Indonesian L2 Speakers of English Talking about their ESL Experiences:

An Overview

by

Rebecca C. Tappendorf

A Thesis Presented in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

Approved July 2015 by the
Graduate Supervisory Committee:

Claire Renaud, Chair
Matthew Prior
Elly van Gelderen

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

August 2015

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.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPENDIX

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

BI	Bahasa Indonesia
DA	Discourse analysis
EFL	English as a foreign language
ELL	English language learner
ESL	English as a second language
IRB	Institutional Review Board
L1	First language
L2	Second language
L3	Third language
L4	Fourth language
MCA	Membership categorization analysis
SLA	Second language acquisition
TESOL	Teaching English to speakers of other languages
U.S.	United States

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.

3

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

7

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 subtlely 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

9

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 subtlely 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

10

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,

2001). 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.

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.). The

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

23

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 ethnical

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

26

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
02       were (.) did you mean in junior high school like
03       before high school (.) um or did you mean when you
04       were in high school and it was your third year of
05       high school
06  N:   (1.0)
07       oh junior high school is abou:t uh: (.h) twelve
08       years old
09  R:   oh >twelve years old okay< alright=
10  N:   =yeah and I- I never learn about English <at all>
11       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

29

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

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 "fin[d] 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

31

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.

RESEARCH QUESTION 1: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

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

LINGUISTIC DEVICE	DEFINITION	TOTAL
Connectives	Coordinating conjunctions (e.g., *and*), subordinating conjunctions (e.g., *since*), and conjunctions at the beginning of the main clause (*And then I told my teacher…*)	796
Discourse markers	Comment phrases, interjections, response tokens, agreement markers, turn-enders	599
Repetition	Immediate/non-immediate, word/phrase, exact or with variation/paraphrase; also parallelism	584
Adverbials	Words or phrases that provide structural and/or temporal cohesion, such as *at that time, now, too, often, besides that, again*	334
Embedded clauses	Embedded clauses with a verb that is not part of a coordinated or subordinated clause	327
Intensifiers	Words that intensify a verb, adverb, or adjective, such as *very, always, never*	230

LINGUISTIC DEVICE	DEFINITION	TOTAL
Like (non-comparison)	Any use of *like* that does not involve comparison, including but not limited to holding the floor, indicating "approximately" or "such as," or introducing reported speech	217
Interaction	Clarification requests, direct addresses to the researcher, laughter	175
Stance	Words/phrases that express the speaker's attitudes, opinions, or feelings, including *I think, I believe, it was fun, I like it, actually, of course*	168
Comparison	Words expressing comparison, such as *like, more, easier, as*	166
Hedges	Words expressing uncertainty or approximation	159
Marked verbal features	Progressives, questions, unnecessary *do*-support	147
Quantifiers	Words that express the quantity of the noun, including *every, some, all, a little, many*	141
Anaphoric phrases	Phrases referring back to something previously said, such as *something like that* or *that's why*	98
Reported speech	Reported speech of self or others, sometimes introduced with quotative *like*	82
Just	Used as a hedge or intensifier, to mean "only," or any other usage	66
Lists	Lists of 2, 3, 4, or 6 items (no 5-item lists occurred)	50
Topics	Topicalization, double topics	39
Negative definitions	Defining something by what it *is not*, rather than by what it *is* (*English is not hard for me to learn*)	38
Indonesian words	Words or phrases spoken in BI, with or without translation by the speaker	30
Relative clauses	Introduced by *who, that, which*	27

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 differen:t 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))
```

```
01  A:  it's all about the day living by the day (.) living
02      today to the fullest today
03      (.)
04  R:  okay [(.) alright
05  A:       [and that's why um: (.) uh: (.) the- the
06      language I think is revolve around (.) that because
07      the culture is uh: (.) it's (.) uh it dic- (.) the
08      language is d- d- dictates by the- (.) the culture
```

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?
02  M:  (.) uh::: (.) not really but (.) we just (.) need
03      uh: (.) the vocabulary (.)=
04  R:  =mhm=
05  M:  =you know (.) yeah ((nods))
06      (1.5)
07      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

37

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
02      elementary language (.h) eh from elementary school I
03      get English (.) uh: (.) but extra- (.) extra::
04      (1.0)
05      extra hours (.h) after: after (.) after I (.)  af-
06      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) Adverbials 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
05      course (.) uh (.) beyond that (.) you know I had
06      conversational English with usually (.h) you know
07      family and friends and- (.) and my aunt
```

39

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
02      immersed myself directly in school
```

(11) Infinitive complement

```
01  H:  I am super excited (.h) >I am super excited I love
02      (.) I love uh: (.) 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

40

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
05      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 hu:sband (.) >always
09      say< 'it's so hard (.) it's so hard' °something like
10      that°
```

41

(15) Approximation *like*

```
01  R:   and when did you first start learning English
02  M:   (.h) u::m in the: middle school (.) when I was like
03       <thi:rteen> years old in the school (.) yeah ((nods)
```

(16) Quotative *like*

```
01  M:   ((laughs)) WHEN I WAS IN (.) SCHOOL I HATE ENGLISH
02  R:   ((laughs))
03  M:   ((joins in laughing))
04       I hate English (.h) >I'm like< 'ugghh (.) <Engli:sh>
05       cla::ss >okay<' (.h) because (.) maybe- maybe
06       because of the teacher you know (.) 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,

42

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

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

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 <fu:nny> 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:  =ri:ght=
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 just said that "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 differen:t 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.

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

```
108   R:   and what were your attitudes or thoughts about
109        learning English? were you excited about it (.) were
110        you- did you feel like you were being forced to
111        [learn it
112   D:   [no I like English (.) I <always> like English (.) I
113        just like to s- >you know< be able to speak English
114        (1.0)
115        so I- I learn by myself as well at home (.) um and
116        also I like to see you know people who speaks
117        English you know I like to approach them and- (.h)
118        and um (.) you know just like you ((motions toward
119        R)) you know now you're learning Indonesian and you
120        just like to be with >Indonesian people< and
121        practice your language [learning] right
122   R:   right
123   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)

```
81   A:   and then I'm still- I'm still learning until today
82        believe it or not Becca
83   R:   okay ((laughs)) are you still [taking English
84   A:                                 [yeah=
85   R:   =are you still [taking English classes
86   A:                  [like uh I'm working here uh with uh:
87        uh college students and >then they use< like all
88        kind a English <slang>  >that I have no idea what
89        was that<
90   R:   right
91   A:   ((laughs))
92   R:   ((joins in laughing))
93        that's [true
94   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

53

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 no:w I'm he:re 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        start in LA fo:r twelve years
305   R:   oh (.) >okay<
306   O:   <twe:lve years> so I speak English (.) not as much as
307        now
308   R:   (.) right
309   O:   (xx)
310   R:   well I can tell that you're really- that you're eager
311        to learn and you really want to (.) um speak English
312        you know and (.) I can tell that. (.) that's really
313        exciting ((laughs))
314   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
27        learning English<
28   H:  (.) (.h) o::h [u::] (.h) great question! ((smiles))
29        (.h) sss- uh saya suka menyanyi I love to sing (.h)
30        so
31        (1.0)
32        uh (.) and my dad is a singer too (.h) so: (.) he
33        ha:s uh (.) he has different kind of (.) uh:: (.)
34        at the time is cassette (.) s- we don't have CD yet
35        back then (.h) uh but from (.) from uh (.) from
36        America and a singer like (.h) ABBA (.) (xx) (.)
37        Pussycat so (.) a:nd (.) >karena saya suka nyanyi<
38        (.) saya juga suka nyanyi >lagu barat< [because I
39        like to sing, I also like to sing Western songs]
40        (.) (.h) uh like ABBA is my favorite even though at
41        the time I'm still little ((makes hand motion))
42        (.h) like elementary >no no< (.) yeah I think (.)
43        oh I- I go to the (.) middle school (.h) but (.h)
44        saya >beli beli< kalau saya ada (.) uang (.h) saya
45        beli uh (.h) uh lagu-lagu barat [I buy, buy if I
46        have money, I buy uh Western songs] like >ABBA< and
47        karena saya suka nyanyi [because I like to sing]
48        ((makes hand motion)) is understood >kalau Bahasa
49        Inggris< [if English]
50        ((something else spoken quickly in Indonesian))
51   R:  you like to sing=
52   H:  =[because I (xxx)
53   R:   [I'm not understanding everything I'm sorry (.)
54        ((both laugh))
55   H:  because I- I love to sing so (.h) uh (.) and then I
56        loves I love to learn (.) English (.) so then >in
57        the middle school< that's the first time I learn
58        English (.) through the (.) through the cover: >of
59        the song< (.h) so I sing and I read the s- (.) I
60        read the- the English (.) lyric (.h) but because
61        >I'm not really fluently yet at the time< so I (.h)
62        uh >most of the time< (.h) I left <behi:nd> >from
63        the melody because like because it< the way English
64        (.) to read is very different (.) with Latín right
65        (.) so
66        (1.0)
67        yeah ((makes hand gestures throughout, illustrating
68        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)
```

```
70  P:  what we (.) what we get from school
71  R:  (.h) oh okay [in school though you studied it=
72  P:               [yeah
73      =in school they teaching it (x) yeah ((nods)) (.) of
74      course I added on like um (.) from outsi:de by: (.)
75      so:ng: (.) you know English songs (.) and like a
76      Bible I like to: (.) see the
77      [(1.0)
78  R:  [right
79  P:  yeah
80      (1.0)
81      yeah
```

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

```
64  M:  =and then I start <learning> and learning more you
65      know (.h) and <the::n> (.) um:
66      (1.0)
67      but that's it (.) not- not really talk (.) so much
68      but (.) I can ty:pe more (.) okay (.) because (.) I
69      always see the dictionary ((smiles))
70      ((laughs))
71      next to me ((laughs))
72      AND THEN WHEN I GOT MA:RRIED two thousand six (.h)
73      um (.) in the end of the 2006 and then the first
74      marri-  first month I still not really talk to my
75      hu:sband
76      ((both laugh))
77  M:  because I'm scared I don't know much you know the
78      vocabulary (.) so (.) (.h) and then I lea:rn: (.) I
79      learn from hi:m (.) you know how he ta:lk (.) 'oh
80      maybe (.) he mean like thi:s (.) to say like this
81      (.) oh he use this se:ntence' something like that
82      (.) and then (.h) I learn more and more and more and
83      then in the like (.) second year of marriage and
84      then I talk uh: more like (.) English (.)=
85  R:  =mhm=
86  M:  =yeah ((nods))
87      (1.5)
88      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.

(36) M: Agency (part 2)

```
145  M:  uh like [husband's] dad side they always (.) try to
146      fix me (.) every time I make words or sentence like
147      that (.h) they always fix me 'oh:: you mean like
148      this' (.) so I learn 'oh >yeah-yeah-yeah-yeah<' so I
149      lea:rn how to sa:y it like next time so I already
150      know (.h) how to
151      (1.0)
152      make the right sentence=
153  R:  =right=
154  M:  =yeah=
155  R:  =so they help you out?=
156  M:  =yea::h
157  R:  they help you improve=
158  M:  =yea:h [they help me
159  R:         [well that's good
```

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 (.) I: had
34      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.

(38) S: Identity (language learner)

```
65  R:  so um (.) I was wondering when you started to learn
66      English
67  S:  uh huh
68  R:  was that in school?
69  S:  yeah I: (.) I got- (.) I get uh English from uh
70      elementary language (.h) eh from elementary school I
71      get English (.) uh: (.) but extra- (.) extra::
72      (1.0)
73      extra hours (.h) after: after (.) after I (.) af-
74      after: (.) after school
75  R:  okay
        ((story continues through line 100 with more I, but
        never we))
```

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).

(39) D: Identity (good language learner)

```
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
```

```
185  D:  Indonesia> (.h) >I mean< yeah they are doctors:
186      they are: (.h) engineers but since English it's not
187      their (.h) (.) they're not- (.) they're (h) (.)
188      what should I say? (.) 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
192      me< I must speak English I- I just like language
193      you know (.h) so: um it is beneficial for me (.) I
194      can go anywhere (.) 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 (.) not (.) not to mention (.) I mean
236      not to (.) giving my (.) telling that I:'m better
237      than them (.) than the rest of you know but those
238      Spanish people Mexican is (.) they don't know even
239      (.) you know small things in English (.) so: (.)
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
244      talking um:
245      (1.0)
246      <dau:ghters> <so:n:>
247  R:  mhm
248  O:  they st- (.) they (.) they feel very comfortable
249      cause everybody speaks Spanish ri:ght?=
250  R:  =mhm
251  O:  (.) so they (.) they don't really wanna push
252      themselves to speak English (.) they can continue
253      with each other they speak Spanish and then (.) you
254      know but (.) but like me:: (.) Indone:sian or
255      Chine:se the (.) you know
256      (1.0)
257      we don't (.) they don't (.) speak (.) that language
258      so (.) you know we have to push ourself to s- (.) to
259      learn how to speak English
```

63

```
260  R:  right
261      ((both laugh))
262  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 (.) uh projects and activities did
 99      you do while you were in the English classroom (.)
100      was it more grammar and translation focused (.) was
101      it more conversational (.) was it kind of a mix (.)
102      do you remember [how it was?
103  L:                  [actually my- my: um (.) my exp-
104      >high school experience< in- in English was (.) was
105      a painful
106  R:  okay
107  L:  ((laughs)) because I (.) um because I think of my
108      (.) Dutch language background I: (.) tended to:
109      (1.0)
110      <do my:>
111      (1.0)
112      projects >for instance if she had something that you
113      had to create in English< (.) I would do it more
114      based on (.) on what I felt was proper (.) uh
115      grammar pronunciation rather than the didactic
116      translation of the words (.) and um (.) I used to
117      get into: (.h) uh:: (.) disagreements with the
118      teacher=
119  R:  =oh wow=
120  L:  =because of- of that (.) and uh (.) my aunt at the
```

```
121  L:  time (.) was um also an English teacher (.) but she
122      was (.) uh classified as higher Cambridge
123  R:  okay=
124  L:  =uh you know uh (.) from uh (.) Oxford (.) and so:
125      (.) it actually at a much higher level than my high
126      school teacher (.h) so I would go to my aunt and-
127      and kind of (.) verify and said '>you know< this is
128      what I did' and she said 'no that's correct' (.h)
129      but then it (.) oftentimes clashed with my (.h) (.)
130      high school teacher
131  R:  okay=
132  L:  =so: (.) uh had some interesting experiences
133      ((both laugh))
134  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)

```
233  R:  <what were some of the things that were hard for you
234      when you were learning English in school>
235  S:  (2.5)
236      eh probably grammar (.) grammar's (.) <pretty hard
237      for me> a::nd (.) to learning >I mean cause there's
238      a major< (.) there's a point (.) you have to know
239      <the> grammar so you can (.h) speak up the em (.)
```

```
240  S:  speak up English (.) em: (.) uh: to-to make people
241      understand you to- so people can see you oh you are-
242      you learning English properly or not or you are- you
243      get English from school or not ((laughs))
```

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))
136  R:  so what do you think are some of the <biggest
137      differences> between Indonesian and English that
138      make it (.) um- and some of the things that were
139      hardest for you when learning English
140  L:  (.) again I think I had an advantage because I did
141      speak Dutch (.) and I do believe that helped me (.)
142      a lot um (.) but um: in Indonesian >as I said< you
143      know you don't have (.) you know past (.) present
144      and future (.) so those things become challenges
145      because if you want to express yourself in English
146      (.h) uh: you have to- (.) you have to kind of (.)
147      >you know< understand that there are (.) past
148      present and future tenses of English you know and-
149      and (x) masculine and feminine as well
150  R:  but since Dutch had those that made it easier for
151      you to learn English?=
152  L:  =um:: (.) I had that in Dutch (.) so to me the
153      transition wasn't as hard (.) as I've seen a lot of
154      people that only spoke Indonesian try to speak
155      English (.) they have: >I think much more of a
156      challenge<
```

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
122       learn?
123  D:  it is very hard (.) very very very hard (.)
124       pronunciation structu::res (.) uh gramma::r (.)
125       everything (.) <it is> very difficult for- (.) for
126       us to learn

         ((lines omitted))

157  R:  alright (.) so what do you think that were (.) um
158       (.) some of the things that were <hardest> for you
159       um- or like >some of the biggest differences between
160       Indonesian and English<
161  D:  that's what I say pronunciations the use of the
162       grammar (.) we don't have grammar in Indonesia like
163       you know past tense future (.h) you know (.) um::
164       things like that we don't have in Indonesia (.) s-
165       so I thi:nk Indonesian language is- it's much much
166       easier >because we don't have to< think abou::t <you
167       know> the ve:rbs 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
173       today' 'I eat tomorrow' you know but it's different
174       in English (.h) so I think that's more in a th-
175       that's more challenges for (.h) most of Indonesian
176       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)

```
84   R:   do you think that English is a hard language to
85        learn?
86   H:   (.h) I don't think so (.) it's a fun to learn
87   R:   mhm
88   H:   yes:
89   R:   (.) were there any things- were there um (.) yeah
90        any things that you really struggled with when you
91        were learning English (.) in school?
92   H:   (.h) not really
93   R:   not really?
94   H:   not really >maybe because I< li:ke it (.) so (.) not
95        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

68

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 afrai:d
196      because (.) uh you know everyone speaks English even
197      thou:gh 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 the< direc:tions: 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)

72

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:  mhm
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      becau:se 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 "ha[d] 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) attitu:des 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=
```

```
222  R:  =right=
223  A:  =so I need to learn that ((laughs))
224  R:  ((briefly joins in laughing))
225  A:  so:: (.) by knowing: uh: that I have to: (.) you
226      know I have to: I have to know about it (.) so just
227      going by it (.) kinda like that
228  R:  mhm
```

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 a:nd 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- 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
```

76

```
352  S:  or they forget Indonesia language uh so (.) the best
353      way is uh (.) to- to communicate- to speak in- in
354      English (.) continue
355  R:  mhm
356  S:  (.h) I think we need it for activity or for our life
357      not for our school (.) so uh lot of opportunity lot
358      of (.) uh benefit too I think
359  R:  mhm
```

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.

77

(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       (.) because this is international (.) once we know
194       English (.) it's not hard for us to go everywhere
195       and then to under- (.h) to communicate with people
196       with the differen:t background (.) different
197       nationality (.) 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

78

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.

```
359  R:  so why did you decide to come to the United States
360      (.) was it- you mentioned that there were some
361      conflicts in Indonesia um (.) was that the main
362      reason why you came?
363  S:  yes yes (.) uh and then- and not only that one uh
364      (.) I'm not come here because our life in that time
365      (.) if our life in the- in- in- in- Indonesia is- is
366      very good life I- I may- maybe I never come United
367      State ((laughs))
```

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.

```
70  R:  and why did you decide to come to Los Angeles
71  O:  (1.5)
72      what's that?=
73  R:  =why did you come to Los Angeles
74  O:  >oh okay:< well I came here because my aunt (.) uh
75      (.) she need help
76  R:  oh
```

```
77  O:  uh: (.) yeah I was uh:: working at the hospital in
78      Indonesia (.) and the <pay>: (.) you know the salary
79      (.) is just <so low> over there
80  R:  mhm
81  O:  so my mom said (.) 'why don't you just (.) you know
82      go to (.) my aunt' willing to
83      (1.0)
84      pay: me (.) a:nd so I can (.) you know look for (.)
85      something better (.) in here
86  R:  mhm
87  O:  she need to work (.) she ha:ve uh (.) three little
88      children (.) very small young age kindergarten
89  R:  alright
90  O:  yea:h so I came here to <he:lp her> and then s-
91      start <study Engli:sh> and (.) just do: (.) a little
92      bit more (.) than (.) >I'm doing in Indonesia< (.) I
93      think (.) that's all
```

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

81

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

83

(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

84

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

85

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.

REFERENCES

Adams Goertel, R. (2011). *The pragmatic use of discourse markers in the unplanned speech of university English language learners* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (Order No. 3482820)

Ahearn, L. M. (2001). Language and agency. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, *30*(1), 109-137.

Alcón Soler, E., & Safont-Jordà, M.-P. (Eds.). (2012). *Discourse and language learning across L2 institutional settings*. New York, NY: Rodopi.

Andrade, L. A. C. (2007). Narrative and identity construction – An analysis of the L2 learning process. *Revista Brasileira de Lingüística Aplicada*, *7*(2), 199-214.

Badan Pusat Statistik (Central Bureau of Statistics). (2010). *Sensus penduduk (Population census) 2010*. Retrieved from http://sp2010.bps.go.id.

Baker, C. (2004). Membership categorization and interview accounts. In D. Silverman (Ed.), *Qualitative research: Theory, method and practice* (2nd ed.) (pp. 162-176). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Berman, L. A. (1992). First person identities in Indonesian conversational narratives. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication*, *3*(1), 3-14.

Blommaert, J. (2010). *The sociolinguistics of globalization.* New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Bloome, D., Carter, S. P., Christian, B. M., Madrid, S., Otto, S., Shuart-Faris, N., & Smith, M. (2008). *On discourse analysis in classrooms: Approaches to language and literacy research*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press, Columbia University.

Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. (J. B. Thompson, Ed., and G. Raymond & M. Adamson, Trans.). Boston, MA: Polity Press.

Boxer, D., & Cohen, A. D. (Eds.). (2004). *Studying speaking to inform second language learning*. Buffalo, NY: Multilingual Matters.

Brown, A. V. (2009). Students' and teachers' perceptions of effective foreign language teaching: A comparison of ideals. *Modern Language Journal*, *93*(1), 46-60.

Brown, G., & Yule. G. (1983). *Teaching the spoken language*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Cameron, D. (2001). *Working with spoken discourse*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Celce-Murcia, M., & Larsen-Freeman, D. (1999). *The grammar book: An ESL/EFL teacher's course* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Heinle/Cengage Learning.

Chafe, W. L. (Ed.). (1980). *The pear stories: Cognitive, cultural, and linguistic aspects of narrative production.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Chafe, W. L. (1982). Integration and involvement in speaking, writing, and oral literature. In D. Tannen (Ed.), *Spoken and written language: Exploring orality and literacy* (pp. 35-53). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Chang, Y.-J. (2011). Picking one's battles: NNES doctoral students' imagined communities and selections of investment. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, *10*(4), 213-230.

Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (2000). *Narrative inquiry: Experience and story in qualitative research*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Connelly, F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (1990). Stories of experience and narrative inquiry. *Educational Researcher*, *19*(5), 2-14.

Dailey-O'Cain, J. (2000). The sociolinguistic distribution of and attitudes toward focuser *like* and quotative *like. Journal of Sociolinguistics*, *4*(1), 60-80.

De Fina, A., & Georgakopoulou, A. (2012). *Analyzing narrative: Discourse and sociolinguistic perspectives*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Djenar, D. N. (2007). *Semantic, pragmatic and discourse perspectives of preposition use: A study of Indonesian locatives*. Canberra, Australia: Pacific Linguistics, Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies, Australian National University.

Doerr, N. M. (2009). Investigating "native speaker effects": Toward a new model of analyzing "native speaker" ideologies. In N. M. Doerr (Ed.), *Native speaker concept: Ethnographic investigations of native speaker effects* (pp. 15-46). Berlin, Germany: De Gruyter.

Dörnyei, Z. (2001). *Teaching and researching motivation*. New York, NY: Longman.

Dörnyei, Z. (2009). Individual differences: Interplay of learner characteristics and learning environment. *Language Learning*, *59*(s1), 230-248.

Englebretson, R. (2003). *Searching for structure: The problem of complementation in colloquial Indonesian conversation*. Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.

Fine, J. (Ed.). (1988). *Second language discourse: A textbook of current research*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Fung, L., & Carter, R. (2007). Discourse markers and spoken English: Native and learner use in pedagogic settings. *Applied Linguistics*, *28*(3), 410-439.

Georgakopoulou, A., & Goutsos, D. (1997). *Discourse analysis: An introduction*. Edinburgh, UK: Edinburgh University Press.

Gu, M. M. (2010). Identities constructed in difference: English language learners in China. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *42*(1), 139-152.

Gubrium, J. F., & Holstein, J. A. (2009). *Analyzing narrative reality*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Gülich, E., & Quasthoff, U. M. (1985). Narrative analysis. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Handbook of discourse analysis: Volume 2, Dimensions of discourse* (pp. 169-197). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English.* London, UK: Longman.

Holt, E. (1996). Reporting on talk: The use of direct reported speech in conversation. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, *29*(3), 219-245.

Hutchby, I., & Wooffitt, R. (1998). *Conversation analysis: Principles, practices and applications*. Malden, MA: Polity Press.

Hutton, C. M. (1990). *Abstraction and instance: The type-token relation in linguistic theory*. Elmsford, NY: Pergamon Press.

Ihsan, D. (1988). *A linguistic study of tense shifts in Indonesian-English interlanguage autobiographical discourse* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (Order No. 8904999)

Jary, D., & Jary, J. (Eds.). (2006). *Collins dictionary of sociology*. London, UK: HarperCollins Publishers.

Jefferson, G. (1978). Sequential aspects of storytelling in conversation. In J. Schenkein (Ed.), *Studies in the organization of conversational interaction* (pp. 219-248). New York, NY: Academic Press.

Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In G. H. Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation* (pp. 13-23). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.

Johnstone, B. (2001). Discourse analysis and narrative. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, & H. E. Hamilton (Eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 635-649). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Kanno, Y., & Norton, B. (2003). Imagined communities and educational possibilities: Introduction. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, *2*(4), 241-249.

Kärkkäinen, E. (2003). *Epistemic stance in English conversation: A description of its interactional functions, with a focus on* I think. Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.

Kasper, G. (2009). Categories, context, and comparison in conversation analysis. In H. Nguyen & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Talk-in-interaction: Multilingual perspectives* (pp. 1-28). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i, National Foreign Language Resource Center.

Kim, J. (2013). *Korean ESL (English as a second language) graduate students' investments, social identities, and imagined communities* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (Order No. 1542413)

Labov, W. (1972). *Language in the inner city*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (Ed.). (1980). *Discourse analysis in second language research*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers.

Lasiter, D. (2013). *Beliefs in action: Ideologies, motivations, and capital among English as a second language learners* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (Order No. 1548165)

Leddon, E. M., Waxman, S. R., & Medin, D. L. (2011). What does it mean to "live" and "die"? A cross-linguistic analysis of parent-child conversations in English and Indonesian. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, *29*(3), 375-395.

Li, L., & Simpson, R. (2013). Telling tales: Discursive narratives of ESOL migrant identities. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language)*, *7*(1), 1-16.

Liddicoat, A. J. (2007). *An introduction to conversation analysis*. New York, NY: Continuum.

Lie, A. (1994). *Paired storytelling: An integrated approach for English as a Foreign Language students in Indonesia* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Thesis Global. (Order No. 9500674)

Lindemann, S., & Mauranen, A. (2001). "It's just real messy": The occurrence and function of *just* in a corpus of academic speech. *English for Specific Purposes, 20*(s1), 459-475.

Mambu, J. E. (2013). Narrative structures across tellings of the same "good" teaching experience. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *2*(2), 199-215.

McCabe, A., & Bliss, L. S. (2003). *Patterns of narrative discourse: A multicultural, life span approach*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

McCarthy, M. (1991). *Discourse analysis for language teachers*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Menard-Warwick, J. (2005). Both a fiction and existential fact: Theorizing identity in second language acquisition and literacy studies. *Linguistics and Education*, *16*(3), 253-274.

Miller, E. R. (2012). Agency, language learning, and multilingual spaces. *Multilingua*, *31*(4), 441-468.

Minami, M. (2002). *Culture-specific language styles: The development of oral narrative and literacy*. Tonawanda, NY: Multilingual Matters.

Miyahara, M. (2010). Researching identity and language learning: Taking a narrative approach. *Language Research Bulletin*, *25*(1). Retrieved from http://lrb.info.icu.ac.jp/home/volume-25-2010.

Mrázek, J. (Ed.). (2002). *Puppet theater in contemporary Indonesia: New approaches to performance events*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, Centers for South and Southeast Asian Studies.

Norrick, N. R. (2000). *Conversational narrative: Storytelling in everyday talk*. Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.

Norton, B. (2000). *Identity and language learning: Gender, ethnicity, and educational change*. Harlow, UK: Longman.

Norton, B., & Kamal, F. (2003). The imagined communities of English language learners in a Pakistani school. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, *2*(4), 301-317.

Norton Peirce, B. (1995). Social identity, investment, and language learning. *TESOL Quarterly*, *29*(1), 9-31.

Ortega, L. (2009). *Understanding second language acquisition*. New York, NY: Routledge/Taylor & Francis.

Oullette, M. A. (2001). "That's too bad": Hedges and indirect complaints in "troubles-talk" narrative. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics*, *19*(1-2), 107-126.

Paltridge, B. (2012). *Discourse analysis: An introduction* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Bloomsbury Academic.

Park, J. S.-Y. (2009). *The local construction of a global language: Ideologies of English in South Korea*. Berlin, Germany: De Gruyter.

Pavlenko, A. (Ed.). (2006a). *Bilingual minds: Emotional experience, expression, and representation*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Pavlenko, A. (2006b). Narrative competence in a second language. In H. Byrnes, H. D. Weger-Guntharp, & K. Sprang (Eds.), *Educating for advanced foreign language capacities: Constructs, curriculum, instruction, assessment* (pp. 105-117). Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Pavlenko, A. (2007). Autobiographic narratives as data in applied linguistics. *Applied Linguistics*, *28*(2), 163-188.

Perry, F. L., Jr. (2011). *Research in applied linguistics: Becoming a discerning consumer* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge/Taylor & Francis.

Polanyi, L. (1985a). Conversational storytelling. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Handbook of discourse analysis: Volume 3, Discourse and dialogue* (pp. 183-201). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Polanyi, L. (1985b). *Telling the American story: A structural and cultural analysis of conversational storytelling*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Sacks, H. (1984). Notes on methodology. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 21-27). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Sacks, H. (1992a). *Lectures on conversation, volume I.* (G. Jefferson, Ed., and E. A. Schegloff, Intro.). Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Sacks, H. (1992b). *Lectures on conversation, volume II.* (G. Jefferson, Ed., and E. A. Schegloff, Intro.). Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Sari, F. (2007). *Pragmatic particles: A cross-linguistic discourse analysis of interaction* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (Order No. 3313743)

Schwartz, J. (1980). The negotiation for meaning: Repair in conversations between second language learners of English. In D. Larsen-Freeman (Ed.), *Discourse analysis in second language research* (pp. 138-153). Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers.

Seargeant, P. (2009). *The idea of English in Japan: Ideology and the evolution of a global language*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Sneddon, J. N. (1996). *Indonesian: A comprehensive grammar*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Sneddon, J. N. (2003). *The Indonesian language: Its history and role in modern society*. Sydney, Australia: University of New South Wales Press.

Stivers, T. (2008). Stance, alignment, and affiliation during storytelling: When nodding is a token of affiliation. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 41*(1), 31-57.

Talmy, S. (2010). Qualitative interviews in applied linguistics: From research instrument to social practice. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 30*(1), 128-148.

Tannen, D. (1980). A comparative analysis of oral narrative strategies: Athenian Greek and American English. In W. L. Chafe (Ed.), *The pear stories: Cognitive, cultural, and linguistic aspects of narrative production* (pp. 51-87). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Tannen, D. (Ed). (1982a). *Coherence in spoken and written discourse*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Tannen, D. (1982b). Oral and literate strategies in spoken and written narratives. *Language*, *58*(1), 1-21.

Tannen, D. (1982c). Spoken and written narrative in English and Greek. In D. Tannen (Ed.), *Coherence in spoken and written discourse* (pp. 21-41). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Tannen, D. (1983). What's in a frame? Surface evidencing for underlying expectations. In D. Tannen (Ed.), *Framing in discourse* (pp. 14-56). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Tannen, D. (1989). *Talking voices: Repetition, dialogue, and imagery in conversational discourse*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Tappe, H., & Hara, A. (2013). Language specific narrative text structure elements in multilingual children. *Stellenbosch Papers in Linguistics Plus*, *42*(1), 297-331.

Tappendorf, R. C. (2014). *A linguistic comparison of English and Bahasa Indonesia: Examining language transfer effects*. (Unpublished undergraduate honors thesis). Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ.

Temple, B., & Koterba, K. (2009). The same but different – Researching language and culture in the lives of Polish people in England. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research (Forum: Qualitative Sozialforschung)*, *10*(1). Retrieved from www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/1212/2643.

ten Have, P. (1999). *Doing conversation analysis: A practical guide*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Tsui, A. B. M., & Tollefson, J. W. (Eds.). (2007). *Language policy, culture, and identity in Asian contexts*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

van de Mortel, T. F. (2008). Faking it: Social desirability response bias in self-report research. *Australian Journal of Advanced Nursing*, *25*(4), 40-48.

van Dijk, T. A. (Ed.). (2011). *Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Vettin, J., & Todt, D. (2004). Laughter in conversation: Features of occurrences and acoustic structure. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, *28*(2), 93-115.

Weatherall, A. (2011). *I don't know* as a prepositioned epistemic hedge. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, *44*(4), 317-337.

Wesely, P. M. (2012). Learner attitudes, perceptions, and beliefs in language learning. *Foreign Language Annals*, *45*(s1), 98-117.

Williams, N. (2012). Toward a linguistic anthropological account of deixis in interaction: *Ini* and *itu* in Indonesian conversation. *Colorado Research in Linguistics, 23*(1). Retrieved from http://www.colorado.edu/ling/CRIL/Volume23_Issue1/ paper_Williams.pdf.

Williams, M., & Burden, R. L. (1999). Students' developing conceptions of themselves as language learners. *Modern Language Journal*, *83*(2), 193-201.

Wolff, J. U., Oetomo, D., & Fietkiewicz, D. (1992). *Beginning Indonesian through self-instruction, book 2.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University, Southeast Asia Program.

Wouk, F. (1998). Solidarity in Indonesian conversation: The discourse marker *kan*. *Multilingua*, *17*(4), 379-406.

Wouk, F. (2001). Solidarity in Indonesian conversation: The discourse marker *ya*. *Journal of Pragmatics, 33*(2), 171-191.

Wouk, F. (2005). The syntax of repair in Indonesian. *Discourse Studies*, *7*(2), 237-258.

Zini, V. (1992). *Narrative structures in interviews of second language learners*. Hamburg, Germany: Research Center for Multilingualism, University of Hamburg.

APPENDIX A

LINGUISTIC DEVICES

| | PARTICIPANT | | | | | | | | | | |
LINGUISTIC DEVICE	D	L	E	S	N	A	O	H	P	M	TOTAL
Connectives	45	64	49	90	116	100	68	35	51	178	796
Discourse markers	41	22	25	41	51	94	67	25	52	181	599
Repetition	61	17	22	132	59	85	52	26	21	109	584
Adverbials	12	27	16	50	46	40	28	19	30	66	334
Embedded clauses	21	33	24	24	43	47	35	12	32	56	327
Intensifiers	22	10	24	18	20	15	23	9	16	73	230
Like (non-comparison)	3	--	8	5	22	49	13	12	7	98	217
Interaction	5	3	6	18	15	40	26	3	7	52	175
Stance	9	18	14	9	23	41	17	5	24	8	168
Comparison	6	17	10	17	10	41	15	4	15	31	166
Hedges	2	9	9	19	19	36	11	4	15	35	159
Marked verbal features	6	10	6	7	10	39	20	3	18	28	147
Quantifiers	6	9	8	9	25	39	13	5	14	13	141
Anaphoric phrases	4	3	7	10	7	15	7	1	2	42	98
Reported speech	--	--	8	4	5	6	4	--	3	52	82
Just	8	2	5	2	1	15	8	1	5	19	66
Lists	9	9	1	5	8	6	3	2	5	2	50
Topics	3	1	4	3	3	5	5	3	6	6	39
Negative definitions	5	3	5	13	--	2	--	--	4	6	38
Indonesian words	--	--	1	--	--	3	2	9	--	15	30
Relative clauses	1	2	10	--	1	3	2	2	5	1	27

APPENDIX B

PARTICIPANTS AT A GLANCE

The First Five Participants

	Participant D (#1) ~835 words	Participant L (#2) ~950 words	Participant E (#3) ~755 words	Participant S (#4) ~1770 words	Participant N (#5) ~1455 words
Where from	Sulawesi island	Jakarta (Java island)	Jakarta (Java island)	Jakarta (Java island)	Jakarta (Java island)
Time in U.S.	9 years	17 years in Canada; 29 years in U.S.	17 years in Canada; 29 years in U.S.	13 years	2 years
College	Yes, Australia	Yes, Canada	Not mentioned	Yes, Indonesia	Yes, Indonesia
Language(s) spoken as a child	Gorontalo & BI; both spoken at home, but only BI spoken in school	Dutch (until age 12) and BI (started at age 12)	Dutch, Chinese (first 5 years in school), and BI (learned at home, and "proper BI" in school starting in 5th grade)	BI; parents spoke Haka (a dialect of Chinese), but didn't learn it; also learned French in middle school	BI
Started English	Junior high (around seventh grade)	High school	First grade	Elementary school (5th or 6th grade, so age 11 or 12)	Junior high
English = L?	L3	L3	L4	L2	L2
English classes	6 years of formal instruction, once a week, in 7th–12th grades; additional English school twice a week for unspecified number of years; college in Australia, preceded by intensive 10-week preparation class (all in English)	4 years formal instruction in high school; additional conversational practice with family and friends, including a "higher Cambridge" aunt who was an English teacher; medical school for 6 years in Canada (all in English)	12 years of minimal formal instruction during grade school; lower Cambridge at the Embassy during high school for unspecified period of time	Probably 7 years of formal instruction, including extra hours after school and TOEFL preparation; plus continuing education classes in U.S. for unspecified amount of time	Probably 10 years of formal instruction (junior high through university)

	Participant D (#1) ~835 words	Participant L (#2) ~950 words	Participant E (#3) ~755 words	Participant S (#4) ~1770 words	Participant N (#5) ~1455 words
Main focus in English classes	Conversation; learned pronunciation, grammar, and writing in Australia	Just "the required high school curriculum"; extra conversational English with family and friends	Some reading in grade school classes, but mainly grammar throughout school years and not conversation	Both grammar and conversation	Conversation, vocabulary, composition, listening lab, some grammar
Attitudes about learning English	"I *always* like English." Approached English-speaking people to practice English.	"I was quite keen in learning English, knowing that um it was an important language…"	"I think I had a really good experience because I immersed myself directly in school…" Had a classmate who was bold to correct her English; really appreciated the help.	"I have- I feel happy [about learning English]."	"So yeah, so my experience learning English is uh yeah, at first I don't like it [because it's difficult], but when I know the purpose of learning English like for traveling, because I love traveling, so I think it's much more fun…"
Additional notes	Went to "conversation school." Attended college in Australia. Married an American.	Had an aunt who was a "higher Cambridge" English teacher. Often got into disagreements with his teacher about what was correct and then would verify his English with his aunt. At age 12, the president banned Dutch in Indonesia, so he was put in an immersion school for BI, which he described as a stressful situation.	Had a classmate who often corrected her English and helped her improve. Now she does the same for others.	Currently works with a number of Spanish speakers, so has picked up some Spanish. She seems to enjoy learning languages.	Worked in a business with international clients, so had to speak English with people who spoke different dialects of English. Studied a bit of Dutch, Chinese, and French, but said she probably forgot them because she didn't use them on a regular basis.

100

The Second Five Participants

	Participant A (#6) ~1935 words	Participant O (#7) ~1225 words	Participant H (#8) ~535 words	Participant P (#9) ~1020 words	Participant M (#10) ~2010 words
Where from	Jakarta (Java island)	Jakarta (Java island)	Pematangsiantar (Sumatra island)	Sulawesi island	Jakarta (Java island)
Time in U.S.	20 years	15 years	18 years	18 years	6 years
College	Yes, U.S.	Not mentioned	Yes, Indonesia	Yes, Indonesia	Yes, Indonesia
Language(s) spoken as a child	BI	Batak; BI	Batak; BI	Manado; BI	BI
Started English	High school	Middle school	Middle school	Junior high	Middle school
English = L2?	L2	L3	L3	L3	L2
English classes	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.	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	Middle school and high school (probably about 6 years of formal instruction)	Middle school and high school (probably around 6 years of formal instruction)	Middle school and high school (probably around 6 years of formal instruction)
Main focus in English classes	Reading, TOEFL test preparation, grammar, conversation	Reading, pronunciation, conversation	Writing, reading, grammar, conversation	Conversation, fill-in-the-blank, and MC based on a story instead of writing essays	Grammar, listening lab

101

	Participant A (#6) ~1935 words	Participant O (#7) ~1225 words	Participant H (#8) ~535 words	Participant P (#9) ~1020 words	Participant M (#10) ~2010 words
Attitudes about learning English	"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."	"So in 1998 [when I came to the U.S.] I start speaking in English like daily because I have to, no other choice."	"I am super excited. I love- I love uh I love to learn uh English class..." "So when every time I saw the tourist American or- or the white people, sometimes they are from Norway or sometimes from, they are from another country, but I try to get close to them and try to practice my English with them."	"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."	"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..."
Additional notes	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.	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).	Both she and her father are singers, so she learned English through songs written in English.	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. Being a minister at an international church in the U.S. and having to use English to speak to the congregation inspired him to learn more English.	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.

APPENDIX C

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:

Type of Review:	Initial Study
Title:	Examining the Speech of Indonesians Speaking in English
Investigator:	Claire Renaud
IRB ID:	STUDY00000321
Funding:	None
Grant Title:	None
Grant ID:	None
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).

Page 1 of 2

104

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.

_____   _____
Name (printed)   Date

_____
Name (signature)

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?

110

- 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]
    - Speaking (dialogues, conversations with classmates/teacher, pronunciation practice, etc.)
    - Listening (to teacher, to tapes/CDs, to radio/TV/movies, to classmates, etc.)
    - Writing (stories, dialogues, reports, etc.)
    - Reading (stories, lessons, vocabulary lists, etc.)
    - Translation
    - Grammar lessons
    - 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!

APPENDIX F

RECRUITMENT SCRIPT

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)

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

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."*

- Stance – shows the speaker's opinions
  - *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
  - *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
  - *all, every, some, part of, much, many, little bit*

- Repetition
  - 1a: Immediate – word or phrase is repeated immediately (or after a pause), but not after a cut-off
  - 1b: Non-immediate – at least one intervening word in between the first word/phrase and repeated word/phrase; pauses don't count as intervening
  - 2a: Exact – word or phrase is repeated exactly (can be immediate or non-immediate)
  - 2b: With variation – word/phrase is repeated with some variation, but mostly the same words
  - 2c: With paraphrase – the basic gist of the word/phrase is repeated but with different vocab words or different structure
  - 3a: Word – one word is repeated
  - 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
  - *"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)
  - *"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
  - *too, also, now, at that time, already, not yet, usually, still, then, in addition, besides that*
  - joining phrases (not clauses): *and, and then, or*
    - *"**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
  - *"I think [that] **my teacher is very nice**."*

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

- Quotative *like* – used to introduce reported speech
  - *"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**."*

120

- 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

LINGUISTIC DEVICE		PARTICIPANT										TOTAL
		D	L	E	S	N	A	O	H	P	M	
		45	64	49	90	116	100	68	35	51	178	796
Connectives	coordinating	22	30	26	53	40	52	33	15	23	72	366
	comparative (but)	9	7	11	18	17	18	11	5	11	23	130
	additive (and then)	3	1	3	13	12	27	10	1	3	38	111
	additive (and)	8	21	9	16	8	7	11	8	8	9	105
	additive (or)	--	--	3	4	2	--	--	--	--	2	11
	additive (and also)	1	--	--	2	1	--	--	--	1	--	5
	additive (and so)	--	1	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	2
	additive (so)	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
	additive (so then)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	1
	subordinating	17	31	18	36	70	30	31	17	23	80	353
	consequential (because)	2	13	9	13	23	11	8	8	2	23	112
	consequential (so)	4	9	3	6	11	10	11	5	7	18	84
	temporal (when)	1	4	1	5	12	6	3	2	7	23	64
	conditional/irrealis (if)	2	3	5	4	15	--	6	--	5	10	50
	conditional (even though)	1	1	--	1	1	--	--	2	--	3	9
	temporal (after)	--	--	--	3	3	1	--	--	--	1	8
	temporal (until)	--	--	--	3	3	1	--	--	--	--	7
	consequential (since)	3	--	--	--	1	--	1	--	--	--	5
	temporal (once)	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	3
	temporal (before)	--	--	--	1	--	1	--	--	--	--	2
	conditional (but if)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	1
	conditional (even if)	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	1
	consequential (but since)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	1
	consequential (if because)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	1
	contrastive (instead of)	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
	locative (where)	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	1
	temporal (if)	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1

LINGUISTIC DEVICE	D	L	E	S	N	A	O	H	P	M	TOTAL
subordinating (cont.)	17	31	18	36	70	30	31	17	23	80	353
temporal (since)	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	1
temporal (so before)	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
at beg. of main clause	6	3	5	1	6	18	4	3	5	26	77
so	5	2	4	--	5	12	3	3	5	18	57
and then	1	1	--	--	--	3	1	--	--	5	11
and	--	--	1	1	--	1	--	--	--	3	6
but	--	--	--	--	--	2	--	--	--	--	2
so therefore	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	1
Discourse markers	41	22	25	41	51	94	67	25	52	181	599
comment phrases	32	17	19	23	29	69	57	8	41	142	437
you know	29	13	14	1	8	36	29	--	9	46	185
yeah	2	--	2	13	16	16	13	4	26	44	136
okay	--	1	--	1	1	5	6	--	1	20	35
(that's) right	--	--	3	1	--	--	1	2	1	12	20
mhm	--	--	--	1	1	5	1	--	--	6	14
yes	--	--	--	2	--	4	2	1	2	--	11
well	--	3	--	--	--	2	2	--	2	1	10
I mean	--	--	--	2	3	--	3	--	--	--	8
uh huh	--	--	--	2	--	--	--	--	--	4	6
huh	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	5	5
so yeah	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	2	4
no	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	1	2
oh yeah	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	1
interjections	0	3	2	3	15	4	3	4	2	19	55
oh	--	1	1	2	10	3	3	2	2	13	37
see?	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	3	3
great question	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	2
ooh	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	2

LINGUISTIC DEVICE	D	L	E	S	N	A	O	H	P	M	TOTAL
interjections (cont.)	0	3	2	3	15	4	3	4	2	19	55
oh no	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	1	2
wow	--	--	--	--	1	1	--	--	--	--	2
oh man	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	1
oh my	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
oh my goodness	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	1
oh my gosh	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	1
oh yeah	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
ugh	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	1
uh oh	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	1
response tokens	3	2	1	11	4	8	4	8	6	7	54
yeah	--	--	--	4	1	3	3	2	5	3	21
yes	3	--	--	7	2	3	1	--	--	--	16
no	--	--	1	--	1	1	--	1	1	3	8
right	--	2	--	--	--	--	--	5	--	--	7
okay	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	1
yep	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	1
agreement markers	2	0	1	4	3	12	2	4	3	11	42
with what R says	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
yeah	--	--	1	3	3	4	--	2	--	8	21
right	--	--	--	--	--	8	--	1	3	--	12
yes	--	--	--	1	--	--	1	1	--	--	3
seeking agreement from R	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
right	2	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	3	6
turn-enders	4	0	2	0	0	1	1	1	0	2	11
so	4	--	2	--	--	--	--	1	--	2	9
though	--	--	--	--	--	1	1	--	--	--	2

LINGUISTIC DEVICE	D	L	E	S	N	A	O	H	P	M	TOTAL
Repetition	61	17	22	132	59	85	52	26	21	109	584
immediate	29	13	13	72	41	43	41	13	9	74	348
word	13	8	1	30	14	20	14	6	3	32	141
phrase	4	3	3	11	18	13	7	6	1	17	83
phrase w/ variation	8	1	6	23	8	5	9	1	2	18	81
word w/ variation	3	1	1	5	1	2	4	--	--	6	23
phrase w/ paraphrase	1	--	2	3	--	3	6	--	3	1	19
word w/ paraphrase	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	1
non-immediate	20	3	7	46	11	33	3	9	7	25	164
word	4	1	4	16	1	8	1	6	2	11	53
phrase	3	1	1	19	6	10	1	1	1	5	48
phrase w/ variation	10	--	--	9	3	9	--	2	2	8	43
phrase w/ paraphrase	3	--	1	2	--	2	1	--	2	1	12
word w/ paraphrase	--	--	1	--	--	4	--	--	--	--	5
word w/ variation	--	1	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	3
repetition of R's words	3	0	0	1	0	4	1	1	1	7	18
immediate	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
word	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	3	5
phrase	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	1	1	--	3
phrase with variation	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
non-immediate	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
phrase	--	--	--	--	--	4	1	--	--	2	7
word	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	2
parallelism	9	1	2	13	7	5	7	3	4	3	54
Adverbials	12	27	16	50	46	40	28	19	30	66	334
sometime(s)	--	--	2	3	11	1	3	4	--	15	39
too	--	--	--	8	--	3	4	2	--	16	33
and	1	3	--	3	6	6	--	--	2	4	25
or	--	--	--	2	2	6	3	1	2	6	22

LINGUISTIC DEVICE	D	L	E	S	N	A	O	H	P	M	TOTAL
Adverbials (cont.)	12	27	16	50	46	40	28	19	30	66	334
now	1	--	2	1	3	1	3	--	3	3	17
still	--	--	1	2	1	2	1	2	--	8	17
(al)ready	--	--	2	3	4	2	--	2	--	2	15
(at) first	--	1	1	1	1	6	1	--	--	--	11
then	3	2	--	--	1	--	1	--	1	3	11
also	3	1	1	2	1	1	--	--	1	--	9
but	--	2	--	3	--	--	--	--	2	--	8
in that time	--	--	--	8	--	--	--	--	--	--	8
and then	--	--	--	1	2	--	--	--	--	4	7
until	--	--	--	--	1	2	1	1	2	--	7
at the time	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	4	1	--	6
beside(s) (that)	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	5	--	6
because of	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	4	--	5
usually	--	1	1	2	--	--	--	--	1	--	5
as well	1	2	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	4
for example	--	--	--	1	--	3	--	--	--	--	4
for instance	--	3	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	4
last time	1	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	1	1	4
right away	--	--	--	1	--	3	--	--	--	--	4
right now	--	--	--	2	--	--	--	--	1	1	4
yet	--	--	--	2	1	--	--	2	--	--	4
after	--	--	--	--	--	--	3	--	--	--	3
again	--	--	--	--	--	--	3	--	--	--	3
and also	--	--	--	--	2	--	--	--	1	--	3
not only	--	--	--	1	2	--	--	--	--	--	3
often (times)	--	2	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	3
that time	--	--	--	--	3	--	--	--	--	--	3
today	--	--	1	1	--	1	--	--	--	--	3

LINGUISTIC DEVICE	D	L	E	S	N	A	O	H	P	M	TOTAL
Adverbials (cont.)	12	27	16	50	46	40	28	19	30	66	334
at that time	--	--	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2
at the same time	--	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2
before	--	--	--	1	--	--	1	--	--	--	2
but also	--	--	--	--	2	--	--	--	--	--	2
daily	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	1	2
except	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	--	2
not yet	--	--	--	1	1	--	--	--	--	--	2
only	--	1	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	2
a lot	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
ago	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	1
all of a sudden	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
anything else	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	1
back then	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	1
beyond that	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
eventually	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
however	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	1
in addition to that	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
in those days	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
next time	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	1
next to	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	1
next week	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	1
once in a while	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
outside of	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	1
prior to that	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
rather than that	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	1
so far	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	1
ultimately	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	1

LINGUISTIC DEVICE	D	L	E	S	N	A	O	H	P	M	TOTAL
Embedded clauses	21	33	24	24	43	47	35	12	32	56	327
Intensifiers	22	10	24	18	20	15	23	9	16	73	230
emphasis	6	2	--	--	1	--	8	4	--	26	47
very	10	2	2	6	1	6	5	1	1	4	38
always	1	1	5	--	3	1	--	--	1	17	29
really	--	--	8	4	1	1	--	1	5	--	20
so	1	--	4	1	--	--	2	1	2	9	20
especially (special)	1	--	--	--	3	--	1	--	6	2	13
much	2	3	1	--	2	1	1	--	--	3	13
even	1	--	--	--	4	2	1	--	--	1	9
(a) lot/lots	--	--	--	1	--	2	1	--	--	4	8
never	--	--	--	--	1	--	1	--	--	5	7
big	--	1	--	1	--	--	1	--	--	1	4
at all	--	--	--	--	2	1	--	--	--	--	3
just	--	--	1	--	--	--	1	--	--	1	3
pretty	--	--	1	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	2
quite	--	1	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2
super	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	--	--	2
too	--	--	--	--	1	1	--	--	--	--	2
totally	--	--	--	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	2
all	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	1
all the time	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
perfectly	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
real	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
small	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	1
well	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	1

LINGUISTIC DEVICE	D	L	E	S	N	A	O	H	P	M	TOTAL
Like (non-comparison)	3	0	8	5	22	49	13	12	7	98	217
other *like* (sometimes ambiguous function)	--	--	5	5	22	43	10	8	7	73	173
quotative *like*	--	--	3	--	--	2	1	--	--	19	25
"such as" *like*	2	--	--	--	--	4	--	2	--	2	10
approximation *like*	1	--	--	--	--	--	2	2	--	4	9
Interaction	5	3	6	18	15	40	26	3	7	52	175
laughter	2	3	3	13	10	28	21	3	5	44	132
direct address	2	--	3	3	2	6	4	--	1	7	28
you got it	--	--	--	--	--	2	--	--	--	--	2
believe it or not	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	1
seeks clarification	1	--	--	2	3	3	1	--	1	1	12
Stance	9	18	14	9	23	41	17	5	24	8	168
I think	2	9	9	2	11	3	8	1	2	--	47
actually	--	6	2	4	--	7	--	--	--	--	19
of course	--	--	--	--	2	1	--	--	12	--	15
it's fun	--	--	--	--	2	4	2	1	--	--	9
it's good/that was good	1	--	1	1	--	1	2	--	--	2	8
I know	--	--	--	1	2	3	--	--	--	1	7
it's funny	--	--	--	--	1	3	--	1	--	2	7
I don't think	--	--	--	--	3	1	--	1	--	--	5
I remember	1	--	--	--	--	2	--	1	--	1	5
I didn't know/I don't know	--	1	1	--	--	2	2	--	--	--	4
at least	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	1	1	3
basically	--	1	--	--	--	1	--	--	1	--	3
definitely	--	--	--	--	--	3	--	--	--	--	3
I believe	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	2	--	3
according to	--	--	--	--	--	2	--	--	--	--	2
bad	--	--	--	--	--	2	--	--	--	--	2

LINGUISTIC DEVICE	D	L	E	S	N	A	O	H	P	M	TOTAL
Stance (cont.)	9	18	14	9	23	41	17	5	24	8	168
hopefully/I hope	--	--	--	1	--	--	1	--	--	--	2
I'm not sure	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	1	--	2
it's/that's easy	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	1	--	2
normally	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	1	--	2
believe it or not	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	1
certainly	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	1
exciting	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	1
for sure	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	1
generally	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
hate	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	1
I love it	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	1
I noticed	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
I say	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
I understand	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	1
I'm glad	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
I'm very fortunate	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
it's beneficial	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
I've seen	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
that's correct	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	1
that's true	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	1
totally	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	1
we know	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	1
Comparison	6	17	10	17	10	41	15	4	15	31	166
more	1	5	5	3	--	6	1	1	5	15	42
different	--	--	2	--	4	3	1	2	4	--	16
other	--	--	--	3	4	5	--	--	2	--	14
as	--	3	--	2	--	2	2	--	--	--	9
than	--	2	--	--	--	--	3	--	--	1	6

131

LINGUISTIC DEVICE	D	L	E	S	N	A	O	H	P	M	TOTAL
Comparison (cont.)	6	17	10	17	10	41	15	4	15	31	166
better	--	--	--	--	--	--	4	--	--	1	5
easier	1	--	2	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	4
best	--	--	--	1	2	--	--	--	--	--	3
compared to/with	--	1	--	--	--	1	--	--	1	--	3
hardest	--	--	--	--	--	2	1	--	--	--	3
biggest	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	--	--	--	2
rather than	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	2
compare X with	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
deeper	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
harder	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	1
similar	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
with	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
like comparisons	3	3	0	8	0	22	1	1	0	14	52
like	1	--	--	1	--	16	--	1	--	3	22
just like	1	1	--	1	--	5	1	--	--	10	19
not like	--	2	--	3	--	--	--	--	--	--	5
more like	1	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	1	3
looks like (that)	--	--	--	2	--	--	--	--	--	1	2
same like	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
Hedges	2	9	9	19	19	36	11	4	15	35	159
maybe	--	--	1	3	10	2	--	1	3	11	31
kind of/kinda	--	3	4	--	--	5	1	--	--	7	20
kind of like	--	--	1	--	--	7	1	--	--	6	15
not really	--	--	--	2	--	2	1	2	1	7	15
probably	--	1	1	7	1	1	1	--	2	--	14
(I) think	--	1	--	1	3	2	1	1	2	2	13
I don't know	--	--	--	3	--	3	--	--	--	2	8

LINGUISTIC DEVICE	D	L	E	S	N	A	O	H	P	M	TOTAL
Hedges (cont.)	2	9	9	19	19	36	11	4	15	35	159
let's put it/let me see/let's see/let me see/let me think/let me try	--	--	--	--	--	5	2	--	--	--	7
only	--	--	--	--	1	4	1	--	1	--	7
about	--	1	--	--	2	1	--	--	2	--	6
just	1	1	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	4
just only	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	4	--	4
around	--	--	--	3	--	--	--	--	--	--	3
I guess	1	--	--	--	--	1	1	--	--	--	3
at least	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	1
hardly	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
I'm not sure	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	1
in a sense	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
in a way	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	1
it depends	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	1
not to mention (say)	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	1
tended to	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
though	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	1
well	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	1
Marked verbal features	6	10	6	7	10	39	20	3	18	28	147
progressives	5	8	4	4	7	34	18	3	18	19	120
questions	1	--	1	--	3	4	2	--	--	5	16
what's that	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	4	4
how to say	--	--	--	3	--	--	--	--	--	--	3
do-support	--	2	1	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	4
Quantifiers	6	9	8	9	25	39	13	5	14	13	141
first	2	1	--	3	1	9	1	1	1	1	20
all	1	--	2	--	3	6	--	1	4	1	18

LINGUISTIC DEVICE	D	L	E	S	N	A	O	H	P	M	TOTAL
Quantifiers (cont.)	6	9	8	9	25	39	13	5	14	13	141
every	–	–	–	–	3	–	1	1	–	6	11
(a) lot of	–	1	1	2	1	4	–	–	1	–	10
most	1	–	1	–	4	1	1	1	1	–	10
little bit	1	–	1	3	2	–	1	–	1	–	9
any	–	–	–	–	3	–	2	–	2	–	7
some	–	–	–	–	1	2	–	–	1	3	7
many	–	2	–	–	2	–	–	1	1	–	6
almost	–	–	–	–	–	–	3	–	–	1	4
little	–	1	2	–	–	–	1	–	1	–	4
part (of)	–	1	–	–	1	2	–	–	–	–	4
whole	1	–	–	–	–	3	–	–	–	–	4
another	–	–	–	–	–	2	1	–	–	–	3
one of	–	–	–	–	1	2	–	–	–	–	3
a bit	–	–	–	–	2	–	–	–	–	–	2
both	–	1	–	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	2
each	–	–	–	–	–	–	2	–	–	–	2
few	–	–	–	–	–	2	–	–	–	–	2
kind of	–	–	–	–	–	2	–	–	–	–	2
much	–	1	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	2
second	–	–	–	–	–	1	–	–	–	1	2
all kind of	–	–	–	–	–	1	–	–	–	–	1
majority	–	–	–	–	–	1	–	–	–	–	1
more	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	1
only	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	–	1
several	–	–	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	1
third	–	–	–	–	–	1	–	–	–	–	1
the rest of	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	–	–	–	1

LINGUISTIC DEVICE	D	L	E	S	N	A	O	H	P	M	TOTAL
Anaphoric phrases	4	3	7	10	7	15	7	1	2	42	98
like that	--	--	3	--	--	3	--	--	--	12	18
that's it/that's all	--	--	--	1	1	2	5	--	1	7	17
sth like that	--	--	--	1	3	4	1	--	--	7	16
that's why	--	--	--	7	3	1	--	--	--	5	16
like this	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	6	7
or something	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	5	6
things like that	2	--	2	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	5
as/like I said/say (before)	--	2	1	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	4
(that) kind of thing	--	--	--	--	--	3	--	--	--	--	3
again	--	1	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2
so that's what we- (as an ending)	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
stuff like that	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	1
that's like what we talk about	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	1
that's what I say	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
Reported speech	--	--	8	4	5	6	4	--	3	52	82
other	--	--	6	4	2	5	4	--	1	25	47
self	--	--	2	--	3	1	--	--	2	27	35
Just	8	2	5	2	1	15	8	1	5	19	66
just = ???	6	--	3	1	1	12	7	1	5	15	51
"only"	1	1	--	1	--	3	--	--	--	2	8
hedge	1	1	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	4
intensifier	--	--	1	--	--	--	1	--	--	1	3
Lists	9	9	1	5	8	6	3	2	5	2	50
list of 2	5	3	1	2	3	4	1	--	3	1	23
list of 3	2	6	--	3	5	1	1	1	1	1	21
list of 4	1	--	--	--	--	1	1	1	1	--	5
list of 6	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1

LINGUISTIC DEVICE	D	L	E	S	N	A	O	H	P	M	TOTAL
Topics	3	1	4	3	3	5	5	3	6	6	39
double topics	2	1	4	--	--	5	4	2	2	4	24
topicalization	1	--	--	3	3	--	1	1	4	2	15
Negative definitions	5	3	5	13	0	2	0	0	4	6	38
Indonesian words	0	0	1	0	0	3	2	9	0	15	30
Indonesian word (no transl.)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	--	10	12
Indonesian word (transl.)	--	--	--	--	--	2	2	--	--	5	9
Indonesian phrase (no transl.)	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	5	--	--	6
Indonesian phrase (transl.)	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	2	--	--	3
Relative clauses	1	2	10	0	1	3	2	2	5	1	27

APPENDIX J

ADDITIONAL IDENTITY EXCERPTS

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      >ten eleven twelve< (.) then you start learning English
71      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       how old were [you
49  A:                [wo::w:
50  R:   (.h) do you remember?
51  A:   ((laughs))
52  R:   ((joins in laughing))
53  A:   <actually:> we start learning English um::
54       (2.5)
55       you know(.) English is not part of the courses
56       (1.0)
57       during uh:: in the elementary schoo:l or junior hi:gh
58       (.h) until probably late high school
59  R:   o:kay
```

138

```
        ((lines omitted))
154  A:  and then:
155      (2.0)
156      and then I: take uh: >it's kinda like< uh (.) extra
157      classes outside of school (.h) like (.) like when you
158      uh:: (.) uh: when you enroll (.) to ASU or to uh other
159      colleges in: the States (.) they require you to have uh
160      some kind of test like TOEFL test=
161  R:  =right=
162  A:  =have you heard of that?=
163  R:  =yes I have=
164  A:  =and they: (.)they wanna know if we are uh (.)
165      proficient enough (.) in English (.) so: (.h) I'm
166      taking uh that classes outside of school and then: my
167      teacher was uh: British actually=
168  R:  =wow=
169  A:  =one of them are British and the other one uh (.) you
170      know American
171  R:  mhm okay (.) so those teachers helped prepare you for
172      the TOEFL test (.) then [through those extra classes
173  A:                          [yes TOEFL test=
174  R:  =okay=
175  A:  =TOEFL te:st SAT test yes ((laughs))
176  R:  now did you: take any other English classes
177      specifically in the English language after college or
178      once you graduated were you ((briefly laughs)) done
179      with studying English (.h) formally
180  A:  mmmm in the (.) in (.) like (.) in MCC when the first
181      time I: arrive there (.) because I'm a international
182      student [(.)
183  R:          [mhm
184  A:  they require me to: take the English for a <Second>
185      Language courses
186  R:  okay
187  A:  (1.0)
188      so um: (.) uh: what- what does it call? (.) English 101
189      and English 102 [(.)
190  R:                  [okay=
191  A:  =that's the courses [(.)
192  R:                      [mhm=
193  A:  =but they have a:: special: uh like
194      (1.0)
195      like uh:: English >101< only for the English speaking
196      people already (.) and then I'm the one that has to
197      take like (.) English 101 for: (.) English as a Second
198      Language
199  R:  okay (.h) [I think it
200  A:            [I don't know if it make sense=
201  R:  =is it 107 and 108? are those the numbers? I think I've
202      (.) heard of those classes [before
203  A:                             [oh:
204      yeah yeah it could- yeah I think it ca:lled uh (.) 107
205      108 (.) I think I remember that too
206  R:  right (.) okay=
207  A:  =mhm=
```

```
208  R:  =so that was kind of- that was the version of 101 for
209       (.) international students then
210  A:  (.) right=
211  R:  =okay=
212  A:  =you got it
213  R:  okay
214       ((both laugh))

         ((lines omitted))

379  R:  now um I was wondering about (.) in your English
380       classes what types of activities you did in (.) your
381       English classes (.h) whether it was <more grammar>
382       based or <conversation> based or (.) kind of a mixture
383       of the two >if you can remember some of the things that
384       you did< (.) the structure of the class
385  A:  (1.0)
386       mmm actually we learned uh: (.) Fri:days (.) I remember
387       uh: (.) my uh (.) American teacher (.) brought a- a
388       game Bunko [boŋko]=
389  R:  =oh=
390  A:  =you know a game Bunko like you shake all the dies and
391       then you have to names all the-
392       (1.0)
393       the words that you catch by your eye (.) and write it
394       down
395  R:  oh (.) I haven't played that before but it sounds fun
396       ((both laugh))
397  A:  yea:h and then it- it was like uh: you know (.) we kind
398       of have to: (.) catch English words and- and then we
399       have to uh (.) confirm it we uh: (.) we: look it up in
400       the dictionary if it's actually a word or not (.) in
401       English ((laughs)) and then uh:: (.) I: I remember
402       <Scrabble> in English class because my uh English
403       teacher uh brought- brought that up to us (.h) and then
404       other than that we: just uh: make a conversations like
405       kind of like uh: (.) uh: (.) role playing (.) in
406       English (.) we just like a conversa- we- we practicing
407       uh: to converse
408  R:  alright (.) so it was more um: practice speaking than
409       just doing all the grammar and (.) um translation and
410       different things like that (.) is that right?=
411  A:  =uh that's for the activity yeah
412  R:  okay
413  A:  but for the: uh (.) grammar tenses like because (.)
414       ultimately we have to (.) learn how to uh (.) you know
415       we have to: pass the test of course the TOEFL test
416       [(.h)
417  R:  [right=
418  A:  =so we learn about that too but more like we: uh you
419       know (.) like a class setting you have to read (.h) you
420       have to uh
421       (1.0)
422       uh fill in the bla:nk you have multiple choice:s you
423       know you just have to uh
```

```
424  A:   (1.0)
425       uh: you know you- you take that kind of like a sample
426       test and then you discuss it (.) why you choose it (.)
427       and then you compare with other (.) student it's kinda
428       like that
429  R:   okay
430  A:   more likely like the pretest
431  R:   mhm (.) it sounds like it was a really fun class
432       ((laughs)) and that [you
433  A:                       [what?
434  R:   it sounds like it was a fun class (.) and
435       [you had a really good teacher
436  A:   [yeah it is fun
437       (.) yeah like um:
438       (1.0)
439       the- the teacher is very easy-going and then you know
440       (.h) uh we have a fieldtrip too and then we cannot even
441       speak (.) a word in Indonesian (.h) uh: if we do: (.)
442       we have to buy everybody's lunches [(.) kind of thing
443  R:                                      [oh no
444  A:   kind of funny ((laughs))
445  R:   that would be really [hard
446  A:                        [only one word in Indonesian and
447       now you just- yeah that's the punishment (.) so it's
448       fun it was a lot of fun
449  R:   uh huh ((laughs)) it sounds like it=
450  A:   =(x) ((laughs))
```

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

```
50   R:   okay (.) and when did you start learning English, O?
51   O:   (1.0)
52       well (.) we learn English in <middle school> [(.)
53   R:                                                [okay=
54   O:   =but we don't (.) we don't <speak Eng:lish> so I start
55       speaking English
56       (3.0)
57       since I (x) 1998 when the first time I (.) arrive in
58       (.) Los Angeles ((laughs)) but I never speak English
59       (.) >I mean< (.) >you know<
60       (1.5)
61       we (.) we try to uh: (.) send le:tters in English
62       sometimes to my aunt (.)=
63   R:   =okay=
64   O:   = because I live with my aunt fo:r
65       (1.0)
66       em six years
67   R:   okay
68   O:   (.) six years (.h) but (.) it's very limited (.) you
69       know just saying 'hi' 'he:llo' 'how are you'=
70   R:   =right=
71   O:   ='I'm sorry' (.) that's all
72   R:   okay
73   O:   ((laughs)) so 1998 I s:tart (.) <spea(.)king>  >in
74       English< like daily ((laughs))=
```

141

```
75    R:    =alright=
76    O:    =because I have to (.) no other choice
77    R:    ((laughs))

            ((lines omitted))

191   R:    >do you remember< what kinds of activities <you did> or
192         (.) um: (.) like was it more conversation-based was it
193         (.) more <grammar> (.) based >was kind of a mixture of
194         the two (.) because I know< there are different
195         <methods of teaching English> so I was wondering kind
196         of wha:t methods they used in your class
197   O:    (1.5)
198         oka:y it was (.) fourteen years ago let me try to
199         remember
200   R:    ((laughs))
201   O:    ((joins in laughing))
202         (1.0)
203         okay first in the morning (.) <the teacher's> gonna
204         start with uh (.) book [buk] we gonna start rea:ding
205         (.)=
206   R:    =mhm=
207   O:    =so each person they gonna read like (.) one paragraph
208         each person and then (.) she will (.) cor- (.) you know
209         correcting us if (.) if she (.) if we (.) read it
210         wro:ng: (.) like the way we pronounce it wrong (.) and
211         she will tell us (.) okay and then after that cause I
212         only spent three hours there [(.)
213   R:                                 [okay=
214   O:    =three times a wee:k not every day
215   R:    okay
216   O:    (.) okay after that then we gonna start um:
217         (1.5)
218         uh conversation
219   R:    mhm
220   O:    (1.0)
221         we gonna a:- (.) we gonna (.) start talking abou:t uh:
222         (1.0)
223         what we have during the weeken:d
224         (1.0)
225         and then uh if somebody doesn't wanna do uh (.)
226         conversation they can (.) write it down (.) like make a
227         short story
228         (1.0)
229         and then we have uh: (.) another thing i:s what did we
230         do again
231         (3.0)
232         uh:: I think most of it is something like that
233   R:    okay
234   O:    yeah (.) but there's a teacher though
235   R:    ri:ght
236   O:    so
237         ((both laugh))
238         (1.5)
239   O:    so it's the- the fu:n part
240   R:    mhm
241   O:    let me see let me think (.) what else did we do?
```

```
242  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:lida: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 (.) when I was like
21        <thi:rteen> years old in the school (.) yeah ((nods)
22        (.) but (.) not active because we just learn: um:
23        whatever the teacher (.) teach us ((nods))

          ((lines omitted))

83   R:   do you remember what types of projects and activities
84        you did in your English classes (.) were they more (.h)
85        conversation-ba:sed more writing-ba:sed more gramma:r?
86   M:   (.) when in the high sch- >not high school in the
87        middle school< (.) the uh: (.) the >teacher always
88        teach us about the grammar okay< just like <subje:ct>
89        and then verb (.) and then something like that=
90   R:   =mhm=
91   M:   =and then (.h) whe::n the college (.) more <listening>
92        (.) we- we go to the lab (.) and then (.) listen the
93        story and then the teacher (.) ask (.) ask like what
94        (.) 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        English, N?
36   N:   (2.0)
37        when I'm in uh junior high school
38   R:   in junior high school (.) 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 (.) so you <learned> it for (.) 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 abou:t wri:ting
 98        (1.0)
 99        I'm having difficulties (.h) but I like (.)
100        conversation (.) I like (.) you know talking °I just°
101        (.) but (.) to place in the word like in writing (.)
102        that is (.) especially because I don't have any (.h) uh
103        other (.) class outside of the school except just only
104        what we have in the school
105   R:   so (.) writing in English was (.) probably the hardest
106        thing for you?
107   P:   yeah for me of course at the time ((clears throat))
108        yeah (.) it's hard (.) until now (.) when you ask me to
```

```
109  P:  writ:e or essay in English (.) yeah I'm not really
110       ((shakes head 'no'))
111       (1.0)
112       yeah
113       ((both laugh))
114  P:  (.) but I just speak and then hear (.) translate
115       ((both laugh))
116  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 (.h)
79       like- like I said if you didn't have a transition of
80       another (.h) uh Western (.) or whatev- 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 (.) 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 pa:st (.h) 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:: (.)
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 agai:n (.) so um you know (.) you
165       have to understand
166  R:  mhm
```

```
167  N:   uh: I think the tenses is the most difficult and then
168       the grammar as well and also the vocabulary because
169       sometimes the vocabulary is (xxxx) (.) uh:: sometimes
170       I:'m not sure what the vocabulary because uncommon
171       especially like (.h) if we um:: have uh like something
172       health (.) for your body:: and then: uh you have to um:
173       talk to your (.) doctor:: about your sickne::ss (.) and
174       sometime you don't know how to (.h) how to speak like
175       uh:: intestine (.) not (.h) not everybody know that
176       ((laughs))
177  R:   right ((laughs))
178  N:   um (.hh) yeah I mean uh: (.) maybe if you: if you speak
179       English every day and you always use it (.h) uh the
180       vocabulary the vocabulary the uh common one (.h) it
181       fine but if it's uncommon I don't think even uh: people
182       understand what there
183  R:   mhm
```

(12) A: Difficulties (self and Indonesians)

```
210  R:   so A, I was wondering what (.h) attitu:des 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=
222  R:   =right=
223  A:   =so I need to learn that ((laughs))
224  R:   ((briefly joins in laughing))
225  A:   so:: (.) by knowing: uh: that I have to: (.) you
226       know I have to: I have to know about it (.) so just
227       going by it (.) kinda like that
228  R:   mhm
229  A:   (.) yea:h (.) but the: (.) the first uh few months (.)
230       like uh: in college I know that I had uh >kind of like
231       difficulty< [(.)
232  R:             [right=
233  A:   =>you know like the challenges [(.)
234  R:                                  [mhm=
235  A:   =speaking English because you don't know how to
236       express< (.) >you know what you <think> you wanna say
237       (.) but you don't know how to express it<
238  R:   right
239  A:   (.) you know it's kinda like you're thinking <first>
240       >in Indonesian< and then translate it in English [(.)
241  R:                                                     [right
242  A:   and then you have to uh say it like you're thinking
243       like three times basically (.) before you say something
244       ((laughs))
245  R:   ((joins in laughing)) right
```

```
246  A:   I don't know if- if that make sense but just like <y-
247       yeah> what I want to say and then (.) you know
248       ((laughs))
249  R:   right=
250  A:   =you have to translate it first to like in Indonesian
251       it is like this but in English (.) like- like that
252  R:   right=
253  A:   =yeah=
254  R:   =yeah it's hard when languages are a little bit
255       different (.) I've experienced that with Spanish >and
256       with Indonesian too< (.) learning both those languages
257       and (.) I tend to like to translate things literally
258       from English into >you know< Spanish for example a:nd
259       it doesn't [always work that way ((laughs))
260  A:             [yeah
261  R:   because they're
262  A:   ((laughs))
263  R:   different languages ((laughs))
264  A:   I know (.) I know (.) and then (.h) uh: (.) bless my-my
265       friend's heart like (.) waiting from (.) for my
266       responses and then 'are you there?' you know 'it's okay
267       you know you can say it you know whatever' like (.)
268       like that
269  R:   ((laughs))
270  A:   friends waiting uh: (.) normally my response like until
271       I get it (.) 'okay what I meant to say is this'
272       ((both laugh))
273  A:   yeah
274  R:   did you think English was <hard> to learn (.h) or
275       >[did you think it was fairly easy?<
276  A:    [umm for
277       (1.0)
278       for <Indonesian> let me see uh::
279       (3.0)
280       I think (.) compared to the (.) my- my native language
281       Indonesian we only have like past and present
282       [(1.0)
283  R:   [mhm
284  A:   you know very simple (.) very simple language (.)
285       according: well (.) >according to me<
286       ((both laugh))
287  A:   um (.) but English have like uh: (.) tenses (.) tenses
288       like (.) past tense (.) past present tense something
289       like that >it is like< a lot of uh:
290       (1.0)
291       you know (.) different timing and different uh way to
292       say it
293  R:   right=
294  A:   =according to uh: (.h) I don't know h- (.) uh- (.) did
295       you follow what I'm trying to say though
296  R:   right I understand what you're saying about how English
297       has verb tense and Indonesian really doesn't
298  A:   (.) right (.) right (.) so sometimes we just put it
299       like uh (.) as simple as like present and (.) past
300       tense and that's it
```

147

(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 gra:mmar to:tally
131   R:   mhm
132   O:   (1.5)
133        that's just the bi:ggest 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
```