lying. At

---

50 The discrepancy between the two lengths of time suggest that in telling his story, Ricardo could have been ‘stretching the truth’, a tendency widely observed in men’s social encounters or storytelling (Bauman, 1986)
the end, he narrated that it was a necessary evil because if he had not lied, his actions would have terminated in his discharge or a worse reprisal.

In the second telling, Ricardo chose to orient the narrative around the aspects related to the background of the storyworld that were previously narrated in the first telling, but in this retelling some of the details Ricardo chose to share were different. For instance, the initial set of actions that led to leaving the rifle behind offer a different perspective on Ricardo’s behavior and presentation of self. Unlike the Spanish version, he chose to use second person singular ‘you’ when narrating about his duty at the main gate (line 8), an interlocutory shift in the narrative which is a commonly used strategy to invite or attempt to get the audience to identify with the teller (O’Connor, 1994). As he continued to retell the part of the story about leaving his post to go to the bathroom, his reasons for leaving his post seemed less compelling. Whereas Ricardo’s first telling communicated a sense of urgency (i.e., “I had to go to the- toilet…” line 10), his second telling transmits a more careless and blasé attitude when he stated “…I want to go (to) the bathroom…” (line 10), immediately followed by his assertion “but I was not in a hurry…” (line 11). Additionally, the information he gave his captain in the first telling changed in the retelling. Instead of claiming to be suffering from diarrhea (Spanish telling, line 42), he chose to inform his captain that he was in a hurry (English telling, line 28-29), further making his storyworld persona less forgivable and excusable.

As was seen in the previous participant’s narratives, the two tellings Ricardo chose to tell reveal differences in the narrated information and the mode of telling the same story, consistent with findings on narrative retellings. Similar to the first participant’s retelling, this story does not seem to be particularly richer or livelier when it is told the second time around. A notable difference between these two tellings of life narratives is the development of different personas
through shifts in speaker roles and the use of informal register. In the first telling, Ricardo’s his actions are those of a man deflecting responsibility, yet in a more apologetic and excusable manner. To a certain degree, the first telling seemed to portray Ricardo in a slightly more face saving and neutral light when it is compared to his retelling, which casts his persona in a more unconcerned yet daring manner. Although these discrepancies in the narratives could be due to the act of repeated narration of the same events to the same audience, the underlying intentions behind these discrepancies may well go beyond the act of just omission or abbreviation of detail in the act of telling the ‘same’ story again. As previously mentioned, these differences could be the result of projecting different self images as a means to redress an affront to face (Brown & Levinson, 1987). A more complete picture of these will be presented and clarified in the section below: how the stories told are presented.

**Reported Speech and Speaker Roles: the How**

While telling and retelling this story about one of the worst moments in his life and how he walked out of it relatively unscathed, Ricardo seemed not only to incarnate the voices of himself, his superior, and his peer, but also to give different self presentations in these two versions of this event in his life. As mentioned in the section above these differences affect not only his self presentation, but also render the codas of the two versions of the ‘same’ story differently. Before analyzing these differences in the crux of the ‘what’ and the ‘how’, I show below Ricardo’s overall usage of reported speech throughout his narrative of his ‘rifle story’ in both of his two languages (Table 5.3).

**Table 5.3 Frequency of Direct vs. Indirect Reported Speech Use in the ‘Rifle Story’**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frequency per 1000 words
According to the table above, the amount of direct reported speech in the first telling (Spanish) exceeds that of the second telling (English), but not by much. Indirect reported speech was not used at all in this particular story, but when compared to Ricardo’s overall indirect RS frequency (2 in Spanish; 4 in English), this lack of indirect RS is not surprising.

As previously mentioned, the increase of reported speech in one telling over another could be due to a range of factors. However, of importance is how these instances of reported speech reveal Ricardo’s presentation of self and presentation of the selves of the other actors in the two versions of the ‘same’ story and how these self presentations change the story’s presentation and the positioning of the narrator in both instances.

**Version A**

In the first telling (Spanish), Ricardo used a variety of voices to reenact his story. He used direct reported speech to give life to the characters of his captain, his peer, and himself. He also used narrative voice, noted by the then-and-there use of past tenses and deictic, and sprinkled in some interlocutory commentary about his then-and-there storyworld in a here-and-now interlocutor voice. Regardless of Ricardo’s multiple discursive resources, he started his story about one of the worst moments in his life with a seemingly standard narrative framework. As stated previously, he started his telling by orienting the events in his storyworld in narrator voice, using his interlocutor voice mostly to insert discourse markers such as ‘bueno’ [well], ‘verdad’ [right], and ‘mira’ [look], (lines 2, 4, and 15, respectively) in the telling. He briefly shifted to interlocutor again when he said ‘cuando viene el oficial [del] dia’ (“when the day’s officer comes”, line 13) followed in line 15 by ‘mira’ [look], marking his involvement in this voice shift greater. The first use of reported speech in this story occurred shortly after this shift in narrator-interlocutor double voicing when he quoted the voice of his army colleague. His exchange is
relatively brief, but conversational in nature, demonstrating again his high involvement in the then-and-there world in the here-and-now space. He continued to narrate the course of events that followed their exchange as a narrator, adding details about the length of his stay there and the period of time he borrowed the cook’s rifle, followed by “me parece” [I think]—a hedging device in interlocutor voice demonstrating uncertainty in the details he had just conveyed to the interviewer. Another instance of here-and-now commentary—“cuando voy” (when I go, line 33)—was inserted to his telling right before shifting to reenact his character voice to present his version of the story and justify his actions to his captain and his listener. This character voice is soon interrupted by another shift to interlocutor voice as a means to justify his ‘embuste’ (lie, line 37) to his listener/interviewer and to a certain extent himself. He continued his reenactment of that moment by shifting back to his character voice to present the excuse delivered to his captain. This particular section of his telling is rich in interactional nature as seen in the repeated turn-taking Ricardo reenacted when telling his story. He reenacted this exchange in a way that captured not only Ricardo’s justification and urgency in his actions, but also the captain’s (and Ricardo’s subconscious) reaction to Ricardo’s excuse. In the end, Ricardo shifted to narrator to communicate a more neutral picture of what had transpired when he finally faced the captain holding the rifle all that time. Even though his voice as narrator is fairly detached from the event that was “the worst moment in his life”, he tells us how the other captain reacted, how he reacted, and even managed to give it a positive spin.

**Version B**

In the second telling, Ricardo maintained an overall distance from the course of events, portraying events in a much more abbreviated manner, as can be seen in (1) the shorter overall length of the narrative in this second telling (i.e., 47 lines of narrative clauses vs. 67 lines in the
first telling) and (2) Ricardo’s somewhat decreased use of overall reported speech in this retelling. Overall, Ricardo reenacted much of his story in the voice of narrator and interlocutor. In the instances Ricardo used the voice of narrator, he repeated many of the events and actions that were narrated in the first telling. The order in which the events were originally narrated and framed in the rifle story are mostly the same with the exception of some lines (see discussion above regarding differences), most notably among them, his inexcusable reason for leaving his station in lines 10-11 (“Then I want to go the bathroom but I was not in a hurry” [emphasis mine]). In the instances where interlocutor voicing is inserted into the narrative, it mostly gives the impression that Ricardo was trying to activate the listener/interviewer’s prior knowledge of his story and create a sense of shared understanding. This is apparent in his repeated use of discourse markers such as ‘you know’ (lines 2, 9, 16). This idea of shared understanding and rapport building is also apparent in his use of second person singular ‘you’ in lines 4-6. Here, Ricardo used ‘you’ to not only explain the norms and regulations of this particular school in Germany during the war but to create a sense of shared understanding and possible rapport with the listener/interviewer regarding a highly symbolic yet downplayed social status downgrade in the exceedingly hierarchical space of the Army. Through this particular instance, he constructed his self-presentation as one who complied with the institutional procedures although this action would result in carrying out work and/or responsibilities of a lower ranking member of the Army—an action that most probably was and still is required in a time of war, and in Ricardo’s eyes, was seen as a deplorable action, as can be seen in his later actions. As Ricardo continued this narrative, this self-construal is reversed and thrown into question. From be(long)ing a member of a group who was willing to give up his rank, Ricardo decided to push the ‘moral’ envelope and defy this institutional mandate as a possible form of resistance and/or reprisal to
the downgrading of status in the hierarchical system that is inherent in the U.S. Army. He, therefore, painted a picture of a himself as a morally questionable figure who managed to get out of a problem through lying—a behavior that is unacceptable in this institutional context.

On the other hand, these instances of interlocutor voicing also add a dimension of cohesion and stability to Ricardo’s self-presentation in and across the narratives, as has been noted in narrative scholarship (Koven, 2002, 2007; L. C. Moore, 2012; Norrick, 1998b). Although in this particular telling these instances of interlocutory voicing lend themselves to implicitly justifying his actions not only in the there-and-then storyworld but in the present, here-and-now time frame, these instances show that, regardless of the version, Ricardo’s agency to go against the ‘established rules and regulations’ results in him getting out of one of the worst outcomes for him in his career.

While using reported speech, Ricardo quoted the same characters in this retelling, yet he did not unfold the events with as much detail as he had previously done in his first telling. As previously stated in the section above, Ricardo refrained from fully playing the voice of character in his exchange with his captain. Instead, he resorted to using his voice as narrator to orient the listener/interviewer to the events of the exchange regarding his rifle while shortening the exchange and cutting down (and possibly downplaying) the details regarding his actions and words. However, the lexical choices and registers used in his exchange are fairly telling of his self presentation at that moment. That is, through his lexical choices and the very informal register he used, he displayed a somewhat disrespectful persona which is at odds with what he would have otherwise said in the actual context. In the Spanish rendition of this event, he quoted himself using a more formal register (i.e., ‘usted’ instead of ‘tu’), marking a status differential between his captain and himself. In this version, however, he took on the role of equals,
addressing his captain with ‘tu’ and using informal lexicon (e.g., ‘Yeah’) to address someone who had a much higher rank in an institution where deferment is the quotidian, the status quo. This rendition of their exchange supports the notion that reported speech is constructed dialogue—not an accurate or faithful representation of some ‘original’, but a more creative performance of actual people. Regardless of the markedness of this exchange, this particular retelling continued to remain less involved. Because Ricardo was retelling this story to someone already familiar with its premise, it is likely that he chose to give an abbreviated version of the events, consistent with findings on repeated tellings.

In sum, unlike the use of reported speech in the first participant’s story, Ricardo’s use of reported speech in these two tellings shows that in the retelling of the story sometimes less details and less reported speech emerge, perhaps due to the familiarity of retelling an already known and shared experience with the listener/interviewer. However, in the retelling, it is clear that the speaker’s critical quoted utterances remain stable, as can be seen by his almost literal translations delivered at times in his retelling. These repetitions support what had already been noted about the dynamics found in the scholarship of repeated tellings in the area of narrative. These instances are shifts from ‘diegesis to mimesis’ (Bauman, 1986). His shifts in speaker roles and lexical choices, moreover, allowed Ricardo to construct/present himself in different ways—which in the actual context where this took place, Ricardo’s actions would have been at odds with what he would had otherwise said. Whereas the first telling paints a more concerned character wanting to save face due to his dishonesty and lack of responsibility, the second paints a very unconcerned and detached persona, unmoved and unaffected by the lie he told his superiors. In the end, his retelling is not more involved but he strategically positions himself and others as particular kinds of socio-culturally locatable actors by doubly voicing his words and
those of others. These instances then come across as emotionally intense renditions—although they hardly communicate a more engaged narrator.

5.2.3 Speaker #3 – Sandra

Sandra, born and raised in Puerto Rico, experienced multiple migrations to the States during her adult life. She spoke both English and Spanish fluently and was very eager to tell her stories of personal experience during the various interview sessions. She explained that she lived in a community with people from many different backgrounds, so English was the language most commonly used. On days when she visited the senior community center, she spoke Spanish. She also mentioned that she spoke Spanish with her children, most of whom were living in the States. She uses English more often when speaking to her grandchildren.

On our first interview, Sandra brought multiple picture albums. She spoke well over an hour during each session, including the first interview. During the narrative interview, she first told her stories in English, followed by the retelling of these in Spanish. Most of these stories were about her experiences growing up in Puerto Rico with a family which was not her own and about later life experiences with her own children and her multiple partners. During the first narrative interview, Sandra told a total of 11 stories. During the second interview, Sandra retold all of the stories from the first narrative interview and interweaved these stories with others which were not told during the first narrative interview, telling a total of 36 stories.

In the following excerpt, which is analyzed below, Sandra was asked to tell a story of a bad experience with a family member. She chose to tell a story of a violent encounter she had with her former daughter-in-law. In the end, the encounter resulted in a physical altercation and aggression involving not only herself and her daughter-in-law but also her son. This story was first told in English.
**Excerpt 5.3. Sandra’s Two Tellings of the Same Story**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English telling (Version A)</th>
<th>Spanish Telling (Version B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.  ...I have problem with her,</td>
<td>I:  ...usted me contó algo acerca de ella</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.  my hu- my son used to be with her...</td>
<td>...you told me something about her</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.  she was living in %XXX% next door to my other son</td>
<td>1.  Ella, que ella me golpeó la cara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.  and um, she used to smell,</td>
<td>Her, that she hit my face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.  how you say, perico?</td>
<td>2.  sí-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I:  Oh, she was using cocaine?</td>
<td>yeah-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.  And ah, my son Luis used to live with her,</td>
<td>3.  I:  Cuénteme eso otra vez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.  but then I was living in ah,</td>
<td>Tell me that again</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.  like three blocks down the street there- where they live.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.  Here in %XXX% and uh, Luis, my son, used to be his,</td>
<td>4.  Este, nosotros, estábamos de visita de Erie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. her husband, he went to me</td>
<td>Eh, we, we were visiting from Erie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. and he told me</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. “Ah, Sandra is telling this and that and that”</td>
<td>5.  pacá y cuando llegamos,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. so I go there to her house</td>
<td>to here and when we arrived</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. and I go in front of her house</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. and she has a- a uncle that lives in %Allentown%</td>
<td>6.  ella está viviendo en la %XXX% con mi hijo y ese nene,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. and he was visiting her with his wife.</td>
<td>she is living on XXX with my son and that kid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Ok and so when I went there</td>
<td>because those two were not even born</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I was in good manner,</td>
<td>[referring to children in picture]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I ask her</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. “what you have to say this and that about me?”</td>
<td>8.  y eso fue en el ‘94,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. she hit me in the face.</td>
<td>and that was in 94.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. She took the %fist%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. and she cut</td>
<td>9.  y cuando mi hijo fue a visitarme,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. she hit me here and my eyes XXX.</td>
<td>and when my son went to visit me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. So my son was looking at her when she hit me</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. and he start hitting her real bad.</td>
<td>10. porque el otro vivía en la %XXX St. %,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Real bad. And they cut,</td>
<td>because the other one lived on XXX street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. he say,</td>
<td>11. el otro hijo mío. y yo estaba de visita.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. &quot;I don’t gonna go with you never again.”</td>
<td>the other son of mine. and I was visiting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. I:  What was she saying about you?</td>
<td>12.  El fue,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. She hit me</td>
<td>He went</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. she was calling me like</td>
<td>13.  el hijo mío mayor fue a vi-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. I was a bitch and a this and that and a-</td>
<td>my oldest son went to vi-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. I don’t know.</td>
<td>14. a buscarte,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to get me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15. me dice,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>he says,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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And my hu-, my son, tell her
“I don’t wanna go live with me-you no more
until you knee, you bend your knees
and say
‘mami, forgive me’,
but if you don’t do it,
no way”.

%And she% we nev- they never get together again.
And he raised her daughter,
because her daughter was two years old when my son start living with her.
But she hits me real bad in the face,
real- she hit me
and she %cut% me.
In front of everybody, and her- and then my son start beating her up,
because he %hit% her
he- he swallowed [swelled] her, her face like that
(hand gesture)
and her uncle was trying to put peace,
you know,
to separate,
a- and my son said,
“no
go to hell,
if she don’t bend the knees to- to beg to my mom
to- to forgiveness, no I don’t wanna go with her no more
she’s not supposed to hit my mother,
what she believes she is?”.
And %he% never went back with her.
ni a joder, or piss anybody off
and she has taken out her fist
and she hit me with a ring here
and she cut me right here
Me dejó esa cara, She left my face
muchacha, girl,
hinchá hinchá. swollen, swollen.
And right there my son smashed up her face too
Y no volvió con ella, and he didn’t get back together with her
desde ese día él dijo, from that day he said,
“No vuelvo contigo “I’m not going to be with you,
hasta que tú no te hiques until you bend your knees
y le pides perdón a mi madre, and ask my mother for forgiveness
¿porque% tú no tenías ningún derecho a darle en la cara a mi mamá, because you had no right to hit my mom on the face
eso es una falta %de respeto tuya%”. that is a lack of respect.”
Y jamás volvió con ella. and he never got back together with her
**Telling and Retelling the Story: the What**

As seen in the previous narratives discussed in this chapter, the events that Sandra told and retold are more similar to each other than not. In both tellings, Sandra appeared to be very engaged in her story—narrating this story in similar length both times (in terms of narrative clauses) and using numerous instances of reported speech and dialogic exchanges in both tellings. In both versions, Sandra unfolds the same story: that of a domestic violence incident and family loyalty embedded in stories of bad moments with family. In both versions, Sandra tells and retells the principal subtopics: (1) daughter-in-law’s drug use, (2) gossip that resulted in domestic violence incident between Sandra and her daughter-in-law, (3) domestic violence incident between Sandra’s son and his wife (daughter-in-law), and (4) the result of this incident. In both versions, Sandra portrayed herself as someone who had been wronged, yet in the storyworld she portrayed herself as being able to handle the incident in a calm manner. Additionally, in both versions, Sandra portrayed her daughter-in-law as the antagonist while her son was portrayed as Sandra’s witness and, later on, her protector. In both versions, Sandra unfolds the principal chain of events that lead to ‘the bad moment’ of the story: (1) Sandra’s son informed her about daughter-in-law’s accusations/gossip; (2) Sandra visited her daughter-in-law to ask about the accusations; (3) Sandra reported to listener/interviewer her state of mind before visiting daughter-in-law; (4) the daughter-in-law hit Sandra; (5) Sandra’s son hit wife; (6) son threatened wife; and (7) son broke up with wife. Finally, in both versions, Sandra personified the voices of herself, her son, and her daughter-in-law. Overall, the story that Sandra told and later retold is consistent in terms of plot, content, and performed characters.

As was also seen in the previous participants’ narratives in this chapter, divergences are also present. One of the first divergences in these two narrations of the ‘same’ story is within the
orientation of the two tellings of the same story. In the first telling, Sandra framed the storyworld around events that happened at a nonspecific time in the past when she was living in Philadelphia with her son in an area that quite possibly was in close proximity to her other son’s residence. In the second telling, Sandra stated that this event took place in 1994 while she was visiting her family in Philadelphia from Erie, Pennsylvania. These differences, although innocuous, reflect a subtle shift in how Sandra portrayed herself in these two versions of the same story. In the first one, Sandra portrayed herself as an assertive and in control woman who went to ask about (and presumably make right) the gossip and accusations that were being said about her by her former daughter-in-law in a familial, yet socially inappropriate context (i.e., the uncle and aunt were visiting, making this delivery and complaint inappropriate in the scheme of the visit; lines 15-17). This is followed by Sandra’s decision to go through with the confrontation—and doing so “in a good manner” (line 19)—further adding that she not only was in control of this situation but was calm about it. However, Sandra’s assertive and in control self-portrayal quickly shifted to that of a defenseless victim, bloodied and cut up as a result of being hit by her cocaine-using, former daughter-in-law. This self-portrayal of victimization and abuse is maintained in her narrative by her repetition ‘she hit me real bad’ (lines 47-48). In the second version, Sandra portrayed herself as assertive, but this time she was less in control and more submissive in her actions and words. Unlike the first version where Sandra was living in close proximity to her children, in this version she repeatedly stated her condition as an outsider and visitor (lines 5-6, 10, and 12). This condition of being a visitor allowed her to position herself in a much more victimized light and as being more greatly wronged when compared to the first version. This self-representation is further amplified by her son’s suggestive imperative —“‘pues vamos alla pa preguntarle…”’ [well let’s go there to ask her] (lines 26-27)—which implicitly placed her in
a more passive role in addition to framing her future actions as an imposition rather than a choice. In essence, her divergence in orientation led to a different self-presentation in each telling of this ‘same’ story. Although both of these versions in the end cast Sandra as an almost innocent victim, prey to the irrational attack of a drug-using daughter-in-law, these self-portrayals paint two different versions of the story and two different versions of Sandra (discussed in next section).

The organization of her two tellings is another area that diverges in her narratives of the ‘same’ story. In the English version, Sandra gave many background details and these were sprinkled in the different moments in the storyworld without any particular regard to order or sequence in the narrative, making the first telling almost seemed like in the process of remembering the details there was fragmentation. This is not the case in the second telling, where Sandra clearly had the time to reformulate and reorganize her narrative according to the events that occurred, supporting the findings of organization in retellings.

Additionally, in the first telling, Sandra included an uncle and aunt (lines 13-15) in the story, adding that they were visiting from Allentown (lines 15-17). Towards the end of her narrative, Sandra stated that “…her uncle was trying to put peace…to separate…” (lines 50-52), something that is not mentioned in the second telling. The uncle’s actions (which presumably were comprised of speech acts not reenacted by Sandra, an instance of NRSA) juxtaposed those of his niece who called her names (‘she was calling me like I was a bitch…’, lines 33-34) and hit her in the face without any remorse (lines 22-23). Sandra also mentioned that it was her son who raised the child the daughter-in-law had from a previous relationship (lines 44-46), further portraying the daughter-in-law as an unapologetic and ungrateful spouse in this particular telling. In this first telling, Sandra’s choice of bracketing in these details (Wooffitt, 1992) not only
showed her underlying need to justify and legitimize the violent actions that were later committed by her son but demonstrated in more tangible terms her ‘problem with her’ (i.e., her daughter-in-law; line 1).

Another striking difference between these two tellings is the repetition of evaluative statements made by Sandra in the first version. First she stated that she had been cut/hit in the face (lines 24-25), and later repeated this information using extreme case formulation ‘real bad’ (lines 47-49). Then she stated that the son hit his wife ‘real bad’ in lines 28-29, only to later restate this same action in lines 50-52 but with different wording. Finally, she repeated the ultimatum her son delivered to his wife before breaking up with her in lines 37-42 and later in lines 56-62. The repetition of these utterances not only reinforces the message Sandra delivered through her story (i.e., her son’s love and loyalty to her is greater than any other woman), but reinforces the violence and the legitimation of said violence in the narrative. In the second version, Sandra did not include all of these details and did not incur in the use of repetition in the narrative. It would seem that the actions that Sandra told the second time were more the result of natural consequences of the events connected to the incident.

In the second telling of this story, most of the events that Sandra had narrated on the previous day were included, with some untold and underexplored parts now included. She oriented the listener/narrator to details such as being a visitor (discussed above), followed by the actions that elapsed before being informed of the gossip. In the process, she briefly talked about some children in the picture she was showing the interviewer and spoke about their connection to the characters in the storyworld. As Sandra continued retelling her story, she revealed more specific details about the actual domestic violence incident. She revealed that her daughter-in-law was wearing a ring which she used to hit Sandra (line 38). She also revealed that because of
this attack, her face swelled up considerably (line 41). These details, although not central to the
telling, continue to enrich Sandra’s story, even if these reveal a process of revision (and possible
reinterpretation) of the events Sandra reenacted. These also reveal insights as to how Sandra’s
self-presentation and sense of self are recasted, shifted, and revised through the utterances she
made.

**Reported Speech and Self-Presentation: the How**

While telling and retelling this story about being illegitimately wronged, Sandra not only
incarnated the voices of herself, her son, and her daughter-in-law, among others but also she
presented different self-presentations of herself and others in these two versions of this event in
her life.

**Table 5.4. Frequency of Indirect vs. Direct RS in ‘Domestic Violence’ Story**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frequency per 1000 words

As can be seen in this table, the amount of direct reported speech exceeds that of indirect
reported speech in both languages. However, the amount of direct reported speech in Spanish
nearly doubles that of its use in English. Additionally, the amount of indirect reported speech in
Spanish more than triples its use in English. Although these great differences are not statistically
significant, it is clear that Sandra’s characters play a more vivid and animated role in the Spanish
version than in the English.

**Version A**

In the first telling (English), Sandra made use of both direct and indirect reported speech.
As was previously noted in the other participants’ narratives, narrator and interlocutor voicing
also functioned as a means to provide numerous background details about Sandra’s story and orient the listener to Sandra’s problem. Unlike the previous participants’ narratives, Sandra began her story using her voice as an interlocutor, observed by her use of present tense ‘have’ in the opening line. This usage could be indicative of language choice (as Sandra seems to prefer present tense throughout her narrative), yet it also is indicative of a deeper impact that this event had on her life. It suggests Sandra’s attitude and feelings regarding this incident were still unresolved and emotionally salient at the time of her narration.

As Sandra continued her narrative, she quickly revealed (through her voice as a narrator) her former daughter-in-law’s problem with drugs—inferring that her problem was with ‘perico’ (i.e., Spanish slang for cocaine, line 5)—not any other drug. This utterance not only contained inferential information about Sandra, but also embedded in it interactional implications. By choosing to say ‘perico’ instead of ‘cocaine’ or ‘coke’, Sandra is bracketing in (Wooffitt, 1992) or indexing her sense of belonging to this particular community of speakers and as a means to check group membership with the listener (a Spanish speaker belonging to the same cultural background as Sandra). Additionally, her utterance made her claim of the “problem with her” (line 1) relevant and implicitly foregrounded the actions and behaviors that were about to be undertaken by her former daughter-in-law in the narrative.

This utterance also served the purpose of attributing negative character traits to the daughter-in-law from the get go as opposed to the other characters mentioned in the storyworld. The claim of “she used to smell…perico” (lines 4-5) would later on serve to bracket out the fact that the daughter-in-law was not just merely having a bad day or displaying a legitimate reason for gossiping about Sandra. She was exhibiting behaviors consistent with those of a cocaine user, as Sandra revealed early on in the narrative and later reiterated.
As Sandra continued her narrative, she reenacted the voice of her son and introduced the crux of the problem: the gossip that the former daughter-in-law was ‘telling’ (line 12). This particular utterance was delivered as a mix of direct reported speech and interlocutor voicing. This is clear in her choice to embed “this and that and that” (line 12)—a direct quote without propositional content yet indicative of interlocutor voicing—immediately after the son’s initial quoted speech. This particular mix of character and interlocutor voicing not only made the delivery more rich, but also suggested that Sandra was evaluating in a here-and-now space the information her son delivered in then-and-there moment. It further revealed Sandra’s here-and-now stance—that is, anger and disbelief—in light of the acts that happened on that day.

Additionally, through this particular quote rendered through the voice of her son, Sandra characterized him in an ambivalent manner. On the one hand, Sandra portrayed him as antagonizing the mother and the daughter-in-law and stirring up trouble. On the other hand, Sandra might have chosen this particular utterance to claim it as an attempt on behalf of her son to request for a clarification of the hearsay. That is, through this utterance, he gave his mother the opportunity to save face and provide him some sort of assurance of the falsehood of his wife’s words. He sought this as a means to achieve some closure to the dispute.

About 10 lines after this instance of direct reported speech, Sandra used her voice as a narrator to contrast herself versus her daughter-in-law when she stated, “I was in good manner…” (line 19). Even though this sole self-portrayal does not reveal much about Sandra’s habitual disposition, it serves the purpose of providing evidence that Sandra was not an instigator or culpable of starting a fight. She was merely saving face, as can be seen when she switched to reported speech to state “what you have to say this and that about me?” (line 21). Similar to the direct reported speech delivered by her son a few lines above, her voice as a character and
interlocutor served the purpose of commenting on the gossip in a here-and-now frame. That is, instead of stating the accusations made against her, she made use of demonstrative pronouns ‘this’ and ‘that’ (lacking propositional content) as a means to perhaps minimize the numerous allegations made about her but in a dismissive manner showing that she was beyond that. These allegations are later revealed when the interviewer asked her for clarification about these, which in turn generated an indirect reported speech instance of the daughter-in-law’s words. These instances of direct and indirect reported speech continue to portray both women as opposites. Sandra’s character is assertive, in control, and somewhat adversarial in nature (although this changed towards the end; discussed below). The daughter-in-law’s character continued to be portrayed as irrational, impulsive, ungrateful (lines 44-46), and violent.

Up to this point in the narrative, Sandra’s use of direct or indirect reported speech is sparse, relegated to only two characters in the story and two instances. As the narrative continued, the use of direct or indirect speech is mostly done by her son. Upon closer observation, Sandra’s reenactment of her son’s voice is prevalent in this telling, with 15 instances of direct reported speech voiced by his character. In contrast, Sandra’s character is voiced directly only once throughout the entire telling, while the daughter-in-law’s character is even less noticeable, relegated to only one instance of indirect speech throughout the entire telling. It is possible that because Sandra could not exert the kind of justice she would have liked for herself (i.e., the proverbial ‘eye for an eye’), she chose to retaliate this injustice through the character voice of her son. It also seems that through his repetitive character voicing (and use of quotation inside a quotation), Sandra formed (and even crystallized) an idealized image of what a good son does: defend, avenge, and honor his parent. Her son not only stood up for her through his actions, but through his utterance, he reiterated the moral code “…she’s not supposed to hit
my mother…” (line 60) followed by his ultimatum: “…bend your knees and say ‘mami, forgive me’” (lines 38-40).

While Sandra reenacted these events, it would seem that in her reenactment, she highlighted the words and actions of the character of the son the most. Her own self-positioning and self-presentation in this story at first glance seemed minimal. As discussed before, Sandra revealed her assertiveness through the role of mother, only to later on appear frail and vulnerable in light of the violent face beating she endured, which appeared in her narrative surrounded by extreme case formulations (Pomerantz, 1986), as seen in this particular utterance: “…but he hits me real bad… in front of everybody…” (lines 47-50; emphasis mine). Her depiction of her vulnerability is effectively communicated through the extreme case formulations in her coda “and he never went back with her” (line 63; emphasis mine) at the end of this narrative.

In addition to the uses of direct and indirect reported speech in this version, Sandra also reported what seemed to be a narration of a speech act in this first telling (NRSA). As Sandra reenacted the incident between herself and her daughter-in-law, she narrated that an uncle, who was visiting his niece during this time, “was trying to put peace…to separate…” (lines 52, 54). This action reports that speech occurred, but what Sandra did not reveal in this telling was the words that were said ‘to separate’ and ‘put peace’ in this violent encounter. Although this particular instance is not particularly significant in terms of self-representation, it reveals another character stepping in to put a stop to the assault and it speaks to the gruesome violence that Sandra encountered and witnessed on that day.

**Version B**

In the second rendition of this same event (Spanish version), Sandra’s use of reported speech is more dialogic in nature, adding snippets of conversational exchanges between her son
and herself along with instances of indirect reported speech. These instances of reported speech were higher in frequency when compared to the first telling (as seen in Table 6.7 above). Her retelling, therefore, seemed more vivid and involved, as was evident in her choice of more dialogically rendered character interactions where a mere translation of the previously reported events could have been delivered. Additionally, in her narrator’s voice, Sandra included more elaborate details regarding the events that led up to Sandra’s assault (as noted previously). The different strategies that Sandra used, therefore, made her reenactment more dramatic, linear, and to a certain degree more ‘tellable’ in the greater scheme of the Labovian narrative.

The first notable difference in the presentation of self and reported speech is Sandra’s self-presentation. In the first version, Sandra seemed more in-control, autonomous, with almost unflinching determination to defend herself in the face of these unmentioned accusations. In this version, she seemed somewhat active, but irresolute. First, the then-and-there Sandra quoted herself inquiring about what was being said about her (line 22), whereas in the first version the then-and-there Sandra did not need to ask this information as her son voluntarily gave it to her, which led her to take matters into her own hands without hesitation. In this version, her question is followed by a speech act evaluating the impropriety of the gossip as well as a justifying her son’s anger at his wife. Unlike the first version, this did not lead up to Sandra quoting her then-and-there self asking her daughter-in-law what she had said about her as she does in the first telling. Her then-and-there voice is silenced in this version of the story, revealing a passive, less in-control then-and-there Sandra.

A second instance in which Sandra’s self-presentation seemed active yet indecisive was when she quoted her son stating “Pues vamos allá pa preguntarle por que ella está diciendo esas cosas” (“Well let’s go there to ask her why she’s saying those things” lines 26-28). By using the
cohortative mood “let’s go”, instead of deontic mood ‘go ask her…’, it seemed that Sandra was encouraging herself via the character voice of her son to perform the action of ‘righting a wrong’. It could also be interpreted that her son’s inclusive ‘let’s go’ can be interpreted as an imperative suggestive modal; the actions that follow this particular quoted speech instance, however, suggest otherwise. Sandra’s decision to go to “…reclamar” (demand; line 29) soon after this quote suggested that she was compelled to confront her daughter-in-law’s gossip as a means to not only to ‘right the wrong’, but to save face. It seemed then that her actions were more the result of a mutual agreement/directive between her son and herself rather than a decision based on her own free will and autonomy. Sandra then is perceived as someone who not only followed suggestions of others, but was easily instigated and manipulated, further portraying her in a less autonomous light.

Another notable difference in presentation of selves and reported speech in this retelling is in the reenactment of the son’s quoted speech, particularly the utterances in lines 17-20, 26-28, and 46-51. While in the English version Sandra did not include any information regarding the son’s previous discussion with his spouse, here the son’s first quote and utterance revealed that prior to visiting his mother he had had a discussion with his spouse (line 17). This inclusion of information changed the dynamic of the story from one of mere gossip to one of ‘troubles telling’ (Brenneis, 1988). As Sandra continued quoting her son’s troubles talk, she revealed that the discussion happened to be about the fact that the wife “…se puso a hablar de ti…” (“…was talking about you…”, line 19) followed by her son’s feelings about the discussion (“…y ya me tenía molesto…”, “…and she had me upset…”, line 20). Up to this point in this segment of the narrative, Sandra constructed a very different image of her son, whereas in the first version, she depicted a picture of a man delivering gossip. And although Sandra could have literally
translated her son’s quoted utterance from the first telling (as she did in lines 46-48), she chose to include this quote inside a quote, revealing not only a more active and present character in the story, but a more affective dimension to her son’s character.

In sum, the use of reported speech in these two tellings of the ‘same’ story make Sandra’s story richer and more involved. As was observed in Maria’s narratives, in Sandra’s telling and retelling, not only do more details emerge in the retelling, but also Sandra’s multiple self representations are conveyed. In the first narrative, Sandra conveyed a strong, assertive woman who later on (due to the circumstances revealed in the storyworld) transformed into a frail and vulnerable person who could only rely on her son to defend and protect her. In the retelling, from the get go Sandra conveyed a sense of ambivalence over her own actions, and although she eventually acted in a proactive manner, in the end she was still perceived as a victim who was vindicated through her son’s actions.

5.3 Summary and Conclusion

In this chapter, I discussed how the presentation of self is presented in the narratives of three different cognitively healthy bilingual older adults. Although the use and extent to which reported speech was used in each of these stories varied extensively, there were some commonalities among these narratives. In terms of referential content, it is clear that in all three cases, the content of each participant’s telling and retelling remained relatively stable across the versions of these same stories. However, the indexicals of the speakers’ attitudes and identities varied, sometimes greatly. Some versions were more involved, animated, and lively, as seen in the extensive use of reported speech/character speech and interlocutory devices used in these narratives, while others were more abbreviated and to the point, as seen by the high ratio of
narrator voicing (e.g., Ricardo’s second narrative). These findings are comparable to what has already been reported in the literature of narrative retellings (Bamberg, 2008; Bauman, 1986; Chafe, 1998; Koven, 2007, 2011; L. C. Moore, 2012; Norrick, 1997, 1998b; Polanyi, 1981; Prior, 2011).

Another interesting commonality these different narratives have is that the tellers seem to be more involved when narrating in Spanish— their first language— regardless of whether the events occurred in English. The higher frequencies of reported speech in Spanish tellings for each of these participants are telling of this dynamic. Although the higher frequencies seen in the tables accompanying each of these excerpts are not statistically significant, it does show that speakers have noticeably different ways of performing diverse identities and selves in discourse.

To restate what I discussed in this chapter, I will provide below a summarized answers to the questions that led the discussion in this chapter.

(1) What personal experiences do the participants narrate in each telling and how are these two tellings similar and/or different?

Some common features are seen in these three excerpts. First, it is clear that the referential content in both tellings across the three speakers is mostly the same in both languages. That is, in both the telling and the retelling, the excerpts shown in this chapter achieve the purpose of telling a story and repeating the ‘same’ information at a later date. This would suggest that language is not a factor in the few differences in semantic content found across the tellings.

Second, no consistent pattern seems to emerge in the length of second tellings across the three speakers' excerpts. This is consistent with the literature on twice-told tellings. That is, when stories are retold to the same person or audience, these retellings do not require an unpacking of corollary information (Chafe, 1994, 1998). Instead of repeating the ‘same’, given information a
second time, a speaker might opt to abbreviate parts to make others more relevant (Bamberg, 2008) or foster more rapport from the audience member (Norrick, 1998a). This could result in a shorter retelling. In contrast, a longer retelling may be the result of a speaker’s need or desire to reshape and reorganize what had already been said to the audience (Ervin-Tripp & Küntay, 1997; Norrick, 1997, 1998a, 1998b). Even though differential patterns of length were not consistently found across these three excerpts, it is clear that these three excerpts possessed the typical characteristics of most retellings: revisions to what had already been said, reorganization of previously given information, abbreviation of previously given information, and highlighting of more relevant parts of the story (Bamberg, 2008; Chafe, 1994, 1998; Koven, 2011; Norrick, 1997, 1998a, 1998b; Prior, 2011). These findings lend support to Chafe’s argument that “when remembering is thus aided by rehearsal, events that are repeatedly refreshed can be more richly experienced” (1994, p. 203).

(2) What strategies do the speakers use while telling their stories of personal experience?

What strategies do they use while using reported speech?

While telling their stories, speakers were found to use a variety of strategies. These ranged from passive voice, extreme case formulations, intensifiers, irrealis modals, alternation in reported verb tenses, use of the historic present, shifts in speaker roles (narrator-interlocutor-character), double voicing, shifts in registers, among others. These different devices were strategically employed to make particular points stand out in the stories these participants told, but their distributions across languages and tellings is not systematically different. In essence, this particular group of participants creatively made use of those linguistic resources available in their semiotic toolbox and at their disposal. In turn, they were better able to make their stories more involved and lively.
In the case of reported speech, the speakers used reported speech to lend more veracity or authority to their stories. In the process, these speakers gave life to the voices of those others that were crucial in telling their stories. Through these characters, they made use of embedded instances of reported speech (particularly embedded direct speech), marking their narratives as more involved and more lively, or as still not having been resolved at the time of narration. The speakers used very few instances of other modes of reported speech. In the cases where other modes were used (such as free indirect speech, narrative reports of speech acts, or narrated voice), these different modes achieved their purpose in the narrative—to show that some stretch of talk occurred. These stretches of talk may not have been essential in communicating the self, but they may have served as a way to move the narrative along. In essence, they used reported speech in their two languages to achieve a communicative purpose: that of telling and retelling stories of personal experience, while drawing from these repertoires to perform and enact the voices of speakers who resemble “images of locally imaginable kinds of speakers” (Koven, 2001, p. 549).

(3) How do the speakers use reported speech and to what extent is reported speech used differently/similarly in the narratives of each participant?

By looking at the frequency tables included in this chapter (Tables 5.2, 5.3, and 5.4), it is clear that speakers strategically chose to make more use of direct speech than indirect speech. These differences in the modes of reported speech (i.e., direct vs. indirect vs. other types of RS) indicate that when telling their stories, some speakers are more engaged in the there-and-now moment than others. Additionally, speakers tended to repeat critical quotes almost verbatim from one language to the next. This only happened once per each speaker. The remaining reported speech, however, either reduces from one telling to the next (as is the case of María when she
gives her mother advice), expands (as is the case of Sandra’s son telling her about the discussion with his wife), is demoted to indirect speech (as is the case of Ricardo’s captain), or is omitted from the retelling. This lends support to the notion that when retelling, the reported speech may remain stable—with critical portions recurring verbatim from one telling to the next—or it may also expand or decrease from one telling to the next given the audience or context. Moreover, these results lend support to the findings on quotation in narrative that point to the stylistic representation of speech as a strategy for the creation of a dialogic space where the speaker can shift in a single utterance from telling to performing/enacting what was said at a particular/presupposed there-and-then in a given here-and-now.

(4) How do speakers perform their own selves or the selves of others through reported speech? Do the speakers quote themselves as extensively or in the same amount as others?

By looking at the excerpts in this chapter, one can see that each speaker’s quotation of the self and of other varies. However, the critical question is: how do they quantifiably ‘do’ the performance of self versus others in each telling? I will examine this question in terms of the first versus the second telling via frequency tables. The tables below demonstrate the frequencies found in the excerpts discussed in this chapter showing each speaker’s ‘performed’ self versus ‘performed’ others. The data in the tables are further categorized into direct reports of self/others and indirect reports of self/others. I begin by considering the first telling (Table 5.5).
Table 5.5. Excerpt Frequencies of Reporting the Self and Reporting Others in the First Telling of Narratives Examined in this Chapter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Reported Self</th>
<th>Reported Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ricardo</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frequency per 1000 words

The frequencies shown above demonstrate the speakers’ preference for using direct speech to quote the self or others. In the case of Ricardo and Sandra, they use direct speech more often to report the voices of others than their own. Ricardo quotes the voice of his captain and his colleague, indicating that these characters in the storyworld are sharing facts (i.e., who has the rifle and where it is located) or are in a position of authority vis-à-vis Ricardo. Sonia quotes the voice of her son—whom she holds in high esteem—to demonstrate with conviction how he defended her honor. María, on the other hand, directly quoted both others and herself. While quoting herself, she made her utterances more subjective, demonstrating a stronger affective stance regarding her mother’s lack of empathy. When quoting her mother, she demonstrated the mother’s faults more explicitly while providing the listener with a perception of that direct experience, à la Clark and Gerrig (1990).

When the speakers use indirect speech, as the table demonstrates, the indirect speech of others appears to be reported but not their own. This could partially be due to the function of indirect speech; that is, indirect speech has a reportive or referential function. Because of its interpretative nature, indirect speech can deemphasize or even hide some aspects of the original utterance. In Sandra’s case, her use of indirect quotation is almost negligible as she used it to report the few words her daughter-in-law had said. Given Sandra’s little use of this type of RS, it
is possible that she intended to hide the ‘original’ words her daughter-in-law used during the domestic dispute—allowing her to save face in light of the accusations made about her.

Turning to the second telling, I ask: do the speakers quote themselves as extensively as others and in the same way? Table 5.9 demonstrates the frequency of these differences.

**Table 5.6. Excerpt Frequencies of Reporting the Self and Reporting Others in the Second Telling of Narratives Examined in this Chapter**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Reported Self</th>
<th>Reported Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ricardo</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frequency per 1000 words

Again, the use of direct reported speech is clearly the preferred device in these narrative excerpts. As is evident from my analyses in this chapter, the effect of this pattern is the same as that found in the first telling. That is, direct reported speech gives life to the self and others while the use of indirect reported speech is only reserved for other characters in the storyworld. Direct speech is María’s preferred mode of RS. Again, she quoted herself more than others in the retelling showing the strength and the performative power (Alvarez-Caccamo, 1996) her words had at that there-and-then space. Similarly, Ricardo and Sandra performed the voices of others more than their own. In Ricardo’s case, the frequency of reported self versus reported other was more even. As was previously stated, the retelling showed more abbreviation and omission of information. Quite possibly the differences in quoted speech of self and others is due to this shift. Sandra again quoted her son’s voice more than her own to demonstrate the close relationship she had with her son.

The immediately preceding analysis concerned the narratives that I subjected to more careful examination in this chapter, but this focus leads to the question of whether these patterns
are consistent across all of the narratives of these speakers. In order to have an ample understanding of each speaker’s linguistic repertoire, the overall frequencies for each speaker are shown and discussed below (Tables 5.10 and 5.11).

**Table 5.7. Overall Frequencies of Reporting the Self and Reporting Others in the First Telling in All Narratives**

| Participant | Reported Self |  | Reported Others |  |
|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|             | Direct        | Indirect        | Direct          | Indirect       |
| Maria       | 65            | 5               | 57              | 11             |
| Ricardo     | 8             | 0.4             | 19              | 2              |
| Sandra      | 4             | 0               | 8               | 0.2            |

Frequency per 1000 words

One may wonder whether speakers overall quote themselves more than others do the first time they tell their stories. However, as shown in Table 5.10, the overall frequencies shown above demonstrate that all three speakers tend to prefer direct speech when reporting the voices of themselves or others in the storyworld. When it comes to the report of their own voices, the frequencies again demonstrate a very different picture. Ricardo and Sandra continued to quote directly the voices of others in their overall narratives. These were quoted twice as much as their own voice. The frequency of quoting indirectly the voice of others was also greater. However, the data above do not demonstrate any consistent pattern in quoting the self or others. Would that be any different in second tellings?

**Table 5.8. Overall Frequencies of Reporting the Self and Reporting Others in the Second Telling in All Narratives**

| Participant | Reported Self |  | Reported Others |  |
|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|             | Direct        | Indirect        | Direct          | Indirect       |
| Maria       | 15            | 0.4             | 12              | 2              |
| Ricardo     | 8             | 0.9             | 17              | 3              |
| Sandra      | 2             | 0.2             | 13              | 1              |

Frequency per 1000 words
Similar to the data in Table 5.10, speakers do not demonstrate a consistent pattern of engaging in the quoting of self or others. Again, Ricardo and Sandra directly reported the voice of others more than twice of that of themselves. Similarly, the indirect report of the voice of others continues to surpass that of indirect report of the self. Given that the tables above are representations of the frequencies of first and second tellings (i.e., showing quantifiably how speakers quote themselves and others), how does the self of the speaker and of others get ‘performed’ through reported speech? In excerpt 5.1 (taken from María’s ‘advice’ tellings), I demonstrate how María not only quotes herself differently, but quotes her mother differently. María’s speech has been underlined once while the mother’s speech has been underlined twice.
Excerpt 5.4. Two Tellings of the ‘Same’ Story Showing Different Self-Presentations

First Telling
Y entonces cuando llegó a casa, a casa mía, me dice, “mira yo fui a ver a tu hermana y está sangrando y el piso embarrado en sangre,” “Y mamá no lo limpiaste?” “No yo no voy a limpiar eso. Allá que lo limpie ella. Y entonces voy a llamar el marido de ella ahora y se lo voy a decir para que le meta una pela.” Yo dije, “Mira, mamá, yo- no te atrevas llamarlo a él.” Yo la aconseje a ella. “Tú no te atrevas a llamarlo a él porque esa es tu hija que tú pariste. Que tú cargaste en el vientre por nueve meses. ¿Cómo tu vas a llamar a un hombre le de una pela a tu hija en las condiciones que está con el derrame que ella está?” “No, que tiene que saberlo él para que le meta una pela.” Le digo, “tú no vas a llamarlo a él. Algo le pasa a mi hermana, tú eres la que lo vas a pagar. Tú no te atrevas a llamarlo a él porque esa es tu hija. Y siente amor por tu hija. Siente cariño por tu yerno, pero amor por tu hija porque tú la pariste a ella. No te atrevas a darle la queja a ella.”

Second Telling
When she come to my house, she said- “I’m going to tell her husband so he can take of her. I’m going to tell her husband.” And he used to abuse my sister. He used to abuse her a lot. Beat her up a lot. And then I said. “Don’t do that. Mama.” I sit down and said. “Mama. Sit down. Let’s talk. Don’t do that because you brought her to this world. You carried her for nine months. You brought her to this world. She’s your daughter. He’s not your son. He’s somebody else’s son. And you know that he beats her up all of the time. If you tell him what she did, he might kill her. So you- you don’t send somebody to beat your daughter. Uhn Uhn. That’s your daughter. That’s my sister. You don’t do that.”

English Translation
And then when she got home, to my home, she says, “look I went to see your sister and she’s bleeding and the floor is covered in blood.” “And mom you didn’t clean it?” “No, I’m not going to clean that. Let her clean it. And so I’m going to call her husband now and I’m going to tell him so he can beat her up.” I said, “Look, mother, I- don’t you dare call him” I gave her advice. “Don’t you da-” I always remember that for the rest of my life. “Don’t you dare call him because that is your daughter that you gave birth to. That you carried in your belly for 9 months How are you going to call a man to give a whooping to your daughter in her condition in which she’s in, with the hemorrhage that she has?” “No, he has to know it so that he could give her a beating.” I said to her, “you’re not going to call him. If something happens to my sister, you are the one who’s going to pay. Don’t you dare call him because that is your daughter. And feel love for your daughter. Feel fondness for your son in law but love for your daughter because you gave birth to her. Don’t you dare complain to him.”

The two excerpts above show a similar number of reported speech clauses delivered at the end of María’s story. A comparison of these two transcripts suggest that critical pieces of
reported speech seem to be recurring verbatim from the first telling to the next. Upon closer analysis, however, both María and the mother are voiced differently. In the first version, both women are quoted more often via direct reported speech than in the second. Furthermore, the voice of the mother and María are both more forceful and angry as noted in the use of words like ‘meter una pela’ (‘give her a beating), ‘tu lo vas a pagar’ (‘you are going to pay for it’), ‘no te atrevas’ (‘don’t you dare’)—all emotionally-laden lexical choices. In María’s case, her emotions are justifiable given her mother’s irrational need to exert control over and punish her younger daughter for her ‘immoral’ action. The mother’s anger, however, is not justifiable in María’s eyes. This leads María to repeatedly threat her mother, which escalates into an even greater threat: the proverbial eye for an eye. In essence, María assumes a similar role as the mother. That is, just as the mother wanted to punish the daughter for an action that does not agree with her worldview, María threatens to punish her mother for any action she commits that does not agree with hers. In contrast to the first version’s tone of anger, threat, and contempt, the second excerpt seems to present María in a more calm and rational manner, while the mother is still portrayed as angry but limited to one verbal exchange in this telling. Through her lexical choices, she communicates a demeanor of composure and sensibility. In this version, María invites the mother to ‘sit’ and ‘talk’ about the logic behind her proposition, and even though she assumes a more firm posture towards the end, she continues to portray a more self-controlled self. In a sense, María gives a sense of a more anger-driven performance of self in Spanish while giving the listener a sense of a more rationally-driven performance in English. The two excerpts above demonstrate that María made creative use of those linguistic resources available in her semiotic toolbox and at her disposal, as well as the fact that she has access to and uses more complex and developed linguistic devices that allow her to enact current and other culturally available
identities with which she may identify with. These differences may vary according to the speaker, and more if the speaker has a dementia. In the next chapter, I will discuss how the presentation of self is presented and varies in the narratives of three older bilingual adults diagnosed with Alzheimer’s disease.
CHAPTER 6

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP AND

INDIVIDUAL SPEAKERS’ RESULTS

6.1 Introduction

In the previous chapter, I discussed the qualitative results of the cognitively healthy older bilinguals group. I focused on the differences in the usage of reported speech and speaker roles. I also analyzed how the usage of reported speech and speaker roles varied in the group and individually. In this chapter, I will discuss how the self is presented at both group and individual levels. I then discuss the results of older bilingual adults diagnosed with DAT. The analyses will focus on three individual participants from this group (i.e., the experimental group) as well as include discussion of the following questions:

(1) Content: What personal experiences do the participants narrate in each telling and how are these two tellings similar and/or different?

(2) Strategies: What strategies do the speakers use while telling the stories? What strategies do the speakers employ while using reported speech?

(3) Reported Speech: How do the speakers use reported speech and to what extent is reported speech used differently/similarly in the narratives of each participant?

(4) Self-Presentation: How do the speakers perform their own selves or the selves of others through reported speech? Do the speakers quote themselves or others as extensively or in the same amount?
6.2 Speaker Results for Bilingual Group with DAT

As I discussed in the previous chapter, the individuals in the cognitively healthy bilingual group were matched to the experimental group based on three different criteria: (1) age, (2) time of residency in the United States, and (3) MMSE score. The application of these criteria is reflected in the table below.

### Table 6.1: Matching of Cognitively Healthy Older Bilinguals and Older Bilinguals with DAT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Years in the USA</th>
<th>MMSE Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>María</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ricardo</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Years in the USA</th>
<th>MMSE Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrique</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucy</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miguel</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As in the previous chapter, the discussion for each participant will first include relevant details about the context of each of the interview sessions. This will be followed by a side-by-side presentation of the two versions of the same story told by each participant followed by a line-by-line translation of the Spanish version. That is, for each participant, a complete version and translation (where necessary) of a particular, twice-told story will be presented and further analyzed.

### 6.2.1 Speaker #1 – Enrique

Before meeting Enrique, I met his caregiver (now his former wife). After seeing flyers posted in the older adult center, she contacted me and expressed interest in having her former husband participate in the study. On the day I met Enrique, I spoke to him about the study in more detail. He expressed interest in participating, and he completed a brief eight item
assessment (Inouye, p. 196) to verify his understanding of the study. He successfully completed the brief assessment of understanding the study and signed the form. He scored 19 on the MMSE.

During the initial interview, Enrique spoke mostly in English, stressing that he was fully bilingual and stating that he served as an interpreter in the local courts before having been diagnosed with memory problems. Although he did not speak English inside the home with his caregiver, he stated that he spoke English mostly with his doctors and with the nurses that provided medical assistance in the subsidized senior housing high rise where he lived. He also mentioned that he spoke English anytime he is around other speakers that are not Spanish speakers.

In the narrative interviews, Enrique spoke for nearly an hour during each session. He had a box full of photographs taken at different moments of his life, but had difficulty thinking of specific stories. In addition to asking about bad life experiences, I asked him to talk about the different stages of his life (20s, 30s, 40s, etc.) partly to help him recollect his life experiences and partly to collect other life stories. He also noted very early on in the interview that he had few bad life experiences (or his recollection of any bad moments in his life), and this made it necessary that I frame the interview in terms of life stages instead of experiences. At the end of our first narrative interview, he had told ten stories in English. In the next session, Enrique spoke under an hour because he was fatigued. He retold eight stories in Spanish, four of which were repeated versions of stories told on the previous interview.

Unlike the narrative interviews conducted with the cognitively healthy bilingual group, most of the interviews in this cohort were collected with the help of spouses, older children, and/or caregivers. In the case of Enrique, his caregiver (and former spouse) was asked to join us
on the days the narrative interviews were held. I made this change in the interview protocol because of Enrique’s increasing frustration at not being able to answer questions or provide narratives at my request. The first time she joined us, she did so upon Enrique’s request and at about 30 minutes into the first narrative session. She helped Enrique to fill in gaps in his stories and even clarify his storyline at times. Additionally, she would aid Enrique during times when he asked for her help in remembering details or events in Enrique’s life. In moments when the caregiver was not there (or was not available), I had to ask more follow-up and clarification questions to help Enrique think more about the stories he told or life events he lived. Many times, I had to repeat the questions during our interview sessions in order to make sure that Enrique understood what I was asking him. Having made this change in the narrative interview protocol, I was careful to offer the same re-structuring for any other participant who requested it (or seemed to need it).

In the excerpt analyzed below, Enrique was asked to tell a story of a bad life experience he had during his 30s. Because he had difficulty in thinking of a story about a bad experience during this period in his life, I asked him to think about a good life experience he may have had with his caregiver during this moment of his life. After some time had passed in the interview, he remembered that he liked going dancing with his former wife, and on occasion, liked going to a particular pool bar to have a beer. A few minutes after this revelation, he remembered a story about a bad experience he had at a bar. In this story, Enrique told of having been mistakenly hit with a billiard stick in a bar. Even though he asked those around him about the incident, he never found out who hit him with the billiard stick or why he was hit. He framed it as a story of mistaken identity.

---

51 Enrique repeatedly stated that the reason he could not think of a bad experience during his life was that he was “a peaceful guy...”, a characterization he repeated over five times during this interview. However, when his former wife stepped in to aid him in the narrative process, this self-characterization seemed to wax and wane.
Excerpt 6.1: Enrique’s Two Tellings of the Same Story

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Telling (Version A)</th>
<th>Spanish Telling (Version B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Oh well</td>
<td>1. <em>I</em>: entonces usted se recuerda de un error de identidad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I could tell you that I got punched</td>
<td>2. <em>I</em>: then do you remember [the story] about a mistaken identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I mean</td>
<td>4. pues que yo me estaba dando una cerveza well that I was having a beer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. somebody hit me on the side</td>
<td>5. un vaso vamos a decir. a glass let’s say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I remember that.</td>
<td>6. Yo estaba sentado- una cerveza por ejemplo XXX en el counter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. With ah with a billiard stick which I didn’t know who it was</td>
<td><em>I</em> was sitting- a beer for example XXX on the counter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Because I remember</td>
<td>7. De momento yo sentí este cantazo. all of the sudden, <em>I</em> felt this blow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I got hit on the side- sideways</td>
<td>8. Y fue que alguien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. <em>I</em>: Okay and what happened?</td>
<td>And it was that somebody</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I got out of-</td>
<td>9. me dio con un taco. hit me with a stick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. That was-</td>
<td>10. Porque yo vi el taco Because <em>I</em> saw the stick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. that was in ah</td>
<td>11. pero no vi la persona. but <em>I</em> didn’t see the person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. they call it ah Duke academy</td>
<td>12. Yo vi el taco I saw the stick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. That’s what they call it</td>
<td>13. pero no vi la persona. but <em>I</em> didn’t see the person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. <em>I</em>: The place where you went</td>
<td>14. Entiendes. You understand?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Yeah</td>
<td>15. Porque cuando miré así de eso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. they play billiard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. <em>I</em>: Aha it was called Duke Academy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. yeah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. you know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. you used to pay a dollar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. and play for an hour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. <em>I</em>:uhum uhum you used to play=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. =I like eh mostly billiards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. I dice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. would that be part of the story</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. you’re looking for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. <em>I</em>: Yes and when you said that you got hit with the=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. =Oh yeah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>I got hit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td><em>I</em>: so what- how did it happen? And what were you doing before that?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>I was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>I was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>I was uh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>when I got hit it was in the bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>in the bar you know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>where they drink beer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td><em>I</em>: ah you were drinking a beer and what happened?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>I was drinking a beer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>ah somebody ah hit me with the stick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td><em>I</em>: And who- you- were you alone?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>No there were more people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td><em>I</em>: Uhum. Friends with you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>No- no-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>you know drinkers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>you know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>people who drink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td><em>I</em>: okay. And do you remember why he hit you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>No idea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>I guess mistaken identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>because sometimes people- you look at people in the back</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>you look at a couple of people in the back</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>and uh uh sometimes they look alike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>someone may-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>someone may be looking for certain person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>and ah that person may injure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>or or hit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>or shoot someone that looks like this person is looking for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td>or she’s looking for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.</td>
<td>because your- have your back</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.</td>
<td>you know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>ya no-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>ya no estaba.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>was not there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Y me quedé dao.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>And so there I was.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>So</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>I: And you did not faint or nothing of the sort?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>no simplemente que me dolió.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Como por aquí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Like around here</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>¿por la cara?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>¿En qué- en dónde fue que le dieron?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>porque me dieron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>the handle has rubber that is to hold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>con sabe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>with y’know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>‘sea no le resbale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Because when I looked like to the-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>no more-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>the person that did it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>ya no-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>no more-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>la persona que fue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>ya no estaba.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>was not there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>And so there I was.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>So</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td><em>I</em>: And you did not faint or nothing of the sort?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>no simplemente que me dolió.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>Como por aquí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>Like around here</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>¿por la cara?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>¿En qué- en dónde fue que le dieron?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>porque me dieron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>the handle has rubber that is to hold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>con sabe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>with y’know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>‘sea no le resbale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>Because when I looked like to the-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>no more-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>la persona que fue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>ya no estaba.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>was not there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>And so there I was.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>So</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td><em>I</em>: And you did not faint or nothing of the sort?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td>no simplemente que me dolió.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.</td>
<td>Como por aquí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.</td>
<td>Like around here</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
65. you’re looking
66. your back ain’t looking
67. you’re looking at uh
68. you know
69. but you have no eyes at the back
70. So you I call it ah a big mistake of uh identity

33. Y parece que me quedé dao
   And it looks like I stayed hit
34. porque no sé.
   because I don’t know
35. Eh pero hace un chorro de años que de-
   Uh but it has been a ton of years that I
36. dejé beber y de fumar.
   stopped drinking and smoking.
37. Hace años.
   It’s been ages
38. Yo diría que hace como veinticinco años.
   I would say that it’s been like twenty-
39. Por ahí.
   five years.
40. I: Y entonces usted no tuvo tiempo de
   hablar con=
   I: And so you didn’t have time to talk
41. =No pues si no había nadie
   No, well because there wasn’t anyone
42. I: y las personas alrededor
   I: And the people around you
43. porque la persona que me dio me tiró con
   el taco.
   because the person that hit me threw the
44. I: y después de eso, ¿n- no habló con
   nadie ni nadie se preocupó?
   I: and after that you- you didn’t talk
   with anybody and nobody was worried?
45. bueno
   well,
46. yo pregunté
   I asked
47. pero no había nadie
   but there wasn’t anyone
48. que “no, nosotros no vimos nada”.
   that “no, we didn’t see anything”
49. I: O sea que la gente no lo vio o lo
   negó
   I: in other words the people didn’t see
   it or denied it
50. tal vez lo negó.
   Maybe he/she denied it.
51. No, pero cuando yo pregunté
   No, but when I asked
52. dije-
   they said
53. “no, nosotros no vimos nada.”
   “no, we didn’t see anything.”
54. I: y usted, ¿qué piensa? ¿que eso fue=
   I: and you think that was=
55. =identidad, identidad...
   identity, identity...
56. I: o sea que no era una cuestión así=
   I: so it wasn’t an act like=
57. =de venganza y eso
   =of revenge and such
58. I: aha si
   I: Uh huh yeah
59. no- no.
   No, no.
60. yo no le he dao.
   I haven’t hit-
61. Yo no buscaba problemas con nadie.
   I wouldn’t look for trouble with anybody
62. Entonces yo veía
   Then I would see
63. que ya. ya.
   that alright already
64. suficiente, tú sabes.
   enough. you know
65. Sí.
Yes.
66. Iba
   I would go
67. y me iba.
   and then I would leave
68. No esperaba que me dieran el otro
   I wouldn’t stick around to get hit
   another time.
69. tú sabes.
   you know
Telling and the Retelling the Story: The What

As with the stories analyzed in the previous chapter, the story that Enrique told and retold shows numerous similarities in terms of the plot, characters, and length of narration. In both versions, Enrique set the scene for the complicating action/problem in his narrative in the first five lines. In both versions, he introduced his story by giving a brief summary of what happened to him, thereby, increasing and/or enhancing the tellability of the story. In both versions, Enrique told the same principal chain of events that gave way to this memorable, yet bad experience he had lived during his 30s: (1) being hit by a billiard stick, (2) drinking a beer at the bar, (3) not knowing the identity of the aggressor, and (4) believing that the blow to his head with a billiard stick was the result of being mistaken for someone else.

Additionally, in both versions, Enrique briefly spoke about the people who were at the bar where the incident happened (albeit, with better development in the second telling), and he established that he was a victim. Both times, he portrayed himself as playing the role of a powerless and passive figure who, when confronted with this act of aggression, decided to leave the place instead of confronting his aggressor. He maintained in both versions that the act of aggression against him was only a case of mistaken identity because he was not the type of person to look for conflict (line 61, version B). In fact, in the lines leading to this story Enrique described himself as “being a peaceful guy”, a description he used over five times during the course of this telling. This disclosure about his persona in the storyworld, thus, lent support to the fact that this act was not due to his own making or to some underlying racial tension and/or discrimination possibly existing in his community.

In terms of the narrative interview protocol/techniques used with this population, in both versions, as interviewer and interlocutor, I scaffolded the telling by supporting the telling
interactionally. That is, in the process of telling and retelling his stories, I repeated questions and statements when necessary, used indirect questions, echoed his utterances, requested extra information to prompt Enrique to go on in his telling, and/or clarify information given, made use of go aheads (i.e., mmh hmm) (see lines 3, 11, 25, 30, 33, 40, 44, 46 in Version A and lines 2, 21, 23, 25, 40, 42, 44, 49, 54, 56, 58 in Version B for examples of these different strategies) (Davis & Moore, 2003; Hydén & Örulv, 2009, 2010; L. A. Moore & Davis, 2002; Ramanathan-Ashott, 1994; Schiffrin, 1994). This support aided Enrique in his telling of his story.

In terms of the linguistic and conversational features that are the focus of these analyses, it is clear that in both versions Enrique used little character development (besides his own) and hardly used reported speech in the tellings. Although reported speech devices were minimal in his tellings, Enrique made use of other speaker roles, and he successfully told a story that presented a much younger, passive version of himself.

In terms of features observed in scholarship in the area of AD, narrative, and communicative decline reviewed above in chapter 1 (see Kempler, 1995; Kempler & Goral, 2008; Usita, Hyman, & Herman, 1998; Utalowska & Bond Chapman, 1990), it is clear that in both tellings Enrique displayed signs of communicative decline. For instance, he repeated information/clauses within the same telling (lines 34 and 36 in version A; lines 10-13, 26, and 33-34 in version B). He had difficulty retrieving lexical items (lines 12 and 34-36, version A; lines 15, 26, version B). He also had difficulty disclosing salient events in the tellings, which to a certain degree was overcome by the interviewer’s use of small questions (Hydén & Örulv, 2009). His story, moreover, included a digression from the main topic (seen in Version B, lines 35-39). Although the representation of this event in his life seemed somewhat unrelated to the main topic, it did not result in failure to tell his story. In contrast to what is typically discussed in this
body of literature, it is clear that Enrique’s narrative possessed the typical characteristics found in most retellings: revision of what had already been said, reorganization of previously given information, abbreviation of previously given information, and highlighting of more relevant parts of the story (Bamberg, 2008; Chafe, 1994, 1998; Koven, 2011; Norrick, 1997, 1998a, 1998b; Prior, 2011). These are further discussed below.

How are these two tellings different? One of the first differences is found in the plot of the English version and concerns the complicating action. He remembered that he had been punched, and immediately retracted that description to clarify that it had been a blow to the side of his body, not a punch. He then provided background information, such as the name of the bar where he received the blow to his head (Duke Academy, line 15) and the activities that people carried out there (play billiards for a dollar the hour, dice, etc., lines 23-27). After I echoed the information Enrique had just shared in line 25, he seemed to interpret my echoing as a request for clarification. He used this opportunity to share new information about his preferred games. Enrique promptly followed this disclosure by shifting roles from storyteller/narrator to interlocutor to verify whether he was fulfilling his ‘duties’ of telling a story of a bad life experience, to which the interviewer affirmed his narrative and asked for information and clarification about the story he chose to tell.

As Enrique continued his narration, I asked him to provide information about other characters in the story by asking him who was with at the time of the incident. This particular question, which served as a request for information, was not repeated in the same way in Version B. My intention was to prompt Enrique to further develop his story and share with me information about other characters in his story. Enrique, however, did not use this opportunity to develop his story further. Furthermore, this information was carefully bracketed by two “you
know” discourse markers which could be interpreted as Enrique checking-in with me to see whether I understood what he was telling me while ratifying to a certain degree some common ground or shared knowledge regarding the type of people found in a bar. This information is then followed by a sustainer (‘okay’, line 51) and request for information regarding the complicating action, to which Enrique responded “No idea” (line 52). In the second telling (Spanish version), however, the background information Enrique chose to share was minimal. He only chose to provide information about his location at the moment he received the blow to his head, using this opportunity to clarify that at the time of the incident, not only was he sitting (making him more vulnerable), but that he was having a glass of beer (as opposed to a pint or a pitcher). These lexical choices further positioned him in the role of a victim.

Another striking difference between these two narrations is found in lines 53 to 70 of Version A. In this segment of the narrative, Enrique used his ‘here-and-now’ voice to explain why he thought this incident occurred to him and to provide a motive and rationale behind the idea that a person’s identity can be mistaken with that of another one. An interesting feature of this particular segment was Enrique’s repeated use of the pronoun ‘you’ and the unspecific gender-neutral pronoun ‘someone’. It may be that via his choice of pronouns in this segment, he was attempting to save face as a result of socially constructed ideas of gender roles (i.e., a man revealing to a woman about ‘getting hit’ by someone else may be considered face threatening). He may also have been suggesting that the act of aggression could have happened to anyone, in which case, his choice of pronouns reflects his seeking empathy, understanding, and compassion for his lived situation (O’Connor, 1994). I discuss this further in the next subsection of this analysis.
Enrique’s unpacking and organization of the events is another difference between the first telling and this one. While in Version A, Enrique seemed to need more support in order to produce this particular narrative, in Version B, the opposite is true. Within the first 15 lines of the telling, Enrique unpacks the background/orientation of his story, the complicating action (being hit, line 7), and the evaluation of the story (staying hit because of not knowing identity of aggressor, lines 15-20). In doing so, Enrique’s retelling seemed to be more concise, direct, and better organized, thus not requiring as much narrative support to reproduce this story.

New information in the retelling is also evident in Version B. Enrique added details such as where he was hit (line 24), the intentionality of the aggressor (since the cue’s rubber handle could not slip out of someone’s hand easily; lines 28-32), and the manner in which the aggressor hit him (line 43). He also revealed that, although he looked to see who hit him (and even asked people around him about the incident, lines 46-48 and 51-53), he did not see the person (lines 15, 16-18). This is then followed by the evaluative comment, “Y me quedé dao” (“And I stayed hit”, line 19), later repeated in a more regretful manner in lines 26, 33 as seen with the addition of an epistemic hedging device (“Pero parece” / “but it seems”, line 26, 33) and an additional evaluative comment (“porque no sé” / “because I don’t know”, line 34). These new details reveal that Enrique knew that this seemingly innocent mistake in identity was not truly ‘just’ a mistake. However, the regretful tone of these utterances conveyed a sense of resignation of Enrique’s here-and-now personae. Thus the course of events, although regretful, could not be changed.

The segment discussed above yields yet another difference. In lines 35-39, Enrique digressed, if only for a moment, to point out that he had stopped drinking and smoking a long time ago (~25 five years, line 38). This particular shift or interference in this story has some
relevance in the larger story. In the tradition of narrative analysis, these additional details can be viewed as a conflation of a ‘small story’ (Bamberg & Georgakopoulou, 2008) within the framework of another ‘smaller’ story. While it demonstrated dysfluency from the perspective of a cognitively healthy speaker, Enrique used the digression in his story as a means to place distance between the then-and-there storyworld and the here-and-now time. His digression in the narrative will be further discussed in the next section of this analysis.

The presentation and voicing of other characters in the storyworld is one of the last differences between these two versions. As previously mentioned, in the first version of this story (English) Enrique hardly spoke about other people at the bar and did not perform the voices of others or himself. In the second version (Spanish) and at the request of the interviewer, not only did Enrique perform the voices of the people at the bar stating “No, nosotros no vimos nada” [“No, we didn’t see anything”, (lines 48 and 53)], but also he portrayed them as accomplices when he stated that “tal vez lo negó” [“maybe they denied it” (line 50)].

In sum, these discrepancies found in Enrique’s two tellings of the ‘same’ story lend support to Chafe’s argument that “when remembering is thus aided by rehearsal, events that are repeatedly refreshed can be more richly experienced” (1994, p. 203). When stories are repeated, discrepancies between these two versions of the ‘same’ story emerge as a result of the speaker’s necessity or desire to reshape and reorganize what had already been said (Ervin-Tripp & Küntay, 1997; Norrick, 1997, 1998a, 1998b). In yet other instances, if stories have been previously shared with the same audience members, these will not require an unpacking of corollary information (Chafe, 1994, 1998). Instead of repeating the ‘same’ given information a second time, a speaker can opt to reveal new information (Chafe, 1994), abbreviate parts to make others
more relevant (Bamberg, 2008), or foster more rapport from the audience member (Norrick, 1998a).

In the case of stories repeated by persons diagnosed with early or mild stages of AD, repetition could be due to the loss of memory associated with the disease. As mentioned in Chapter 3 of this study, perseveration, or repetition, is common and more acute in moderate stages. However, Enrique’s twice-told tales did not present the type of perseveration typically observed in people diagnosed with DAT (i.e., repetition of ephemeral utterances, and repetition of chunks of discourse, among others, without the appropriate stimulus or context). In fact, his repetitions and the discrepancies found in his twice-told tales seem to be no different from those found in cognitively healthy older adults. Although in certain instances in his storytelling Enrique had difficulty communicating his life story accurately (as seen more markedly in his difficulty sharing more salient details in his story and the repetition of certain utterances within the stories themselves), Enrique demonstrated his ability to tell and retell a story. The fact that he opted to leave out background information in the second telling demonstrates that he possessed the crucial narrative form observed in repeated and twice-told tellings. His reshaping/revising of his narrative (as seen in his more detailed description of the cue’s rubber handle, lines 28-32) called into question being hit accidentally in the bar. More importantly, Enrique’s retelling seemed richer and livelier than the first telling, which is consistent with some of the findings described in the previous chapter. All of these points clearly demonstrate that Enrique not only could retell his story as would a cognitively healthy person (thus demonstrating his versatility as a good storyteller), but that in the process of retelling his stories he could reenact and reinterpret the events differently while still communicating and negotiating his own and others’ sense of self.
Redefining the How: Shifting from Reported Speech to Speaker Roles, Repetitions, and Interactional Scaffolding

Unlike the findings presented for each of the cognitively healthy participants in the previous chapter regarding reported speech, the findings that are demonstrated below necessitate a redefinition of how Enrique communicated a sense of self in his narrative. It is clear that there was little use of reported speech in his telling and retelling. In fact, when looking carefully at the frequency of Enrique’s reported speech in ‘Mistaken Identity’, reported speech was not of importance in the telling and retelling as seen below.

Table 6.2. Frequency of Direct vs. Indirect Reported Speech Use in ‘Mistaken Identity’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frequency per 1000 words

As this table shows, the frequency of reported speech in both tellings is extremely low when compared to the frequencies seen in the previous chapter. The mode Enrique chose to use was that of direct reported speech, and only in the Spanish telling (Version B). He completely eschewed direct and indirect reported speech in English (Version A) and did not make use of any indirect speech in the Spanish version of his story. We might ask whether this rather low frequency is only apparent in this telling and retelling or a broadened phenomenon in Enrique’s narrative landscape. When his overall RS profile is taken into account, this rather low use of reported speech is also present and found across the narrative landscape of Enrique’s two interviews. The table below shows Enrique’s overall usage in both interviews.

Table 6.3. Overall Frequency of Direct vs. Indirect Reported Speech Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frequency per 1000 words
Both of these tables show that Enrique did not make much use of these devices in his narratives. In terms of language-based usage, it is clear that his use of reported speech (direct vs. indirect) is more prevalent in Spanish (Version B) than in English (Version B), with indirect speech slightly prevailing over direct speech. Interestingly, the frequency of indirect speech is higher in both languages than the frequency of direct speech, making indirect speech the dominant RS device in both languages. Unlike the findings demonstrated for the English telling in Table 6.2, the findings in Table 6.3 suggest that even though RS in English is present, it is still markedly lower than the usage seen in the Spanish telling.

Could these declines be due to his advancing cognitive decline as a result of DAT? Do these findings hamper his presentation of self and/or others? The data seems to suggest that these declines could indeed be the result of cognitive decline. However, the answer to this question has to be taken in light of the rest of the data, which will be presented in this chapter. Regarding the latter question, the declines do not hamper his presentation of self. As demonstrated above, Enrique effectively communicated not only his story, but could also reinterpret and reenact his story differently. These are clear indications that declining cognition resulting from DAT does not immediately result in deficit of self presentation.

Given the decrease in details and salient events found in his narrative (which may be due to memory deficits associated to the disease), it could be expected that the use of RS in Enrique’s narratives would decline. As previously stated, the decrease of RS in Enrique’s narratives, however, does not imply that presentation of self and/or others are not present in the stories that Enrique chose to tell. It would seem that Enrique used different strategies to communicate discursively his sense of self and of others in the storyworld. Similar to the findings presented in
the previous chapter, some of his self-presenting strategies are observable in the shift of speaker roles, such as narrator-interlocutor-character roles/voicing.

According to the literature on narrative and DAT, there have been other ways of presenting the self in narratives told by people with or without a diagnosis of AD. Self can be manifested through scaffolding support given to the storyteller\(^{52}\) and the act of repetition of utterances within the storyworld\(^{53}\). In terms of other communicative resources, grammatical structures (i.e., the shift and use of tenses, such as the historical present) can also reveal and manifest the self in that these reveal more involvement on behalf of the speaker. The historical present in the narrative, in particular, is a powerful linguistic feature found in narrative, among other genres, which serves the purpose of bringing forward a sense of immediacy to the narrated past (Chafe, 1980, 1994). Its use would indicate a higher involvement in the narrative, thus indicating a more marked here-and-now self presentation.

While the present analysis will include a closer look at Enrique’s presentation of self and the selves of others in his narrative through the use (or lack thereof) of RS and character voicing, the discussion will also touch upon other aspects of his narrative. In particular, I will examine (1) the use of interactional scaffolding, (2) the use of the historical present, and (3) the repetition of utterances in the narrative as other possible communicative resources to narrate the ‘self’. These will be presented as was previously done in Chapter 5 of this dissertation (i.e., Version A, Version B).

\(^{52}\) The act of scaffolding in narratives told by people with DAT is known as ‘vicarious storytelling’ (Hyden, 2008; Hydén & Örulv, 2010) or ‘quilting’ (Davis & Maclagan, 2014; Davis et al., 2014). Vicarious storytelling allows more information-seeking questions while ‘quilting’ is the process of repeating formulaic expressions that the PWD used in their stories at adequate times in the narrative.

\(^{53}\) Müller and Mok (2014) posit that the person with DAT makes use of repetition in discourse in order to track and rehearse information previously shared with them; via repetition they are in fact doing “active learning management and conversation-based rehearsal” (p. 81).
Version A

As noted above, in the first telling (English), Enrique did not make extensive use of reported speech. He reenacted his story mainly by using his voice as a narrator and interlocutor to tell his story and give life to the bad experience he lived during his early 30s. He started this narrative with an ‘Oh’-prefaced turn and the discourse marker ‘well’, indicating not only his here-and-now interlocutor presence but his epistemic authority over his narrative (Heritage, 2005). Through ‘Oh’ –prefaced turns, speakers interactionally communicate underlying cognitive processes, similar to how “ouch” is an outward expression of pain. In the case of “oh”, speakers not only express a change of cognitive state (i.e., not knowing → knowing), but also they convey ‘ownership’ of knowledge. ‘Oh’-prefaced turns, thus, establish that the speaker’s words have “epistemic supremacy in relation to other interactants” (2005, p. 196). That is, it is a way for speakers to ‘keep score’ on the rights and knowledge they have over particular facts. In the case of Enrique’s narrative, he established his rights to share and impart knowledge regarding his life story. Through his lexical choice, thus, Enrique portrayed himself as a capable storyteller, able to tell his story.

As his narrative continued, Enrique shifted to narrator voice to ‘tell’ his story about ‘getting punched’ (line 2). Within these next few lines of his narrative, Enrique positioned himself as a victim in his story given the fact that he was hit with a billiard stick. He then contrasted this role when he shifted to interlocutor voice. Through his voice as interlocutor, he clarified to the audience the information he had previously given in line 2 (“I got punched”). Through this shift, he reorganized the narrative around the action—that of being mistakenly hit by an unknown person for no good reason. This shift is not particularly self revealing, but when seen in light of what followed a few lines later when he said, “I remember that” (line 7), and later
on through repetition, “Because I remember I got hit on the side- sideways” (lines 9-10), these three instances of interlocutor voicing are quite powerful. At first glance, Enrique’s repeated use of “I remember” signals a moment of clarity in his narrative (Norrick, 2003, 2005, 2009). As Norrick notes, comments about a speaker’s positive memory (i.e., ‘I remember’ utterances) play various roles in narrative. These utterances can be used to preface a story, finish a story, justify the telling of a story, or transition from a general story to a particular event in the storyworld. In some instances, these utterances can be accompanied or followed closely by utterances of uncertainty (e.g., ‘I guess’, ‘I forget’ ‘I don’t know’), revealing a change in internal cognitive states (i.e., uncertainty \(\rightarrow\) certainty). In the case of the latter, transitions of this sort make a particular event in the storyworld particularly clear and authenticate the event(s), lending the story more credibility. In Enrique’s narrative, the use of ‘I remember’ in line 7 followed by an expression of forgetfulness in line 8 clearly demonstrates a change in internal cognitive state, where both clarity of memory and forgetfulness lend veracity to his story. He reiterated this in lines 9-10, yet at that moment, this reiteration seemed to give closure to his story.

Another possible interpretation of his repeated ‘I remember’ utterance is the following. According to the literature in pragmatics and discourse, people with early stage AD have been found to use formulaic phrases and comments about memory as a means to compensate for other communicative problems in talk or narrative (Davis & Guendouzi, 2013; Davis & Maclagan, 2009, 2014; Guendouzi & Müller, 2006; Ripich, Fritsch, Ziol, & Durand, 2000). Given these findings and in light of Enrique’s diagnosis of possible AD, he may have strategically employed repetition as a means to establish his communicative competence in this task and his positive face in light of his AD diagnosis. Moreover, the repetition of his words conveyed a powerful message that Enrique seemed to convey to his here-and-now self. That is, in the here-and-now
moment, he not only possessed the rights to his narrative, but through the act of ‘remembering’ he conveyed his ability and capability to tell and revise his story. These shifts reveal how Enrique saw himself here-and-now and how he wished to be seen by his audience. That is, he wished to be seen as a competent interlocutor who still possessed the ability to accurately remember the events in his life independently of his condition, diagnosis, and the larger discourse and culture behind the label of Alzheimer’s disease. Through his lexical choices, Enrique again portrayed himself as an active, in-charge person capable of revising his own story while simultaneously casting a net of innocence and empathy on his then-and-there personae.

Moving on in the narrative, Enrique continued playing the role of competent narrator and storyteller. When I asked him to elaborate on the complicating actions, he began to answer the question but soon switched the topic to reveal more background information about the place where the events happened, shifting into a more vulnerable narrator in the here-and-now context. I then used this opportunity to support his narrative’s new direction and asked an information-checking question (Schiffrin, 1994) (line 17) and then echoed Enrique’s utterances (lines 20 and 25). As Enrique continued his narrative, he moved from narrating background information to asking information-seeking question in lines 28-29 (presumably to check in with me) deviating from the narrative. This deviation could be interpreted as a means for Enrique to align his here-and-now personae with that of a ‘good’ and ‘competent’ storyteller or as a mechanism to save face since he had much difficulty thinking of a ‘bad personal experience’ prior to this narrative.

As he continued, his narrative remained somewhat fragmented, with some dysfluencies, pauses, and digressions, but he continued to sustain an innocent and victim-like sense of self. This innocent, nonconfrontational self portrayal in the storyworld was even more evident in the last twenty lines of the narrative. In this portion of his narrative, Enrique took the voice of
interlocutor (noted by shift to present tense) to evaluate why he received a blow to his side. By stating that he had ‘no idea’ (line 52) followed by a possible guess of the motive (as seen in line 53 and later restated with an extreme case formulation in line 70), Enrique bracketed out any ties to pre-existing racial tension that could have existed and any indication that this act was self-provoked. Instead, he continued bracketing in his innocence as seen in lines 53-56 while also distancing himself from committing that kind of mistake (i.e., by shifting to third-person singular ‘someone’ in lines 57-58 and later using deictics like ‘that person’ in line 59 while using ‘this person’ in line 61 to possibly make reference to himself).

Another shift observed in the last 17 lines of Enrique’s telling was the use of the historic present. As described by Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech, and Svartik (1985, p. 181), “The historic present describes the past as if it is happening now: it conveys something of the dramatic immediacy of an eye-witness account.” It would seem then that through this shift to present tense (in addition to the shift to second person pronoun ‘you’ in portions of this segment), Enrique relived this experience in the telling making it immediate, more tangible, more involved, and more vivid. This would suggest that at the time of the telling, Enrique’s here-and-now self was still consolidating this unresolved bad moment in his life.

**Version B**

In the second telling (Spanish), Enrique seemed more involved in his storytelling, incorporating some instances of RS and a more varied use of speaker roles to his narrative. The discussion of this particular subsection is divided into five parts corresponding to ‘natural’ topic shifts that occur in Enrique’s retelling as an effect of the interviewer’s information-seeking questions and/or pauses that occurred in the narrative. These are: (1) the restatement of the plot (lines 1-20); (2) the delivery of additional information regarding the cue used by the assailant in
As I noted in the discussion of ‘the what’ in the section above, Enrique’s story seemed to be more concise, direct, and better organized in this retelling, reflecting a more in-control, focused here-and-now personae. He unpacked and organized the events including the what, the how, the why, and the who in the first 10 lines of his narrative. The first glimpse of his self-presentation is evident in his immediate response to my question regarding the story. Enrique responded without hesitancy or qualification, “Oh el taco… el taco…” [“Oh the cue… the cue…” (line 2)], to my information-seeking question. Similar to the ‘oh’ prefaced lexical choice made in Version A of this story (line 31), Enrique again claimed his rightful control and knowledge of the information while portraying a more secure and cognitively stable storyteller.

As he continued his story, he took the role of narrator but shifted to interlocutor voicing in two instances (lines 5 and 14). In the first instance, he used this opportunity not only to clarify the previous utterance “…me estaba dando una cerveza” (“I was having a beer”; line 4), but also to downplay the quantity of beer he had and the action of having an inebriating beverage by stating that it was “un vaso…” (“a glass…,” line 5) instead of a pint or a pitcher. This also served to bracket out that at that then-and-there moment, he was not drunk. He was fully aware and was seemingly in possession of his senses—which further positioned him as a victim of someone else’s lack of judgment or cruelty. His shift also served as a means to establish rapport while establishing shared understanding about his unfortunate turn of events.

In the second section (i.e., description of the cue; lines 21-32), I posed a couple of information-seeking questions, which generated new information regarding the event. Unlike the
previous section, the majority of the utterances in these 11 lines were delivered in interlocutor voicing, with the exception of a few utterances delivered in narrator voicing. Of particular interest is Enrique’s disclosure of the apparent intentionality behind the blow to his side, which appears in lines 28-32. Through his careful description of the rubber on the handle of the stick (lines 29-32) and his claim that the rubber is there so that “…no le resbale”/ “…it won’t slip” (line 32), Enrique demonstrated to both me and perhaps to his here-and-now self that this event could not have been a mistake. In fact, the blow to Enrique’s face was a deliberate attempt to forcefully turn away a ‘then-and-there’ younger version of himself. Even though this action came as a surprise to him [as noted in his utterance “porque no sé” (“because I don’t know”; line 34)], Enrique seemed to make do with the fact that he stayed hit. He did not retaliate because he was certain that this was a case of mistaken identity because “[el] no buscaba problemas con nadie” (“[he] did not look for problems with anyone”, line 61).

In the third section, Enrique seemed to seek closure and shift in topic. This particular section, however, seemed to mark a ‘small story’ (à la Bamberg and Georgakopoulou, 2008) as he had not addressed his smoking and drinking previously. This small story can be interpreted in three different ways (and can better explain how and why this is relevant to the larger narrative). First, it would seem that this segment could be related to a larger, unspoken narrative regarding being Latino in the U.S., at a time when being an outsider, speaking with an accent, or not being the ‘right’ race could lead to discrimination, rejection, or worse, physical assault. Thus, perhaps this event (and other related/unspoken incidents like this one) led him to leave behind a life where smoking, drinking, and going to bars would have resulted in experiencing discrimination, rejection, physical assault, or being labeled as an ‘angry and violent’ Hispanic (therefore justifying any of the previous actions). Another possible interpretation is that Enrique used this
digression as a mechanism to save face and distance himself from that type of activity, playing down the gravity of this event in his life. A third interpretation of this digression is the need to justify his lack of knowledge about this face threatening event in light of the fact that it happened years ago or around the time he stopped drinking and smoking. In any event, any of these interpretations could be possible regardless of the many possibilities that can be stated. It signals a shift in Enrique’s narrative, which could be perceived as a means to distance himself from his past and give closure to his narrative.

The fourth section of this retelling is where Enrique developed the other characters involved in his story in greater detail, while using his narrator’s voice to represent his there-and-then voice. The development of others’ speech in this particular segment of the telling are in no doubt due to the interactional scaffolding support that I lent to Enrique. As a result of the questions that I asked him [e.g., “…no tuvo tiempo de hablar con-” and later “…no habló con nadie ni nadie se preocupó?” (“…you didn’t have time to talk to- …you didn’t talk with anyone and nobody was worried?”), lines 40 and 44], Enrique not only lent a voice to other characters in the storyworld, but also depicted the lack of empathy he felt when he received the blow to his head. Through the voicing of the ‘anonymous’ collective—an RS strategy known as choral dialogue (Tannen, 2007, pp. 114-115)—Enrique portrayed ‘those other people’ in various ways. At first, the ‘other people’ were portrayed as nonexistent, nonpersonas when he uttered “…yo pregunté pero no había nadie…” (“…I asked but there wasn’t anyone”, lines 46-47). Then they were portrayed as a collective colluding to hide the truth or unperceptive to the act of aggression when he quoted them saying twice “no, nosotros no vimos nada” (“no, we didn’t see anything” lines 48 and 53). Finally, they were portrayed as turning a blind eye to the acts when he stated “tal vez lo nego” (“Maybe they denied it”, line 50), further demonstrating that this was no
accident. These three descriptions of the people around him revealed (1) Enrique’s then-and-
there frustration at not being aided by others in a situation where he could have been seriously
injured (thus adding insult to injury) and (2) his here-and-now offense and possible indignation
at being ignored. The voice of the collective, in contrast, first cast as nonpersonas, was then
transformed to an anonymous collective in collusion with the aggressor and implicitly implicated
in his experience.

In the last section of his narrative, Enrique reiterated his evaluation of the events (i.e.,
that it was an error of identity, not an act of revenge, line 55) in his here-and-now voice by
latching on to the interviewer’s previous utterance [“qué piensa? que eso fue= … o sea que no
era una cuestión de=” (“what do you think? That that was=… so it wasn’t an act of=”), lines 54,
56]. In these two interrupted turns, Enrique’s completion of the utterance may be a way of
warding off the interviewer’s potential conclusion that his here-and-now self knew what was on
the mind of the interviewer (suggesting ‘shared knowledge’ of cultural/social scripted motives
behind acts of aggression). He again reiterated his innocence by restating that the act of
aggression was solely one of mistaken identity because he had not committed an act of physical
aggression (line 60) before then. This image of innocence and certainty was recasted in his then-
and-there voice through the repeated use of the modal ‘would’ (lines 62-69). The use of ‘would’
in his utterances not only marked his epistemic certainty of the events that occurred, but also
reiterated his then-and-there and here-and-now identity as a passive and peaceful person who
would rather walk away from acts of aggression than remain in their presence. By telling his
story and repeating his evaluative claims, Enrique not only made claims about his identity as a
‘peaceful guy’, both in his then-and-there and here-and-now voice, but also demonstrated his
serenity to accept and walk away from a situation which threatened his there-and-then life.
6.2.2 Speaker #2 – Lucy

When I first approached Lucy, she was very eager to participate and tell her stories. She seemed a happy-go-lucky woman who always had a happy disposition, but she had memory problems. She expressed that she knew she had trouble with her memory, but it wasn’t until her leaving a stove on causing a fire in her apartment, that her family noticed she was having problems with her memory. Because she was in moderate stages of the disease and did not have the ability to complete the brief assessment about the study during our first encounter, I contacted her son and to receive his consent before she commenced the study. Although she scored 15 on the MMSE, she seemed relatively independent as she lived by herself in an older adult housing building, and was able to carry out daily tasks. This low score could have been the result of low literacy.

At the time the study took place, she was living in a subsidized older adult residential high rise which was in a mostly Latino neighborhood where Spanish was spoken regularly in the surrounding community. She explained that although she understood English, she had difficulty speaking it. She mostly spoke Spanish on a daily basis with the other residents in her building and with her grown children, who mostly spoke English. The exception was when she had to speak to the nurse who provided medical assistance to the senior center in her building. During these bimonthly visits, she spoke some English.

In each interview, Lucy spoke over an hour, telling a total of 14 stories during the first narrative interview and retelling ten of these stories in the third interview. Similar to Enrique, Lucy was asked to talk about the different stages of her life (20s, 30s, 40s, etc.) as well as about bad life experiences. This helped her recollect more life experiences and stories. Although her stories lacked concrete details, she had much to say about her life and interspersed her
storytelling with many pieces of advice. Unlike the other participants interviewed for this study, Lucy had difficulty using English to retell her stories. Her stories, hence, were retold in Spanish during the English interview, with some English interspersed randomly in her stories. Even though she did not have the ability to fully retell her stories in English, the interview was solely conducted in English, with all questions, comments, and backchannelling done in that target language.

As a brief summary, in the following excerpt Lucy tells a story of when she started to learn English while living in Miami and working as a nanny/housekeeper. She recalled that when she first started working as a nanny/housekeeper in Miami, she knew very little English and had difficulty communicating with the parents of the family she worked for. This led her to recall another story related to her difficulty learning English. In this telling, Lucy recalled a day when she was taking care of the family’s young children in the house where she worked. Through a series of communicative mistakes and misspoken words, Lucy informed the mother of the children that they had been sleeping all day and, at that point in the storyworld, had not awakened yet. Lucy then recalled the panic that ensued nearly causing the mother of the children a nervous fit. Lucy’s friend then came to her aid and acted as her interpreter, clarifying the report Lucy had previously given the girls’ mother. Lucy’s story ended on a positive note, as noted by her laughter towards the end of her narrative and her comment on all turning out okay in the end.

Lucy’s initial telling of this story (“Communication Failure”) was first told in Spanish, and although she retold the story in Spanish (not in English, as was requested of her), she retold some clauses in English while I carried out the interview in English.
## Excerpt 6.2: Lucy’s Two Tellings of the Same Story

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Telling (Version B)</th>
<th>Spanish Telling (Version A)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. I:</strong> and you told me uh of a story that once happened to you when you were in Miami and you were sleeping the girls that you took care of. You were- you- sa- you- you were gonna tell the g- the lady of the house that the girls were sl-</td>
<td><strong>1. I:</strong> Okay doña Lucy, ‘tonces le voy a preguntar. Este me dijo que tenía 28 años cuando empezó a aprender espa- el- el inglés y lo estaba aprendiendo acá cuando vino a Miami-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. oh cuando p- eso fue a principios que yo fui. oh when p- that was that I went</td>
<td><strong>I:</strong> Okay Mrs. Lucy, so then I am going to ask. uh you told me that you were 28 years old when you started learning spa- English and you were learning here when you came to Miami</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Como yo no sabia inglés</strong></td>
<td>2. Si a cuidar las niñas <strong>Yes to take care of children</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. pues yo tenia que cuidar las niñas</strong></td>
<td>3. ahí tuve que (.) <strong>there I had to (.)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Entonces pues ella me preguntaba por las tardes cuando llegaban,</strong></td>
<td><strong>4. porque n- sabia palabritas asi because n- I knew words here and there</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>So then she would ask me in the afternoons when they would get home</strong></td>
<td><strong>5. pero no sabia hablar mucho.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. ”what did they do?”</strong></td>
<td><strong>but I didn’t know how to speak much</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>”what did they do?”</strong></td>
<td><strong>6. Pero aprendi</strong> <strong>But I learned</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>You know,</strong></td>
<td><strong>I: And how did you learn it? With the girls?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8. cómo se portaron</strong></td>
<td><strong>8. Sí. Hablan-</strong> <strong>Yes. Talkin-</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>how did they behave</td>
<td><strong>9. tenia que oir la señora lo que me decia; I had to listen to what the lady would tell me</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9. y yo pueh una vez le queria decir and so one time I wanted to tell her</strong></td>
<td><strong>10. Porque ella me tenia que explicar que era lo que- (.)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>and so one time I wanted to tell her</strong></td>
<td>Because she had to explain to me what it was that-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10. que qued- la habia puesto a dormir that they- I had put them to sleep</strong></td>
<td><strong>11. Una vez- deja ver si me recuerdo de ese cuento. one time- let me see if I remember that story</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11. desde las- como desde las doce y que a las tres de la tarde aun no habian despertao.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>from- from like noon and that at three in the afternoon they still had not woken up.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12. Pero lo queria decir de por ejemplo (PHONE RINGS - break in narration)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>But I wanted to tell her for example (PHONE RINGS - Break in narration)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. I: so you were telling me the story about the time that you were trying to tell the mom that you put the girls to sleep. And it was they’ve been- that you were trying to tell her that they had been sleeping for a long time-

14. aha y me dejaron las niñas
Aha and they left the girls with me

15. I: so what happened

16. y entonces pues yo las acosté a dormir
and so then I put them to sleep

17. y les di la comida.
and I gave them food

18. Pero siguieron durmiendo bien tranquilit-.
But they kept sleeping real peacefully

19. Cuando la mama vino
When the mother came

20. ella quería saber que
she wanted to know what

21. y yo como no sabía inglés
and since I didn’t know English

22. le quería explicar (.)
I wanted to explain

23. yo le quería decir a ella-.
I wanted to tell her-

24. Como cuando nosotros decimos
Like when we say

25. “pues mira fulano vino aquí
“well look, what this name came here

26. y desde ese tiempo estuvo
and from that time he was here

27. y vino a irse”
and came to leave"

28. you know
you know

29. por ejemplo a decir
for example, to say

30. “y se fue”.

12. Una vez que me dejaron (.)
One time that they left me

13. Que estaba cuidando las niñas
that I was taking care of the girls

14. entonces durmieron tanto que cuando vino la señora
so then they slept so much that when the lady came

15. yo le quise decir desde cuando las niñas estaban durmiendo.
I wanted to tell her from what time the girls were sleeping

16. Y no le podía explicar.
And I could not explain

17. Y le dije(.)
And I said (.)

18. La cosa fue que yo le explique de una manera
The thing was that I explained it to her in a way

19. que esa señora se volvió loca
that that lady went crazy

20. y dijo
and said,

21. “Ay Dios Mío”
“Oh my God”

22. Porque yo ni sabía (.)
Because I didn’t even know

23. yo no sabía lo que era.
I didn’t know what it was

24. Pero buscaron la amiga mía
But they looked for my friend

25. y entonces ella le explicó
and then she explained to them

26. de que era lo que yo quería decir.
what it was that I wanted to say

27. Porque yo (laughs)
“and he left”

31. Pues yo quería decir
   So I wanted to say
32. que vino
   that he came
33. y cuando yo le dije
   and when I told her
34. “las niñas yo las puse a dormir
   “I put the girls to sleep
35. y vinieron a despertar ahora”.
   and they now came to wake up”
36. La señora se volvió loca.
   The lady went crazy
37. Le creía – ca que yo le di vino a lah mucha–
   She thought – th- that I had given the girls wine
   (laughs)
38. I: oh my goodness.
39. Porque yo no le sabía explicar.
   Because I didn’t know how to explain
40. Pero después todo estaba bien.
   But afterwards everything was fine.
41. I: and how did you explain it to her
42. tuve que buscar mi- mi amiga que era la que me
   I had to get my friend who was the one that had
   habia llevado allá.
   taken me there
43. y yo decir mi amiga
   and I tell my friend
44. que era lo que yo quería decirle.
   what it was that I wanted to say
45. Entonces le explico.
   And then she explained it to her (the lady)
46. Y entonces ella se reía.
   And then she was laughing
47. But she was scary.
   But she was scary.

Because I (laughs)
28. yo no sabia
   I didn’t know
29. le estaba explicando
   I was explaining
30. quería la-
   I wanted to-
31. quería decirle
   I wanted to tell her
32. pero no sabia lo que era.
   but I didn’t know how to say it
33. I: (Laughs) Wow
34. pero gracias a Dios
   But thank God
35. no se me hizo tan imposible la vida.
   life did not turn out so impossible
36. Ahí aprendí bastante
   I learned quite a bit there
48. I: Yeah?
49. Yeah. But she said,
   Yeah but she said,
50. “Oh my God!
   “Oh my God!”
51. “Me le dió bebida
   “she gave them some drink
52. y están durmiendo
   and they are sleeping
53. “eso es muy de” (laughs)
   that is very-” (laughs)
54. I: (laughs) oh my goodness
55. Pero yo pase tiempo bueno en Miami.
   But I had a good time in Miami
56. Ahí fue donde más trabaje.
   It was there where I worked the most
**Telling and the Retelling the Story: The What**

The story of Lucy’s “Communication Failure” shows many similarities in plot in both tellings, revealing Lucy’s control and stability as narrator and storyteller. In particular, Lucy told and retold the principal topic of her story: the problem of not being able to speak English while working for an English speaking family. This was followed by her report of the principal chain of events that lead the communicative breakdown. In both versions, Lucy revealed that the breakdown in communication happened while she was conveying some information to the mother of the children of the family she had been working for in Miami (subtopic). In both versions, she communicated the main plot lines of her story—the necessity to communicate adequately and accurately with her boss and the mother of the girls regarding the length of time the girls had napped. In both versions, her intent to communicate was to no avail, resulting in the mother’s bewildered reaction to the information Lucy had previously conveyed regarding the girls’ long nap. Finally, in both versions the actions narrated led to the necessity of having Lucy’s friend serve as interpreter/translator to clarify what Lucy had not been able to communicate clearly in English.

Additionally, in both tellings, Lucy performed the voice of the mother and her own there-and-then character while telling her story. She also introduced the character of the friend who served as an interpreter/translator for her and presumably the mother. Both times, she conveyed her communicative breakdown in a positive light, laughing off the miscommunication as a learner’s gaffe. In the end of both tellings, she evaluated her circumstances, concluding that it all ended well.

Differences between these two versions are also present. In terms of overall number of words, in the second version, it seemed that Lucy had more to say about the circumstances that
she lived through (169 words in Version A vs. 289 words in Version B)\(^{54}\). This is comparable to scholarship on repeated tellings in narrative work—the act of repeating serves the purpose of reorganizing, reshaping, reframing, and/or realigning a previously shared story. The increase in the number of words in her retelling demonstrates she had a more active role in narrating her story. It clearly shows, then, that discursive strategies that are found and used by cognitively healthy speakers are present and remain stable in Lucy’s speech in spite of her memory problems.

The background story that led up to the subtopic in Version A and the interruption in Version B are other differences in the two versions. The background story, shared in the first telling, was due to the questions I had previously asked her regarding her English language proficiency and acquisition. These series of questions resulted in Lucy’s narrative about how she learned English (lines 2-10), which triggered the memory that I discuss below. Once the subtopic of her story is revealed in Version A, Lucy immediately focused on the facts. In Version B, I did not ask her about the process of her English language acquisition; hence, Lucy did not share this information again. She went about telling her story until the phone rang, an environmental event (Mathieson & Barrie, 1998) triggering an interruption in Lucy’s narrative. While it may have derailed the first part of her interview, she regained control of her narrative once I reminded her about the topic of her retelling. Although this environmental event had an impact on the flow of the discourse (as she stopped to answer the telephone), she realigned herself to that then-and-there space, and we were eventually able to resume where we had left off.

\(^{54}\) The uptick in words in Version B was partly due to the interruption that took place soon after the interview had begun (line 12). When the number of words was counted (from line 14 to 23 which corresponds to the point in which we were interrupted up to the point where she had left off), only 46 additional words resulted from the interruption. Although the interruption resulted in a longer telling and the addition of information that she might not have otherwise disclosed, her retelling demonstrated other features that are typical of narrative retellings, as I demonstrate in this section.
The commentary on her memory or the ability to remember is another difference found between these two versions (line 11). A comment on one’s memory, such as the one Lucy uttered in Version A, could be seen as a marker of memory problems. However, linguistic displays of uncertainty are not unique to people who have reported memory problems or a possible diagnosis of DAT. They are quite common in cognitively healthy speakers, yet in the case of a cognitively healthy adult, the use of this expression may demarcate the necessity of being aided by a listener(s) (Goodwin, 1987), or the desire to maintain control of the floor in conversation with others (Norrick, 2003, 2005, 2009). The act of remembering can also be used as a marker in the discourse to signal to the listener the beginning or preface of a story (Norrick, 2001, 2005). In Lucy’s case, even though she disclosed her uncertainty about the act of remembering her story, which was genuine given her DAT diagnosis, she probably did not intend for this disclosure to serve as a request for help in remembering nor as a technique to keep hold of the conversational floor. Her disclaimer marked the beginning of a new story—a shift from supertopic to topic. Although she made this disclaimer prior to telling her story, she did not pause for an extended time, use circumlocution, nor make use of other formulaic expressions or fillers typically found in the speech of people with DAT. She continued with her story, revealing not only her ability to tell her story without scaffolding but her narrative expertise. In other words, she successfully and succinctly organized her story.

Her difficulty with lexical retrieval was another visible difference found in two versions. In Version A (lines 3 and 10), Lucy commenced an utterance and stopped abruptly—failing to complete the idea—leaving out some information (e.g., perhaps the tasks that the mother wanted

---

55 Due to the nature of our interviews, Lucy held the floor while telling her stories, with the exception of moments when I needed to scaffold her telling or ask small questions in order to aid her in the narrative process (à la Tannen’s co-construction of narrative). Because these stories were based on her life story (not general claims or shared knowledge), it would be unnecessary for her to ask for my co-participation in her tellings since she is the sole authority of these stories further demonstrating her capacity to access these memories.
Lucy to complete while she was out). In Version B, the tasks Lucy needed to do were never mentioned. Her difficulty with lexical retrieval is visible again in line 17 of this same version, where she intended to state what she presumably told her boss. However, instead of directly or indirectly quoting what her boss told her, she briefly paused and abandoned her intent at delivering the quotative. She compensated for this by delivering a report of that exchange along with its outcome. In Version B, Lucy not only quoted what she said to the mother in direct speech but previously provided a hypothetical quote to exemplify the type of information rendered. While Lucy’s abandoned utterance in Version A seemed marked in her narrative, these are commonly observed in the speech of persons with DAT (Davis & Guendouzi, 2013; Guendouzi & Müller, 2006; Müller, Guendouzi, & Wilson, 2008; Wray, 2013). However, she problem-solved her momentary lapse in the narrative by employing other modes of reported speech, as I discuss in the next section. This gave continuity to the narrative as well as offered a there-and-then evaluation of the verbal exchange she had difficulty delivering in the here-and-now context. Her lexical retrieval problem, while leaving out salient information from this part of the narrative, did not detract her from the act of continuing with her story.

Along with the difficulty with lexical retrieval seen in this version, Lucy also relied heavily on repetition and the production of formulaic language or “frozen phrases” (Davis & Moore, 2003). This can be seen in lines 22, 23, 27, 28, and 30-32 of Version A. Much like her difficulty with lexical retrieval discussed above, each time Lucy would commence certain utterances, she would stop abruptly, failing to complete the ideas as well as failing to reveal the underlying concern she had at that then-and-there time—that of not being able to communicate effectively with her boss in English. In lines 22-23 and again in lines 27-28 and 32, Lucy repeated the utterance “porque yo no sabía- yo no sabía lo que era” (“because I didn’t know- I
didn’t know what it was”), a formulaic expression in Lucy’s discourse. Left out of these utterances is Lucy’s frustration with her inability to possibly say “I didn’t know how to explain myself.” According to scholarship in the area of discourse and DAT, Lucy’s difficulty in producing these utterances is possibly due to cognitive overload or lost access to lexicon. As I will discuss later, she uses other compensation strategies available in her semiotic toolbox, allowing her to patch up her telling. Nevertheless, she worked with what she could access and produce at that time, successfully telling her story. Even though this may have seemed face threatening for her, she maintained a positive and cheerful disposition as can be observed in her laughter while telling me about her very tangible moment of tension as an employee with very limited knowledge of English.

In Version B, instances of abandoned utterances and difficulty with lexical retrieval are not as prominent. On the contrary, in Lucy’s retelling, the act of performing what she said, what her boss said, and what she wanted to communicate was effortless and hardly required scaffolding or support from me. This contrasted starkly with her previous version, and even more so between herself and Enrique—as Enrique’s tellings required more scaffolding support overall. It would seem, then, that in the retelling of her story she not only strengthened her performance and ability to reorganize, abbreviate, highlight, and add to what she had already said but also had better access to these long-term memories in the retelling, thus enhancing the narrative and her position as a capable storyteller.

If lexical retrieval difficulties and repetition seemed overwhelming in Version A, the dearth of RS was also noticeable. In Version A, Lucy limited her use of reported speech to deliver directly the voice of a concerned mother. Other exchanges in the narrative, however, are not delivered using direct speech. They are delivered in modes of RS closer to the narrator’s
voice (i.e., narrator’s representation of voice and internal narration, a subset mode of reported thought, discussed below). In Version B, Lucy not only delivers and further develops the mother’s voice, but she quotes herself as well as employs hypothetical speech. These differences (further discussed in the next section) are a testament to Lucy’s ability to access and retell her own story, and with it, the ability to reorganize, abbreviate, highlight, and/or add to what had already been said—all features typically observed in narrative retellings. They also reveal her positivity and resilient persona regardless of her inability to communicate in another language in a situation as precarious as working with children.

**Redefining the How: Other Modes of Reported Speech and Repetition**

Just by glancing over Lucy’s two tellings of the ‘same’ story, it is clear that she made some use of direct and indirect reported speech, although less so in the first telling. Because she uses less reported speech, the findings below focus on what use she did make of reported speech as well as her use of other modes of RS, reported thought, and repetition. Below, I show Lucy’s overall usage of reported speech in her first and second telling of the ‘same’ story (Table 6.4). Because she predominantly used Spanish in both tellings, I present the frequencies in terms of first and second telling instead of organizing these by language. However, each interview was conducted in one of her two languages (i.e., Spanish and English, accordingly). As can be seen in the excerpt, at times she would code switch to English to enact the voices of others or to utter discourse markers commonly used in English (e.g., ‘you know’). Her ability to code switch during her twice-told stories demonstrates that even though she had claimed to forget most of her English, she continued having access to expressions that are formulaic, a phenomenon commonly found in the speech of persons with DAT (Davis & Maclagan, 2014).
Table 6.4. Frequency of Direct vs. Indirect Reported Speech in “Communication Failure”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Telling</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Telling</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frequency per 1000 words

Table 6.4 demonstrates that the amount of reported speech in each telling varies. Like Enrique, Lucy did not employ indirect RS to report her or others’ speech. Nevertheless, Lucy used more direct RS overall, with the first telling demonstrating very little use of direct speech (much like Enrique’s first telling) and the second telling incrementing its use by four times as much as that of the first telling. The frequencies of direct speech shown here clearly demonstrate Lucy’s increased engagement and involvement in performing her voice and that of other characters in the retelling, a feature found in retellings. Through her quotations, she offers a direct experience of other characters’ reactions/stances as well as a direct experience of her predicament, marking her retelling as more engrossed.

Now, are these frequencies of reported speech sustained throughout her overall narrative landscape? When her overall RS profile is taken into account, Lucy’s retelling did not seem as vivid and animated as it did in the excerpt chosen for analysis. The table below shows Lucy’s overall usage in both interviews.

Table 6.5. Overall Frequency of Direct vs. Indirect Reported Speech Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Telling</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Telling</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frequency per 1000 words

Not only does her RS profile in the first telling increase, but also her RS profile in the retelling seems to decline in comparison to the excerpt shown above. Unlike Enrique, Lucy used more direct RS than indirect RS in both tellings. Even though RS is present in her overall profile, the frequencies for both the excerpt and the overall interviews are rather low. As was observed in
the data presented for Enrique’s two excerpts, the above data seem to indicate that with the presence of cognitive decline, the use of RS as a narrative device decreases.

Do the data hold the same implication for the presentation of self? Similar to Enrique’s findings, the data presented above do not imply that lower RS frequencies result in decrease in the presentation of self and/or others. As has been demonstrated in the sections above, Lucy continued to display her sense of self in her twice-told story. She voiced herself as a character in her story as well as lent a voice to the character of the mother of the girls. Moreover, other strategies to communicate a clear sense of self are evident. Repetition helps persons with DAT rehearse what they had previously heard, giving them time to plan the next part of an utterance (Davis & Maclagan, 2014). These devices and strategies are discussed in more detail below.

**Version A**

Before discussing the ways Lucy presented her sense of self and that of others in Version A, I briefly explain the organization of this section. Given the manner in which Lucy’s story emerged (i.e., from the language questionnaire section of her interview), I divided the discussion into three parts. First, I discuss other modes of RS found in Lucy’s story along with their frequencies. Then, I discuss the background that frames the actual story, focusing on how she initially presents herself via her qualifications of her spoken English and the learning process that took place in her workplace (lines 2-10). Lastly, I discuss the story she offered as an example of one particular time where her problem with not knowing ‘much English’ led to a major miscommunication episode resulting in a particularly stressful and eventful experience (lines 12-36).

Looking back at the frequencies noted in Table 6.4, it is apparent that both the indirect as well as the direct modes of RS prove to be challenging for Lucy. She told most of her story from
the viewpoint of the narrator, with very few shifts to interlocutor or character voicing. When she made use of direct speech, she chose to enact the voice of concern of the mother half way into her story. Although the task of performing the voice of self and others proved to be challenging for her, she compensated by using other strategies that were available in her semiotic toolbox. For instance, she made use of other modes of RS: narrator’s representation of voice and internal narration (Semino & Short, 2004), a subcategory of thought presentation which encompasses the presentation of either internal or inferred emotional and cognitive processes in narrator voice that have no propositional content or no actual quoted words uttered by the speaker (e.g., ‘The man was grief-stricken by the news’). Table 6.6 demonstrates the frequencies in which these two modes were used in her telling.

Table 6.6 Other Modes of RS in Lucy’s First Telling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Narrator’s representation of voice</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal narration</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frequency per 1000 words

As was discussed in Chapter 3, the use of narrator’s representation of voice has the function of reporting verbal activity without the disclosure of any anterior discourse or speech act\(^{56}\). Internal narration, a subset category of reported thought\(^{57}\), refers to “the presentation of mental states and changes which involve cognitive and affective phenomena but which do not amount to specific thoughts… let alone any propositional content or wording that might have formed in the relevant person’s mind” (Semino & Short, 2004, pp. 132-133). Although these devices reflect high narrator presence as well as seldom show character involvement, these can

---

\(^{56}\) Any clause containing verbs revealing talk (i.e., ‘talk’, ‘explain’, ‘tell’, etc.) were coded as an instance of narrator’s representation of voice. For instance, a clause such as “…yo le expliqué” (“I explained it”; line 16) was coded as an instance of NV in her speech.

\(^{57}\) Because of the distance internal narration has to the different modes of reported speech and the relative infrequent occurrence of it in narrative (Chafe, 1994; Haakana, 2007; Vásquez & Urzúa, 2009), I chose not to include it (or its parent form, reported thought) in Chapter 3. However, see Semino & Short (2004), Chapter 6, for a thorough discussion of thought presentation in speech and writing.
produce a variety of different effects in the context. For instance, the use of these modes can achieve an economical rendition of the events. Given Lucy’s difficulty with lexical retrieval, these would afford her the ability to complete her story. They also demonstrate what communicative repertoire is still preserved in Lucy’s speech, as I present below.

The first segment of Lucy’s story (lines 2-10) served to (1) answer my initial question regarding her language acquisition and (2) segue into the telling of a story about a stressful experience during the time that she could not say more than a handful of words in English. In these first lines of her narrative, she conveyed a change in her communicative repertoire—from knowing some words in English to not really knowing as she revealed that these were not enough to engage in actual communication with others. Lines 4-6 then establish the premise of the story she would later give—that of not really possessing the ability to communicate clearly and effectively with others, but eventually gaining enough competence to overcome the language barrier. That is, at first she presented her knowledge in a positive manner (line 4) but then she backtracked her claim, confessing that she really did not know much (line 5). She immediately countered this portrayal, demonstrating that in the end, she overcame her obstacle.

As she continued her narrative, her voice as a narrator is evident until lines 9-10 when she first represented the voice of the mother through narrator’s representation of voice. The representation of the mother’s actual words (i.e., the propositional content) is absent, but it could be assumed that the actions that would take place often during Lucy’s time there were related to general norms and rules related to housekeeping. One could assume that her continued exposure to English in her work environment would eventually lead her to an increased competence in the language.
In the second segment of the story (lines 12-36), Lucy segued into her story—one in which she had the intention of not only demonstrating her claim of not knowing ‘how to speak much English’ but also sorting out the confusion she created at that then-and-there moment. As she told her story, she delivered her story using narrator role as well as narrator’s representation of voice, direct speech, and internal narration. This allowed her to move the story along, while recognizing some exchanges that were not verbalized directly in the telling, but took place between Lucy and the mother, and later Lucy, her friend, and the mother. Through narrator’s representation of voice, she revealed her repeated, yet failed intents at communicating with the mother (lines 27-32). Her repeated attempts to tell the mother about the girls’ recreated the sensation of confusion in the there-and-then context, while transmitting humor in the here-and-now context. The latter is more tangible in her laughter in line 27, a technique for inviting laughter (Jefferson, 1979), which I later accept by laughing later in the telling (line 33). The repeated utterances found in these lines (lines 22-23, 28, 30-32) constitute what is known as hypothetical discourse. That is, discourse that “may be true in a present or future world, or could have been true in a past world given certain conditions” (Silva-Corvalan, 2014, p. 87). In effect, Lucy’s intent at telling the mother about the girls’ long nap (lines 14-15) may have occurred in the ‘actual’ then-and-there world or in an ‘intention world’—a possible world outlined by a speaker’s “plans for future action...” (Semino, Short, & Wynne, 1999, p. 319) yet it is not very clear as Lucy contradicted herself when she uttered in narrator’s voice “y no le podí explicar” (‘and I could not explain it to her’, line 16) followed by “y le dije” (‘and I told her’, line 17). Lucy’s utterance, thus, indicated that her intention may have been realized in the ‘actual’ or ‘real’ world—and its result was discourse which did not deliver the message she had intended. In
her ‘intentions world’, her utterance could have been effectively uttered, yet in the real world, it was not as she did not possess the language to do so.

As she continued telling her story, it was noticeable that Lucy attempted to make her story more effective (given Lucy’s difficulty with lexical retrieval in the here-and-now context and her there-and-then difficulty with the language). She compensated by using different modes of speech throughout the rest of her telling, and at times, with one following the other. She embedded internal narration in an instance of narrator’s representation of voice, reporting the state of confusion her ‘intent’ created while explaining the mother’s mental state—‘going crazy’. She then employed direct speech (line 19) to achieve an instance of dramatic effect in her story, short lived given that she quickly reverted to narrator role. However, the rhetorical move from proposition-less utterances to direct speech to describe a mental state and demonstrate it created a greater dramatic effect in her telling, especially after many attempts to communicate.

Embedded in these shifts is Lucy’s portrayal of the mother. First, she presented her as ‘going crazy’, an emotionally intense word (and marked register) affectively communicating how justifiably upset the mother was. This shifted to a concerned and worried mother, who is given the ‘authority’ to talk in the telling as she is quoted saying “Ay Dios mío!” (‘Oh my God’; line 21). Finally, she presents the mother as assertive and in control when she (and another unnamed character) looked for Lucy’s friend—an unnamed and unvoiced character in the there-and-then storyworld serving as the interpreter/translator of the story. This friend not only helped clarify the mix-up, but also she helped redeem the trust Lucy temporarily lost in this ordeal. Meanwhile, Lucy came across as incompetent and possibly untrustworthy in the mind of the mother. Furthermore, in the there-and-then context, she displayed a dependent persona unable to communicate, and later requiring the assistance of others to sort out the confusion she created.
This supported her initial evaluation of herself at the beginning of the narrative—she was no expert in English. In the end, Lucy closed off the narrative, demonstrating that all ended well as she learned ‘quite a bit’.

The first telling then is a tale of redemption on two planes. In the there-and-then story space, her ability to take care of the girls is implicitly questioned but then redeemed once her friend clarified the misunderstanding to the mother, who presumably allowed Lucy to not only keep her job but also continue taking care of the girls. Likewise, in the here-and-now storytelling space, the missing salient information, her difficulty with lexical retrieval, and her repetition of utterances may lead one to question her ability to tell her story. Nevertheless, she eventually redeemed herself as a capable and competent storyteller, delivering a story worth sharing while presenting herself in a more positive light as well as demonstrating her resilience when she stated—“no se me hizo tan imposible la vida” (‘life did not turn out that impossible’; line 35), an evaluation demonstrating her spirit and positive outlook on life. Furthermore, her experience, among many other communicative mishaps she may have encountered at the onset of her job, probably afforded her a better grasp of the language, further justifying her evaluation at the end of her story—“Ahí aprendí bastante” (‘I learned quite a bit there’; line 36).

**Version B**

In the second telling, Lucy used more instances of direct and indirect reported speech, seeming more engrossed in the process of retelling her story. She incarnated her voice as a character, the voice of the mother of the children, and the hypothetical voice of a collective. As in the previous version, she made use of narrator’s representation of voice to represent the voice of the friend who comes to her aid, and sprinkled in some internal narration to the retelling. Her use of the different devices and discursive strategies while retelling her story contributed to this
enhanced and more vivid version of her story, as I will demonstrate. I divided the discussion into four segments: (1) the uses of other modes of RS found in Lucy’s retelling, along with their frequencies; (2) the narrative section prior to the interruption (lines 1-12); (3) the narrative section post interruption (lines 13-40); and (4) the scaffolding section post coda (41-56). Table 6.7 shows the frequency of other modes of speech/thought found in Lucy’s retelling.

Table 6.7 Other Modes of RS/Thought in Lucy’s Second Telling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Narrator’s representation of voice</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal narration</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reported indirect thought</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothetical direct speech</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothetical indirect speech</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frequency per 1000 words

Table 6.7 demonstrates Lucy’s creative use of other modes of reported speech/thought in her discourse, making her retelling stand out when compared to other participants’ tellings. Her use of different hypothetical modes of speech, or what Semino, Short, and Wynne (1999) define as “projections in the minds of participants in the narrative…or in the minds of narrators” (p. 316), allow her to present an image of more confidence or certainty in what she narrated. Her use of reported thought, or “something that was not said in the reported conversation…but only in their [the speaker’s] mind” (italics in original; Haakana, 2007, p. 153) allowed her to assess (and evaluate) the mother’s own assessment of Lucy’s behavior. Lastly, her use of direct/indirect modes of reported speech made her telling seem more active. While these different discursive strategies are not distributed evenly across her tellings, her varied use of these made her retelling seem more captivating and vivid.

In the first part of the retelling, her narrative began with an ‘Oh’-prefaced turn. Much like Enrique’s tellings, the use of the lexical particle ‘oh’ indicated her here-and-now interlocutor presence as well as her epistemic authority over the narrative (Heritage, 2005). It also
demonstrated that she understood my request and responded by claiming control and knowledge of the information, while being afforded her the opportunity to portray a more secure and cognitively stable storyteller. Her narrator voice was also present in these first few lines, commenting on her lack of English and her daily routine. She immediately switched to her character role, enacting the routine questions the mother would ask Lucy. Although she had begun the retelling in Spanish, she chose to perform the mother’s voice in English (line 6)—providing a direct experience of that exchange and possibly portraying the mother as a kind of socio-culturally locatable persona. She then switched to Spanish to continue her enactment of the mother’s voice (line 8). Bracketed around the two quotes she enacted was the discourse marker “you know”, possibly to check-in with me or ratify shared knowledge regarding the type of habitual questions parents asked child caregivers upon returning home. After she switched to Spanish to enact the remainder of the ‘typical’ information-seeking questions the mother would ask, Lucy again switched to narrator voice, this time using indirect hypothetical speech to again represent her intention world during that ‘one time’ she wanted to answer her employer’s questions but could not. The first part then came to a stopping point when the phone call interrupted the flow of the narrative.

After the interruption, Lucy again took on the role of narrator, this time providing more details of the events that took place in the there-and-then context. Once she was able to re-quilt the narrative to the point where she had left off, she then delivered a hypothetical reported speech utterance using the personal pronoun ‘we’ in the reporting utterance as well as a present tense reporting verb (line 24). While this particular reported utterance seemed fragmented when compared to the rest of her narrative, she could have been trying to create more involvement in

---

58 Although it was explicitly stated that interruptions should be kept to a minimum during the interview process, in Lucy’s case, an exception was made because she not only lived alone, but had difficulty remembering when her adult children would call.
her retelling. She could have also been establishing a link between the length of time the girls slept and the length of time a hypothetical visitor stayed in the home before leaving. Although neither of these are clear, her use of ‘nosotros’ (we) suggests that she was establishing and confirming common ground or shared knowledge regarding the lexical choices she made in the reported utterance (lines 25-27), while the employment of the present tense ‘decimos’ (say), rather than ‘said’, suggests a factuality or habitualness embedded in the utterance. Moreover, the fact that she chose ‘nosotros decimos’ (‘we say’) to frame her reported speech gave more leverage to the hypothetical utterance that followed in lines 25-27. That is, her reported utterance was not just something she would say, but something that an inclusive collective would say. In essence, the hypothetical report that followed then served to index words that are not only found in some other ‘possible’ world, but in a ‘possible’ world where the speaker and audience had shared membership. This is further evidenced by her immediate use of ‘you know’ (line 28), a discourse marker also establishing a degree of common ground or shared knowledge regarding the previous utterance. In lines 29-30, Lucy again made use of hypothetical speech as can be observed in her reporting utterance (‘por ejemplo a decir’/ for example to say, line 29), and the reported utterance itself (‘y se fue’/ and he left, line 30). These examples of hypothetical speech, although seeming fragmented, ‘modeled’ a possible response that could be given to a hypothetical other. According to Myers (1999), when speakers model a possible response, they “suggest an orientation or a way of responding without actually giving the content of the response” (p. 580). Hence, the lack of content in Lucy’s expressions as evinced in her use of the nondescript noun ‘fulano’, followed by deictic expression ‘ese tiempo’ (that time) could have

---

59 This particular report made her retelling seemed fragmented given that the report did not add information related to the amount of time the girls had slept. Furthermore, she had not spoken about any other characters in the storyworld being present or visiting the home. However, it is an attempt to model RS in the narrative, perhaps even a mechanism for coping with lexical retrieval difficulty.
been substituted with actual content, but were not. By using hypothetical reported speech in her utterances, she moved the narrative along as well as performed what she would have said—however fragmented it may have seemed in the here-and-now context.

As she continued her retelling, she quoted herself telling the mother in a very matter-of-fact manner about the girls’ long nap. Lucy’s matter-of-fact quotation contrasted with the internal narrative describing the mother’s reaction and mental state in line 36. Lucy then switched to reported indirect thought (line 37), revealing what the mother might have been thinking at that there-and-then moment that she had given the girls alcohol, thus the girls slept more than what they would normally have. According to Haakana (2007), reported thought, usually preceded by an instance of direct reported speech, allows speakers to give a multilayered picture of the events that are being narrated. Through it, speakers can provide information about what was happening at the surface level of that there-and-then interaction as well as reveal what was happening below the surface level of the interaction. Reported thought thus allows speakers to reveal the underlying or internal perceptions and evaluations they had at that there-and-then moment without actually verbalizing these in the there-and-then interaction—a silent response or inference to a given there-and-then turn-at-talk. In Lucy’s retelling, she used reported thought to embed an evaluation of her own then-and-there persona. The instance of reported thought delivered through the voice of the mother revealed Lucy’s problem with speaking English as well as justified the mother’s then-and-there bewildered reaction to Lucy’s direct quote in lines 34-35. Underlying as well is the impression the mother might have had of Lucy. That is, of a young woman somewhat under-qualified for the job, who perhaps also lacked the experience and the know-how required for taking care of young children. This utterance was then followed by laughter, which acts as an invitation to laugh as well as a mechanism to close or
end a narrative topic (Jefferson, 1979). Neither of these resulted as Lucy’s invitation was not reciprocated, nor was she able to close the story topic.

In the latter part of the retelling (lines 41-56), I posed an information seeking question in order to understand the resolution to the miscommunication gaffe, to which she used a combination of narrator, character, and interlocutory voicing in the next 13 lines. Unlike Version A, she did not position herself in a vulnerable and dependent position here. Through narrator role, she revealed her sense of urgency and her agency in the matter as she actively sought out her friend so that she could explain the situation. Her in-control and assertive portrayal goes hand-in-hand with the mother’s changed demeanor when she revealed the mother laughing at the gaffe (line 46). She then re-evaluated why the mother was scared, this time reenacting the mother’s words (lines 50-53) not as reported thought, but as direct speech so as to provide a new outlook on the mother’s persona as well as a direct experience of the mother’s initial reaction. Because the mother’s utterance is at first delivered in English, it seemed to allow for a more engrossed account of the mother’s behavior. The utterance, thus, offered a new take on the reasoning behind Lucy’s initial description of the mother’s mental state as well as justified the mother’s change in mental state earlier in the narrative. As she had done previously, she laughed after voicing the mother’s initial concern. This time, I accepted and joined her laughter, ratifying the humorous aspect of her story. In the end, Lucy closed off her narrative by evaluating her experience in Miami, a place where she had a ‘good time’ and worked ‘the most’. By choosing an extreme case formulation at the closing of her narrative, it would suggest that although her evaluation of her time there was positive, she did not want to underestimate its intensity and degree of complexity.

60 Although Lucy used the word ‘scary’ to describe the mother, the mother does not cause fear in others. Since Lucy revealed the mother’s fright, I analyze Lucy’s utterance as an attempt to describe the mother as ‘scared’, not ‘scary’.
In sum, the use of different modes of RS in Lucy’s retelling, along with the incorporation of reported thought and hypothetical utterances, made her second telling much more captivating and vivid than the first telling. She not only came across as more assertive, but more resourceful as she sought out her friend to help her ‘correct’ the misunderstanding. In the first telling, however, a more dependent and vulnerable persona came across, as seen in her lack of action in correcting the misunderstanding, as well as her inability to quote herself explaining the situation to the mother (only the mother is given the ‘authority’ to talk in that telling). Unlike previous narrative tellings analyzed in this dissertation, both tellings end positively. In both, she evaluated her experience as intense but positive, maintaining the cheery disposition she demonstrated throughout her interviews.

6.2.3 Speaker #3 – Miguel

Miguel was living in his home at the time of our first interview. His wife and caregiver found out about the study through word of mouth and enrolled Miguel in the study. I visited him in his home on various occasions during the evening time, which according to his wife, was the time he was most lucid. He was given the brief assessment of understanding the study and was consented. He scored 15 on the MMSE, but did not display any difficulty with following or starting a conversation in either of his two languages, which he used without any noticeable difficulty. He explained that he was raised in Ohio as a child. He learned English while at school and used it with friends. He spoke Spanish in the home. When he was a teenager, his parents returned to Puerto Rico, and he polished up his Spanish. He uses Spanish mostly with his wife, but speaks English with his children who live in the Southeast.

In the context of the narrative interviews, Miguel spoke a little under an hour each time. He mostly spoke about his family, particularly his grown children. He told a total of 13 stories in
the first narrative interview, which was carried out in English. In the second narrative interview, he retold a total of four stories and interweaved four additional stories in the process. On this day, he seemed more weary and fatigued. Half way in the session, he reported that he was too fatigued to continue the study, hence four of the stories told during the first narrative interview, were not retold.

In the excerpt analyzed below, Miguel tells a story of his sons and their involvement with selling marijuana when they were teenagers in school. He described his concern over dealing with this situation given the illicitness of it. In an effort to put a stop to the sons’ involvement with drug dealing, he sent them to live with their older sister, thinking this would put a hamper on their participation.
### Excerpt 6.3: Miguel’s Two Tellings of the Same Story

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Telling (Version A)</th>
<th>Spanish Telling (Version B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I: Do you recall any— any, um, bad experiences while your children were growing up, at least these in the picture, some story that you remember that was, you know, a bad memory or a bad situation that happened?</td>
<td>I: Mhm. Y usted me estaba contando también, bueno me contó de cada uno de ellos, pero me contó en particular acerca de— de, de ese que usted me contó, me contó la historia de los problemas con la marihuana… puedo contarme esa— esa historia—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Well (.)</td>
<td>I: Mhm. And you were telling me as well, well you told me about each of them, but you told me in particular about one— the one you told me, you told me about the story regarding the problem with marihuana…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The one that isn’t there, Gian— Giancarlo,</td>
<td>2. Ah, bueno,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. his name is Giancarlo,</td>
<td>Ah, well,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. he, he and my— the son that died,</td>
<td>3. este, cuando ellos eh, vivíamos en Filadelfia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. they— they got involved in marijuana and uh— in school</td>
<td><strong>eh, when they eh, we used to live in Philadelphia</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. they would sell it</td>
<td>4. y cuando yo averigüé que ellos estaban envueltos en ese mundo,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. and get a dollar here, a dollar there,</td>
<td><strong>and when I discovered that they were involved in that world,</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. and I had a lot of trouble with them</td>
<td>5. pues, yo me asusté</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. it was uh pretty tough this uh situation</td>
<td><strong>well, I got scared</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. but the oldest one, the one that died,</td>
<td>6. y pensé qué— qué iba a hacer,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. well</td>
<td><strong>and I thought what— what was I going to do</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I sent him to— to</td>
<td>7. entonces a— ah, lo cogí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. because th— this one [pointing to woman in photo], uh, she got married</td>
<td><strong>then a— ah, I caught him</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. and and I send her,</td>
<td>8. y lo mandé,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I help her get the— Tampa</td>
<td><strong>and I sent him</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. to settle down in Tampa and then</td>
<td>9. porque esta hija [pointing to woman in photo] ya se había casado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. uh, my son the— wa— he was messed up in marijuana,</td>
<td><strong>because this daughter [pointing to woman in photo] had already gotten married</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. he, uh, I sent him to— with her</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. see if he can,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. get him out of the environment he was in here, the situation,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. but, over there it was easier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. and he got</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. he XXX. I— I— I don’t—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. I don’t think they used it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
or if they used it, they used marijuana they didn’t get- they weren’t junkies and Uh, they, they were involved there but I-I- I never got to penetrate in whatever they were doing and when they were doing it It was just, a (.) headache

I: Now, do you recall telling them something about, you know, these things, did you ever warn them and what was their reaction?...

...well I, I talked to them and I- I sent them with her, his older sister, to see if I could get them away from the environment here but, uh, he- he, those friends are easy to catch, you know, uh, in school you- you find them, in the corner you find them, everywhere you go you- you get somebody to sell you something or- or buy something from you so, um, I had those experiences
Telling and the Retelling the Story: The What

The events in the story that Miguel chose to tell had some resemblances in both versions. In both stories, he revealed the subtopic of the story: recalling a bad experience with his children when they were growing up. In both tellings, Miguel unfolded the subtopic of the story: his two sons’ involvement in marijuana when they were teenagers. In both tellings, he resolved the problem by reaching a temporary solution—sending the oldest to live in Tampa, Florida with one of his daughters. In both tellings, he revealed that his daughter was a key figure in helping him solve his problem. He revealed both times that she was married and that at some time in the past, he helped her when she needed his help.

In terms of the characteristics commonly found in narrative retellings, Miguel employed some of the features commonly observed in retellings. Although his retelling seemed more fragmented (as can be observed in the topic shifts in Version B and eventual abandonment of the narrative in the end), Miguel’s narrative (1) contained revisions to what he previously said, (2) reorganized the plot, and (3) abbreviated previously given information—all features commonly found in narrative retellings (Norrick, 1998a, 1998b). It seemed though that he hardly highlighted relevant or important information in his retelling, making this feature not relevant in this particular excerpt.

With regards to the features observed in scholarship in the area of dialogue and DAT, it would seem that the twice-told story analyzed in this section displayed more instances of communicative decline than other excerpts analyzed previously. Miguel, for instance, had difficulty staying on topic (i.e., topic maintenance) during the second telling, as can be observed in his shift of topics at the end of the narrative. He also demonstrated difficulty with lexical retrieval during the first telling, as can be observed in the considerable number of false starts and
hesitations, most likely due to a combination of L2 attrition and his advanced cognitive decline. Miguel also seemed more fragmented in the retelling as he shifted in topic and failed to provide ‘proper’ closure to the narrative made his telling and retelling stand out. Although there are differences in the process of telling and retelling his story, they do not hinder the narrative production in the end. That is, through the act of telling and retelling his story, he communicates that he is capable to tell his story as well as reminds his audience (and positions himself) as a worthy storyteller. This is further discussed below.

Other differences highlight Miguel’s twice-told story—most abundant are narrative features highlighted by Labov & Waletsky (1967) and later Labov (1972). That is, the orientation, the complicating action, and the resolution are three areas where the twice-told stories differ the most. Most prominent however, is the resolution and lack of coda in the retelling. These will be discussed in the order they have been presented.

The orientation, or the background information, and the complicating action of these two versions of the same story show some differences. In Version A, the narrative was oriented around the complicating actions in a relatively swift manner, with the main parts of the narrative told within the first 10 lines of the telling. In the first four lines (2-6), Miguel revealed the who (the sons), the what (involvement in selling marijuana), and the when (during their high school years, or adolescence). In the lines that follow, Miguel revealed that this caused him a lot of grief, eventually evaluating the situation as tough. In Version B, the story’s orientation was different. He immediately positioned the story around himself, first revealing how he felt about it and then wondering what he would do about it. Omitted from his retelling are the facts that the sons sold it and that one of the sons had died—omissions that are typically observed in narrative retellings. He then narrated that he caught one of the boys and was about to retell where he sent
him, but a smaller story narrative of the daughter emerged in his narrative. Her small story, revealing how Miguel helped his daughter, seemed to sidetrack the narrative, yet upon a closer glance, Miguel used it as a way to set the scene for the next point in his story. This digression or possible subtopic in the story allowed him to demonstrate not only his good will and sense of responsibility towards his daughter, but also demonstrate that he was not abandoning his son—he was sending him somewhere where would feel comfortable. The father was leveraging his position as a parental figure (and his position as a provider given all the help he afforded his daughter in the past) to pressure the daughter to take in her brother. His son, on the other hand, was portrayed as a bargaining chip.

The resolution, evaluation, and coda in these two tellings varied substantially. In Version A, he narrated that he had sent his son to live in a different state (where his daughter was living at that then-and-there time in the story), hoping this would solve the problem, but to his surprise and dismay, the problem continued in the new environment where access was easier and parental guidance was unavailable. In Version B, Miguel repeated that he sent him to live with his daughter, this time performing the conversation he had with her prior to his son moving to Tampa. Absent from this retelling are the reasons why he sent him to live with the daughter and the results of the move (i.e., having an easier time getting marijuana, and perhaps using marijuana as well as other drugs more freely). Likewise, the first telling did not reveal any additional information about the other son nor the mother (Miguel’s former wife).

The evaluation and coda portion of these two tellings are somewhat revelatory of Miguel’s cognitive decline as well as his difficulty with topic maintenance. In Version A, Miguel commented upon the suspicions he had about the teenagers’ drug use at that then-and-there time, adding his evaluation of the entire ordeal—a headache. I scaffolded his telling, trying to help him
remember if he offered any warning in the past, or perhaps their own reaction to his warnings. This recast an even shorter version of the events, with the addition of another evaluation. He gave closure to his telling using *so*, a discourse marker used to give closure to a narrative topic. This was followed by the proposition ‘I had *those* experiences’, with the deictic *those* marking his here-and-now distance from his there-and-then experiences. In the end, his telling is one of regret and powerlessness, as his desperate move to ‘rescue’ his son from this situation backfired. For him, nothing that he did or could have done helped get his sons out of the drug world because he was faced with a situation that was “hard to penetrate” (line 31) and worst, easily found “everywhere you go” (line 43). In Version B, none of these evaluations was provided. Furthermore, he did not provide a coda to his story. He shifted topics to discuss his former wife’s move to Tampa and their eventual marital rupture. When I scaffolded his telling asking about the son in Florida, he shared new, unrelated information about the son who stayed with him after the ordeal (see Appendix G).

Other features which varied in Miguel’s telling and retelling are the use of RS and the shifts in speaker roles. In the first telling, Miguel’s development of RS—the voicing of other characters or himself as a character in the then-and-there story context—did not come through, even when I explicitly scaffolded for it. Some other modes of RS were used instead, as well as the use of historical present at the end of his telling. In the second telling, although a shorter account (144 words in second telling vs. 277 in the first), the narrative contained more development of character voice, along with a few instances of other modes of RS. Much like Lucy’s retelling, Miguel’s story seemed more vivid and animated the second time he told it, even though his story was not developed in the same way and did not give a sense of closure to the audience. However, these differences do not imply that Miguel was not a competent storyteller.
On the contrary, his richer and more dialogic rendition of the events in the second telling, in addition to his reinterpretation of the events at the end of the telling, demonstrate that he not only had the ability to retell his story, but in the process could reenact, reinterpret, and negotiate his sense of self and that of others in the there-and-then story. These differences, along with the frequencies of RS observed in Miguel’s twice-told story, will be further discussed below.

**Redefining the How: Reported Speech, Speaker Roles, and Other Communicative Resources**

Much like the previous two participants analyzed in this chapter, Miguel employed a combination of linguistic and communicative resources to present his sense of self and that of others. One of these was the use of reported speech, as noted above, a device used more extensively in his retelling, casting it as more vivid and engrossed. Along with RS, Miguel made use of a combination of speaker roles in the two tellings, as well as other communicative resources found in the speech of cognitively healthy and cognitively impaired speakers, such as extenders, extreme case formulations, and intensifiers. These different linguistic devices will be discussed further in each discussion section. As for the frequency of RS observed in his twice-told story, Table 6.8 shows that indeed, Miguel’s retelling (Spanish) was more vivid.

**Table 6.8. Frequency of Direct vs. Indirect Reported Speech Use in ‘Drug Problem’**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frequency per 1000 words

Although Miguel did not make use of RS in his first telling, the extensive use of RS in the retelling is evidence that in retellings, he added, omitted, and consolidated information, as well as communicated a more engrossed storyteller. The use of DS and IS in his retelling also show a clear reorganization and reinterpretation of the events that he lived at that there-and-then moment. He seized that opportunity to offer a direct experience of that moment, demonstrating
his sense of self and that of others. Are these frequencies sustained throughout his overall narrative landscape? When his overall RS profile is taken into account, the retellings (Spanish) did not seem as vivid and animated as the tellings (English). Table 6.9 demonstrates Miguel’s overall RS usage in both interviews.

**Table 6.9. Overall Frequency of Direct vs. Indirect Reported Speech Use**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(The frequencies shown in his RS profile in the telling are considerably high when compared with the excerpt analyzed in this section as well as the RS profiles of the other speakers analyzed in this chapter (which I will discuss in the chapter’s summary). This significant change in his RS profile could be due to fatigue. As I had stated earlier, Miguel appeared more fatigued in the second narrative interview. In fact, he retold only four of the stories he had told during the first narrative interview. This may be a possible explanation as to why the frequencies are much lower than expected, but it cannot be certain.

Do the data hold the same implication for the presentation of self? Although the varied results of Miguel’s RS profile suggest that he had a high presentation of self and of others throughout his twice-told stories, these frequencies are still low when compared with the data in the previous chapter. The fact that cognitive decline affected his ability to retell all of the stories he had previously told has to be considered when analyzing a device such as RS in narrative. This factor, present in the frequencies of all the participants in this chapter, will be discussed further in the summary of this chapter. Regarding his presentation of self and others, it is clear that Miguel used RS in addition to other communicative resources to transmit selfhood, and that both tellings show variance.)
Version A

In the first telling (English), Miguel maintained an overall distance from the events he narrated, using mostly his role as interlocutor and narrator (and the combination of the two) to tell his story about family troubles. Although the use of any form of direct or indirect reported speech is absent from his narrative, he sprinkled in very few instances of other modes of RS, though towards the end, he interspersed some instances of historical present, making his narrative more involved. He also included the characters of his sons, his daughter, as well as himself in his story. Although he did not perform any character voices (including his own), the use of historical present and the narrator-interlocutor double-voicing (as seen in the combination of interlocutory devices with narrator voicing), communicate a more interactional telling.

He commenced his narrative employing interlocutor voice as observed in his use of well, a discourse marker frequently used to preface a response to a question. In this case, his use of well followed by a pause leads to what Schiffrin argues is a request for hearers to “temporarily suspend expectations for coherence” (1985, p. 648) in order to make way for a narrative. Well followed by a pause in his speech also afforded him more time to organize what he planned to narrate. He then oriented the narrative around his two sons’ drug involvement conveyed in narrator voice. Via narrator voice in lines 6-10, he unpacked and organized the events of the storyworld, revealing that the actions in which his sons incurred were habitual, as marked by ‘would’, a modal expressing habitual repetition. Their behavior, the partaking of an illicit, not yet sanctioned business (as demonstrated by their sale of the product, making “a dollar here, a dollar there”, lines 7-8) allowed for the first displays of self. His sons were portrayed as resourceful, given their ability to not be caught. On the other hand, Miguel portrayed himself as the more vulnerable party, having “a lot of trouble with them” (line 9). He then reiterated his initial
evaluation—from having “a lot of trouble with them” he described the situation as “…pretty tough” (line 10). This suggests that he was not only reformulating what he had previously said, but magnifying his struggle with them and his lack of control over the situation. From these initial displays of struggle and pain, Miguel then narrowed down the ‘trouble with them’ to ‘the oldest one’ via but, a discourse connector that marks a contrasting action (Schiffrin, 1988). The oldest one was then positioned as being ‘messed up in marijuana’ (line 18), bracketing in not only the nature of his involvement in selling marijuana (i.e., deeply involved), but also quite possibly his chemical dependence. Although Miguel did not reveal his daily struggle with this situation, his decision to send his son away (line 13)—one which probably came as a last recourse in his struggle with his sons—backfired, as the move made his access to marijuana “easier” (line 22). He continued his narrative, shifting from narrator to interlocutor. Meanwhile, in what followed as a combination of hedgers, conditionals, and negatives (lines 25-30), Miguel revealed his uncertainty about his sons’ drug use, suggesting that besides marijuana, they might have been using some other drug, as seen in his repetition of ‘it’ (lines 25 and 26). The reference to ‘junkies’ (line 29), furthermore, bracketed in that it may have been something more potent than marijuana, as a ‘junkie’ is a term (low register) to describe a person who is addicted to narcotics, such as heroin or other opioid-like drugs. He stuck to this explanation, again shifting to interlocutor role through the discourse marker but, followed by never, an extreme case formulation, to further explain/justify his inability to stop them. In line 33, he reclaimed his powerlessness, this time equating his problem with a headache, pain that with time can reach to be debilitating and severe.

After I scaffolded his telling (line 34), he again framed his talk in the here-and-now context, using well to preface a response to a question as well as indicating his possible
employment of direct speech (Svartvik, 1980). However, he did not follow up on this; rather, via narrator’s representation of voice, he revealed that there was some exchange between him and his sons, but the actual propositional content was not revealed. He then reiterated that he sent ‘them’ (instead of ‘him’) to live with their sister as a last recourse in hopes to remove them from the source of their (his and his sons) troubles. In the last seven lines in this telling, he took on a more involved role, as evinced by his using the historical present to reveal the precariousness of his situation as well as further demonstrate the hardship he went through and his eventual failure in trying to put an end to their involvement with drugs. By shifting to present tense, Miguel gave a sense of immediacy to the narrated past (Chafe, 1980, 1994), again demonstrating the pain that this life experience brought to him and quite possibly his family. Furthermore, through his use of historical present tense and the addition of the second person pronoun ‘you’ in lines 41, 42, 43, 44, and 45, Miguel not only sought empathy, understanding, and compassion for his lived situation, but also relived the experience which in the end was much more intense than he had thought. Through these devices, he also gave this telling a sense of immediacy not previously observed; in turn, the telling came across as more tangible, more involved, and more vivid. Much like Enrique’s first telling, Miguel’s telling suggests that at the time of the telling, his here-and-now self was still consolidating this unresolved bad experience in his life.

*Version B*

In the second telling (Spanish), Miguel reenacted his story, giving life to his character, while indirectly reporting the voice of the daughter (line 11), employing reported thought, and using other less involved modes of reported speech (e.g., narrator’s represented voice) to retell his story. From the beginning, his retelling seemed more focused on his perceptions, feelings, and reactions regarding his sons’ drug involvement. He presented himself as scared and
concerned about the situation, immediately followed by a more assertive persona in the there-
and-then storyworld as he sent them to live with their sister. He then provided a small story
inside this story as a way to frame his character as a provider and family patriarch, and to reveal
that although this happened to his son, he did not abandon him. In this smaller story, he reported
the voice of the daughter requesting her desire to go to Tampa, followed by a list of what he
provided to her, suggesting not only his sense of obligation toward his children but also his
parental love. To a certain degree, these details imply that he was not abandoning his son or
disinheriting him, but accommodating him in a space where his material needs would be met. He
then abandoned the utterance (line 15) to reenact what he told his daughter as well as provide a
direct experience of what he expected her filial duty would be—to provide and protect him, be
her brother’s keeper. As he moved on in the narrative, he switched back to narrator voice, not
revealing any other details about that exchange, only revealing that the youngest son stayed with
him. In a sense, these last few lines included in the excerpt serve to close off his narrative
retelling, and although the audience is left to ask the questions, “so what?” or “what happened
next?”, these are never answered. His narrative retelling might not have achieved the closure that
might have been expected, but given that he had previously revealed this information in the first
telling, it could be the case that he did not feel the interactional need to fulfill these questions. In
the end, his story retold what he deemed necessary while accomplishing his telling, revealing in
the process different self-presentations and evaluations of that there-and-then moment that
caused him a lot of trouble and suffering.

In sum, via the employment of different linguistic devices, modes of reported speech,
thought, and speaker roles, Miguel demonstrated different self-presentations in his two versions
of the ‘same’ story. He reorganized his tellings, adding information while omitting other. In his
first telling, he presented a more overwhelmed and powerless self, while in the second, he focused on his role as a family provider and provider as he developed the stressful circumstances of his experience. Although neither of these tellings seemed to possess a high degree of engrossment, both had sections that suggested that this event was still unresolved for Miguel.

**6.3 Summary and Conclusion**

In this chapter, I discussed how three different cognitively impaired bilingual older adults present and shape their self-presentations in the narrative forms. Although the use and extent to which reported speech was used in each of these stories varied extensively, there were some commonalities among these narratives. In terms of referential content, not all cases demonstrated similarities or perhaps stability across the versions of the ‘same’ stories. This may be due to cognitive decline or to other interactional needs that I may not have been aware of at the time of the interview. Moreover, the indexicals of the speakers’ attitudes and identities varied, sometimes greatly.

In comparison to first tellings, the second versions of all the speakers’ tellings were somewhat more involved, animated, and lively, as seen in the employment of varied modes of reported speech and thought, character speech, and the interlocutory speaker role in these narratives. The first version of their narratives, however, were more abbreviated, as seen by the high ratio of narrator voicing and low ratio of character voicing. Although the retellings do not possess the majority of the features typically found in retellings, the fact that all three speakers employ more character voicing in their retellings (with or without my scaffolding) demonstrates that these participants continue to exhibit the ability to expand their narratives.
Additionally, all three demonstrated the ability to reorganize their narrative and highlight more important details in their retellings, as is the case of the first participant, Enrique, who revealed additional information about the intentionality behind the act of aggression he experienced in a bar in New Jersey. All three also consolidated or omitted information from their retellings, as seen in Miguel’s retelling, where he not only omitted painful information, such as the death of his son, but also omitted their degree of involvement in using/selling drugs and the lack of success his decision had. These findings, although somewhat different from the cognitively healthy group, are comparable to what has been reported in the literature of narrative retellings in populations with or without DAT (Bamberg, 2008; Bauman, 1986; Chafe, 1998; Davis, 2011; Davis & Maclagan, 2014; Hydén & Örulv, 2009; Koven, 2007, 2011; L. C. Moore, 2012; Norrick, 1997, 1998b; Polanyi, 1981; Prior, 2011).

As regards the preservation of self, all of these participants exhibited self-preservation in their narratives, as may be seen in the narrating of actions representative of who they were and what they did or in the ability they exhibited when repeating stories told in a previous interview. To restate what I discussed in this chapter, I will provide below a summarized answers to the question that led the discussion in this chapter.

1. What personal experiences do the participants narrate in each telling and how are these two tellings similar and/or different?

The data in this chapter demonstrated that for the most part, cognitively impaired participants told and retold similar stories, with most key referential content repeated in the speakers’ other language. In most of the excerpts, that is, speakers achieve the retelling of their previously told stories, even when cognitive decline and/or language may be a barrier to their retelling (as is the case of Lucy who chose to retell her story in Spanish given her L2 attrition).
An interesting commonality in these tellings is that the speakers seem to be more involved when retelling their stories in Spanish—their first language—regardless of whether the events occurred in English. It is possible that many of these stories were more involved and richer in Spanish than in English because the language of encoding (Spanish) matched the language of retrieval (Spanish). When the language of encoding and the language of retrieval are the same, the result is richer memories (Schrauf, 2000). Moreover, the higher frequencies of reported speech in Spanish tellings for each of these participants are telling of this dynamic. Although the higher frequencies seen in the tables accompanying each of these excerpts are not statistically significant, it does show that speakers have noticeably different ways of performing diverse identities and selves in discourse, and more so when it is done in their L1.

Second, although length of each telling (i.e., number of words in each telling) was not initially a crucial data point in the analysis of the data, the analysis showed that two out of three speakers used less words in their second telling than in the first. Although data larger sample would be necessary to confirm this pattern, it suggests that these speakers employed features commonly found in retellings: that is, reorganization and abbreviation of information. In Enrique’s case, certain background details were omitted (i.e., the place where he received the blow to his head, the activity in the bar, etc.). In Miguel’s case, the story was reorganized to reveal other details while portraying his there-and-then role differently. Moreover, this suggests that the ability to reorganize and abbreviate a retelling are communicative resources still available to them.

(2) What strategies do the speakers use while telling the stories or while using reported speech?
While telling their stories, speakers in this group were found to use a variety of strategies. These ranged from extreme case formulations, intensifiers, alternation in reported verb tenses, use of different modes of reported speech, use of the historic present, shifts in speaker roles (narrator-interlocutor-character), double voicing, reported thought, repetition, among others. These different devices were strategically employed to make particular points stand out in the stories these participants told. Their use of these devices, however, was not consistent throughout their tellings. For instance, Lucy used more varied modes of reported speech in her retelling, while both Enrique and Miguel used few modes besides direct reported speech and narrator’s representation of voice. In essence, this particular group of participants employed those linguistic resources available in their semiotic toolbox and at their disposal in an effort to come off as more competent interlocutors and competent storytellers. In turn, they were better able to make their stories somewhat more involved and lively.

In the case of reported speech, the speakers used reported speech more in their retellings to lend more veracity or authority to their stories, as well as displaying more worthy storytellers. In the process, these speakers gave life to their voice or the voices of those others that were crucial in telling their stories. Through their voice as character or the voicing of other characters in the storyworld, they were able to embed instances of reported speech, marking their narratives as more involved or as still not having been resolved at the time of narration. Unlike the previous group of speakers, the speakers in this chapter used more instances of other modes of reported speech, achieving their purpose in the narrative—to show that some stretch of talk occurred. In cases where reported thought was used, these gave another dimension to the surface interaction. These stretches of talk/thought may not have been essential in communicating the self, but they may have served as a way to move the narrative along. Their use of reported speech in their two
languages achieved a communicative purpose. That is, to successfully tell and retell their stories of personal experience as well as come off as engaging and, at times, amusing storytellers, with life stories worth sharing with others. Through these twice-told stories, these speakers used strategies not only to tell their stories of personal experience but also give life to the voices of speakers who resemble that which Koven noted was the “images of locally imaginable kinds of speakers” (2001, p. 549).

(3) How do the speakers use reported speech and to what extent is reported speech used differently/similarly in the narratives of each participant?

By looking at the frequency tables included in this chapter (Table 6.2 to 6.9), it is clear that speakers made more use of direct speech than indirect speech, but not markedly so. At times, these differences were due to the scaffolding I provided participants; at others, these employed RS without scaffolding. The differences in the modes of reported speech (i.e., direct vs. indirect vs. other types of RS) suggest that even though reported speech may not have been effortless for them, when they made use of it, these speakers seemed more engaged in the there-and-now moment. Because RS did not come easy to these participants, critical quotes were not always found in both tellings. In fact, some participants only employed certain types of RS in the retelling, such as the case of Enrique and Miguel who inserted direct quotes in their retellings. The use of scaffolding, although employed to help the speaker reveal more information (and RS) in their tellings, did not always result in more RS. In Lucy’s case, scaffolding led to an increase in reported speech, particularly direct speech. In Enrique’s case, scaffolding also revealed verbal exchanges between the people at the bar and Enrique. In Miguel’s case, scaffolding did not lead to more RS, but it allowed him to reevaluate the circumstances of his family troubles. In the case of speakers with cognitive decline, then, retellings do not necessarily expand or decrease from
one telling to the next. It is possible that because both the telling and the retelling is delivered to
the same audience (i.e., the interviewer in this case), the speakers in this group may not find the
need to reveal previously shared information, even if this was not fully developed in the telling.
(4) How do the speakers perform their own selves or the selves of others through reported
speech? Does the speaker quote her/himself as extensively as others and in the same amount?

By looking at the excerpts in this chapter, one can see that each speaker’s quotation of the
self and of other varies, sometimes greatly. Critical to this chapter, as well, is the question: how
do they quantifiably ‘do’ the performance of self versus others in each telling? I will examine
this question in terms of the first versus second telling via frequency tables. The tables below
demonstrate the frequencies found in the excerpts discussed in this chapter showing each
speaker’s ‘performed’ self versus ‘performed’ others. The data in the tables are further
categorized into direct reports of self/others and indirect reports of self/others.

Table 6.10. Frequencies of Reporting the Self and Reporting Others in the First Telling of
Narratives Examined in this Chapter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Reported Self</th>
<th>Reported Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrique</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miguel</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frequency per 1000 words

The frequencies shown above demonstrate the lack of reported speech found in the first
telling of all speakers. Neither direct nor indirect speech was a sought after technique in making
the telling more engrossed. The only speaker to use direct speech was Lucy, and this was
employed to give life to the mother. Her use of reported speech in the first telling quite possibly
highlighted the power differential between the two of them.
Turning to the second telling, I ask: do the speakers quote themselves as extensively as others and in the same way? Table 6.11 demonstrates the frequency of these differences.

**Table 6.11. Frequencies of Reporting the Self and Reporting Others in the Second Telling of Narratives Examined in this Chapter**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Reported Self</th>
<th>Reported Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrique</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucy</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miguel</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frequency per 1000 words

Unlike Table 6.10, direct and indirect reported speech to perform the self and others is more prevalent, suggesting that as the speakers retold their stories, they had better access to their memories and the information they had previously given. All speakers used more direct speech than indirect speech, suggesting that in the course of retelling their stories, they were more involved and engrossed in that there-and-then storyworld context. The fact that only one of the three speakers quoted himself more than others suggests that the voices of other speakers in the storyworld context held power or authority over that of the speakers. In Enrique’s case, the voice of the collective anonymous not only denied that he was hit on purpose but colluded with his aggressor in hiding the truth of the situation. In Lucy’s case, the voice of the mother in the storyworld came across as first demanding information about the girls’ day and later, reacting to Lucy’s report. Moreover, Lucy is not just revealing what she said at that there-and-then context as she did in the first telling, but *demonstrating* the mother’s bewildered reaction more explicitly while providing the listener with a perception of that direct experience, à la Clark and Gerrig (1990). The quotes of others in both Enrique and Lucy’s tellings, thus, show the strength and performative power these characters had at that there-and-then storyworld context.
Were these patterns consistent across all of the narratives of these three speakers? In order to have an ample understanding of each speaker’s linguistic repertoire, the overall frequencies for each speaker are shown and discussed below (Tables 6.12 and 6.13).

**Table 6.12. Overall Frequencies of Reporting the Self and Reporting Others in the First Telling in All Narratives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Reported Self</th>
<th>Reported Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrique</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucy</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miguel</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frequency per 1000 words

The overall frequencies shown above demonstrate that speakers quote others more than themselves, be it directly or indirectly. Two out of three speakers prefer using direct rather than indirect speech when reporting the voices of others in the storyworld, demonstrating that even in the first telling, reported speech is employed, unlike what was demonstrated in table 6.10. When it comes to the report of their own voices, the frequencies drop substantially, demonstrating that the voices of other characters in the storyworld are at the forefront of their tellings. The data, thus, do not demonstrate any consistent pattern in quoting the self or others. Would that be any different in second tellings?

**Table 6.13. Overall Frequencies of Reporting the Self and Reporting Others in the Second Telling in All Narratives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Reported Self</th>
<th>Reported Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrique</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucy</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miguel</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frequency per 1000 words

Similar to the data in Table 6.12, speakers do not demonstrate a consistent pattern of engaging in the quoting of self or others. Again, Lucy and Miguel use more direct reported
speech, but this time they quote themselves more than others. Nevertheless, the frequencies of reported speech in the first telling are higher than the second, contrary to the data shown in table 6.11. Enrique, on the other hand, continued to quote the speech of others, this time employing more direct reported speech than indirect speech. Given that the tables above are representations of the frequencies of first and second tellings (i.e., showing quantifiably how speakers quote themselves and others), how does the self of the speaker and of others get ‘performed’ through reported speech? In excerpt 6.4 (taken from Lucy’s tellings), I demonstrate how Lucy engaged in somewhat more direct quotation in her retelling. In the retelling, as I show below, she quotes herself for the first time in her narrative, and continues to quote the voice of the mother of the girls, but this time in a more extensive manner. Lucy’s speech has been underlined once while the mother’s speech has been underlined twice.

**Excerpt 6.4. Two Tellings of the ‘Same’ Story Showing Different Self-Presentations**

**First Telling**

Una vez que me dejaron (.) Que estaba cuidando las niñas entonces durmieron tanto que cuando vino la señora yo le quise decir desde cuando las niñas estaban durmiendo. Y no le podía explicar. Y le dije (.) La cosa fue que yo le explique de una manera que esa señora se volvió loca y dijo “Ay Dios Mío” Porque yo ni sabía (.) yo no sabía lo que era.

**English Translation First Telling**

One time that they left me that I was taking care of the girls so then they slept so much that when the lady came I wanted to tell her from what time the girls were sleeping And I could not explain And I said (.). The thing was that I explained it to her in a way that that lady went crazy and said, “Oh my God!” Because I didn’t even know I didn’t know what it was

**Second Telling**

Pues yo quería decir que vino y cuando yo le dije “las niñas yo las puse a dormir y vinieron a despertar ahora”. La señora se volvió loca. Le creía – ca que yo le di vino a lah mucha- (laughs)

*I: oh my goodness.

Porque yo no le sabía explicar… Yeah. But she said, “Oh my God! Me le dió bebida y están durmiendo %eso es muy de%” (laughs)

**English Translation Second Telling**

So I wanted to say that he came and when I told her “I put the girls to sleep and they now came to wake up” The lady went crazy. She thought- th- that I had given the girls wine (laughs) Because I didn’t know how to explain Yeah but she said, “Oh my God!” “she gave them some drink and they are sleeping that is very-” (laughs)
In these two excerpts of the same story, Lucy displayed a more involved teller in the second telling than in the first. In the first, she could not communicate what she wanted to say to the mother of the girls given her limited proficiency in the language. In the second telling, however, she delivered her report in a very clear manner, even though the mother did not really understand her report due to her difficulty with speaking in English. A comparison of these two transcripts, furthermore, suggest that the mother’s reaction—a critical piece of information revealing the fact that there was a misunderstanding—seems to be recurring, although in the second telling, the report is further developed, further demonstrating the mother’s concern.

In terms of the presentation of self, it is clear that Lucy tried to come off as more assertive in the second telling than in the first. This could be observed in her matter-of-fact manner of speaking to the mother. The mother on the other hand is more verbose in the second telling, this time quoting not only her own reaction to Lucy’s words, but also the deduction the mother made of Lucy’s words. Although these two versions of the same story are not as engaged or involved as the tellings seen in the previous chapters, Lucy’s telling and retelling demonstrate that she used those communicative resources that were available to her. She also demonstrated that even though her tellings seem a bit simpler than those found in the previous chapter, she could perform her voice and that of others, and through these simple performances index and give life to the self, as well as communicate a desire to interact and come across as a good storyteller.

In the next chapter, I will discuss how results of these two chapters vary, particularly those regarding the use of reported speech to index the self.
CHAPTER 7

CONCLUSION

7.1 Overview of the Study

As established in the introduction, this study sought to answer questions about the presentation of self as mediated through narrative production in three cognitively healthy and three cognitively impaired older bilingual Latinos. First, I analyzed the content of the participants’ narratives to understand how their repeated stories would vary and/or stay the same across two specific contexts. In particular, I focused on how such differences or divergences in content indexed shifts in language-specific self-presentations in the discourse. Then I analyzed how the participants enacted their own voices and those of others in the story world context in their two languages while also shifting speaker roles across their two languages. The questions asked in the introduction aim to examine the maintenance or persistence of the self in bilingual persons with dementia of the Alzheimer’s type, a life altering disease for the person and his/her caregiver, while using a framework from which to analyze bilingual data in studies of linguistic nature. At a broader level, this study is in dialogue with other studies focusing on the relationship between language, the self, and the persistence or maintenance of the sense of self. Through the analysis of the three cognitively impaired and three cognitively healthy bilinguals’ narrative production, not only is a comparative, discourse-based view on language, the self, and identity provided, but also another effort is provided that challenges the view that the self is lost. Underlying the analysis of narrative production on behalf of speakers diagnosed with DAT, the results of this study demonstrate that the notion of sense of self is present and publicly
manifested via discursive and interactional contexts, and is enhanced through the act of narration.

In answering the questions posed previously, I conclude this study by reflecting on the findings and the analytical process of the current study. The conclusion is organized as follows: in section 7.2, I provide a summary of the overall objectives and findings of the current study. Within this section, I include a closer look at the representation of self as viewed in both groups, and I address the preserved abilities observed in the narratives of the participants diagnosed with DAT. In section 7.3, I discuss the current study’s limitations followed by the study’s implications for future work (section 7.4).

7.2 Summary of Objectives and Findings

The objectives of this dissertation were to describe how the self, afflicted with DAT, is mediated through language in older bilingual Latinos as well as to describe how language choices helped them present/construct their sense of self across two languages. Underlying is the aim to examine the presentation or construction of self in persons with DAT, since one of the key arguments advanced by many proponents of the deficit model is the loss of self in DAT. Given the progressive degeneration that persons with DAT exhibit, many researchers suggest that difficulty with lexical retrieval as well as reduced usage or absence of personal pronouns leads to a decrease in language production which in turn leads to a generalized fear or belief that the person is losing his/her sense of self (Herskovits, 1995). As established in the introduction, it is undeniable that persons with DAT suffer declines in memory, language, and reasoning, among others, yet it seems tenuous to argue that problematic lexical retrieval and reduced pronoun use lead to a loss of self. Rather, as others have argued, speakers diagnosed with DAT slowly present changes to the way they use language (Hamilton, 1994). As the current study has demonstrated,
the participants with DAT continued to display their sense of self, making a variety of lexical choices to index the self and their subjectivity. These findings will be reflected upon below, followed by a brief discussion of the hypotheses formulated in chapter 1 of the current study.

### 7.2.1 Representations of Self in Persons with DAT: Reported Speech

One of the aims of the current study was to examine the self-presentations of persons with DAT. In particular, I asked the following question of the data: how is the self of the speaker and of others ‘performed’ through reported speech? To address this question, I focused on the mode (i.e., direct/indirect speech) of each of the instances of reported speech found in the twice-told narratives. I focused on reported speech as this linguistic device is a particularly powerful discursive resource in narrative through which speakers display and present the self. Speakers not only display and present their own and others’ self-presentations, but also construct, contest, negotiate, and/or recreate their own and others’ identity and sense of self. Given the ubiquity of this feature in narrative, I analyzed the frequency of reported speech as a means to examine the presentation of self in participants diagnosed with DAT and cognitively healthy counterparts. In the following table, I demonstrate the frequency of reported speech in first and second tellings in the excerpts discussed in chapters 5 and 6 as a means to examine these speakers’ self-presentations.

**Table 7.1. Frequency of Reported Speech in First and Second Tellings in Both Groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bilinguals with DAT</th>
<th>Total Words</th>
<th>Cognitively Healthy Bilinguals</th>
<th>Total Words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First telling</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>74.07</td>
<td>1,107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second telling</td>
<td>25.07</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>57.39</td>
<td>1,028</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frequency per 1000 words; excerpts only
As shown in Table 7.1, the findings demonstrate that although the overall frequency of reported speech in the bilingual participants diagnosed with DAT is low (as noted in the lower frequency of reported speech in both tellings when compared to the cognitively healthy group), the frequencies of reported speech for the DAT speakers increased slightly in the retelling. This contrasts with the findings in the cognitively healthy group, where the frequencies decreased slightly in the retelling.

These findings suggest three different phenomena at work in the DAT speaker group. First, the increase in frequency suggests that upon retelling, the DAT speakers in this study had better access to their memories and/or had better access to language. It is possible that rehearsal may have led to better access to their memories as well as better access to language, supporting the argument that narrative retelling (or rehearsal) in this group aids remembering (Chafe, 1994). Second, the increase in frequency resulted in increased dialogic quality in the narrative retellings of this group. This lends support to the idea that when speakers retell a story, the dialogic quality of their stories may increase, resulting in a more richly experienced and narrated retelling for the audience and the speaker. In turn, more variation in the retelling (possibly to fit the particular context where/when the story is told) is possible. Third, the decrease in the number of words in the retelling suggests a consolidation or omission of noncritical details from the previously told stories, resulting in shorter tellings. This finding lends support to the idea that when retelling their stories, speakers may reorganize and omit details in the retelling. Overall, in the DAT speaker group, the slight increase in RS and the slight decrease in the number of words may very well be due to all three of the aforementioned factors, which afford these speakers the opportunity to appear as competent and interesting conversationalists with a good story to tell.
In the cognitively healthy group, on the other hand, the participants chose to omit both noncritical information (as noted in the slight decrease in number of words) and some of the previously quoted speech (as noted in the decrease in frequency of reported speech). Much like the findings noted in the DAT speakers, findings from the cognitively healthy group lend support to the features of retelling discussed in chapter 2. That is, repetition can result in condensed versions of the original account, with noncritical information and reported speech omitted from the retellings (Chafe, 1994, 1998; Norrick, 1997, 1998a, 1998b).

The second aim of the current study was to examine whether speakers diagnosed with DAT quote themselves or others as extensively or in the same amount compared to the cognitively healthy group. As I stated earlier, it has been observed that when speakers quote themselves or others in speech, they can perform and construct their own and others’ identity and sense of self (De Fina, 2003; Johnstone, 1996; Schiffrin, 1996, 2002, 2006), as well as engage in multiple other functions. Table 7.2 demonstrates the frequency of these differences.

Table 7.2 Frequency of Quoting the Self vs. Quoting Others

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reported Self</th>
<th>Reported Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bilinguals</td>
<td>Cognitively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with DAT</td>
<td>Healthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First telling</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second telling</td>
<td>14.74</td>
<td>25.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frequency per 1000 words; excerpts only

Much like the frequencies observed in Table 7.1, the frequencies shown in Table 7.2 demonstrate the lack of reported speech for self and others found in the first telling of the DAT speakers. The cognitively healthy group quoted themselves just as extensively as they quoted themselves or others.

---

61 As discussed in chapter 3 of this work, reported speech, and in particular, the direct mode, can function as a means to track status differentials between speakers and others (Hamilton, 1998; Johnstone, 1987), construct and enact power relations as a means of interactional positioning (Van De Mieroop & Clifton, 2013; Wortham, 2000, 2001), perform code displacements as a means to contest or align themselves with socially locatable identities (Alvarez-Caccamo, 1996; Frick & Rionheimlo, 2013; Guerini, 2009), and perform and construct multilingual socio-culturally locatable identities (Koven, 1999, 2001, 2007).
others in the first telling. In the second telling, the DAT speakers exhibited roughly equivalent increases in the frequency of reported speech for self and others. The cognitively healthy group continued to quote the self and others, yet the frequency of reported speech decreased slightly upon retelling. Both the increases in the DAT speakers and the decreases in the cognitively healthy group lend further support to features observed in retellings. That is, via retellings, speakers are afforded the opportunity to expand their tellings (Chafe, 1994, 1998; Norrick, 1997, 1998a, 1998b; Schiff et al., 2006; Schiffrin, 2003, 2006; Van De Mieroop, 2009). They are also afforded the opportunity to reshape and reorganize what had already been said to the audience, consolidating less salient or less important information (Chafe, 1998; Ervin-Tripp & Küntay, 1997). In the case of the DAT speakers, the expansion and reorganization in the retelling may result in an increase in the dialogic quality of their stories, whereas in the cognitively healthy group, the reorganization and condensation may lead to omission of noncritical reported speech. Hence, while both groups benefited from the act of revisiting their stories, the DAT group seemed to have doubly benefited from retelling their stories by gaining better access to their own and others’ reported speech. This suggests that retellings afforded the DAT speakers more easily accessible presentations of self and others, resulting in perhaps more easily performed and constructed identity and sense of self.

In terms of the second aim of this study, I also examined complexity in reported speech, or the embedding of others’ speech in the there-and-then storyworld context. If reported speech is a particularly powerful discursive resource in narrative, speakers’ practice of embedding the words of others who are not present in the there-and-then story world is an even more powerful and rich linguistic site for indexing the self. When speakers embed quotation inside other quotes, their stories are not only more dramaturgical in nature, but also more syntactically complex. That
is, when speakers embed quotes within other quotes, they use complex syntactical structures, or left-branching sentences, which are sentences containing relative clauses. As a person ages, his/her use of syntactically complex sentences declines given that an older adult’s working memory may already be taxed with other complex processing demands (Kemper, 1987a, 1987b). Hence, embedding quotations in conversation is no easy feat. At an interactional level, speakers have to manage multiple shifts in frame and roles, making this task more complex. This can become more difficult if a person has been diagnosed with DAT.

When it came to complexity of reported speech, the DAT group employed reported speech (as evinced in the slight increase of reported speech in the retelling), yet none of the excerpts discussed in chapter 6 demonstrated complex embedding of others’ speech as seen in the case of the cognitively healthy group. The lack of complexity of reported speech in the DAT group, however, does not equate failure to use it in their speech, as their overall narrative tellings feature some embedded reported speech. This finding then lends support to declines in syntactical complexity in this group (Kemper, 1987a, 1987b; Snowdon et al., 1996). The cognitively healthy group, on the other hand, reported the speech of others and embedded quotes within quotes more often than the DAT group. In fact, two out of the three participants’ excerpts analyzed in chapter 5 made use of at least one instance of embedded speech in their excerpts.

Finally, the analysis considered other modes of reported speech or representations of speech, such as hypothetical speech and reported thought. These two different modes (one of speech, the other of thought) also accomplish the presentation of self in narrative, albeit to a lesser degree, as these indicate high narrator presence. It has been established that reported thought and hypothetical speech are sites where speakers present their own and others’ selves and subjectivities (Koven, 2007), since through them speakers enact a performance at the
interactional level. Hence, through the use of these other modes, the speakers in the current study “do” what it is being a language learner, a caregiver, a mother, etc.

The findings demonstrate that both modes occurred in either the tellings or retellings of the DAT group, further demonstrating their versatility when it came to telling their stories. For example, in her retelling, Lucy used reported thought to assess (and evaluate) the mother’s own assessment of Lucy’s behavior vis-à-vis Lucy’s here-and-now implicit interpretation of the events (lines 37-40, Version B, chapter 6). In Lucy’s case, the use of reported thought (and what follows later in this telling) afforded her the opportunity to construct what it was for her to be doing her job as a caregiver with little communicative abilities in the other language.

Based on these different aims discussed above, and in spite of their diagnosis with DAT, the three DAT speakers highlighted and profiled in the current study represented the sense of self and the identities of themselves and others via reported speech, albeit to a greater extent in the retelling. Their choice to employ more reported speech in their retellings yields insight into a possible manner in which these speakers may be afforded better access to their stories as well as additional opportunities to display their and others sense of self and identity. The findings regarding the use of reported speech as a cue for the presentation of self in this group clearly lend support to Hyden and Örulv’s (2009) findings on the use of reported speech in storytelling, or what they label as a “dramatic narrative style” (p.213). Hence, even when other linguistic and cognitive competences falter in persons with DAT, skilled and creative DAT storytellers may continue using the linguistic resources available to them (in this case, reported speech), making readjustments in their discourse according to their needs. Needless to say, more research on reported speech in repeated tellings in older bilinguals with DAT is needed. Undoubtedly, the act of repeating their stories gave a boost to the frequency of reported speech observed in this group.
as well as boosted these speakers’ self-presentations in their narratives. Thus, the current study’s findings regarding self-presentations via reported speech have lent support to Chafe’s 1994 claim that retelling is remembering. In the case of the current study, retelling is significant because it not only aids in remembering (and thereby offers a unique glimpse into these speakers’ past-lived experiences), but also affords the group of DAT speakers the opportunity to better organize their stories and better access the words used by themselves and others in that there-and-then context. In light of this, retellings in the context of bilingualism and cognitive impairment of the Alzheimer’s type necessitate a broader and far-reaching examination, be it in the context of the home, the support group, day care center, or the nursing home. Next, I discuss other preserved abilities exhibited in the narratives of the speakers diagnosed with DAT.

7.2.2 Other Preserved Abilities in Narrative

Beyond the use and complexity of reported speech found in the narrative discourse of DAT speakers, these speakers also employed other ways to display the self in their narratives—that is, via speaker roles, other linguistic strategies, and referential content. I will first address the use of speaker roles and doubly voiced speaker roles in both the bilinguals with DAT and the cognitively healthy bilinguals. Then I will briefly discuss other linguistic strategies observed in the DAT speakers as well as their ability to repeat some salient referential content in the retellings.

Speaker Roles

Much like the use of embedded reported speech in narrative, the shift in speaker roles, or the shift between different roles within the different speech events and frames, is also a rather complex task. Speakers not only have to manage the different roles in the act of narrating, but also manage multiple frames (the here-and-now context and the there-and-then context) while
enacting multiple interactional feats. As noted in chapter 3, a key distinction here is that between each role—character role (the representation of speech events that took place in the past), narrator role (narration of events in the past, divorced from the here-and-now context), and interlocutor role (metanarration acting like a bridge between the narrated event and the narrating context). The current study demonstrated that speakers took on roles in their tellings either to convey different degrees of proximity to the events narrated or to distance themselves from those events. Table 7.3 below more clearly demonstrates the proportion of shifts in narrator, interlocutor, and character roles made during the course of the telling and retellings of both groups.

Table 7.3. Shifts in Speaker Roles across the DAT and Cognitively Healthy Bilinguals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roles</th>
<th>Bilinguals with DAT</th>
<th>Cognitively Healthy Bilinguals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First Telling</td>
<td>Second Telling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrator</td>
<td>40.88</td>
<td>48.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interlocutor</td>
<td>38.69</td>
<td>19.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>10.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proportion of total utterances

While in the first telling the group of speakers diagnosed with DAT employed narrator and interlocutor role to a greater extent than character role (as noted in the lower proportions), in the second telling, the proportion of character role increased ten-fold. The interlocutor role proportion, however, dropped considerably while the narrator role proportions increased. The cognitively healthy bilinguals, on the other hand, exhibited roughly equal proportions in narrator and character roles in both tellings, yet the proportions of interlocutor role were low in both tellings. With regards to the increase in character role, and much like the frequencies observed in the use of reported speech in retellings, the findings demonstrated above further support the role retelling has on the group of speakers diagnosed with DAT. That is, retelling results in increased dialogic quality as well as reorganization in retellings. This in turn lends further support to
Chafe’s argument that “when remembering is thus aided by rehearsal, events that are repeatedly refreshed can be more richly experienced” (1994, p. 203). In the case of the speakers diagnosed with DAT, one can argue that the increase in character role upon retelling their stories results in a more richly experienced retelling, given that they are *demonstrating* (not merely reporting) their experience, providing a more direct experience to the listener (à la Clark and Gerrig, 1990).

Moreover, these proportion shifts (especially in the interlocutor and character categories) suggest underlying needs in the interactional and/or narrative space. That is, in the first telling, DAT speakers may have used more interlocutor and narrator roles in order to communicate their current stance (displaying more interpersonal rapport, affect, and nonreferential indexicals). In the second telling, they may have used more narrator and character roles in order to demonstrate a detachment from the narrated events as well as provide a more iconic or socially-recognized identity (thereby *demonstrating* that experience). In the case of the cognitively healthy group, the proportions are higher due to the sheer number of clauses present in the telling and retelling.

When compared to the number clauses used by the DAT speakers, the higher number of clauses used by the cognitively healthy group gives the illusion that they used more character role in the retelling. However, the opposite is true as the number of instances of reported speech in this group decreased upon retelling (from 52 instances to 39). Nevertheless, the findings demonstrate that the cognitively healthy group maintained relatively stable proportions from one telling to the next. The data suggest that the DAT speakers fared better at shifting roles in the retelling while the cognitively healthy group displayed a relatively stable pattern in both tellings.

Double voicing, or the combination of two speaker roles (e.g., narrator-character), was also observed in each group’s tellings and retellings. Table 7.4 below more clearly demonstrates the proportion of double voicing instances in the telling and the retelling. As stated in chapter 3,
these consist of the following double role combinations: narrator-character, interlocutor-narrator, and character-interlocutor.

Table 7.4 Double Voicing across the DAT and Cognitively Healthy Bilinguals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roles</th>
<th>Bilinguals with DAT</th>
<th>Cognitively Healthy Bilinguals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First Telling</td>
<td>Second Telling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First Telling</td>
<td>Second Telling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrator-Character</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interlocutor-Narrator</td>
<td>18.25</td>
<td>19.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character-Interlocutor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proportion of total utterances

Unlike the previous table, the proportions above remain relatively stable from one telling to the next in both the DAT speakers and the cognitively healthy group. The only exception was the slight increase of interlocutor-narrator role in the cognitively healthy group, which seems to suggest the speakers made use of more nonreferential indexicals while advancing the plot. This could have been established by using other linguistic strategies (i.e., discourse markers, quantifiers, intensifiers, etc.). These strategies will be discussed further in the next subsection.

In Table 7.5 below, I demonstrate the main categories, combining the clauses marked under both the principal roles (narrator, interlocutor, character) and the doubly voiced roles addressed above. These are included for purposes of better understanding the phenomena involved in speaker roles in these two populations of speakers. I presented these combined roles differently, including all combined categories after each principal role. That is, narrator is listed with narrator/character and narrator/interlocutor. Interlocutor is listed with interlocutor/character and interlocutor/narrator. Character is listed with character/narrator and character/interlocutor. Hence, these proportions overlap with other double voiced roles.
Table 7.5 Shifts in Speaker Roles across the DAT and Cognitively Healthy Bilinguals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roles</th>
<th>Bilinguals with DAT First Telling</th>
<th>Second Telling</th>
<th>Cognitively Healthy Bilinguals First Telling</th>
<th>Second Telling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N + N/C + I/N^a</td>
<td>59.12</td>
<td>67.93</td>
<td>51.43</td>
<td>68.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I + I/N + C/I^b</td>
<td>56.93</td>
<td>41.98</td>
<td>33.34</td>
<td>41.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C + N/C + C/I^c</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>13.74</td>
<td>33.34</td>
<td>36.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proportion of total utterances
a Narrator (N)
b Interlocutor (I)
c Character (C)

Similar to the findings in Table 7.3, the proportions for all possible combinations of speaker roles suggest that the DAT speakers benefited from retelling their stories. Again, this group demonstrates noticeable increases in the narrator and character role, while demonstrating a decrease in the interlocutor role. This contrasts with the cognitively healthy group as the proportions of all categories increase slightly for this group. These tables suggest that when using the data provided here, we can further observe how narrative retellings benefit both groups, but more so the DAT speakers’ group. The proportions also seem to point to some of the features of retellings previously discussed in chapter 3. That is, the data seem to support the notion of reorganization, consolidation, omission of less salient details, and an increase in dialogic quality. The data also suggest that the current study’s participants demonstrated a keen understanding of these varied and complex shifts in roles that hint to a preserved narrative ability, which is enhanced upon retelling.

Other Linguistic Strategies

While the various strategies used by speakers in the telling and retelling of their stories were not analyzed quantitatively, the qualitative analysis presented in chapters 5 and 6 of the two different versions of their stories brings to light the significance of these in the tellings and retellings. Much like the cognitively healthy group, DAT speakers also employed other strategies...
to display the self. That is, while telling their stories, participants used extreme case formulations, intensifiers, alternation in reported verb tenses, discourse markers, oh-prefaced turns, and repetition, among others. They strategically employed these various devices to make particular points stand out in the stories these participants told. In turn, these strategies afforded them with multiple ways of presenting the sense of self in their two languages and two tellings.

**Referential Content**

Referential content across the tellings was also analyzed. The cognitively healthy group repeated the referential content of their stories without displaying many difficulties. On the other hand, in the DAT group some differences were observed in the process of the retellings. In terms of referential content, not all cases demonstrated stability across the versions of the ‘same’ stories. As I had previously noted in chapter 6, most of the first tellings were more abbreviated than their counterparts (the cognitively healthy group) and offered less salient details. Nevertheless, most key referential content was repeated in the speakers’ other language. The retellings in the DAT group revealed that through the act of rehearsing their previously told stories, the speakers enacted more active, involved, and lively versions of the ‘same’ stories. The differences observed across the two tellings may be due to cognitive decline or to unmet interactional needs that I may not have been aware of at the time of the interview. Regardless of the differences observed in the referential content between these two groups, the DAT speakers demonstrated their abilities to tell and retell their stories, and through these present their sense of self. This will be addressed below in the discussion of the hypotheses formulated in this study.

**7.2.3 Hypotheses Revisited**

Based on the research questions that guided the current study, I formulated three hypotheses regarding the narrative expression of the sense of self in older bilingual Latinos with
DAT. These were listed as follows in chapter 1: (1) participants with DAT will display a preserved sense of self in their twice-told stories; (2) participants with DAT will show fewer instances of reported speech and character speaker role than normal controls in both tellings, and (3) participants with DAT will show lower complexity of reported speech than normal controls in both tellings. These will be addressed individually below.

Hypothesis #1: participants with DAT will display a preserved sense of self in their twice-told stories

The findings discussed above demonstrate that DAT speakers indeed displayed a preserved sense of self in their twice-told stories. This was manifested in the various forms of indexing the self in their stories. These speakers indexed the self through reported speech or voicing of self and others, speaker roles, language/coding choices, among other linguistic strategies. Moreover, these speakers’ sense of self seemed enhanced in their retellings, a crucial finding greatly benefitting the group of DAT speakers in the current study. The boost received from ‘rehearsing’ their stories was noticeable not only in the frequency of reported speech and speaker roles (as noted in the tables above), but also in the increased richness and liveliness of their retellings. Furthermore, in narrating their stories in their two languages (Spanish and English), participants displayed and maintained their sense of self without much (if any) hesitation—even at times where they might not have been able to produce their narratives in the target language that was called for in the interview.

Hypothesis #2: participants with DAT will show fewer instances of reported speech and character speaker role than normal controls in both tellings

The findings demonstrate that DAT speakers consistently show fewer instances of reported speech in both the tellings and the retellings. Results also show that the proportions of
character role (and its double voicing with other roles) are consistently lower for this group in both the tellings and retellings. However, the findings also demonstrate that although speakers made use fewer instances of reported speech and character role, they were capable of telling and retelling their stories, and through them, display who they are (or were) in a given here-and-now/there-and-then context (and language). More revelatory, though, is the fact that retellings are favorable for these DAT speakers as twice-told stories seem to enhance the speakers’ overall access to memory, language, and narrative ability. Hence, while the data supports the hypothesis, other factors need to be considered to obtain a better perspective of the overall lower usage of reported speech and character role.

_Hypothesis #3: participants with DAT will show lower complexity of reported speech than normal controls in both tellings_

Much like the findings seen for the second hypothesis, the findings for complexity of reported speech suggest that indeed DAT speakers showed lower complexity of reported speech. While the cognitively healthy group embedded the voices of others in their stories, the DAT speakers did not embed others’ speech in the stories analyzed in chapter 6. As I had previously mentioned, this does not mean that these speakers failed to use embedded reported speech in their stories as their overall narrative tellings feature some embedded reported speech. More so, the failure to use it in the excerpts analyzed in chapter 6 may have been due to decline in syntactical complexity (Kemper, 1987a, 1987b; Snowdon et al., 1996).

_General Summary_

To the extent that the maintenance of self in persons with DAT can be indexed through the use of the various linguistic and discourse-based features discussed in the current study, the findings presented above reveal that the sense of self in this group of individuals seem somewhat
compromised at first (as seen in the data shown for first tellings). However, upon observing the data in second tellings, this characterization seemed to lose its grounding as the speakers seem vindicated upon retelling their stories. This is evident in the patterns of slight increase in frequency in reported speech or in the slightly increased proportions of character voicing in retellings. The findings presented above suggest that narrative retelling may aid a person’s access to memory, language, narrative ability, and may even replenish the display of his/her sense of self and identity. However, with a diagnosis of DAT, many communicative abilities (though not all) often persist into the late stages of the disease, and careful attention to this speech reveals that in storytelling, speakers may exhibit dimensions of meaning making that may not appear as evidently in other conversational genres (e.g., question-answer). It would seem, thus, that narrative inquiry offers an alternative frame to the dominant discourses regarding the self in DAT, or more precisely, the narration of the self in DAT. The fact that this group of bilingual older adults can narrate their stories and then retell them at a later date is a testament to the meaning making ability as well as a challenge to the perspective that DAT leads to “loss of self”.

With this said, I do not claim that narrative is certain to ameliorate lexical retrieval or, more generally, the progressive cognitive decline found in DAT. What this study aimed to show is that bilingual persons diagnosed with DAT can and are able to narrate their stories, and through these index who they are as discussed above. Next, I will discuss the limitations the current study presents.

7.3 Limitations

One limitation of the current study is that it focuses on a small number of participants, limiting the overall observations made about the narrative production of the self. The findings discussed above and in chapters 5 and 6 limit the results to these three individuals. A larger data
sample would be necessary to confirm the patterns observed in the current study. It should be noted that the specific strategies employed by this group of individuals, along with the results discussed in the current study, remain part of these individuals’ linguistic repertoires. As other researchers have noted, the findings reported here, thus, are specific to these individuals and may not be true of other speakers with DAT, as the disease can affect people differently.

Another limitation of this study is that it did not collect the speakers’ intuitions and self-perceptions of their own sense of self and identity. Asking the speakers how they felt and experienced their own sense of self in their two languages would have worked as an added layer of analysis to the current study, providing multiple dimensions to how language and identity are linked. In the cognitively healthy group, this data would have added to the growing body of literature and research conducted on bilinguals’ experience of language and identity (Dewaele, 2016; Koven, 2007; Pavlenko, 2006), adding a new dimension to the study of language, self, and identity. For the group of bilinguals diagnosed with DAT, this could serve as an additional strategy to analyze the persistence or maintenance of self in these individuals as well as provide a more personalized account of how a person with DAT experiences the disease.

Lastly, the fact that the current study did not use a multimodal perspective, such as video recording, in order to reach a better understanding of other aspects of discourse is another limitation. Nonverbal communication is an important factor to consider when a researcher is interpreting not only what was said, but how it was said and what kind of gestures were used in the exchange. This will be discussed further in the next section.

### 7.4 Implications for Future Studies

While the current study contributes to an understanding of which narrative abilities persist or are maintained in bilinguals with DAT, and how those abilities, when rehearsed, are
enhanced, one area that is not explored in the current study is how the inclusion of interview assistants would have affected the process and the product of the narratives told by the participants. Other studies have noted that the use of interview assistants or other participants to play the role of interviewer have generated referential content that is stable across both tellings (Koven, 2001, 2002, 2007). However, in the case of eliciting narrative data from persons with DAT, it would be interesting to discover whether this approach may result in similar consistencies and stability in the narrative elicitations.

As I stated in the previous section, another underexplored area in the current study is the use of multimodal perspectives in the analysis of self and identity in bilinguals with DAT. In particular, video-recording the interactions between bilinguals with DAT and a non-impaired interlocutor can afford researchers with a better understanding of the strategies used by the DAT group vis-à-vis a cognitively healthy group. Researchers can explore the interpersonal and intercultural dynamics that occur in the interview process, as well as the way speakers use gesture (or perhaps gaze) to signal their identities and perhaps negotiate identities with others in their interactional space. This would be worth pursuing as a means of adding another layer of analysis to future studies.

Regardless of the suggested directions provided above, more studies on the presentation of self and identity in persons with DAT are undoubtedly necessary. Not only are these needed so that we as a society continue to challenge the idea that the self is lost in DAT, but also so that we reach a better understanding of what communicative abilities remain in a person with DAT and what these findings may imply about social interaction with a loved one with DAT, caregiving, or even clinical interventions. Moreover, more research on language and self that includes participants of Hispanic background (generally both underrepresented and underserved)
is necessary to improve our understanding of how bilingual Hispanics diagnosed with DAT communicate sense of self in his/her two languages. Studies of this nature contribute to the nation’s on-going engagement with Hispanics with DAT, a vulnerable population, and the implications of living, participating, and engaging in/with a multicultural society.

The study of the narrative production of self can be expanded to include other bilingual groups as the methodology employed in the current study can be utilized in other contexts and across different language groups. Its use can provide not only a richer body of literature of the sense of self in DAT, but can also contribute to the call to provide data-rich language examples to further support the analysis of how persons with DAT communicate and how we can enhance our communication with them (Davis, 2005). Furthermore, data rich samples can contribute to the growing body of literature that explores how the self persists and is maintained in persons with DAT. In this sense, we can conclude with Ballenger that “We need to find ways to listen to and appreciate the experience of people with dementia, not only to create a truly ethical approach to our treatment of them but because we need to bear witness to their struggle as a shared experience” (Ballenger, 2006).
APPENDIX A

DEMOGRAPHICS AND LANGUAGE HISTORY QUESTIONNAIRE

Please check/fill out all that apply.

1. Sex:
   □ Male
   □ Female

2. Age: ______ years

3. Marital Status:
   □ Single (never been married)
   □ Married
   □ Separated
   □ Divorced

4. What is your religious preference? ________________

5. Which category best describes your ethnicity? Please choose one.
   □ Latino/a
   □ Puerto Rican-American
   □ Chicano/a
   □ Hispanic
   □ Spanish
   □ Caucasian
   □ Black or African-American
   □ Biracial
   □ Other (please specify): __________

6. Where were you born (city, state, country)? _______________

7. How long have you lived in the United States? ________ years

8. Mark the generation that best applies to you. Choose only one.
   □ 1st generation = You were born in another country.
   □ 2nd generation = You were born in USA, either parent born in another country.
   □ 3rd generation = You were born in USA, both parents born in USA and all grandparents born in another country.
   □ 4th generation = You and your parents born in USA and at least one grandparent born in another country with remainder born in the USA.
   □ 5th generation = You and your parents born in the USA and all grandparents born in the USA.
9. a. What is the highest level of education that you have completed? Check one.
   - Grade school or less
   - Some high school
   - High school degree/GED
   - Some college or vocational school
   - College degree
   - Some graduate school
   - Graduate degree
b. How many years did you complete? ____________ years

10. Are you working at this time?
   - yes
   - no
10b. What is/was your job title? ______________________

11. What is your total annual income? Check one.
   - $10,000 or less
   - $20,000 or less
   - $30,000 or less
   - $40,000 or less
   - $50,000 or less
   - Other: ______________________

12. Are you currently enrolled in school?
   - yes
   - no
12b. If yes, what type of school do you attend?
   - High school/GED
   - College or vocational school
   - Graduate school

13. How well do you understand Spanish?
   - Not at all
   - Somewhat well
   - Very Well

14. How well do you speak Spanish?
   - Not at all
   - Somewhat well
   - Very Well

15. How well do you understand English?
   - Not at all
   - Somewhat well
   - Very Well
16. How well do you speak English?
   - [ ] Not at all
   - [ ] Somewhat well
   - [ ] Very Well

17. How did you learn Spanish and English?
   - [ ] I learned both languages at the same time.
   - [ ] I learned Spanish and then English.
   - [ ] I learned English and then Spanish.

18. Approximately how old were you when you learned Spanish? _____ years

19. Where did you learn Spanish?
   - [ ] mostly at home
   - [ ] mostly at school
   - [ ] both at home and at school

20. How old were you when you learned English? _____ years

21. Where did you learn English?
   - [ ] mostly at home
   - [ ] mostly at school
   - [ ] both at home and at school

Circle the number that best describes your language usage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Only Spanish</th>
<th>Mostly Spanish</th>
<th>Both Spanish and English</th>
<th>Mostly English</th>
<th>Only English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22. Spouse/Domestic Partner?</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Father/Mother/siblings/son/daughter?</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Latino friends or relatives of similar age?</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. What language do you normally use at home when discussing personal and domestic matters with your:

23. What language do you normally use when discussing daily events with your:

24. What language do you normally use in shops/markets in speaking to your:

   - [ ] Spouse/Domestic Partner?
   - [ ] Father/Mother/siblings/son/daughter?
   - [ ] Latino friends or relatives of similar age?

   - [ ] Only Spanish
   - [ ] Mostly Spanish
   - [ ] Both Spanish and English
   - [ ] Mostly English
   - [ ] Only English
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### 25. Please indicate whether each of the following people can speak or understand English.

- **Your spouse/domestic partner:**
  - [ ] yes
  - [ ] no
  - [ ] N/A

- **Your family (father/mother/siblings/son/daughter):**
  - [ ] yes
  - [ ] no
  - [ ] N/A

- **Your Latino friends or relatives of similar age:**
  - [ ] yes
  - [ ] no
  - [ ] N/A

### 26. Please indicate whether each of the following people can speak or understand Spanish.

- **Your spouse/domestic partner:**
  - [ ] yes
  - [ ] no
  - [ ] N/A

- **Your family (father/mother/siblings/son/daughter):**
  - [ ] yes
  - [ ] no
  - [ ] N/A

- **Your Latino friends or relatives of similar age:**
  - [ ] yes
  - [ ] no
  - [ ] N/A
APPENDIX B

OPEN-ENDED BILINGUAL HISTORY QUESTIONNAIRE

Title of Project: Narratives of Self in Bilingual Hispanics diagnosed with Alzheimer’s Disease

Principal Investigator: Patria C. López de Victoria

(1) How long did you live in your country?
(2) Where did you live in your country?
(3) When did you move to the United States?
(4) Why did you move to the United States?
(5) Where did you live in the United States?
(6) What was your occupation when you lived in the United States?
APPENDIX C

NARRATIVE INTERVIEW

Title of Project: Narratives of Self in Bilingual Hispanics diagnosed with Alzheimer's Disease

Principal Investigator: Patria C. López de Victoria

The participants will be asked the following questions in Spanish:

- ¿Me podría contar algo acerca de esta foto?
- ¿Cuál es el contexto de esta foto?
- ¿Cuándo se tomó esta foto?
- ¿Cuál es la ___ y los eventos relacionados con esta foto?
- ¿Ud. me podría contar algo acerca de las personas en esta foto?
- ¿Quién/es es/son la/s persona/s que aparece/n en esta foto?
- ¿A qué edad Ud. conoció esta persona?
- ¿Cómo conoció a esta persona?
- ¿Me podría contar algo de algún buen momento que haya pasado con esta persona?
- ¿Me podría contar alguna historia de un momento triste/malo que haya pasado con esta persona?
- ¿Me podría contar alguna historia de algún momento que haya tenido una discusión o desacuerdo que haya tenido con esta persona?

The participants will be asked the same questions in English:

- Can you tell me about this photograph?
- What is the context of this photo?
- When was this photo taken?
- What is the location and events related to this photo?
- Can you tell me something about the person/s in this photo?
- Who are they?
- At what age did you meet this/these person/s?
- How did you meet this/these person/s?
- Can you tell me about a good time you had with a/the person in this photo?
- Can you tell me about a bad time you had with a/the person in this photo?
- Can you tell me of a time you had a discussion or a disagreement with this person?
APPENDIX D

TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS

. A period with space on either side indicates a full stop pause (less than 0.5 second). Longer pauses are given in parentheses and are rounded to the nearest second

? A question mark indicates the end of a clause analyzed as a question

- A hyphen indicates an incomplete word or utterance

(1.0) A period inside parentheses indicates a timed pause of more than 1 second

= An equal sign at the end of one’s speaker’s utterance and at the start of the next utterance indicates the absence of a discernible gap (i.e., a latch to the start of another speaker’s words)

(  ) Single parentheses provide more information (i.e., laughter, cough)

(( )) Double parentheses indicate that there exists some doubt as to the accuracy of the transcription

[  ] Brackets indicate transcriber’s notes

XX XX indicate inaudible material or material difficult to make out.

Capital letters are used for words/syllables uttered with emphasis

% % The percent symbol encloses words or phrases that were spoken very quietly.

.hh .hh indicates a sharp intake of breath.

… ellipsis indicates material has been omitted
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