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ABSTRACT

This thesis examines the narratives and meta-commentary of Indonesian users of English about their English as a Second Language (ESL) experiences. It approaches interview data with ten Indonesian second language (L2) speakers of English from a narrative analysis/inquiry perspective. Each interview was transcribed according to a modified set of discourse analysis (DA) transcription conventions, then coded by the researcher. The first research question addressed what linguistic devices members of this population used to achieve cohesion and coherence in their narratives, and the second research question examined how members of this population portrayed their L2 selves in their narratives. The data yielded 21 linguistic devices that fell into three levels of frequency. Connectives, discourse markers, and repetition were by far the most common linguistic devices, followed by adverbials, embedded clauses, intensifiers, and the word like (non-comparison uses), which were somewhat frequent linguistic devices. The data also showed that participants constructed their L2 selves using three main categories: agency, identity, and perceptions of English and the U.S. In regard to identity, participants invoked membership categorization, where they portrayed their identities in relation to other individuals. The study concludes with suggestions for future research, especially relating to Indonesian L2 users of English.
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INTRODUCTION

This thesis tackles the broad question of how Indonesian second language (L2) users of English speak, especially when talking about their English as a Second Language (ESL) experiences. To do so, I rely on theory and methods from the fields of second language acquisition (SLA), narrative analysis, and narrative inquiry. I consider two aspects of participants’ speech: what linguistic devices they use in their narratives, and how they portray their L2 selves. Studying the specific linguistic devices used by participants is valuable because it provides information on how they achieve cohesion and coherence in their narratives. It shows how they speak on a more “micro” level, that of words, phrases, and sentences. In addition, examining how participants construct their L2 selves through their narratives is important because it demonstrates how they view themselves and others in relation to their ESL experiences. It gives insight into how they address more “macro” issues in their narratives, such as their agency, identity, and ideologies associated with language learning. The data for this study stem from research interviews used to generate data on Indonesian L2 users of English and their grammatical errors when speaking in English. In the present thesis, I examine the data in a significantly different manner. First, I take a quantitative approach to participants’ linguistic devices in their narratives, then turn to a more qualitative study of participants’ L2 identities.
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Theoretical Framework

Storytelling is a central part of what it means to be human – to doing, being, and negotiating in the world. Every day, in all different contexts and situations, we tell stories to convey and construct our experiences and to “make sense of ourselves as individuals and as members of groups” (Johnstone, 2001, p. 640). In a similar vein, Connelly and Clandinin (1990) describe humans as storytelling beings “who, individually and collectively, lead storied lives” (p. 2). Given the importance of stories in people’s lives, narrative analysis and narrative inquiry are important fields because they allow us to better understand how we view and construct ourselves, others, and our world.

Georgakopoulou and Goutsos (1997) define narratives as “reconstructions and reconstitutions of past events” (p. 44) that are portrayed from a particular perspective and within a particular context, so they do not merely recount past events, but also reflect the storyteller’s attitudes and beliefs. Polanyi (1985b) describes narrative as a temporally-ordered timeline of events (instantaneous occurrences) and states (durative occurrences). She also distinguishes several sub-categories of narrative: stories (where the reference point is in the past compared to the time of narration), plans (where the reference point is in the future compared to the time of narration), and simultaneous narration (where the reference point and narration move along together). In this thesis, I use the terms story and narrative interchangeably, as Gubrium and Holstein (2009) and Norrick (2000) do, to refer to retellings of events and/or states in the past, present, or future. However, not
everyone agrees with this view (see Polanyi, 1985a).\(^1\) I recognize that not all of participants’ interview data can be considered narratives in the traditional sense, as they did not involve a temporal sequence of events (Polanyi, 1985b). However, for ease of terminology, I use the terms narrative and story as umbrella terms to refer to participants’ actual narratives, as well as other meta-commentary about their ESL experiences that did not involve temporally-ordered events (Pavlenko, 2007).

Stories are inherently “communicative act[s]” and “interactive process[es]” (Gülich & Quasthoff, 1985, p. 170). This goes along with the larger notion in discourse analysis (DA) that discourse is transactional, in that it allows us to communicate information and ideas to others. Discourse (and narrative) is also interactional, in that it allows us to express and perpetuate social relationships and values (Brown & Yule, 1983). As a genre of discourse, stories “are not simply told by storytellers who in some sense take a long turn at talk; rather, they are collaboratively achieved by the participants through and in the telling of stories” (Liddicoat, 2007, p. 302). In the case of this study, narratives were produced in an interview setting, in response to the researcher’s explicit solicitation of narratives through interview questions (Norrick, 2000). In many cases, the storyteller first provided a story preface. This negotiated interactional space (that the teller wanted to talk for an extended amount of time), established tellability (that the story was unknown, interesting, and relevant), and gave some sort of clue as to what the story was about (Liddicoat, 2007; Sacks, 1992a, 1992b). As the researcher, I aligned as the story recipient and indicated my willingness to listen to the participant’s story through

---

\(^1\) According to Polanyi (1985a), all stories are narratives, but not all narratives are stories. A narrative is merely a recounting of events organized in chronological order, whereas a story is “a specific past-time narrative that makes a point” (p. 189). The distinction will be irrelevant for the current study.
silence or the use of continuers such as *mhm* (Jefferson, 1978). In some cases, I provided assessments such as *yeah or that’s great!* to agree that the story had been completed or remark on the point of the story, and in other cases, I asked follow-up questions that prompted another story. Thus, both the storyteller and I (as the researcher) were active participants in the narrative itself.

One direction that narrative analysis often takes is studying the overall structural design of stories; another direction is studying the linguistic techniques common in stories (Gülich & Quasthoff, 1985). The first part of this thesis addresses these linguistic devices used by participants in their narratives. Conjunction (joining words or phrases together through coordinating or subordinating conjunctions) is a frequent linguistic device, as are discourse markers, which include interjections (*oh, well*) and comment phrases (*you know, I mean*) (Georgakopoulou & Goutsos, 1997; Halliday & Hasan, 1976; Labov, 1972). Repetition occurs in various forms and is quite common in narratives (Labov, 1972; Tannen, 1989). Other important linguistic devices are reference (including pronouns), substitution (using one or more words to substitute for a different group of words), ellipsis (omitting one or more words to avoid unnecessary repetition), and collocation (using groups of words that go together) (Chafe, 1982; Halliday & Hasan, 1976). Hedges, intensifiers, and reported speech are common linguistic devices, as are verbal features such as progressives, participles, negatives, questions, commands, and modals (Chafe, 1982; Labov, 1972). According to Labov (1972), linguistic devices allow the storyteller to provide evaluation on the story, while Chafe (1982) states that certain linguistic features can show the narrator’s personal involvement in or connection to the events of the story. Tannen (1989) explains that features such as repetition allow
storytellers to get their point across and enable the audience to follow along, while Georgakopoulou and Goutsos (1997) state that linguistic devices signal temporal and causal relationships, provide connection between ideas, and indicate the key points of the story. These individuals’ lists of linguistic devices overlap to some degree, so in this study, I have combined these researchers’ ideas to create a list of linguistic devices used by participants. See Appendix A for this list.

The second part of this thesis falls under the area of narrative inquiry. According to Clandinin and Connelly (2000), narrative inquiry exists in a three-dimensional model. First, narrative inquiry addresses temporality, or the past, present, and future dimensions of events. Second, narrative inquiry treats narratives as social interaction, in that they are co-constructed by the storyteller and audience (Liddicoat, 2007). This gives both a personal and social element to any narrative. In the context of the research interview, the way that participants answer varies based on factors such as the interaction between the participant and researcher, the questions the researcher asks (or does not ask), the responses or lack of responses the researcher gives, the context of the interview, and the relative social status and power of the participant and researcher. Finally, narrative inquiry examines the context and space in which the narrative takes place (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000). According to Pavlenko (2007), narrative inquiry also takes into account the fact that storytellers construct their experiences as a particular version of reality, based on the audience and social context in which the story is told. Additionally, participants often construct their identities and ideologies through narrative. Narrative inquiry looks at what participants are doing through their narratives and how they do so.
It assumes that narratives are not neutral, but always have some purpose and outcome in mind (Pavlenko, 2007).

Narrative analysis and narrative inquiry exist as approaches within the larger framework of DA, which is the study of language in context and language in use (Cameron, 2001). DA examines “patterns of language across texts as well as the social and cultural contexts in which the texts occur” (Paltridge, 2012, p. 1). Over the past several decades, much DA research has intersected with SLA studies, especially in regard to the semantic, communicative, and pragmatic functions of language (e.g., Alcón Soler & Safont-Jordà, 2012; Bloome et al., 2008; Boxer & Cohen, 2004; Fine, 1988; Larsen-Freeman, 1980).

Before proceeding further, it is important to make a note about terminology. In this thesis, I adopt the convention in SLA to use the term L2 as an umbrella term to refer to any language that is learned after an individual’s first language (L1), whether that be a second, third, fourth, etc. language (Ortega, 2009). It is important to remember that while I refer to participants of the study as L2 speakers of English, several learned English as a third language (L3) or fourth language (L4), rather than as an L2. Also within SLA research, a distinction is sometimes made between English as a second language (ESL) and English as a foreign language (EFL) learning environments (Ortega, 2009). ESL contexts (such as the U.S. or Australia) are primarily English-speaking countries, whereas English is not the primary language in EFL environments. Though the distinction is sometimes beneficial, here I use the term ESL to refer to any and all of participants’ experiences learning English, both those in ESL and EFL contexts.
Linguistic Devices

In this study, I first examine the various linguistic devices that participants used to achieve cohesion and coherence in their narratives. Cohesion refers to the various ways that storytellers use language to create connectedness in their narratives. For example, the use of adverbial clauses such as first and next provides cohesion in narratives so the listener can follow what is happening. Coherence refers to meaningfulness, or the overall ability of the listener to make sense out of the narrative. For example, adverbial clauses also contribute to the meaning of a narrative by providing a framework (often temporal or causal) in which to interpret the story. Cohesion and coherence are very closely intertwined, and both are equally important in narratives.

Connectives have been described in the literature as expressing additive, causal, and temporal relationships between events and ideas (Celce-Murcia & Larsen-Freeman, 1999). This is especially important in narratives, as connectives enable the listener to understand the relationship between events (cohesion) as well as the meaning of these relationships (coherence). For example, the use of temporal connectives in stories (such as and then, when, before, after) provides a sense of connectedness in the story (cohesion) by indicating the relative times at which events took place, while also providing a framework in which listeners can make sense of the events (coherence).

Discourse markers have also been described in the literature as creating cohesion and coherence in spoken communication (Adams Goertel, 2011; Fung & Carter, 2007; Georgakopoulou & Goutsos, 1997). The term discourse marker refers to a variety of linguistic devices, including comment phrases (such as yeah, mhm, you know), interjections (such as oh, oh yeah, wow), response tokens (such as yes, no), agreement
markers (such as right, yeah), and turn-enders (such as so, though). Discourse markers serve a variety of functions, and a single discourse marker can fulfill more than one function, such as framing the story, creating rapport between the storyteller and listener, affirming ideas, involving the listener in the story, or expressing surprise or emotion (Georgakopoulou & Goutsos, 1997). In a study on discourse markers, Adams Goertel (2011) examined the unplanned speech of university-level English language learners (ELLs). She found that discourse markers signal relationships between utterances and point the listener’s attention to the immediate discourse context. She also found that discourse markers (plus repetition and silence) were used by participants for a variety of pragmatic functions, including holding the floor, affirming opinions, linking ideas, clarifying statements, redirecting the conversation, and carrying out repair. Without discourse markers, the connectedness and meaningfulness of discourse (especially oral narratives) would be significantly less.

Repetition also facilitates cohesion and coherence. Tannen (1989) lists five reasons why we use repetition in discourse: 1) production is more efficient if the same structure can be used again; 2) the listener’s comprehension is better, as repeated ideas give the listener more time to process the words; 3) connections between ideas (cohesion) are more easily apparent if certain parts or structures are repeated; 4) interactional purposes are accomplished, such as getting/keeping the floor or linking one’s ideas to someone else’s; and 5) meaning (coherence) can be subtly adjusted with each repetition. Although all of these are important in participants’ data, the third and fifth points are most relevant when discussing the role of repetition in creating cohesion and coherence in participants’ talk.
Other linguistic devices provide structural cohesion within a narrative. For example, adverbials provide this structural cohesion by giving information about the direction, goal, location, time, manner, frequency, and purpose (Celce-Murcia & Larsen-Freeman, 1999). In some ways, they are the “glue” that holds the narrative together, especially by answering the questions *where*, *when*, *why*, *how*, and *to what extent*. In addition to providing a sense of connectedness among events, adverbials also indicate the context of events (such as when and how they occurred), thus clarifying the meaning of the utterance. In a similar fashion, embedded clauses contribute to the structural cohesion of a narrative, in that a more complex sentence structure reduces the number of simple sentences, thus making the narrative less choppy. Embedded clauses also enhance coherence by providing additional information and indicating relationships between ideas (Celce-Murcia & Larsen-Freeman, 1999). Similar to embedded clauses, relative clauses contribute to the structural cohesion of utterances because they connect adjectival phrases with the nouns they modify. They also contribute to meaning, because a phrase such as *the English teacher who was from Indonesia* is more descriptive (and thus more meaningful) than the phrase *the English teacher* (Celce-Murcia & Larsen-Freeman, 1999). Labov (1972) suggested the categories of comparators (marked verbal features such as questions, commands, and modals) and correlatives (more complex syntax such as progressives and participles). Comparators and correlatives are important for both cohesion and coherence, as they provide a structural framework in which certain events took place, from which the meaning is derived. For example, with the progressive, one can indicate that a certain event was going on when another event occurred. Finally, according to Halliday and Hasan (1976), anaphoric reference also contributes to
structural cohesion, in that it refers to anything that came before in the context of the conversation. Anaphoric reference helps maintain clarity throughout the narrative, which is essential to the listener’s understanding.

Still other linguistic devices mainly contribute to the meaning of a word, phrase, or utterance. According to Chafe (1982), intensifiers contribute to speakers’ meaning by intensifying specific words in some way or another. Saying that English is very hard to learn, for instance, is more emphatic than saying that English is hard to learn. The addition of an intensifier can yield a different meaning, sometimes quite different and other times only subtly different. Hedges often express uncertainty, hesitation, or approximation, or are used when giving a noncommittal response. Hedges are important for coherence, as they provide a sense of uncertainty or guessing that can change the meaning (Oullette, 2001; Weatherall, 2011). Quantifiers express the quantity of nouns and also contribute to coherence, as there is a significant difference in meaning between a few people and many people, or the first time and the fifth time (Celce-Murcia & Larsen-Freeman, 1999). The word just can take on a variety of functions, including intensifier, hedge, and quantifier, that change the meaning of the utterance (Lindemann & Mauranen, 2001). Comparison words make an overt comparison between two or more entities, thus giving meaning to utterances by providing a framework in which to understand the topic at hand (Celce-Murcia & Larsen-Freeman, 1999). Double topics and topicalization are marked grammatical constructions that provide emphasis to the sentence, thus changing the meaning in often subtle ways. A double topic is when a noun (often a subject) is spoken twice, often with variation (such as a pronoun for the second time). Topicalization is when the object of the sentence is placed in subject position, with the subject and verb
following it (Celce-Murcia & Larsen-Freeman, 1999). Although the word *like* is often used in comparisons, it also fulfills a number of other functions in discourse that contribute to cohesion and coherence. The use of *like* helps to hold the floor and eliminate longer pauses between utterances, which could reduce the connectedness between ideas. As a quotative, *like* signals to the listener that reported speech is about to be mentioned. Using *like* to mean “such as” or “approximately” refers the listener to something that is already known, thus providing a frame of reference in which to interpret the utterance. In other cases, the use of *like* can signal a cognitive search on the part of the speaker or provide focus or emphasis on particular ideas (Dailey-O’Cain, 2000).

Some linguistic devices help facilitate the interaction between participants in a conversation or narrative. According to Vettin and Todt (2004), laughter is an intensely interactive process, since it is rare that an individual will start laughing with no external person or stimulus to make him/her do so. Someone may laugh at a joke or facial expression, when watching another person, in the context of conversation, or even at a memory; however, these triggers of laughter are based on interaction of some sort, thus showing that laughter does not exist in a vacuum. Vettin and Todt bring out that laughter can fulfill many different purposes, and people laugh when experiencing a range of emotions, including happiness, surprise, amusement, and nervousness. Direct addresses are also inherently interactional, in that they involve the speaker directly talking to an interlocutor, thus involving him/her more actively in the conversation (Georgakopoulou & Goutsos, 1997). The same is true of clarification requests, which are a specific type of repair used to ask for additional information on or an explanation of something that
remains unclear or confusing to the listener (Schwartz, 1980). Epistemic stance markers are words/phrases that express the speaker’s attitudes, opinions, or feelings. Examples of stance markers include *I think, actually, of course, it’s fun, that was good,* and *I know.* Stance markers make the speaker’s opinions clear, thus giving structure and clarity to the interaction (Kärkkäinen, 2003). The use of reported speech conveys immediacy, credibility, vividness, and involvement on the part of the storyteller (Chafe, 1982; Holt, 1996; Labov, 1972). Reported speech not only aids in the unfolding of a cohesive narrative, but also contributes to the meaning of the narrative (and the interaction between speaker and listener) as being more “alive” and authentic (Celce-Murcia & Larsen-Freeman, 1999). In sum, the literature describes many linguistic devices used to achieve cohesion and coherence.

**Cross-Linguistic Narrative Studies**

There is a growing body of research on narrative structure and linguistic devices in narratives across different languages (e.g., Chafe, 1980; De Fina & Georgakopoulou, 2012; McCabe & Bliss, 2003; Minami, 2002; Pavlenko, 2006a; Tannen, 1982c; Tappe & Hara, 2013; Zini, 1992). These studies show that narratives are not organized the same way and do not use linguistic devices in the same way across all languages. Regarding narrative structures across languages, Temple and Koterba (2009) state that bilinguals sometimes present themselves differently in different languages. Pavlenko (2006b) emphasizes that narrative competence is dictated by cultural and linguistic norms, with the understanding that L2 learners will need to have a knowledge of narrative structures in the target language so as to produce appropriate narratives in their L2. Pavlenko (2006b) also suggests that narratives take on different structures in different languages,
such as the extent to which emotions are described, whether or not events unfold chronologically, and how resolution of conflict is addressed. The amount and type of evaluation, which is an important part of narrative structure, also varies cross-linguistically; for example, Spanish and Greek speakers tend to offer more evaluation than English speakers by adding their interpretation of events and the meaning of the story as a whole (Tannen, 1980, 1982c, 1983).

Regarding linguistic devices to create cohesion and coherence in narratives, Pavlenko (2006b) states that these devices exist cross-linguistically but vary from language to language. She highlights that the cohesive use of reference, temporality, and conjunction looks particularly different across languages. For example, Puerto Rican adults used significantly more reference in their Spanish narratives than English-speaking adults (McCabe & Bliss, 2003), whereas Japanese storytellers generally did not use nominal reference if something was already the center of the conversation (Chafe, 1980; Minami, 2002). De Fina and Georgakopoulou (2012) highlight that reference (specifically pronoun choice) indexes personalization (I), collectivization (we), or depersonalization (one) as individuals construct their identities through stories. Across different languages and cultures, stories display global themes that are basic to humanity, though embodied in local contexts and embedded within local norms and values.

Regarding temporality, some languages, such as Slavic languages, use the perfective/imperfective aspect where English would use simple past and present prefect (McCarthy, 1991). Other languages, such as Bahasa Indonesia (BI), do not have lexical tense or aspect but indicate durativity, perfectivity, and some sense of time (e.g., two weeks ago, tomorrow) through the use of optional adverbs (Sneddon, 1996). Finally,
Zambian speakers generally do not use the conjunctions *and* and *but* where English speakers would use them (McCarthy, 1991).

In many cultures, stories are viewed as “performances.” This is especially salient in cultures where oral literature (perhaps poetry) is an integral part of what it means to speak that particular language (De Fina & Georgakopoulou, 2012). BI and other languages spoken in Indonesia would fall under this category, especially in regard to traditional storytelling practices such as *wayang kulit* (shadow puppet theater) (Mrázek, 2002). For oral storytelling, linguistic devices such as reported speech, syntactic parallelism, significant detail, and meta-commentary or asides about the story all enhance the performance (De Fina & Georgakopoulou, 2012). Tannen (1989) found some of these same involvement features in Greek stories, though she also noted the use of the historical present and second person singular. She also brought out that *sense patterns* (such as tropes and imagery) and *sound patterns* (such as rhythm and repetition) create greater involvement in the story and enhance the credibility of the storyteller (that he/she was really there). Having reviewed some of the literature on similarities and differences in narratives cross-linguistically, we now turn to relevant research on agency, identity, and individuals’ perceptions.

**Agency, Identity, and Perceptions**

In the literature, agency is defined as the “socioculturally mediated capacity to act” (Ahearn, 2001, p. 112). In other words, an individual is free to act within the bounds determined by his/her culture and society. While a person is free to make many decisions about the course of his/her own life, these choices are governed (to some extent) by the laws, social norms, and expectations of other individuals and of society at large (Ahearn,
Agency is an important concept in SLA because it implies that the learner can take responsibility for his/her own language learning, at least to the extent of what he/she can control. An L2 learner may express agency by seeking out additional ways to learn and practice the L2, apart from in-class instruction. This might include speaking the L2 with friends or classmates, chatting with native speakers of the L2, finding ways to experience the culture of countries that speak the target language, watching movies or television in the L2, or visiting a country that speaks the L2. The topic of agency is an important consideration in any study involving L2 learners, as they often like to portray themselves as good language learners who own their language learning (Miller, 2012).

SLA does not depend solely on the individual, but is also governed by the social structures surrounding the L2 learning and teaching process. This tie between agency and social structures in L2 learning should not be underestimated (Ahearn, 2001). Social structures (such as schools, governments, or society at large) often require English language classes for schoolchildren. They determine the variety of English taught, the amount of instruction, and the methodologies used, thus exerting some control over the learner’s agency in the L2 learning process. The target language speakers and their willingness (or unwillingness) to engage in conversation in the target language with the learner can also affect the learner’s agency (Miller, 2012). However, this is not to say that everyone whose agency is lessened by social structures governing L2 learning and teaching lacks motivation, since motivation and investment in language learning can come from many different sources, including from within the individual (Dörnyei, 2001). It is important to remember that knowing a certain language (such as English) gives an individual linguistic capital that can lead to economic, educational, and social resources –
which then gives him/her more agency (or ability to act and be something) in society.

Conversely, not knowing a certain language can restrict one’s resources and thus position and mobility in society (Bourdieu, 1991).

Identity is also a key consideration in SLA. As described in the literature, identity is viewed as “multiple, fluid, dynamic, and constituted in discourse” (Menard-Warwick, 2005, p. 270). Identity is not static, but rather is a dynamic process that changes diachronically (over time) as people discover who they are, especially in relation to other individuals or groups. Identity can also change synchronically, as people can have different identities in different social contexts, or even different identities in the same social context (e.g., parent, boss, friend, volunteer). According to Menard-Warwick (2005), identity is a social activity, since identity is constructed in relation to and, to some extent, by the various social communities to which an individual belongs. Through discourse, individuals express, construct, negotiate, and challenge both their identities and the identities of other people. The way that people speak, the words and register they choose, the topics they bring up, and the group(s) with which they affiliate (or disaffiliate) in a given situation are all part of the construction of their identity and how they portray themselves to others.

This relates to the concept of membership categorization analysis (MCA), which examines how individuals negotiate and construct their identities in relation to various social groups (Sacks, 1992a, 1992b). MCA sheds light on how people view themselves and their sense of belonging in the world (Kasper, 2009). According to Baker (2004), people use language to seek belonging in or separation from specific groups in order to “achieve identities, realities, social order and relationships” (p. 164). This means that how
individuals use language gives insight into how they view themselves as individuals and as members of larger social communities and structures. In MCA, categorization in a particular group is just as important as categorization not in a particular group. In terms of L2 learning, MCA is an important concept because it examines how L2 learners construct their identities in regard to language and the communities to which they belong. For example, some language learners may identify more with their L1 community, while others may identify as L2 learners, L2 speakers, multilinguals, or full members of the target L2 community (Kasper, 2009).

Some recent research in narrative analysis and inquiry has focused on how L2 users construct their self identity through autobiographical narratives (e.g., Andrade, 2007; Miyahara, 2010). Li and Simpson (2013), for instance, found that migrant ESL learners expressed the concepts of investment in language learning, language as social/cultural capital (a resource that provides social power and value, as per Bourdieu, 1991), and imagined communities (communities to which individuals would like to belong in the future) through their personal narratives. By bringing up these ideas, they constructed their identity as language learners and as the type of English users they hoped to be someday. This study is relevant to the current study, as it shows how participants construct their identities (especially in relation to learning English) through their narratives.

Much recent work in SLA and DA has also focused on L2 learners’ perceptions of English and the U.S.. Wesely (2012) brings out that learner perceptions usually fall under two categories in the literature: learners’ perceptions of themselves (Williams & Burden, 1999) and learners’ perceptions of their language learning environment (Brown, 2009).
These perceptions also include learners’ beliefs about the target language and culture, and how they see themselves as belonging to that community (Wesely, 2012). In the literature, motivation is often tied to learners’ perceptions, in that learners who have positive perceptions of themselves as language learners, the language learning context, or the target language and culture may be more motivated to learn the L2 (Dörnyei, 2009). The concept of imagined communities is a key concept in SLA, especially as it relates to agency, motivation, identity, and perceptions (Norton, 2000; Norton Peirce, 1995).

Imagined communities refer to the communities to which learners see themselves belonging. For example, a junior high school student in China might learn English with the hope of being able to attend college in the U.S., which would be her imagined community. Learners’ perceptions are very closely tied to their imagined communities, and their goal of belonging to an imagined community may supply them with intrinsic motivation and lead them to take responsibility for their own language learning (Kanno & Norton, 2003; Norton, 2000).

In the literature, learners’ perceptions of English usually fall into several distinct categories. One of these is the various opportunities and resources afforded to those who possess the linguistic and cultural capital of knowing English (Bourdieu, 1991). For example, Korean graduate students studying in the U.S. viewed English as providing them with better educational opportunities, more prestigious and better-paying jobs, and higher social status, especially in relation to English-speaking communities (Kim, 2013). Chang (2011) found that Taiwanese students completing a doctoral degree in the U.S. assigned a very high value to a Ph.D. earned there, as well as the research assistantships, job opportunities, financial earnings, and other resources associated with English-
speaking countries. Learners’ perceptions of English also have to do with taking part in an increasingly globalized world. Gu (2010), for example, found that Chinese university students were motivated to learn English in order to be part of an imagined global community. Pakistani middle school students exhibited similar feelings; they viewed English as a language of opportunity and the language of media, science, and technology, and thus important for their global future (Norton & Kamal, 2003). In summary, research in SLA and DA continues to explore the role of agency, identity, and perceptions in SLA.

Motivation for the Study

There is relatively little research on BI, especially from a DA perspective. Several studies found that BI shares some similarities with English. For example, both Sari (2007) and Wouk (1998, 2001) found that speakers of BI use pragmatic particles and discourse markers to fulfill a variety of functions similar to those in English, such as expressing affirmation, indicating or inviting agreement, extending common ground, carrying out repair, building solidarity with interlocutors, or eliciting responses. Wouk (2005) noted that, just as in English, conversational same-turn self-repair in BI can consist of either a single word, or a clausal or verb phrase repair. Other studies have found differences between BI and English, especially in regard to the use of complementation structures (Englebretson, 2003) and locative prepositions (Djenar, 2007). Also different from English, demonstrative pronouns are often used as placeholders in BI when speakers are searching for words (Williams, 2012). With regard to identity and membership categorization, Berman (1992) found that the Indonesian participant in her study only used I in autobiographical narrative about life experiences specific to her; the rest of the time, she avoided personal, agentive involvement and
instead used the communal *we*. English speakers, on the other hand, do not tend to stay away from pronouns indicating personal involvement in events. Studies on Indonesian L2 users of English are even fewer; I only found three from a DA perspective and none relate directly to this study, as they focused on tense shift (Ihsan, 1988), paired storytelling techniques in the ESL classroom (Lie, 1994), and parent-child conversations about life and death (Leddon, Waxman, & Medin, 2011).

To my knowledge, researchers have not considered narrative structure or linguistic devices in BI, or the identities of Indonesians as expressed in their narratives. Also, Mambu’s (2013) study is the only one I am aware of that has investigated the structure of narratives told by an Indonesian L2 speaker of English. In his study, Mambu studied the narrative structure of three versions of the same story told by this advanced male EFL student. Mambu found that the participant roughly followed Labovian (1972) story structure (abstract, orientation, complicating action, evaluation, resolution, and coda) when telling a story in English, though these six components were not always organized according to Labov’s model, and certain components (e.g., complicating action and resolution) appeared more than once per story. I am not aware of any studies on the linguistic devices used by Indonesian L2 speakers of English, or how they express their identities in English narratives. With this gap in the literature in mind, it is the goal of this study to examine linguistic devices and identities in ESL narratives told by Indonesian L2 users of English.
THE RESEARCH STUDY

Research Questions

In this thesis, I aim to address the general question of how Indonesian L2 users of English speak through these questions:

1. What types of linguistic devices do Indonesian L2 speakers of English use in order to create cohesion and coherence within their narratives about learning English?

2. How do participants use language to portray their L2 selves (agency, identity, perceptions of English) when talking about their ESL/EFL experiences?

It should be noted that these two research questions are quite distinct and take two very different approaches to answer the same broad question. The first question takes a “micro,” quantitative approach to the data, while the second question takes a “macro,” qualitative approach. Since I treat these questions as two separate inquiries driven by two separate research methods, rather than combining them into a single approach, a divide exists in this thesis between these two questions. I recognize that this is perhaps the greatest flaw in this work, and I certainly realize the value of using an integrated approach to answer the question of how Indonesian L2 users of English tell stories. Future research could make connections between the two, showing how participants use specific linguistic devices (such as intensifiers, adverbials, or stance) to construct their agency, identity, and ideologies in their ESL narratives.

Participants

Indonesians in the community were solicited for participation in one-on-one interviews with the researcher. In the fall 2013 semester, I approached a few acquaintances who were originally from Indonesia about the possibility of participating
in research interviews about their experiences learning English as an L2. These volunteers helped to identify many other potential participants, both inside and outside the Phoenix, Arizona area. In order to be eligible for participation, volunteers had to be at least 18 years of age, originally come from Indonesia, speak BI, be an L2 user of English, reside in the U.S. at the time of the study, and not belong to vulnerable populations. Due to my personal preference of conducting in-person interviews if possible, only individuals who resided in the Phoenix area were invited to participate in the study, and due to time constraints, only the first ten volunteers for the study were interviewed. As such, my sampling methods for this study fell under the purposeful sampling paradigm common in qualitative research in applied linguistics. This type of sampling paradigm nearly always produces biased samples, but with the goal of providing quality, information-rich data (Perry, 2011). Specifically, I used criterion sampling, which selects participants based on specific criteria – in this case, that of being an adult Indonesian L2 speaker of English living in the U.S.. I also used convenience sampling, which selects participants based on their ease of accessibility to the researcher (Perry, 2011).

Despite the fact that the participants were not randomly sampled according to representative (probability) sampling techniques, they did represent fairly diverse backgrounds. Eight females and two males participated in the study, ranging in age from late twenties/early thirties to late sixties. Seven participants were from Jakarta, the capital of Indonesia, which is on the island of Java; two were from the island of Sulawesi; and one was from the island of Sumatra. The participants had lived in the U.S. (and Canada) for anywhere between two and 40+ years. Three participants had pursued some form of higher education in an English-speaking country (Australia, Canada, and the U.S.).
participants also represented a variety of educational, occupational, and socioeconomic backgrounds. Some had attended school through high school, while others held advanced degrees and worked in more specialized fields.

In addition to their other differences, participants came from different linguistic backgrounds. Out of the ten participants, four learned English as an L2 (after BI), while six grew up speaking a different language in addition to BI. More specifically, five participants learned English as their L3, after their native language (or “island language,” as they called it) and BI. One participant learned English as an L4. Language backgrounds other than BI included Gorontalo, Batak, Manado, Dutch, and Chinese. The linguistic backgrounds of participants reflect the greater linguistic diversity in Indonesia. BI (also called Indonesian) is a dialect of Malay and has been the official language of the Republic of Indonesia since 1945. (For more information on BI, see Sneddon, 1996; Tappendorf, 2014; Wolff, Oetomo, & Fietkiewicz, 1992.) Since about 550 different languages are spoken in Indonesia, BI serves to unite the nation in the midst of many linguistic, ethnic, and cultural differences. In 1928, around 5% of the population spoke BI as their native language, but as of the 2010 census, 92% of Indonesians speak BI, either as their L1 or L2 (Badan Pusat Statistik, 2010; Sneddon, 2003). The diversity in participants’ backgrounds reflects the even greater linguistic, ethnic, and cultural diversity found among the citizens of Indonesia, and indicates that the participants in this study formed a reasonably representative sample of the target population. See Appendix B for more detailed information about participants.

Even though participants represented diverse backgrounds, there are several limitations of the data given the fact that they were not randomly sampled. Since this is
the case, it cannot be assumed that the results of this study can be generalized to all adult Indonesian L2 speakers of English living in the U.S.. To make such a claim would require a much larger and even more diverse participant base. However, the data are useful in understanding how these individuals create cohesion and coherence in their narratives, and how they view their L2 identities and the L2 learning process. Secondly, the fact that participants were acquainted with the researcher (or were acquainted with participants who were acquainted with the researcher) may have had important ramifications on the topics they chose to mention, the amount of detail they provided, and the manner in which they talked about their experiences. Also, the fact that the majority of participants led relatively privileged lives – in that they attended college, live and work(ed) in the U.S., and enjoy many of the benefits associated with knowing English – perhaps makes the results of this study less applicable to other groups of adult Indonesian L2 users of English who are not as privileged. However, despite the limitations of the sampling of participants and thus the data, there is still much to be gleaned from the ESL experiences related by these individuals.

**Methodology and Materials**

Before beginning the study, the researcher secured approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) to ensure that the study would be carried out in a fair and ethical manner. The IRB granted the researcher exempt status in December 2013. See Appendices C-F for IRB documents related to this study.

Prior to each interview, the participant was informed about the study and signed an information and consent form acknowledging the procedures to be used. Participants were given the choice to complete an in-person, Skype, or phone interview, whatever was
most preferable and convenient for them. Six interviews took place in-person, two via Skype, and two on the phone. With the exception of one participant who Skyped while her children were in the room, all interviews took place one-on-one to avoid possible distractions. The in-person interviews were conducted at public places, such as at a gathering of Indonesians, a local business, and a church. The ten interviews were completed between December 15, 2013 and February 9, 2014 and were audio/video recorded so they could later be transcribed and analyzed.

During the interview, participants were asked a series of ten questions (some involving sub-questions) about their experiences learning English. Questions were somewhat open-ended and were designed to elicit stories from participants about their experiences learning English. In cases where the participant provided a yes/no response or minimal information, the researcher tried to elicit a story by asking one or more follow-up questions. As such, the interviews fell into the category of semi-structured research interviews (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998), which involve a set of questions that may be asked slightly differently to participants, while also allowing the researcher to ask follow-up questions, such as to elicit more details or clarify a participant’s statement.

The interviews generated 3 hours and 58 minutes of data. Interviews ranged in length from 10 minutes 29 seconds to 52 minutes 50 seconds. Of the nearly 4 hours of interview data, only the parts directly relating to participants’ experiences learning English were transcribed and analyzed. This amounted to 2 hours and 10 minutes of data. The researcher began each interview by asking about the participant’s language background; however, the information elicited from these questions was not included in the analysis since it did not constitute stories specifically relating to ESL experiences.
Relatively early in the interview, the researcher asked a question about whether or not the participant’s English teachers were native or non-native speakers; this question and resulting responses have also been excluded from the analysis, due to problematic constructions of the native/non-native speaker dichotomy, as well as the fact that this set of turns generally produced a yes/no response and/or very little information from participants. Certain other sections within participants’ stories about their ESL experiences that were judged by the researcher to contain sensitive or irrelevant information were omitted from the analysis. A somewhat significant portion of the data involved discussion of cultural traditions and values in Indonesia, so this information also was not included in the analysis since it did not fit the criteria for the content to be examined. Thus, the final set of questions included in the present analysis (in roughly this order, though the order varied slightly as the researcher followed up on various questions at different points in the interviews) is as follows:

1) When the participant first started learning English and how many years he/she studied English
2) What English classes the participant took
3) What attitudes or thoughts the participant had about learning English
4) Whether or not the participant thought English was hard to learn
5) What activities the participant did when in the ESL/EFL classroom
6) What the participant viewed as some of the biggest differences between BI and English
7) What thing(s) the participant found most difficult when learning English
8) Why the participant moved to the U.S., and how long he/she had been living here
9) Anything else the participant wanted to add about his/her experiences learning English

In excerpt (1) below, lines 10-11 would traditionally be considered *meta-commentary* instead of *narrative*, since they do not involve two or more event clauses (Polanyi, 1985b). However, as explained in the literature review, excerpts like this one were still considered under the umbrella term *narrative*, since they were highly relevant...
to how participants talked about their experiences learning English, as participants used various linguistic devices and portrayed their L2 selves. In excerpt (1), participant N used the intensifiers never, at all, and always (lines 10-11), as well as the quantifier every (line 11), to make her statement much more emphatic. These linguistic devices were common in other participants’ talk to emphasize certain statements or feelings. Additionally, participant N described a time in her life when her identity involved speaking BI rather than English. Excerpts that would traditionally be considered meta-commentary, such as the one below, are important to understanding how members of this population talked about their ESL experiences, and are thus considered in this analysis.

(1) Example of meta-commentary

```
((participant N had previously said that she started learning English when she was “junior”; here, R clarified what “junior” meant))

01 R: you said that you started learning English when you were (. ) did you mean in junior high school like
02 were (. ) did you mean in junior high school (. ) um or did you mean when you were in high school (. ) um or did you mean when you were in high school and it was your third year of
03 high school
04 N: (1.0)
05 oh junior high school is about uh: (. h) twelve
06 years old
07 R: oh >twelve years old okay< alright=
08 N: =yeah and I- I never learn about English <at all>
09 because I always speak Indonesia <every> day
```

In my analysis, I adopted Talmy’s (2010) opinion that research interviews are a type of social practice or interaction. As such, both production (how the participant talks) and reception (how the participant responds to the researcher’s input) are key components of the research interview. In this thesis, I focus only on production to examine how participants talked about their ESL experiences, but I recognize that reception is an important consideration as well. Along with Talmy, I view participants’ responses as accounts of truth/attitudes/beliefs/etc. that were co-constructed by both the participant
and myself. Although the participant constructed his/her version of ESL experiences for me, this occurred in response to explicit interview questions, and after the participant judged certain experiences to be research-worthy and tell-worthy. Thus, we collaboratively generated the data in the interviews and collaboratively produced the participant’s voice.

In light of this fact, I realize that the specific questions I asked (including follow-up questions), as well as the questions I did not ask, influenced the participants’ narratives. Not only did the questions themselves come into play, but also how I asked them, including choice of vocabulary, tone of voice, and use of interactional devices (such as laughter or direct addresses). My choice of continuers, which showed my level of affiliation with participants’ responses, also influenced participants’ talk. Affiliation is defined in the literature as affective cooperation, where the listener endorses the speaker’s affective or evaluative stance by displaying empathy, cooperation, or agreement in some way (Stivers, 2008). For example, if a participant told a story about a bad teacher, he/she might expect a somewhat sympathetic response, such as oh no! or that’s terrible! In cases where I failed to provide a more affiliative response, such as right, yeah, or that’s good, and instead remained silent or used a more neutral mhm or uh huh, participants sometimes intensified the emotionality of their talk to gain the desired affiliative response from me. They may have employed more or different linguistic devices (such as intensifiers or repetition) to gain a more affiliative response, or they may have portrayed their L2 selves in a clearer or more dramatic way to obtain the desired reaction. In cases where I provided a more affiliative response without extra prompting
from the participant, this may have set the tone of the interview and thus influenced the amount and type of information they provided later on.

The possibility of interviewer bias exists in this study, in that participants may have given the answers they did because of who I as the researcher was at the time of the interviews (Jary & Jary, 2006). My positionality at the time of the interviews was a female Caucasian university student, nearly finished with an undergraduate degree, part of the honors program, an English major, interested in teaching ESL in the future, taking BI in college. The participants’ assumptions of my assumptions likely played a role in the interviews as well. According to the social desirability hypothesis (van de Mortel, 2008), participants may have answered how they thought I wanted (or expected) them to answer, or in a way that portrayed their actions or beliefs in a “good” light. For example, given my interest in teaching ESL in the future, participants may have emphasized the importance of English more than they would have done had a different individual conducted the interviews. Participants likely highlighted certain ESL experiences that they thought I would think were interesting. They also may have used certain linguistic devices or presented dramatic versions of their L2 selves in order to elicit specific responses from me, perhaps compliments such as you were a great language learner or you speak English very well. I also recognize that my own ideologies came up in the questions I asked and the comments I made during the course of the interviews. The types of continuers, degree of affiliation, and amount of affirmation/approbation of participants’ experiences necessarily reflected my own beliefs about L2 learning. For better or worse, each participant and I co-constructed his/her ESL narratives during the course of the interview. These co-constructed narratives stemmed from our own
ideologies as well as our shared interaction during the interview. And although this co-
generation of data is a part of any research interview, these points should be kept in mind
when considering the results of this study.

One way that the co-construction of stories clearly manifested itself was when a
participant gave a very brief answer to an interview question, then the researcher took the
floor asked some sort of follow-up question, thus giving the participant the opportunity to
take more turns to expand on his/her story (Sacks, 1992a, 1992b). An example of a
follow-up question is shown in the excerpt in (2). Here, R did not treat participant A’s
answer in line 4 as an acceptable or complete response (story), so she questioned A’s
response by saying yes with rising intonation (line 5). In response, participant A told a
more detailed story (lines 6-20).

(2) Story told in response to a follow-up question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>R:  &gt;so how many years did you study&lt; English in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>&lt;school&gt; did you continue with it in college as well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>A:  (1.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>uh in college yes ((laughs))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>R:  yes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>A:  when I first coming here uh::</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>(1.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>it very briefly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>(1.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>and then you just go by the motion you know like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>uh::</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>(2.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>let me see so it start whe::n what year was that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>(1.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>from &lt;nineteen ninety one&gt; &gt;or nineteen ninety two&lt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>(. ) we start learning the English at schoo:l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>(1.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>and then go to college uh: let’s see::</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>(2.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>about two years to three years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Methods of Analysis

The interviews were transcribed according to Jefferson’s (2004) transcription conventions, simplified by the researcher in order to better fit the needs of the current study. The most notable changes to Jefferson’s list include notating pauses of less than one second with the symbol (.), which is traditionally used for pauses of less than 0.5 second, and sometimes for pauses of 0.1 second. Also, symbols pertaining to intonation and contour were omitted. As noted in the preceding section, data involving sensitive or irrelevant information were not included in the analysis. See Appendix G for a list of transcription conventions used.

The analysis involved both a quantitative and a qualitative element. As Perry (2011) states, studies in linguistics often exist on a continuum between quantitative and qualitative, and both methods can provide unique perspectives on linguistic data. After being transcribed, the data were coded into various categories, according to the method of types and tokens (Hutton, 1990). During the analysis, I followed Sacks’ (1984) approach of unmotivated looking, which seeks to “find patterns and explicat[e] their logic” (ten Have, 1999, p. 102). Rather than starting with preconceived notions of what elements of cohesion and coherence narratives should (or do) display, I went through the data word by word, assigning words and phrases to various categories based on traditional grammatical knowledge and also according to some of the categories discussed in the literature on narrative analysis. However, these categories were not pre-determined ahead of time, but rather emerged as various categories of linguistic devices consistently appeared in the data. Not every word was coded as a linguistic device while some words or phrases received more than one type of coding. For the qualitative element, I coded
segments of participants’ narratives according to broader themes – namely agency, identity, and language ideologies – then went through the data several times to code these themes into sub-themes, such as ideologies about English and ideologies about the U.S.. Once again, I did not begin the analysis with preconceived ideas of what themes I wanted to find in participants’ narratives, but rather allowed the list of themes to emerge based on what participants addressed when talking about their ESL experiences.

Two independent reviewers, both students in the English department at ASU, each coded one participant’s interview for linguistic devices. One reviewer was a graduate student in the MTESOL program with experience in linguistics; the other reviewer was an undergraduate linguistics student taking graduate-level linguistics courses. The reviewers coded two of the shortest interviews, and this amounted to approximately 10% of the interview data. The reviewers were given a detailed list of codes (see Appendix H) and were asked to code the data accordingly. Overall, both reviewers achieved 76% similarity with the researcher in their initial coding. (This excludes repetition, since the researcher’s method of coding for repetition was not able to be reproduced by the reviewers with greater than 60% agreement.) Some occurrences of linguistic devices (mainly connectives, comment phrases, intensifiers, and embedded clauses) were overlooked by the reviewers, which reduced the similarity between the reviewers’ and researcher’s codings. After discussing differences in coding, each reviewer and I reached agreement on the various categories of linguistic devices (e.g., intensifier, quantifier, hedge). In the very few cases where agreement could not be reached, the researcher’s original coding was used. As such, it is reasonable to conclude that the methods of coding used by the researcher are relatively reliable.
Excerpts included in this thesis were selected based on several factors. First, excerpts (especially those in the linguistic devices section) needed to clearly illustrate the point at hand. Brevity was also a consideration, and when possible, excerpts were chosen that did not need a considerable number of lines before and after the segment of interest in order to understand the excerpt. Finally, it was my goal to include excerpts from each participant so as to avoid favoring certain participants more than others in the presentation of the data.
Participants were found to use 21 different types of linguistic devices to achieve cohesion and coherence in their narratives. The length of the corpus (participants’ responses only) was about 12,500 words. (Each participant’s number of words is noted in Appendix B.) Linguistic devices were divided into three categories of frequency: over 500 occurrences, between 200 and 350 occurrences, and fewer than 200 occurrences.

Connectives, discourse markers, and repetition fell into the most frequent category. Adverbials, embedded clauses, intensifiers, and the use of like (non-comparison) fell into the category of next-most frequent devices. The rest of the linguistic devices (given in Table 1) were much less frequent, with 175 or fewer occurrences. See Appendix I for a list of the individual tokens that fell under each category.

Table 1

Linguistic Devices and Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LINGUISTIC DEVICE</th>
<th>DEFINITION</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connectives</td>
<td>Coordinating conjunctions (e.g., <em>and</em>), subordinating conjunctions (e.g., <em>since</em>), and conjunctions at the beginning of the main clause (<em>And then I told my teacher...</em>)</td>
<td>796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse markers</td>
<td>Comment phrases, interjections, response tokens, agreement markers, turn-enders</td>
<td>599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetition</td>
<td>Immediate/non-immediate, word/phrase, exact or with variation/paraphrase; also parallelism</td>
<td>584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverbials</td>
<td>Words or phrases that provide structural and/or temporal cohesion, such as <em>at that time, now, too, often, besides that, again</em></td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embedded clauses</td>
<td>Embedded clauses with a verb that is not part of a coordinated or subordinated clause</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensifiers</td>
<td>Words that intensify a verb, adverb, or adjective, such as <em>very, always, never</em></td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINGUISTIC DEVICE</td>
<td>DEFINITION</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like (non-comparison)</td>
<td>Any use of <em>like</em> that does not involve comparison, including but not limited to holding the floor, indicating “approximately” or “such as,” or introducing reported speech</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>Clarification requests, direct addresses to the researcher, laughter</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stance</td>
<td>Words/phrases that express the speaker’s attitudes, opinions, or feelings, including <em>I think, I believe, it was fun, I like it, actually, of course</em></td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>Words expressing comparison, such as <em>like, more, easier, as</em></td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedges</td>
<td>Words expressing uncertainty or approximation</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marked verbal features</td>
<td>Progressives, questions, unnecessary <em>do-support</em></td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantifiers</td>
<td>Words that express the quantity of the noun, including <em>every, some, all, a little, many</em></td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaphoric phrases</td>
<td>Phrases referring back to something previously said, such as <em>something like that or that’s why</em></td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reported speech</td>
<td>Reported speech of self or others, sometimes introduced with quotative <em>like</em></td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just</td>
<td>Used as a hedge or intensifier, to mean “only,” or any other usage</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lists</td>
<td>Lists of 2, 3, 4, or 6 items (no 5-item lists occurred)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topics</td>
<td>Topicalization, double topics</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative definitions</td>
<td>Defining something by what it <em>is not</em>, rather than by what it <em>is</em> (<em>English is not hard for me to learn</em>)</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian words</td>
<td>Words or phrases spoken in BI, with or without translation by the speaker</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative clauses</td>
<td>Introduced by <em>who, that, which</em></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Most Frequent Linguistic Devices**

**Connectives.** The nearly 800 connectives included both coordinating (*and, or*) and subordinating conjunctions (*because, when*) that connect two elements at the same level (for example, nouns, verbs, or clauses). It also included coordinating or subordinating conjunctions that introduce a main clause at the beginning of the sentence.
but do not overtly connect two elements, such as in the sentence And then I told my teacher that English is hard.

In example (3), participant P used both a subordinating and coordinating conjunction. The subordinating conjunction once (line 1) indicated a temporal relationship, where the acts of being able “to go everywhere” and to communicate with others with a “different background” occurred after the act of knowing English. Once also seemed to have a somewhat causal relationship, where knowing English causes or enables one to go places and communicate with others, though this causal relationship was less pronounced than if the participant had used a clear causal subordinating conjunction such as because. The coordinating conjunction and then (line 2) indicated an additive relationship, where “going everywhere” and “communicating with others” followed as the results of knowing English.

(3) Connectives: Subordinating and coordinating

01 P:  once we know English (. ) it’s not hard for us to go
02   everywhere and then to under- (. h) to communicate
03   with people with the different: background (. )
04   different nationality (. ) different race from all
05   over the world

In example (4), participant A used the coordinating conjunction and to introduce the main clause (“that’s why…”) in line 5. Since A’s previous statement (lines 1-2) was also followed by a pause (line 3) and a discourse marker (okay) from R (line 4), the and in line 5 introduced the beginning of a new clause, rather than serving as an additive conjunction joining two main clauses together.

(4) Connective introducing a main clause

((A had just mentioned how “tropical countries” don’t have verb tense, which reflects their cultural value of living for the present))
Discourse markers. The nearly 600 occurrences of discourse markers in participants’ data included comment phrases, interjections, response tokens, agreement markers, and turn-enders (Georgakopoulou & Goutsos, 1997). Instances of hesitation markers such as *um* and *uh* were not counted as discourse markers in this study, even though they have been in other studies (e.g., Adams Goertel, 2011). In example (5), participant M used two comment phrases, *you know* and *yeah* (line 5). The use of *you know* signals that M was addressing R in order to keep her actively involved in the conversation. *You know* was the most frequent discourse marker, accounting for over 30% of total discourse markers and over 40% of comment phrases. The use of the comment phrase *yeah* during and at the end of participants’ narratives occurred second most frequently in the data, accounting for over 20% of discourse markers and over 30% of comment phrases. In example (5) and other places, *yeah* signaled the participant’s affirmation of what she was saying.

(5) Comment phrases

01 R: do you think um: English is a hard language to
02 learn?
03 M: (.) uh::: (.) not really but (.) we just (.) need
04 uh: (.) the vocabulary (.)=
05 R: =mhm=
06 M: =you know (.). *yeah* ((nods))
07 (1.5)
08 that’s it

Repetition. Repetition in participants’ talk included immediate and non-immediate repetition, at the levels of words or phrases (two or more words), both exact
and with variation or paraphrase. Parallelism, a type of repetition where a similar structure is repeated but the content is different, was also included in this count. In example (6), participant D told a story to illustrate her point that “I can go anywhere, you know, all around the world…because everyone speaks English.” After introducing the main point of the narrative (“I went to Korea,” line 1), D repeated this idea five times (with some variation) in the next few lines. By the end of the narrative, the listener certainly got the point about “going to Korea.”

(6) Repetition: Common thread

01 D: um I remember last time (.). I went to Korea (.). it
02 was my first time to go to Korea but (.). you know I-
03 (.). I went to Korea from Australia so I (.). you know
04 I >speaking just a little bit of time< (.hh) and um
05 (.). I went to Korea >by myself (.). I didn’t even
06 know how to get there (.). but since I know how to
07 speak English you know< (.). I got there ((laughs and
08 smiles)) so.

In other cases, participants used repetition in a more interactional way. In example (7), participant S used repetition to complete self-initiated self-repair (“I got” – “I get,” line 1, and “elementary language” – “elementary school,” line 2). S repeated the phrase “I get English” in lines 2-3 after completing the “elementary” self-repair in line 2. In lines 3-6, S repeated the words “extra” and “after” several times each. Her body language in the recording indicated that she was concerned about using the correct words. However, even her repeated words made her narrative more coherent, as hearing repeated words was easier to follow than if S had left long pauses when searching for the correct word. By using repetition, S also kept the floor during her narrative, showing that she was not yet finished expressing her ideas.
(7) Repetition: Self-repair and searching for words

01 S: yeah I: (.) I got- (..) I get uh English from uh elementary language (.h) eh from elementary school I get English (..) uh: (..) but extra- (..) extra::
02 (1.0)
03 extra hours (.h) after; after (..) after I (..) af-
04 after: (..) after school

Somewhat Frequent Linguistic Devices

It is interesting to note the gap between the “most frequent” and “somewhat frequent” linguistic devices: 250 occurrences. This is not entirely surprising, however, as much of the literature (e.g., Georgakopoulou & Goutsos, 1997; Tannen, 1989) discusses connectives, discourse markers, and repetition as main linguistic devices.

Adverbials. Adverbials in participants’ data contributed to both cohesion and coherence. Adverbials of time are shown in example (8) and an additive adverbial and adverbial of frequency in example (9). Without these adverbials, the relation of events to each other, as well as the meaning of these events, would not be as clear.

(8) Adverbs of time (now, before)

((O and R previously discussed how English is hard due to different accents))

01 O: yeah
02 ((both laugh))
03 O: especially where you on the phone you know
04 R: mhm
05 O: (..) but now
06 (1.0)
07 I- I- I handle it better than (..) you know years
08 before ((laughs))

(9) Additive adverbial and adverbial of frequency (beyond that, usually)

01 R: did you do a lot of (..) um translation and grammar
02 then when you were learning or um-
03 L: just a- (..) the- (h) >you know the kind of< required
04 high school curriculum (..) for the English (..) uh course (..) uh (..) beyond that (..) you know I had
05 conversational English with usually (.h) you know
06 family and friends and- (..) and my aunt
**Embedded clauses.** Instances of embedded clauses included full clausal complements that were optionally introduced by a *that*, infinitive and bare infinitive complements, gerund complements, and noun-participle complements (Celce-Murcia & Larsen-Freeman, 1999). Of these, the *that*-type complements (without the *that*) and infinitive complements were the most common embedded clauses by far. A majority of *that*-type complements (with the *that* omitted) occurred with epistemic stance markers such as *I think*. An example of this is shown in (10). Infinitive complements were also common, especially in constructions such as *want to, try to, or like to*. An example of an infinitive complement is given in (11).

(10) *That*-type complement (with the *that* omitted)

01 E: I think I had a really good experience because I immersed myself directly in school

(11) Infinitive complement

01 H: I am super excited (.h) >I am super excited I love (.h) I love uh: (.h) I love to learn uh English class<

**Intensifiers.** Participants used a significant number of intensifiers (adverbs that "intensify" verbs, adjectives, or other adverbs) in their data. The most common intensifier was *very*, though other common intensifiers included *always, really, and so*. In example (12), there are two intensifiers: *just* and *so*. *Just* is an intensifier for *so*, and *so* is an intensifier for the adjective *low*. In example (13), there are three intensifiers: *never, at all,* and *always*. In this analysis, I analyzed *always* and *never* as intensifiers rather than adverbials of frequency because they intensified the meaning of the verb. Participant N could have said, “I didn’t learn about English at all because I speak [spoke] Indonesia every day.” However, this version is less emphatic since it lacks *never* and *always*, which
intensify the meaning of learn and speak, respectively. For this reason, never and always are treated as intensifiers in this analysis.

(12) Intensifiers

01 O: uh: (. ) yeah I was uh:: working at the hospital in
02 Indonesia (. ) and the <pay>: (. ) you know the salary
03 (. ) is just <so low> over there

(13) More intensifiers

01 N: I- I never learn about English <at all> because I
02 always speak Indonesia <every> day

Like (non-comparison). It is well known that the word like can be used in a variety of ways. Any function of like not involving a comparison was included in the total count for this category. Participant M, for example, used the word like very frequently in her narratives. In the exchange with M in (14), the first two examples of like have a somewhat ambiguous function; for example, they could be interpreted as holding the floor or focusing on specific words or phrases in M’s narratives (“Indonesian” and “I can say that…”). The third occurrence of like in this excerpt shows like used to mean “such as.” Example (15) shows the word like used to mean “approximately,” and example (16) shows a quotative like used to introduce reported speech (self). These usages of like contributed to the overall connectedness and meaning of M’s narratives.

(14) Various functions of like

01 R: and what do you think are some of the biggest
02 differences between Indonesian and English?
03 M: ((laughs)) because I’m Indonesian so (. ) so (.h) so
04 it’s not easy for me you know like Indonesian like I
can say that Indonesian is easy very easy language
06 you know and English is just so hard language (. )
07 but (. ) (.h) if because of- I’m Indonesian but if
08 (. ) American people like my husband (. ) >always
09 say< ‘it’s so hard (. ) it’s so hard’ “something like
10 that”
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(15) Approximation like
01 R: and when did you first start learning English
02 M: (.h) um in the middle school (.h) when I was like
03 <thirteen> years old in the school (.h) yeah ((nods))

(16) Quotative like
01 M: ((laughs)) WHEN I WAS IN (.h) SCHOOL I HATE ENGLISH
02 R: ((laughs))
03 M: ((joins in laughing))
04 I hate English (.h) >I’m like< ‘ugghh (.h) <English>
05 class >okay<’ (.h) because (.h) maybe- maybe
06 because of the teacher you know (.h) so that’s why I
07 don’t like [it]

Other Linguistic Devices

The third tier of linguistic devices includes those that occurred fewer than 200

times in the data. Each of these was relatively infrequent, though still frequent enough to
merit recognition as a specific linguistic device. However, not all of these devices
occurred across the majority of participants, unlike all of the linguistic devices in the first
tier and some of the linguistic devices in the second tier. Many of these devices have
been discussed in the literature, especially in regard to creating cohesion and coherence in
discourse (e.g., Chafe, 1982; Georgakopoulou & Goutsos, 1997; Halliday & Hasan,
1976; Tannen, 1982b).

Interaction. Conversation is by nature an interactional process, even in the
context of a research interview. In this study, laughter often was an interactional process,
as the participant began laughing and R joined in, or vice versa. Although I as the
researcher did not know what participants were thinking or feeling during the interviews,
I perceived the laughter that we shared as creating a “friendly” atmosphere where
participants could reflect on (and even laugh about) their ESL experiences, hopefully
without nervousness or fear of making grammatical mistakes. By laughing together,
participants and I were able to connect on a deeper level, and I shared in their experiences and showed affiliation with them. In excerpt (16) above, R laughed at M’s dramatic way of saying “I hate English” (line 1), then both laughed together (line 3), creating a shared understanding of M’s story.

Eight of the participants used direct addresses to involve the researcher more in the conversation. Clarification requests involving the pronoun you were counted as direct addresses. Out of the twelve instances of participants seeking clarification (listed in (17)), most involved asking a question. Only one (“Say it again”) took the form of an imperative, though pragmatically all clarification requests expected a response where R would repeat or rephrase the question.

(17) Clarification structures

D: Uh you mean in the class?
N: Uh you mean my difficulty to learn English?
P: When you see [say]...you mean...?
A: Uh for learning English?
A: What?
O: What’s that?
M: What, sorry?
A: What is it, I’m sorry?
S: I’m sorry?
N: Pardon me?
N: Hmm, can you say it again?
S: Say it again.

**Stance.** Stance markers often occurred in conjunction with that-type embedded clauses and expressed participants’ opinions, attitudes, or beliefs. In the excerpt in (18), participant L used the epistemic stance markers actually and I think twice each (lines 5, 8) to reinforce his opinions about how Dutch helped him learn English, and to show his orientation toward the feelings he expressed in his narrative.
(18) Stance markers

01 R: so what were the main differences that you saw
02 between Dutch and English then
03 L: (.). um:
04 (1.0)
05 actually I think Dutch <helped> me with English (.).
06 because I was: (.). used to: speaking (.). speaking a
07 foreign language in Indonesia and um (.). uh it- it
08 it actually I think helped me more in the transition
09 than it hindered me

Comparison. Throughout their narratives, participants frequently made
comparisons between themselves and other individuals, or between two people or
entities. The words/phrases in this category included those that directly expressed
comparison. Words that were included under other categories, such as the comparative
conjunction but, were not also counted in the comparison category. The most frequent
comparison word was more, though different and other were also common. Additional
comparison words included like, as, than, and the comparative/superlative forms of
words such as good, easy, and hard.

Hedges. Hedges included phrases such as maybe, kind of/ kinda, kind of like,
probably, not really, and I think. Participants used hedges to qualify their answers, offer
possible explanations, indicate approximation, or show their uncertainty.

Marked verbal features. Verbal features in this category included progressives
(n = 120), questions (n = 16), and do-support constructions (n = 4). In example (19),
participant E used the past progressive in her narrative to provide background
information (line 1) for her larger narrative about learning English. This provided a sense
of continuity to her statement, in that the listener could relate Americans not wanting
Indonesians to learn English (lines 2-3) as occurring when she was “growing up in high
school” (line 1).
(19) Progressive

01 E: we were also growing up in high school (.). in a
02 period of time where (.). Americans (.). they didn’t
03 want us to learn English

In example (20), participant L used do-support twice (once in line 1 and another
time in line 2), which is marked because English does not usually employ do-support
except in questions and negatives. Here, L used do-support to emphasize certain facts and
provide a more emphatic meaning to his words.

(20) Do-support

01 L: (.). again I think I had an advantage because I did
02 speak Dutch (.). and I do believe that helped me (.).
03 a lot

Quantifiers. Quantifiers (all, every, a lot of, most), partitives (part of, the rest of),
and ordinal numbers (first, second) were included this category. Although quantifiers
were often used by participants to express mere quantity, sometimes they used quantifiers
to express generalizations, or what they perceived to be general truths. In example (21),
participant D used the quantifier most to express a general statement that the majority of
Indonesian people struggle with English grammar (lines 13-15). D could have said that
all Indonesians struggle with English grammar, but she used the quantifier most as a
hedge to indicate that her statement was not true for every individual.

(21) Quantifier: General statement/hedge

01 D: that’s what I say pronunciations the use of the
02 grammar (.). we don’t have grammar in Indonesia like
03 you know past tense future (.h) you know (.). um::
04 things like that we don’t have in Indonesia
((lines 5-12 omitted))
13 (.h) >so I think that’s more in a th- that’s more
14 challenges for (.h) most of Indonesian people (.).
15 the grammar<
Anaphoric phrases. Anaphoric phrases refer back to previously stated ideas.

Looking at pronouns was too involved for this project, but fourteen specific anaphoric phrases (collocations) did come up in the data and are given in Table 2.

Table 2

Anaphoric Phrases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTICIPANT(S)</th>
<th>ANAPHORIC PHRASE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E, A, M</td>
<td>like that</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S, N, A, O, P, M</td>
<td>that’s it/that’s all</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S, N, A, O, M</td>
<td>something like that</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S, N, A, M</td>
<td>that’s why</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A, M</td>
<td>like this</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S, M</td>
<td>or something</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D, E, O</td>
<td>things like that</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L, E, P</td>
<td>as/like I said/say (before)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>(that) kind of thing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L, E</td>
<td>again</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>ending: so that’s what we</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>stuff like that</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>that’s like what we talk about</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>that’s what I say</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some anaphoric phrases were used in or after lists, especially or something and things like that. In other cases, participants used an anaphoric phrase such as again or as I said to refer back to a previously expressed statement or idea, especially when R repeated the question or asked a similar question, and they indicated something along the lines of I already told you this, but I’ll tell you again. Other times, participants used the phrase that’s why to indicate a causal relationship in the next sentence, often after a long statement and sometimes in conjunction with an embedded and/or relative clause.

Participants frequently used anaphoric phrases such as that’s it to indicate the end of their stories or comments. Finally, anaphoric phrases were also used as hedges, as in example
(22), where participant A used the phrase *something like that* (lines 9-10) to indicate a possible reason for why she and her classmates remembered the “bad words.”

(22) Anaphoric phrase: Hedging

```
01 A: uh:: this is maybe sounds kind of bad ((laughs)) but
02 the: (.) the first thing that we learn about English
03 is (.) you know uh:
04 (2.5)
05 the one that really stuck in our mind first is like
06 the bad words
07 R: mhm
08 A: ((laughs)) I don’t know why (.) you know it’s just
09 because (.) because it is <funny> or something like
10 that but (.) we- we- we certainly >remember the bad
11 words< because that’s like (.) >you know< ((laughs))
12 I don’t know <why> (.) but I thought it’s kind of
13 funny but uh yeah it’s kind of bad in a way but (.)
14 (.h) that’s the first thing that (.) we pick up (.)
15 very fast right away
```

**Reported speech.** Participants used reported speech in their talk about their ESL experiences, both to report what they said and what others said. Reported speech often occurred along with a quotative *like*. An example of two instances of other reported speech (lines 8 and 10-11) is given in (23), one with and the other without quotative *like*.

(23) Other reported speech

```
01 O: you know sometimes (.) we’re afraid (.) the way we
02 pronounce it (.) and then people sometimes can have
03 (.) <funny> to them and then we don’t have any
04 courage to (1.0)
05 to say it again because (.)=
06 R: =right=
07 O: =it’s- it’s- (.) an accent just ((laughs)) make
08 people like ‘wha::t? I don’t understand’ (.) uh: (.)
09 that (.) that’s it (.) and we try so hard to spell
10 it <ou:t> >you know he says< ‘oh::: okay <you meant
11 THIS>’
12 R: ((laughs))
13 O: I think that’s all ((laughs))
14 R: uh huh
15 O: accent (.) yeah
```

**Just.** Similar to the word *like*, *just* also took on a variety of functions: quantifier (n = 8), hedge (n = 4), and intensifier (n = 3). The majority, however, had a function that
could not easily be classified, yet the presence of *just* seemed to make some subtle difference in the meaning.\(^2\) One example of many from the data is shown in (24). Here, participant S contrasted her abilities in English (“have to think first,” line 8) and BI (“just come out directly,” line 13). The use of *just* gave a more colloquial flavor and also a sense of immediacy. Over three quarters of the occurrences of *just* fit into this category.

\(24\) *Just* with unknown function

\[
((S \text{ just said that } \text{“grammar” was hard for her, so R sought further clarification as seen below}))
\]

01 R: and why was that- why was that hard for you
02 S: (2.5)
03 uh:
04 (6.0)
05 it is hard because- (.). because before I- I- I (.)
06 speak up I have to
07 (1.0)
08 uh: (.). have to think first
09 ((laughs))
10 R: ((joins in laughing))
11 S: which one part I have to use um: (.). which- which
12 part I cannot use (.). um: not like in Indonesia like
13 just come out eh (.). directly

**Lists.** Participants sometimes used lists when talking about their ESL experiences. Lists of two and three items were by far the most common, though five lists of four occurred, as well as one list of six. Lists often occurred in conjunction with parallelism.

**Topics.** The category of topics included double topics (\(n = 24\)) and topicalization (\(n = 15\)). An example of topicalization is given in example (25), where the anaphoric phrase “things like that” is placed in subject position, with the subject “we” and verb “don’t have” directly following (line 8).

\(^2\) The four occurrences of *just only* were counted only in the category of hedges, and the nineteen occurrences of *just like* were counted only in the category of comparisons, since these phrases could be considered collocations used for the purpose of hedging or comparing. However, instances of *just* used as intensifiers, hedges, and quantifiers were counted in both the *just* category and the other categories to which they belonged.
(25) Topicalization

01 R: so what do you think that were (..) um (..) some of
02 the things that were <hardest> for you um- or like
03 >some of the biggest differences between Indonesian
04 and English<
05 D: that’s what I say pronunciations the use of the
06 grammar (..) we don’t have grammar in Indonesia like
07 you know past tense future (.h) you know (..) um::
08 things like that we don’t have in Indonesia

Negative definitions. Participants sometimes used negative definitions to
describe something by what it is not, rather than by what it is. In example (26),
participant P stated that if you know English, it is “not hard” (line 1) for you to travel and
communicate internationally. P could have said that it is “easy” to communicate cross-
culturally, but he did not. By using the word not, P indicated that there is a category of
things that are hard to achieve, but with English, these things become not hard.

(26) Negative definition

((P just provided a long narrative about how knowing
English enables him to communicate with individuals
with different backgrounds))

01 P: once we know English (..) it’s not hard for us to go
02 everywhere and then to under- (.h) to communicate
03 with people with the different background (.)
04 different nationality (..) different race from all
05 over the world

Indonesian words. Five participants used at least one BI word or phrase in their
interviews; several used more than one. More than half did not involve any translation
into English. In some cases, participants used a BI word or phrase when giving an
example (often in relation to tense/grammar). At other times, it was unclear why
participants used BI words/phrases; perhaps they felt more comfortable expressing
themselves in BI. An example of a BI phrase with translation (line 4) and without
translation (lines 9-10) is given in example (27).
(27) Indonesian phrases

01 R: and then I was wondering >when you first started 
02 learning English<
03 H: (.h) o::h [u::] (.h) great question! ((smiles))
04 (.h) sss- uh saya suka menyanyi I love to sing 
   ((rest of line 4 through line 8 omitted))
09 H: and (.) >karena saya suka nyanyi< (.) saya juga suka
10 nyanyi >lagu barat< [because I like to sing, I also
11 like to sing Western songs]
   ((uses several more Indonesian phrases without 
   translation in the next 9 lines))

Relative clauses. The least frequently occurring linguistic was relative clauses, 
which were used to provide additional information about nouns.

Conclusion: Research Question 1

The first research question investigated which linguistic devices Indonesian L2 
speakers of English use in order to create cohesion and coherence in their talk about their 
ESL experiences. The data showed 21 different linguistic devices that were spread out 
across participants. Without these devices, participants’ narratives would not have been 
nearly as connected or meaningful as they were with the use of these devices.

Connectives, discourse markers, and repetition were by far the most frequent linguistic 
devices. Some linguistic devices (such as adverbials, embedded clauses, and anaphoric 
reference) helped achieve structural cohesion, while others (such as intensifiers, 
quantifiers, and comparison) contributed more to the specific meaning of a word or 
utterance (Chafe, 1982; Halliday & Hasan, 1976; Labov, 1972). However, regardless of 
function, all of these linguistic devices together contributed to creating a cohesive and 
coherent narrative. With this in mind, we now turn to the second research question: how 
participants portrayed their L2 selves when talking about their ESL experiences.
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RESEARCH QUESTION 2: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The second research question examined how participants used language to portray larger concepts while talking about their ESL experiences. Throughout the interviews, several recurring themes appeared: agency, identity (especially in relation to others), and perceptions of English and/or the U.S.. In general, participants expressed agency, identity, and perceptions with little direct prompting from the researcher, though I recognize that the fact that this was a research interview about participants’ experiences learning English may have influenced them to address these topics.

Agency

In the interviews, six of the ten participants clearly portrayed agency through their narratives. In these stories, they expressed their desire to learn English and described the steps they took in order to achieve this goal.

Participant D: “I like English” and talking to English-speaking people. The excerpt in (28) occurred about halfway through participant D’s interview. Here, D told R about her feelings regarding learning English (lines 112-113). These lines are important to the discussion of D’s agency, since they show her strong positive emotional orientation toward learning English. By recounting how she made efforts to learn English outside the classroom (lines 115-121), D portrayed herself as an active, motivated learner of English. Besides stating that she learned on her own at home (line 115), participant D used two action verbs to describe her agency: approaching English speakers (lines 116-117) and practicing her language learning (lines 120-121).
(28) D: Agency

R: and what were your attitudes or thoughts about learning English? were you excited about it (. ) were you- did you feel like you were being forced to [learn it]  
D: [no I like English (. ) I <always> like English (. ) I just like to s- >you know< be able to speak English (1.0)  
so I- I learn by myself as well at home (. ) um and also I like to see you know people who speaks English you know I like to approach them and- (.h) and um (. ) you know just like you ((motions toward R)) you know now you’re learning Indonesian and you just like to be with >Indonesian people< and practice your language [learning] right  
R: right  
D: that- (. ) that’s >what it was last time< (. ) so

Participant A: “Still learning” English. Like D, participant A also portrayed her agency in her talk about her ESL experiences. Prior to the excerpt recorded in (29), participant A told R about her enjoyment learning English in school (including at college in the U.S.) and then mentioned that she is “still learning until today” (line 81). Participant A stated that her job involved working with college students, so she continued to learn English, especially “all kind a English slang” (lines 87-88). Here, she indicated her willingness to continue learning English and her desire to take advantage of her current work situation to actively keep learning.

(29) A: Agency (part 1)

A: and then I’m still- I’m still learning until today believe it or not Becca  
R: okay ((laughs)) are you still [taking English [yeah=  
A: =are you still [taking English classes  
R: =like uh I’m working here uh with uh: uh college students and >then they use< like all kind a English <slang> >that I have no idea what was that<  
R: right  
A: ((laughs))  
R: ((joins in laughing))  
A: that’s [true  
A: [so I’m still learning
The excerpt in (30) occurred later on in participant A’s interview, after her long and detailed narrative about the differences between English and BI, especially grammar. Participant A mentioned how “some people” might have a problem with “vocabulary” (lines 338-339) but then mentioned various ways to actively learn English. Here, she used a number of action verbs – reading (lines 339-340), listening to the news (line 342), and looking up words (lines 344-345) – and clearly showed her agency by saying that learning on her own through these activities was “not an issue at all” (lines 345-346).

(30) A: Agency (part 2)

336 A: so:
337 (1.5)
338 yeah but some people have like uh: (.) you know a
339 challenges maybe vocabulary (.) but you just have to
340 read a lot that’s all
341 R: mhm=
342 A: =and listen uh to the news (. ) you know and then
343 catch (. ) what’s that (. ) you know what’s that word
344 means actually and then look it up in the (. )
345 dictionary (. ) that’s uh (. ) for me that’s not– not
346 an issue at all
347 R: well that’s good at least ((laughs))
348 A: ((joins in laughing))
349 R: it sounds like you’re a quick learner and you like
350 to (. ) immerse yourself [in the language
351 A: [we::ll that’s- that’s the
352 benefit of being young ((laughs))
353 R: ((joins in laughing))

Participant O: “Trying to be better.” Participant O’s excerpt in (31) occurred at the end of her interview, when R asked her if there was anything else she would like to share and after she mentioned that her aunt and uncle really helped her learn English by correcting her when she was wrong (she lived with them for her first six years in the U.S.). Participant O expressed agency by saying that even though her English is “on and off” (line 287), she is “trying to be better” (lines 288-289). Unlike participant A, participant O did not give specific examples of how she does that; however, she stated
that she is giving her “best here” (line 314), indicating that she makes the effort to use and learn English here in Arizona more than she did in Los Angeles (lines 306-307).

(31) O: Agency

((O just explained how she spoke English less in Los Angeles than in Arizona))

284   O: and now I’m here I’m start using my English again
285   which is good I hope
286   R: right
287   O: it’s on and off though Becca (. ) my English is on and
288   off but (. ) you know I- I’m trying- I’m trying to be
289   better=
290   R: =right=
291   O: =that’s right
292   ((both laugh))
293   R: so how long have you been in Arizona
294   O: (3.5)
295   two years
296   R: two years?
297   O: (. ) yeah (. ) two years yeah
298   R: alright
299   O: ye:s (. ) almost no: w two years and three months I
300   guess
301   R: okay
302   O: (. ) yeah (. ) we: uh:
303   (1.0)
304   R: start in LA fo:r twelve years
305   O: <twe:lve years> so I speak English (. ) not as much as
306   now
307   R: (. ) right
308   O: (xx)
309   R: well I can tell that you’re really- that you’re eager
310   to learn and you really want to (. ) um speak English
311   you know and (. ) I can tell that. (. ) that’s really
312   exciting ((laughs))
313   O: true (. ) my best here ((laughs))

Participant H: Singing in English and talking to tourists. In her narratives, participant H reported that she learned English on her own in two ways: through listening to English songs and by talking to English-speaking tourists. Throughout her narratives, H constructed her identity as a singer, and several of her stories centered around music or singing in some way or another. In the excerpt in (32), H told the story of how she bought new songs in English whenever she had the money (lines 44-46) so she could learn
English through listening to the songs (lines 32-47) and reading the lyrics on the album covers (lines 55-68).

(32) H: Agency (part 1)

26 R: and then I was wondering >when you first started learning English<
28 H: (.h) o:h [u:] (.h) great question! ((smiles))
29 (.h) sss- uh saya suka menyanyi I love to sing (.h) so
31 (1.0)
32 uh (.h) and my dad is a singer too (.h) so: (.h) he has uh (.h) he has different kind of (.h) uh:: (.h)
34 at the time is cassette (.h) s- we don’t have CD yet back then (.h) uh but from (.h) from uh (.h) from America and a singer like (.h) ABBA (.h) (xx) (.h)
37 Pussycat so (.h) a:nd (.h) >karena saya suka nyanyi< (.h) saya juga suka nyanyi >lagu barat< [because I like to sing, I also like to sing Western songs]
40 (.h) (.h) uh like ABBA is my favorite even though at the time I’m still little ((makes hand motion))
42 (.h) like elementary >no no< (.h) yeah I think (.h)
43 oh I- I go to the (.h) middle school (.h) but (.h)
44 saya >beli beli< kalau saya ada (.h) uang (.h) saya beli uh (.h) uh lagu-lagu barat [I buy, buy if I have money, I buy uh Western songs] like >ABBA< and karena saya suka nyanyi [because I like to sing] ((makes hand motion)) is understood >kalau Bahasa Inggris< [if English]
49 ((something else spoken quickly in Indonesian))
50 R: you like to sing=
52 H: =[because I (xxx)
53 R: [I’m not understanding everything I’m sorry (.h)
54 ((both laugh))
55 H: because I- I love to sing so (.h) uh (.h) and then I loves I love to learn (.h) English (.h) so then >in the middle school< that’s the first time I learn English (.h) through the (.h) through the cover: >of the song< (.h) so I sing and I read the s- (.h) I read the- the English (.h) lyric (.h) but because >I’m not really fluently yet at the time< so I (.h)
60 uh >most of the time< (.h) I left <behind> >from the melody because like because it< the way English (.h) to read is very different (.h) with Latin right (.h) so
65 (1.0)
67 yeah ((makes hand gestures throughout, illustrating holding CD lyrics and reading them))

A little later in her interview, in response to R’s question about her feelings about learning English, participant H told the story of how she approached tourists while
attending college so she could practice her English, as shown in (33). Because H felt positive emotions about English (lines 74-76), she took steps to learn English on her own. One of these steps was chasing down English-speaking tourists (lines 83-84, 87-88), whom she identified based on racial features (lines 84-86).

(33) H: Agency (part 2)

72 R: what- what did you think about learning English?
73 were you excite:d (. ) did you ["like it"]
74 H: [(h) I am super
75 excited (.h) >I am super excited I love (. ) I love
76 uh: (. ) I love to learn uh English class< (.h) and I
77 remember (. ) uh because (. ) (.h) in the college I
78 have to go to the different city (.h) which is
79 <Medan> (. ) so sometimes there is >a tourist< ( .)
80 from Medan (. ) with the bus (.h) so eh to the- going
81 to uh: Pematangsiantar because they’re going to li-
82 uh- uh Samosir Island which is a place for (. ) for
83 beautiful place close to my uh hometown (.h) so when
84 >every time< I saw the tourist American (. ) >or- or<
85 the white people (.h) sometimes they from Norway or
86 sometimes from (.h) they are from another s- country
87 (.h) but I- (. ) I try to get close to them and try
88 to practice my English with them

**Participant P: Learning outside the classroom.** In the excerpt in (34), participant P also illustrated agency by recounting how he learned English outside the classroom. Prior to this excerpt, R and P had discussed P’s first language background (Manado) and when he started learning English (in sixth grade). P said that he did not take any English classes other than “what we get from school” (lines 69-70), but he took responsibility for his language learning through additional listening and reading material outside the English classroom: “English songs” (which he stated elsewhere that he loved) and “Bible” (which was a familiar text to him) (lines 75-76).

(34) P: Agency

66 R: and did you continue taking English classes in high
67 school and college
68 P: uh no ((shakes head ‘no’)) I didn:’t take a special
69 uh:: (. ) you know class (. ) except just only (.h)
Participant M: Chatting online and learning from family. Participant M consistently expressed agency in her narratives, many of which centered around how her family helped her learn English. The excerpt in (35) occurred after M discussed her language background and when she started learning English. Right before this excerpt, M had passionately explained why she hated learning English in school and then launched into the story below. In this excerpt, M first admitted her “need to improve” (line 55) and then showed how she made efforts to do so by chatting online with English-speaking people (lines 60-62) and looking up words in the dictionary (lines 67-71). After her marriage to her American husband, M had trouble communicating with him due to her limited vocabulary and fear of speaking English (lines 72-78); however, she actively sought to learn English by listening to and analyzing what he said to her (lines 78-82).

(35) M: Agency (part 1)

50 M: and then I start to chat ((smiles, makes hand
gesture indicating computer keyboard))
51 ((laughs))
52 and then
53 (1.0)
54 like ‘oh (. ) I need to improve’ you know and then
55 (. ) talk more English you know because (. )
surrounded me is (. ) talking Indonesian so we not
56 really use the English (. ) like daily basis you know
57 (. ) so (. ) we just uh: >a- and- and then in 2004<
58 when I start u::m chatting with the: (. ) people from
59 uh: >what’s that< (. ) Venezuela (. ) and then from
60 Swe:den from America: like by online=
61 R: =mhm=

57
M: and then I start <learning> and learning more you know (.h) and <the::n> (.u) um:
(1.0)
but that’s it (.u) not- not really talk (.u) so much
but (.u) I can type more (.u) okay (.u) because (.u) I always see the dictionary ((smiles))
((laughs))
next to me ((laughs))
AND THEN WHEN I GOT MARIED two thousand six (.h)
um (.u) in the end of the 2006 and then the first marri-
first month I still not really talk to my husband
((laughs))
M: because I’m scared I don’t know much you know the vocabulary (.u) so (.u) (.h) and then I learn from him (.u) you know how he talk (.u) ‘oh maybe (.u) he mean like this (.u) to say like this (.u) oh he use this sentence’ something like that (.u) and then (.h) I learn more and more and more and then in the like (.u) second year of marriage and then I talk uh: more like (.u) English (.u)=
R: =mhm=
M: =yeah ((nods))
(1.5) that’s it

The excerpt in (36) represents one of many stories that M told about how her family (husband, six-year-old daughter, and in-laws) helped her learn English by correcting her when she was wrong and teaching her new vocabulary. In this excerpt, M recounted how her in-laws often “try to fix” [meaning “correct”] her English (lines 145-146). Through her response (“oh yeah yeah yeah yeah,” line 148) to her in-laws’ clarification phrase (“oh you mean like this,” lines 147-148), M showed her willingness to learn English by accepting correction from others so she could do better “next time” (lines 148-152). Although she did not explicitly say so in this excerpt, elsewhere M stated that it is “good my husband sometimes correct me” so that her English could “improve.” Throughout her interview, M portrayed herself as actively and eagerly seeking to learn English from those around her.
Conclusion: Agency. Agency was a recurring theme in participants’ narratives about their ESL experiences. This is not surprising, given the centrality of agency in the literature on SLA (e.g., Ahearn, 2001). In their ESL narratives, six of the participants portrayed their agency and gave specific examples of how they took responsibility for their own language learning. These ranged from looking up words in the dictionary to seeking out additional reading material to chasing down English-speaking tourists. The fact that over half of the participants referred to agency in some way or another is important for a couple of reasons. First, through their stories, participants showed that learning English was (or still is) important to them. Rather than sitting back and passively absorbing English in the ESL classroom, they made efforts to improve their English on their own, and several participants pointed out that they were still actively learning English. Additionally, for many participants, agency was tied to their positive emotionality about English. Despite the fact that English is a required class for most Indonesian schoolchildren, the majority of participants mentioned that they enjoyed learning English or at least felt it was important to their future goals. Participants’ positive emotions or views about English were often tied to the imagined communities or
benefits they associated with knowing English, and spurred them on to become even more fluent in English.

Agency is closely related to identity, and by showing their agency in their narratives, participants were constructing their identity as active, motivated language learners. Perhaps this was influenced by the context and topic of the research interviews, in that participants might have felt the need to construct their identities as “good” language learners, as that might be more interesting or acceptable to tell the researcher. However, regardless of their motivations for doing so, many of the participants did construct their identities as agentive learners of English. We now consider in more detail how participants constructed their identities through their narratives.

**Identity and Membership Categorization**

**Identity: Language learner.** The most basic (and widespread) identity that participants expressed was that of a language learner. This is not at all surprising, considering that the interview questions focused on participants’ experiences as language learners learning English as an L2. However, it was interesting to note the different ways that participants oriented to the identity of language learner, especially with regard to other language learners in their classes. Of the ten participants, eight consistently used the pronoun *we* when telling stories about more general events in their language learning career (such as when they started English or what activities they did in their English classes). They switched to the pronoun *I* (whether in the same or a different turn) when recounting more personal events that would likely not apply to the other students in their classes (such as when they came to the U.S., what they majored in, or where they were living at the time of the story). This showed that they tended to orient toward their
language learning as a group activity, and they categorized themselves as part of this group. Only two participants always referred to their language learning experiences using the pronoun *I*, regardless of whether or not other language learners were involved in those experiences. Here, we consider an example of *we* and *I*; the other participants’ excerpts can be found in Appendix J.

*Participants D, L, E, A, O, H, P, & M: “We.”* An example of a participant who used the collective *we* is given in excerpt (37). Here, participant L answered R’s question about when he started learning English using the first person plural *we* rather than the first person singular *I* (line 29). By using *we* instead of *I*, L categorized himself as part of the group of Indonesians taking high school English at that time. However, in line 33, L switched to *I* when talking about when he moved to the U.S., since those experiences only related to him.

(37) L: Identity (language learner)

```
28  R: now what point did you <start learning English>
29  L: well *we* had high school English=
30  R: =okay=
31  L: =and um (.h)
32   (1.0)
33   and then when *I* came to the States in ’67 (.)
34   *I* had to: (. ) learn English >in a hurry<
```

*Participants S & N: “I.”* It is interesting to note the difference between *we learned English* and *I learned English*. With the former, participants oriented to their English class members, thus affirming that learning English is more of a collective (rather than individual) activity. In (38), however, when participant S said “I got English” (line 69), she emphasized her own role in language learning as compared to the role of the class. In this excerpt and elsewhere, she did not overtly identify with any particular group that defined her identity as a language learner; the same was true of participant N.
Identity: Good/motivated language student. Seven participants portrayed their identity as a good or motivated language student when telling their ESL stories. In addition to the excerpts in the Agency section, in which participants portrayed themselves as agentive learners of English, there are three other examples of identity I would like to highlight. These involve participants invoking membership categorization to accentuate their identities as good language learners.

Participant D: “For them English is not very important.” In the excerpt in (39), participant D expressed her identity as a user of English for whom English is very important. She did this by comparing herself to her friends in Indonesia, who are successful in their careers but do not need to know English (lines 184-191). She, on the other hand, portrayed herself as belonging to the group of people that “must speak English” (line 192) due to living in the U.S., a predominantly English-speaking country. D constructed her identity as a good language learner because English was important to her, unlike her Indonesian friends (lines 190-192).
D: Indonesia> (.h) >I mean< yeah they are doctors:
they are: (.h) engineers but since English it’s not
their (.h) (.h) they’re not- (.h) they’re (h) (.h)
what should I say? (.h) um
(2.5)
((speaks in higher tone of voice)) for them English
is not very important right? but not for me=>for
me< I must speak English I- I just like language
you know (.h) so: um it is beneficial for me (.h) I
can go anywhere (.h) you know all around the world

Participant O: “They don’t…push themselves to speak English.” Participant O
constructed her identity as a good language learner in (40) by comparing herself to her
ESL classmates. After providing a hedge (lines 235-237), O distanced herself from her
“Spanish” classmates (line 238) who did not learn much English because they usually
spoke to each other in Spanish (lines 252-253). Rather, she portrayed herself and the
Chinese student(s) in her class as belonging to the group of good language learners who
“push[ed] [themselves] to learn how to speak English” (lines 258-259).

(40) O: Identity (good language learner)

235  O: but you know (.h) not (.h) not to mention (.h) I mean
236   not to (.h) giving my (.h) telling that I:’m better
237   than them (.h) than the rest of you know but those
238   Spanish people Mexican is (.h) they don’t know even
239   (.h) you know small things in English (.h) so: (.h)
240   after a year then I feel like you know I don’t get
241   anything else in here so I stop
242  R: okay
243  O: ((laughs)) because they still learning like you know
talking um:
245   (1.0)
246   <daughters> <son:>
247  R: mhm
248  O: they st- (.h) they (.h) they feel very comfortable
249   cause everybody speaks Spanish ri:ght?=
250  R: =mhm
251  O: (.h) so they (.h) they don’t really wanna push
252   themselves to speak English (.h) they can continue
253   with each other they speak Spanish and then (.h) you
254   know but (.h) but like me:: (.h) Indone:sian or
255   Chinese:se the (.h) you know
256   (1.0)
257   we don’t (.h) they don’t (.h) speak (.h) that language
258   so (.h) you know we have to push ourself to s- (.h) to
259   learn how to speak English
R: right
((both laugh))
O: yeah (.h) that’s all

Participant L: “I used to get into disagreements with the teacher.” In the excerpt in (41), participant L portrayed his identity as a good language learner by telling the story of learning English from his aunt, who taught higher Cambridge English. Participant L recounted how he “used to get into disagreements with the teacher” about the proper use of English (lines 116-118). Throughout this story, L set up the dichotomy of his high school English teacher versus him and his aunt (lines 126-130). In the excerpt below, L portrayed himself as an eager learner of English who was concerned about using English properly, so much so that he was willing to challenge his teacher and risk possible disapproval and sanction, just to use the “proper grammar, pronunciation” (lines 114-115). Not only did L portray himself as bold in standing up to his teacher, but also intelligent and adept at using English correctly.

(41) L: Identity (good language learner)

98 R: so what types of (.u) uh projects and activities did you do while you were in the English classroom (.)
99 was it more grammar and translation focused (.u) was it more conversational (.u) was it kind of a mix (.u)
100 do you remember [how it was?
101 L: [actually my- my: um (.u) my exp-
102 >high school experience< in- in English was (.u) was a painful
103 R: okay
104 L: ((laughs)) because I (.u) um because I think of my (.u) Dutch language background I: (.u) tended to:
105 (1.0)
106 107 <do my:>
108 (1.0)
109 110 projects >for instance if she had something that you had to create in English< (.u) I would do it more based on (.u) on what I felt was proper (.u) uh grammar pronunciation rather than the didactic translation of the words (.u) and um (.u) I used to get into: (.h) uh:: (.u) disagreements with the teacher=
111 R: =oh wow=
112 L: =because of- of that (.u) and uh (.u) my aunt at the
L: time (. ) was um also an English teacher (. ) but she was (. ) uh classified as higher Cambridge
R: okay=
L: =uh you know uh (. ) from uh (. ) Oxford (. ) and so: (. ) it actually at a much higher level than my high school teacher (.h) so I would go to my aunt and-
R: okay=
L: =so: (. ) uh had some interesting experiences ((both laugh))
R: sounds like it

Identity: Language learner experiencing difficulties. Experiencing difficulties or challenges when learning a language is a natural part of the learning process, but it is interesting to take a closer look at how participants talked about these difficulties.

Participants’ narratives fell into one of four approaches: 1) addressing their own personal struggles; 2) addressing other people’s struggles (but not their own); 3) addressing their struggles as part of the average Indonesian’s struggles; and 4) denying that they struggled with anything. We will examine an example of each of these; the rest of the excerpts can be found in Appendix J.

Participants S & P: My personal struggles. Participants S and P only mentioned their own personal struggles with English. For example, in (42), S produced a narration about her difficulties learning English. By using the word me (lines 236-237), she portrayed her identity as a language learner in relation to her own individual struggles, rather than the challenges faced by others.

(42) S: Difficulties learning English (own)

R: <what were some of the things that were hard for you when you were learning English in school>
S: (2.5)
R: eh probably grammar (. ) grammar’s (. ) <pretty hard for me> a::nd (. ) to learning >I mean cause there’s a major< (. ) there’s a point (. ) you have to know <the> grammar so you can (.h) speak up the em (. )
Participants L & E: Indonesians’ struggles (but not mine). Two participants, L and E, specifically mentioned the struggles of Indonesians in general to learn various concepts in English but excluded themselves from these struggles because of their language background in Dutch. In (43), L excluded himself from the group of Indonesians who struggle with the concepts of verb tense and grammatical gender (lines 144-149, 152-156). By mentioning his Dutch L1 background, he portrayed his identity as not struggling with these concepts, and thus as being a better language learner.

(43) L: Difficulties learning English (Indonesians)

((L previously mentioned that BI lacks tense and grammatical gender, but Dutch does not))

Participants D, N, A, & O: Indonesians’ struggles (including mine). Participants D, N, A, and O all mentioned specific challenges that Indonesians in general face, but unlike participants L and E, they included themselves in this assessment. In the excerpt in
(44), participant D mentioned that English is “very difficult for us [Indonesians] to learn” (lines 125-126), especially because “we don’t have grammar in Indonesia” (line 162). Here, D included herself in the group of “most of Indonesian people” (lines 175-176) who struggle to learn English (especially “grammar,” line 176), since BI is so different from English.

(44) D: Difficulties learning English (self and Indonesians)

121 R: so do you think English was a hard language to learn?
123 D: it is very hard (.). very very very hard (.)
124 pronunciation structures (.). uh grammar (.).
125 everything (.). <it is> very difficult for- (.). for us to learn
126
((lines omitted))
157 R: alright (.). so what do you think that were (.). um (.). some of the things that were <hardest> for you um- or like >some of the biggest differences between Indonesian and English<
161 D: that’s what I say pronunciations the use of the grammar (.). we don’t have grammar in Indonesia like you know past tense future (.h) you know (.). um:
164 things like that we don’t have in Indonesia (.). s-
165 so I think Indonesian language is- it’s much much easier >because we don’t have to< think about <you know> the verbs you know and- a- and the time (.h)
168 (.). stuff like >we don’t have that<
169 [in Indonesia ((smiles and laughs))]
170 R: [right ((laughs))]
171 D: ((talks with a lot of energy)) >we just say ‘eat’
172 just say ‘eat’ you know (.). 'I eat yesterday' 'I eat today' ‘I eat tomorrow’ you know but it’s different in English (.h) so I think that’s more in a th-
175 that’s more challenges for (.h) most of Indonesian people (.). the grammar<

Participants H & M: No struggles. Finally, participants H and M claimed that they did not experience difficulties when learning English. In the excerpt in (45), H portrayed her identity as a language learner who did “not really” struggle with anything (lines 92, 94-95). She called English a “fun” language (line 86) and attributed her success in learning English to her enjoyment of the language (line 94).
(45) H: Difficulties learning English (none)

R: do you think that English is a hard language to learn?
H: (.h) I don’t think so (.). it’s a fun to learn
R: mhm
H: yes:
R: (.). were there any things—were there um (.). yeah any things that you really struggled with when you were learning English (.). in school?
H: (.h) not really
R: not really?
H: not really >maybe because I< like it (.). so (.). not really

**Conclusion: Identity.** Through their stories, participants clearly portrayed their identities by affiliating or disaffiliating as members of certain groups (Sacks, 1992a, 1992b). When describing their general language learning experiences, the majority of participants used the pronoun *we*, whereas they used the pronoun *I* when telling about their own personal experiences. In other cases, participants showed their agency in learning English, thus constructing their identity as an active, motivated language learner. Finally, participants also expressed their identities when discussing the struggles they faced while learning English, especially with regard to their mention (or not) of fellow Indonesians.

Participants’ patterns when discussing their L2 identities, especially their use of membership categorization, provide insight into how they situate themselves in relation to the larger L2 learning community (Kasper, 2009). For example, those who consistently used the pronoun *we* to refer to their ESL experiences showed their sense of belonging in the ESL classroom and oriented toward the process of language learning as collaborative and interactional. In contrast, those who used the pronoun *I* indicated a more individualistic and less group-oriented view of language learning. However, many of the participants who described their ESL identity in relation to the group also discussed their
agency in learning English, thus indicating that they also viewed themselves as individuals who were ultimately responsible for their own language learning. Although they considered themselves to be members of larger social institutions or groups (such as the L2 learning community at their school), they also saw themselves as individual language learners (Baker, 2004). These tensions between individual and group identity were especially evident in the way participants affiliated or disaffiliated with certain groups when talking about their difficulties learning English. For example, those who stated that they faced similar difficulties as most Indonesians do chose to identify as Indonesian speakers of BI, whereas the participants who contrasted their relative ease in learning English with the challenges experienced by most Indonesians invoked their L1 identity (Dutch) rather than their identity as an Indonesian or as a speaker of BI. With these thoughts in mind about participants’ L2 identities, we now examine their views of English and the U.S..

Perceptions of English/U.S.

In addition to examining how participants used language to portray agency and identity, it is also interesting to take a closer look at how participants expressed their perceptions about the English language and/or the U.S. in their narratives. Of the ten participants, four mentioned their perceptions of English, two mentioned their perceptions of the U.S., and one mentioned both. The five mentions of English revolved around three distinct themes: 1) (most) everyone speaks English, 2) English is important for communication with people from different backgrounds, and 3) knowing English allows one to travel around the world. The three mentions of the U.S. referred to better
opportunities (whether educational, occupational, or financial) as compared to those in their home country of Indonesia.

**English and traveling.**

*Participant D: English spoken by “everyone.”* In the excerpt in (46), after R asked her if there was anything else she wanted to add, participant D stated her ideologies about English. D said that English allows one to travel “all around the world” (lines 193-194) because “everyone speaks English” (line 196). D described both English and French as lingua francas, but English as more common (lines 197-202). By bringing another major language into the discussion, D portrayed English as more widespread (and perhaps more useful to know). D’s statement also exemplifies the tension between global languages (such as English and French) and local languages (such as BI). D specifically stated that knowing English is useful so others can “answer your questions” (line 199), give “directions” (lines 201-202), and do other “things like that” (line 202). Through these statements, D represented English as empowering the tourist to find her way, to go where she wanted, and to resolve any questions or problems that might arise. It is interesting to note the strong emotionality that D associated with English; she characterized English as removing fear, especially when traveling (lines 195-196).

D’s story of how she “went to Korea” further displayed her perceptions about English (lines 203-210). Even with a somewhat limited knowledge of English, D traveled alone to Korea and had a successful trip (lines 207-209). The question of access played an important role in D’s narrative about her trip to Korea, because without English, she would not have had those experiences. While BI sufficed for travel within Indonesia, English afforded her with broader experiences and participation in the global community.
D concluded her story by advising others to learn English because it is “very beneficial” (lines 212-213, 215-217).

(46) D: Language ideologies

177 R: and then (. ) is there anything else that you want to
178 share about your experiences learning English: (. )
179 um
180 (1.0)
181 or (. ) not? ((laughs))
182 D: (. ) um::: (.h) <I think it is very (. ) uh:
183 beneficial> for everyone: to speak English: (.h)
184 <I: (. ) compare myself with my friends in Indonesia>
185 (.h) >I mean< yeah they are doctors: they are: (.h)
186 engineers but since English it’s not their (.h) (. )
187 they’re not- (. ) they’re (h) (. ) what should I say?
188 (. ) um
189 (2.5)
190 ((speaks in higher tone of voice)) for them English
191 is not very important right? but not for me=>for me<
192 I must speak English I- I just like language you
193 know (.h) so: um it is beneficial for me (. ) I can
194 go anywhere (. ) you know all around the world (. )
195 and: (. ) you know I don’t have to be afraid:
196 because (. ) uh you know everyone speaks English even
197 though even though there’s French you know
198 generally they >they speak and they get it (. ) you
199 know be able to answers your questions we have- you
200 know if you have a questions but if you cannot speak
201 English (.h) it’s hard for you you know special to
202 ask thee directions: things like that you know (.h)
203 um I remember last time (. ) I went to Korea (. ) it
204 was my first time to go to Korea but (. ) you know I-
205 (. ) I went to Korea from Australia so I (. ) you know
206 I >speaking just a little bit of time< (.hh) and um
207 (. ) I went to Korea >by myself (. ) I didn’t even
208 know how to get there (. ) but since I know how to
209 speak English you know< (. ) I got there ((laughs and
210 smiles)) so.
211 R: right
212 D: ((smiles)) >so I encourage everyone to speak
213 English<
214 R: alright
215 D: >not just English you know< le:arn other languages
216 it’s- it’s- (. ) it’s good (. ) it’s- it’s very
217 beneficial (. ) so.
218 R: yeah

Participant N: English spoken by “many people.” In the excerpt in (47), which
also took place at the end of her interview, participant N expressed a similar view of

English as participant D. Participant N responded to R’s open-ended question with a brief
narrative about how learning English enables Indonesians to travel (lines 222-225). In these lines, N portrayed the tension between BI and English: BI is limited and exists in local contexts, whereas English is global and provides international access. This mirrors D’s statement in line 196 in excerpt (46) that “everyone speaks English,” so if you know English, you can travel the world and thus have access to belonging in the global community. Like D, N also mentioned that English is useful for asking directions when traveling (lines 238-242). Although it is obvious that knowing the language(s) of the country where one is traveling would enable communication (such as asking directions), it is important to note that both D and N assumed that the individuals they would be speaking to during their travels knew English, presumably because they believed English to be so widespread. Although N never explicitly said that she believed “everyone speaks English,” she did indicate that this is the case when she said in lines 243-244, “so how do I know [the directions] if I cannot speak English?”

It is interesting to note the appearance of both emotion and motivation in N’s talk. In the first part of her narrative, N stated that “I think learning English is fun” (lines 215-216) and then described how learners’ like/dislike of the English language is tied to their enjoyment of learning it. In the second part of her narrative, N continued with a more detailed description about how she did not like English at first but liked it more after she realized she could use English to pursue one of her interests, traveling (lines 229-234). Thus, improving her English to facilitate her travels proved to be a motivation for her when learning English, and she thought of English as “fun” (line 233). For N, traveling the world was her “dream” (line 234) – her imagined community. She envisioned herself as “understand[ing] many people” and asking “about the direction” (lines 237, 241-242).
in English, thus being able to participate in the global community and explore her identity as a world traveler.

(47) N: Language ideologies

209 R: and then (.) um is there anything else that you
210 want to add about (..) your experiences learning
211 English
212 N: (3.0)
213 (.h) <oh:: my goodness>
214 R: okay
215 N: I think learning ((coughs)) excuse me I think
216 learning English is (.). is fun (.). I mean (.). if
217 you- if you like English (.). you will uh: (..) you
218 will enjoy it but if you don’t like English I don’t
219 think you will (.). uh: (..) you know (.h) uh
220 ((coughs)) you will enjoy how to (.h) but ((coughs))
221 maybe if you have like a thing and you would like
222 (.). to: go travel: (.). and I don’t think without
223 English (.). you can uh you can speak Bahasa because
224 Bahasa Indonesia I- I think is only in Indonesia (.)
225 yeah
226 R: mhmm
227 N: ((coughs))
228 R: alright
229 N: so (.) yeah so uh- my experience learning English is
230 (.hh) uh:: (.). yeah: (.). at first I don’t li:ke it
231 but (.). (.h) when I know the purpose (.). of learning
232 English like for traveling: because I love
233 traveling: (.h) so I think it’s much more fun
234 because I have to uh: (.). remember my dream how to
235 ‘oh (.). how: (.). how wonderful if I can: (..) speak
236 English uh: (.). fluently and then I can uh
237 understand oh: (.). many people who: (.). ((coughs))
238 who can help (.). me to get the direction and >then
239 tell me< (.). when I have traveling uh:: (.). other
240 country and then (.). how do get how I use the map
241 (.). a::nd I have to ask many people: (..) about the
242 direction about the: (.). where is like uh: the (x)
243 (.). so how do I uh know if I- I- I cannot speak
244 English’ (.h) so therefore I think uh: English is
245 very important

English and international connections.

Participant A: English spoken by “the majority of the world.” Similar to participants D and N, participant A also expressed the idea that English is a global language. The excerpt in (48) occurred after participant A’s long narrative about her experiences learning English in Indonesia and then in the U.S. This excerpt occurred
after R’s general opinion question about A’s thoughts about learning English, which was then reformulated as an emotion-implicature question where R expected A to address emotionality (lines 210-214). In response to this somewhat complicated question, participant A did not list any particular emotions but rather indicated her need to learn English because it is a widespread language (lines 218-221, 223). Participant A addressed the first part of the question (what were your thoughts about learning English?) but did not address the second part of the question (what were your feelings about learning English?). In her response, participant A did not indicate that there was even an option to learn English (lines 225-226). Since “the majority of the world” speaks English (lines 220-221), participant A did not want to be excluded from communication with the English-speaking world (and other opportunities that are associated with knowing English, such as educational or financial), so she “had to know about it” and “just [went] by it” (lines 226-227). Thus, English was not a choice for her but rather a necessity – she had to learn a global language to take part in the global community, since her local language (BI) only gave her access to her local community in Indonesia. Participant A expressed the common ideology of many language learners that knowing English will connect them with the rest of the world and bring them success.

(48) A: Language ideologies

210  R:  so A, I was wondering what (.h) attitudes or (.)
211  thoughts you had about learning English (.h) were
212  you excited about it did you- was it just a
213  required class (.h) um (..) or did you have other
214  (..) feelings about it
215  A:  (1.0)
216  uh for learning English?=
217  R:  =mhm
218  A:  (..) mmm (..) I only know that I have to- I have to
219  know (..) >you know how to speak English< (.)
220  because English is uh spoken by (..) the majority of
221  (..) >you know< (..) the world=
Participant S: “We need…English for communication.” Participant S displayed a related but slightly different ideology about English: that it is necessary for “activity life” (line 334) and “business” (lines 337-338). In excerpt (49), S stated that “English is international” and thus allows for international communication (lines 343-345).

Participant S clearly identified which languages are necessary in which contexts: in Indonesia, when talking to individuals who speak BI, “there is no need” for English (line 337). This echoed D’s, N’s, and A’s statements about the tension between local (BI) and global (English) contexts. It is especially interesting to note how S positioned English as a lingua franca. First, she stated that English is necessary for communication between people from “different nation[s]” (lines 345-346) such as “German” (line 342). Then, she expanded the idea of English as a lingua franca to Indonesians who grew up elsewhere or “forget Indonesia language” (lines 350-352). None of the other participants mentioned English as a lingua franca between Indonesians. Participant S essentially said that when Indonesians become part of the global community, “the best way” for them to communicate with each other may be using English rather than their own language (lines 352-354).

As did other participants, S tied emotionality to learning English. She associated happiness and enjoyment with learning English (lines 328-329). Like participant A, S portrayed learning English as a necessity; however, unlike participant A, she implied that she had a choice (lines 329-330). The pronominal alternation between we and they in
lines 334-358 is also important to note. Here, S characterized several distinct groups of people: Germans (they), Indonesians (we), and Indonesians who do not really speak BI (they). By setting up these categories, S painted a contrast between local people (Indonesians who speak BI in Indonesia, or Germans who speak German in Germany), and global people (Indonesians or people from different language backgrounds who use English to communicate with each other). Participant S stated that knowing English brings about “lot of opportunity” and “lot of benefit” (lines 357-358). In the context of her talk, this probably referred to the benefit of being globally connected with people from all over the world, as well as the business-related benefits of knowing English (such as employment, finances, and the international market).

(49) S: Language ideologies

323 R: ((laughs)) so how did you feel about learning
324 English? did you want to learn English (.). did you
325 just have to in school (.). um did you not care
326 (1.0)
327 how did you feel about it
328 S: um (.). I have- I feel happy (.). I like uh um (.). I
329 like English (.). language and no- no really have to
330 in the school but um
331 (1.5)
332 but (.). um (.). that’s- how to say- um (.). because
333 (1.0)
334 we need it as uh: (.). our activity life and when-
335 and when I grow up too I have who- who I talk-
336 whoever I talk in- in Indonesia no- no speak
337 English there is no need (.). but (.). um: I using for
338 business too sometime last time (.). in- in- at- at
339 the- (.). at my um when I was in at home at the (.h)
340 hometown (.h) and now (.). all oh <we need for when
341 we see the foreign language> in: I cannot speak >the
342 other language< or maybe they are from German or
343 something but- but (.). English is international and
344 we- we need an English- speak English for (.)
345 communication (.). uh for people: different (.).
346 nation or: if they- even though they are Indonesian
347 (.). but they cannot- they are not grow up here but
348 they’re from (.). uh grow up in
349 (1.0)
350 >I mean< no grow up in- in Indonesia but they grow
351 up here or they grow up in the other (.). uh country
Participant P: “It’s not hard for us…to communicate with people.” In the excerpt in (50), participant P expressed a similar sentiment as the other four participants already discussed: that English is crucial for international communication. This excerpt is taken from near the end of P’s interview. Prior to this excerpt, P had shared how knowing English helps him in his occupation, which is pastoring a church in the U.S. with members from diverse ethnic and linguistic backgrounds. He mentioned that he sometimes has difficulty knowing how to explain concepts but appreciates the support from his congregation. He then launched into the segment in (50), where he explained how English is “international” (line 193) and allows people to “go everywhere” (line 194). It is interesting that P said “it’s not hard for us to go everywhere” (line 194) rather than “it’s easy for us to go everywhere” when talking about the benefits of English. Perhaps this is because of his awareness, as the minister of an international church, that international communication is not always easy, but it is achievable if the participants speak the same language. Participant P expressed the view that English is powerful because it provides a means of communication among diverse groups of people (lines 195-198). If you know English, you have power to communicate with people from different backgrounds as part of an international community, whereas if you do not know English, then you do not. Once again, this evokes the tensions between global/local languages and global/local communities.
(50) P: Language ideologies

189  P:  yeah I think basically that is uh (.) the wonderful
190   we are talking about Indonesian and also English
191   (.h) hard to learn English (.) but as a challenge
192   that make us really (.h) would like to learn more
193   (.h) because this is international (.h) once we know
194   English (.h) it’s not hard for us to go everywhere
195   and then to under- (.h) to communicate with people
196   with the different background (.h) different
197   nationality (.h) different race from all over the
198   world

Ideologies about the U.S.

Participant L. In addition to ideologies about English, participants also expressed ideologies about the U.S. in their narratives. In excerpt (51), toward the end of his interview, participant L expressed his belief that Western countries (Canada and the U.S.) provided “better” opportunities (lines 190-191). Earlier, L had described how he came to the West to pursue medical training. Although L did not directly say so, he took advantage of the “better” educational and employment opportunities in the West. Through his statement about “better opportunities,” he implied that knowing English enables one to better appropriate those opportunities in the West. Studying, living, and working in an English-speaking country were part of his “dream” (line 188), and to gain access to this imagined community, he needed to learn English.

(51) L: Ideologies about the U.S.

184  R:  now um why did you decide to move to the United
185   States from Indonesia (.) was it to pursue your
186   medical training?
187  L:  oh that was part of it (.) and- and uh (.) I’ve
188   always- (.) always had a dream to (.) come to North
189   America (.) I didn’t know it was Canada first but
190   (.) uh eventually the States (.) I thought the
191   opportunities were better and- (.) and they have
192   been for me

Participant S. Participant S expressed a similar sentiment in excerpt (52). Toward the end of the interview, S mentioned that due to the riots and economic crisis in
Indonesia, she came to the U.S. to seek a better life. Like participant L, participant S expressed a perception that the U.S. offers better opportunities but did not specifically mention what those opportunities involve. Since she desired to be part of this imagined community that offered a better life (lines 365-367), she learned English.

(52) S: Ideologies about the U.S.

Participant O. Participant O was the third participant who expressed her ideologies about the U.S. in her narrative. However, participant O was different than participants L and S in that she explicitly stated why she believed the U.S. provided better opportunities. In excerpt (53), which occurred early in the interview, O said that she came to the U.S. to look for a job with a higher salary (lines 84-85). Her job opportunity turned out to be nannying for her aunt, which also provided O with the opportunity to study English on the side (lines 90-93). Her employment opportunity in the U.S. fulfilled her expectations that the U.S. offered better opportunities than Indonesia. In order to become more involved in her new community, participant O learned English from her aunt and uncle and also took a community ESL class.

(53) O: Ideologies about the U.S.
Conclusion: Research Question 2

In their narratives, participants clearly portrayed their L2 selves through agency, identity, and ideologies. Participants often mentioned specific instances of their agency in learning English, and by doing so portrayed their identities as “good” language learners (Ahearn, 2001). Throughout their narratives, participants constructed their different identities, especially by invoking membership in or disassociation with certain groups (Kasper, 2009). Finally, participants also mentioned their ideologies of English as providing them with better opportunities and connecting them with the global community, both of which are consistent with findings in the literature (e.g., Chang, 2011; Norton & Kamal, 2003; Wesely, 2012).

A few key points follow from these results. First, van Dijk (2011) notes that there is a difference between having an ideology and acting on that ideology in real life. This “action” can be seen in several participants’ narratives; for example, participant A knowing that she “had” to learn English and then doing so, or participant N pushing herself to learn English so she could travel around the world. In these and other cases,
participants’ ideologies about English motivated them to pursue some course of action and thus influenced their agency in learning English. Their ideologies did not stay dormant in their heads, but rather became the catalyst for change in their language learning experience (Norton Peirce, 1995).

Van Dijk (2011) also points out that simply having an ideology (or belief system) does not indicate the truth value of that ideology. As can be seen, each of the participants’ ideologies about English aligned with the real world, at least to some extent. For example, it is true that “many people” speak English (though not “everyone,” of course), since English has become an important lingua franca used for international communication. However, most participants failed to recognize that other languages may be equally (or more important) for communication in the context of particular regions (such as Indonesia or the European Union), and that knowing English may or may not aid one in international travel, depending on the area to which one is traveling. On a broader scale, knowing English does not necessarily guarantee success or better opportunities for an individual, whether these opportunities are related to education, occupation, socioeconomic status, or prestige. Also, simply knowing English does not always ensure a place of belonging or sense of identity in an imagined community (Norton Peirce, 1995), contrary to what some participants seem to believe.

Two other points deserve mention. The concept of imagined communities came up quite frequently in participants’ narratives, especially in conjunction with the constructs of motivation, agency, identity, and ideologies. All of these concepts are intricately related. In the data, participants talked about their views of English, the benefits associated with English, and the communities to which they imagined belonging.
when they knew English. These beliefs motivated them to learn English, and to do so in an agentive manner. One final note is that global/local tensions were evident throughout participants’ talk. Participants consistently characterized English as a global language spoken by many people in the world. For participants, knowing English granted access to the global community, including communicating with people from all different backgrounds and traveling the world. In contrast, only knowing a local language (such as BI or another language spoken in Indonesia) limited one’s access and opportunities. This idea seems to be prevalent among L2 speakers of English (e.g., Gu, 2010; Norton & Kamal, 2003). While it may be true, at least to some extent, this belief can be problematic because it places incredible value on English and a globalized community at the expense of devaluing local languages and local communities. These are important considerations as English becomes even more widespread and the world becomes increasingly globalized (Blommaert, 2010).
CONCLUSION AND DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

This thesis has focused on the narratives of Indonesian L2 speakers of English from a narrative analysis/inquiry perspective. This study was motivated by the gap in the literature on topics relating to BI and on narratives told by Indonesian L2 speakers of English. The ten participants came from a variety of language backgrounds, but all spoke BI as a native or additional language. Participants were invited to talk about their ESL experiences with the researcher through a series of interview questions. In each interview, the participant and researcher co-constructed the participant’s experiences and responses.

The first research question centered around the types of linguistic devices that members of this population used in order to ensure cohesion (connectedness) and coherence (meaning) in their talk about their ESL experiences. The data showed that participants used a variety of linguistic devices, distributed across participants and various categories. The 21 different types of linguistic devices occurred in three distinct levels of frequency; the most frequent linguistic devices, by far, were connectives, discourse markers, and repetition. Given the attention in the literature to the linguistic devices in the first tier especially, as well as the second tier, this is not unexpected (e.g., Chafe, 1982; Georgakopoulou & Goutsos, 1997; Halliday & Hasan, 1976; Labov, 1972; Tannen, 1982a, 1989). Some devices (e.g., connectives, discourse markers, repetition) clearly contributed to both cohesion and coherence. Other linguistic devices (e.g., adverbials, embedded clauses, relative clauses, marked verbal features, anaphoric reference) contributed more to structural cohesion, while still others (e.g., intensifiers, hedges, quantifiers, comparison words) provided a deeper or more specific meaning to individual words and phrases, thus enhancing the meaning of the narrative. A few devices
(e.g., laughter, direct addresses, clarification requests, reported speech) helped facilitate the interaction between participants in the interview. Put together, the use of these linguistic devices served to make participants’ narratives cohesive and coherent so the story recipient could follow and understand what they were saying.

Future research could look at the linguistic devices used in BI narratives, then compare the devices used by Indonesians in BI and English. Another study could compare the linguistic devices used by Indonesian speakers of BI and American speakers of English. Other research could compare the linguistic devices used by L1 and L2 speakers of English. Each of these studies would be valuable because they would provide insight into the linguistic devices used in both BI and English, and whether L2 users tend to draw more on linguistic devices from their L1 or L2 when telling stories in their L2.

The second research question considered how participants used language to portray their L2 selves (agency, identity, perceptions of English/U.S.) when talking about their ESL experiences. Six of the ten participants clearly portrayed their agency and showed how they actively pursued (or still actively pursue) learning English. Participants also frequently constructed their identities in relation to others. When talking about their general language experiences, eight of the ten participants consistently used the pronoun we, thus constructing language learning as a group process. Seven of the participants constructed their identity as a “good” language learner by describing how they actively learned English, usually in relation to other individuals who were not as skilled at or motivated while learning English. When asked about the difficulties they encountered when learning English, participants also constructed their identities by mentioning (or not mentioning) fellow Indonesians and their struggles. Five of the participants expressed
their ideologies about English and the U.S. when co-constructing their ESL experiences with the researcher. These ideologies fell into four categories: 1) English is spoken by (most) everyone, 2) English is important for international communication and participation in the global community, 3) English allows one to travel all around the world, and 4) knowing English and/or living in the U.S. (or another Western country) provides better opportunities. Within their narratives, participants frequently referred to English as a lingua franca and portrayed the tensions between BI (or their native language) as a local language and English as a global language.

Some of the participants made sweeping generalizations about English along the lines of (almost) everyone speaks English or if I just know English, then I can travel anywhere I want/communicate with everybody/be successful in life/do XYZ. This tendency to overestimate the scope, power, and imperativeness of English was common across participants. It is important to note that these ideologies are not limited to the participants of this study; speakers of Korean (Park, 2009), Japanese (Seargeant, 2009), and Spanish (Lasiter, 2013) also share these views, as well as native English speakers (Doerr, 2009). One important point to bring out is that such ideologies about knowing English could potentially be dangerous to L2 learners/users. It is possible that learners could undertake learning English believing that simply knowing English will bring them success in life, enable them to communicate with everyone, allow them to travel the world without difficulties, bring them a better life and opportunities, etc. – whatever their ideologies may be. However, this is not always the case, and learners may sometimes be disappointed to find that simply knowing English may not automatically guarantee them
the results they had imagined or the fulfillment of their dreams throughout many years of language study (Tsui & Tollefson, 2007).

Future research could continue to unpack the ideologies of both L1 and L2 speakers of English, with the goal of determining where these ideologies come from and how they are perpetuated in society. For example, studies could look at how language teachers (including L1 English teachers), schools, and governments perpetuate these ideologies through their choice of curricula, teaching methods, advertising, and the like. Other studies could continue to explore the connections between ideology and motivation, ideology and identity, and ideology and agency. Finally, since ideology informs and motivates one’s actions, it would be interesting to note the connection between L2 students’ ideologies about learning English with their motivation and performance in the L2 classroom and beyond.

This thesis addresses two separate areas relating to how Indonesian L2 users of English speak: what linguistic devices they use in their narratives and meta-commentary about their ESL experiences, as well as how they portray their L2 selves with regard to agency, identity, and ideology. Studying these issues is important because it sheds light on how L2 learners use and view English, as well as how they see themselves as L2 learners and users. These are significant questions, and the answers will continue to provide further insight into SLA.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LINGUISTIC DEVICE</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connectives</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse markers</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetition</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverbials</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embedded clauses</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensifiers</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Like</em> (non-comparison)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stance</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedges</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marked verbal features</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantifiers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaphoric phrases</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reported speech</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Just</em></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lists</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative definitions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian words</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative clauses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

PARTICIPANTS AT A GLANCE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The First Five Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Where from</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time in U.S.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language(s) spoken as a child</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Started English</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>English – L?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>English classes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant D (#1) ~835 words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main focus in English classes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attitudes about learning English</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional notes</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## The Second Five Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Participant A (#6)</th>
<th>Participant O (#7)</th>
<th>Participant H (#8)</th>
<th>Participant P (#9)</th>
<th>Participant M (#10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Where from</td>
<td>Jakarta (Java island)</td>
<td>Jakarta (Java island)</td>
<td>Pematangsiantar (Sumatra island)</td>
<td>Sulawesi island</td>
<td>Jakarta (Java island)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time in U.S.</td>
<td>20 years</td>
<td>15 years</td>
<td>18 years</td>
<td>18 years</td>
<td>6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>Yes, U.S.</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
<td>Yes, Indonesia</td>
<td>Yes, Indonesia</td>
<td>Yes, Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language(s)</td>
<td>BI</td>
<td>Batak; BI</td>
<td>Batak; BI</td>
<td>Manado; BI</td>
<td>BI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spoken as a child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Started English</td>
<td>High school</td>
<td>Middle school</td>
<td>Middle school</td>
<td>Junior high</td>
<td>Middle school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English = L?</td>
<td>L2</td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>L2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English classes</td>
<td>English classes in high school and ESL classes in college (ENG 107/108); additional classes outside of school to prepare for TOEFL test and college in the U.S.</td>
<td>English classes in middle school and high school (probably around 6 years of formal instruction); community ESL class 9 hours a week in LA for about a year</td>
<td>Middle school and high school (probably about 6 years of formal instruction)</td>
<td>Middle school and high school (probably around 6 years of formal instruction)</td>
<td>Middle school and high school (probably around 6 years of formal instruction)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main focus in English classes</td>
<td>Reading, TOEFL test preparation, grammar, conversation</td>
<td>Reading, pronunciation, conversation</td>
<td>Writing, reading, grammar, conversation</td>
<td>Conversation, fill-in-the-blank, and MC based on a story instead of writing essays</td>
<td>Grammar, listening lab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant A (#6)</td>
<td>Participant O (#7)</td>
<td>Participant H (#8)</td>
<td>Participant P (#9)</td>
<td>Participant M (#10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935 words</td>
<td>1225 words</td>
<td>535 words</td>
<td>1020 words</td>
<td>2010 words</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attitudes about learning English</strong></td>
<td><strong>Attitudes about learning English</strong></td>
<td><strong>Attitudes about learning English</strong></td>
<td><strong>Attitudes about learning English</strong></td>
<td><strong>Attitudes about learning English</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I only know that I have to- I have to know, you know, how to speak English because English is uh spoken by the majority of, you know, the world, so I need to learn that.”</td>
<td>“So in 1998 [when I came to the U.S.] I start speaking in English like daily because I have to, no other choice.”</td>
<td>“I am super excited. I love- I love uh I love to learn uh English class…”</td>
<td>“Oh, as I say, I’m very excited, I really love. If you ask me compare learning English and also learning mathematic or algebra, I saying, ‘English!’ So I really love, yeah.”</td>
<td>“When I was in school I hate English…. But after um like after I graduate in from the college…and then I start to chat [online] and then like ‘Oh, I need to improve,’ you know…and then I start learning and learning more, you know…”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional notes</strong></td>
<td><strong>Additional notes</strong></td>
<td><strong>Additional notes</strong></td>
<td><strong>Additional notes</strong></td>
<td><strong>Additional notes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked hard to learn vocabulary by reading, watching the news, and looking up words in the dictionary. Attended a community college for two years and ASU for three years. Currently works with ASU students and picks up slang words from them.</td>
<td>Lived with aunt and uncle for six years in LA; they made her speak English in their home. Speaks English more now that she lives in Arizona (as compared to LA).</td>
<td>Both she and her father are singers, so she learned English through songs written in English.</td>
<td>His father was a teacher, so he learned “proper Indonesian” at home and in school. Also learned English on his own through the Bible and songs.</td>
<td>Married to an American. Husband, daughter, and in-laws all help her improve her English, and she is eager to learn from them. Due to negative past experiences, she doesn’t want to go to the doctor’s office or other appointments without her husband because she is afraid people won’t understand her English.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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IRB APPROVAL LETTER
EXEMPTION GRANTED

Claire Renaud
English
Claire.Renaud@asu.edu

Dear Claire Renaud:

On 12/3/2013 the ASU IRB reviewed the following protocol:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Review</th>
<th>Initial Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Examining the Speech of Indonesians Speaking in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigator</td>
<td>Claire Renaud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRB ID</td>
<td>STUDY00000321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Title</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant ID</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Documents Reviewed | • Revised information & consent form _ R. Tappendorf.pdf, Category: Consent Form;  
                     • IRB form _ R Tappendorf - 2nd revision.docx, Category: IRB Protocol;  
                     • Revised procedures _ R. Tappendorf.pdf, Category: Measures (Survey questions/Interview questions /interview guides/focus group questions);  
                     • CITI completion report _ R Tappendorf.pdf, Category: Other (to reflect anything not captured above);  
                     • Recruitment script _ R Tappendorf.pdf, Category: Recruitment Materials; |

The IRB determined that the protocol is considered exempt pursuant to Federal Regulations 45CFR46 (2) Tests, surveys, interviews, or observation on 12/3/2013.

In conducting this protocol you are required to follow the requirements listed in the INVESTIGATOR MANUAL (HRP-103).
Sincerely,

IRB Administrator

cc: Rebecca Tappendorf
APPENDIX D

INFORMATION AND CONSENT FORM
Dear speaker of Bahasa Indonesia and English:

My name is Rebecca Tappendorf, and I am a senior studying at Arizona State University. For my honors thesis that I am writing this year, I am researching the differences between Bahasa Indonesia (BI) and English. Specifically, I am interested in how speakers of BI use English. I am writing my thesis under the direction of Dr. Claire Renaud, a professor in the English (Linguistics/TESOL) department at ASU.

I would like to invite your participation in this study. Volunteers need to be 18 years or older. Interviews will take approximately 30 minutes to an hour.

As part of this study, your answers will be recorded by video equipment. These videos will let me review what you have said after the interview so that I don’t have to take as many notes during the interview, allowing me to give better attention to the participants. All videos will remain confidential, and your responses will never be associated with your name. You will be assigned a number (for example, “Participant 3”) or a fake name (for example, “Bob”) that will be associated with your responses. I will respect and protect your privacy at all times in this study to the best of my ability.

There are no foreseeable risks to your participation in this study. You are free to stop participating in the study at any time, or you are free to not answer a question if you do not want to or begin to feel uncomfortable. There are no penalties for not participating in the study or for choosing not to answer a question.

Although there are no direct benefits for participants of the study, I am maybe considering teaching English to Indonesians at some point in time. If I follow this plan, then the information that I learn in this study will help me to be a better English teacher and will benefit my Indonesian students.

If you would like to participate in this study, please read and sign the information below. (If you would like to participate in the study but not be recorded, please let me know.)

I acknowledge that I have read this description of the study. I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I can stop participating in the study at any time with no penalties. I understand that I can refuse to answer a question if it makes me feel uncomfortable. I understand that my interview will be video recorded so the researchers can review my answers after the interview. I understand that my privacy will be protected, that my responses will never be linked to my real name, and that videos will be viewed only by the researchers. I have been informed about the purpose of this study. I acknowledge that I am at least 18 years of age and am a willing participant in this study.
If you have any questions about your rights as a participant in this research, or if you feel you have been placed at risk, you can contact the Chair of the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board through the ASU Office of Research Integrity and Assurance at 480-965-6788.

If you have any questions about this study, please contact the researcher.
APPENDIX E

PROCEDURES TO BE USED IN

“EXAMINING THE SPEECH OF INDONESIANS SPEAKING IN ENGLISH”
Part I: Interviews

The purpose of the interviews is to gain insight about when, where, and how participants learned English. This will provide valuable background information for my thesis. I will ask participants the following questions:

1. Information about participant
   - Name
   - Age (participants can choose an age range, for example 30-39, if they prefer)
   - Gender
   - Where from (which town/city and island)
   - How long they have lived in the U.S.

2. Language background
   - What language(s) did you grow up speaking? What language(s) did you regularly speak in your home?
   - Did you speak Bahasa Indonesia (BI) as your first language, or did you learn it in school?
   - At what age (or grade) did you start learning BI?
   - Did you have to learn BI to go to school?
   - Did the schools you attended teach in BI or in your native language?

3. How similar are BI and your native language?
   - Vocabulary?
   - Sentence structure? (for example, *Saya senang musik* [I like music] – subject, verb, object)
   - Pronunciation?
   - Verbs and tense? (English: *Yesterday I went to the market.* / BI: *Kemarin saya pergi ke pasar.*)
   - Are there any other differences you can think of?

4. Background in English
   - When did you first start learning English?
   - How old were you? What grade?
   - Was English a required class?
   - How many years did you study English in the classroom?
   - Approximately how many years has it been since you started learning English?
   - How many languages did you speak before you started learning English?
   - Are you still taking one or more formal English classes?
     - If not, when was the last time you took a formal English class?

5. Experiences learning English
   - Were your English teachers native speakers of English?
   - What attitudes did you have about learning English?
   - Did you want to learn English, or were you forced to learn English by your school/parents/etc.?
   - Do you think English is a hard language? Why or why not?
• What types of projects and activities did you do while learning English? [If the participant doesn’t know what to say, I’ll ask them if they did the following activities or not]
  o Speaking (dialogues, conversations with classmates/teacher, pronunciation practice, etc.)
  o Listening (to teacher, to tapes/CDs, to radio/TV/movies, to classmates, etc.)
  o Writing (stories, dialogues, reports, etc.)
  o Reading (stories, lessons, vocabulary lists, etc.)
  o Translation
  o Grammar lessons
  o What things did you/your school/your teacher(s) focus on the most while learning English?
• What do you think are some of the biggest differences between BI and English?
• What were some of the things that were the hardest for you when you were learning English?
6. Free responses of participants
• Is there anything else that you would like to share about your experiences learning English?
• Thank you for your participation!
Hi, my name is Rebecca Tappendorf. I’m a senior at ASU and am currently writing my honors thesis about the differences between English and Bahasa Indonesia. I was wondering if you would be willing to participate in a study I am doing.

My study involves interviews with speakers of Bahasa Indonesia who also speak English. The interviews will take about 30 minutes to an hour to complete. Each interview will take place individually. I will be asking you questions about your experiences learning English. The interview will be audio/video recorded for research purposes. All recordings will be anonymous.

Your participation in this study is voluntary. If you have any questions concerning the research study, please contact me. If you are interested in participating, please read and sign the Information and Consent Form. Thank you so much!
APPENDIX G

TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS

(MODIFIED DISCOURSE ANALYSIS STYLE)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYMBOL</th>
<th>MEANING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(.)</td>
<td>pause of less than 1 second</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2.0)</td>
<td>timed pause (2 second in this case)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:</td>
<td>elongated sound (written yeaːh instead of yeaah)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((notes))</td>
<td>extra notes about the participant, nonlinguistic behavior, context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of the excerpt, omitted lines, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[overlapping talk]</td>
<td>talk that occurs at the same time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;faster speech&lt;</td>
<td>speech that is faster than the surrounding speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;slower speech&gt;</td>
<td>speech that is slower than the surrounding speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOUDER SPEECH</td>
<td>speech that is louder than the surrounding speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>°softer speech°</td>
<td>speech that is softer than the surrounding speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>rising intonation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(xx)</td>
<td>unintelligible word/phrase (more x’s = more unintelligible words)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>word cut-</td>
<td>word cutoff; the word is quickly ended or ended partway through; can</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>indicate what some (not linguists) might call a “stutter”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>important</td>
<td>used in some of the excerpts to draw attention to specific words or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>phrases that are under discussion or analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emphasis</td>
<td>participants’ emphasis on a particular word or phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kata</td>
<td>word in another language (BI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[translation]</td>
<td>translation of a BI word or phrase (if not given by the participant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in the interview)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[phonetic]</td>
<td>phonetic pronunciation of a word or phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[clarification]</td>
<td>word(s) inserted to clarify a participant’s meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>right=</td>
<td>latching utterances (no pauses), either between participants or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=together</td>
<td>within one participant’s utterance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX H

CODES GIVEN TO REVIEWERS
- Pronouns
  - *I, you, they, we* (per turn)
  - Pronoun switch (in the same turn) – for example, *you → we* or *we → they*
    - “We start learning English if you are in high school.”

- Discourse markers
  - Comment phrases – occur at the beginning, middle, or end of the participant’s speech – *well, you know, yeah, yes, right*, etc.
    - “Well, I like English a lot, *you know.*”
  - Interjections – *oh, oooh, oh my goodness*, etc.
  - Agreement markers – occur in response to a statement that the other person made – *yeah, that’s right, exactly*
    - R: “English has many different dialects.”
    - P: “*Yeah, it does. Australian is hard for me.*”
  - Response tokens – occur in response to a question: *yes, no, yeah*
    - R: “Did you take English in middle school?”
    - P: “*Yes, and in high school too.*”

- Connectives (between clauses)
  - Coordinated
    - Additive: *and, and also, and then, or*
    - Comparative: *but*
    - “I took the TOEFL and then I went to college.”
  - Subordinated
    - Temporal: *when, until, since, before*
    - Consequential: *because, so, since*
    - Conditional: *if, even though*
    - “*If you don’t speak English you will not be able to talk to many people.*”
  - Main clause
    - Occurs when a connective is used to introduce a main clause; common ones are *so, and then*
    - “*So that’s how I learned English.*”

*note: for the coding, I would write “connective: C, add (and)” or “connective: S, temp (when)” in the notes*

*the main thing to make sure of is that the two elements are clauses (subject and verb...or at least subject and verb if you take into account ellipsis), not just two words: maroon and gold*

- Hedging – shows hesitation or approximation on the part of the speaker
  - *I’m not sure, I guess, kind of, not really, hardly, probably, maybe, I don’t know, just*
    - “I don’t know, English is *kind of* hard, it’s just different than Indonesian.”
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• Stance – shows the speaker’s opinions
  o I think, I believe, of course, I’ve noticed, that’s good, that’s bad, hopefully

• Intensifiers – intensify or build up the speech; often adverbs
  o very, really, so, pretty, never, always, even, still, just, emphasis (marked by underlining in the transcript)
    • “So I love English very much because it is so fun.”
  *note: just can take on various functions, including hedge and intensifier; it depends on the context!

• Quantifier – quantifies a noun phrase
  o all, every, some, part of, much, many, little bit

• Repetition
  o 1a: Immediate – word or phrase is repeated immediately (or after a pause), but not after a cut-off
  o 1b: Non-immediate – at least one intervening word in between the first word/phrase and repeated word/phrase; pauses don’t count as intervening
  o 2a: Exact – word or phrase is repeated exactly (can be immediate or non-immediate)
  o 2b: With variation – word/phrase is repeated with some variation, but mostly the same words
  o 2c: With paraphrase – the basic gist of the word/phrase is repeated but with different vocab words or different structure
  o 3a: Word – one word is repeated
  o 3b: Phrase – two or more words are repeated
*choose from 1, 2, & 3 (any combination is possible)
*pauses don’t count as intervening words
*a word that is repeated after a pause, however, does count as a repeated word
*words repeated after a word cut-off (indicated with -) don’t count
*something can be said at the beginning of a turn and then repeated at the end of the turn, and it is still repetition, just non-immediate
*repetition can occur across turns – the speaker says the same thing (or roughly the same thing in his/her next turn)
*repetition occurs A LOT and is also probably the hardest thing to code (in my opinion) – but don’t be intimidated!
*here are some examples:
  ▪ NOT repetition: “Englis- English is-is-is fun.”
  ▪ Immediate (word): “English (.) English is fun.”
  ▪ Immediate (phrase): “It’s just like that, just like that.”
  ▪ Immediate with variation (word): “English (.) the English language is fun to learn.”
  ▪ Immediate with variation (phrase): “It’s just like this, just exactly like that.”
- Immediate with paraphrase (word): “My teacher (.English professor
was kind.”
- Immediate with paraphrase (phrase): “So I learned English in school.
I went to school and I studied British English.”
- Non-immediate (word): “My teacher is very (.yeah, I don’t know (.very
strict.”
- Non-immediate (phrase): “My teacher is very funny (.yeah, she
always makes me laugh (.very funny.”
- Non-immediate with variation (word): same idea as above, only
intervening word(s) between the repeated parts
- Non-immediate with variation (phrase)
- Non-immediate with paraphrase (word)
- Non-immediate with paraphrase (phrase)

- Parallelism – similar to repetition, except that the structure is similar, not the
actual words; can coincide with lists (see below) but not necessarily
  o “First we gonna do reading. Then the teacher gonna ask us questions.
   Then we gonna do conversation.”

- Lists – lists of 2+ people, nouns, verbs, adjectives, etc., often in a parallel
  structure (but not always)
  o “I study grammar writing the pronunciation, yeah.” (list of 3)

- Conjunctive adverbials – the “glue” that holds the speech together and helps the
  listener understand how and when things happened
  o too, also, now, at that time, already, not yet, usually, still, then, in
    addition, besides that
  o joining phrases (not clauses): and, and then, or
    o “At that time um when I was in college, I studied in Canada too
       with my friend and sister.”

- Relative clause – introduced by who, that, which

- Embedded clause – often introduced by that, but sometimes doesn’t have it
  o “I think [that] my teacher is very nice.”

- Reported speech
  o Self: quotes self as saying something
  o Other: quotes someone else as saying something

- Quotative like – used to introduce reported speech
  o “She was like, ‘That’s not right.’ ”
• *like* – the use of *like* any time when it is NOT a quotative *like* (see above) or a comparison *like* (i.e., English is like [similar to] Dutch)
  - “It is *like* so hard. English is *like* so hard.”
  - “I learned English for *like* six years in school.”

• Comparison words
  - Used to compare two things
  - *Like, as, similar, better, worse, more, than*
  - “I think British English is *more* polite than American English.”

• Double topic – subject is stated twice
  - “*My sister she* learned English in Korea.”

• Topicalization – topic (object) is placed in subject position
  - “*English* we learned.”

• Anaphoric phrases – point to something already said
  - Don’t need to code every anaphoric reference to *that*, just the ones that occur in lexical phrases such as those below:
  - *stuff like that, things like that, that’s why, as I said, something like that*

• Seeking clarification – can occur in various ways when the participant doesn’t understand what I said (*I’m sorry?*, *What was that?*, *Please say that again.*)

• Laughter – any time the participant laughs (this can sometimes be less obvious if the notes read, “R laughs, P joins in”)

• Indonesian word/phrase
  - With translation: “*Kemarin – that’s ‘yesterday’ – I talked on the phone.*”
  - Without translation: “*Saya belajar Bahasa Inggris.*”

• Direct address to R: could be a question (*what do you think?*), comprehension check (*does that make sense?*), use of my name (*Becca/Rebecca*), or use of *you* (*you’ll see it if you go to Indonesia*)

• Summary:
  - Connective: *so, but*
    - “*I like English, so.*”
  - Phrase: *or something, that’s it*
    - “*(Story about English.) That’s it.*”
  - Clarification: usually of something referred to before but maybe not directly
    - “*In Indonesian we don’t have grammar. Yesterday, today, tomorrow, it’s all the same. That was the hardest thing about English (. . .) the grammar.*”
Marked verbal/syntactic features

- Questions: participant asks a question in the middle of his/her turn
  - “It’s uh, how do you say it? A continuing class, continuing education class.”
- Perfectives: past or present perfective
  - “When I go to college I have already studied English for 5 years.”
- Progressives: participant uses past or present progressive
  - “When I was going to school, I learn English.”
- Negative definition: participant defines something by saying what it is not
  - “My class was not so much about grammar. More like conversation.”
APPENDIX I

DETAILED LIST OF LINGUISTIC DEVICES
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LINGUISTIC DEVICE</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coordinating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comparative (but)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>additive (and then)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>additive (and)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>additive (or)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>additive (and also)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>addictive (so)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>additive (so then)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subordinating</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consequential (because)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consequential (so)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>temporal (when)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conditional/irrealis (if)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conditional (even though)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>temporal (after)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>temporal (until)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consequential (since)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>temporal (once)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>temporal (before)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conditional (but if)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conditional (even if)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consequential (but since)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consequential (if because)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contrastive (instead of)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>locative (where)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>temporal (if)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINGUISTIC DEVICE</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subordinating (cont.)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>temporal (since)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>temporal (so before)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at beg. of main clause</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>so</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and then</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>but</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>so therefore</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse markers</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comment phrases</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you know</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yeah</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>okay</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(that’s) right</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mhmm</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>well</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I mean</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uh huh</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>huh</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>so yeah</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oh yeah</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interjections</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oh</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>see?</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>great question</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ooh</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINGUISTIC DEVICE</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interjections (cont.)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oh no</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wow</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oh man</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oh my</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oh my goodness</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oh my gosh</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oh yeah</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ugh</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uh oh</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>response tokens</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yeah</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>right</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>okay</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yep</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agreement markers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with what R says</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yeah</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>right</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seeking agreement from R</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>right</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>turn-enders</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>so</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>though</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINGUISTIC DEVICE</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetition</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>immediate</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>word</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phrase</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phrase w/ variation</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>word w/ variation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phrase w/ paraphrase</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>word w/ paraphrase</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-immediate</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>word</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phrase</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phrase w/ variation</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phrase w/ paraphrase</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>word w/ paraphrase</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>word w/ variation</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>repetition of R’s words</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>immediate</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>word</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phrase</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phrase with variation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-immediate</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phrase</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>word</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parallelism</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverbials</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sometime(s)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>too</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINGUISTIC DEVICE</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverbials (cont.)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>now</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>still</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(al)ready</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(at) first</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>then</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>also</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>but</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in that time</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and then</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>until</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at the time</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beside(s) (that)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>because of</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>usually</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as well</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for example</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for instance</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>last time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>right away</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>right now</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yet</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>after</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>again</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and also</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not only</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>often (times)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that time</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>today</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINGUISTIC DEVICE</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverbials (cont.)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at that time</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at the same time</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>before</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>but also</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>daily</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>except</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not yet</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>only</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a lot</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ago</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all of a sudden</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anything else</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>back then</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beyond that</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eventually</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>however</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in addition to that</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in those days</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>next time</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>next to</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>next week</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>once in a while</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outside of</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prior to that</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rather than that</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>so far</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ultimately</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINGUISTIC DEVICE</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embedded clauses</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensifiers</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emphasis</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>always</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>really</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>so</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>especially (special)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>much</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>even</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) lot/ lots</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>never</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>big</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at all</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>just</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pretty</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quite</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>super</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>too</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>totally</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all the time</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perfectly</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>real</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>small</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>well</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINGUISTIC DEVICE</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like (non-comparison)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other like (sometimes ambiguous function)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quotative like</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“such as” like</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>approximation like</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laughter</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>direct address</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you got it</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>believe it or not</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seeks clarification</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stance</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>168</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actually</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of course</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it’s fun</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it’s good/that was good</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it’s funny</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t think</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I remember</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I didn’t know/I don’t know</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at least</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>basically</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>definitely</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>according to</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bad</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINGUISTIC DEVICE</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stance (cont.)</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td><strong>168</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hopefully/I hope</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’m not sure</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it’s/that’s easy</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>normally</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>believe it or not</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>certainly</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exciting</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for sure</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>generally</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hate</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I love it</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I noticed</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I say</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’m glad</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’m very fortunate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it’s beneficial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’ve seen</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that’s correct</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that’s true</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>totally</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we know</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comparison</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>41</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
<td><strong>166</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>different</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>than</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINGUISTIC DEVICE</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison (cont.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>better</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>easier</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>compared to/with</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>best</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hardest</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>biggest</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rather than</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>compare X with</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deeper</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>harder</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>similar</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>like comparisons</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>like</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>just like</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not like</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more like</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>looks like (that)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>same like</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maybe</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kind of/kind of</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kind of like</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not really</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>probably</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t know</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LINGUISTIC DEVICE</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| "let's put it/let me see/let's see/let me think/let me try"
  only | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1 | 4 | 1 | -- | -- | -- | 7 |
<p>| about | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 6 |
| just | 1 | 1 | 1 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 4 |
| just only | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 3 |
| around | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1 |
| guess | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1 |
| at least | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 3 |
| hardly | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1 |
| I'm not sure | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1 |
| not to mention | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1 |
| in a way | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1 |
| it depends | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1 |
| tended to | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1 |
| though | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1 |
| well | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1 |
| Marked verbal features | 6 | 10 | 6 | 7 | 10 | 39 | 20 | 3 | 18 | 19 | 147 |
| progressives | 5 | 8 | 4 | 7 | 34 | 18 | 18 | 3 | 18 | 19 | 120 |
| what's that | 1 | -- | 1 | 1 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 4 |
| how to say | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 4 |
| do-support | -- | -- | 2 | 1 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 4 |
| Quantifiers | 6 | 9 | 8 | 9 | 25 | 39 | 13 | 5 | 14 | 14 | 141 |
| first | 2 | 1 | -- | 3 | 1 | 9 | 1 | -- | -- | 4 | 18 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LINGUISTIC DEVICE</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quantifiers (cont.)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>every</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) lot of</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>most</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>little bit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>any</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>some</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>many</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>almost</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>little</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>part (of)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whole</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>another</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one of</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a bit</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>both</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cash</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>few</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kind of</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>much</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>second</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all kind of</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>majority</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>only</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>several</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>third</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the rest of</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINGUISTIC DEVICE</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaphoric phrases</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>like that</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that’s it/that’s all</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sth like that</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that’s why</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>like this</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or something</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>things like that</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as/like I said/say (before)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(that) kind of thing</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>again</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>so that’s what we- (as an ending)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stuff like that</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that’s like what we talk about</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that’s what I say</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reported speech</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lists</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>just = ??</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“only”</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hedge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intensifier</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lists</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>list of 2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>list of 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>list of 4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>list of 6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINGUISTIC DEVICE</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>double topics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>topicalization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative definitions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian words</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian word (no transl.)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian word (transl.)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian phrase (no transl.)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian phrase (transl.)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative clauses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNER

(1) D: Identity (language learner, we)
65   R:  mhm (.) so when did you first start learning English
66   D:  (. ) we Indonesian (. ) uh Indonesian people (. ) um (. ) we  
67       start learning English if you: (. ) are (. ) <uh (. ) in>  
68       >primary school< (. ) I say I guess (. ) uh (. ) in the  
69       grades seven (. ) start grade seven=seven eight nine  
70   R:  >ten eleven twelve< (. ) then you start learning English  
71   D:  so we s:=- we learn English at schoo:l (. ) um (. ) once a  
72       week (. ) but it’s >very basic< (. ) >but it’s the whole  
73       year like six years< {makes smoothing gesture with  
74       hand})
75   R:  okay (. ) right (. ) um so it’s a required class then?  
76   D:  ye::s ((nods))
77   R:  so all Indonesians learn English?
78   D:  ye::s ((nods))

(2) E: Identity (language learner, we)
33   R:  so I was wondering um (. ) what- do you remember what  
34       grade it was when you first started learning English?  
35   (1.5)
36   E:  um
37   (1.5)
38   grade one
39   R:  okay
40   E:  little bit ((nods))
41   R:  okay
42   (1.5)
43   and: (. ) how many years did you study English then  
44   E:  (. ) we always (. ) had seco- (. ) English as a second  
45       language but very little ((smiles))
46   R:  okay
47   E:  actually very little ((shakes head ‘no’)) we didn- we  
48       didn’t speak English hardly (. ) but you know you just  
49       (. ) kind of read and understand ((makes hand gestures))

(3) A: Identity (language learner, we)
46   R:  (. ) <no:w> when did you start learning <English>  
47   (1.0)
48   A:  [wo::w:
49   R:  (.h) do you remember?
50   A:  { (laughs) }
51   R:  {(joins in laughing)}
52   A:  <actually:> we start learning English um::  
53   (2.5)
54   you know(.) English is not part of the courses  
55   (1.0)
56   during uh:: in the elementary schoo:l or junior hi:gh  
57   (.h) until probably late high school
58   R:  o:kay
A: and then:
(2.0)
and then: >it’s kinda like< uh (. ) extra
classes outside of school (. h) like (. ) like when you
uh:: (. ) uh: when you enroll (. ) to ASU or to uh other
colleges in: the States (. ) they require you to have uh
some kind of test like TOEFL test=
R: =right=
A: =have you heard of that?=  
R: =yes I have=
A: =and they: (. ) they wanna know if we are uh (. )
proficient enough (. ) in English (. ) so: (. h) I’m
taking uh that classes outside of school and then: my
teacher was uh: British actually=
R: =wow=
A: =one of them are British and the other one uh (. ) you
know American
R: mhm okay (. ) so those teachers helped prepare you for
the TOEFL test (. ) then [through those extra classes
the TOEFL test =]
yes TOEFL test=
R: =okay=
A: =TOEFL te:st SAT test yes [(laughs)]
R: now did you: take any other English classes
specifically in the English language after college or
once you graduated were you ((briefly laughs)) done
with studying English (. h) formally
A: mmmm in the (. ) in (. ) like (. ) in MCC when the first
time I: arrive there (. ) because I’m a international
student [(.)
R: [mhm=
A: they require me to: take the English for a <Second>
Language courses
R: okay
A: (1.0)
so um: (. ) uh: what- what does it call? (. ) English 101
and English 102 [(.)
R: =okay=
A: =that’s the courses [(.)
R: =mhm=
A: =but they have a:: special: uh like
(1.0)
like uh:: English >101< only for the English speaking
people already (. ) and then I’m the one that has to
take like (. ) English 101 for: (. ) English as a Second
Language
R: okay (. h) [I think it
A: [I don’t know if it make sense=
R: =is it 107 and 108? are those the numbers? I think I’ve
(. ) heard of those classes [before
A: [oh:
R: yeah yeah it could- yeah I think it ca:llled uh (. ) 107
108 (. ) I think I remember that too
A: =mhm=
R: =so that was kind of- that was the version of 101 for (. ) international students then
A: (. ) right=
R: =okay=
A: =you got it
R: okay
((both laugh))
((lines omitted))
R: now um I was wondering about (. ) in your English
classes what types of activities you did in (. ) your
English classes (.h) whether it was <more grammar>
based or <conversation> based or (. ) kind of a mixture
of the two >if you can remember some of the things that
you did< (. ) the structure of the class
A: (1.0)
mmm actually we learned uh: (. ) Fri:days (. ) I remember
uh: (. ) my uh (. ) American teacher (. ) brought a- a
game Bunko [boƞko]=
R: =oh=
A: =you know a game Bunko like you shake all the dies and
then you have to names all the-
(1.0)
the words that you catch by your eye (. ) and write it
down
R: oh (. ) I haven’t played that before but it sounds fun
((both laugh))
A: yea:h and then it- it was like uh: you know (. ) we kind
of have to: (. ) catch English words and- and then we
have to uh (. ) confirm it we uh: (. ) we: look it up in
the dictionary if it’s actually a word or not (. ) in
English ((laughs)) and then uh: : (. ) I: I remember
<Scrabble> in English class because my uh English
teacher uh brought- brought that up to us (.h) and then
other than that we: just uh: make a conversations like
kind of like uh: (. ) uh: (. ) role playing (. ) in
English (. ) we just like a conversa- we- we practicing
uh: to converse
R: alright (. ) so it was more um: practice speaking than
just doing all the grammar and (. um translation and
different things like that (. ) is that right?=
A: =uh that’s for the activity yeah
R: okay
A: but for the: uh (. ) grammar tenses like because (. )
ultimately we have to (. ) learn how to uh (. ) you know
we have to: pass the test of course the TOEFL test
((h)
R: [right=
A: =so we learn about that too but more like we: uh you
know (. ) like a class setting you have to read (.h) you
have to uh
(1.0)
uh fill in the bla:nk you have multiple choice:s you
know you just have to uh
A: (1.0) uh: you know you- you take that kind of like a sample test and then you discuss it (.0) why you choose it (.0) and then you compare with other (.0) student it’s kinda like that

R: okay

A: more likely like the pretest

R: mhm (.0) it sounds like it was a really fun class ((laughs)) and that [you

A: [what?

R: it sounds like it was a fun class (.0) and

A: [yeah it is fun (.0) yeah like um:

(1.0)

the- the teacher is very easy-going and then you know (.h) uh we have a fieldtrip too and then we cannot even speak (.0) a word in Indonesian (.h) uh: if we do: (.0)

we have to buy everybody’s lunches [(.) kind of thing

R: [oh no

A: kind of funny ((laughs))

R: that would be really [hard

A: [only one word in Indonesian and

now you just- yeah that’s the punishment (.0) so it’s fun it was a lot of fun

R: uh huh ((laughs)) it sounds like it=

A: =((laughs))

(4) O: Identity (language learner, we)

R: okay (.0) and when did you start learning English, O?

O: (1.0)

well (.0) we learn English in <middle school> [(.)

R: [okay=

O: =but we don’t (.0) we don’t <speak English> so I start speaking English (3.0)

since I (x) 1998 when the first time I (.0) arrive in (.0) Los Angeles ((laughs)) but I never speak English (.0) >I mean< (.0) >you know<

(1.5)

we (.0) we try to uh: (.0) send le:tters in English sometimes to my aunt (.0)=

R: =okay=

O: = because I live with my aunt for:

(1.0)

em six years

R: okay

O: (.0) six years (.h) but (.0) it’s very limited (.0) you know just saying ‘hi’ ‘hello’ ‘how are you’=

R: =right=

O: =‘I’m sorry’ (.0) that’s all

R: okay

O: ((laughs)) so 1998 I start (.0) <spea(.)king> >in English< like daily ((laughs))=
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R: =Alright=
O: =Because I have to (. ) no other choice
R: ((laughs))
((lines omitted))
R: >Do you remember< what kinds of activities <you did> or (. ) um: (. ) like was it more conversation-based was it (. ) more <grammar> (. ) based >was kind of a mixture of the two (. ) because I know <there are different <methods of teaching English> so I was wondering kind of what methods they used in your class
O: (1.5)
Okay: it was (. ) fourteen years ago let me try to remember
R: ((laughs))
O: ((joins in laughing))
O: Okay first in the morning (. ) <the teacher’s> gonna start with uh (. ) book [buk] we gonna start reading
(1.0)
R: =mhm=
O: =So each person they gonna read like (. ) one paragraph each person and then (. ) she will (. ) correcting us if (. ) if she (. ) if we (. ) read it wrong: (. ) like the way we pronounce it wrong (. ) and she will tell us (. ) okay and then after that cause I only spent three hours there [(.] [okay=]
R: =Okay=
O: =Three times a week not every day
R: Okay
O: (. ) okay after that then we gonna start um:
(1.5)
uh conversation
R: mhm
O: (1.0)
we gonna a:- (. ) we gonna (. ) start talking about uh:
(1.0)
what we have during the weekend
(1.0)
and then uh if somebody doesn’t wanna do uh (. ) conversation they can (. ) write it down (. ) like make a short story
(1.0)
and then we have uh: (. ) another thing is what did we do again
(3.0)
uh:: I think most of it is something like that
R: Okay
O: Yeah (. ) but there’s a teacher though
R: Right
O: So
((both laugh))
(1.5)
O: So it’s the- the fun part
R: Mhm
O: Let me see let me think (. ) what else did we do?
O: (1.5)
243 uh::
244 (3.0)
245 oh we learn about uh:
246 (2.5)
247 the firefighter
248 R: mhm
249 O: "you know" it’s- it’s different in Indonesia and in
250 here=
251 R: =oh okay=
252 O: =if it’s (. ) if things happe::n uh:: (. ) what- what-
253 what we need to do: (. ) why: (. ) we have to call nine
254 <one o:ne:> they teach us that too (. ) in- in that
255 school (. ) <a:nd uh:>
256 (1.0)
257 what else? like uh:: (. ) the presidential too: like the
258 fla:g American fla:g (. ) and the:n uh American
259 <ho:li:da:y> why there’s (. ) why is it (. ) uh: why- (. )
260 why we have Thanksgiving
261 (1.0)
262 what is it (. ) yeah things like that
263 R: okay
264 O: (xxx)
265 ((both laugh))
266 R: so like American culture things
267 O: yeah (. ) yeah
268 R: okay (. ) to help out people who just came to the States
269 and (. ) to help them fit into the culture better
270 O: (. ) ye:s [(. ) that’s correct
271 R: [yeah
272 that would [be helpful
273 O: [yeah

(5) H: Identity (language learner, we)

69 R: did you take English classes in school
70 H: (.h) uh:
71 (1.5)
72 yeah >in the middle school we start< uh take English
73 classes (. ) until high school
74 R: "mhm" did you take English classes in college too
75 H: >uh no< (. ) >no yeah< ((shakes head ‘no’))

(6) P: Identity (language learner, we)

48 R: I was wondering when you first started learning English
49 P: ((looks up, raises eyebrows)) wo:w (. ) the first time
50 (h) uh learning English when we were in the school (.h)
51 which is in um:
52 (1.0)
53 hmm
54 (1.0)
55 I think junior (.h) yeah we have been taught English in
56 there
(7) M: Identity (language learner, we)
19   R:  and when did you first start learning English
20   M:  (.h) u::m in the middle school (.h) when I was like
21     <thirteen> years old in the school (.h) yeah ((nods)
22     (.h) but (.h) not active because we just learn: um:
23     whatever the teacher (.h) teach us ((nods))
     (lines omitted))
83   R:  do you remember what types of projects and activities
84   M:  you did in your English classes (.h) were they more (.h)
85     conversation-based more writing-based more grammar?
86   M:  (.h) when in the high sch->not high school in the
87     middle school< (.h) the uh: (.h) the >teacher always
88     teach us about the grammar okay< just like <subject>
89     and then verb (.h) and then something like that=
90   R:  =mhm=
91   M:  =and then (.h) whe::n the college (.h) more <listening>
92     (.h) we- we go to the lab (.h) and then (.h) listen the
93     story and then the teacher (.h) ask (.h) ask like what
94   M:  (.h) about the story about something like that

(8) N: Identity (language learner, I)
34   R:  so when you first- so when did you first start learning
35   N:  English, N?
36   N:  (2.0)
37     when I’m in uh junior high school
38   R:  in junior high school (.h) and then did you learn it in
39     high school too
40   N:  (2.5)
41     yeah junior high school until- until I- I graduated
42     from university
43   R:  <okay> alright (.h) so you <learned> it for (.h) a number
44     of years then
45   N:  yes

LANGUAGE LEARNER EXPERIENCING DIFFICULTIES

(9) P: Difficulties (self)
95   R:  do you think English is a hard language to learn
96   P:  uh the beginning of course it is hard (.h) yeah
97     especially when you’re talking about writing
98     (1.0)
99     I’m having difficulties (.h) but I like (.h)
100   P:  conversation (.h) I like (.h) you know talking “I just”
101     (.h) but (.h) to place in the word like in writing (.h)
102     that is (.h) especially because I don’t have any (.h) uh
103     other (.h) class outside of the school except just only
104     what we have in the school
105   R:  so (.h) writing in English was (.h) probably the hardest
106     thing for you?
107   P:  yeah for me of course at the time ((clears throat))
108     yeah (.h) it’s hard (.h) until now (.h) when you ask me to
P: write or essay in English (.) yeah I’m not really ((shakes head ‘no’))
110  (1.0)
111  yeah
112  ((both laugh))
113  P: (.) but I just speak and then hear (.) translate ((both laugh))
114  P: *yeah*

(10) E: Difficulties (Indonesians, but not self)
62  R: so I was wondering how similar um (.) you think
63  Indonesian and Dutch are and I know there are quite a
64  few differences I would imagine
65  E: I think it’s quite (.) different
66  (1.0)
67  quite different
68  R: mhm (.) but Dutch and English are more similar?
69  E: right ((nods and smiles))
70  R: right okay
71  E: right (.h)
72  (1.5)
73  I think what I’ve noticed that people that speak Dutch
74  (.h) it’s easier for them (.) to pick up English
75  ((makes upward hand gesture))
76  R: right (.) do you think that English is a hard language
77  to learn?
78  E: (.) not for me but I think for (.) a lot of people (.)
79  like- like I said if you didn’t have a transition of
80  another (.) uh Western (.) or whatever you
81  want to call it Western or- (.) or Romantic language
82  ((smiles)) it’s- I think it’s- it’s (.) probably hard

(11) N: Difficulties (self and Indonesians)
147  N: uh:: (.) I think
148  (1.0)
149  the most difficult was like uh
150  (2.0)
151  yeah because I learn English since I was uh junior high
152  school (.h) mmm (.h) it depends when I’m in- when I was
153  in high school (.h) I <think> uh:: (.) the most
154  difficult is make comparatives sometimes I don’t know
155  how to make something like in the past (.) but uh
156  still running until now: and I have to make sure (.h)
157  if it already do::ne (.) or not ye:t so (.h) so I think
158  that’s the thing that uh (.) is the most problem for
159  common including me (.h) until I <know> here um:: (.h)
160  if I know like uh >it already done< so I have to use
161  like ‘have’ ‘has’ and then past participle and then (.)
162  that’s it ((coughs)) but sometimes I have to use like
163  past tense because it’s already past and never (.h)
164  never: uh: (.) occur again (.) so um you know (.) you
165  have to understand
166  R: mhm
N: uh: I think the tenses is the most difficult and then
the grammar as well and also the vocabulary because
sometimes the vocabulary is (xxxx) (.h) uh:: sometimes
I’m not sure what the vocabulary because uncommon
especially like (.h) if we um:: have uh like something
health (.h) for your body:: and then: uh you have to um:
talk to your (.h) doctor:: about your sickne::ss (.h) and
sometime you don’t know how to (.h) how to speak like
rh:: intestine (.h) not (.h) not everybody know that
((laughs))

R: right ((laughs))

N: uh (.hh) yeah I mean uh: (.h) maybe if you: if you speak
English every day and you always use it (.h) uh the
vocabulary the vocabulary the uh common one (.h) it
fine but if it’s uncommon I don’t think even uh: people
understand what there

R: mhm

(12) A: Difficulties (self and Indonesians)

R: so A, I was wondering what (.h) attitu:des or (.h)
thoughts you had about learning English (.h) were
you excited about it did you- was it just a
required class (.h) um (.h) or did you have other
(.) feelings about it

A: (1.0)

R: uh for learning English?=

A: mhm

R: =mhm

A: (.h) mmm (.h) I only know that I have to- I have to
know (.h) >you know how to speak English< (.h)
because English is uh spoken by (.h) the majority of
(.) >you know< (.h) the world=

R: =right=

A: =so I need to learn that ((laughs))

R: = (briefly joins in laughing))

A: so:: (.h) by knowing: uh: that I have to: (.h) you
know I have to: I have to know about it (.h) so just
going by it (.h) kinda like that

R: mhm

A: (.h) yeah (.h) but the: (.h) the first uh few months (.h)
like uh: in college I know that I had uh >kind of like
difficulty< [(.)

R: [right=

A: =>you know like the challenges [(.)

R: [mhm=

A: =speaking English because you don’t know how to
express< (.h) >you know what you <think> you wanna say
(.) but you don’t know how to express it<

R: =right

A: (.h) you know it’s kinda like you’re thinking <first>
in Indonesian< and then translate it in English [(.)

R: [right

A: and then you have to uh say it like you’re thinking
like three times basically (.h) before you say something
((laughs))

R: ((joins in laughing)) right
A: I don’t know if- if that make sense but just like <y- yeah> what I want to say and then (. ) you know ((laughs))
R: right=
A: =you have to translate it first to like in Indonesian it is like this but in English (. ) like- like that
R: right=
A: =yeah=
R: =yeah it’s hard when languages are a little bit different (. ) I’ve experienced that with Spanish >and with Indonesian too< (. ) learning both those languages and (. ) I tend to like to translate things literally from English into >you know< Spanish for example and it doesn’t [always work that way ((laughs))
A: [yeah
R: because they’re different languages ((laughs))
A: I know (. ) I know (. ) and then (. h) uh: (. ) bless my- my friend’s heart like (. ) waiting from (. ) for my responses and then ‘are you there?’ you know ‘it’s okay you know can say it you know whatever’ like (. ) like that
R: ((laughs))
A: friends waiting uh: (. ) normally my response like until I get it (. ) ‘okay what I meant to say is this’ ((both laugh))
A: yeah
R: did you think English was <hard> to learn (. h) or >[did you think it was fairly easy?<
A: [umm for (1.0) for <Indonesian> let me see uh:: (3.0) I think (. ) compared to the (. ) my- my native language Indonesian we only have like past and present
R: [(1.0) mhm
A: you know very simple (. ) very simple language (. ) according: well (. ) >according to me< ((both laugh))
A: um (. ) but English have like uh: (. ) tenses (. ) tenses like (. ) past tense (. ) past present tense something like that >it is like< a lot of uh: (1.0) you know (. ) different timing and different uh way to say it
R: right=
A: =according to uh: (.h) I don’t know h- (. ) uh- (. ) did you follow what I’m trying to say though
R: right I understand what you’re saying about how English has verb tense and Indonesian really doesn’t (. ) right (. ) right (. ) so sometimes we just put it like uh (. ) as simple as like present and (. ) past tense and that’s it
(13) O: Difficulties (self and Indonesians)

128 R: so (. ) what do you think are some of the biggest
129 differences between <Indonesian> and (. ) English
130 O: (. ) the grammar totally
131 R: mhm
132 O: (1.5)
133 that’s just the biggest one
134 (1.0)
135 you know in Indonesia when you say (. ) uh: lihat [to
136 see]
137 (1.0)
138 i- it’s lihat but in English you can see saw seen=
139 R: =mhm
140 O: (. ) you know
141 (1.0)
142 that’s the hardest part=
143 R: =right
144 O: (((laughs)))
145 R: (((joins in laughing)))
146 O: yeah (. ) yea::h (. ) that- that’s the biggest problem
147 for me I think (. ) and most Indonesian I believe=
148 R: =mhm

(14) M: Difficulties (none)

77 R: do you think um: English is a hard language to learn?
78 M: (. ) uh::: (. ) not really but (. ) we just (. ) need uh:
79 (. ) the vocabulary (. )=
80 R: =mhm=
81 M: =you know yeah ((nods))
82 (1.5)
83 that’s it