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Abstract

This longitudinal study investigated the acquisition of interpersonal markers by adolescent German students on a five or ten month exchange to Australia. Interpersonal markers were defined as syntactically optional elements of speech that provided implicit information about the relationship between the speakers and the message. The study also explored how structured and semi-structured data collection methods impacted on interpersonal marker use.

The data consisted of audio-recordings of informal conversational interviews and the retelling of a story based on Mr Bean DVD clips. A language contact questionnaire was also used to help explain variation in acquisition.

Three groups of sixteen to seventeen year old adolescents were recruited for the study: an experimental group of twenty-six German exchange students to Australia, a control group of twenty adolescents in Germany and native-speaker data from a group of twelve Australian adolescents. The experimental group was further divided into fourteen teenagers on a ten month exchange and twelve adolescents on a five month exchange to Australia.

The exchange students acquired a large number of those interpersonal markers most associated with adolescent language within the first five months of their exchange. However, even after ten months of the exchange, levels of interpersonal marker use did not always match that of native speakers. Lower levels of interpersonal markers were found for students participating on a five month exchange compared to those on a ten month programme. This was most likely due to lower levels of personal investment and social integration in the five month cohort. Little or no acquisition was observed for German high school students who did not participate in an extended exchange. On a methodological level, a reliable system for the coding of pragmatic markers was developed. The study also highlighted issues of task effects in interview versus retelling data collection and of collecting information via written language contact profiles.

The research adds to the growing repertoire of study abroad and developmental pragmatic competence literature and is of particular interest to exchange programme development as well as curriculum design for second language teaching.
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Chapter 1  Introduction

1.1  Construct and significance

Pragmatic markers are critical components of speech that not only greatly enrich understanding, but provide scope for expression of identity and give voice to the cultural values and beliefs that underlie speech. They are essential to the success of communication, a role which becomes most apparent in situations where one or more speakers are not conversing in their mother tongue. In this study, interpersonal markers were a subset of pragmatic markers. Their primary function was to establish or maintain interlocutor relations and give voice to the expression of the self.

This study investigated the acquisition of interpersonal markers by twenty-six adolescent German exchange students to Australia. It adds to the growing repertoire of study abroad and developmental pragmatic competence literature and is of interest to exchange programme development as well as the fields of language and identity, adolescent language and second language acquisition. In particular, it broadens the scope of current scholarly research to involve study abroad participants from a new combination of sending and receiving countries (Kinginger, 2009).

One of the most persuasive arguments in favour of study abroad is the opportunity to acquire high levels of proficiency in another language (Freed, 1998). However, very little is known about the mechanisms that facilitate or inhibit this acquisition, especially in the development of pragmatic competence (Barron, 2003; Regan, 1998).

While pragmatic markers have become one of the central areas of pragmatics (Östman, 1995), most research to date has focused on pragmatic ability in a second language (e.g. Müller, 2005; Nikula, 1996), general use of markers and other pragmatic features by native-speakers (e.g. Chen & Weiyun He, 2001; Kasper & Rose, 2002; Montolio Durán & Unamuno, 2001; Tanaka, 2000; Wouk, 2001) or bilingual speakers (e.g. Goss & Salmons, 2000; Hlavac, 2006; Maschler, 2000). This research shifted this focus to the development of pragmatic ability and the acquisition of interpersonal markers by non-native speakers of Australian English.

It is through such a shift that a foundation for the instruction of second language pragmatics can be established (Kasper & Rose, 2002). The shift means an increased focus on learners’ interlanguage: a language that does not simply reflect a speaker’s first
language or the target language, but is characterised by its own particular interlanguage system (Selinker, 1972). A detailed understanding of this system is necessary for making principled decisions in language teaching and curriculum design (Siepmann, 2005).

The interlanguage of even advanced foreign language learners is characterised by a ‘Partikelarmut’ or ‘dearth of particles’ (Nikula, 1993; Romero Trillo, 2002; Rost-Roth, 1999), which could impact directly on the success of intercultural communication (Wierzbicka, 2003). Delving into the reasons for the success or failure of intercultural communication is of particular importance to German non-native speakers of English. Due to basic differences in conversational style (Tannen, 1984), German non-native speakers of English are stereotypically viewed as impolite by speakers of American and British English (Byrnes, 1986; House, 1996). Differences include cultural preferences for directness/indirectness, orientation towards the self or other, orientation towards content or addressee(s), degree of explicitness and implicitness and use of ad-hoc formulations or verbal routines (House, 1996). In-depth analysis of German-English interaction may help break down the stereotypes that inhibit communication between speakers of these two linguistic backgrounds (House & Kasper, 1981).

Another area of research relevant to this study is that of adolescent language. Adolescents play a pivotal role in language change (Andersen, 2001) and their speech is particularly suited to the study of pragmatic markers (Andersen, 1997, 1998; Tagliamonte, 2005), especially those that establish and maintain the relationship between speakers (Andersen, 2001). In a study abroad context, establishment of friendships between exchange students and local teenagers is critical to a sense of belonging and to the overall success of the exchange experience. Indeed, the extent of native-like use of pragmatic markers in English by the exchange students can be seen as an “accurate indicator of the extent to which a speaker is integrated into the local speech community” (Sankoff, Thibault, Nagy & Blondeau, 1997, p. 193).

To date, most studies of adolescent language have focused on first language usage and not non-native speaker acquisition. This research opens this under-represented field of research. Additionally, considering the fact that pragmatic markers are undoubtedly a means of both expressing and managing the presentation of self (Overstreet & Yule, 2001), this study touches on a subject central to both adolescent
language and study abroad: how does an adolescent, whose sense of self is at a critical stage of development in their first language and culture, develop a capacity for identity expression and impression management when transported to a new cultural and linguistic environment? This question is particularly relevant to the study abroad context, in which an adolescent’s developing sense of identity may become fragmented or even torn apart in the new cultural and linguistic environment (Murphy-Lejeune, 2002).

On a methodological note, this research adds to the still under-represented repertoire of longitudinal studies within the fields of both second language developmental research and study abroad (Coleman, 1997). A number of researchers emphasize the need for more longitudinal studies (e.g. Bardovi-Harlig, 1999; Barron, 2000; Cohen, 1996; Rose, 2000), based mainly on the fact that longitudinal designs allow for the direct observation of developmental patterns over time as well as the establishment of strong causal relationships and reliable inferences (Kasper & Rose, 2002). It also answers the call for study abroad and pragmatic marker research that combines quantitative and qualitative approaches (Macaulay, 2002).

Finally, the research responds to Kasper and Schmidt’s (1996) call for an acquisitional research agenda in interlanguage pragmatics that investigates both the changes within the second language pragmatic system and influences on that system (Bardovi-Harlig, 1999). In doing so, it strengthens the currently weak links between interlanguage pragmatics, second language acquisition and cross-cultural pragmatics (Bardovi-Harlig, 1999).

1.2 Research hypotheses

This study focused on changes in the frequency and function of interpersonal markers by German exchange students during a five or ten month exchange to Australia. In doing so, it provided answers to four hypotheses.

1.2.1 Hypothesis One

*Exchange students on a ten month exchange (GES10) learn those markers most associated with expression of adolescent identity in the first five months of the exchange.*
Changes in the use of markers used by GES10 over the first five months of a ten month exchange were analysed and compared to acquisition in the second half of the exchange. Results are reported in Chapter seven.

1.2.2 Hypothesis Two

Adolescents learning English in Germany (GS) also acquire a number of key markers of adolescent language to a significant degree, but not to the same level as GES10.

Changes over ten months in GS were analysed and compared to GES10 at the ten month data collection point. Results are reported in Chapter eight.

1.2.3 Hypothesis Three

GES10 matches Australian English speaker (AES) use of a number of key adolescent markers after spending 10 months in Australia.

The ten month data of GES10 was compared to native-speaker AES recordings. Results are reported in Chapter nine.

1.2.4 Hypothesis Four

Exchange students on a five month exchange (GES05) use significantly less interpersonal markers than exchange students on a ten month exchange (GES10) after five months in Australia. This is due to differences in personal investment and social integration.

Interpersonal marker use of GES05 and GES10 were compared after both groups had spent five months in Australia. The interview content and language contact questionnaires were used to see if differences between the two groups could be explained by differences in participants’ degree of integration in the Australian host family and adolescent community. Results are reported in Chapter ten.

1.3 Contents of thesis

This thesis is divided into eleven chapters. Chapter two provides a discussion of the thorny issue of defining pragmatic markers and outlines how the term ‘pragmatic marker’ was operationalized in this study. Chapter three focuses on the areas of research most relevant to this study: second language acquisition, study abroad and adolescent
language and identity. In Chapter four, the thesis moves on to discuss the research strategy and the ways in which external and internal validity of design were ensured. Chapter five provides an overview of how pragmatic markers were subdivided into discourse markers and interpersonal markers in this study and includes a detailed report of the inter-coder reliability process. Chapter six focuses on four analyses conducted to ascertain the reliability of the data before the core analysis could commence. The first of these checked for outliers. The second analysis tested whether the control (GS) and experimental groups (GES10, GES05) were the same at the outset of the study. The third analysis reported in Chapter six focused on task-effects in the two data collection instruments (i.e. sociolinguistic interviews and retellings) and the fourth analysis focused on the reliability of language contact questionnaires and scores. We then move on to the first core analysis in Chapter seven, where results for Hypothesis One and the impact of a ten month exchange on interpersonal marker acquisition are discussed. Chapter eight reports on a comparison of the interpersonal marker acquisition of GES10 to that of students who did not go on exchange (GS). This provided answers to Hypothesis Two. The analysis reported in Chapter nine answered Hypothesis Three by focusing on differences between GES10 and Australian English native-speakers (AES) at the end of data collection. Chapter ten is the final analysis chapter. It focuses on differences in social integration and interpersonal marker acquisition by students on a five (GES05) or ten month exchange (GES10), which provided answers to Hypothesis Four. Chapter eleven includes an overview and discussion of the results, concludes the study and provides directions for further research.
Chapter 2  Pragmatics and pragmatic markers

2.1 Developmental interlanguage pragmatics

*Pragmatics is the study of language from the point of view of users, especially of the choices they make, the constraints they encounter in using language in social interaction and the effects their use of language has on other participants in the act of communication.*

(Crystal, 2010, p. 301)

Pragmatics is the study of language in use (Crystal, 2010). It sees language as a system of choices made by users, which are constrained by the context in which language occurs. A basic tenet of pragmatics is the belief that communication takes place on explicit and implicit levels simultaneously (Östman, 1995). An utterance is always explicitly anchored to its propositional content and, at the same time, implicitly tied to attitudes, opinions and the context at large. The main, but certainly not exclusive, focus of pragmatics is on this implicit level (Blakemore, 2002), for example, how interlocutors draw inferences, adapt to new situations via language, negotiate meaning (Östman, 1995) and express subjectivity through language.

Pragmatics assumes that communication is an inherently social activity, requiring the coordinated efforts of two or more individuals (Gumperz, 1982). Proficiency goes beyond a basic grammatical competence necessary to decode messages: it requires knowledge of the social conditions governing language use (‘sociopragmatics’) and the linguistic means to express oneself appropriately (‘pragmalinguistics’) (Thomas, 1983). Problems may arise when interlocutors don’t share the same sociopragmatic or pragmalinguistic codes, such as when people do not have a history of interacting regularly over time (Cameron, 2000) or in interlanguage situations.

Interlanguage situations involve communication between interlocutors with different cultural and linguistic backgrounds (Gumperz, 1982). Since at least one of the interlocutors is communicating in a second language, such situations usually involve the bringing together of differing linguistic and cultural perspectives. These different perspectives may mean that there are “radically conflicting interpretations of

---

1 As defined by Fraser (1996), the proposition or propositional content is the content meaning of a sentence and represents a state of the world to which the speaker wants to draw attention.
what is happening” (Young, 1994, p. xiv), resulting in misunderstandings of interactional intent.

A contributing factor to such miscommunication is difference in the use of signals or contextualisation cues (Gumperz, 1982) to create coherence, organise discourse and establish interpersonal relationships, e.g. using lexical cues to show how one proposition relates to the previous one or signalling points of turn-taking and turn-yielding. Conventions necessary for understanding contextualisation cues are acquired through socialisation (Ochs, 1996) (e.g. at school or home, through peers) and difficulties arise when one speaker’s understanding of contextual inferences does not accord with that of other participants. In such cases, conversational expectations are felt to be violated and the ‘offenders’ are often seen as being rude or inconsiderate (Young, 1994). While comprehension is still achieved on a propositional level, there may be a complete misunderstanding of intended interactional messages as well as misinterpretation of the speaker’s interest in maintaining a harmonious relationship and the projection of his/her personal stance, attitude and identity. In such situations, there is a tendency to project misunderstandings on individuals, resulting in both the creation and reinforcement of intercultural stereotypes (Gumperz, 1982; Young, 1994).

Interlanguage describes not only a constellation of differences in speakers’ linguistic backgrounds, but it also refers to the learners’ version of the target language (Selinker, 1972). This version may include features from either the native or target language as well as features that are not present in either language (Selinker, 1992). Interlanguage pragmatics is the study of a learner’s interlanguage with either a focus on how non-native speakers implicitly comprehend and produce action in a target language (language use) or how they develop the ability to understand and perform action in a target language (language development) (Kasper, 1998; Kasper & Rose, 2002). This research falls into the second category: non-native speaker pragmatic development in English – an area which, compared to studies in first language developmental pragmatics, remains under-represented (e.g. Becker, 1990; Clancy, 1986; Ervin-Tripp, Guo & Lampert, 1990; Kwarciax, 1993; Ochs & Schieffelin, 1983; Snow, Perlman, Berko-Gleason & Hooshyar, 1990).

Within the field of developmental interlanguage pragmatics, this research focuses on the acquisition of pragmatic markers by non-native speakers of English in interlanguage situations. Pragmatic markers are “the surface manifestations par
excellence of the underlying, implicit aspects of our messages” (Östman, 1995, p. 100) and represent one type of contextualisation cue that we use to create coherence, organise discourse, infer meaning and show attitude, identity and stance.

2.2 Pragmatic markers

2.2.1 Terminology

A multitude of terms have been used to describe pragmatic markers, e.g. ‘pragmatic particles’ (Östman, 1995), ‘particles’ or ‘discourse particles’ (Aijmer, 2002; Schourup, 1985), ‘discourse markers’ (Jucker & Ziv, 1998; Müller, 2005; Schiffrin, 1987; Schourup, 1999), ‘discourse connectives’ (Blackmore, 1992; Unger, 1996), ‘contextualization cues’ (Gumperz, 1982), ‘pragmatic force modifiers’ (Nikula, 1996) and ‘discourse operators’ (Redeker, 1990).

Similar to Andersen (1997, 1998), Andersen & Fretheim (2000), Brinton (1996), Erman (2001), Fraser (1996), Redeker (1990) and Watts (1988), ‘pragmatic marker’ was employed as an umbrella term for all those “seemingly empty expressions found in oral discourse” (Brinton, 1996, p. 29) in this study. The word ‘pragmatic’ was chosen as it pointed to the fact that all markers had pragmatic functions (Östman, 1995; Zwicky, 1985) and implied that they had a low degree of lexical specificity and were highly contextually sensitive (Andersen, 2001). ‘Marker’ was used as it allowed the inclusion of both single-word and phrasal-items and wouldn’t be confused with the syntactic class of ‘particles’ (e.g. ‘modal particles’ in German) (Brinton, 1996; Schourup, 1999). The term ‘marker’ was also sufficiently broad to include a range of linguistic phenomena (Brinton, 1996).

In line with Fraser (1999), ‘discourse marker’ was used to describe a subclass of pragmatic marker that helped establish coherence of the conversational structure and signaled the relationship of the basic message to the foregoing discourse. This excluded markers that functioned primarily on the interpersonal level of communication (Aijmer, 2002; Andersen, 2001).

Pragmatic markers that functioned primarily on the interpersonal or interactional level were called ‘interpersonal markers’ in this study. Interpersonal markers were those that expressed the speakers’ attitudes and their attempts to impact on the attitudes and behaviours of hearers (Halliday, 1973). Often described as phatic (e.g. Aijmer, 2002; Bazzanella, 1990), such markers did not necessarily make the discourse more cohesive or signal any structural positioning of sentences in an
exchange (Wierzbicka, 1986, p. 524) but focused on the relationship between the interlocutors and/or the expression of identity and beliefs. They included:

- **Evidentials,** which expressed the speakers’ attitudes toward knowledge (Chafe, 1986) and/or the degree of certainty or commitment to their message (e.g. ‘I mean’, ‘I think’, ‘sort of’) (Beeching, 2002)
- **Other expressions** that performed more affective (e.g. ‘you know’ to express solidarity) or facilitative functions (e.g. ‘yeah’ to relinquish a turn) (Beeching, 2002).

### 2.2.2 Pragmatic markers in Australian English and German

Pragmatic markers are pervasively present in ordinary conversation in a number of languages (Nikula, 1996; Overstreet, 2005). They play a central role as interacting, cognising human agents in the communication process (King, 1992). They are a defining element of human speech (Wierzbicka, 1986, p. 519) and provide the conversational glue that integrates structure, meaning and action into a comprehensible whole (King, 1992; Schiffrin, 1987).

While Wierzbicka (1986) claims that their role in English is “unusually limited” (p. 519), Aijmer (2002) found that pragmatic markers in British English constitute the fourth most frequently used word-class after verbs, pronouns and nouns. Differences in both the function and use of specific markers may exist between different world Englishes (Lenk, 1998a; Tottie, 1986), especially between the British, New Zealand and American English varieties and sub-varieties (Erman, 1998; Macaulay, 2002). For example, comparing discourse quotatives in Australian, British, North American and Canadian adolescent English, Winter (2002) found that, the discourse quotative ‘go’ is the most frequently used in Australian English, while ‘say’ is the most dominant form in Canadian English. ‘Be + like’ is less frequent in Australian English than in North American, Canadian and British English varieties. The null/zero form occupies a firm position in Australian and Canadian English, but is rare in American English.

To the best of the researcher’s knowledge, no other studies of pragmatic markers in Australian adolescent English have been conducted. However, other more general studies of Australian English point to regional, gender and socio-economic lexical language variation among speakers of Australian English (Oliver, McKay & Rochecouste, 2002). This indicates that there may be differences in the function and
use of pragmatic markers not only between varieties of English, but also within the
Australian English-speaking context.

German is renowned for prolific use of modal particles (e.g. ‘denn’, ‘auch’,
‘ebenso’), which indicate the speaker’s attitude towards an utterance as well as his/her
intended perception (Möllering, 2001). Modal particles in German are of prime
importance to politeness and face-saving. Indeed, if a non-native speaker merely
focuses on syntactic mode to encode a speech act in German and fails to perceive the
modifications brought about by the use of modal particles (House & Kasper, 1981),
he/she may mistakenly perceive the speech act as being very direct (Rall, 1981).

Some similarities and close matching exist between German and English
pragmatic markers. Focusing on the frequency and distribution of general extenders
such as ‘and stuff’/’und so’ and ‘or something’/’oder so’, Overstreet (2005) found
that, despite formal level differences (e.g. grammatical distribution, degree of
prosodic prominence, form of extender), they seem to have cross-linguistic functional
similarities with comparable contexts of occurrence in German and English. In both
languages, these expressions are highly formulaic and are used to mark assumptions
of being similar, informative, accurate and polite or as intensification or evaluative
devices (Overstreet, 2005). However, Overstreet (2005) is careful to point out that
cross-linguistic one-to-one matching is problematic and there may be essential
differences that could not be fully captured by her limited data. For example, overall
frequency of usage may be higher in English and there may be a number of general
extenders that have no counterpart in the other language.

Scherer (1979) found that the frequency of pause fillers in German and
American English was similar but there were more periods of silence in the American
data. Scherer (1979) suggests that this may be due not only to differences in the
degree of syntactic complexity and structure of the two languages, which in turn leads
to differences in cognitive processing capacity, but also to differing cultural
expectations or sanctions concerning speech fluency.

Even though German and English share some similar pragmatic markers (e.g.
‘yeah’/’ja’ or ‘and stuff’/’oder so’, ‘also’/’auch’), the discourse and interpersonal
functions of these markers may differ greatly. There may also be differences in terms
of intonational integration, syntactic positions and sentence type restrictions (Fischer,
2007). For example, in the case of the pragmatic markers ‘also’ and ‘auch’, English-
speakers assume an implicit parallel conjunct between the propositions ‘also’ joins,
but this is not the case in German (Blass, 1990). Unlike the restricted discourse use of ‘also’ in English, ‘auch’ in German can be used to strengthen or confirm preceding propositions. In these cases, it is best translated with the English pragmatic markers ‘after all’, ‘indeed’ or ‘even’ (Blass, 1990).

Difficulties in the translation of markers or marker function is by no means particular to German and English (e.g. Bazzanella, 1990; Brinton, 1996; Nikula, 1996; Siepmann, 2005; Svartvik, 1980). It is rare to find an exact equivalent in another language (Wierzbicka, 2003) and languages may use apparently equivalent markers in different ways or to a different extent (Lamiroy, 1994). Often the functions of one marker in one language can be distributed among a variety of markers in another (Schiffrin, 2003) or even fulfil entirely different interpersonal functions (Nikula, 1996). For example, ‘so’ in English may be translated into ‘also’, ‘denn’ (modal), ‘dann’ (modal), ‘aber’ (modal), ‘na und’ or a zero form in German and the English discourse marker ‘well’ becomes ‘also’, ‘naja’, ‘na’, ‘komm’, ‘ach’, ‘na also’, ‘ja’, ‘ija’, ‘schön’ or ‘gut’ in German (Fischer & Drescher, 1996). In these and other examples, German offers a range of markers for the one marker in English and these are taken from entirely different grammatical categories than the English marker. Additionally, while one language may rely on lexical-phrasal items for modifications, other languages may achieve the same interpersonal functions by other means. For example, noun phrase demonstratives in Bunaq and choice of converbs or participle forms in Buryat perform the same interpersonal functions as lexical devices such as ‘actually’ in English (Evans, 2010).

This lack of form-function mapping across languages can cause specific interlanguage problems (Perdue, Benazzo & Giuliano, 2002) and may be a reason for the difficulties encountered by learners in understanding the importance and use of pragmatic markers in a second language. This means that German non-native speakers of English may unwittingly transfer functions of markers from German into English (Nikula, 1996) and fail to fulfil pragmatic functions of markers in English.

Indeed, markers play a pivotal role in cross-cultural and interlanguage encounters and an ability to understand and use them correctly is an indication of pragmatic competence (Möllering & Nunan, 1995). They have a high societal value (Mey, 1993) and if they are absent or used unexpectedly, the potential for miscommunication and misunderstandings is high (Fraser, 1990; Gumperz, 1982; Svartvik, 1980). Not only can the absence of markers make an utterance seem
unnatural, awkward, disjointed, impolite, unfriendly or dogmatic (Brinton, 1996; Svartvik, 1980), but misunderstandings arising from deviant- or non-use tend to be interpreted in attitudinal not linguistic terms (Gumperz, 1982). In turn, such miscommunication and misunderstanding can threaten the speakers’ identities, self-confidence and willingness to interact (Jackson, 2008).

2.2.3 Properties of pragmatic markers

Despite general agreement concerning the primary importance of pragmatic markers to successful discourse (Östman, 1995), a number of highly variable definitions exist, resulting in large differences in the inclusion or exclusion of particular lexical items. For example, Fraser’s (1996) definition of markers excludes ‘oh’, ‘y’know’, ‘well’, ‘I mean’ and ‘because’, whereas all of these are classed as markers by Schiffrin (1987). Similarly, while Schiffrin’s (1987) broad definition includes ‘y’know’ when used literally (e.g. ‘You know my host family?’), Redeker (1990) excludes this particular usage of ‘y’know’. Indeed, Schiffrin’s (1987) broad definition suggests that even paralinguistic features and non-verbal gestures are pragmatic markers (p. 328).

Schourup (1985) also prefers to keep the definition of pragmatic markers (or, in his terms ‘common discourse particles’) broad. He defines pragmatic markers as items used to indicate the relationship between a speaker’s mental processes prior to and during discourse production. They are items that disclose processes of “covert thinking” (p. 103). While Schiffrin’s (1987) and Schourup’s (1985) definitions risk considering every non-propositional or non-lexical item as an expression of invisible thinking and fail to distinguish markers effectively (Lenk, 1998a), they allow researchers to focus on a range of items and avoid the creation of unnaturally clear definitions of language items that are continually changing and inherently fuzzy.

For the most part, scholars side-step definition and inventory issues by restricting their interest to pragmatic markers that have been studied previously (e.g. Brinton, 1996; Hellermann et al., 2007; Müller, 2005), focusing only on those that have already undergone a process of routinisation or grammaticalisation (e.g. Aijmer, 2002; Andersen, 1997) or using a ‘bottom-up’ approach that focuses on a somewhat haphazard (Redeker, 1991) description of one or more particles that appear in the data (e.g. Hellerman & Vergun, 2007; Müller, 2005; Nikula, 1996; Schiffrin, 1987).

The difficulty of defining and understanding pragmatic markers is by no
means a new phenomenon (King, 1992; Locke, 1689/1996; Michael, 1970) and is mostly due to:

- differences in scholarly focus or approach (Jucker & Ziv, 1998).
- the functional-pragmatic as opposed to formal morphosyntactic basis of defining markers (Mosegaard Hansen, 1998).
- the multiplicity of pragmatic marker functions (e.g. connectors, turn-takers, confirmation-seekers, intimacy signals, topic-switchers, hesitation markers, boundary markers, fillers, prompters, repair markers, attitude markers and hedging devices) (Beeching, 2002).
- the difficulty of defining pragmatic markers by function alone as many of their functions are fulfilled by other linguistic features, such as modal verbs or adverbs, speech formulas and non-lexicalised metalinguistics devices (Fischer, 2006).

Even though broad structural and functional characteristics of pragmatic markers in a wide range of languages can be gleaned from the existing literature (e.g. Brinton; 1996; Jucker & Ziv, 1998), almost all of these remain under some degree of dispute. We will now focus on some of these characteristics of pragmatic markers in more detail.

2.2.3.1 Propositional content

A number of researchers claim that markers have little or no propositional content themselves and do not add to the informational content of an utterance (Erman, 2001; Fraser, 1990; Östman, 1981; Romero Trillo, 2002; Sankoff et al., 1997; Schiffrin, 1987, 1986). However, non-propositionality cannot ever be used as a defining criterion for pragmatic markers as it involves a highly problematic separation of propositional and pragmatic or evaluative meaning (Caron-Prague & Caron, 1991; Müller, 2005; Nikula, 1996; Scheibman, 2002; Vološinov, 1973). Any word in speech possesses both referential and evaluative content (Vološinov, 1973) and pragmatic markers have decisive truth conditional implications (Andersen, 2001). They provide critical information to the listener, allowing him/her to quickly interpret the utterance as being relevant to the context of the ongoing discourse (Watts, 1988). They are indexical of situational dimensions (Aijmer & Simon-Vandenbergen, 2004) and are linked to attitudes, evaluation, types of speakers and other dimensions of the communication situation (Aijmer, 2002; Norrby, 2000; Stubbe & Holmes, 1995,
1990). They reflect a speaker’s metapragmatic awareness of communication as a process that takes place in a particular context (Aijmer & Simon-Vandenbergen, 2004). This means that the identification of propositional meaning is inextricably tied to pragmatic markers and any lack of pragmatic or semantic knowledge of pragmatic marker use would make it difficult to understand what is actually intended in an utterance (Wang, 2005).

An alternate approach to the thorny issue of propositional content is to define markers as items that may affect propositional content, but whose specialty is modification of pragmatic force (Nikula, 1996). However, this can only apply to those markers that function on interpersonal or politeness levels of discourse, and not those whose main role is to provide local or global coherence (Lenk, 1998b). Since a single marker may act on textual, interpersonal and/or politeness levels depending on the context in which it appears, completely excluding one functional level is undoubtedly problematic.

Similar to Aijmer (2002) this study takes the position that pragmatic markers impact on propositional content, but pragmatic functions overshadow their literal meanings. Such pragmatic functions are defined by the fact that they display the subjective covert thinking of the speaker (Schourup, 1985). Covert thinking includes stance, evaluation, appraisal, perspective, modality, affect and evidentiality (Scheibman, 2002).

### 2.2.3.2 Syntactic integration

Equally debatable is the idea that pragmatic markers are syntactically free (Brinton, 1996; Fraser, 1996; Schiffrin, 1987). Pragmatic markers have no grammatical function (Brinton, 1996) and are not drawn from a single grammatical source, e.g. they may be adverbials, idiomatic phrases, verbs, interjections or conjunctions (Fraser, 1996; Svartvik, 1980). As such they are typically seen as being independent of sentential structure (Brinton, 1996; Chalker & Weiner, 1994; Schiffrin, 1987) and function mostly on a discourse as opposed to syntactic level of interaction (Schiffrin, 1987).

While non-inclusion of pragmatic markers may not make a sentence ungrammatical (Brown & Yule, 1983; Fraser, 1988; Schiffrin, 1987), they are often pragmatically essential and their absence can render discourse less understandable or indeed impenetrable to the listener (Brinton, 1996). The syntactic position of a marker
is also inextricably tied to its pragmatic function and is therefore often highly restricted. Indeed, markers are by no means haphazard or loosely placed at any point in the discourse. They are often strategically placed “with great precision at different places in the discourse” (Aijmer, 2002, p. 1) and provide important clues to how discourse is to be segmented, processed and understood (Watts, 1988). Strategic placement results in markers being found in utterance-initial position (Bell, 1998; Brinton, 1996; Jucker & Ziv, 1998; Schiffrin, 1987) at the beginning of a turn (Biber, Johansson, Leech, Conrad & Finegan, 1999), at clause boundaries (Erman, 1992), parenthetically within a clause (Schourup, 1999) or as separate tone units (Du Bois, Cumming, Schuetze-Coburn & Paolino, 1992). Watts (1988, 1989) maintains that pragmatic markers placed in sentence final position (‘right-hand position’) are perceptually more salient than those in sentence initial position (‘left-hand position’). Parenthetically placed markers allow speakers to interrupt the idea or structure they are developing and/or highlight the importance of what is to follow to the hearer.

The critical role played by markers in a sentence and their strategic placement within syntactical structures may mean that they are not necessarily outside syntactic structure, but that our existing syntactic models are simply inadequate to account for them (Lewis, 2007). Macaulay (2002) and Watts (1988) also argue that markers can function both inside and outside canonical sentence structure and are not always easily extracted from the sentence. This is especially the case for conjunctives and other markers that focus on local textual coherence.

Fischer (2006) argues that a marker usually lies on a spectrum between being integrated into the host utterance or constituting independent utterances. Those that are integrated usually fulfil textual connecting functions, are typical of written texts and focus on the utterance in which they appear. Independent markers have conversation management functions (e.g. turn-taking, interpersonal management), are typical of spoken interaction and recognise large host units such as topic and sequential structure, extra-linguistic activities and participation frameworks. Independent markers can also have their own internal syntactic or clausal structure (e.g. ‘on the other hand’, ‘y’know’) (Schourup, 1999). As discussed in Chapter five, in this study ‘integrated’ markers fell into the subcategory of ‘discourse markers’ whereas ‘unintegrated’ markers were ‘interpersonal markers’. Simply as a means of reducing the number of markers included in this study, syntactic independence was used as a defining characteristic for all interpersonal markers.
2.2.3.3 Multifunctionality

Dispute also exists concerning the multi-functionality of pragmatic markers. While some researchers consider markers to be multifunctional (e.g. Aijmer, 2002; Burridge & Florey, 2002; Erman, 2001; Lenk, 1998a; Schiffrin, 2003), others maintain that they are essentially uni-functional in the context in which they appear (Fraser, 1996). While multi-functionality has been a point of contention in scholarly circles, it does not seem to present a problem for speakers and listeners who not only seem to know what a marker means, but are also able to use it appropriately in different contexts (Aijmer, 2002). The fact that listeners seem to interpret marker usage with ease may indicate that, even if markers can express several meanings simultaneously, one function is primary (Burridge & Florey, 2002; Lenk, 1998a). Contextual clues that enable the hearer to interpret the function of a particular marker include the collocation in which it appears, text type or type of interaction, prosody and, for some markers, the type of speaker (e.g. age, gender, social class) (Aijmer, 2002). The relationship of the speakers to each other, including their roles, and degree of threat to face (Nikula, 1996) may also guide interpretation. The flexible position of a marker in a sentence or larger piece of discourse is also often indicative of its primary function (Aijmer, 2002; Bazzanella, 1990; Burridge & Florey, 2002; Clift, 2001). For example, ‘actually’ can have a polite intimacy-building function when placed as an afterthought at the end of a turn and a cohesive discourse developmental function when placed in turn-initial position (Aijmer, 2002). In TCU- and turn initial position ‘actually’ explicitly marks a change in mind and in TCU- and turn-final position it marks the turn as informing about previously established information and may create a space for speaker transition of turns (Clift, 2001). Whether the marker occurs within a turn or makes up a turn on its own and where this turn appears in the exchange are also indicators of marker function (Stenström, 1994).

2.2.3.4 Core meaning

Related to issues of multifunctionality, are disputes concerning core meaning. Grammaticalisation studies often provide evidence to support the claim that pragmatic markers have a core meaning that is compatible with all of its possible contextual uses (e.g. Fraser, 2006; Schourup, 1985; Traugott & Heine, 1991; Travis, 2007). For example, the pragmatic marker uses of ‘like’ in English and genre in French retain remnants of their lexical source meanings of ‘similarity’ and ‘comparison’ (Fleishman
& Yaguello, 2004). However, a number of researchers also maintain that markers can have more than one related but different meaning on a semantic level (e.g. Mosegaard Hansen, 2007) Additionally, as a marker and its functions develop, a clearly perceptible link to a core semantic meaning can disappear entirely (Mosegaard Hansen, 2007).

2.2.3.5 Orality

There has also been lively debate as to whether pragmatic markers are exclusive to oral discourse (see Brinton, 1996; Chafe, 1982; Schourup, 1999, 1985; Siepmann, 2005; Svartvik, 1980 for contrastive views). However, aided by the advent of communication channels that blur the boundaries between written and spoken language (e.g. email, SMS), it is increasingly clear that pragmatic markers are used in both oral and written forms of communication.

2.2.3.6 Short items

Arguments as to whether pragmatic markers only include short items (Östman, 1995) are also becoming less salient, as an increasing number of researchers include whole clauses such as ‘to get back to what I was saying’ (Fraser, 1990; Watts, 1988) within the pragmatic marker category.

2.2.3.7 Phonological reduction and independence

Brinton (1996), Jucker and Ziv (1998) and Schiffrin (1997) claim that phonological reduction is one of the defining characteristics of pragmatic markers. However, others indicate that only some pragmatic markers display phonological reduction (Erman, 1992; Mosegaard-Hansen, 1997; Sankoff et al., 1997; Schourup, 1999) and that a possible relationship between phonology and pragmatic markers is of little importance (e.g. Müller, 2005).

2.2.3.8 Idiosyncratic use and subjectivity

Finally, one of the few undisputed characteristics of pragmatic markers is their idiosyncratic use (Burridge & Florey, 2002). While this may cause havoc for taxonomic studies, it highlights the fact that pragmatic markers are central to individuality and expression of the self (Johnstone, 1996). Indeed, emerging work on subjectivity assists in providing at least one clear characteristic of pragmatic markers: simply that they must involve “self-expression in the use of language” (Lyons, 1994,
This includes the expression of the speaker’s attitudes, evaluations, opinions, beliefs, commitment to the truth, sense of self and understanding of his/her relation to the world (Scheibman, 2002; Weedon, 1997). Especially in the case of adolescents, pragmatic markers are non-referential indices that index the social identity of a speaker (Ochs, 1990). This is discussed further in Chapter 3.

Since subjectivity remains undisputed it was used as one of the defining characteristics of pragmatic markers in this study. Relying on the most up-to-date literature at the time of developing the coding system, it was also decided that pragmatic markers in this study could impact on propositional content but pragmatic functions overrode literal meanings. Since they functioned on a discourse rather than syntactic level of interaction, they could be extracted from their context with little or no impact on syntactic structure. Pragmatic markers in this study were also defined as being multifunctional, but having a primary function in the context in which they appeared.

2.2.4 Theoretical approaches to pragmatic markers

Just as there are a multitude of terms and definitions of markers, so too is there “a jungle of different approaches” (Fischer, 2006, p.1) to their study. Fischer (2006) divides this jungle into polysemy- and monosemy-based approaches, resulting in an exceptionally diverse ecosystem of studies that are synchronic or diachronic, formal or informal, built on text linguistic models, focused on general cognitive processing, emphasising interactive relevance and/or highlighting the semantic, syntactic, pragmatic or prosodic aspects of markers.

While some of these approaches consider markers within one or another theory of grammar, others are “firmly anchored in the study of pragmatics and also sociolinguistics” (Watt, 1988: p. 241). However, even those grounded in pragmatics and sociolinguistics, tend to take a variety of perspectives, including semantics (Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech & Svartvik, 1985), conversation analysis (CA) (e.g. Gardner, 2001; Watts, 1987; Wootton, 2010), discourse analysis and interactional sociolinguistics (e.g. Schiffrin, 1987; Stenström, 1986; Svartvik, 1980; Watts, 1989). Focusing on semantics and pragmatics, Wierzbicka (1986) lists eleven approaches, many of which are by no means mutually exclusive and all of which have certain limitations and drawbacks. Of these, the functionalist and conversational/discourse approaches were those that were most drawn upon in this study (see Section 2.3).
The functionalist approach draws heavily on pragmatics to characterize and explain the function of a particular particle in the context in which it appears. While Wierzbicka (1986) may be justified in her lamentation that this particular approach fails “to offer the reader anything firm and conclusive to hold on to” (p. 523), the goals of pragmatic marker research need not always be taxonomic. The research reported here does not set out to provide a clear and conclusive overview of all of the possible functions of markers in English or a taxonomy of meaning, but to gain a deep understanding of how markers are used and acquired by non-native speakers in a finite data set. In such cases, a functionalist perspective is appropriate.

A key work in the functional classification of pragmatic markers is Schiffrin’s (1987) interactional-sociolinguistic discussion of eleven pragmatic markers in English. This is discussed in detail in Section 2.2.5. CA researchers have also focused on the function of pragmatic markers in specific contexts of interaction. CA is a sociolinguistic line of enquiry that focuses on the interactional organisation of social activities and the role of talk in social processes (Kärkäinen, 2003). However, as the non-natural data collection, quantitative analysis and developmental pragmatics focus of this study did not adhere to CA requirements or applications (Kasper & Rose, 2002), these were only ever used as resources for the functional classification of individual markers (e.g. ‘okay’ - Beach, 1993; ‘actually’ - Clift, 2001; ‘yeah’ - Wong, 2000), marker types (e.g. epistemic stance - Kärkkäinen, 2003) or marker subgroups (e.g. back channels – Gardner, 2001; Schegloff, 1982). The development of this functional classification system is explained in detail in Chapter five. Due to the low theoretical relevance of CA to this study, it will not be discussed in detail here.

Wierzbicka’s (1986) discussion of conversational/discourse approaches restricts itself to Coherence Theory perspectives. According to Coherence Theory, a defining characteristic of pragmatic markers is connectivity or coherence (Schwenter, 1996). Connectivity may take place on the level of textual units or utterances (Fraser, 1996; Schiffrin, 1987) or the broader context (Fraser, 1999). However, a Coherence Theory focus on local relations does not account for discourse-initial markers such as ‘well’ or ‘so’ (Schourup, 1999) or markers used in situations where only one textual unit is apparent (Wierzbicka, 1986). It is also difficult to include markers of stance, interjections, hesitation markers or back channels from a coherence perspective (Fischer, 2006). While coherence may be achieved through marker usage, it is not necessarily always the main, most important or interesting function (Blakemore,
Highly critical of Coherence Theory are cognitive linguists who approach markers from a Relevance Theory perspective (e.g. Blakemore, 2002; Schwenter, 1996). Developed by Sperber and Wilson (1986) and based on the Gricean maxim of relation (1975), relevance theorists believe that all utterance interpretation is constrained by the search for optimal relevance. A speaker aims to minimize the hearer’s processing effort by including a range of linguistic and non-linguistic devices to indicate how the proposition expressed is to be processed. According to Relevance Theory, pragmatic markers act as guideposts for utterance interpretation in all of the world’s languages (Blass, 1990).

Fraser (2006) takes issue with Relevance Theory. He argues that it prematurely writes off discourse markers as a group of items worthy of study and excludes a number of markers due to an oversimplified distinction between procedural and conceptual meaning. While both Coherence and Relevance Theory undoubtedly provide valuable insight to the field of pragmatic marker research, neither is sufficiently comprehensive to account for the meanings or functions of all pragmatic markers (Schourup, 2001). Unfortunately, the forming of barricades between Relevance and Coherence perspectives (Blakemore, 2005; Fraser, 2006) blurs the fact that is possible and fruitful to combine the two approaches.

Establishment of coherence is dependent on hearer interpretation (Lenk, 1998a). This means that a speaker may use pragmatic markers to guide the listener’s understanding of an utterance’s relationship to other utterances or stretches of discourse and, in doing so, constrain utterance interpretation and minimise the cognitive processing load.

This study was not exclusively grounded in any one theory and drew on a range of approaches, particularly functionalist, relevance and coherence theories, to classify marker functions in the context in which they appeared. The research did not posit semantic identity between marker and non-marker uses in order to ascertain function (Schourup, 2001), but focused on context of use.

While this entailed an essentially data-driven bottom up approach, decisions still drew heavily on classification systems established by previous researchers.

2.2.5 Classification of pragmatic markers

The wide variety of definitions and theoretical perspectives has naturally
given rise to a range of marker classification systems, none of which are able to capture the full range of pragmatic markers.

Systems based on grammatical or syntactic categories (e.g. Hentschel & Weydt, 1989) fail to capture the pragmatic differences between individual modifiers (Nikula, 1996; Watts, 1988). Semantic approaches (e.g. Quirk et al., 1985) cannot cover those markers working on an interpersonal level or provide adequate explanations for the prolific use of markers in discourse (Nikula, 1996). Coherence theory also fails to explain the full gamut of marker usage (Unger, 1996). Theories that focus solely on degree of commitment to the proposition, illocutionary force or lexical item are difficult to apply to real contexts, due to the blurred distinctions between proposition, illocutionary force and lexical items (Nikula, 1996). Equally problematic and restrictive is dividing markers according to mitigating versus emphatic functions (e.g. Biber & Finegan, 1989; House & Kasper, 1981), as there are a number of markers that don’t fall into either category (Nikula, 1996). Nikula (1996) attempts to overcome this by adding implicit modifiers as a third category of markers to the hedge-emphatic dichotomy, but concedes herself that implicitness represents a different level of analysis than hedges and emphatics. She suggests classification according to a continuum of explicitness at one end of the spectrum and implicitness at the other (Nikula, 1996). However, this can only be applied to markers functioning on interpersonal or politeness levels, not those that focus on textual coherence. Similarly, Bell’s (1998) division of markers according to core or periphery functions only works for markers of textual coherence. Finally, the three-tiered classification system based on relevance proposed by Blakemore (1992) is unable to cater for finely grained distinctions between the meanings of markers within each category (Blakemore, 2002; De Klerk, 2005a).

While it may be that we will never establish a universally acceptable account of pragmatic markers (Blakemore, 2002), agreement has been largely reached that markers are functionally related (Schourup, 1999) and any classification system must, at some level, focus on the function of the marker in the context in which it appears.

### 2.2.6 Functional classification

From the perspectives of functional, coherence and relevance theories, scholars agree that markers:

- assist hearer understanding and interpretation (e.g. Ferrara, 1997; Fox Tree
function on both textual and interpersonal levels of interaction (e.g. Aijmer, 2002; Andersen, 2001; Biber et al., 1999; Blass, 1990; Brinton, 1996; Fuller, 2003; Müller, 2005; Siepmann, 2005).

Those markers functioning on a textual level were classified as ‘discourse markers’ in this study. Textual level functions are those that monitor discourse (Erman, 2001), such as signalling sequential relationships between prior, present and subsequent discourse and the contextual coordination of utterances (Fraser, 1996). Markers functioning primarily on a textual level help provide structure and coherence (González, 2004) and enable the speaker to organize what he/she is saying so that it makes sense in the given context and fulfils its function as a message (Halliday, 1973). Such markers create boundaries between topics, modes of speech (e.g. direct or reported), foregrounded and backgrounded information and are the glue between sets of propositions at the textual level (Erman, 2001). Textual level functions can be further broken down into:

- Decoding of information: use of a marker to urge the addressee(s) to interpret the information conveyed in a certain way and make sure the speaker is properly understood.

- Orientation in the discourse: use of a pragmatic marker to mark transitions or moves between phases or stages in the discourse.

Arguably, textual functions may also include markers used for the regulation of conversational turns (e.g. turn-taking and turn-yielding) (Erman, 1992). However, since turn-taking must involve interaction between two or more speakers, such markers may also be classified as interpersonal (Erman, 2001). As discussed in Chapter five, this research followed the Erman (2001) classification.

Markers operating on a textual level must occur at specific points in the discourse structure, whereas those functioning on the interpersonal level can occur whenever the speaker has a need for them (Erman, 1992). As such, textual level markers are less syntactically free than those that function on an interpersonal level of interaction.

Interpersonal functions are social and monitor the activity of communication (Erman, 2001). They also express speaker stance in securing cooperation and understanding (Siepmann, 2005) and his/her attitude of solidarity and
acknowledgement of other interlocutors (Brinton, 1996). Pragmatic markers working on the interpersonal level attempt to achieve intimacy between the speaker and addressee by expressing the speaker’s attitudes, evaluations, judgments, expectations and demands (Brinton, 1996). By employing such markers, the speaker conveys information about undisclosed thinking and a concern for the unobservable non-discoursal aspects of communication. The speakers shows that the interlocutors are not regarded as “mindless beacons emitting signals, but as complex organisms whose behaviour goes beyond impulse.” (Schourup, 1985, p. v).

While there is overall consensus that markers work on interpersonal and textual levels, a number of scholars argue for an extension of this dichotomy to include various other functional levels or ‘planes’ (e.g. Andersen, 2001; Erman, 2001; Nikula, 1996; Östman, 1995; Redeker, 1991; Schiffrin, 1987).

Nikula (1996) suggests subdividing interpersonal markers into two distinct parts: markers that explicitly indicate the speaker’s relationship to the message (explicit modifiers) and those that implicitly mark the speaker’s relationship to the addressee (implicit modifiers). For example, ‘kind of’, ‘I think’ and general extenders such as ‘and whatever’ explicitly show the speakers degree of uncertainty concerning the content of the message. Comparatively, the function of the markers ‘I mean’ or ‘you know’ is not closely tied to their literal meanings and their function is open to interpretation. They are the means by which the speaker relates to the addressee, albeit implicitly.

Andersen (2001) argues that subjectivity should not be incorporated into interactional functions and proposes a three-dimensional model to assess the meaning of a pragmatic marker, namely subjectivity, interactional and textual capacity. Subjectivity focuses on the relationship between the speaker and a proposition (speaker-focused). The interactional function indicates how the hearer is perceived to be related to a proposition (hearer-focused). Finally, the textual function is about the speaker’s perception of the relation between an existing proposition and an upcoming one (textual-focus).

Similarly, Erman (2001) argues for dividing interpersonal functions into two distinct levels: interpersonal and metalinguistic monitors. He argues that interpersonal markers are oriented towards the addressee (i.e. Nikula’s (1996) implicit modifiers) and metalinguistic markers focus on the message proper. They are comments on the implications of the propositional content and its intended effect (i.e. Nikula’s (1996)
explicit modifiers). In this sense, metalinguistic monitors are “clearly modal and speaker-oriented, either emphasizing the speaker’s authority as to the illocutionary force of an utterance or serving as a face-saving device” (Erman, 2001, p. 1337). By employing such markers, the speaker provides implicit information about his/her commitment to the truth of the proposition or judgement of its importance or value (Erman, 2001).

Erman’s (2001) three functional levels or ‘domains’ tie in with Östman’s (1995) three parameters for pragmatic marker functions: Coherence, Politeness and Involvement. The coherence parameter relates to the use of pragmatic markers to organise discourse (textual). The politeness parameter involves adherence to interactional constraints for establishing, maintaining or breaking interpersonal relationships (interpersonal) and the involvement parameter entails signalling implicit attitudes, feelings and prejudices (metalinguistic).

However, the distinction between interpersonal and metalinguistic functions remains somewhat fuzzy, especially in terms of those markers with politeness, solidarity and face-saving functions (Nikula, 1996). According to Erman (2001) and Östman (1995) interpersonal markers include those that regulate both conversation and interpersonal relationships. The regulation of interpersonal relationships often involves mitigating or emphasising the illocutionary force of an utterance for politeness purposes (Brown & Levinson, 1987). However, according to Erman (2001) such markers of politeness (i.e. hedges, approximators, downtoners) function exclusively on the metalinguistic and not the interpersonal level. A more plausible approach is to understand politeness as “a higher meta-level” of discourse (Hasund, 2002). In other words, a marker can have a lower-level function of coherence or approximation and, at the same time, a higher-level function of signalling informality, solidarity and in-group identity (Hasund, 2002). This is the approach used in this study.

Schiffrin (1987) argues for a completely different approach to the functional categorisation of markers. The aim of her research is to give an account of the contextualised meaning and pragmatic functions of markers and to determine their contribution to discourse coherence. She argues that markers locate an utterance on one of five distinct and separate planes of talk:

1. Exchange structure: reflects the mechanics of the interchange and shows the result of turn-taking and how these alternations are related to each
other.

2. Action structure: reflects the sequence of speech acts (contextually and contextually situated).

3. Ideational structure: reflects relationships between ideas (propositions) within the discourse (e.g. cohesive relations, referential relations, topic relations, functional relations).

4. Participation framework: reflects the ways in which the speakers and hearers can relate to one another and their orientation toward utterances.

5. Information state: reflects the ongoing organization and management of knowledge and meta-knowledge of the speaker and hearer as it evolves over the discourse (e.g. ‘oh’ displays recognition of familiar information or receipt of new information).²

By locating the utterance on one or more of the five planes, markers provide coherence. They index the utterances to the interlocutors and to prior or subsequent discourse. They can relate to the semantic reality of the utterance or they may relate sentences on a logical (epistemic) level or a speech act (pragmatic) level.

Importantly, Schiffrin (1987) makes it clear that markers can function on different planes, for example ‘oh’ marks recognition of familiar information or receipt of new information (information plane) and displays the speaker’s participation status as an active recipient and creates a joint focus of attention between speaker and hearer (participation plane). She postulates, however, that a primary function can usually be discerned by looking at the context in which the marker appears.


However, Redeker (1991) points out that this “arbitrary delimited subset” (p. 1141) is not an adequate basis for the formation of a clear definition to cover all markers. While Schiffrin (1987) proposes that only ‘well’ and ‘so’ operate on all planes, Redeker (1991) argues that nine of the eleven markers in Schiffrin (1987) operate on all five planes simultaneously and concludes that the five planes “fail to discriminate

² ‘Information state’ is introduced as mediating between the participants and propositional contents in the ideational structure, but is later promoted to an independent (fifth) plane of talk (Redeker, 1991).
between markers” (p. 1159). Additionally, Redeker (1991) proposes that Information structure and Participation framework do not work independently of the other planes and should be incorporated into them. She concludes that “the problem of defining and delimiting the class of discourse markers has not been satisfactorily solved” (p. 1167) by Schiffrin (1987) and calls for “a clearer definition of the components of discourse coherence and a broader framework that embraces all connective expressions and is not restricted to an arbitrarily selected subset” (p. 1167).

Redeker (1991) proposes a “simpler” and “more rigorously defined revised model of discourse coherence” (p. 1167). She suggests there are three components of coherence which can be used to classify marker functions:

1. Ideational structure: two discourse units are ideationally related when the utterance entails the speaker’s commitment to the existence of a relation in the world the discourse describes (e.g. temporal sequence, elaboration, cause, reason, consequence). The use of markers of ideational structure is determined by the speaker’s or writer’s conception of what the hearers know and what they are likely to infer.

2. Rhetorical structure: two discourse units are rhetorically related when the strongest relation is not between the propositions but between the illocutionary intentions conveyed in the two units. Pragmatic markers used in the rhetorical structure express or create illocutionary relations and contribute to the listener’s/reader’s conception of the discourse purpose.

3. Sequential structure: involves paratactic and hypotactic sequential relations. Paratactic sequential relations are those in which a transition between issues or topics occurs, following a pre-planned or locally occasioned list. Hypotactic sequential relations are those leading into or out of a commentary, correction, paraphrase, aside, digressions or interruption segment. Signals of sequential structure guide the listener’s attention by suggesting that the issues in the current context space should be closed off or temporarily displaced by an intervening subordinate segment.

Any utterance or sentence operates in all three components but one of them will usually dominate. A pragmatic marker (or in Redeker’s terms a ‘discourse operator’) is “a word or phrase (…) that is uttered with the primary function of bringing to the listener’s attention a particular kind of linkage of the upcoming
utterance with the immediate discourse context” (p. 1168). This excludes clausal indicators of discourse structure (e.g. “Let me tell you a story”), deictic expressions if not used anaphorically (e.g. now, here, today) and anaphoric pronouns and noun phrases as well as any expression whose scope does not extend over the whole clause or utterance (i.e. focus particles, intrasentential ‘oh’).

Lenk (1998a; 1998b) is critical of both Redeker’s (1991) three components and Schiffrin’s (1987) planes of talk. She argues that Schiffrin (1987) fails to address issues of interpretative problems for the hearer due to markers functioning on more than one level at once and that her model only focuses on markers that establish local rather than global coherence within discourse. A shortcoming of Redeker (1991), Schiffrin (1987) and even Lenk herself (Lenk, 1998a), is their exclusive focus on local and global coherence as the defining element of marker functions, resulting in a downplaying of other interactional functions, including issues of politeness and face-saving.

To the other extreme, researchers such as Holmes (1984) focus exclusively on use of markers to modify illocutionary force. Holmes (1984) argues that pragmatic markers are one of many devices used in English to modify the illocutionary force of different speech acts. She argues for focus on not only the mitigation of negatively affective speech acts, but also both the boosting and attenuation of positively affective speech acts and the boosting of negatively affective speech acts. While the current study is not based on speech act theory, Holmes’ (1984) categorisation system is used in the classification system described in Chapter five.

In sum, due to differences in theories of language use, research focus and the difficulty of defining pragmatics as a coherent set of linguistic items, each of the current pragmatic marker classification systems tends to encompass only a select range of marker function and type. For this study, a new classification system has been developed based on previous classification systems and the data itself. It takes a bottom-up approach to the coding of pragmatic markers, drawing on previous research and classification systems to understand the function of pragmatic markers in the contexts in which they appear.

2.3 Pragmatic markers in this study

2.3.1 Definition

Pragmatic markers in this study were linguistic items that indicated “some
action, or intimation of the mind” (Locke, 1689/1996, p. 204) and provided the listener access to the covert thinking processes of the speaker (Schourup, 1985). They implicitly anchored utterances “vis-à-vis the communicative restraints of a culture and society, the demands of aspects of interactive politeness, and the prevalent norms of affect and involvement” (Östman, 1995, p. 100). They are social indexes and contextualisation cues that create coherence, organise discourse and link propositional content to social acts, stances and identity (Gumperz, 1982; Ochs, 1993).

As discussed in 2.2.3.8 all pragmatic markers in this study provided a means of self expression in the use of language (Lyons, 1994) and could be omitted from the context without rendering the speech incomprehensible. They could impact on propositional meaning, were not drawn from a single grammatical source and could have their own internal syntactic structure. While they were multifunctional, a primary function could be identified in the context the marker was used.

### 2.3.2 Classification system

A detailed explanation of the classification system is provided in Chapter five. However, for readability, a short description is also provided here.

In this study, pragmatic markers were divided into the two subcategories of discourse and interpersonal markers. Discourse markers focused on the text and were further subdivided into a range of functional areas (e.g. editing, coherence, quotatives). As discourse markers were not the focus of this study, these subcategories were not clearly defined or developed in detail. Interpersonal markers focused on relationships between the interlocutors and the proposition. They were further subdivided into the functional categories of ‘attitude’ and ‘management’, which were again subdivided down to an individual marker level. While a marker could only have either a discourse or interpersonal primary function, it could concurrently have a politeness function. Politeness functions involved use of markers to save the face of self or other.

Only those interpersonal markers that showed subjectivity and could be extracted from the context in which they appeared without rendering the speech syntactically or propositionally incomprehensible were included. Only those discourse markers that also had interpersonal functions in other contexts in the data were coded.

Although individual markers within the same category were grouped together, they were not necessarily interchangeable (Bell, 1998; Gardner, 2001). However,
analysis of choices governing use of one marker over another was beyond the scope of this study.
3.1 Second language acquisition

3.1.1 Terminology

Keeping in mind the continuing debate concerning use of ‘second language’ or ‘foreign language’ (e.g. Crystal 1997; Kramsch, 2002; Müller, 2005; Phillipson, 1991), ‘second language’ has been chosen to describe all German non-native speakers of English in this study. Whenever the term ‘second language’ is used, it refers to any language learnt after acquisition of a first language (i.e. German) and its speakers do not consider it to be one of their mother tongues. This means that a second language may actually be the third or fourth language acquired by the speaker (Ellis, 2002).

The prevailing distinction between a ‘foreign language’ (learnt in first language environments and instructional settings) and a ‘second language’ (learnt in the second language environment in natural or instructional settings) (e.g. Kramsch, 2002) was not used simply because the ‘foreign’ vs. ‘second’ distinction is difficult to maintain in study abroad situations in which foreign language learners suddenly become second language learners once they arrive in the host country. Given the frequency of Germany-Great Britain school exchange programmes as well as the ease of travel for many Germans to English-speaking environments, even when English is learnt as a foreign language at school, second language learning in the target language environment can take place concurrently.

3.1.2 Second language acquisition and pragmatics

To date second language acquisition research has predominantly focused on the acquisition of formal features of language (Ellis, 2002). However, learning a second language entails more than simply knowing the grammar and vocabulary of the target language. It also involves acquiring pragmatic competence. Pragmatic competence is the ability to communicate appropriately in different contexts (Nikula, 1996) and can be divided into two aspects (Bachman, 1990):

1. Illocutionary competence or “knowledge of the pragmatic conventions for performing acceptable language functions” (p. 90), e.g. knowing that ‘I think’ and ‘kind of’ can be used to modify illocutionary force.
2. Sociolinguistic competence, which encompasses knowledge of the sociolinguistic conventions for performing language functions.
appropriately in different contexts, e.g. knowing which marker is likely to be the most appropriate and successful in a given content.

Lack of pragmatic competence may hinder successful communication and result in failure to reach the interactional goals of the speakers. In interlanguage situations this may lead to cross-cultural pragmatic failure (Thomas, 1983). Tying in with Bachman’s (1990) aspects of pragmatic competence, cross-cultural pragmatic failure can occur on two planes:

1. Pragmalinguistic failure: when the pragmatic force of an utterance is different from the force most frequently assigned to it, e.g. through inappropriate transfer of markers from one language to another (Nikula, 1996).

2. Sociopragmatic failure: when there is a difference in perceptions of what constitutes appropriate behaviour in a given context.

Such failure can have serious repercussions because pragmatic shortcomings are often interpreted on a personal level rather than one of linguistic competence. This means that due to a lack of pragmatic appropriateness speakers are considered rude, insensitive and uncooperative (e.g. Holmes, 1982; Loveday 1982; Thomas, 1983).

Research in pragmatic competence in a second language has focused largely on gambits or the realisation of speech acts by non-native speakers, e.g. requests (Byon, 2004; Blum-Kulka, 1991), apologies (Grieve, 2010), complaints (Olshtain & Weinbach, 1995), compliments (Golato, 2002; Hoffman-Hicks, 1999), making and rejecting suggestions (Bardovi-Harlig & Hartford, 1993, 1990; Sum-hung Li, 2010), offers (Barron, 2003) and refusals (Gass & Houck, 1999). Overwhelmingly, these indicate that second language learners acquire large amounts of formulaic speech which serves critical communicative roles and, at the same time, renders their speech more fluent (Ellis, 2002). However, the same body of research also indicates that while non-native speakers acquire a range of formulaic expressions, they still fail to modify their speech appropriately in situations where there is threat to face. This means they are often considered too direct or indirect by native-speakers of English.

Modification of speech can be achieved through use of pragmatic markers. While second language research on gambits and speech act realisation undoubtedly includes use of pragmatic markers, only a few second language studies of pragmatic competence have taken pragmatic markers as their primary point of departure. These are discussed in detail in Section 3.1.5.
3.1.3 Second language acquisition and language contact

Even if a second language learner has reached high levels of grammatical and pragmatic competence, he/she may still not be able to become an integral and accepted member of the target language community. Indeed a shortcoming of Bachman’s theory of pragmatic competence is its focus on individual cognition (Bremer, Broeder, Roberts, Simonot & Vasseur, 1993; McNamara, 1997) and failure to take the complex relationship between language acquisition and social integration into account. Language learning is not a simple isolated act of cognition, but is the means by which language learners position themselves in society (Menard-Warwick, 2005). As already mentioned in Section 3.1.2, in order to position oneself in discourse and project subjective identity, a speaker needs to master those aspects of language that express social stance and social acts (e.g. appropriate use of pragmatic markers). Without this ability, the individual may not become an integrated member of the professional or non-professional discourse community of which they wish to be apart (Baumgarten & House, 2010). Paradoxically however, an individual’s ability to acquire expression of social stance is directly related to his/her degree of integration in the target community. In other words, especially while living in the target language culture, a second language learner has to “learn in order to communicate, whilst communicating in order to learn” (Bremer et al., 1993, p. 154). Through contact with native speakers novices are socialized through language to use language meaningfully, appropriately and effectively (Ochs, 1996). It is through both implicit and explicit language socialization with expert target language speakers that novices learn to assign situational meaning (e.g. social identity, epistemic and affective meaning) to particular forms (e.g. pragmatic markers).

Becoming an integrated member of the target language community is a three-step process (Hall, 1995). Firstly, an individual discovers interactive patterns that are particularly salient to in-group members. He/she then observes and reflects on how these patterns are exercised in discourse. Finally, the language learner develops his/her own unique set of responses and strategies for interacting in the group. This entire process is, however, dependent on the novices’ motivation to develop a social identity within that particular group (Hall, 1995) as well as the in-groups’ acceptance of the novice member (Norton, 2000).

While opportunities for communication in the second language undoubtedly
increase in a study abroad context, the target-language learning environment does not necessarily offer each individual the same opportunities for second language learning (Spolsky, 1989; Wang, 2010). Additionally, even if the contact opportunities are similar, the learners’ perceptions of them may vary greatly (Wilkinson, 1998) and living abroad is not necessarily personally, culturally or linguistically enriching (Byram & Feng, 2006). For example, in this study, all students participated in the same exchange programme. They lived in host families, were enrolled in a local high school and attended events organised by the exchange organisation. However, while some found it easy to make friends and come into contact with native speakers of Australian adolescent English, others struggled to access social networks that allowed them to develop their English language skills in safe and supportive environments (Norton, 2000). Hostile host family relations severely hampered the ability of some individuals to socialise with host family members as well as other teenagers and friends outside of school. Not all students and members of the host culture were interested in investing in their own or each others’ personal and linguistic expansion (Jackson, 2008).

The regularity, quantity and quality\(^3\) of native-speaker contact are, to some degree, dependent on the second language learners’ sense of human agency (Willis Allen, 2010). In order to acquire pragmalinguistic competence and be integrated in the host community, he/she must seek out opportunities to learn, be highly motivated, attend to detail, be able to tolerate ambiguity in language and not be highly anxious (Norton, 2000). However, language learners are never fully able to control the conditions under which they interact with native speakers and, regardless of individual agency, access to native-speakers may be hampered by the “frequently inequitable, social structures which are reproduced in day-to-day social interaction” (Norton, 2000, p. 5).

According to Norton (2000), almost every social encounter between a language learner and native-speaker involves negotiation of power due to differential access to symbolic resources (e.g. language, education, friendship) and material resources (e.g. capital goods, real estate, money). Access to resources is inextricably linked to a speaker’s identity and how an individual understands his/her position in

\(^3\) The quality of native-speaker contact is highly complex and includes assessment of the presence of foreigner talk (Ellis, 2002) and levels of negotiation of meaning (Long, 1996).
the world. For the novice language learners, limited access to symbolic and material resources directly impacts on the range of identities they can negotiate and construct in the target language. The less they are able to express their social identities, the more marginalised their position in the target language community remains (Kanno & Norton, 2003). It is to a brief discussion of the inextricable link between second language acquisition, identity and investment in the target language community that we now turn.

3.1.4 Second language acquisition, identity and investment

The multifaceted and dynamic identities of both the individual learners and members of the target language community impact on the ways in which language learners respond to and create opportunities to speak English (Norton, 2000). In turn, the ways in which learners respond to and create opportunities to speak English impacts on language learning in powerful and unpredictable ways (Menard-Warwick, 2005). The participants in this study were not simply adolescents, but had a multitude of other identities, which could constrain or enhance their abilities for social interaction and human agency (Norton, 2010). At any given moment, their identities as adolescents, host brothers/sisters, German non-native speakers, exchange students, males/females, musicians and sportspersons may have impacted on language use and acquisition as well as their ability to access the ‘imagined community’ of native speakers of Australian English.

According to Norton (2010) an ‘imagined community’ is the imaginary group of individuals to which a language learner aspires when learning a new language. This group of individuals may be a community of the imagination, but may also be represented by particular members of the target language community (e.g. a group of Australian adolescents in an exchange student’s school). It is these representatives of the ‘imagined community’ in which a language learner has the greatest degree of investment. Norton’s (2010, 2000) ‘investment’ extends previous constructs of ‘motivation’ in second language acquisition. Motivation presupposes a “unitary, fixed and ahistorical language learner” while investment “conceives of the language learner as having a complex social history, multiple desires and multiple identities” (Norton, 2000, p. 10). When investing in a language, learners invest in the construction of their own identities. However, identities and investment in the target language are complex, contradictory and constantly changing over time and space. Investment in
the non-native language poses a threat to the identity of the learner (Jackson, 2008; Pellegrino-Aveni, 2005) and, at any given moment, an individual’s investment in the target language may conflict with his/her identity and desires for future relations. As such, identity and investment can never be fully understood without reference to the larger social world. For example, in a social context where there is an unequal distribution of power between the language learner and the native speaker community, a learner’s investment in the target language might not necessarily result in profitable returns. This may result in resistance to the continued use and acquisition of the target language in that particular social context.

While recognising the existence of such multiple identities, at this stage in their personal and language development, adolescents in Germany and Australia are preoccupied with the expression of their adolescent selves (Section 3.3). This means the focal imagined community for the exchange students in this study was most likely that of Australian adolescents, who both represented and provided access to the learner’s imagined community (Norton, 2010). As discussed in Section 3.3, high use of interpersonal markers is one indicator of in-group membership to this community. This means that research on second language acquisition of pragmatic markers by adolescents may concurrently provide insight into the dynamics of social integration and identity in the target language community. For example, by assimilating the key markers of Australian adolescents, exchange students in this study expressed not only their own identities, but also degrees of social and psychological integration with Australian adolescents (Beebe & Giles, 1984; Schumann, 1978).

### 3.1.5 Second language acquisition of pragmatic markers

Despite the importance of pragmatic markers and the fact that learner varieties are generally renowned for being poor in use of them (Nikula, 1993; Rost-Roth, 1999), research on pragmatic marker acquisition in English is particularly sparse. Most research has focused on first language use (e.g. Chen & Weiyun He, 2001; Kasper & Rose, 2002; Montolio Durán & Unamuno, 2001; Tanaka, 2000; Wouk, 2001) or use of markers by bilingual speakers, e.g. Croatian-English (Hlavac, 2006), Hebrew-English (Maschler, 2000), Germanic languages-American English (Goss &
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Salmons, 2000; Salmons 1990), Shaba Swahili-French (de Rooij, 2000) and Canadian French-English (Sankoff et al., 1997).

For the purposes of this study, bilingual studies differ from second language acquisition research in that they focus on individuals who are permanently living in an environment where two or more languages are spoken. Second language acquisition contexts, such as study abroad, also involve direct language contact with native-speakers, but learners have not and do not envision living permanently in an environment in which they speak both languages simultaneously.

Two recent studies focusing on second language use of markers in English are Müller (2005) and Aijmer (2004). Müller (2005) focused on the functions of four pragmatic markers (‘so’, ‘well’, ‘you know’ and ‘like’) by native-speakers of American English and German non-native speakers of American English. Müller (2005) found that while both German and American speakers used the markers ‘so’, ‘well’, ‘you know’ and ‘like’, there were differences in both frequency and range of functions. While ‘so’ was the most frequently used marker in both groups, the Americans used it twice as frequently as the Germans. The Americans used ‘like’, ‘you know’ and ‘well’ as the 2nd, 3rd and 4th most frequent markers whereas the Germans used ‘well’, ‘like’ and ‘you know’ as their next three markers. ‘You know’ and ‘like’ were used five times more frequently by the Americans than the Germans. ‘Well’ was used more frequently by the Germans, but the difference in frequency was not statistically significant. Some functions were exclusively used by native-speakers of American English, and others only by the German non-native-speakers. The extent of such difference was highly dependent on the marker itself as well as interaction and contact with native speakers: the more interaction and contact a German-speaker had, the closer his/her usage of markers resembled that of native-speakers. A number of other factors may also have played a role, including the treatment of markers in formal language education and avoidance of markers that sound too similar to ones used in German (Müller, 2004).

Müller’s (2005) results were based on the retelling and discussion of a silent movie. Unlike this research, her study did not include interview data, was not longitudinal and involved eighteen to twenty-eight year old university students rather than school-age adolescents. Her participants did not speak with the researcher, but spoke either in monologue or with each other. Recruitment of native speakers did not follow the matched pair technique used in this study and did not include an extensive
language contact questionnaire. While Müller (2005) described her research as “bottom-up” or “corpus-driven”, her choice of the four markers was not based solely on their presence in the data, but on “practical” and “theoretical” (p. 26) grounds (i.e. sufficient presence in the corpus, range of different characteristics, previous research).

Aijmer (2004) focused on the use of pragmatic markers by Swedish second language speakers of English. Similar to this research, her data was based on 15-minute semi-structured informal interviews with a native speaker of English, followed by a structured task (describing a set of pictures from a comic strip). Her aim was to find out whether native-speakers and learners used markers for the same purposes. She found that the main difference between native speakers and learners was in the overall frequency of individual markers. Some markers were frequent in both groups (‘I think’, ‘you know’, ‘sort of’, ‘I mean’, ‘well’, ‘actually’, ‘really’), while others were particularly salient in the non-native speaker interlanguage (‘I don’t know’, ‘yeah’). Only native speakers employed the marker ‘you see’. Repetition, stranding, clustering and collocations of markers were also more frequent in the non-native speaker data. Moreover, Aijmer (2004) claims that while native-speaker usage of hedges, approximators and general extenders was related to face-saving and politeness (Brown & Levinson, 1987), their usage by non-native speakers was best explained by cognitive and verbal planning issues. Learners tended to use markers to express uncertainty or hesitation and as strategies to overcome communication problems. However, Aijmer’s (2004) study was not longitudinal and the native-speaker data was not an equivalent native-speaker source for comparison. It stemmed from the London-Lund corpus of Spoken English which focused on adolescent speakers of British English and was compiled thirty years before Aijmer’s (2004) corpus of non-native speaker data.

Anping (2002) compared the use of the marker ‘so’ in its grammatical, discourse and pragmatic functions by Chinese non-native writers of English and native British English writers. Her analysis included a comparison with spoken data in both languages. She found that overuse of ‘so’ by Chinese non-native speakers of both low level and advanced proficiency was due to lack of awareness of stylistic differences in written and spoken discourse, limited exposure to English, reliance on simpler means of expression and early-learned strategies and negative transfer from Chinese to English.

Nikula (1996) focused on how a small group of advanced Finnish non-native
speakers of English mastered the use of ‘pragmatic force modifiers’. While not longitudinal, her research indicated that even at an advanced level of English proficiency, Finnish non-native speakers’ performance was still characterised by directness, detachment, formality and low involvement in comparison to the linguistic performance of their native speaker counterparts. This was due to differences in assessment of the appropriateness of pragmatic marker use in a given linguistic context and choice of type of modifier. Non-native speakers employed modifying devices more sparingly than native speakers of British English and favoured expressions that functioned as all-purpose modifiers (e.g. ‘I think’, ‘I don’t know’, ‘or something’, ‘really’) over the wider repertoire of modifiers used by native speakers (Nikula, 1993). Non-native speakers also tended to use explicit modifiers (e.g. ‘I think’, ‘and whatever’), which clearly showed the speaker’s attitude to the message, whereas native-speakers showed a preference for inexplicit forms (e.g. ‘well’, ‘you know’, ‘like’), which were more directly related to the speaker’s attitudes and relationships to the addressee (Nikula, 1996). Additionally, non-native speakers were less skilful than native speakers of English in adapting their use of modifiers to changes in role relationships (e.g. native vs. non-native speaker, acquaintance vs. stranger, expert vs. non-expert). While transfer alone could not explain differences between native and non-native speaker use of markers in English, non-native speakers tended to favour markers that had a close translation equivalents in Finnish (Nikula, 1993; 1996). Evidence of non-transfer outweighed evidence of transfer.

Romero Trillo (2002) compared use of the pragmatic markers ‘listen’, ‘I mean’ and ‘well’ by adults and children in their native-language of Spanish and in English as a foreign language. Learners of English used ‘well’ and ‘you know’ much less frequently than native speakers and when they used these lexical items, they were most likely to be employed in their ideational non-pragmatic functions (e.g. ‘you know’ with a complement and ‘well’ as an adverb). He considered the main problem faced by non-native speakers learning English in a non-native environment was pragmatic fossilization, whereby learners systematically used pragmatic markers inappropriately due to a delay in exposure to pragmatic variation in the second language. In first language acquisition, onset of pragmatic development precedes the onset of grammar (Berko-Gleason & Bernstein-Ratner, 2009) and, typically, in a foreign language teaching situation this order is reversed. This leads to adult learners lacking competence in the use of involvement markers, which in turn, results in

However, the learning of pragmatic marker use is by no means easy (De Klerk, 2005a, 2005b) and may follow an order of acquisition. In a longitudinal study, Perdue et al. (2002) found that the acquisition of finiteness marking in English and French as second languages, in particular by the use (and non-use) of focus markers (e.g. ‘also’, ‘only’, ‘just’, ‘again’, ‘already’, ‘still’, ‘(not) yet’, ‘no more’) represented a complex task for the language learners. They argued that this was because finiteness marking works hand-in-hand with morphosyntactic development in the second language. Adult immigrant learners acquired focus markers relatively early and in fixed order with negation preceding additive (e.g. ‘also’, ‘too’) and restrictive (e.g. ‘only’, ‘just’) particles followed by temporal items. Within temporal items, particles marking the iteration of an event (e.g. ‘again’) preceded temporal adverbs of contrast (e.g. ‘already’, ‘still’, ‘no more’). In the course of this process, they also observed non-standard use and some overgeneralization.

Hays (1992 in Müller, 2005) also found evidence for a developmental order of acquisition, albeit influenced by textbooks and exposure to the discourse community. Focusing on the acquisition of seven English pragmatic markers by native-speakers of Japanese in their first, second or third year of study in Japan, he found marker use undoubtedly increased with proficiency (see also Hellermann & Vergun, 2007). Markers that functioned primarily on Schiffrin’s (1987) ‘ideational plane’ (e.g. ‘but’, ‘and’, ‘so’) were learnt earlier than those that mainly functioned on other planes (e.g. ‘well’, ‘you know’). It was speculated that this was because those that functioned on an ‘ideational plane’ carried greater semantic weight and were taught first, while interactional markers that were more pragmatic could only be expected with exposure to native-speaker discourse communities. Hay’s (1992) order of acquisition differed strikingly from first language acquisition studies which have shown that Schiffrin’s (1987) ‘exchange’ functions (i.e. turn-taking) are acquired first, followed by those functioning on ‘action’ then ‘ideational’ planes. Participation frameworks then come into play when children move from local to global coherence.
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5 Despite contacting interlibrary loans, Dr. Paul Hays, Dr. Simone Müller and the editors of the volume in which Hays (1992) was published, direct access to Hays (1992) was not possible.
usage (Kyratzis & Ervin-Tripp, 1999). Such differences between first and foreign language acquisition may be due to the fact that ideational markers are generally the only markers that are overtly taught in the second language classrooms (Hays, 1992 in Müller, 2005).

The first language of learners may also play a role. For example, Hays (1992 in Müller, 2005) results may not be applicable to German learners of English as a foreign language. German learners in Müller (2004) tended to over use ‘well’ in nine of its twelve functions and these functions extended beyond ideational planes of talk. However, this may have been due to over-representation in German foreign language textbooks and avoidance of other markers that sounded more German than English. Use of ‘well’ was reduced, even to below native-speaker norms, through exposure to the discourse community (Müller, 2005).

While exposure to the discourse community is undoubtedly a critical factor in pragmatic marker acquisition, it is not clear how long this needs to be to reach native-like usage. For example, in a case study of the acquisition of the particles ‘mais’ and ‘but’ as turn-taking devices by advanced learners of French and English before and after an extended period of study abroad (8-10 months), Guillot (2005) found that there was an overall increased use of ‘mais’ and ‘but’, especially at the beginning of turns. However, levels still fell short of native-speaker usage and there was a mismatch of pragmatic functions in the native and non-native speaker data.

Focusing on three generations of Korean-Americans living in the United States of America, Lee (1999) found that Korean adult immigrants used the fewest number of markers. Those who had emigrated to the USA before they turned eighteen used the most, even outnumbering participants born and raised in the USA of Korean parents. Unfortunately, no reason is given for the apparent over-use of markers by the non-USA born participants who emigrated before they were eighteen.

Also focusing on adult learners of English, Hellermann & Vergun (2007) found that those individuals who had spent more time in the USA and had high contact with the target language culture used the pragmatic markers ‘well’, ‘like’ and ‘you know’ more than those who were not as acculturated. Additionally, while level of literacy did not seem to influence marker usage, the type of material read outside the classroom did. Those who read formal literature such as student books, children’s books or academic material acquired fewer markers than those who read less formal publications such as the daily newspaper.
It seems, however, that much is dependent on the type of pragmatic marker under study. In a study of additive focus particles in French and Italian by both native and non-native speakers in a picture description task, Watorek & Perdue (1999) found that non-native speakers were more iconic in their use of focus particles. Not only did they use more focus particles than the native-speakers but they also used them to structure their utterances more transparently (i.e. by placing the focus particle immediately to the left of the constituent with which it associates). The difference lay not necessarily in quantity but in range of use and creative departure from iconic norms. Even advanced learners tended to “make linguistic structure reflect information structure as faithfully as possible” (Watorek & Perdue, 1999, p. 313).

Similarly, focusing on the use of markers by German non-native writers and translators of English texts, Siepmann (2005) found that even very advanced learners of English experienced great difficulty in using markers in a native-like manner. He found non-native speakers tended to over-use some markers and under-use others. While transfer accounted for the over-use of some markers (e.g. ‘namely’ / ‘nämlich’), most of the errors were interlanguage items that had no basis in the writer’s first language. Similarly, Lorenz (1997) found over-use of intensifiers by German writers of English, which declined with increased proficiency.

While studies focusing on the acquisition of pragmatic markers in English are sparse, much research has been conducted on the acquisition of German modal particles (e.g. Abraham, 1991; Weinert, 1998; Weydt, 1981). Learners of German under-used German markers for discourse-pragmatic coherence (Weinert, 1998), often failed to use or understand modal particles (Möllering & Nunan, 1995; Rost-Roth, 1999) and tended to misinterpret their communicative value in conversation (Harden & Rösler, 1981; Möllering & Nunan, 1995). The acquisition of a range of different particle functions was accumulative and took place over a long period of time (Möllering, 2001).

In a longitudinal study, Rost-Roth (1999) found that while native speakers of German used modal particles quite regularly, especially in instructions, storytelling and argumentation, they were often missing in the German non-native speaker interlanguage, including that of advanced learners of German. There was a pattern of acquisition with some modal particles acquired and used frequently by learners (e.g. ‘ja’, ‘auch’, ‘schon’, ‘mal’, ‘vielleicht’, ‘einfach’) and others being acquired much later in the acquisition process (e.g. ‘halt’, ‘eben’, ‘bloß’, ‘wohl’, ‘etwa’, ‘schon’).
However, in comparison to native-speaker discourse, modal particle usage by non-native speakers was restricted: particular functions of modal particles were not present in the non-native speaker data and often the particles were used in set ‘stereotypical’ formulae.

Realising the critical importance of marker acquisition, a number of researchers have tried to identify ways by which learners can be taught to use and understand pragmatic markers in a number of target languages in a classroom language learning setting. These include language analysis and observation activities that focus on marker use or non-use (McCarthy & Carter, 1994; Rathmayr, 1989; Rösler, 1982), drama, simulation and role-plays (Kasper, 1997). However, while such tasks may increase marker awareness and/or use in a non-native language, their value may be dependent on a number of other contextual factors, such as overall quality and frequency of input, existence of equivalents in the first language, correlations between the primary and marker function of a lexical item, existence of stereotypical formulae and grammatical competence in the second language (Rost-Roth, 1999).

Two contextual factors for acquisition most relevant to this study are the environment in which the participants are exposed to the second language (‘Study abroad’) and the age of the participants (‘Adolescent language’).

3.2 Study abroad

Study abroad is an umbrella term for all programmes that combine language and/or content learning in a formal classroom setting with immersion in the native speech community (Freed, 1995a). It is “a temporary sojourn of a pre-defined duration, undertaken for educational purposes” (Kinginger, 2009). In this study, ‘exchange’ refers to study abroad experiences involving living with a family that speaks the target language and participating in classroom-based content study in a mainstream high school. It does not include full study abroad for a foreign qualification or study as part of an academic partnership between educational institutions at home and abroad (Kinginger, 2009).

Due to the complex nature of language learning in a study abroad setting, research to date has focused on a wide array of issues from a wide range of theoretical and methodological perspectives (Kinginger, 2009). Despite such diversity, research on language learning in a study abroad context has given wide support for the positive role played by an in-country experience for language acquisition, especially in terms of listening and speaking skills (e.g. Davidson, 2010; Freed, 1995b; Meara, 1994;
Raupach, 1984) and social interaction (Kinginger, 2009). Möhle & Raupach (1983) indicated that the biggest gain in proficiency through study abroad was the ability to sound good due to increased rate of speech, decreased length of time between utterances, use of appropriate fillers, speech markers, modifiers, formulae, compensation strategies and use of a range of communicative strategies for discourse management. Of these, acquisition of a native-like use of pragmatic markers has been identified as a clear indicator of fluency (Olynyk, d’Anglejan & Sankoff, 1990), although it may be influenced by idiomatic language style in the speakers’ first language.

Study abroad may also influence students’ beliefs about language learning and language learning strategies (Adams, 2006; Kinginger, 2009). For example, Tanaka (2005) found that post-elementary level Japanese students on a 12-week private study abroad language programme to New Zealand rediscovered the importance of analytic learning (e.g. learning vocabulary and grammar, focus on accuracy) and became more responsible and realistic about seeking avenues for opportunities for language learning after their study abroad experience.

There is also some evidence to suggest that time spent in a target language country is a primary opportunity for language learners to acquire pragmatic knowledge (Barron, 2003; Coleman, 1997; Matsumura, 2001; Miller & Ginsberg, 1995) or even master the use of pragmatic markers “without any textbooks or exercise-books whatsoever” (Wierzbicka, 1986, p. 523). However, only a limited number of studies have focused on the development of pragmatic competence or acquisition of pragmatic markers during study abroad.

Focusing on the sociopragmatic deletion of ‘ne’ in the French negative construction ‘ne (verb) pas ’ by study abroad students in France, Regan (1995) found that, similar to native-speaker usage, study abroad students tended to increase their deletion of ‘ne’ during a year abroad. Also focusing on the acquisition of French, Kinginger (2008) found that university-age native-speakers of English were more able to appropriately match address forms to interactive contexts after a semester study abroad experience than beforehand. In particular, there was a decrease in unmotivated switching and an increase in appropriate choice of the informal tu form for the indexation of age-related group solidarity rather than intimacy. She also found increased general academic proficiency as well as increased language awareness of colloquial words/phrases and speech acts in French. The acquisition of colloquial
words in advanced French was also the focus of Dewaele & Regan (2001). They found that active and authentic communication in French in a francophone environment predicts the use of colloquial lexemes in the target language and that classroom interaction had no predictive value on the use of colloquial vocabulary in French. The colloquial lexemes under focus included the pragmatic marker interjections ‘hein’ and ‘ben’ and ‘okay’.

However, focusing on pragmatic development of strategies in second language French greetings, leave-taking and compliments, Hoffman-Hicks (1999) found that the development of her ten-month study abroad students was only slight and limited in scope, especially in terms of compliments. She found even less development amongst second language students who did not participate in a sixteen month study abroad programme to France. She argued that low acquisition of native-like compliments was not entirely unexpected as neither the study abroad nor the control group received direct instructions in complimenting in French and the natural occurrence of this speech act in authentic communication was most likely low.

In a study of the acquisition of Spanish, Lafford (1995) found that a study abroad experience broadened the repertoire of communicative strategies of second language learners and that they were more likely to develop key elements of ‘communicative competence’ (Hymes, 1972) than students in a home-country classroom environment. Unlike Hoffman-Hicks (1999) and Lafford (1995), Rodriguez (2001) found no significant difference in second language pragmatic acquisition between participants in a study abroad or foreign language context. Over the course of one semester, both groups moved closer to native-speaker norms of politeness in making requests in Spanish.

Owen (2002) also focused on the acquisition of request strategies in a one term study abroad context. Her longitudinal research suggested that, regardless of proficiency level, a study abroad experience led to more native-like preferences for directness in request strategies of non-native speakers of Russian. A higher pre-departure proficiency level increased the ability of the non-native speakers to approximate native speaker preferences for directness levels. However, at the end of their stay, even the most advanced speakers failed to make use of Russian negative and conditional particles that the native speakers typically employed to mitigate their requests. Similarly, Bataller (2010) observed some acquisition of request strategies by non-native speakers of Spanish spending four months living and studying in Spain.
However, their use of these strategies was statistically different from native-speaker baseline data. Unfortunately comparisons with the results of Rodriguez (2001) are not possible, as neither Owen (2002) nor Bataller (2010) included control groups of participants learning Russian or Spanish in a foreign language setting.

Owen’s (2002) results do, however, contrast strongly with Matsumura (2001) who found the development of near if not native-like proficiency in offering advice in English during an 8-month study abroad to Canada. Matsumura (2001) focused on the impact of study abroad on Japanese students’ perceptions of social status and, in turn, on their pragmatic use of English. Similar to this study, Matsumura (2001) included a control group consisting of Japanese university English as a foreign language (EFL) students as well as a group of native-speakers as base-line data. He found that initially both the study abroad (ESL) and EFL groups exhibited the pragmatic competence required to offer advice appropriately to a higher status person but, over the course of the study, only the ESL students developed a native-speaker-like pragmatic competence when giving advice to individuals of equal and/or lower status. He concluded that while some socialisation and awareness of pragmatic norms in a second language can be acquired in the home country, living and studying in the target speech community undoubtedly has a positive impact on students’ second language pragmatic development.

Barron (2003) investigated the development of pragmatic competence in realisations of requests, offers and refusals of offers by Irish native-speakers of English on a ten month study abroad programme in Germany. In support of Ellis (1992) and Trosborg (1995), Barron (2003, 2000) concluded that there was probably an order of acquisition of politeness markers in a second language. Formulaic pragmatic routines (Coulmas, 1981) such as ‘please’ were one of the first politeness features to appear and more cognitively complex elements, such as downtoners (e.g. ‘maybe’, ‘perhaps’) appeared later in the interlanguage. A similar pattern has been found in second language oppositional talk, with initial strong disagreements gradually being downtoned by inclusion of agreement components over a 12-month period (Bardovi-Harlig & Salsbury, 2004).

Also focusing on the acquisition of speech acts, Kondo (1997) analysed the realization of apologies by forty-five Japanese high-school learners of English on a one-year study abroad program to the United States. Similar to this study, the acquisitional patterns of the exchange students were compared to native-speaker use
and a questionnaire focusing on contact with native-speakers of English was included. The data was, however, based on a Discourse Completion Task (DCT) rather than spoken interviews. Kondo’s (1997) results indicated that choice of apology strategies in American English by Japanese non-native speakers more closely approximated that of Americans after their study abroad experience. However, Japanese cultural norms still influenced choice, leading to overuse of some apology strategies (e.g. expressing concern for the hearer). Additionally, Japanese assessment of contextual factors influencing apology strategy choice (e.g. severity of offence, likelihood of apology acceptance) increasingly matched American assessment after twelve months of study abroad. However, no correlations could be established between the assessment of the situation and choice of strategy employed.

Sawyer (1992) also found an order of acquisition of the sentence-final affective particle ‘ne’ by eleven adult beginners of Japanese of different first languages over a year in Japan. ‘Ne’ invites the conversational partner to become an active and emotionally supportive co-conversationalist (Cook, 1992) and can be represented by the phrase ‘I think you would say the same’ (Wierzbicka, 1994). It was not found in the initial stages of language acquisition, however, after some time during the year abroad, it appeared in formulas in the Japanese interlanguage and, later still, it was employed creatively (Sawyer, 1992). Also focusing on the acquisition of ‘ne’, Ishida (2009) traces how one American Japanese learner (‘Fred’) used ‘ne’ in interaction during a nine month study abroad. The breadth of functions Fred applied to ‘ne’ increased greatly from zero to nine months. This meant he was increasingly able to engage in conversations, take a variety of interactional roles and indicate degree of alignment with his native-speaker interlocutors.

Strategies for maintaining and developing a conversation in a communicative situation (i.e. use of fillers and connectors, back channel signals, repairs/repeats and addition of information) also followed an order of acquisition in Lafford (1995). For example, Lafford (1995) found that the use of the fillers and connectors ‘pues’ and ‘este’ in Spanish were acquired late and a semester abroad was not long enough for students to rely solely on native-like fillers to hold the floor in a conversation (e.g. they still tended to fall back on prototypical fillers in their own language, such as the use of ‘uhm’ in English).

The diversity of results discussed above and the sequential nature of the second language acquisition of pragmatic features during study abroad indicates a
relationship between time spent abroad and pragmatic proficiency. Félix-Brasdefer (2004) focused on whether length of residence in a target language community correlated with a move towards an approximation of native-speaker norms in refusals by advanced non-native speakers of Latin-American varieties of Spanish. He found that short lengths of stay in the second language community (one to five months) might help learners’ productions become more target-like at the beginning of pragmatic development. However, the interlanguage of learners who had spent less than five months in the target language culture showed a preference for more direct refusals and a more abrupt ending to refusal interactions than the native-speaker norm. Comparatively, after at least nine months in the second language community, learners’ abilities to negotiate a refusal (sequential organization) and mitigate a refusal (lexical and syntactic mitigation) approximated native speaker levels.

Despite such noticeable increases in sociolinguistic competence, in a range of studies the stylistic variability of study abroad learners still deviated from that of native speakers (Ferguson, 1995; Marriott, 1995; Regan, 1995) as did their use of native-like sociolinguistic forms (Regan, 1995). Within study abroad groups, there was a great deal of individual variation, especially in the acquisition of sociolinguistic norms (DeKeyser, 1991; Marriott, 1993; Regan, 1995). In fact, the range of individual variation among learners who spend time abroad has been found to be far greater than that among those studying in the home country (Guntermann, 1995; Huebner, 1995; Regan, 1995).

Individual variation in general language proficiency is due to a wide range of factors (see Coleman, 1997 for a detailed description). These include age (Johnson & Newport, 1989; Krashen et. al, 1979), language learning aptitude (Freed, 1995a), previous language learning experiences (Brecht, Davidson & Ginsberg, 1995; Davidson, 2010; DeKeyser, 2010), gender (Brecht & Robinson, 1995; Lemée & Regan, 2009; Marriott, 1995; Polyani, 1995; Siegal, 1996), motivation (Ellis, 1994; Gardner, 1985; Willis Allen, 2010), learning styles and strategies (Huebner, 1995; Miller & Ginsberg, 1995), study abroad program design (Huebner, 1998) and host family relations (Jackson, 2008). Similarly researchers have highlighted a range of principle variables influencing the acquisition of sociolinguistic competence in a study abroad context. These include context of acquisition, degree of contact with native-speakers, (initial) level of proficiency, type and amount of input, native speaker sociolinguistic norms, individual differences, gender and length of stay.
Particular characteristics of the target language, such as the type of linguistic constraints placed on pragmalinguistic language features (e.g. grammatically or socially constrained features of linguistic politeness) may also play a role. Examples of this can be found in Indonesian, whereby use of particular address terms is socially constrained and the use of the grammatical terms ‘belum’ and ‘tidak’ in experience questions and negative responses is grammatically constrained (DuFon, 1999). Möhle (1984) argues that characteristics of both the first and the target language influence acquisition in a study abroad setting. She focused on differences in planning behaviour in spoken texts produced at the beginning and end of a one-semester study abroad by university level German non-native speakers of French in France and French non-native speakers of German in Germany. German native speakers increased their speech and articulation rates in French considerably. They displayed large reduction in pauses and elongation of speech units. However, French native-speaker speech rates in German barely changed after several months in Germany. Their articulation rates increased somewhat, but the number of pauses and number of speech units remained the same. The German speakers’ language became increasingly idiomatic but there were few improvements in grammatical correctness. Comparatively, French speakers made enormous improvements in grammar (especially inflections) and increased their use of idiomatic expressions, but made more mistakes in idiom. For both groups, hesitation phenomena decreased after the stay abroad and both groups produced fewer filled pauses and more drawls at the end of their stay: possibly indicating that filled pauses are more a sign of general insecurity in the second language than drawls. There were no differences in the communication strategies employed by the two groups. These results indicated differences in planning behaviour during and after a semester abroad, which, in turn, can be explained by:

- the respective language-specific structure and its demands on the speaker; and
- differences in pre-study abroad classroom-based teaching of ways to resolve language problems; and
- emphasis placed on the pre-departure teaching of grammatical correctness
or communicative competence in the second language.

Iino (1999) focused on language input provided by host family members during an eight-week summer homestay program in Kyoto for North American English-speaking students. Unlike the exchange students in this study, Iino’s (1999) participants attended Japanese language classes and did not go to a regular school. However, they did live with Japanese host families. Iino (1999) found that the host families modified their linguistic and behavioural codes when addressing the American students. For example, they rarely used Kyoto dialect (preferring to employ Tokyo dialect, which was considered to be more standard Japanese), spoke slowly, relied on facilitating acts (e.g. body language) for comprehension, overused personal pronouns and used written forms of Japanese that native speakers would not usually use in daily conversations. While Iino (1999) himself indicated that his study may only be applicable to the Japanese short homestay situation, this use of ‘textbook’ language was of interest to this study as pragmatic markers, especially those working on interpersonal levels, are typical of oral not written language. If his results can be extended to host family interactions in other linguistic and cultural contexts, it could mean that, at least initially, exchange students in their host families received a lower input of markers than would be typically used in native speaker to native speaker interactions. Unfortunately, his ethnographic study did not include a pre-post comparison or provide a link between input and second language acquisition.

McMeekin (2006) compared negotiation in the study abroad classroom and host family setting for English native-speakers living in Japan for eight weeks. She found that host family negotiations provided more comprehensible input (e.g. through repetitions, circumlocutions, explanations and examples) than classroom discourse. On the other hand, classroom interactions provided increased opportunities for student modification of output (e.g. self correction of grammar) than host family interactions. This meant that maximum exposure to to comprehensible input, modification of output and focus on form could be achieved by ensuring a combination of in- and out-of-class interaction with native speakers during study abroad.

Cook (2008) also highlighted the central role of host families in the acquisition of communicative competence during study abroad. She focused on the ways in which nine university-age study abroad learners and their host family members used the multiple social meanings of the masu form in Japanese to construct their social identities during dinnertime talk. She argues that host family interactions
during study abroad resemble primary socialization in the ways in which novices are socialized to use indexes appropriately. It was only through a host family study abroad experience that learners acquired the linguistic resources for the expression of a range of social identities by choosing when and where use of the masu-form was appropriate. As discussed in Section 3.3, learning to express a range of social identities is of central importance to studies of adolescent second language acquisition.

Factors influencing second language acquisition during study abroad cannot be viewed as independent, but are intrinsically entwined in the multifaceted process of language acquisition. For example, Freed (1990) found that interactive activities seem to benefit low to intermediate level speakers, whereas students at the upper levels of language proficiency profit most from non-interactive target language contact (e.g. reading, watching TV). Quantity of input also plays a role, with advanced learners seeking more interactive contact with native speakers as well as non-interactive contact (Freed, 1990, 1995b).

Further studies found that degree and type of contact were constrained by gender and native speaker sociolinguistic norms (Marriott, 1995; Siegal, 1995; Twombly, 1995). One type of contact is corrective feedback from native speakers. In situations where native speakers do not provide corrective feedback on language that does not conform to politeness norms, the development of sociolinguistic competence is hindered (Marriott, 1995). Whether corrective feedback is given may depend on the type of pragmatic feature. For example, DuFon (1999) found that inappropriate use of features in the Indonesian language that have strong social indexicality were less likely to be corrected by native-speakers than features with weak social indexical properties. Even the physical characteristics and/or gender of the non-native speaker may play a role in type or use of corrective feedback by native speakers (Iino, 1999).

The ways in which feedback is given can also influence degree of contact and participation in second language opportunities to interact. If, for example, insulting feedback or harsh correction is received, motivation to speak the second language may be severely reduced. Additionally, language contact may be dependent on differences in culturally-defined politeness norms of giving and receiving feedback. The higher the difference between ‘host’ and ‘home’ cultural norms, the higher the impediment to non-native speaker use of the second language in interlanguage situations (Pellegrino Aveni, 2005).
Similarly, when the gendered or hierarchical roles of interlocutors are defined differently by the ‘host’ and ‘home’ cultures, a conflict of language identities may occur (Brecht & Robinson, 1995; DuFon, 1999; Polyani, 1995; Siegal, 1995). For example, Siegal (1995) found that failure to use appropriate honorifics by women learning Japanese in Japan was due to their refusal to accept Japanese societal rules of appropriate women’s behaviour. A conflict thus arose between language acquisition and the loss of one’s sense of identity.

Input is also dependent on individual characteristics of the learner such as introversion or extroversion, motivation to integrate (Gardner, 1985) and general willingness to take up opportunities to speak (DeKeyser, 1991). The more an individual restricts his/her language use and input to comfortable zones, the more restricted the type of input becomes. In turn, if input is restricted to only a few registers, over-generalisation of sociolinguistic features may occur (Regan, 1998).

Pellegrino Aveni (2005) points out that such individual characteristics are by no means stable and vary greatly according to the situations in which interaction is possible. According to Pellegrino Aveni (2005), a quintessential factor influencing participation by the second language speaker is the connection between the speaking situation, the speaker’s communicative goal (e.g. information exchange, social networking, second language practice) and perceived threat to the expression of an ideal image of self. When use of the second language in a particular situation threatens the representation of self, anxiety levels increase and the quality and/or quantity of interaction decreases. In such situations, second language use is often avoided and alternate forms of communication are found or the communication is abandoned completely. In other words, “language use ultimately suffers in an effort to protect the self.” (p. 147).

McLaine-Yanagihara (1997) also found that use of a particular sociolinguistic rule in an in-country interlanguage encounter is closely tied to issues of identity. Non-use does not necessarily mean that the learner is unaware of or does not possess the pragma-linguistic tools to produce it: there may be other situational and identity factors that lead to a rejection of that rule.

Projection of identity is critical to adolescents (Androutsopoulos & Georgakipoulou, 2003; Stenström & Jørgensen, 2009) and, although it is not listed as one of the variables influencing sociolinguistic competence (Regan, 1995), it seems highly likely that age plays a role. Krashen, Scarcella and Long (1979) found that
adults acquired a second language faster than children in target language settings. Adolescents were faster than pre-adolescent children, but pre-adolescent children were more likely to achieve accent-free, native-like performance. Evidence also indicates that there may be a sensitive period for second language acquisition which ends around puberty, i.e. about 17 years (Johnson & Newport, 1989). There are, however, a number of exceptions to the rule (e.g. Bongaerts, 1999; Moyer, 1999), possibly indicating that the sensitive period is not simply due to a limit in an individual’s cognitive capacities, but also to the impact of contextual factors such as differing motivations, exposure and interactions in the target language (Singleton, 2001).

While the adolescents in this study were apparently nearing the end stage of Johnson & Newport’s (1989) sensitive period for second language acquisition, they were still acquiring skills in their first language, especially in terms of pragmatic competence. It is to a discussion of first language development in adolescence that we now turn.

3.3 Adolescent language

With some exceptions (e.g. Andersen, 2001) little attention has been placed on adolescent language variation from a pragmatic perspective. While most research focuses on native adolescent speakers of varieties of English, there is evidence to suggest that certain characteristics of adolescent speech may be universal, especially the prolific use of pragmatic markers (Andersen, 1997).

Undoubtedly, adolescent language differs from adult language and, in the case of British English, from mainstream English as represented by the British National Corpus (Andersen, 2001). Additionally, adolescent language is a ‘work in progress’ with some competencies being fully developed and others in the process of acquisition and/or change.

Adolescents usually have a fully developed competence of phonological rules and utilise a fully developed grammar in their first language (Andersen, 2001). A massive growth in vocabulary size occurs between eleven and fourteen years of age (Andersen, 2001) and there is a marked increase in a varied use of more complex syntactic structures (Scott, 1988). Turn-taking rules in adolescence are not fully developed and seem to operate on a principle of survival of the fittest (Poulsen, 1996).
While no research has been conducted on the use of turn-taking markers by adolescents, Kyatzis & Ervin-Tripp (1999) found that seven year old children did not yet use pragmatic markers for turn-taking purposes.

In a first language, the acquisition of pragmatic marker functions is a gradual and ordered process. Having already acquired the textual local coherence functions of markers (Andersen, Brizuela, Du Puy & Gollermeier, 1999), four to five year old children understand how to use them to both reflect and manipulate social relationships (Kyatzis & Ervin-Tripp, 1999). At six years of age they have acquired a fairly sophisticated ability to use markers in order to mark status asymmetry and manipulate control (Andersen et al., 1999). By seven years of age, children use different markers for different contexts and for ideational and global marking (Kyatzis & Ervin-Tripp, 1999). Eleven year old children can manage sociolinguistic style shifts (Romaine, 1984) and this ability is continually developed in adolescence through increased exposure to a wide range of linguistic varieties. By the end of their adolescent years, speakers are able to modify their speech in accordance with the speech situation (Andersen, 2001) by use of a range of linguistic tools, including pragmatic markers. The mastery of language aspects that require a level of abstraction and logical reasoning is still developing throughout adolescence. This includes use of discourse connectives and figurative uses of language by means of metaphor, irony, proverbs and idioms (Nippold, 1988a, 1988b; Nippold & Martin, 1989).

In adolescence the immediate peer group takes on a significant role in influencing language development and use (Eckert, 2000; Labov, 1970; Tagliamonte, 2005). Indeed, “one of the most important influences in the development of communicative competence is the style of speaking used in peer group interaction and the continuous monitoring from peers to which members are subjected” (Romaine, 1984, p. 183). The influence of the peer group is a reflection of an adolescent’s need to discover an awareness and acceptance of self (Heaven, 1994). Adolescents are pre-occupied with developing a sense of identity within the boundaries set by their peer group that marks their independence from adult figures of authority (Chambers, 2000). Such boundary marking has distinct linguistic manifestations, such as the appearance of subculture dialects and in-group languages. This includes use of in-group vocabulary and slang (Eble, 1996; Labov, 1992; Stenström, Andersen &

---

6 Poulson (1996) could not be cited directly as it was written in Danish.
Hasund, 2002) and phonological marking (Eckert, 2000, 1988; Garrett, Coupland & Williams, 1999). The volatile and turbulent nature of adolescent rite of passage into adulthood (Chambers, 2000) is also reflected in a high degree of linguistic creativity, with teenagers (especially females) being at the forefront of processes by which lexical items take on new discourse and pragmatic functions (Labov, 1994; Tagliamonte, 2005). This includes the use of ‘go’ as a reporting verb (Butters, 1980) and ‘like’ as a discourse quotative (Romaine & Lange, 1991).

Teenagers also tend to employ a high involvement style in which the expressive aspects of language supersede referential meaning (Andersen, 2001). This results in frequent use of reported speech, voice quality modulation (Eckert, 2000; Nordberg, 1986; Tannen, 1984), high use of intensification (Stenström, 2000; Tagliamonte, 2005), vivid and dramatic conversational storytelling (Andersen, 2001; Eriksson, 1994) and prolific use of pragmatic markers such as ‘like’, ‘just’ and ‘well’ (Andersen, 2001; Erman, 1998, 1997; Romaine & Lange, 1991; Tagliamonte, 2005). Adolescents tend not only to use pragmatic markers more than adults but they also use them for different purposes. For example, adults tend to use the marker ‘you know’ as a textual monitor (i.e. for textual cohesion) whereas adolescent use of the same marker is more oriented towards the social aspects of communication (Erman, 2001). Adolescents also tend to use markers such as ‘you know’ in formulaic chunks, reflecting their concern for quick processing and fluency rather than linguistic form (Erman, 2001).

Use of pragmatic markers by adolescents plays a critical role in the construction of youth identity (Norrby, 2000). Issues of identity become particularly salient in a study abroad setting where clashes may occur between the need to preserve one’s own sense of identity and, at the same time, become grammatically and pragmatically proficient in a second language (DuFon, 1999; Siegal, 1996, 1995). For adolescents who are, even in a first language setting, undergoing rapid cognitive, social and physiological developments (Andersen, 2001), the costs of not acquiring such pragmatic skills in an interlanguage may be high (Wierzbicka, 2003). This study aims to provide insight into factors impacting on the acquisition of pragmatic markers by adolescent exchange students and it is to a discussion of its methodological approach that we now turn.
Chapter 4  Research strategy

4.1 Experimental design

The research is quasi-experimental and longitudinal, based on recordings at zero, five and ten months with two experimental groups (GES10, GES05), a control (GS) and a base-line native-speaker group (AES). The independent variable was participation in an exchange programme, while the dependent variable was use of pragmatic markers in a semi-structured conversational interview and structured retelling task.

4.2 Participants

4.2.1 Non-native speakers (GES10, GES05, GS)

All non-native English-speaking participants were first introduced to formal classroom instruction of English in either Year four (last year of primary school) or Year five (first year of high school). At the time of data collection, it was mandatory for all German children to attend school from the age of six to fourteen years. They attended primary school until the age of ten (Years one to four), after which they were sent to one of three types of high schools: ‘Hauptschule’, ‘Realschule’ or ‘Gymnasium’. Only those who completed their schooling at a ‘Gymnasium’ were able to continue with university studies. Those who attended a ‘Hauptschule’ or ‘Realschule’ could only pursue vocational training after they left school. All of the participants in this study attended a ‘Gymnasium’, where schooling was for eight years (Year five to Year thirteen). Participants had just completed Year ten at the start of data collection. This meant they had learnt English as a second language at school for at least six years.

At the time of data collection, school curricula varied from state to state and there was no national testing. All students in German schools were assessed by their teachers on a scale of ‘1’ (extremely good) to ‘5’ (poor). English grades for the three non-native speaker groups in this study ranged from 1 to 4 and the average score for each group was between 2 and 3 (Table 4-1). They had little (i.e. two weeks or less) experience of living in the target culture.

\[^{7}\] Since data collection some changes have been implemented in Germany schools, mostly due to the results of the OECD Programme for International Student Assessment 2000 (OECD, 2001). These include reduction of the number of ‘Gymnasium’ school years and earlier introduction of English language classes in primary school.
Table 4-1 School English grades in Germany (GES10, GES05, GS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>min</th>
<th>max</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>st. dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GES10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GES05</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Intermediate to advanced learners of English were particularly suited to this study as, when exposed to the target language culture, they were better equipped to learn the subtle sociolinguistic and pragmatic aspects of language than those at a lower level of general proficiency (Kasper, 1996). Advanced students make important developments on the sociolinguistic and not the structural level of language in a study abroad setting (DeKeyser, 1991; Möhle & Raupach, 1983). At the same time, in interlanguage situations between advanced second language speakers and native speakers, the risk of pragmatic failure is high because native speakers no longer consider lack of proficiency to be an excuse for impoliteness (Barron, 2003; Enomoto & Marriott, 1994).

4.2.1.1 GES10 and GES05 (experimental)

GES10 and GES05 were pre-existing groups of sixteen to seventeen year old participants. GES10 initially consisted of sixteen German exchange students on a ten month exchange to Australia. There were nine females and seven males. However, as discussed in Chapter six, one GES10 female participant showed extreme outlier behaviour and one male did not complete the five month recordings, so only fourteen (eight females, six males), were included in the final analysis. GES05 consisted of twelve students on a five-month exchange to Australia. There were eight females and four males.

Due to differences in northern and southern adolescent German language use (Ehmann, 1992) and large differences in Bavarian English curriculum focus compared to all other German states, participants were all from northern Germany and spoke High German as their mother tongue. They were given a book (Bill Bryson’s *Breakfast with Kangaroos*\(^8\)) as an incentive for participation in the research project.

The exchange to Australia was provided by a student exchange organization

---

\(^8\) Titled “Down Under” in Australia, “In a Sunburned Country” in the USA and “Breakfast with Kangaroos” in Germany.
called WALKABOUT9. WALKABOUT’s programme goals were broadly educational: students were expected to be a part of the regular K-12 educational system and no formal foreign language instruction was provided. Out-of-class contact and language acquisition were fostered by living with a host family, which reduced the importance of individual learner differences with respect to the opportunities students seek for informal out-of-class language contact (Huebner, 1998).

WALKABOUT exchange students had to be between fifteen and eighteen years of age with at least a satisfactory grade in English and good grade in all other subjects. They had to be physically and psychologically healthy as well as flexible, adaptable, curious, tolerant and open-minded. These attributes were established through the application process. In order to participate in an exchange, students had to submit a written application to WALKABOUT describing their interests, motivation and personality, a photo of themselves as well as school and medical reports. An interview was then conducted between the student and WALKABOUT representatives.

From the perspective of the organisation, improved language abilities were not a target outcome of an exchange. Instead, the desired benefits of the exchange were the development of:

- added maturity and confidence
- worthwhile perspective towards oneself and one’s own culture
- desire for more knowledge and achievement
- tolerance of cultural and other differences
- ability to compromise and modify behaviour
- coping and decision-making skills
- international friendships
- goal-setting and perseverance10

While some students received a full-paying scholarship from WALKABOUT, most paid a comprehensive fee of approximately €8400 for a five month programme and €9400 for a ten month exchange to Australia. This included return airfares, health and travel insurance, administrative costs, pre- and post-exchange seminars and some transportation within Australia. Educational costs were usually covered by the

9 Pseudonyms are used for all participants and organisations involved in this study.
10 For anonymity, the reference for the brochures from which this information was extracted could not be supplied.
Australian government or, in the case of private education, waivered by the school.

These costs and the WALKABOUT recruitment process, undoubtedly meant that the exchange students in this study were by no means a random sample of German adolescents. They were students who were motivated and confident to go on exchange and excelled in most school subjects. Their families were willing and able to cover the high costs of the exchange experience.

4.2.1.2 GS (control)

The control group (GS) was carefully selected to match the experimental groups (GES10, GES05) as closely as possible. Each participant in GES10 and GES05 was asked to find a student of the same age, gender and English grade in his/her class to participate in the project. This recruitment process was based on the assumption that the most salient factors influencing language acquisition in a home-country classroom setting were the student’s first language, the teacher, the curriculum and the school he/she attended. Due to the absence of a national English language grading system, the only reliable means of obtaining equivalent pre-proficiency levels in GES10, GES05 and GS was to ensure that GS participants represented a similar mix of teachers, schools and grading procedures as GES10 and GES05 participants.

Unfortunately, six of the GES10 and GES05 participants were not able to find an equivalent GS participant, so GS group size was smaller than that of GES10 and GES05. Despite differences in group size, the ‘matching pair’ recruitment process resulted in a control group that was highly comparable to the experimental groups (Chapter six). This meant the control provided essential counterfactual evidence for pragmatic marker development had the study abroad experience not occurred (Shadish & Cook, 1999).

GS consisted of twenty German speakers (GS) who did not go on an exchange to Australia. They were sixteen to seventeen years of age and there were fifteen females and five males. Similar to GES05 and GES10, all GS participants were speakers of High German who lived in northern Germany. None of the GS participants went on an exchange programme to an English-speaking country for longer than two weeks during the data collection period (i.e. July, 2005 to April, 2006). While some went on one to two week home-stay school excursions to England and America during this period, this was not considered problematic as the GES10
and GES05 participants would also have participated in one of these school-initiated home-stay programmes had they not gone to Australia.

4.2.2 Native-speakers (AES)

While little research exists for Australian adolescent use of pragmatic markers, some regional variation has been found in terms of lexis, phonology and grammatical features (Oliver et al., 2002). As such, in recruiting native-speakers for the analyses reported in Chapter nine, it was necessary to control for variation in pragmatic marker use based on region or rurality (Beeching, 2002; Ferrara, 1997), education and education type (Bjurström, 1993 in Norrby, 2000\(^\text{11}\)), gender (Beeching, 2002; Erman, 1992; Holmes, 1995, 1986; Lakoff, 1975/2004; Winter & Norrby, 1999), age (Andersen, 2001; Beeching, 2002; Burridge & Florey, 2002; Erman, 1998), language variety and culture (Erman, 1998; Ferrara, 1997; Rall, 1981) and peer group (Eckert, 1988). To do this, the matching pair technique was used to establish base-line data that represented the language input experienced by the GES10 exchange students.

GES10 participants nominated an Australian teenager to participate in the study who:

- spoke Australian English and had lived in Australia for most of his/her life
- lived in the same region (e.g. urban/rural, state of residence) as the exchange student’s host family in Australia
- was preferably of the same gender and age
- attended the same school or type of school (e.g. private/public) (Bjurström, 1993 in Norrby, 2000) as the exchange student in Australia
- was preferably from the exchange students’ direct Australian peer group (Eckert, 2000)

The socio-economic class of the participant was inherently included by the matching of region, peer group and type of school (Dines, 1980). Since the socio-economic status of an adolescents’ parents plays a minimal role in adolescent language use (Andersen, 2001; Eckert, 1997, 1988), the socio-economic class of the parents (as indicated by occupation, income, educational level and area/locality of residence) (ABS, 2001; Milroy & Milroy, 1997) did not play a role in selection.

Due to the large amount of data and the fact that only comparisons between GES10 and AES were required to answer hypothesis three, only AES participants that

\(^{11}\) Since Bjurström (1993) was written in Swedish, the researcher relied on descriptions provided by Norrby (2000).
matched a GES10 participant were recruited. This resulted in a group size of thirteen participants (ten female and three male). The high number of females to males was due to the fact that some GES10 male participants elected a female as the Australian native-speaker with whom they had spent the most time outside of school. They were often their girlfriends or host sisters. All AES participants were native speakers of Australian English and had been educated for at least the past seven years in the Australian school system.

A group of German native speakers recorded in German was not included because the focus of this study was on acquisition and development of an interlanguage. While it may be interesting to consider transfer of first language norms into the interlanguage (Connor, 1996), previous research makes it clear that transfer cannot adequately explain differences between native- and non-native speaker marker use (Nikula, 1996; Siepmann, 2005). It is also highly problematic to regard “even fluent foreign language speakers’ performance as a mirror-image of their native language or of their cultural preferences” (Nikula, 1996, p. 227).

4.3 Instruments

4.3.1 Semi-structured interviews

A critical decision-making process in research design was choosing whether to collect naturally-occurring, simulated or experimental data. A number of researchers have used natural data as the basis of their research on pragmatic markers (e.g. Cook, 2008; Iino, 1999; Ishida, 2009; McMeekin, 2006). However, use of natural data would have restricted the scope of the study to qualitative analysis and reduced the comparability of data from student to student and situation to situation. For example, particularly in the longitudinal study of pragmatic markers, differences in familiarity and changes in student-host family or peer-group relationships could impact on marker use both from one data collection time to another as well as from one study abroad student context to another. Additionally, frequent changes in host families, including schools and friendship groups would have severely hampered data collection over the five or ten month period. Similar to Aijmer (2004), Marriott (1995), Müller (2005), Regan (1995) and Sawyer (1992), recorded interviews with the same interviewer were used as the main data. All interviews were conducted in English by the researcher (AG), who is a native-speaker of Australian English and highly fluent in German.
Semi-structured sociolinguistic interviews in which the participants were asked about their life history, experiences and attitudes (Labov, 1984) were chosen because they had the potential to develop into a conversation (Van Lier, 1989), were particularly appropriate for the study of pragmatic markers (Aijmer, 2004; Schiffrin, 1987) and allowed a high degree of flexibility.

Despite the advantages of group interviews (Labov, 1984; Schiffrin, 1987), one-on-one interviews were chosen. This was mostly due to the fact that group interviews would have entailed native-speakers of German speaking to each other in a second language. Such a situation could affect performance and reduce the authenticity of the speaking situation. Additionally, group interviews may have created difficulties not only in terms of logistics (e.g. finding a group of Australian teenagers in Germany for the five and ten month periods), but also the speakers knowing each other to differing degrees: a situational factor that could easily influence their use of pragmatic markers in either their first or second language (Möllering, 2001). Differences in talk time due to degree of extroversion/introversion influencing participant performance would also have had a strong and possibly negative impact on individual marker production in a focus group situation.

The interviews were always based on a general topic area (i.e. holidays, parties and celebrations, pastimes and hobbies). However, similar to authentic speaking situations, no set schedule of conversation was followed and the speakers often diverged into a range of other conversational themes. The degree of such digression varied as it was entirely dependent on interviewee-interviewer relations, shared interests, interviewee proficiency and general conversational flow. Such variation could undoubtedly impact on pragmatic marker use (Starks, Thompson & Christie, 2008) but a natural flow of conversation was always given precedence over strict interview style.

General interview topics were established by disseminating a conversation topic table (Appendix 1) to sixty-one Australian public and private school sixteen to eighteen year old pupils. These pupils noted down details of the conversations they had throughout three days, including when and where the conversation took place, with whom they interacted and the topics of the conversation. The tables were then analysed according to the most frequent topics of conversation with other adolescents and adult friends. Choice of topic was also guided by Aijmer (2004) who based her study of pragmatic markers on interviews about holidays and Stenström et al. (2002)
who found that the most salient topics among British teenagers are social networking, romance, sex talk, partying and drinking, the body, pastimes and hobbies, ‘bad’ things, race relations and school.

Paralinguistic devices (e.g. gesture, facial expression) undoubtedly play a role in the transmission of epistemic stance (Reilly, 1992) and may even be considered a type of discourse marker (Schiffrin, 1984). However, the interviews were not videotaped as video recording could have negatively impacted on authenticity and increased both participant anxiety and formality, which would have impacted on marker usage.

4.3.2 Structured retellings

In order to distract attention away from performance in the semi-structured conversations as well as understand the impact of structured versus semi-structured tasks on pragmatic marker use, participants completed a retelling task directly after the semi-structured sociolinguistic interviews. As discussed in Chapter six, the retelling data was only used in comparisons of structured vs. unstructured data collection.

Similar to Müller (2005) and Redeker (1990), participants watched a short Mr Bean movie, reported on what happened and provided a personal opinion of the clip to the interviewer. The interviewer could assist whenever necessary (e.g. vocabulary prompts). The recordings always followed the same sequence and were divided into three segments:

1. Main Retelling: The interviewer asked, ‘Can you tell me about the Mr Bean clip you have just seen?’ and the participant retold the story.
3. Secondary Retelling: The interviewer asked, “Can you tell me about another Mr Bean clip you have seen?” and the participant responded.

Mr Bean was chosen as it was widely known in both Germany and Australia and little or no language comprehension was necessary to understand the clips or their humour. The use of non-verbal stimuli was important for equality in native and non-native speaker comprehensibility and meant that the speaker produced his/her own language rather than that produced in the clip (Speight, 1987). Additionally, children and adolescents enjoy working with film (Brown, Anderson, Shillcock & Yule, 1984)
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and the recounting of vicarious experiences and reporting on films they have seen is a common occurrence for most adolescents (Erman, 2001; Speight, 1987).

**Table 4-2 Overview of interview themes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data collection</th>
<th>Interview topic</th>
<th>Mr Bean clip</th>
<th>Clip length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-mth</td>
<td>Holidays</td>
<td>Mr Bean packing for a trip</td>
<td>3:43:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-mth</td>
<td>Festivities</td>
<td>Mr Bean spending Christmas Eve and Christmas morning at home</td>
<td>4:26:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-mth</td>
<td>Free time</td>
<td>Mr Bean watching a scary movie with his girlfriend at the cinema</td>
<td>4:26:21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The clips were approximately equal in length, relatively culturally neutral and could be linked to the topics chosen for the interviews (Table 4-2). To avoid a task effect created by differences in the level of inherent structure of the stories to be retold (Skehan & Foster, 1999), all three clips involved stories that had an obvious and familiar inherent structure:

- **Zero month**: Mr Bean was packing his suitcase to go on holidays. However, his suitcase was too small and he had to decide what not to take. In the end, he had one item that wouldn’t fit into the small suitcase. He found a bigger suitcase under his bed and put the small suitcase in the big suitcase and left the room.

- **Five month**: Mr Bean was preparing for Christmas on Christmas Eve. He hung up three Christmas stockings: a large, medium and small sized one. He then watched some television, listened to some Christmas carols and went to bed. The next day he looked into the stockings and found presents for himself, his teddy bear and a mouse that lived in his flat. He then placed the present for the mouse on a mouse trap.

- **Ten month**: Mr Bean went to the cinema with his girlfriend. It was a horror movie and before it started he fooled around trying to scare everyone. When the movie began, he got very scared and tried to leave and/or hide from the movie screen. At the end of the movie he pretended he was not scared, but then got spooked by his girlfriend’s overcoat.

4.3.3 **Language contact profiles (LCP)**

An adapted version of Segalowitz & Freed’s (2004) Language Contact Profile (LCP) helped take into account differing degrees of input and use of English and
German outside of school (Appendix 2). This allowed the researcher to gain insight into specific characteristics of the learning contexts in both Australia and Germany and an understanding of the extent to which students took advantage of extracurricular activities and opportunities for language learning (Freed, Dewey, Segalowitz & Halter, 2004).

The main adaptation made to the original LCP (Segalowitz & Freed, 2004) was that not only information about use of the target language, but also use of the native language was collected. As pointed out by Gumperz (1982), it is important to take account of both exposure to the target language as well the formation of ‘networks of relationships’ when assessing the effectiveness of communication of non-native speaker immigrants. For example, a German exchange student in Australia may receive high exposure to Australian English at school, but interact mainly with other German native speaking peers outside of school. This may, in turn, impact on his/her ability to acquire some pragmatic features of Australian English.

The LCP focused on how often and for how long participants interacted with speakers of English and German. Participants were also asked to indicate the amount of time they spent doing specific activities of a non-interactive nature in English and German, such as watching TV or movies, reading novels and listening to music.

Two LCPs were developed, one for the zero month data collection and one for the five and ten month data collection points. These differed mainly in terms of provision of background information.

4.3.4 Piloting of instruments

In a pilot using three German exchange students in Australia (one male, two females) and four Australian teenagers (two males, two females), it was found that the instruments elicited discourse and interpersonal markers. In-depth analysis of marker usage was not conducted, but the frequency and range of interpersonal markers increased with time spent in Australia.

The main aim of the pilot was to obtain participant reactions to the interview topics and Mr Bean clips. One of the Mr Bean clips used in the pilot (‘exams’) tended to elicit a higher number of hesitation markers by the exchange students, indicating that the clip was more difficult to talk about than the other two. This was confirmed by one of the pilot participants and the ‘school/exams’ instrument was replaced with a general topic of festivities and a Mr Bean clip about Christmas (Table 4-2). The new
topic area and clip were piloted and were found to be of similar difficulty to the other two clips.

The pilot also indicated that, after the retelling, participants were often eager to talk about other Mr Bean clips they knew. In order to ensure consistency in the structured task, a question concerning other Mr Bean clips the participant had seen was added (see Section 4.3.2).

4.4 Data collection

In order to reduce power differentials between interviewer and participant, the interviews were all conducted in a relaxed and friendly atmosphere and, wherever possible, in the private homes of the participants. Whenever the interview could not be held in the participant’s home, a relaxed setting familiar to the participant was chosen, even if this compromised the quality of the recording e.g. outdoors, on a roof terrace or at a local café.

All of the recordings involved the researcher speaking with a participant. This meant that no controls existed for differences in gender dyads (i.e. which would have been possible with a male and a female interviewer) and the structured task involved relating a film to someone who had undoubtedly already seen it (Müller, 2005). However, it also meant that differences in marker production due to interviewer style or differing degrees of familiarization between interlocutors were minimized. All students in GES10, GES05 and GS first met the interviewer (AG) in person at the zero month recording session and met her again at the five and ten month recordings. Between recordings some email and phone contact to arrange interview times was maintained for all non-native participants.

By carefully choosing instruments and methods of data collection, a number of important aspects that may impact on pragmatic marker use were held constant. These included register and degree of formality (Beeching 2002; Ferrara, 1997), language variety and culture (Erman, 1998; Ferrara, 1997; Rall, 1981), speech medium (Tannen, 1982), discourse type (Norrick, 2001), interlocutor constellations (Beeching, 2002; Erman, 1992) and degree of speaker involvement (Beeching, 2002).

4.4.1 German exchange students (GES10, GES05)

Data collection points for GES10 and GES05 were June-July, 2005, November-December, 2005 and March-April, 2006. As suggested by Matsumara (2001), to increase the validity of any conclusions concerning the impact of study
abroad on language acquisition, all zero month interviews were recorded before the students left on exchange. This meant they were conducted in Germany between June and July, 2005. The November-December, 2005 and March-April, 2006 interviews were mostly conducted in the Australian host family homes of the participants or in an informal guest lounge at a hotel in Cairns, Australia during a WALKABOUT trip to far north Queensland.

Since there was a five month gap between testing and the pilot indicated that the interview topics were equally difficult, counterbalancing was not used and topicality was considered to be more important than task sequencing. Talking about holidays coincided with summer holidays in Germany and the topic of festivities and Christmas was covered in November-December. Counter-balancing would also have reduced the group sizes to such an extent that individual differences could over-ride the ability to detect any developmental patterns.

An original aim of the study was to compare GES10 after ten months with GES05 after five months. As such, the zero month and five month interview topics were kept the same. This means that only GES10 and GS completed the five month festivities and Christmas topic (Table 4-3).

Table 4-3 Data collection (GES10, GES05)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data collection</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Language Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June-July, 2005</td>
<td>GES10, GES05</td>
<td>holidays</td>
<td>LCP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov.-Dec., 2005</td>
<td>GES10</td>
<td>free time</td>
<td>LCP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GES05</td>
<td>festivities</td>
<td>LCP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April, 2006</td>
<td>GES10</td>
<td>free time</td>
<td>LCP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.2 German students (GS)

GS completed the same zero month interview and LCP as GES05 and GES10 in June-July, 2005 (Table 4-4). Due to administrative and travel difficulties as well as the low likelihood of rapid acquisition of pragmatic markers by GS participants, no recordings were made in November-December, 2005. However, a five month LCP was filled out in order to track any changes in language contact. The ten month interview and LCP data were collected in April, 2006 for all control group participants. The November-December, 2005 and April, 2006 LCPs for GS differed slightly from those given to GES (Appendix 2), but the format and content of the interviews and retellings remained the same.
Table 4-4 Data collection (GS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data collection</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Language Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June/July, 2005</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>holidays</td>
<td>LCP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov./Dec., 2005</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>- *</td>
<td>LCP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April, 2006</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>free time</td>
<td>LCP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A dash (-) indicates no data collected or data not used in this study*

4.4.3 Australian English speakers (AES)

Since AES participants were native-speakers and there were no issues of acquisition, data was collected from April, 2006 after GES10 exchange students had nominated a participant. In order to answer Hypothesis three, AES were only required to complete the ten-month interview topic (‘free time’) and associated Mr Bean retelling (‘movies’). As such, AES participated in one conversational interview/retelling and filled out a questionnaire on background details, e.g. age, languages spoken at home (Appendix 2). Due to the interview vs. retellings task effect for non-native speakers reported in Chapter six, only the AES interview data was eventually used.

An overview of the data collection for GES10, GES05, GS and AES is provided in Table 4-5.

Table 4-5 Timeline of data collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jun/July</td>
<td>Nov/Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GES10</td>
<td>holidays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GES05</td>
<td>holidays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS</td>
<td>holidays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AES</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A dash (-) indicates no data collected or data not used in this study*

4.5 Total recording times

Table 4-6 Total recording times (interview)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GES10 (n = 14)</th>
<th>GES05 (n = 12)</th>
<th>GS (n = 20)</th>
<th>AES (n = 13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-mth</td>
<td>163.17</td>
<td>156.44</td>
<td>233.59</td>
<td>-*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-mth</td>
<td>221.21</td>
<td>183.85</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-mth</td>
<td>242.24</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>345.54</td>
<td>199.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL (mins)</td>
<td>626.62</td>
<td>340.29</td>
<td>579.13</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL (hrs)</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A dash (-) indicates no data collected or data not used in this study.*
As shown in Table 4-6 and Table 4-7, the data was divided into:

- three data collection points (zero, five and ten months).
- two types of data (semi-structured interviews and Mr Bean structured retellings).
- four groups of participants (GES10, GES05, GS and AES).

Table 4-6 and Table 4-7 exclude one outlier in GES10 (ERM) (see Chapter six for details) and two participants who did not complete all data collection tasks (GG in GES10 and CR in GS). Participants also completed five month (GES10, GES05) and ten month (GES10, GS, AES) retellings, but these were not used in the final analysis due to a task effect in the non-native speaker zero month retelling versus interview data as reported in Chapter six.

**Figure 4-1 Variation in interview length (GES10, GES05, GS)**

Due to increased language abilities, the five and ten month semi-structured GES10, GES05 and GS interviews were longer than the zero month interviews.
Ideally, the interviews and retellings would also be the same length for each speaker (e.g. 10-15 minutes for the interview and 3-5 minutes for the retelling). However, in practice, this was not possible due to differences in language ability and willingness to talk. As a result, interview lengths varied from participant to participant (Figure 4-1) as did the length of the zero month retellings (min. = 1.43 min, max = 7.78 min). This was taken into account in the analysis by reporting results as average marker use per minute or using percentages, rather than raw frequencies.

### 4.6 Transcription

*Table 4-8 Transcription conventions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcription Conventions</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>rising intonation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@ xx @</td>
<td>overlapping speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(.)</td>
<td>pause (less than one second)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2.0)</td>
<td>pause (2 seconds)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xx</td>
<td>emphasis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=</td>
<td>latching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/</td>
<td>repair (i.e. change of sentence started, resumption after a pause)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ X ]</td>
<td>unclear (one word or syllable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ XX ]</td>
<td>unclear (two words)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ XXX ]</td>
<td>unclear (more than two words)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ xxx ~</td>
<td>non-English words</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AG: interviewer (Averil Grieve)

All non-native speaker data was transcribed by the researcher and about 75% of the native speaker data was transcribed by an external professional transcription company. All transcriptions were double checked by the researcher.

All spoken sounds, including ‘um’, ‘ah’, ‘pf’ etc., were included in the transcriptions. Considering the large amount of data, a very simple transcription mark-up system was used, which included the transcription conventions shown in
Table 4-8. In all transcripts ‘AG:’ is used to indicate the interviewer’s speech. The participant’s speech is marked on a new line with two or three initials (e.g. ‘AP:’ or ‘MAM:’). For anonymity purposes, the initials of the participants have been randomly assigned.

4.7 Coding

A concordancer was developed to extract all occurrences of the pragmatic markers identified for this study (Section 4.7.1, Appendix 3) in their context. These markers were then coded for function according to the classification system described in Chapter five. Similar to Müller (2005), coding was essentially data driven, using the functions found by previous researchers as a “mental background” (p. 28). Mirroring authentic interaction in which the hearer needs to decide on the primary function of a marker (Aijmer, 2002), coding focused on identifying the primary role of the marker in the context in which it appeared.

4.7.1 Developing an interpersonal marker inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Empathizers or appealers</td>
<td>‘you know’, ‘you see’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn-taking or topic change signals</td>
<td>‘well’, ‘right’, ‘anyway’ / ‘anyhow’ / ‘anyways’ / ‘at any rate’, ‘yeah-no’, ‘now’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slot or gap fillers and stalkers</td>
<td>‘um’, ‘well’, ‘right’, ‘you know’, ‘sort of’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximators or adjusters</td>
<td>‘sort of’, ‘kind of’, ‘quite’, ‘pretty (much)’, ‘(not) so much’, ‘basically’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasisers and both additive and restrictive focus particles</td>
<td>‘really’, ‘very’, ‘now’, ‘even’, ‘just’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terms of (token or weak) agreement or (hedged) disagreement</td>
<td>‘sure’, ‘that’s right’, ‘yeah?’ / ‘yes’ / ‘no’, ‘all right’, ‘OK’, ‘yeah-no’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverbs and lexical items expressing degrees of reliability</td>
<td>‘maybe’, ‘probably’, ‘certainly’, ‘perhaps’, ‘(be) like’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General extenders and completers</td>
<td>‘and that sort of thing’, ‘and stuff like that’, ‘or something’, ‘or whatever’, ‘and all’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tag questions and utterance final tags</td>
<td>‘…, okay?’, ‘…, right?’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back channels</td>
<td>‘mhm’, ‘ahha’, ‘yeah’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interpersonal markers had to display attitude or epistemic stance and be extractable from the discourse without impacting on syntactic structure. As discussed in Chapter two, the multifunctional nature of markers, the difficulty of defining them in structural terms (Östman, 1995) and their ever changing nature (Hopper & Traugott, 2003) means that no complete inventory exists or ever will exist for any language (Bazzanella, 1990). However, research to date (e.g. Andersen, 2000; Bazzanella, 1990; Brinton, 1996; Broccia & Puddu, 2005; Burridge & Florey, 2002; Chafe, 1986; Dines, 1980; Ferrara, 1997; Östman, 1981; Overstreet, 1999; Smith & Jucker, 2000; Stenström, 1994; Taylor, 2005) indicates that all of the items listed in Table 4-9 can fulfil the two defining characteristics of interpersonal markers chosen for this study, depending on the context in which they appear. The preliminary list of markers in Table 4-9 was used to check the data for interpersonal markers and additional items were added during transcription. The final list of interpersonal markers can be found in Appendix 3. Once this list was established a detailed coding system of interpersonal markers and their functions could be developed.

4.7.2 Developing a coding system

Based on research to date, the final list of interpersonal markers and the data, a coding system was developed that categorised pragmatic markers into discourse or interpersonal markers. A detailed explanation of this system is provided in Chapter five.

4.7.3 Total number of coded markers

17 561 interpersonal markers were coded for GES10, GES05, GS and AES and used in the analyses reported in Chapters seven to ten (Table 4-10). A further 16 473 items were coded as having a primary discourse function (Table 4-11), but were not analysed in detail in this study.

For comparisons of the zero month interviews and retellings reported in Chapter six, a further 952 interpersonal markers and 2586 discourse markers were coded in the GES10, GES05 and GS zero month retelling data12. Finally, the outlier analysis reported in Chapter six included an additional 228 interpersonal markers, which were used by ERM, who was identified as an extreme outlier in GES10 and

---

12 Markers in the five-month and ten-month retelling data were not coded for this study due to the interview and retelling task effects reported in Chapter six.
therefore excluded from the main analysis. ERM’s use of discourse markers totalled 189 in the zero month interviews.

Table 4-10 Total interpersonal markers (interview)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GES10 (n = 14)</th>
<th>GES05 (n = 12)</th>
<th>GS (n = 20)</th>
<th>AES (n = 13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-mth</td>
<td>1199</td>
<td>1196</td>
<td>1649</td>
<td>-*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-mth</td>
<td>2783</td>
<td>2086</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-mth</td>
<td>2928</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2675</td>
<td>3045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>6910</td>
<td>3282</td>
<td>4324</td>
<td>3045</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* A dash (-) indicates no data collected or data not used in this study.

Table 4-11 Total discourse markers (interview)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GES10 (n = 14)</th>
<th>GES05 (n = 12)</th>
<th>GS (n = 20)</th>
<th>AES (n = 13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-mth</td>
<td>1315</td>
<td>1742</td>
<td>2194</td>
<td>-*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-mth</td>
<td>1838</td>
<td>1637</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-mth</td>
<td>2287</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2934</td>
<td>2526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>5440</td>
<td>3379</td>
<td>5128</td>
<td>2526</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* A dash (-) indicates no data collected or data not used in this study.

Due to differences in group size and interview length as well as the need for simple transcription (e.g. transcription doesn’t include intonation units), interpersonal marker usage was measured as average marker per minute. Marker use per number of words was not used. The disjointed nature of non-native speaker spoken data made such calculations difficult due to the high number of incomplete lexical items, repetitions and false starts.

Table 4-12 Interpersonal marker descriptives (interview)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GES10 (n = 14)</th>
<th>GES05 (n = 12)</th>
<th>GS (n = 20)</th>
<th>AES (n = 13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-mth</td>
<td>Mean 7.3</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>-*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St.Dev. 1.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-mth</td>
<td>Mean 12.6</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St.Dev. 3.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-mth</td>
<td>Mean 12.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St.Dev. 3.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* A dash (-) indicates no data collected or data not used in this study.

Table 4-13 Interpersonal marker descriptives (retelling)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GES10 (n = 14)</th>
<th>GES05 (n = 12)</th>
<th>GS (n = 20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-mth</td>
<td>Mean 4.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St.Dev. 1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A summary of total average per minute use and standard deviations of
interpersonal marker use for each group is provided in Table 4-12 for the interviews and in Table 4-13 for the retellings. Discourse markers are not included in Table 4-12 and Table 4-13 because they were not analysed in this study. Reasons for excluding one outlier in GES10 (resulting in an n-size of 14) are discussed in Chapter six.

4.7.4 Intercoder reliability

Having established a coding system and coded all relevant pragmatic markers in the data, intercoder reliability was conducted to assess the validity of the coding system. The results of this are discussed in detail in Chapter five.

4.8 Calculating hours of language contact

Hours per week of extracurricular language contact for each the four areas of contact in the LCP (reading, writing, speaking and listening) were calculated using answers provided in the language contact questionnaire. This meant that each participant received a language contact score out of 168, reflecting the fact that there are 168 hours in one week.

An overall hours per week rate for all four language contact areas was not calculated due to issues of overlap (i.e. speaking and listening or reading and listening can occur simultaneously). Additionally, any calculation of an overall score for the four areas would entail weighting reading, writing, listening or speaking language contact situations according to their impact on pragmatic marker acquisition. Not enough is known about their relative importance and valid arguments can be put forth for a range of skill weighting systems. For example, oral contact (i.e. speaking and listening) could be considered more advantageous than the literary contact (reading and writing) for pragmatic marker acquisition. Alternatively, it could be argued that language contact situations involving the participant’s own language production (i.e. speaking and writing) are more important than receptive ones of listening and reading. Or reading and listening might be given more weight than speaking and writing situations as they are more likely to entail confrontation with language that is unknown to the learner.

4.9 Analysis

4.9.1 Statistical and analytical procedures

Considering the highly idiosyncratic nature of pragmatic marker use, the data was not expected to be normally distributed in any of the groups. Group sizes were
not always greater than thirty and, therefore, were not large enough to represent the entire population of Australians, exchange students or German adolescents. This meant that the data did not fulfil more than one of the assumptions required for parametric statistical testing (e.g. t-test, ANOVA) and nonparametric statistics were used.

To compare similarities and differences between the GES10, GES05 and GS at zero months (Chapter six), Kruskal-Wallis H-tests were used as well as Mann Whitney U-tests with a Bonferroni correction to pinpoint which two of the three groups showed the greatest difference. Longitudinal analyses focusing on the acquisition of interpersonal markers in GES10, GES05 and GS (Chapters seven, eight and ten) relied on Wilcoxon Signed Rank tests for statistical significance. For comparisons of GES10 with GS, AES and GES05 at ten months in Chapters seven, eight and nine Mann Whitney U-tests were used.

Significance levels for all tests were set at $p < .05$. If significance levels were reached, an effect size was calculated using Cohen’s d. If effect size was greater than 0.8, it was considered large (Cohen, 1988) and further detailed analysis was conducted. If effect size was small or medium (i.e. less than 0.8), the result was not considered large enough to warrant further investigation.

### 4.9.2 Testing the data

Before the core analysis could be conducted, a number of analyses were run to check the strength of the data. This included checking for outliers, testing whether GES10, GES05 and GS were the same at the outset of the study, whether there was a task effect for interpersonal marker use in the interviews and retellings and whether the LCP scores could be a true representation of language contact. The results of these analyses are reported in Chapter six.

### 4.9.3 Core analysis

Having established the reliability of the coding system and data, acquisition of interpersonal markers during the study abroad by GES10 was analysed in detail (Chapter seven). This was then compared to acquisition by GS from zero to ten months (Chapter eight) and GES05 from zero to five months (Chapter ten). Comparisons were also made between use of interpersonal markers by GES10 and AES after ten months of living in Australia (Chapter nine). These provided answers to
the four hypotheses of the study.

4.10  Reliability and validity of design

Throughout research design and analysis, a range of mechanisms were put into place to increase reliability and the internal validity, statistical conclusion validity, construct validity and external validity of the project (Shadish et al., 2002). A summary is provided in Appendix 4 and only those issues that were arguably only partly resolved are discussed here.

4.10.1 Internal validity

4.10.1.1 Maturation

The exchange students may have matured more quickly than the students who remained in Germany and this may have impacted on language acquisition and use. There was no way to control for this in research design. However, as the focus of the research is on the impact of study abroad, accelerated maturation during the student exchange was simply seen as part of the experimental treatment.

4.10.1.2 Perception of roles

While perception of roles may have impacted on interpersonal marker use, the relationship between the interviewer and participant was the same for all recordings. Naturally, the researcher was aware of the purpose of the recordings but it is unlikely that this impacted on the participants’ use of interpersonal markers as such items are difficult to elicit.

The interviewer’s own use of pragmatic markers was not taken into account in this study. While time, resource and technical restrictions were at play, this decision was also based on Hellerman and Vergun (2007) who found that even in situations where a teacher interacts with non-native speakers every week for at least three hours, his/her use of pragmatic markers does not influence the use of markers by students. This is especially the case for markers used to establish local, interpersonal relationships in interaction, which are the main focus of this study.

4.10.1.3 Mortality

The success of this longitudinal research was dependent on participants completing at least two recordings over the ten month period. The highest risk was if GES10 or GES05 participants decided to return to Germany earlier than expected and
not complete the five or ten month recordings. The possibility of GS participants dropping out of the study was also high as they were recruited by GES10 and GES05 participants and had less invested interest in the project. To reduce the risk of mortality, the researcher kept herself in the students’ radar by e-mailing participants between interviews (e.g. a friendly thank you note for participating in the project, a reminder about up-coming interviews, Christmas greetings). These e-mails were written in English, maintained a low level of formality and provided GS participants a means of passively or actively practising their English with a native speaker. The mortality rate was extremely low: one male GS participant (CR) was unable to complete the ten month interview due to a severe case of hayfever on the day of data collection and one male GES10 participant (GG) was not able to participate in the five month data collection due to host family difficulties at the time. Data for CR and GG was not used. Two of the GES10 participants (SJ and MD) returned home early due to severe difficulties in the Australian host family and a family illness in Germany. However, both returned very late in the course of their exchange (i.e. no more than three weeks before the end). They still participated in the ten month interviews and were included in the study.

4.10.2 Construct validity

4.10.2.1 Task perception

The participants did not know the focus of the study until the zero, five and ten month recordings were completed. Some participants thought it was a memory test and other believed it was testing vocabulary acquisition. While it may be the case that some participants used less interpersonal markers because they were trying to speak their best English (Brinton, 1996), a large number of interpersonal markers were found in the data and the research does not set out to describe an individual’s full interpersonal marker repertoire after a student exchange. By including the retelling task as a distractor, most of the students thought that the main data was the retellings. As discussed in Chapter six, they may have been less likely to consider the interview as a formal test of their abilities, giving rise to less focus on form and increased interpersonal marker use.
4.10.3 External validity

4.10.3.1 Generalizability

As with many quasi-experimental designs, generalizability was an issue and the results may only be applicable to German-language background exchange students in Australia. Considering the large number of exchange programmes in Germany and the popularity of English as a second language, the number of such individuals is likely to remain high.

Due to the contextual sensitivity of pragmatic marker use (Fuller, 2003; Möllering, 2001), especially in terms of level of formality, gender and familiarity of the interlocutors (Jucker & Smith, 1998; Redeker, 1990), the results may also be limited to conversational interviews between adolescents and thirty-three year old female adults who were, at least initially, only vaguely familiar with each other. Indeed, conversations between adolescents who are familiar with each other may be very different to those produced in this study.

There was also no means of excluding the possible effects of increased familiarity between the researcher and participants over the course of the study. For example, increased use of interpersonal markers or choice of particular markers may simply have been due to the fact that the researcher and participant became increasingly familiar with each other as the project progressed. Results by Redeker (1990) support this supposition; she found that speakers who were describing a silent film to a friend used more markers of pragmatic structure (as opposed to markers of ideational structure) than participants who were talking to a stranger. Similarly, participants talking to a stranger used more formal and more strictly idea-oriented language, resulting in high use of ideational and low use of interpersonal markers. Jucker & Smith (1998) also found that the choice of marker was based on assumptions speakers make about the knowledge of their interlocutors. Reception markers such as ‘oh’ and ‘yeah’ were used more between strangers and presentation markers such as ‘like’, ‘well’ and ‘you know’ were used more in interactions between friends. This came as no great surprise considering that a number of interpersonal markers reveal assumptions about the interlocutor’s knowledge or frame of mind (Jucker & Smith, 1998). However, Jucker & Smith’s (1998) and Redeker’s (1990)
results were not supported by those of Bazzanella (1990) who found that with increased intimacy, the use of the Italian equivalents of ‘you know’, ‘let’s say’ and ‘well’ diminished. Bazzanella (1990) found that the more familiarity between participants, the more superfluous markers of intimacy became. These seemingly contradictory results may, however, simply be due to large differences in data collection and methodological structure. Bazzanella’s (1990) study was based on a range of authentic data sources (e.g. everyday conversations, TV and radio programs, university and classroom interactions, telephone calls), whereas Redeker (1990) used film retellings by North American university and non-university students. Jucker & Smith (1998) based their findings on semi-structured fifteen minute conversations between North American university students. In Redeker’s (1990) study there was no visual contact between participants, some of Bazzanella’s data excluded visual contact, and participants in Jucker & Smith (1998) completed the recordings face-to-face. Naturally the two different languages of study (i.e. Italian and American English) could also have played a role.

In defence of the semi-structured interviews, they may well have reflected a situation that was very familiar to all an exchange students. Over the course of their exchange, the students gradually got to know a wide range of people with whom they initially shared a very low level of familiarity. Their interaction was not exclusively with other adolescents, but with native-speakers from a wide range of age groups. This included their host parents, teachers, host grandparents and younger or older host-siblings, with whom they initially shared no relation. Indeed, host family members were their initial point of contact in Australia and, in most cases, the students interacted with them on a daily basis throughout the duration of their exchange. Additionally, even though the German exchange students who remained in Germany got to know the researcher equally as well as the exchange students, very little interpersonal marker acquisition took place. The Australian native speakers also made frequent use of interpersonal markers when speaking to the researcher, even though they had only just met her in order to conduct the recordings. These two results clearly indicated that increased familiarity between the researcher and participants could not explain non-native speaker marker acquisition.

Additionally, as pointed out by Fuller (2003), while the speech context may influence the use and frequency of some markers (e.g. ‘oh’ and ‘well’ as reception markers between turns), there are a number of markers that are relatively universal
across interviews and casual conversations (i.e. ‘you know’, ‘like’, ‘yeah’ and ‘I mean’ as presentation markers). As such the conversational interviews yield results that reflect, to at least some degree, the use of pragmatic markers in casual conversation.

A speech context is not indexed by the use of some markers and not others, but is created by higher or lower frequency of use of markers with certain functions.

(Fuller, 2003, p. 44)

Finally, the fact that the researcher and participants got to know each other better throughout the course of the study mirrors authentic study abroad experiences, in which the students arrive knowing no-one but gradually get to know host family members and friends throughout the course of their exchange.
Chapter 5  The coding system

The coding system was developed through both bottom-up and top-down processes. Initially, an inventory of interpersonal markers as defined by previous research was compiled and a range of other markers that fulfilled the pragmatic marker criteria of this study were added during transcription. Once an inventory of markers was established (Appendix 3), markers were coded according to their primary function in the data. The coding was based on previous research but was also continuously adapted according to the use of the markers in the data.

This chapter provides a detailed overview of the final coding system and examples from the data. Whenever possible, examples focus on use of the pragmatic marker ‘like’ due to its wide range of functions and recognised role as a key marker of adolescent speech. For exemplification of functions that ‘like’ did not fulfil (e.g. turn-taking), other markers were selected.

Before describing the classification system used in this study, it is important to emphasise that while a classification system was necessary for analysis, it did not assume a one-to-one matching of function with marker. Pragmatic markers are notoriously multifunctional and classification in this study was based on the primary function of the marker in the context in which it appeared.

As shown in Figure 5-1, pragmatic markers were coded as either interpersonal or discourse markers. Interpersonal markers were further subdivided into attitude and management markers. Attitude markers were once again subdivided into approximation, intensification and knowledge markers. Management was split into markers of involvement, turn-taking and reformulation. Discourse markers focused on the text and were further subdivided into editing, quotative, topic and syntactic coherence markers. These subcategories of discourse markers were not, however, developed in detail as they were not the main focus of this study. While a marker could only be coded as either interpersonal or discourse, it could simultaneously be classified for politeness marker functions. As discussed in Section 5.3, this was based on Nikula’s (1996) assertion that pragmatic force modifiers can mark both politeness and interpersonal stance concurrently.
5.1 Interpersonal markers

In this study, interpersonal markers were those that signalled implicit attitudes, feelings or prejudices and highlighted an interest in securing understanding. As the name suggests, interpersonal markers helped establish an implicit relationship between the speaker, hearer and message. In contrast to discourse markers, interpersonal markers in this coding system were closely associated with the expression of personal identity. They incorporated Östman’s (1981) pragmatic particles and Schiffrin’s (1987) markers, which Nikula (1996) highlighted for their interpersonal significance. Nikula’s (1996)
implicit markers to show consideration, involvement and friendliness towards the addressee were also included.

5.1.1 Attitude markers

Attitude markers were speaker focused and monitored the relationship between the message and speaker. They enabled the speakers to implicitly express their attitude to the content of the proposition (Holmes, 1984) as well as to the addressee. For example, they provided implicit information about the speaker’s commitment to the truth and his/her personal judgment of the proposition (Coates 1987; Palmer, 2001).

The subcategories of interpersonal-attitude markers are shown in Table 5-1. They draw on the work of the semanticists Prince, Bosk and Frader (1982) who clearly distinguished between ‘hedges’ (i.e. approximators) and ‘shields’ (i.e. mental state predicates). This category also incorporated Nikula’s (1996) explicit modifiers, which explicitly signalled the speakers’ attitudes to their messages by showing (un)certainty, fuzziness or vagueness. Inclusion of mental state predicates and emphatic particles as markers of attitude also tied in with Chafe’s (1986) categories of ego-involvement and topic involvement. There was, of course, some degree of overlap between the three categories but as a general rule of thumb, approximation rendered something vague or imprecise, while intensifiers were indefinite and pertained to extent (Athanasiadou, 2007). Knowledge markers focused on expression of personal opinion and commitment to the truth of the proposition (Kärkkäinen, 2003; Mullan, 2010).

Table 5-1 Interpersonal markers – attitude

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) Approximation and vagueness</td>
<td>Approximation of concept (e.g. ‘sort of’/’kind of’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modal adverbs meaning ‘more or less’ (e.g. ‘like’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Numerical and non-numerical vague quantifiers (e.g. ‘(not) much’, ‘about’, ‘a bit’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General extenders (e.g. ‘and stuff’, ‘and things’, ‘or what’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Intensification of proposition</td>
<td>Adverbial intensifiers (e.g. ‘actually’, ‘very’, ‘really’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phrases of emphasis (e.g. ‘I must say’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emphasis on a particular word/phrase (e.g. ‘like’, ‘all’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Knowledge and epistemic modality</td>
<td>Mental-state predicates (e.g. ‘I think’, ‘I suppose’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other markers of personal opinion (e.g. ‘for me’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modal adverbs showing certainty (e.g. ‘probably’)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.1.1.1 Approximation

Approximators did not impact on the speaker’s commitment to the truth of a proposition but created a degree of vagueness (or fuzziness) in the propositional content (Prince et al., 1982). They could be extracted from the syntactic context, but their distribution was often highly restricted, especially for numerical and non-numerical vague quantifiers (Waksler, 2001) and general extenders (Overstreet 2005, 1999).

Example 5-1 (AES, 0-mth, interview)

CM: yeah we stayed (1.0) where did we stay that time + we stayed in a caravany park thing
AG: oh ok @ yep @
CM: and that was like really expensive
AG: oh
CM: but it was nice they had **like** tropical parrots and everything
AG: yep
CM: in huge cages that you could walk into +

By marking use of vague terminology or rendering an exact term or quantity vague (Jucker, Smith & Lüdge, 2003), the speaker automatically highlighted his/her assumption of mutual understanding and knowledge of both the content and context of speech (Channell, 1994; Jucker et al., 2003). He/she also highlighted that the focus of the conversation was to share experiences rather than convey precise information (Channell, 1994). As such, the approximation markers provided global coherence (Lenk, 1998a, 1998b) between the proposition, the knowledge base of the participants and the world beyond the immediate context. In Example 5-1 CM prefaced ‘tropical parrots’ with ‘like’ to indicate use of a random example. ‘Like’ indicated that there were not only tropical parrots in the cage, but also other exotic small animals such as turtles or butterflies. By not providing a more accurate term for the types of animals in the cage, CM assumed shared interlocutor knowledge, whereby both CM and AG knew that the approximate group of exotic animals did not include tigers or bears. In this particular example, both ‘like’ and the general extender ‘and everything’ rendered the term ‘tropical parrots’ vague. Indeed approximator-‘like’ often, but not always, collocated with a general extender. This meant a vague term could be marked twice for vagueness (Jucker et al., 2003) in the same way that a lexical item may be intensified by
more than one intensification marker (Labov, 1985).

5.1.1.2 Intensification

Unlike Lenk (1998a), markers used for propositional emphasis were included as pragmatic markers as they fulfilled the two defining characteristics of markers in this study. They could be extracted from the discourse and undoubtedly expressed the speaker’s covert thinking processes (Schourup, 1985), emotions, attitudes and degree of commitment to the proposition (Labov, 1985). Use and choice of particular intensifiers also signalled in-group membership (Peters, 1994), involvement in the subject matter (Biber & Finegan, 1989, 1988; Chafe, 1985) and subjective interpretation of salient information (Athanasiadou, 2007).

The majority of intensifiers in this study were degree adverbs. Degree adverbs for intensification were included as they showed subjectivity (Aijmer, 2002), indicated emotional involvement (Athanasiadou, 2007) and were grammatically optional. The degree modifiers included in this study all imposed “a reinforcing or attenuating reading on the elements they modify, thus exhibiting the speaker’s assessment of these elements” (Athanasiadou, 2007, p. 560). They indicated a desire to be original, were a demonstration of verbal skill and were intended to capture the audience’s attention (Peters, 1994). As such, they played a central part in the social and emotional expression of the speaker (Ito & Tagliamonte, 2003; Labov, 1985; Peters 1994). By using degree adverbs for intensification, the speaker clearly indicated that the presentation of events was from a personal insider perspective (Athanasiadou, 2007).

Discourse focus marking (Section 5.2) and intensification overlapped somewhat as they both highlighted the salience of upcoming propositional content. The difference was, however, that intensifiers not only added focus to a particular lexical item or concept, but scaled the properties of that item or concept up or down (Athanasiadou, 2007). The lexical item being modified was often an adjective, verb or adverb of strong opinion or emotion or one that expressed extreme characteristics. Intensification of such items highlighted the speakers’ emotive involvement in the discourse. Unlike intensifiers, discourse focus markers did not collocate with gradable entities or items expressing particularly strong or extreme values. Their function was to lessen the
comprehension load of the hearer by highlighting salience. For example, ‘like’ in Example 5-2 was classified as an intensifier because it modified an adjective of extreme value and highlighted use of colloquial adolescent language (i.e. ‘unreal’ as opposed to ‘fantastic’ or ‘brilliant’). However, ‘like’ in Example 5-3 was classified as a discourse focus marker because it was not used with extreme values and its main role was to simply highlight new or given information (Miller & Weinert, 1995; Underhill, 1988). In doing so it guided the listener’s comprehension of the speaker’s intended message.

Example 5-2 (GES10, 10-mth, interview)

US: [...] well they do gymnastics
AG: yep
US: and they could even stand / they could um stand up on a boogie board +
AG: yep
US: but they're balance is **like** unreal (laughs)
AG: really +

Example 5-3 (GES10, 10-mth, interview)

ERM: and then I stac / actu- / I actually never sat on the side where a car driver **like** sits +
AG: yep @ yep @
ERM: @ so @ I just I don't know normally you would try to do something but I just let go and she was like oh my god

As was the case for intensifier ‘like’ in Example 5-2, most intensifiers were semantically bleached. In the contexts they were used, they had lost most if not all of their lexical meaning or semantic content, and had shifted from a modal use to one of intensification (Partington, 1993).

5.1.1.3 Knowledge

Classification of mental state predicates or markers of personal opinion was mostly based on Prince et al.’s (1982) concept of ‘shields’. They impacted on the speaker’s commitment to the truth of the proposition and introduced “a fuzziness in the relationship between the propositional content and the speaker” (p. 85). This set them apart from markers of approximation which only created a degree of vagueness in the propositional content.
itself.

While it is clear that epistemic expressions can also have discourse roles (Mullan, 2010), they were classified as knowledge markers in this study because they invariably marked the speaker’s stance towards a proposition (Baumgarten & House, 2010; Mullan, 2010). In this study, all epistemic expressions indicated the speaker’s personal judgement and degree of confidence in the evidence on which a proposition was based.

Example 5-4 (GES05, 0-mth, interview)

CLO: hm I tend to do like last minute +
AG: hmhm
CLO: so (.) for example I haven't packed anything yet
AG: hmhm
CLO: for Australia so I'll do it on monday **I guess**
AG: yep
CLO: I fly on thursday + so I just

Example 5-5 (AES, 10-mth, interview)

AG: oh is it +
MS: yeah like our house isn't fabulous + it's just like a little sort of (.) cottage + not even like a cottage just like a little @ house @
AG: @ yep @
MS: but um (.) the land **apparently** it's worth heaps around there +
AG: yep

Example 5-6 (GES10, 10-mth, interview)

US: and they make just stupid comments about that and stuff
AG: oh
US: so (.)
AG: yeah that makes it difficult because then you really can't talk @ about @
US: @ yeah @ **I know**
AG: and it was a big part of your life + the

The majority of knowledge markers were epistemic expressions (Example 5-4) such as ‘I (don’t) think’, ‘I (don’t) know’, ‘I guess’ and ‘I (don’t) reckon’ (see Appendix 3 for more examples). Knowledge markers also consisted of modal adverbs expressing degree of certainty and/or evidentiality (Kärkkäinen, 2003) such as
‘probably’ or ‘apparently’ (Example 5-5). One exception was the use of ‘I know’ to indicate agreement with the interlocutor rather than expression of epistemic stance (Example 5-6). These were coded as involvement markers.

During transcription the grammatically optional expressions ‘for me’ or ‘to me’ (Example 5-7) were added as they were often used to clearly indicate that the idea being expressed was a personal opinion that did not necessarily have to be universally accepted. In Example 5-7, AKK could have excluded ‘for me’ without compromising syntactic integrity or propositional clarity. By including ‘for me’ she highlighted the fact that her reaction to the film was entirely personal and other viewers may not have experienced the same emotional response to the film.

Example 5-7 (GS, 10-mth, interview)

AKK: […] (.) after I didn't wanted to see it (laughs)
AG: (laughs) (.) did you watch the whole movie + and then (.)
AKK: no (laughs)
AG: no (laughs)
AKK: only the beginning and that was ah (.) horrible enough **for me**
(laughs)
AG: (laughs) wow and you've never

5.1.2 Management markers

As the other major category of interpersonal markers, management markers were hearer focused and monitored the activity of communication between interlocutors. They indicated the speakers’ interest in securing cooperation and understanding and marked points of negotiation of the meaning and management of discourse.

They were sub-divided into three categories as shown in Table 5-2.

Table 5-2 Interpersonal markers - management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) Involvement</td>
<td>• Ensuring comprehension (e.g. ‘you know what I mean’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Display of understanding (e.g. ‘ahha’, ‘hmhm’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Exclamations (e.g. ‘oh’, ‘ah’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Showing agreement (e.g. ‘exactly’, ‘that’s true’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Turn-taking</td>
<td>• Turn-regulation, including turn-uptake, turn-end</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e.g. ‘um’, ‘well’, ‘yeah’, ‘so’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Reformulation</td>
<td>• Explicit reformulation for increased comprehension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e.g. ‘in other words’, ‘I mean’)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.1.2.1 Involvement

Involvement markers implied interest, understanding and agreement with the interlocutor and emotional involvement in the conversation taking place. Unlike Nikula (1996) and similar to Gumperz (1982), the term ‘involvement’ was not restricted to emotive communication but also included active co-involvement in the management of discourse such as ensuring understanding, showing agreement and signalling attention.

The majority of involvement markers were back channels (Yngve, 1970). Back channels were all those verbal signals of attention that did not interrupt the flow of the speaker’s talk or turn (Yngve, 1970), but showed involvement, interest and attentiveness towards the interlocutor and his/her speech. At the same time they assisted in co-constructing the turn (Young & Lee, 2004) and indicated to the speaker that he/she should continue talking (Schegloff, 1982). They included vocalizations such as ‘hm’ or ‘ahha’, words such as ‘yeah’, ‘ok’ and ‘wow’ and even brief reactive questions such as ‘really?’. Many of these not only indicated attentiveness but also the speaker’s agreement, surprise or other emotional engagement with the topic at hand. In Example 5-8 AG was describing an article she had read about cultural differences in choice of board games played in the USA and Germany. The contents of the article supported JP’s previously mentioned negative opinion of board games played in Australia. JP used ‘yeah’ as a question and ‘oh’ to indicate her interest in AG’s information as well as surprise that her opinion had been ratified by scientific research.

Example 5-8 (GES10, 5-mth, interview)

AG: yeah (1.0) it’s funny I (.) read somewhere that / that board games that you play in germany + and board games that you play (.) / it was in america + I think + that / are / that they’re very different +
JP: **yeah +**
AG: like they're based on really different skills +
JP: **oh**
AG: and it sort of applied to australia as well

Agreement phrases typically appeared as back channels in overlapping speech or at grammatical junctures in the interlocutor’s turn, but could also appear at the start of
the speaker’s own turn (Example 5-9). In all cases, they related directly to the opinions expressed by the interlocutor and showed attentiveness and involvement in the discourse.

Example 5-9 (GES10, 5-mth, interview)

AG: and some people / or at least my (.) husband said that it's (.) easier here because it's summer + so @ it doesn't @
LD: @ yeah @
AG: feel like Christmas +
LD: yeah
AG: yep
LD: **that's true** I just (.) um (2.0) before dinner I went up

Exclamations were closely related to such phrases of agreement and emotional engagement and were initially all coded as intensifiers. However, it became apparent during coding that it was difficult to disambiguate back channels from exclams. Exclams were classified as involvement markers when they showed an emotional involvement in the interlocutor’s speech, but not one’s own. In these cases the main focus of the exclaim was on the relationship between message and interlocutor (i.e. management) and not on the speaker and proposition (i.e. attitude markers). If the exclaim was used to intensify emotive involvement in one’s own propositional content, it was classified as an intensifier (e.g. Example 7-17). Clearly, the two categories often overlapped, but needed to be clearly defined for coding purposes.

Finally, ensuring comprehension between the two interlocutors included the use of markers to confirm the listener had fully understood the proposition, such as the phrase ‘you know (what I mean)’.

Example 5-10 (GES10, 5-mth, interview)

AG: ah yeah (3.0) um (.) I was about to ask you something (.) oh yeah so you've moved / you've moved host families +
LD: yeah because um (.) yeah it just didn't work + I su- / I guess we are just (.) **you know** + too different + (laughs)
AG: yep yep
5.1.2.2  Turn-taking

Turn-taking markers were all those markers that were used for turn uptake (Example 5-11) or to indicate the end of a turn (Example 5-12).

*Example 5-11 (GES05, 5-mth, Retelling)*

AG: hah (laughs) ok cool (.) um can you tell me about another mr bean that you've seen + (.) that sort of you can remember +
HP: (3.0) **hm** (1.0) I remember the one you showed me @ before

*Example 5-12 (GES10, 5-mth, interview)*

JP: but here it stops at midnight so you can't really go out +
AG: hmm
JP: and you have to be (.) / it's really un- / annoying I don't like this +
AG: hmmhm (.)
JP: **yeah**
AG: because it's so restricted +
JP: yeah @

As explained in Section 5.5.4, for consistency in coding, any marker that began a turn regardless of the length of pauses before or after the marker was coded as a turn-taking marker. Floor-holding devices were not included in this category as they were typically concurrently markers of hesitation or topic continuation.

5.1.2.3  Reformulation

Reformulation markers were those that ensured interlocutor comprehensibility by marking the provision of an alternate wording (Example 5-13). Initially, these were classified as discourse markers but reformulation markers were moved to the interpersonal marker category because of their inherent dependence on assumption of mutual knowledge and understanding between the interlocutors and message. They did not simply link two discourse segments but highlighted insertion of a segment based on an assumption of potential interlocutor misunderstanding. In other words, use of reformulation markers highlighted an assumption of misunderstanding or a lack of mutual knowledge.
Reformulations were difficult to differentiate from hesitation or editing and were only used once in the retellings by the non-native participants in this study. For these reasons, they were not included in the analyses reported in Chapters six to ten.

**Example 5-13 (GES10, 10-mth, Retelling)**

AG: hmm
GH: and when he went to the beach there was no change / no changing room +
AG: hmm
GH: **so** no toilet or anything so he had to change at

5.2 Discourse markers

As discourse markers were not the focus of this study, they are not discussed in extensive detail here. A brief overview is, however, provided in order to increase understanding of why markers were sometimes classified as discourse and not interpersonal markers in this study.

*Table 5-3 Discourse markers - textual*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) Editing</td>
<td>• Repair (e.g. ‘actually’, ‘oh’, ‘no’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Hesitation (e.g. ‘um’, ‘ah’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Fillers (e.g. ‘yeah’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Quotative</td>
<td>• Mark speech that is being reported (e.g. ‘like’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Topic and focus</td>
<td>• Topic change, i.e. introduction of a completely new topic (e.g. ‘by the way’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Topic shift, i.e. focus of conversation centres on a different aspect of the same topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Topic continuation (e.g. ‘actually’ or ‘yeah’ after an editing phase)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Topic digression (e.g. ‘actually’, ‘oh’, ‘hang on’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Summing up (e.g. ‘and so’ …)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Focusing on main point (e.g. ‘like’ to highlight answer to question)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Coherence</td>
<td>• Sequencing (e.g. ‘firstly’, ‘then’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Connectives/conjunctions (e.g. ‘since’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Causal relations (e.g. X + Y, ‘so’ Z)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Examples (e.g. ‘like’, ‘for example’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Establishing contrasts (e.g. ‘but’, ‘actually’, ‘then-now’)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discourse markers monitored the discourse and focused on the text. Their main purpose was to reduce the hearer’s processing load in utterance comprehension (Andersen, 1998). They provided local coherence by signaling sequential discourse
relationships within or between two utterances (Lenk, 1998a, 1998b). They also established global coherence by showing the relation of utterances to each other within longer stretches of discourse (Lenk, 1998a, 1998b). They could refer back to something mentioned earlier in the conversation or project ahead to something the speaker intended to mention in the ensuing stretch of discourse. They also marked transitions or moves between phases within a text (but not turns between speakers).

In this study, discourse markers were sub-categorised into four types (Table 5-3). However, as mentioned above, clear distinctions between or within these categories were not established simply because they were not the main focus of the study. This was especially the case for topic/focus and coherence, while editing and quotative markers were more easily classifiable with clear coding rules. It is important to note, that editing markers were not necessarily signs of disfluency, but use of such markers may have been used by both native and non-native participants to indicate the speaker was managing throughout disfluency and repair (Wong, 2000).

### 5.3 Politeness markers

Similar to Nikula (1996), the data for this study did not involve any severe face-threatening acts. However, as the majority of linguistic acts entail a potential threat to face (Brown & Levinson, 1987), there were instances in the data where the expression of opinion or the telling of an event may have threatened the face of the self or other. This included discussing relationship difficulties with the host family, providing dispreferred responses to yes/no questions or even discussing cultural differences between Australia and Germany.

Politeness markers were initially a subcategory of interpersonal markers until it became obvious that politeness markers invariably concurrently fulfilled discourse or interpersonal functions. This added weight to Nikula’s (1996) hypothesis that “it is probably the case that pragmatic force modifiers are capable of signalling both politeness and involvement simultaneously” (p. 97) as well as Jucker et al.’s (2003) assertion that approximators can signal vagueness and politeness concurrently. As a result, markers for politeness were not a separate category to discourse or interpersonal markers, but discourse or interpersonal markers were double coded for politeness in
contexts involving threat to face. This meant there was a clear separation of politeness functions from those that serve to further the interaction and regulate conversation (Erman, 2001). There was also a clear delineation between subjectivity marking and highlighting a concern for the relationship between interlocutors (Andersen, 2001).

Example 5-14 (GS, 10-mth, interview)

AG: cause here / you can go in + but you can't drink + if you're under eighteen + @ is that right + @
AM: @ **yeah** that would @ / that would be like a solution but **um** actually (.) they'd / you're not allowed to go in +
AG: yeah
AM: if you're less than twenty one years old + (.) @ and @
AG: @ wow @
AM: I mean in germany you are not allowed ah (.) to drink as well

In Example 5-14 the face of AG was threatened by the fact that AM had to provide a negative response to AG’s yes/no question. He began the turn with the turn-taking marker ‘yeah’ which concurrently fulfilled a politeness function, whereby he expressed agreement despite the fact that he was disagreeing. Similarly ‘um’ fulfilled a discourse marking function of hesitation but concurrently indicated the speaker’s concern for saving the face of AG. It was not possible to ascertain whether the interpersonal (‘yeah’), discourse (‘um’) or politeness function was primary.

Table 5-4 Politeness markers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| i) Mitigating a negatively affective speech act | • Soften objections or counterclaims (e.g. ‘well, ‘actually’, ‘just’)
|                             | • Downtone a claim/criticism or something that places the speaker in a bad light (e.g. ‘a bit’)
| ii) Mitigating a positively affective speech act | • Relativise a compliment (e.g. ‘kind of’/‘sort of’)
|                             | • Downtone self appraisal (e.g. ‘um’, ‘kind of’)
| iii) Boosting a positively affective speech act | • Strengthen a compliment (e.g. ‘really’, ‘amazingly’)
|                             | • Strengthen agreement (e.g. ‘really’)
| iv) Boosting a negatively affective speech act | • Upgrade a claim or counterclaim (e.g. ‘in fact’)
|                             | • Strengthen a criticism (e.g. ‘my god’)

When markers had an additional politeness function, a link was created between the speaker, the addressee and the message as a whole (hearer-speaker-message focus). Markers with an additional politeness function expressed “affective meaning or the speaker’s attitude to the addressee in the context of the utterance” (Holmes, 1984, p.
348). Politeness functions were only added if there was a clear threat to the face of self or other due to the content and context of the utterance. Based on Holmes (1984), there were four subcategories of politeness marking (Table 5-4).

5.4 Non-markers

Similar to Müller (2005) lexical items were coded for non-marker use in order to gain an understanding of the full use of a particular lexical item. Non-markers were those that did not display subjectivity and could not be easily extracted without severely impacting on the grammatical and syntactical structure of the sentence in which the item appeared (Table 5-5).

Table 5-5 Non-markers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| i) General non-marker usage | • Verbal, adjectival or prepositional use of lexical items that may also be used as pragmatic markers (e.g. ‘I like her’, ‘the only one’, ‘any kind of girl’)  
• ‘You know’ in a direct question (e.g. ‘do you know it?’)  
• ‘(not) know’ with a complement (e.g. ‘I don’t know the word.’)  
• ‘So’ instead of ‘as’ in comparisons or mental state predicates (e.g. ‘not so big groups than we have here’, ‘I think/hope so’)  
• ‘No’, ‘yes’ or ‘yeah’ as a response to a yes/no question |
| ii) Markers within reported speech | • ‘Oh’, ‘well’ etc. in the reported speech of others or self when relating a past conversation |
| iii) German markers in English | • German discourse markers used in English (e.g. ‘also’ to rephrase/explain, ‘ja’ for hesitation) |
| iv) Non-codable | • Markers that were not heard clearly  
• Role of marker not clear due to incomplete sentence |

5.5 Intercoder-reliability

Intercoder reliability was conducted with an external coder. An external coder was chosen as it was believed that even after one to three weeks of coding (Müller, 2005), the researcher would still have been able to remember how some of the markers had been previously coded, especially in cases of high uncertainty.

Funding was available for twenty hours of re-coding, which meant the external coder was able to code 1626 items. Although only a small sample of the data, this number of items was deemed adequate because:
• Reliable statistical analyses could be undertaken.
• It was large enough to include a range of different markers and marker functions.
• It was a completely random selection (Banerjee, Capozzoli, McSweeney & Sinha, 1999).

An additional 191 items were coded by the external coder in a trial training run. The markers for the trial were not selected randomly but were chosen manually in order to highlight particular marker functions in training.

The external coder had completed a Bachelor of Arts in Linguistics with Honours and was working towards a Masters of Arts in Linguistics at the time of coding. He was trained by the researcher and used a detailed coding manual, which included an overview of the coding system as well as a list of individual markers and examples of possible codes.

Politeness markers were not included as they were often highly dependent on contextual details that could not possibly have been clear to the external coder. For example, they were based on discussions or events that occurred before the recording or earlier in the interview.

The researcher and external coder met for an hour’s training session before the external coder coded 191 markers on his own in a trial run. The trial was followed by a consensus agreement meeting, in which the two coders discussed and resolved some discrepancies in the codes.

The external coder then coded 500 randomly selected markers, followed by a consensus meeting to resolve some discrepancies. Whenever the coders were not able to agree on a code, they were left as different or the coding system was adapted. This process was continued until the external coder had coded 1627 items. Training and consensus meetings totalled five hours and the external coder took twenty hours to code the markers on his own.

Both percentage agreement and Cohen’s kappa were used to calculate reliability. Although not widely recommended (Lombard, Snyder-Duch & Campanella Bracken, 2008), percentage agreement was included to facilitate comparisons with other studies that do not take chance into account when calculating agreement (Banerjee et al., 1999). Krippendorff’s alpha could not be used due to the unavailability of reliable software for
According to current standards for the interpretation of kappa values (Banerjee et al., 1999) and keeping the highly interpretative and multifunctional nature of pragmatic markers in mind, a coefficient of 0.75 or greater was considered acceptable. A 0.75 agreement represented an “excellent agreement beyond chance” (Banerjee et al., 1999, p. 6) and was slightly higher than Müller’s (2005) co-efficient of 70%, which, she argued, was sufficient in psycholinguistics.

5.5.1 Overall consensus

Calculations were made for pre- and post-consensus as well as overall consensus after the final coding session (Table 5-6). For full code consensus to be reached both coders had to agree on all subcategories of marker classification (Figure 5-1). For example, both coders had to agree as to whether a lexical item was a marker or non-marker. If it was a marker, they both had to classify it as either discourse or interpersonal. If interpersonal, they had to agree as to whether it was an attitude or management marker and if, for example, it was an attitude marker, they both had to agree that it had an approximation, intensification or knowledge marking function.

Table 5-6 Inter-coder reliability results: full code

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. markers</th>
<th>Pre/post consensus</th>
<th>% Agreement</th>
<th>Cohen’s kappa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st code</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>506</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd code</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd code</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th code</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(excluding trial)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The trial run was conducted somewhat differently to the real intercoding, resulting in a higher pre consensus and lower post consensus than the real re-coding sessions (1st, 2nd, 3rd and 4th code). Firstly, the trial markers were not selected randomly, but were chosen by the researcher. Secondly, during the trial consensus meeting, the
coders did not refer to the researcher’s original codes but discussed agreement of each individual code and the thought processes used in decision-making. This method was employed for training purposes as it enabled the coders to discuss thought processes for each code and not only for those where disagreement occurred. Naturally, such time-consuming discussion could not be continued for the larger data set. While non-reference to the original codes resulted in lower post-consensus agreement, final total agreement levels remained high (90%).

The first real code resulted in a decline in agreement compared to the trial run. This was due to misunderstandings between the two coders, which were rectified before the intercoder reliability process continued.

5.5.2 Marker vs. non-marker

Misunderstanding concerning the definition of marker or non-marker usage accounted for 31.4% of the discrepancies. In 22.7% (10/44) instances, this involved the lexical items ‘yeah’, ‘yes’, ‘yep’, ‘no’ and ‘nah’. The researcher coded these as non-markers when used as a direct response a yes/no question because they were not easily extractable from the context and were prompted by the interviewer. However, lack of clarity in the coding manual meant that the external coder classified these as interpersonal markers.

Similarly, the researcher coded mental state predicates with a complement (e.g. ‘I don’t know how to say it in English.’) as non-markers as the mental state predicate could not easily be extracted without damaging the syntactic and grammatical structure of the phrase. The external coder tended to classify these as knowledge markers.

After in-depth discussion concerning the definition of markers used for this study, especially in terms of syntactic independence, further examples and information were added to the coding manual. Although these changes decreased the overall number of discrepancies, in the 4th code, 30% of discrepancies were still those in which the coders disagreed as to whether a lexical item was a pragmatic marker. Just over a third (11/30) were whether ‘yeah’, ‘yep’, ‘yes’ and ‘no’ were responses to a yes/no question. This was due to the difficulty of deciding whether a high-rising terminal constituted a yes/no question. For example, whether the ‘yeah’ followed by a high rising terminal in Example 5-15 should be considered a yes/no question.
Example 5-15 (GES05, 5-mth, interview)
AG: yep (.) yep and do you get along well with your host brother +
HB: yeah yeah
AG: yeah +
HB: **yeah** (1.5) / overall yeah

5.5.3 Discourse topic vs. editing

Misunderstanding concerning marking of topic continuation versus editing in an editing sequence accounted for 28.6% (40/140) of the 1st recode discrepancies. After lengthy discussion, it was decided that any marker that appeared at the end of an editing phase, was not followed by a pause and marked a return to the topic at hand was a marker of topic continuation. These were usually ‘yes’, ‘yeah’ or ‘um’. As shown in Example 5-16, such markers pulled the speakers out of the editing phase, allowing them to continue the topic of conversation.

Example 5-16 (GES10, 5-mth, Retelling)
MD and he gave (.) / but like (.) hm (.) there’s buttons for his teddy so he can see again +
AG: yep
MD: and he gave (.) / **yeah** he had cheese for the mouse + but he (.) put it onto a mouse (.) trap +

Similarly, any commonly recognised hesitation marker such as ‘ah’ or ‘um’ that appeared at the start of a syntactical unit and/or after a connective and without any pause or other sign of hesitation was classified as topic continuation and not editing (Example 5-17).

Example 5-17 (GES10, 5-mth, interview)
MK: and it wasn't late + and / and they were just pissed off I guess and **ah** just say go home +

These changes meant that by the 4th code, differences in the classification of editing markers was reduced to 18.8% (18/96). Discrepancies remained in cases where the language preceding the lexical item was typified by pauses and other hesitations, but there was no hesitation directly following the marker. However, the language remained somewhat disjointed, making it difficult to decide on the primary role of the marker in the context in which it appeared (Example 5-18).
Example 5-18 (GES10, 10-mth, interview)

AG: tell me what it's about I don't watch any a-action movies (laughs)
GH: ah ok **ah** it's about / it's with / the lead's with Martin Lawrence
+ cause there are two cops @ so yeah @

After completion of intercoding, it was decided that only those markers that preceded the beginning of a new phrasal unit were topic continuation markers, whereas those that simply returned to the topic but did not involve the start of a new syntactical structure were editing markers. The difference can be seen in Example 5-19 where ‘yeah’ was a marker of topic continuation, and Example 5-20, where ‘yes’ was an editing marker.

Example 5-19 (GES05, 0-mth, interview)

CL: yeah but um (.) in the night + we have um time to come home + so AG: yep
CL: um (.) **yeah** at four o'clock in the morning or so (laughs) AG: four o'clock in the morning +

Example 5-20 (GES05, 0-mth, interview)

AW: @ terrible @ (laughs) I'm I I am scared AG: yep
AW: **yes** to / oh no it's not my sport AG: hmmhm did you ski when you were there + or did you

5.5.4 Interpersonal vs. discourse

15% (21/140) of the differences in the 1st code were due to unclear definitions of interpersonal and discourse markers. Nine of these constituted differing decisions concerning turn-taking (interpersonal) and editing (discourse). This invariably involved typical hesitation markers such as ‘um’, ‘ah’ and ‘oh’ appearing at the start of a turn. It was decided that any marker beginning a turn with less than one second pauses before, but not after, the item were turn-taking markers. Those that were preceded and followed by pauses were editing markers.

Eight of the remaining discrepancies between interpersonal and discourse marking in the 1st code involved turn-taking (interpersonal) versus topic and focus (discourse). The two coders discussed what they felt constituted a turn. However, in some cases, especially where laughter and a repeated exchange of small tokens was
used (Example 5-21), they were not able to agree on who actually held the turn.

Example 5-21 (GES05, 0-mth, interview)

AG: were you free to just do as you liked + @ during the @
CL: @ yeah @
AG: yep
CL: yeah
AG: yep
CL: yeah but um (.) in the night + we have um time to come home + so

There were also a number of cases where the speaker might actually have been intending to end the turn, but then continued on with the topic. In Example 5-22, AG interpreted LK’s ‘yeah’ after ‘I don’t know’ as marking the end of the turn and started her own turn with ‘like’. However, LK continued the turn with ‘yeah I think so’. The fact that the listener had interpreted the marker as one of turn-completion may indicate that LK changed her mind mid-conversation, resulting in a change in the intended function of ‘yeah’.

Example 5-22 (GES05, 0-mth, interview)

LK: yeah I don't know yeah
AG: @ like @
LK: @ yeah @ I think so
AG: that surprises me cause it / I don't know / I thought @ the @

The coders were not entirely able to resolve issues of turn-taking (interpersonal) versus topic and focus or editing (discourse) marking. By the 4th code the number of instances reduced slightly and accounted for 16% of all disagreements. Seven of these concerned turn-taking versus topic or focus and the remaining five involved turn-taking versus editing. After completion of intercoder reliability, all turn-taking and editing markers were revised according to the simple rule that any marker beginning a turn was a turn-taking marker, regardless of the number or length of pauses preceding or following it. For such markers, the primary function was to mark willingness to take up the turn. Their secondary function was to allow for thinking time.

Similarly, to alleviate difficulties in coding turn-taking and topic markers, it was decided that laughter was not a turn, nor was any back channelling or direct repeats of what had been previously said by the interviewer.
5.5.5 Interpersonal vs. discourse vs. non-marker

Calculations were also made for inter-coder agreement as to whether a lexical item fulfilled interpersonal, discourse or non-marker functions (i.e. the first level of categorisation in Figure 5-1). Despite the discrepancies reported in 5.5.2 and 5.5.4, percentage agreement for interpersonal or discourse functions was always greater than 85% or Cohen’s kappa of .77 in all coding sessions (Table 5-7). After the trial and 1st code, all Cohen’s kappa values were above .8.

These analyses and adjustments indicated that for the purposes of this study, the coding system was reliable.

Table 5-7 Inter-coder reliability: interpersonal vs. discourse vs. non-markers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. markers</th>
<th>Pre/post consensus</th>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>Cohen’s kappa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st code</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>506</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd code</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd code</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th code</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(without trial) 1627</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.6 The coding system and this study

While this chapter provides a comprehensive overview of the entire pragmatic marker coding system, the focus of this study was only on interpersonal markers. Interpersonal markers were chosen due to their key importance to the expression of adolescent identity. As previously explained, interpersonal markers focused on the expression of social relations and identity (Erman, 2001) and due to their “illogical, non-truth-functional, subjective and generally rather messy” nature (Wierzbicka, 1986, p. 521), posed greater problems for the second language learner than discourse marker acquisition.

14 Table 5-6 reports agreement on all levels of marker classification, whereas Table 5-7 focuses only on the first level of classification. This means that in Table 5-7 (dis)agreement concerning the subcategories of discourse or interpersonal functions were not taken into account.
Both discourse and interpersonal markers were included in the coding system because a lexical item that functioned primarily on an interpersonal level in one context could be employed on a discourse level in another. In Example 5-23, ‘so’ functioned as a discourse marker to show consequential relations between two propositions. Comparatively, in Example 5-24, ‘so’ played an interpersonal function of intensifying the speaker’s attitude to the proposition.

*Example 5-23 (AES, 10-mth, interview)*

CM: [...] I don't think yeah I've moved most of the stuff out of that one
AG: so where do you get your ide-/ideas for/ for the photos + is it just something you see or +
CM: yeah it's just impulse things **so** I always have my camera on me
AG: yep yep

*Example 5-24 (GES10, 10-mth, interview)*

LD: when I um was in the third family +
AG: yep
LD: that was / yeah I'm glad I came in this family really (.) I got along **so** well with them and it just it just fitted **so** good like we fit together **so** good
AG: yep
LD: and it was **so** good for me and my host sister +
AG: yep
LD: both + she wrote me a really lovely goodbye letter +

The discourse markers coded in this study were restricted to those that also functioned on an interpersonal level in the data. This means that markers that always functioned on a discourse level (e.g. the conjunctions ‘and’ or ‘because’) were not included.

Having established a reliable coding system for discourse and interpersonal functions of pragmatic markers, analyses of interpersonal marker use and change could be conducted. These are reported in Chapters six to ten.
Chapter 6  

Testing the data

6.1 Introduction

This chapter reports on four preliminary tests that were conducted to ascertain the reliability of the data before the primary analysis of marker acquisition could take place.

The first of these focused on the identification of potential outliers in each groups’ zero month data (GES10, GES05, GS and AES). This was to ensure that pre versus post or non-native versus native speaker comparisons were not distorted by participants who showed extreme behaviour in interpersonal marker use and acquisition. At the same time, some leniency had to be applied due to the idiosyncratic nature of interpersonal marker use.

The second test of the data focused on ensuring GES10, GES05 and GS used the same levels of interpersonal markers at the outset of the study. Again, any analysis of interpersonal marker acquisition over five or ten months by GES10 and GES05 (i.e. treatment) compared to GS (i.e. control) had to involve groups that were comparable at the outset of the study. By ensuring the control and treatment groups were the same at zero months, it was more likely that the control group provided counterfactual evidence for which markers would have been acquired had the participants in the two experimental groups not embarked on an exchange to Australia (Shadish & Cook, 1999). In the same vein, if GES10 and GES05 used interpersonal markers to a similar extent in the zero month data, any differences after five-months were most likely due to difference in their exchange experiences (Chapter ten).

The third preliminary test compared interpersonal marker usage in the retellings and interviews. This allowed the researcher to ascertain the impact of data collection on marker use as well as test the comparability of the results to previous studies. For example, if the retellings and interviews were found to show similar interpersonal marker use, the results of this study could be compared to any previous study based on retellings or interviews. However, if the retellings and interviews showed differential use of interpersonal markers, results based on the interview data could only be compared to previous studies that use interview data. Similarly, retelling results could only justifiably draw upon the results of previous studies that used retellings as the data source.
Finally, the fourth test focused on participant responses to the language contact profiles (LCPs) and the set of scores generated from the LCPs. This was to ascertain whether the self-reporting instrument was strong and reliable enough to be used in correlations of language contact and interpersonal marker use.

All four pre-analysis tests were conducted to ensure reliability of the analyses reported in Chapters seven to ten. They also helped the researcher make grounded decisions about how to conduct these analyses with the highest degree of reliability. For example, as discussed in Section 6.4, comparisons of the retelling and interview data clearly indicated that the two types of data must be analysed as separate data sets because interpersonal marker use changed according to the data collection method.

6.2 Outlier identification (GES10, GES05, GS, AES)

6.2.1 Interviews (GES10, GES05, GS, AES)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GES10 (n = 15)</th>
<th>GES05 (n = 12)</th>
<th>GS (n = 20)</th>
<th>AES (n = 13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the outset of the study, GES10 used more interpersonal markers than GES05 and GS and there was more homogeneity (i.e. lower range and standard deviation) in GES05 and GS than in GES10 (Table 6-1). The maximum rate was highest in GES10. As would be expected, AES used more interpersonal markers than the non-native speakers and there was less homogeneity amongst native speakers (AES) than the non-native speakers (GES10, GES05, GS).

An analysis of outliers (Figure 6-1) showed that differences between GES10, GES05 and GS were due to an extreme outlier in GES10 (ERM). There were no outliers in AES. Focusing on the subcategories of interpersonal markers, ERM was also an extreme outlier in her high use of attitude markers and, within attitude markers, in her high use of both approximation and intensification markers. She did not show any outlier behaviour in her use of management markers or any management marker subcategories. As attitude markers are those most closely associated with adolescent...
language, this indicated higher ability to use teenage speech than her GES10 participants prior to the exchange.

*Figure 6-1 Interpersonal marker outliers, 0-mth interview*

ERM was a bilingual speaker of Spanish and German. She attended an English-German bilingual school in Germany, her best friend at the time of data collection was British and she had a Danish boyfriend, with whom she conversed in English on a daily basis. At the outset of the study, her English language contact was high and she also showed extreme outlier behaviour in the zero month LCP English contact score for speaking (Figure 6-2). She was also an outlier for high listening and writing English language contact prior to her departure. As shown in Figure 6-1, there was also one outlier in GS (AP). This was due to her higher use of involvement markers than all other GS participants. As discussed in Chapter five, involvement markers were a subset of management markers in this study. However, AP’s outlier behaviour was not extreme, nor did she indicate exceptionally high English language contact before the first data collection (Figure 6-2). AP was therefore included in the study, but ERM was not.
MK in GES10, HB in GES05 and AM and MR in GS showed outlier behaviour in their high assessment of native-speaker contact (Figure 6-2), but were not outliers in terms of overall interpersonal marker use (Figure 6-1). As personal assessment of speaking contact was less reliable than actual language data (Section 6.5), it was decided that these three speakers should be included in interpersonal marker analyses, but their reportedly high English language contact should be kept in mind when interpreting results.

**Table 6-2 Interpersonal marker descriptives excluding ERM, 0-mth interview**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GES10 (n = 14)</th>
<th>GES05 (n = 12)</th>
<th>GS (n = 20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exclusion of ERM from GES10 meant that the three groups were similar in terms of both homogeneity and average/min use of interpersonal markers in the interviews at the outset of the study (Table 6-2) and there were no extreme outliers for interpersonal marker use (Figure 6-3). There were also no extreme outliers for use of
attitude and management markers (MK was an outlier in GES10 for high use of attitude marking, but her behaviour was not extreme). Figure 6-3 also shows that GES10’s interpersonal marker use was more parametric than that of GES05 or GS, but this was not necessarily the case for all interpersonal marker subcategories and was not of importance as only nonparametric statistical tests were used on the data.

*Figure 6-3 Outliers excluding ERM, 0-mth interview*

6.2.2 Retellings (GES10, GES05, GS, AES)

Similar results were found for the 0-month retelling data, where ERM was an extreme outlier due to her high use of interpersonal markers (Figure 6-4). Focusing on the subcategories of interpersonal marker use, she was also an extreme outlier in her high use of attitude markers and, within attitude markers, she showed extreme outlier behaviour for high approximation marking. In GES05, CLO was also an outlier in terms of high overall use of interpersonal markers in the retellings, but his behaviour was not extreme (Figure 6-4). MAM was also an extreme outlier in high use of approximation markers in GES10.

---

15 Due to the results reported in Section 6.4, markers in the AES retelling data were not coded.
As shown in Table 6-3, when ERM was included in the data set for retellings, GES10 showed a greater average per minute use of interpersonal markers and less homogeneity than GES05 or GS. Exclusion of ERM rendered the three groups similar, so she was excluded from all analyses.

Table 6-3 Interpersonal marker descriptives, 0-mth retelling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GES10 with ERM (n = 15)</th>
<th>GES10 w/out ERM (n =14)</th>
<th>GES05 (n = 12)</th>
<th>GS (n = 20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3 Testing for a true control (GES10, GES05, GS)

In order to see if GS could reliably be used as a control group, the GES10, GES05 and GS zero month interpersonal marker usage was compared for statistical similarity at the outset of the study. As discussed in Section 6.2, ERM was excluded due to her consistent outlier behaviour. This meant group sizes for the test for a true control were n = 14 for GES10, n = 12 for GES05 and n = 20 for GS. The zero month interview and retelling data for the three groups were compared on the following levels:
• overall interpersonal average/minute marker use
• average/minute use of the two subcategories of interpersonal markers (management and attitude)
• average/minute use within management (turn-taking and involvement) and attitude (approximation, intensification and knowledge).
• average/minute use of individual markers within turn-taking, involvement, approximation, intensification and knowledge.

Kruskal-Wallis tests were used to ascertain differences between the three groups. If the Kruskal-Wallis test was significant (p < .05), separate Mann-Whitney U tests were performed to ascertain which two groups showed the most difference. To avoid Type 1 error, a Bonferroni correction was applied. The Bonferroni correction meant the significance level became p < .0167 instead of p < .05 (i.e. p-value/number of tests to be conducted).

6.3.1 Interviews (GES10, GES05, GS)

Figure 6-5 Interpersonal markers, 0-mth interview (GES10, GES05, GS)

As shown in Figure 6-5 and statistically confirmed by Kruskal-Wallis tests, the three groups showed highly similar use of interpersonal markers (H = 1.764, df = 2, p = .414). Within interpersonal markers, relative use of attitude (H = .583, df = 2, p = .746) and management markers (H = 1.779, df = 2, p = .411) was also highly comparable.
Figure 6-6 shows management markers divided into the two subtypes of turn-taking and involvement. There were no significant differences in the average marker/min use of turn-taking (H = 3.422, df = 2, p = .181) and involvement markers (H = .420, df = 2, p = .811), despite a slightly higher rates of turn-taking markers in GES05.

Figure 6-7 Attitude markers, 0-mth interview (GES10, GES05, GS)
Within attitude markers, there were no significant differences in the use of approximation (H = .951, df = 2, p = .622), intensification (H = .208, df = 2, p = .901) or knowledge markers (H = 3.512, df = 2, p = .173) (Figure 6-7).

Even down to the individual marker level, very few significant differences were found in the zero month interview data of GES10, GES05 and GS. Within attitude markers, there were no individual approximation, intensification or knowledge markers that were used to significantly different degrees by the three groups. Similarly, within the management marker subcategories, the only significant differences were found in use of the two involvement markers ‘ahha’ (H = 7.959, df = 2, p = .019) and ‘you know’ (H = 7.166, df = 2, p = .028). These low rates of difference were somewhat surprising given the idiosyncratic nature of individual marker use, but may have simply been due to the fact that participants were all non-native speakers and, therefore, only had a limited number of markers at their disposal. These markers would most likely have been learnt in a controlled second language classroom-based setting.

Figure 6-8 ‘Ahha’ and ‘you know’, 0-mth interview (GES10, GES05, GS)

Figure 6-8 shows higher use of ‘ahha’ in GES05 than in GS or GES10. ‘Ahha’ was not used as a back channel at all in GES10, but was used by \( \frac{4}{12} \) GES05 participants (Example 6-1) and \( \frac{1}{20} \) participants in GS. Each participant used the item only once. However, the use of ‘ahha’ was low compared to other back channel devices in all groups and separate Mann-Whitney U tests with a Bonferroni correction showed no
significant difference between GES10 and GES05 (p = .160), GS and GES05 (p = .224) or GS and GES10 (p = .823).

Example 6-1 (GES05, 0-mth, interview)

AG: yep yep yep ok alright well the mr bean you're going to watch is about packing +
HP: **ahha**
AG: him packing to go on holidays + and you said you haven't packed yet so @ [ for your holidays] @
HP: hnhm
AG: have you ever sort of packed for something and taken too much + or too little + or

Figure 6-8 also shows that ‘you know’ was only used in GES10. However, average marker/minute rates were low (.0029/min) and it was only used five times by \(3/15\) GES10 participants (Example 6-2).

Example 6-2 (GES10, 0-mth, interview)

RHI: um I think because the Turkish men + are um (..) yes very / (..) they are the highest ah **you know** +
AG: hnhm
RHI: because ah they say (..) um women you must stay at home + and

None of the separate Mann-Whitney U tests with a Bonferroni correction were significant.

6.3.2 Retellings (GES10, GES05, GS)

Figure 6-9 Interpersonal markers, 0-mth retelling (GES10, GES05, GS)
As shown in Figure 6-9, average interpersonal marker/minute use was similar across the three groups in the retellings ($H = 5.487$, $df = 2$, $p = .064$). This held true for management markers ($H = 1.374$, $df = 2$, $p = .503$), including the subcategories of turn-taking ($H = .319$, $df = 2$, $p = .853$) and involvement ($H = .898$, $df = 2$, $p = .638$).

No significant difference was found in attitude marking ($H = 5.572$, $df = 2$, $p = .062$), even though GES10 uses more attitude markers than GES05 and GS (Figure 6-10). Within attitude markers, there was no significant difference in GES10, GES05 and GS’s use of approximation ($H = 2.025$, $df = 2$, $p = .363$) or knowledge markers ($H = .326$, $df = 2$, $p = .850$). However, there was a significant difference in intensification ($H = 8.236$, $df = 2$, $p = .016$) due to lower use in GES05 compared to GS or GES10 (Figure 6-10). GES10 showed the highest use of intensification markers of all groups, closely followed by GS. Mann-Whitney U tests with Bonferroni correction showed that differences between GES10 and GES05 were significant with a large effect size ($p = .005$, $ES = 1.0$), while differences between GES05 and GS ($p = .021$) and GES10 and GS ($p = .569$) were not.

Figure 6-10 Attitude markers, 0-mth retelling (GES10, GES05, GS)

This clearly indicated that the three groups did not behave similarly in their use of intensification markers in the retelling data. Considering the fact that intensification markers have been identified as key elements of adolescent speech, these significant differences in intensification markers in the retellings rendered any longitudinal or
control (GS) versus experimental (GES10, GES05) comparisons problematic.

The fact that this significant difference was only found in the retellings and not the interviews indicated a possible task effect, whereby participants in GES05 were more aware of the change in speaking context (i.e. retelling vs. interview) than participants in GES10 and GS. GES05 participants may have interpreted the retelling as a test, resulting in greater focus on form rather than the expression of subjectivity. Comparatively, GES10 and GS did not distinguish between the two recording contexts in the same manner as GES05. However, there was no plausible explanation as to why this may have been the case. A more likely explanation may simply be the instability of retellings as a data collection method for interpersonal marker research compared to less formal unstructured conversations.

6.3.3 Implications of test for a true control (GES10, GES05, GS)

In the zero month interview data, significant differences between GES10, GES05 and GS were minimal. The only significant differences were use of ‘ahha’ and ‘you know’ for involvement marking. Considering the inextricable link between marker use and expression of individual identity, these differences were to be expected and the three groups were highly comparable in their interpersonal marker use at the outset of the study.

However, in the zero month retellings, the groups differed in their overall use of attitude markers, especially in terms of intensification. Since attitude markers are closely connected with adolescent language and the expression of identity, it would be difficult to argue that these differences would not impact on longitudinal analyses of interpersonal marker acquisition. While analysis of the interview data indicated it could be used to ascertain the impact of an exchange on interpersonal marker acquisition, the retelling data did not. In both the zero month interviews and zero month retellings, significant differences only appeared between GES05 and GS or GES10 and GES05. GES10 and GS displayed strikingly similar behaviour in both data collection procedures.

Based on these results, it is clear that all three groups could be used in longitudinal analysis of the interview data. As GS was a true control for both GES10 and GES05 in the interviews, any comparisons of change over the ten months of data
collection could be explained as resulting from the student exchange experience (Chapters seven and eight). Differences between GES10 and GES05’s use of interpersonal markers after five months of the exchange could also be accredited to differences in their exchange experiences (Chapter ten).

However, for the retelling data, only GES10 and GS data could have been used for longitudinal analysis due to significant differences in marker use between GES05 and GES10 and GES05 and GS at the outset of the study.

One explanation for the fact that differences were found for the retellings but not the interviews may be that some participants interpreted the Mr Bean retelling as a formal test, in which use of interpersonal markers was not desired, expected or considered necessary. Alternatively, differences may simply reflect a comparative instability of retellings as opposed to interviews for interpersonal marker data collection. Regardless of the explanation, the results clearly indicated that retellings were less appropriate than the interviews for the study of interpersonal markers. This is investigated further in Section 6.4.

6.4 Comparison of interviews and retellings (GES10, GES05, GS)

Figure 6-11 Task effect participants (GES10, GES05, GS)
To ascertain whether there was a semi-structured interview versus structured retelling task effect, all zero month data from GES10, GES05 and GS was combined to compare interpersonal marker use in the interviews and retellings at the outset of the study. As discussed in 6.2, ERM showed outlier behaviour in the zero month data and was excluded from all analyses. This resulted in a zero month group size of 46 participants (females = 31; males = 15), which later splits into three groups in the five and ten month data (Figure 6-11).

Similar to the test for a true control, the interview and retelling data was compared on four levels:

• average/minute overall interpersonal marker use
• average/minute use of the two subcategories of interpersonal markers (management and attitude).
• average/minute use in the subcategories of management (turn-taking and involvement) and attitude (vagueness, intensification and knowledge).

Analysis of individual markers was not conducted as the above-mentioned three levels of analysis clearly indicated that the retelling data was less appropriate than the interview data for the purposes of this study. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test and Cohen’s d were used to ascertain significance and effect-size levels. Significance levels were set at p < .05 and effect size had to be above .8 for in-depth analysis.

There was significantly more use of interpersonal markers in the interviews than in the retellings and effect size was large (p = .000, ES = 1.5).

*Figure 6-12 Interpersonal markers, 0-mth interview & retelling (GES10, GES05, GS)*
In the interviews there was a fairly equal split of interpersonal markers into those used for attitude and those for management (Figure 6-12), whereas attitude markers were used more frequently than management markers in the retellings. Significantly greater use is made of both attitude (p = .000, ES = 0.5) and management (p = .000, ES 1.9) markers in the interviews compared to the retellings. Effect size was medium for attitude and large for management.

6.4.1 Attitude (GES10, GES05, GS)

While the relative distribution of the three subtypes of attitude markers was similar (Figure 6-13), the semi-structured interview showed significantly more use of approximation (p = .003, ES = 0.5) and intensification (p = .001, ES = 0.5), although in both cases effect size was only medium. There was no significant difference in knowledge marking.

*Figure 6-13 Attitude markers, 0-mth interview & retelling (GES10, GES05, GS)*

While effect sizes were only medium, it would be difficult to argue that the consistently lower use of attitude markers in the retellings would not impact on the results of a study focusing on use of subjectivity markers in adolescent language. Lower use of attitude markers in the retellings may be due to the fact that the interviewer already knew the story being re-told, so there was less need to embellish the story by use of intensification and the participant had less emotional involvement in the narrative than in the interviews. The retelling was not based on personal experience and had little to do with the projection of one’s own identity through narrative. In the interviews,
participants related their own experiences or opinions and, as it was the first time the interlocutors had met face-to-face, all information was new. This may have meant that the participant was more likely to project subjectivity through narrative. This is illustrated in Example 6-3 and Example 6-4. In Example 6-3, MK was retelling the Mr Bean story about packing to go on holidays. Use of intensification was low and there was high reliance on ‘just’. ‘Just’ was predominantly used in its restrictive rather than upgrading function due to the content of the Mr Bean clip, whereby Mr Bean needed to reduce the amount of items he wished to take so that it would fit into his small suitcase.

Example 6-3 (GES10, 0-mth, Retelling)

MK: and ah (.) he **just** takes (.) um **just** one pair of shoe (.) and (.) um one (.) / he **just** cutted a / a jeans @ of him @
AG: @ hmmm @
MK: and um (.) he **just** um (.) um a tooth ah cream +
AG: hmmm
MK: he **just** ah (.) let the (.) half of it go out +

However, when talking about her own ability to pack in the interview (Example 6-4), MK utilised a greater range of degree adverbs and intensifiers (e.g. ‘like’, ‘even’, ‘just’, ‘only’) to embellish her story and provide information to the listener about her subjectivity and attitude to packing. ‘Just’ is predominantly used as an upgrader rather than a restrictive marker.

Example 6-4 (GES10, 0-mth, interview)

AG: are you good at packing +
MK: no
AG: oh why not + (laughs)
MK: **like** I didn’t **even** pack the / the things for Australia +
AG: hmmm
MK: (laughs) and ah um (.) normally I **just** (. ) pack too many things +
AG: hmmm
MK: and then because I **only** wear a few (. ) ah clothes or something+
AG: hmmm
MK: and um (. ) yeah I often fo- / forget a lot of thing
AG: hmmm
MK: because it’s that / I **just** forgot a lot of things (laughs)
AG: hmmm
MK: not **only** in / in holidays but (. ) in normal life as well
Additionally, due to the structured nature of the retellings, individual speakers were provided little opportunity to indicate their attitude to propositions and there was little or no threat to face. As explained in Chapter four, the retellings consisted of three question-answer sequences. Firstly, the main retelling (Can you tell me what the clip was about?), followed by appraisal (Which bits did you find funny?) and, finally, a secondary retelling (Can you tell me about another Mr Bean you have seen?). This meant that evaluation and expression of personal opinion was only ever explicitly expected in the appraisal stage of the recording and it was predominantly only in this section that use of attitude markers with an additional politeness function occurred. For example, approximation by use of ‘not’ + degree adverb in the retelling was predominantly used with a politeness function in the retellings when the participant expressed a negative opinion of the clip (Example 6-5). Comparatively, approximation with a politeness function occurred throughout the interviews and was often in the context of an evaluative comment when talking about holiday experiences or to soften a negative response to the interlocutor’s question (Example 6-6). Clearly the fact that there were more questions and turns in the interviews than the retellings meant that the interviews were more interactive and there was increased opportunity to imply solidarity and an interest in maintaining harmonious relations between speakers.

Example 6-5 (GS, 0-mth, Retelling)

CR: there was a quite (.) funny / funny story +
AG: ahha
CR: (.) no **not really** (laughs)
AG: (laughs) not your humour

Example 6-6 (GES10, 0-mth, interview)

AG: hm so it was a very active holiday +
LD: ~ ja ~ (.)**not so much** but it was very nice and at the evening we had party +

Differences in the amount and fluidity of turns in the interviews and retellings could also account for significantly lower use of management markers in the retellings than the interviews.
6.4.2 Management (GES10, GES05, GS)

Within management markers, the interview data showed significantly more use of involvement (p = .000, ES = .6) and turn-taking (p = .000, ES = 2.5) markers. Effect size for differences in turn-taking was high. This is most likely due to the fact that the retellings were much shorter than the interviews and consisted of only three interviewer questions, so there was very little need for turn negotiation.

Figure 6-14 Management markers, 0-mth interview & retelling (GES10, GES05, GS)

While effect size for differences in involvement markers was only medium, consistently lower use of these markers further indicated that the retellings were a less adequate data source for interpersonal marker analysis than the interviews. Involvement markers consisted mainly of back channels which showed the speaker’s understanding that a turn or unit of talk was in progress but not complete (Gardner, 2001). As there were more turns in the interviews and the interviewer’s turns were not restricted to three questions, it is not surprising that the interviews produced more back channels than the retellings.

Finally, while analysis of differences in individual involvement marker use in the retellings and interviews was not considered necessary, it is interesting to note that ‘ok’ was the only involvement marker that was used significantly more in the retellings than the interviews (p = .000, ES = .8). 32/45 (71%) occurrences of ‘ok’ were minimal response tokens at the end of the recording after the interviewer (AG) had indicated that the recording session was complete (Example 6-7). Three others occurred at the end of
the main retelling. These fulfilled a similar function to those at the end of the recording and the participant may have believed that the completion of the main retelling also marked the end of the recording session (Example 6-8).

*Example 6-7 (GS, 0-mth, Retelling)*

AG: that's alright @ that's @
AR: @ yes @
AG: fine () alright that's all you have to do
AR: **ok**

*Example 6-8 (GS, 0-mth, Retelling)*

NH: um () he () ah () didn't need to ah () cut his trousers + and his ()
    toothbrush @ and so on @
AG: @ yep @ yeah perfect (laughs)
NH: (laughs) **ok**
AG: which bits did you find funny + were there

78% of the instances of ‘ok’ as involvement markers in the retellings indicated to the interviewer that the participant understood the rules of the joint activity (Clark, 1996; Condon & Čech, 2007) and signalled a point of topic or activity shift (Beach, 1993; Gardner, 2001). In the interviews, $\frac{32}{50}$ (64%) of instances of ‘ok’ were for joint-activity comprehension (Example 6-9) and $\frac{12}{50}$ (24%) instances indicated comprehension and involvement with the interviewer on a range of topics in the body of the interview (Example 6-10). This contrasted starkly with the retellings, in which only 9% of the instances of ‘ok’ were employed for this purpose in short asides.

*Example 6-9 (GES10, 0-mth, interview)*

AG: alright so we're going to talk about holidays +
RHI: holidays **ok**

*Example 6-10 (GES10, 0-mth, interview)*

AG: they were there and they said it was just fantastic
US: **ok** (laughs) great [ XX ]
AG: and do you like do you like the sun + do you like the beach + or

This further illustrated that the interviews allowed interlocutors greater opportunity to implicitly build a relationship with each other than the retellings.
‘ok’ was used more in the retellings, its primary use was to show understanding of a joint activity and not to establish interpersonal relations. It marked common ground in terms of mutual understanding of the participants’ navigation within the task assigned (Condon & Čech, 2007). This emphasis on processes in the retellings may indicate that the task was more formal than the interviews and differences in power relations were highlighted more in the retellings than the interviews. High use of ‘ok’ to show understanding of the task in the retellings concurrently highlighted the fact that the interviewer controlled the rules of the joint activity.

6.4.3 Implications of interview vs. retelling results

The analysis indicated a zero month task effect in interpersonal marker use in structured (retelling) and semi-structured (interview) data collection procedures. Not only did the retellings permit fewer opportunities for the expression of self, but participants may have interpreted the retelling as a test or formalized task rather than a communicative event, as evidenced by their higher use of ‘ok’ to acknowledge understanding of a task. Different interpretations of the speech event meant that participants tended to employ a careful style in the retellings and a vernacular style in the interviews (Ellis, 2002). When employing a careful style, participants consciously attended to choice of linguistic form and used fewer markers of adolescent identity. Comparatively, when using a vernacular style participants made spontaneous choices in language use, as would occur in free conversation (Ellis, 2002).

Increased processing load may also have played a part (Möhle, 1984). In the retellings participants were asked to watch, memorise and then retell the story of a video clip. As such, the task was not only a test of language performance, but also of memory. The additional processing required may have resulted in participants placing less focus and interest in projection of self in language.

This analysis indicated that the semi-structured and structured data were separate data sets and studies based purely on retelling data may fail to capture a speaker’s ability to express subjectivity and interpersonal relations in dialogue. This has implications not only for this study, but also raises concerns about the comparability of interpersonal marker studies that use retellings or socio-linguistic interviews as their data source. As this study focuses on the acquisition of those markers that express
attitude and interpersonal relations, only the semi-structured interviews were used for further analysis.

6.5 Reliability of language contact profiles (LCP)

A German and an English language contact score was calculated for speaking, reading, writing and listening at zero, five and ten months for each non-native speaker (Chapter four). This was based on the responses participants provided to questions in the language contact profile (LCP). As interpersonal markers are mostly associated with spoken rather than written language, the scores for English speaking contact were taken as the basis of the analysis reported in this section.

Example 6-11 Question from 0-mth language contact profile16

1d) Do you speak English with strangers outside of school (e.g. with British tourists in Germany)?

yes (continue question) no (go to next question)

If yes, how often?

less than monthly monthly weekly daily

In each case, how often?

<10 min 10 min-1 hr 1-2 hrs 2-4 hrs 4+ hrs

The English speaking contact score was calculated using Questions 1a to 1f in the LCP (Appendix 2). For each question in the LCP, participants assessed how often they spoke English in a particular setting. For example, in Question 1d (Example 6-11) of the zero month LCP, SJ in GES10 answered ‘yes’ to speaking English with strangers outside of school. He then indicated that this contact was on a less than monthly basis and when the contact occurred it was less than 10 minutes in duration.

The final speaking contact score was out of 168 and indicated the total hours per week a participant spoke in English or German. In the zero month data language contact scores for speaking were very low in GES10, GES05 and GS. Even though there were some extreme outliers, the number of hours per week spent speaking English remained below two (Figure 6-15).

16 This is a translation into English of the original LCP (Appendix 2), which was in German in order to ensure equal comprehensibility between participants.
Figure 6-15 Speaking score outliers, 0-mth LCP

Figure 6-16 Speaking score outliers, 5-mth LCP
As would be expected, the English language contact scores of GES10 and GES05 increased after the participants left for Australia and their German language contact decreased. English LCP speaking scores for GS did not increase as much as those for GES10 and GES05. After five months of living in Australia, there was a wide range of speaking scores in GES10 and GES05: the highest being 157.93 hours / week by LS in GES10 and the lowest being 12.24 hours/week by LK in GES05. The mean and median levels for GES10 speaking were higher than those of GES05 (Figure 6-16).

However, it would actually have been impossible for LS in GES10 to have spent 157.93 hours/week speaking English outside of school in Australia. She attended school from 9am to 3:30pm every week day (i.e. 32.5 hours/week) and would have slept a minimum of five hours/night (i.e. 35 hours/week). This means the maximum possible score for speaking would have to be around 100 hours/week (i.e. 168 minus 67.5 hours). This still does not allow any time for activities that did not involve speaking, such listening, watching TV, showering or doing homework. Based on these calculations, at least four of the GES10 speakers over-estimated time spent speaking English (i.e. LS = 157.93, MAM = 105.99, US = 102.77). This may be due to the fact that, when fully immersed in the language, it was difficult (if not impossible) to estimate the time spent actively speaking or listening to English. For example, when living in Germany, it was easy to single out the exact times and situations in which English was spoken. Comparatively, when English was the language in which most transactions took place and the participant lived in an English-speaking host family, estimating the exact length of time spent speaking English was difficult. Additionally, in the Australian English immersion context, moments of speaking, listening, reading and writing were more likely to overlap than when the participant came in contact with English in Germany. For example, an exchange student was sitting in the kitchen preparing an essay for school (writing). To do so, they referred to reference and resource material (reading). The radio was on in the background (listening) and they intermittently talked to members of their host family in the room (speaking). In such situations, it would be very difficult to ascertain what portion of the time was spent speaking, reading, writing and listening to English.
As shown in Figure 6-17, in the GES10 ten-month LCP scores, RHI also overestimated her language contact (158.63 hours/week) and there was an unexplained drop in language contact by those speakers who overestimated their contact in the five month data, i.e. LS reported only 58.27 hours/week, MAM 91.25 hours/week and US was just below 100 at 98.19 hours/week. Additionally, lower language contact in the second half of the ten month exchange did not tally with information in the interviews, whereby US, LS and MAM all reported spending most of their time after school with Australian friends and host family members. The lower median and mean in the ten month compared to the five month data was most likely an artefact of the unreliability of language contact responses, rather than a reflection of the participants’ true levels of speaking contact in Australia.

*Figure 6-17 Speaking score outliers, 10-mth LCP*

### 6.5.1 Implications of LCP reliability results

This brief overview of GES10 and GES05’s five and ten month LCP speaking scores indicated that the LCP scores were not reliable. This was most likely due to the fact that it was difficult for individuals to quantify hours of language contact in an
immersion situation or separate hours of contact into those spent speaking, reading, writing and listening.

An additional downfall of the LCP is that, even if complemented by additional measures of interaction type (Freed, 1990), it can only take quantity and not quality of language contact into account. Issues of quality include the extent of foreigner talk used by native speakers (Ellis, 2002) and the perceived psychological and social distance as well as power relations between the exchange student and native speakers (Norton, 2010; Schumann, 1978). All of these have been shown to critically impact on second language acquisition.

For these reasons, LCP scores for speaking, reading, writing and listening were not used for any correlations or calculations. However, information reported in the questionnaires was sometimes used to explain results, especially in Chapter ten.
Chapter 7  Interpersonal marker acquisition over ten months (GES10)

7.1  Introduction (GES10)

The first section of this chapter focuses on GES10 interpersonal marker development during the first five months of the students’ stay in Australia. The aim of this analysis was to test the first hypothesis of this study, i.e. whether exchange students showed the greatest increase in those markers most associated with adolescent speech in the first five months of their ten month exchange.

The second half of the chapter compares interpersonal marker development in the first five months to that of the second five months of the exchange. This provided a developmental picture of acquisition and further evidence to support the hypothesis that acquisition of markers for the expression of adolescent identity was most prolific in the first five months of a ten-month student exchange to Australia.

One extreme outlier (ERM) was not included (Chapter six) and one participant in GES10 (GG) was not able to attend the five month data session, resulting in group size of n = 14. Changes over time were only analysed in detail if a Wilcoxon Signed Rank test was significant (p < .05) and Cohen’s d effect size was greater than .8. The analysis began at the top of the hierarchical order of pragmatic markers that formed the basis of this study (Chapter five) and moved down to the individual marker level. For increased comprehensibility, explanations of marker definitions and coding rules were included for the individual marker results.

7.2  Acquisition from zero to five months (GES10, 0-5mth)

Table 7-1 Interpersonal marker repertoire, 0 & 5-mth interview (GES10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpersonal marker type</th>
<th>0-mth</th>
<th>5-mth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximation</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensification</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn-taking</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reformulation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this study, interpersonal markers were syntactically optional lexical items that marked projection of subjective identity and focused on the social and interactional aspects of communication. Over the five month period, average/minute use of
interpersonal markers doubled from 9.7/min to 18.8/min, resulting in a statistically significant and large increase (p = .001, ES = 2.1). The repertoire of markers also increased from 88 lexical items in the zero month data to 122 in the five month interviews (Table 7-1).

As discussed in Chapter five, interpersonal markers were subdivided into lexical items that indexed the speaker’s relation to the proposition (attitude markers) and those that were hearer-focused and monitored the activity of communication (management markers). Of these two categories attitude marking showed the greatest increase (Figure 7-1), which was large and significant (p = .001, ES = 2.3). Management marking also increased significantly, but effect size was less than .8 (p = .009, ES = .7).

Figure 7-1 Interpersonal markers, 0 & 5-mth interview (GES10)

There was also a slight increase in the proportional use of attitude markers compared to management markers. In the zero month data, 54% of all interpersonal markers were attitude markers and this increased to 59% in the five month data. Management markers accounted for the remaining 46% in the zero month data and 41% in the five month data.

These results gave credence to the first hypothesis of this study, namely that students learnt those markers most closely associated with adolescent identity in the first five months of their stay. Attitude markers showed the greatest increase and encompassed those items of speech most associated with the expression of adolescent identity, including vague language markers such as general extenders and intensifiers.
such as ‘like’. We will now discuss changes in attitude marking in detail.

### 7.2.1 Attitude (GES10, 0-5mth)

As discussed in Chapter five, attitude markers were further divided into approximation, intensification and knowledge markers. There was an increase in all three types of attitude markers after the first five months of the student exchange (Figure 7-2). Increased use of approximation markers was significant and large (p = .001, ES = 2.9), as was that of intensification markers (p = .001, ES = 1.6). However, increased use of knowledge markers was not significant (p = .056).

*Figure 7-2 Attitude markers, 0 & 5-mth interview (GES10)*

The relative ratio of approximation markers to intensification and knowledge marking also increased. As shown in Figure 7-3, 27% of all attitude markers were approximators in the zero month data, compared to 43% in the five month interviews. Intensification decreased slightly from 43% to 38% and knowledge decreased by 11% (i.e. from a 30% share in the zero month data to 19% in the five month data).
These results also supported the hypothesis that the exchange students learnt those markers most closely associated with adolescent language in the first five months of their exchange. Native adolescent speech is characterised by high use of vague (Gare, 2006; Romaine & Lange, 1991) and emphatic language (Stenström, 2000; Tagliamonte, 2005) and this was reflected in the students’ increased use of approximation and intensification markers. While use of knowledge markers (e.g. ‘I think’, ‘I don’t know’) are known to be used extensively in English (Mullan, 2010; Urbanová, 2001), research to date has not identified them as key markers of adolescent language. Accordingly, their use did not change to any great extent in the first five months of the student exchange to Australia.

7.2.1.1 Approximation (GES10, 0-5mth)

Figure 7-4 Approximation marker repertoire, 0 & 5-mth interview (GES10)
In the zero month data, GES10 participants used twenty-seven lexical items for approximation. After five months in Australia, they used thirty-two different lexical items, seven of which were exclusive to the five month data (Figure 7-4). The two approximators that were only used in the zero month data (i.e. ‘I say it’ and ‘so’) were most likely due to transfer from German and they were never used for approximation by the Australian adolescent native-speakers. In Example 7-1, RHI struggled to point out that her friend’s family was very close to her own and she viewed them as her ‘third family’. She prefaced her sentence with ‘ok I say it’ to mark inexact usage of the term ‘family’. This closely resembled use of the German phrase ‘Ich sag’s (mal) so’/ ‘I’ll say it this way’. Similarly, in Example 7-2, PN’s use of ‘so’ was similar the German use of the same lexical item to indicate an approximation (e.g. ‘sie haben Kinder so in meinem Alter’). These were the only instances of ‘I say it’ and ‘so’ for approximation in the data, indicating they were highly idiosyncratic and were not items explicitly taught in German second language classrooms. The disappearance of ‘I say it’ and ‘so’ in the GES10 five month data was not statistically significant.

Example 7-1 (GES10, 0-mth, interview)

AG: yep yep and it was / was it fun because Astrid was with you or +
RHI: no @ um @
AG: @ no @
RHI: my family is um (. ) ok I / **I say it** um my family is ah ( . ) ah the third family

Example 7-2 (GES10, 0-mth, interview)

PN: and we aft- / we went to denmark with my two cousins + my aunt +
my ah uncle + and two other family +
AG: big group
PN: yes
AG: yep yep
PN: and they also have children **so** in my age +
AG: yep
PN: my cousins are fift-

The seven approximation markers that appeared exclusively in the five month data were also only used by a limited number of speakers in a small number of instances. ‘Basically’, ‘(not) exactly’, ‘mainly’ and ‘not quite’ and the general extender
‘and what not’ were each used by a single speaker in no more than two instances.

‘Pretty much’ and ‘(and) whatever’ were each used by three different speakers in seven and eight instances respectively. None showed significant increase, but all were present in the native-speaker interview data, indicating a move from non-native speaker marker types to ones that sound more native-like. This is explored further in Chapter nine.

Only the twenty-five markers that were already present in the zero month data and continued to be used in the five month data (i.e. overlapping section of Figure 7-4) showed statistically significant change. Most notably, and as shown in Figure 7-5, there was significant and large increase in the approximator ‘all’ (p = .005, ES = 1.31), general extenders based on ‘stuff’ (p = .007, ES = 1.14) and ‘thing’ (p = .026; ES 1.16) and ‘not really’ (p = .001, ES = 1.38). Increased use of the approximator ‘like’ was also significant but effect size was only medium (p = .001, ES = .7). These were all present in the native-speaker data.

Figure 7-5 Approximation markers, 0 & 5-mth interview (GES10)

7.2.1.1.1 ‘All’ (GES10, 0-5mth)

Initially ‘all’ was not included as a marker of approximation in this study. However, it became increasingly obvious in transcription that the quantifier ‘all’ was used by the non-native speakers in a variety of syntactic positions (Example 7-3) and could often be extracted from the sentence without loss of meaning or syntactic
integrity. In these cases, ‘all’ provided insight into the attitudes (Labov, 1985) and covert thinking (Schourup, 1985) of the speaker by implying that the vague number of items ‘all’ modified was considered large, but the exact quantity was not important.

Example 7-3 (GES10, 5-mth, interview)

JP: or we are just having a nice night + at my friend's house +
AG: yep
JP: so we are coming **all** over to her place +
AG: yep
JP: it's really.

Example 7-4 (GES10, 5-mth, interview)

AG: always different yep (.) hm and what do you like most at christmas + (. ) if anything (laughs)
LN: I like the presents +
AG: yep
LN: and to see **all** my family + (.) it's very nice
AG: yep (.) @

In Example 7-3 JP quantified ‘we’ with ‘all’. However, had she not included ‘all’, the listener would still have assumed every member of the group represented by ‘we’ went over to the friend’s place. By including ‘all’, the speaker indicated that ‘we’ was a large but inexact number of people. Similarly, in Example 7-4, LN preceded ‘my family’ with ‘all’. However, had she not used ‘all’, the listener would have still assumed that she was referring to a range of family members and it would remain uncertain with whom she actually spent her Christmas (e.g. Her immediate family? Her immediate family and grandparents? Or perhaps even her immediate family, grandparents and cousins?). The role of ‘all’ was not necessarily to specify the number of family members, but to indicate the speaker’s subjective stance towards this number of individuals, i.e. that the exact quantity was irrelevant, but the speaker considered it to be large. It could equally be argued that ‘all’ in these and other examples was not a quantifier but an intensifier placing emphasis on the lexical item it preceded and highlighting use of hyperbole (Labov, 1985). However, for the purposes of consistency ‘all’ was classified as an approximator when it modified a plural subject noun phrase (Waksler, 2001). In the majority of cases, ‘of’ could be inserted between ‘all’ and the
noun phrase it modified.

Approximator-‘all’ was used by $^{13}_{14}$ speakers at a total average rate of .3124/min (71 instances) in the five month data, compared to $^{9}_{14}$ speakers and an overall average rate of .093/min (twenty-one individual instances) in the zero month interviews. While there is no existing research linking quantifier use of ‘all’ with adolescent speech, use of ‘all’ as a quotative or intensifier has been classified as a feature of adolescent language (Rickford, Wasow, Zwicky & Buchstaller, 2007; Waksler, 2001). Analysis of the native-speaker data in this study showed that quantifier-‘all’ was also used extensively by adolescent native-speakers of Australian English (AES) at an average rate of .5058/minute. As discussed in Chapter nine, after five months of the student exchange there was no significant difference between use of ‘all’ by AES and GES10 ($p = .076$). However, as no equivalent data for adult and pre-teen speakers of Australian English data was included in this study, it was not possible to ascertain whether high use of approximator-‘all’ was a marker of Australian English or Australian adolescent language.

7.2.1.1.2 ‘And/or stuff’ and ‘and/or thing’ (GES10, 0-5mth)

Example 7-5 (GES10, 5-mth, interview)

RHI: um (.) no not really + @ but @
AG: @ yep @
RHI: (1.0) ah maybe we have / when we have a party that it's not really a party + it's like (.) um movie evening **and so on** +

Example 7-6 (GES10, 0-mth, interview)

AG: (laughs) have you ever forgotten anything + (3.0) that you should have taken +
SJ: (1.0) no not really but something like a jacket **or something like this ** but it wasn't too / too important
AG: no no it's not like it's your passport or

General extenders indicated that the preceding discourse was inaccurate (Overstreet, 1999) or was an “illustrative example of some more general case” (Dines, 1980, p. 22). Unlike Terraschke’s definition (2008), in this study, general extenders were coded as items that always fulfilled interpersonal functions. By rendering
discourse vague, general extenders automatically established rapport and reduced social
distance. They appealed to shared background knowledge and conveyed the speaker’s
degree of certainty concerning the validity of a proposition. In Example 7-5 and
Example 7-6, the speakers appealed to the shared knowledge of the interlocutor by
providing an example of a larger unnamed category. In Example 7-5, RHI provided
‘movie evenings’ as an example of something that was similar to a party, but not quite a
party. By adding ‘and so on’ she implied that both interlocutors were aware of other
social activities similar to parties, but not quite parties (e.g. meeting up in a café,
hanging out a friend’s place). Similarly, in Example 7-6, SJ indicated that a jacket was
but one example of many non-essential items that he had previously forgotten to pack.
By using ‘and something like that’ he drew on the shared knowledge of the participants
that, for example, a toothbrush or sunscreen belonged to the same unnamed category,
but a passport did not.

Table 7-2 ‘And/or stuff’ and ‘and/or thing’, 0 & 5-mth interviews (GES10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0-mth av./min.</th>
<th>5-mth av./min.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>and/or thing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or something like that</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or something like this</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or something</td>
<td>.540</td>
<td>.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or anything</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or nothing</td>
<td></td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and something like this</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and everything</td>
<td></td>
<td>.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>everything</td>
<td></td>
<td>.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>.098</strong></td>
<td><strong>.374</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and/or stuff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or stuff</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and stuff</td>
<td></td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stuff like that</td>
<td></td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and stuff like that</td>
<td></td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and that stuff</td>
<td></td>
<td>.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and this kind of stuff</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and all that stuff</td>
<td></td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and all this stuff</td>
<td></td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>.005</strong></td>
<td><strong>.520</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General extenders modified a noun, verb, adjective or entire sentence
(Terraschke, 2008) and, depending on stress or focus, appeared in clause-final or clause-
medial position (Overstreet, 2005). As shown in Example 7-5 and Example 7-6, they
followed the general formulae of conjunction + (premodifier) + vague expression
(Terraschke, 2008). However, there were also instances of general extenders without an adjunct or disjunct (Example 7-7). These were included as they functioned the same way as general extenders and followed similar syntactic placement, albeit without a conjunction.

The labels ‘and/or stuff’ and ‘and/or thing’ included all general extenders that used ‘stuff’ or ‘thing’ as their base nouns (Table 7-2). In the zero month data, there was only one instance of the general extender ‘and stuff’ (Example 7-8). It was used by MK who received average to high grades in English at school. On a scale of ‘1’ (excellent) to ‘5’ (poor), she scored a ‘2’ in Year nine and a ‘3’ in Year ten. Based on her responses to the language contact questionnaire, she also had the highest level of English-speaking opportunities leading up to the exchange. She spent two weeks in Florida visiting a friend in 2002, had non-German speaking American exchange students staying at her home in January and June, 2005 and kept in regular phone contact with her American friends (1-2 hours/week). The fact that the participant with the greatest native-speaker contact was the only one who used ‘and stuff’ in the zero month data, may indicate that use of ‘and stuff’ was dependent on high levels of native-speaker contact.

**Example 7-7 (GES10, 5-mth, interview)**

US: (1.0) the good mood + the good / right people +  
AG: yeah  
US: and I don't know (2.5) some if they are [ hard left ] (. ) disgusting guys + like drunk + and oh ( . ) just disgusting rude +  
AG: yeah  
US: **stuff like that** +  
AG: yeah  
US: and people you know

**Example 7-8 (GES10, 0-mth, interview)**

MK: [...] know ( . ) it was (1.0) amazing there were these ah / ( . ) a party where um (1.5) I don't know how you describe it ( . ) um (2.5) a ~ Schaumparty + ~ like with all the  
AG: hmhm  
MK: ( . ) bubbles **and stuff** +  
AG: yeah yep yep  
MK: and um like you were
Indeed, after five months of native-speaker contact, use of general extenders based on ‘stuff’ increased to eighty-one instances by \( \frac{10}{14} \) speakers and a variety of eight forms (Table 7-2). 97.5% \( (\frac{79}{81}) \) of these were preceded by an adjunct and 1.2% \( (\frac{1}{81}) \) used ‘or’. Only 2.5% \( (\frac{2}{81}) \) of all instances were without a connective (Example 7-7).

General extenders based on ‘thing’ were used seventeen times by \( \frac{7}{14} \) speakers in the zero month data. Of these, 82.4% \( (\frac{14}{17}) \) took a disjunct and 17.6% \( (\frac{3}{17}) \) an adjunct. Five different forms were employed (Table 7-2). This increased to eighty-two instances by \( \frac{14}{14} \) speakers in the five month data and a total of eight forms (Table 7-2). The proportional use of general extenders based on ‘thing’ with a disjunct decreased to 57.3% \( (\frac{47}{82}) \), while those using an adjunct increased to 39% \( (\frac{32}{82}) \). The remaining 3.7% \( (\frac{3}{82}) \) did not use any connective.

A number of general extender forms that did not use ‘stuff’ or ‘thing’ were also apparent in the zero to five month data (Table 7-3). Interestingly, ‘and/or so on’ and ‘and/or so’ were the most frequent forms in the zero month data, accounting for 44.2% of all general extenders. However, after five months of living in Australia, those based on ‘stuff’ made up 42.7% of all extenders and those based on ‘thing’ contributed to a further 43.2%. ‘Or something’ was the most frequent general extender and ‘and so on’ was the only extender that decreased in use, albeit not to significant levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GES10</th>
<th>0-mth</th>
<th>+/-</th>
<th>5-mth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘(and/or) all that’</td>
<td>.0053</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>.0293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘and/or so’</td>
<td>.0254</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>.0475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘and/or so on’</td>
<td>.0695</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.0185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘and/or what (not)’</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>.0042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘(and/or) whatever’</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>.0106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘and/or stuff’</td>
<td>.0055</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>.3357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘and/or thing’</td>
<td>.1052</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>.3662</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These results indicated high acquisition of markers of adolescent speech. The formal general extender ‘and so on’ was replaced within five months of living in Australia with general extenders based on ‘stuff’ and ‘thing’. These have not only been identified as characteristic features of youth language (Stenström & Jørgensen, 2009), but also as the two most common general extender forms in Australian adolescent language (Norrby & Winter, 2002). A shift toward using the adjunct ‘and’ over the
disjunct ‘or’ also indicated a move toward native-speaker use (Terraschke, 2008), although it remained unclear as to whether preference for adjunctive general extenders was typical of English in general or specific to adolescent speech.

7.2.1.1.3 ‘Not really’ (GES10, 0-5mth)

Similar to ‘all’, collocations of ‘really’ with negation were added as approximators during transcription as it became increasingly apparent that ‘really’ in negation was used to render a particular item, concept or proposition vague and could be extracted from the context without compromising syntactic integrity. The marker was labelled ‘not really’ as collocations typically involved negation realized by ‘not’. However, it also included collocations of ‘really’ with other negative items such as ‘never’, ‘nobody’ and ‘just’ (Stenström, 1986).

Listed as a pragmatic force modifier by Nikula (1996), ‘not really’ encoded a concept similar to ‘not entirely’, which, in turn, encoded the same vague concepts as the pragmatic marker “sort of” (Aijmer, 2002; Andersen, 1998). There was little or no connection between the semantic meaning of ‘really’ (i.e. ‘in truth’ or ‘in reality’) and its use as an approximator (Ito & Tagliamonte, 2003). Similar to Aijmer’s flexible definition of “sort of” (2002), ‘not really’ constructions could impact on truth conditions, but their main purpose was to indicate approximation. In many cases, ‘not really’ behaved “as a borderline case between pragmatic marker and adverbial” (Andersen, 2001, p. 210).

In its most clearly identifiable form, ‘not really’ was a set phrase often preceded (Example 7-9) or followed by ‘no’ (Example 7-10) which allowed the speaker to say ‘no’ without being definite. By rendering an otherwise clearly defined lexical item vague, ‘not really’ implicitly expressed an attitude towards knowledge (Chafe, 1986, p. 262) and an interest in maintaining harmonious relations between the speaker, hearer and message.

Example 7-9 (GES10, 5-mth, interview)

AG: would something like that make you really nervous + @ or + @
RHI: @ ah no @ **not really**
AG: yep
RHI: I love English and I think / now at the moment I think I can (.) speak really well + nothing like (.) / when / when did we meet +
Example 7-10 (GES10, 5-mth, interview)
AG: @ are @ they different + to german ones + or are they
LD: **not really**
AG: no +
LD: no (.) @ they @

Example 7-11 (GES10, 5-mth, interview)
AG: ok ok (.) oh (1.0) pr- / why did you like that sort of movie + do do you like the scariness of them + or the +
HP: no I'm **not really** a person who likes scary movies
AG: no +
HP: pretty scared of horror movies
AG: oh (1.0) but something like that would give me nightmares +

The ‘not really’ category also included use of ‘really’ in negative syntactic constructions. Unlike other ‘not’ + adverb collocations such as ‘not very’ or ‘not so’, ‘not really’ modified a verb phrase or noun phrase (Example 7-11). When rendering a verb or noun phrase vague, ‘not really’ often had a concurrent politeness function, such as hedging a negative response, complaint or negative opinion. In Example 7-11, by including ‘really’ in his description of his tastes, HP indicated he more or less liked horror movies. By creating such vagueness, HP ensured it was acceptable for him to watch and enjoy some horror movies (such as the one he was describing), but not necessarily others. This not only protected him from the repercussions of expressing clearly defined opinions, but also indicated an interest in protecting the face of the interlocutor in a situation involving a negative response to a yes-no question.

In GES10’s interlanguage, the position of ‘really’ was predominately medial and directly after ‘not’ (Example 7-12), but it also appeared in clause final position (Example 7-13) or medially before negation (Example 7-14). Note that when ‘really’ was clause-initial or placed between the subject and negative verb, it was typically coded as an intensifier (Section 7.2.1.2.3).

Example 7-12 (GES10, 5-mth, interview)
AG: […]yep (.) yeah (.) ah and what are some of the things you sort of do + do you go out to parties and stuff a lot + @ or @
PN: @ hm @ not now actually because (.) at first a couple of months I **didn't really** (.) make a lot of friends +
Example 7-13 (GES10, 5-mth, interview)

RHI: and um (.) yeah we have a big dinner + and (. ) I think (. ) yeah the next day lunch + and everything +
AG: yep
RHI: and really I / I don't know **really** but (. ) so much food and everything (laughs)

Example 7-14 (GES10, 0-mth, interview)

AG: no but you obviously don't need to +
NS: no um there's this / it's a um (. ) / it's a little village +
AG: hmhm
NS: and but it's / it looks **really** um not that touristic + as it is +
AG: hmh

‘Not really’ increased from .0889/min in the zero month data to .2890/min in the five month data in GES10. In 67% (10/15) of instances in the zero month data and in 72% (41/57) of all instances in the five month data, the vagueness achieved by use of ‘not really’ indicated an interest in saving the face of self or other (i.e. politeness hedging). Politeness functions typically involved hedging a negative response to a positive question or softening a potential complaint or criticism, such as when talking about tenuous host family relations (Example 7-15). Any complaint about the relationship between host family and exchange student inherently threatened the face of the student as he/she could be seen to have been responsible for the failed relationship. Therefore, it required careful use of hedging devices and avoidance of non-negotiable expression of opinion. In Example 7-15, MF, used ‘I didn’t really’ and ‘didn’t very’ to achieve this. ‘Really’ was also used with the disjunct ‘just’ in ‘I really just stayed with my host family’ for the same function.

Example 7-15 (GES05, 5-mth, interview)

AG: @ have @ you made lots of friends here + or
MF: yeah my friends are really the best thing about ah um the whole exchange because I **didn't really** get along with my host family very well +
AG: ok @ yep @
MF: @ and @ um in in the end I **really just** stayed um with my host family because of my friends because they were such good friends and
While ‘really’ in negative constructions was not always interchangeable with other degree adverbs, it is interesting to note a non-significant decreased use of ‘not so’, ‘not too’ and ‘not very’ (Table 7-4). Decreased use of ‘not very’ and increased use of ‘not really’ ties in with Ito & Tagliamonte (2003) who argue that the intensifier ‘really’ is typical of adolescent language, while the intensifier ‘very’ is more likely to appear in adult speech. Having been taught by adult speakers of English and using English language textbooks written by adults in Germany, the exchange students may have arrived in Australia using forms that were more typical of adult language. Increased language contact with adolescent native speakers over the course of five months in Australia resulted in increased use of more typically adolescent forms, such as ‘not really’. Such assumptions were supported by the native-speaker data for this study, in which ‘not really’ was used at an average rate of .3091/min for approximation purposes compared to only .0349/min for ‘not very’. However, this would need to be tested by comparing Australian adolescent use of ‘not really’ and ‘not very’ to that of pre-teen and adult Australian native-speaker discourse. As discussed in Chapter nine, after five months in Australia, there was no significant difference in the use of ‘not really’ and ‘not very’ by AES and GES10.

Table 7-4 Frequency of ‘not’ + degree adverb, 0 & 5-mth interview (GES10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0-mth</th>
<th>+/-</th>
<th>5-mth</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘not much’</td>
<td>.0135</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>.0500</td>
<td>.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘not quite’</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>.0032</td>
<td>.317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘not really’</td>
<td>.0889</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>.2890</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘not so’</td>
<td>.1122</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.0509</td>
<td>.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘not too’</td>
<td>.0598</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.0580</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘not very’</td>
<td>.0616</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.0282</td>
<td>.128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.2.1.2 Intensification (GES10, 0-5mth)

The other area of significant and large increase within attitude marking in the first five months was that of intensification. Intensification markers were those that highlighted the speaker’s emotional involvement and subjective stance towards the proposition as well as reinforced speaker meaning or strengthened the impact of it on the hearer (Urbanová, 2001). Intensification included all syntactically optional lexical items that placed emphasis on information the speaker found particularly interesting or surprising (Example 7-16) as well as exclamations that clearly indicated surprise or
emotion (Example 7-17). In Example 7-16, CL was talking about her favourite film which was based on the true story of a high school teacher who was trialled and convicted of having a love affair with an underage school student. CL used the degree adverb ‘really’ to intensify her evaluation of the film as well as ‘actually’ to highlight information she found particularly surprising (i.e. that the two lovers ended up getting married even though the teacher had to go to gaol because of the relationship).

Example 7-16 (GES05, 5-mth, interview)

CL: that's a really nice story I love it
AG: @ why what happened + @
CL: @ they **actually** got married @ () um () she um got into gaol +
AG: yep
CL: and in true life she just got out and they married +

Example 7-17 (GES10, 5-mth, interview)

MM: […] to like () carry him () like on both sides + and we had to walk two hours home +
AG: two hours +
MM: like there wasn't one taxi +
AG: oh
MM: it was like ten ks or something +
AG: yeah yeah
MM: **oh** () hard night
AG: and you were pulling this

In this study, intensification included a range of degree adverbs. As pointed out by Aijmer (2002), even when modifying a verb phrase, degree adverbs provide insight into the subjective stance of the speaker. While inclusion of the degree adverb may impact on the proposition, its main role is to provide subjective information about the speaker’s attitude to the message and listener (e.g. Ito & Tagliamonte, 2003; Urbanová, 2001). In Example 7-18 and Example 7-19, ‘heaps’ and ‘all’ did not actually change the fact that teenagers partied differently in Germany and Australia or that Christmas was celebrated in a different season in Australia and Germany. They did, however, provide insight into the speaker’s attitudes to the proposition and level of emotional involvement (Labov, 1985). Similarly, in Example 7-20, MK’s emotional involvement and attitude towards police arriving at a party she attended was marked by her use of the intensifiers ‘just’, ‘totally’ and ‘not even’.
Example 7-18 (GES10, 5-mth, interview)

LN: but they are not (.) we are just going to the pool +
AG: hmm
LN: having a sleep over +
AG: yep
LN: yeah (.) but it's fun
AG: yep (.) is that dif- / wh- / different to (.)
LN: yeah it's **heaps** different to germany +
AG: really +
LN: yeah

Example 7-19 (GES10, 5-mth, interview)

MK: and over here it's just like yeah let's go to the beach @ or @
AG: @ yep @
MK: um (1.5) you sweat so much + @ and it's @
AG: @ yeah @
MK: it's like (.) it's **all** a different season
AG: yep (.) yep bizarre

Example 7-20 (GES10, 5-mth, interview)

AG: yeah
MK: you / you just had a good time + you were not / you **weren't even** (.) loud I reckon + there / there @ wasn't @
AG: @ yep @
MK: there **wasn't even** music on + @ I was @
AG: @ ah @
MK: **totally** surprised

Similar to approximation marking, within five months of living in Australia the range of intensification markers used by GES10 increased, with ten new lexical items appearing in the five month data. However, none of these were used widely or often. The intensifier-'all’ was the most widely used with 5/14 speakers, but in only six instances. ‘Actually’ was used the most with nine instances, but only by 4/14 different speakers. Also similar to the results for approximation, no markers that only appeared in the five month data showed significant or large increase.
‘Yep’ was the only intensification marker that was used exclusively in the zero month interview. Variants of ‘yes’ and ‘no’ (including ‘nah’ in the five month data) were classified as intensification markers when they were repetitions. In Example 7-21, MAM placed extra emphasis on his response to AG’s question by repeating ‘yep’. Repeated ‘yep’ reappeared as an intensification marker in the GES10 ten month interviews and its non-use in the five month data was not significant.

Example 7-21 (GES10, interview, 0-mth)

MAM: yeah
AG: yep very unusual and what is it like for you do you / do the Turkish people see you as Turkish + or as (.) German-Turkish + or
MAM: yep **yep**
AG: yep
MAM: German-Turkish +
AG: yep is there

Of the eighteen markers used in both the zero month and five month interviews, ‘just’ (p = .009, ES = 1.24), ‘like’ (p = .002, ES = 1.22) and ‘really’ (p = .009, ES = 1.04) showed significant increase with large effect sizes and ‘very’ (p = .003, ES = 1.5) showed significant decrease with a large effect size (Figure 7-7).
7.2.1.2.1 ‘Just’ (GES10, 0-5mth)

‘Just’ was an intensifier when it oriented to the “involvement of the discourse partners in the speech event and functions as a subjective or interpersonal modal particle” (Aijmer, 2002, p. 153). It could have a concurrent politeness function (Aijmer, 2002; Brown & Levinson, 1987; Holmes, 1984).

Similar to Aijmer (2002) and Tottie (1986), use of ‘just’ purely as a restrictive adverb (e.g. ‘just past Sydney’) and with temporal meaning (e.g. ‘just then’) were not categorised as pragmatic markers. To qualify as an intensifier, ‘just’ had to upgrade or downtone the proposition and index the emotional involvement and attitudes of the speaker. Similar to ‘really’, it could modify the proposition (Aijmer, 2002), but its core function was procedural. When used as a downtoner, ‘just’ implied a speaker stance of this is not much and one could think it is (would be) more (Wierzbicka, 2003). When used emphatically, it signalled enthusiastic involvement, which increased common ground and established a group feeling (Aijmer, 2002; Chafe, 1982). While such clear definitions were necessary for coding and analysis purposes, attenuation and accentuation were a cline rather than two distinct categories (Urbanová, 2001) and in many instances it was difficult to distinguish whether ‘just’ was being used to upgrade or downgrade the proposition.
‘Just’ was used at an average rate of .3873/min. in the zero month data by 8/14 speakers. 55.3% (26/47) of these instances were by MK, the participant who had had the highest amount of native-speaker contact up to the point of departure for the exchange. MK and the other seven users all showed a preference for ‘just’ as an emphazizer (66%, 31/47), rather than a downtoner (34%, 16/47). In the zero month data ‘just’ did not consistently occur in any of Erman’s (1997) ‘prefabs’ nor collocate with other intensifiers such as ‘really’, nor with extreme verbs/adjectives (Aijmer, 2002), nor expletives/exclaims (Kishner & Gibbs, 1996). Except for one instance of ‘just’ with ‘weird’ (Example 7-22) and another with ‘huge’, adjectives were rarely the topmost members of synonymic sets (Erman, 1997).

Example 7-22 (GES10, 0-mth, interview)
MK: but it's just the Belgian coast
AG: yep
MK: but (.) it's just nothing / it wasn't that expensive
AG: no well
MK: (laughs)
AG: how bizarre
MK: they were **just** weird
AG: yep yep so you won't go back to th

Use of ‘just’ for intensification increased to 1.966/minute and 14/14 speakers in the five month data. Adding strength to Erman’s (1997) conclusion that adolescent speakers tend to use upgraders more than downtoners, over the course of five months in Australia, there was a strong increase in preference for emphasis (87%, 218/246) over the downtoning functions of ‘just’ (11%, 28/246). While few if any prefabs were used in the zero month data, 36% (89/246) of instances of ‘just’ in the five month data occurred in an exclusive, restrictive or emphasizing prefab (Erman, 1997). These included ‘just like (this/that)’ (Example 7-23), ‘just a little (bit)’, ‘just really/very’, ‘just depends’, ‘just think’ and ‘just for fun’ and ‘just’ with verbs of saying and thought in quotative contexts (Example 7-24). ‘Just

17 Erman (1997) defines prefabs as “units of language which through frequent use by members of a language community eventually become the natural or conventionalized ways of referring to certain standard phenomena in every day interaction” (p. 104). For ‘just’ these include prefabs with an exclusive function (e.g. ‘just a little’), restrictive function (e.g. ‘just like that’), temporal function (e.g. ‘just now’) and emphasizing function (e.g. ‘like just’).
like’ was by far the most commonly used prefab and typically occurred in the discourse marker phrase ‘it’s just like’ (Andersen, 2001; Schourup, 1985). In these cases ‘it’ had no anaphoric referent and the collocation was completely outside of the propositional clause structure.

Example 7-23 (GES10, 5-mth, interview)

AG: canberra really strange (.) it's got no like / it's got no really soul + @
the city + @
MD @ yeah yeah @
AG: you know
MD: and it looks all the same + kind of +
AG: yep
MD: yeah
AG: yep
MD: it's **just like** the politicians over there and no one else

Example 7-24 (GES10, 5-mth, interview)

MM: like just (.) warm christmas +
AG: yeah
MM: it's like I feel like july now +
AG: yeah
MM: cause our summer's just in july + and (.) um they're talking about
christmas and I **just say** nah it doesn't feel like Christmas

As shown in Example 7-25 and Example 7-26, ‘just’ was sometimes used to intensify the topmost member of a synonymic set of nouns or adjectives (Erman, 1997) or extreme verbs (Aijmer, 2002) in the five month data. However, these were not the majority of cases and ‘just’ was never used in front of ‘so’ or ‘such’ (Erman, 1997).

Example 7-25 (GES10, 5-mth, interview)

MM: yeah awesome I think / (.) like I came + and just this warm and oh
it's @ **just @
AG: @ yep @
MM: awesome**

Example 7-26 (GES10, 5-mth, interview)

JP: yes I've played it and I don't like it (laugh)
AG: you don't like it +
JP: everyone **just loves** it + but I just think it's so (.) boring
The significant and large increase in ‘just’ (p = .009, ES = 1.24) and its increased use as an upgrader, supported the hypothesis that the markers learnt in the first five months were those most associated with adolescent language (Erman, 1998, 1997; Tagliamonte, 2005).

7.2.1.2.2 ‘Like’ (GES10, 0-5mth)

Despite ongoing debate as to whether ‘like’ only has discourse functions (Miller & Weinert, 1995; Müller, 2005; Underhill, 1988), interpersonal functions (Andersen, 2001; Schourup, 1985) or both (Terraschke, 2008), it was classified as an intensifier if it highlighted information the speaker considered to be particularly surprising or interesting (Example 7-27).

Example 7-27 (GES10, 5-mth, interview)

MM: and um just went up the street + and this one guy had like (.) fourteen beers or something + it / it was like this little guy + AG: yeah +
MM: and then he just say oh no I sleep here + and it was **like** in the middle of the road + AG: (laughs)

Example 7-28 (GES10, 0-mth, interview)

h no [ you got to stay ] in the shadow (laughs) and I don't want to go in the sun (.) it's (.) it's too hot for me but I / I think it's weird because (.) I was always like in the sun + AG: hm
MK: **like** every f- / free minute + AG: hmm
MK: (.)

Intensifier-‘like’ was also used to highlight hyperbole, sarcasm/irony or jokes. In Example 7-28, by prefacing ‘every free minute’ with ‘like’, MK not only strengthened her description of changes in her attitude to the sun, but concurrently highlighted the fact that she had resorted to hyperbole. In doing so, she indicated to the interlocutor that ‘every free minute’ was not to be interpreted literally.

Example 7-28 was the only occurrence of intensifier ‘like’ in the GES10 zero month data (i.e. average .007/min). Once again, it was used by MK who had concurrently been exposed to the highest amount of native-speaker language contact.
prior to the exchange.

In the five month data, intensifier–‘like’ was used at an average rate of .354/min by 12/14 speakers. It typically appeared directly before an adjective or a noun phrase headed by an adjective (69.5%, 41/59). 76% (31/41) of these adjectives expressed a surprisingly large or small quantity (Example 7-29) or an extreme characteristic (Example 7-30).

Example 7-29 (GES10, 5-mth, interview)

LS: hang out (.) yeah we have heaps of dvds because my host family were in bali before +
AG: hmmhm
LS: so we have **like** two hundred dvds (laughs)
AG: two @ hundred

Example 7-30 (GES10, 10-mth, interview)

US: […] well they do gymnastics
AG: yep
US: and they could even stand / they could um stand up on a boogie board +
AG: yep
US: but they they're balance is **like** unreal (laughs)
AG: really +

If the adjective did not express extreme characteristics, it was usually intensified by another degree adverb (e.g. ‘totally’, ‘so’, ‘pretty’, ‘really’) and 30% (18/61) of intensifier–‘like’ tokens collocated with another degree adverb (Example 7-31), particularly ‘really’ (7/18) and ‘just’ (4/18).

Example 7-31 (GES10, 5-mth, interview)

AG: when you get home + @ you're mum's going to go + @
JP: @ I can cook @
AG: yeah
JP: yeah I can cook cause she's **like** really excited about it (laughs)
AG: yep
JP: and my grandma

17% (10/59) of intensifier–‘like’ tokens preceded a noun, adverb, prepositional phrase or verb in sentence medial position. 8.5% (5/59) appeared in sentence initial position (Example 7-32) and 5% (3/59) were part of the discourse token ‘it’s like’
(Example 7-33). As shown in Example 7-32 and Example 7-33, when used in ‘it’s like’ or in sentence-initial position, ‘like’ intensified the entire phrase. In Example 7-32 ‘like’ indicated the start of a joke and in Example 7-33 ‘it’s like’ highlighted a hyperbolic description of the partying behaviour of German teenagers.

Example 7-32 (GES10, 5-mth, interview)

AG: @ I'm sure @ he put on weight
NS: if you meet him + **like** if you do an interview georg have you put on weight + @ and then @
AG: @ gee @ you're looking fat georg
NS: (laughs)
AG: (laughs)

Example 7-33 (GES10, 5-mth, interview)

MAM: and in germany goes like it starts at seven (.) or eight o'clock + and goes like to two three o'clock in the morning +
AG: yep
MAM: but then like at two three o'clock **it's like** everybody start to get drunk +
AG: hmhm

Increased use of intensifier-‘like’ clearly indicated acquisition of adolescent language. ‘Like’ is probably the most widely researched (e.g. Terraschke, 2008), and socially-maligned marker of teenage language (e.g. Gare, 2006) and plays a critical role in establishing in-group membership and bonding. Over the course of five months, the exchange students not only made extensive use of ‘like’ as an intensifier in a range of expressive functions and syntactic positions, but there was concurrently a large increase in all other interpersonal and discourse functions of ‘like’. There was a significant increase in its use as an approximator (but with only a medium effect size) as well as significant and large increases in all of its discourse marker functions. These included ‘like’ for quotatives, exemplification, editing, lexical focus and topic linking. However, as discourse marking was not the focus of this study, these results were not explored further.
7.2.1.2.3 ‘Really’ and ‘very’ (GES10, 0-5mth)

As discussed in Chapter five, by expressing the extent of a certain quality, degree adverbs were defined as speaker-oriented boosters that reinforced a positive or negative quality and thereby reflected the attitude of the speaker towards the message (Urbanová, 2001). They inherently showed subjectivity (Aijmer, 2002), could be extracted from their context without syntactic disruption, and indicated degree of emotional involvement (Athanasiadou, 2007). Especially in the case of ‘really’ and ‘very’, the literal meaning of the adverbs (i.e. ‘in reality’ or ‘genuinely’) was overridden by pragmatic functions of indexing the speaker’s relationship to the hearer, utterance or text (Aijmer, 2002; Ito & Tagliamonte, 2003).

‘Really’ behaved differently to other degree adverbs in that it was syntactically more mobile, could appear in isolation and could be used for a range of non-intensifying pragmatic functions, including turn-taking (Stenström, 1986). In this study, intensifier-‘really’ included both its pre-adjective sentence medial functions as well as evaluation in sentence initial and final positions (Stenström, 1986). While both types showed personal involvement and evaluation, subjectivity was probably more marked sentence initial and final positions (Aijmer, 2002; Stenström, 1986).

Example 7-34 (GES10, 5-mth, interview)

MD: and (.) yeah they speak also English +
AG: hmmh
MD: and they have a own language + it's (.) Maltese or something +
AG: yep yep
MD: yes that's **really** strange (laughs)
AG: ah Malta
MD: yes

Example 7-35 (GES10, 5-mth, interview)

US: I like the people I like the places
AG: yep
US: go to the cities have some ah bigger streets (laughs)
AG: yeah +
US: they / **really** they are
AG: yep
US: and I don't know
‘Really’ was used at an average rate of .122/min in the zero month data. In 89% (24/27) of instances, ‘really’ intensified an adjective (Example 7-34) and in 7% (2/27) it intensified a verb of taste (i.e. ‘like’ and ‘enjoy’). Except for ‘hot’, adjectives modified by ‘really’ expressed a degree of evaluation or emotion, i.e. ‘exciting’, ‘exhausting’, ‘fun’, ‘funny’, ‘good’, ‘nice’, ‘strange’ and ‘cool’. In the remaining 6% (1/27) of instances, ‘really’ appeared in sentence initial position and modified the entire phrase (Example 7-35).

In the zero month data, average use of ‘very’ (1.09/min) was much higher than for ‘really’. Before embarking on a student exchange, ‘very’ was mostly used to modify emotive or evaluative adjectives (63%, 79/126). However, the adjectives that ‘very’ modified were more varied than those modified by ‘really’ (e.g. they include descriptive adjectives of colour, size, quantity and touch), but this may have simply been due to the higher number of occurrences. Unlike ‘really’, ‘very’ never appeared in initial or final position, and could only modify adjectives.

Example 7-36 (GES10, 5-mth, interview)
MK: they're really / they **really** want to know + and they um (.) yeah they / they always say oh we're going to miss you and all that +
AG: oh yep
MK: it's / yeah I don't know how it would get any better + @ **really**
AG: @ no @
MK: (laughs)

Example 7-37 (GES10, 5-mth, interview)
MAM: […] stopped there + and the policeman comes and asks + and then he's like yeah I have ps maybe in the boot + and he get out of the car + and the policeman get in the car + and get like (.) shit / was like **really** pissed the policeman + @ he was @
AG: @ oh

In the five month data, average frequency of ‘really’ (1.09/min) surpassed that of ‘very’ (.173/min). While ‘very’ continued to only ever modify adjectives in sentence-medial position, the scope and syntactic positions of ‘really’ widened. In the five month data, ‘really’ modified entire phrases in final and initial positions (Example 7-36, second instance). In medial position, it modified both verbs (Example 7-36, first
instance) and adjectives (Example 7-37).

‘Really’ was predominantly used directly before an emotive or evaluative adjective (59% or $89/151$) in the five month data. A further 17% ($26/151$) of instances preceded verbs of feelings and personal taste such as ‘like’ or ‘feel’. 3% ($3/151$) occurred in the discourse marker phrase ‘it’s really like’ or in sentence-initial or final position (2%, $3/151$). The remaining 17% ($26/151$) preceded descriptive adjectives. Comparatively, ‘very’ only appeared directly before an adjective and in 67% ($10/15$) of all instances the adjective was descriptive (Example 7-38) in the five month data. This indicated that the exchange students not only developed a preference for the more flexible ‘really’, but considered it to have a greater role in conveying subjective emotion and evaluation than its near lexical equivalent ‘very’.

Example 7-38 (GES10, 5-mth, interview)

AG: no and often at those parties like drinking's an issue (.) and
SJ: oh no this is um (1.0) / the thing is that (.) / the problem here is
they're **very** Christian here +
AG: ok
SJ: they're **very very** Christian that's (.) quite hard + so an

Finally, additional politeness functions with ‘really’ and ‘very’ were rare in both the zero and five month data. This clearly set them apart from ‘not really’, which was predominantly used for both approximation and politeness (Section 7.2.1.1.3). It also did not support Stenström’s (1986) claim that sentence-final ‘really’ often has a softening or cajoling effect.

Significant and large decreased use of ‘very’ ($p = .003$, ES = 1.5) coupled with significant and large increased use of ‘really’ ($p = .009$, ES = 1.94) reflected the acquisitional patterns of ‘not very’ and ‘not really’ as approximators. Once again, this indicated that over the course of five months, the exchange students changed to a more typically adolescent colloquial register (Ito & Tagliamonte, 2003; Labov, 1985). Additionally, considering degree of subjectivisation is related to the type of the adjective an intensifier modifies (Athanasiadou, 2006), the development of a preference for ‘really’ over ‘very’ also reflected a desire to be more emotionally involved and expressive in English. In other words, over the course of five months, ‘very’ was relegated to a lower subjectivity position than ‘really’.
The fact that ‘very’, ‘so’ and ‘really’ were the only degree adverb intensifiers that showed significant change tied in with Ito & Tagliamonte (2003) and Yaguchi, Iyeiri and Baba (2010), who found that ‘really’/‘real’, ‘very’ and ‘so’ were the most commonly used intensifiers in American English and British English conversation. While all three forms were widely used in this study, there was a preference for ‘really’ and ‘so’ over ‘very’ in the interlanguage of German exchange students after five months in Australia. As discussed in Chapter nine, similar patterns of usage were found for adolescent native speakers of Australian English.

7.2.2 Management (GES10, 0-5mth)

Despite lower significance and effect size levels compared to changes in attitude marking, the development of management markers over the five month period also supported the hypothesis that exchange students were most likely to learn those markers most associated with adolescent language in the first five months of their stay.

Figure 7-8 Management markers, 0 & 5-mth interview (GES10)

As discussed in Chapter five, management markers were a subset of interpersonal markers that focused on maintaining successful exchange between interlocutors and showed involvement in the conversation. Management markers were subdivided into involvement, turn-taking and reformulation markers. Reformulation
markers were not used by the non-native participants in the interviews and were not analysed. As shown in Figure 7-8, turn-taking showed only some increase (p = .074), while increased use of involvement markers was both significant and large (p = .004, ES = 1.0).

The same pattern was reflected in changes in relative proportions of use. In the zero month data, there was a fairly even split between involvement (49%) and turn-taking (51%). However, in the five month data, involvement markers contributed to 63% of all management markers. Again, in support of hypothesis one, using language that shows high personal involvement is a distinguishing feature of adolescent language (Andersen, 2001), whereas managing turns by use of markers is not (Poulson, 1996 in Andersen, 2001).

Involvement markers were those that expressed comprehension, mutual understanding and interest in the interlocutor. A large number of these were back channels (such as ‘ah’ in Example 7-39), which indicated agreement, comprehension and interest in what the interlocutor was saying (Urbanová, 2001).

Example 7-39 (GES10, 5-mth, interview)

AG: […] just @ turned two yeah she's kind of cute (. ) um (1.0) but um (. ) I haven't got a better photo +
US: (laughs)
AG: where she's actually looking + cause I took them all (. ) portrait + @
that way @
US: @ **ah** @
AG: you know @ so @
US: @ yeah @ you can't

Patterns of involvement marker use were somewhat irregular. While there was a significant increase from zero to five months (p = .004, ES = 1.0), rates decreased significantly from five to ten months (p = .002, ES = .9). This meant that when the entire ten months was taken as the basis of statistical calculation, increased use of involvement markers was no longer significant (p = .730). Reasons for increase and decrease in involvement marking are discussed further in Section 7.3.2.1 and Chapter nine.
There were no involvement markers that were only used in the zero month data and eight new markers appeared in the five month data (Figure 7-9). Seven of these were used to mark mutual agreement. ‘Really’ marked interest and surprise in what the interlocutor was saying. Of the thirteen markers used in both the zero and five month data, use of the back channels ‘hm(hm)’, ‘yep’ and ‘yes’ decreased. As shown in Table 7-5, decreased use of ‘yes’ as a back channel was significant, as was increased use of the back channels ‘oh’ and ‘yeah’. The agreement marker ‘that’s true’ also increased significantly, but effect size was only medium (Table 7-5).

Table 7-5 Significant change in involvement, 0 to 5-mth interview (GES10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>+/-</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>ES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘oh’</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘yeah’</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘yes’</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘(that’s) true’</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While none of these markers have been identified as key indicators of adolescent speech, increased use of ‘yeah’ coupled by decreased use of ‘yes’ indicated a move towards a less formal (and therefore more adolescent-like) register. General increase in involvement markers indicated a shift towards the high involvement style of adolescent native speakers (Andersen, 2001).

7.2.3 Summary of zero to five months results (GES10)

Analysis of the development of interpersonal markers over the first five months of a student exchange to Australia indicated a clear pattern of acquisition of those...
markers typically associated with adolescent language. Not only was the most significant and large change seen in attitude markers, but the individual attitude markers that showed the most significant and large increases all allowed the speaker to concurrently perform their identity as an adolescent. Even within management markers, the subtype of markers most associated with adolescent language showed the most significant and large increase.

In many cases, increased use of a key adolescent marker was mirrored by decreased use of alternatives that were less associated with adolescent language, more formal or had less scope for the expression of subjectivity. This included replacement of ‘very’ with ‘really’ and ‘yes’ with informal varieties such as ‘yeah’.

The results indicated that increased use of markers that were present prior to the exchange as well as acquisition of new items after arriving in Australia was due to native speaker contact. Two prime examples for this were the approximators ‘like’ and ‘and/or stuff’. These two markers were only used in the pre-exchange data by one participant (MK) who had been in more contact with native speakers before the exchange than other GES10 participants. ‘Like’ and ‘and/or stuff’ were used by almost all participants after five months of living in Australia, where they were in direct daily contact with native speakers.

Interestingly, a number of the markers that increased significantly were already used by many participants before they left for Australia (e.g. ‘just’ and ‘really’). This indicated that the participants had already acquired these markers (or pragmalinguistic tools) before the exchange, but did not fully comprehend the social conditions governing their use (sociopragmatic knowledge). It was only after immersion in a native speaker environment that the participants made extensive use of the pragmalinguistic tools they had acquired before the exchange. Previous exposure to the markers may have been through sporadic native-speaker exposure while living in Germany (e.g. music, television, holidays and short two week school exchange programmes).

These results provided substantial evidence in support of the hypothesis that exchange students on a ten month programme to Australia were most likely to acquire those markers most associated with expression of adolescent identity within the first five months of their exchange. However, it remained unclear whether this pattern of learning continued into the remaining five months of their stay in Australia. It is to a
discussion of this that we turn.

7.3 Acquisition from five to ten months (GES10, 5-10mth)

In the second half of their exchange, GES10 continued to increase their use of interpersonal markers to significant levels (p = .035), however effect size for this acquisition was only medium (ES = 0.7). The number of individual interpersonal marker items increased only slightly from 122 in the five month data to 128 in the ten month interviews (Table 7-6).

**Table 7-6 Interpersonal marker repertoire, 5 & 10-mth interview (GES10)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpersonal marker type</th>
<th>5-mth</th>
<th>10-mth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximation</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensification</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn-taking</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reformulation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within interpersonal markers, attitude markers continued to increase significantly with a large effect size (p = .035, ES = 0.9), but the average rate of management markers decreased significantly with a medium effect size (p = .019, ES = 0.7). This meant that when the full zero to ten month period was used as the basis of calculation, there was no significant change in management marker use (p = .683), but increased use of attitude markers remained significant and large (p = .001, ES = 2.3).

**Figure 7-10 Interpersonal markers, 5 & 10-mth interview (GES10)**
Some change was also seen in the relative distribution of attitude and management markers. In the five-month data, attitude markers accounted for 59% of all interpersonal markers, which increased to 67% in the ten month data. The 8% increase was due to lower proportional use of involvement markers within management marking and increased proportional use of intensification within attitude marking (Figure 7-11).

Figure 7-11 Interpersonal marker distribution, 5 & 10-mth interview (GES10)
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This meant that acquisition of markers continued in the second half of the exchange, albeit to a far lower extent than from zero to five months. The repertoire of markers increased slightly and, in both the five and ten month data, attitude markers were the most frequently used type of interpersonal marker.

### 7.3.1 Attitude (GES10, 5-10mth)

As shown in Figure 7-12, within attitude, intensification markers continued to show significant and large increase (p = .035, ES = 1.0), while approximation markers did not (p = .510). Similar to results for zero to five months, knowledge markers did not change significantly (p = .198).
While the proportional use of intensification and approximation markers was similar in the five month data (43% approximation, 38% intensification), after an additional five months of living in Australia, intensification superseded approximation as the most used type of attitude marker. Interestingly, the relative proportional use of approximation and intensification at ten months showed more resemblance with the zero month data (27% approximation, 43% intensification) than with the five month data. This may have been due to overextension, whereby learners initially overused key language items but, over time, reverted back to more native-speaker-like levels of use. As this can only be determined by comparison with native-speakers, it is discussed further in Chapter nine.

Figure 7-13 Attitude marker distribution, 5 & 10-mth interview (GES10)
7.3.1.1 Approximation (GES10, 5-10mth)

Figure 7-14 Approximation marker repertoire, 5 & 10-mth interview (GES10)

Four new approximation markers appeared in the ten month data and two were exclusive to the five month interviews (Figure 7-14). In the five month interviews, ‘mainly’ only occurred twice by one speaker (Example 7-40) and the general extender ‘and what not’ was only used by one speaker in one instance.

Example 7-40 (GES10, 5-mth, interview)
NS: and they've got the rule that if I th- / ah throw up I have to clean it myself +
AG: fair enough
NS: so yeah @ yeah @
AG: @ yeah @
NS: that's it
AG: yeah
NS: **mainly** (. ) and they buy alcohol for me + and cigarettes

Average per minute rates and number of speakers for markers that only appeared in the ten month interviews were also low. There was no single item that was used more than twice by more than two different speakers. Aside from ‘fairly’ and ‘what’, the new approximation markers already had other functions in the zero to five month data, e.g. ‘really’ and ‘not even’ were already used as intensifiers and ‘stuff’ was used extensively with a conjunction in general extenders. This indicated an expansion of functions of existing markers from five to ten months. Due to low levels of use and statistical non-significance, this was not explored further.

Unlike the zero to five month development, none of the thirty individual approximation markers used in both the five and ten month data (Figure 7-14) showed
significant increase or decrease. This, however, did not necessarily mean that changes had not occurred within the use of individual markers, e.g. range of syntactic positions or degree of concurrent politeness functions. As it was not possible to check all individual markers, the four that had showed significant and large increase in the first five months were tested for internal change (i.e. ‘all’, and/or stuff’, ‘and/or thing’ and ‘not really’).

From five to ten months, ‘all’, ‘and/or stuff’, ‘and/or thing’ and ‘not really’ increased in average use per minute, albeit minimally and not to significant levels. After ten months of living in Australia, they were used by all fourteen participants, except for ‘and/or stuff’, which was not used by MK in the ten month data. Politeness functions and syntactic position for ‘all’ and ‘really’ showed little change from five to ten months. Similarly, very little difference was detected in choice of disjunct or adjuncts and types of general extenders when analysing ‘and/or stuff’ and ‘and/or thing’. Further analysis of the four markers did, however, reveal consistently higher degrees of variation in the ten month data compared to the zero and five month data. This indicated that non-significant increase from five to ten months was not due to stabilisation, but a combination of increased and decreased use. Increased use of ‘all’, ‘and/or stuff’, ‘and/or thing’ and ‘not really’ from zero to five months was fairly consistent and homogeneous. Comparatively, in the five to ten month interviews there were both large decreases and increases in individual use of the four markers and a number of outliers appeared (Figure 7-15). This was particularly the case for ‘and/or stuff’ where US and MAM were outliers due to increased use and SJ and NS were outliers due to decreased use. In her increased use of ‘not really’, LD was an extreme outlier. It may be that while the first five months of the exchange were typified by acquisition and expression of a general adolescent identity, in the second half of the exchange individuals became more focused on the expression of both adolescent and individual identities (e.g. sportspersons, musicians, Germans, school students, extroverts). As a result, interpersonal marker use became more idiosyncratic and there was higher variation of use within the group.
7.3.1.2 Intensification (GES10, 5-10mth)

Two new lexical items appeared in the ten month data for intensification and three were exclusive to the five month data (Figure 7-16). None of these items showed significant increase or decrease and they were used in fewer than four instances by two or fewer speakers.

The only intensification marker that increased significantly (p = .030) from five to ten months was ‘pretty’ (Example 7-41). ‘Pretty’ was classified as an intensification
marker when its literal meaning of aesthetic beauty was bleached in favour of intensification (Nevalainen & Rissanen, 2002). It was used as both an upgrader (i.e. meaning ‘really’, ‘very’, ‘considerable’ or ‘fair-sized’) or a downtoner (i.e. ‘kind of’), but it was often impossible to distinguish between the two functions. In Example 7.41 ‘pretty’ might have boosted the fact that LN could go to horse shows and did a good job (i.e. ‘it was really good’ or ‘I did a really good job’). However, it would be equally valid to interpret ‘pretty’ as a downtoner (i.e. ‘it was sort of good’ and ‘I did a sort of good job’). The syntactic position of ‘pretty’ was predominantly directly before an adjective and it was used at an average rate of .1193/min in the five month data and .2480/min in the ten month interview. However, as effect size for increased use of ‘pretty much’ from five to ten months was only medium (ES = .62), it was not explored further.

Example 7.41 (GES10, 10-mth, interview)

LN: because [ without ] horses I couldn't go anywhere +
AG: yep
LN: yeah and it was **pretty** good that I could go to shows + and everything and (.) I did a **pretty** good job + so (.)
AG: hmhm
LN: that was fun and at school I met lots of friends + and (.) yeah it was a bit boring like on the weekends because (.) like my friends they / they are not going out a

The analysis so far indicated that the significant increase in intensification from five to ten months was not due to changes in the use of individual markers, but a general increase of a number of intensifiers. Similar to the five to ten month analysis of approximation markers, detailed five to ten month analysis of those intensifiers that showed significant and large increase (i.e. ‘just’, ‘really’ and ‘like’) and decrease (i.e. ‘very’) in the zero to five month data was also conducted. From five to ten months ‘just’, ‘really’ and ‘like’ continued to increase, while ‘very’ continued to decrease. No changes were found in terms of upgrading, downtoning or politeness functions, type of item modified, collocations and syntactic position. Reinforcing results for five to ten month approximation (Section 7.3.1.1), the only detectable difference between the zero and five month results and those for five to ten was degree of individual variation. From zero to five there was a uniform increase in use of ‘like’ and ‘really’ and a uniform decrease in ‘very’. One participant (MK) used ‘just’ less in the five month interviews
than the zero month ones, but all others increased their use. JP and NS showed some non-extreme outlier behaviour in their high use of ‘just’ and ‘really’ respectively and MM was an extreme outlier in his low use of ‘very’. Comparatively, the five to ten month data showed a much higher mix of decreased and increased use and a number of outliers, including three cases of extreme outlier behaviour (i.e. MM for high use and NS for low use of ‘really’ and US for her low use of ‘like’). This may due to individual speakers focusing more on establishing their own idiosyncratic marker use and extending the performance of identity beyond the broad category of adolescence. In doing so, they continued to express their adolescent identity, but also created a more individualised expression of self.

Figure 7-17 Intensification variation, 0 to 5-mth & 5 to 10-mth interview (GES10)

7.3.2 Management (GES10, 5-10mth)

Effect size for significant decrease in management markers was below .8 (p = .019, ES = 0.7). Analysis of the two subcategories of management markers showed no significant change in turn-taking markers (p = .397), but a significant and large decrease in involvement markers (p = .002, ES .9). Reduced use of involvement markers meant that frequency rates were at around the same level as those of the zero month data. As such, when the entire exchange period (i.e. zero to ten months) was used as the basis of
calculations, there was no significant change in involvement marker use (p = .730).

7.3.2.1 Involvement (GES10, 5-10mth)

Table 7-7 Significant change in involvement, 0 to 5-mth interview (GES10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marker</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>+/-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ah</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hm</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oh</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ok</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yeah</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of changes in individual involvement markers (Table 7-7) indicated that the significant and large decrease in involvement was due to lower use of back channels by GES10. Decreased use of the back channels ‘oh’, ‘ok’ and ‘yeah’ was significant and large (Table 7-7).

Example 7-42 (GES10, 5-mth, interview)

GH: yeah that's kind of weird yeah that's strange [you're right]
AG: and it's a bit easy the ball's already sitting on a pole + (.) it's pretty easy to hit it +
GH: **yeah**
AG: (laughs) (.) whereas you know if someone

Example 7-43 (GES10, 5-mth, interview)

LN: and had fun there + and then (.) we went all home + and then some other people came and we had a (.) sleep over + and we were watching dvds + @ and @
AG: @ yep @ (1.5) yep
LN: **yeah**
AG: what do you like most about your birthday +

Back channels signalled a listener’s attention and interest without interrupting the main speaker’s stream of talk (Yngve, 1970). To distinguish them from items that signalled the initiation of repair, passing of an opportunity to produce a full turn in periods of turn negotiation or relinquishment of a turn (Schegloff, 1982), back channels in this study had to appear between two stretches of lengthy discourse produced by the one interlocutor. This meant that ‘yeah’ was coded as a back channel in Example 7-42 as it did not challenge primary speakership (Heinz, 2003). However, it was coded as a
A turn-taking marker in Example 7-43, where it was used to show lack of interest in picking up a turn during a period of turn negotiation (Schegloff, 1982). In Example 7-43, LN’s turn was interrupted by AG’s back channel ‘yep’, followed by a 1.5 second pause when it was not clear who would be the next speaker. AG said ‘yep’ to indicate lack of interest in picking up the turn and LN responded to this with ‘yeah’ also to indicate lack of interest in turn-uptake. Eventually AG picked up the turn with a question about what LN liked most about her birthday.

While German monolingual non-native speakers of English have been found to produce significantly fewer back channels than native-speakers of American English (Heinz, 2003), differences in involvement marking in this study was never significantly lower than AES at the zero month (p = .402), five month (p = .519) or ten month (p = .220) data collection. This might be due to the fact that Heinz’s (2003) participants were adults, not adolescents. Indeed, research in first language acquisition suggests that the development of back channel responses may be amongst the last conversational skills acquired from childhood to adolescence (Hess & Johnston, 1988). This means that the adolescent native-speakers in AES may still have been acquiring back channel responses in Australian English, and the GES10 participants may have still been acquiring them in both their first and second languages. If so, it is not surprising that GES10 participants’ use of back channels was irregular and showed both increased and decreased use. The late development of back channels in first language acquisition may also explain why they have not been identified as a key feature of adolescent language.

7.3.2.2 Turn-taking (GES10, 5-10mth)

There were no individual turn-taking markers that showed any statistically significant change from five to ten months.

7.3.3 Summary of five to ten months results (GES10)

Compared to the many significant and large changes in the first five months of the exchange, the second five months showed very little development. The only area of significant increase was that of intensification and there were no individual markers that showed significant and large increase or decrease. Even analysis of internal changes and development of individual marker use revealed little or no change. This indicated that
the participants had indeed acquired those markers most associated with adolescent identity within the first five months of their exchange.

However, differences were found in terms of individual choice of markers. After five months in Australia, the group was less homogenous than at the outset of the study, but there were only a few participants who showed outlier behaviour. Generally, increased average rates of use were due to across-the-board individual increases. Comparatively after ten months of living in Australia, individual variation was high and there were a number of participants who showed outlier or even extreme outlier development. Non-significant changes were often due to a mix of increased and decreased use by individual participants.

One explanation for this may be a process of overextension and normalisation, whereby participants initially overuse a particular marker but then normalise use to match native speaker norms. The five to ten month section of the exchange may have been a period of mixed acquisition, whereby some speakers had not yet peaked in use of a particular marker and others had already begun a process of normalisation. In the first five months of the exchange, almost all participants were acquiring markers and had not yet reached overextension levels of use. However, ascertaining or defining peak usage would be problematic and such an interpretation of results could not take into account the highly idiosyncratic nature of pragmatic marker use.

A more plausible explanation is that in the second half of the exchange, individuals no longer only focused on expressing adolescent identity, but also on the expression of themselves as individual adolescents with a number of salient identities. As such they began to be more selective about which markers they used to best express their own identities within an overarching adolescent identity.

Two questions essential to this analysis remain unanswered. Firstly, would these changes have occurred had the participants not embarked on an exchange? Secondly, was the participants’ use of interpersonal markers a reflection of native-speaker contact and use? Analyses that provide some insight to these two questions are reported in Chapters eight and nine.
Chapter 8  Comparison with the control group (GES10, GS)

8.1 Introduction (GES10, GS)

This chapter compares the ten-month interview data of GES10 with that of the control group, GS. This was to make sure that any changes in pragmatic marker use identified in Chapter seven were due to contact with native speakers in an exchange situation. It also tested the strength of the second hypothesis that German adolescents learning English in Germany (GS) acquired a number of key markers of adolescent identity, but not to the same degree as GES10. The significance values and effect sizes reported for GES10 in this chapter are slightly different to those reported in Chapter seven as this analysis focused on comparisons at zero and ten months, rather than zero and five and then five and ten months of the exchange.

Since interview times and group sizes were slightly different (GES10 n = 14, GS n= 20), percentage and average per minute rates were used for comparisons. Similar to Chapter seven, differences were only analysed in detail if a Wilcoxon Signed Rank or Mann-Whitney U test was significant (p < .05) and Cohen’s d effect size was greater than .8. The analysis began at the top of the hierarchical order of interpersonal markers (Chapter five) and moved down to the individual marker level.

To fully understand the comparisons, the analysis is prefaced with a short overview of the speakers and the environments in which they acquired English over the ten months of data collection.

8.2 Language contact (GES10, GS)

As discussed in Chapter four, GES10, GES05 and GS were recruited using a matched pair technique. Whenever possible, a participant in GES10 and GES05 was matched with a GS participant who was taught by the same teacher in the same school and had similar, if not identical, school grades in English. Chapter six provided a detailed report of analyses indicating that the two groups had the same levels of interpersonal marker use at the outset of the study. Individual variation within each group was also highly comparable, as was English native-speaker language contact outside of the classroom. This meant that any differences at the ten month stage were most likely due to living in two different language acquisition environments.

GS represented the acquisition environment to which the exchange students would have been exposed had they not gone on exchange. It is important to note that language contact in Germany was not only restricted to classroom-based learning of English. For example, at the time of data collection, it was common practice for
students in Year 9 to Year 11 at a German Gymnasium to go on two or even four week exchanges to England or the USA and to host British and American exchange students in their own families in Germany. Adolescents learning English in Germany also had access to English-speaking radio, films and TV channels and much of the music they listened to was in English. Many also travelled with their families to Great Britain or the USA during school holidays or attended intensive English language schools in Great Britain. This meant that participants did have the opportunity to increase their language contact outside the classroom, albeit to a far more limited extent than participants in GES10. Unlike GES10, there were some GS individuals who reported zero English-speaking contact outside of the classroom over the ten months.

Although they lived in a predominantly Australian English-speaking environment, the GES10 participants were not immersed in the English language to the same degree. Levels and quality of contact depended on their own abilities to seek out language contact opportunities and be accepted as equal in-group members of any imagined speech community (Menard-Warwick, 2005; Norton, 2000; Spolsky, 1989). For example, some preferred to socialise with other German exchange students in their schools or spent a great deal of their free time chatting in German to friends over the Internet. Some wrote and read mostly in English, while others chose to do the same in German in their free time. The host family and living arrangements also impacted on the students’ ability to seek out language contact situations after school, e.g. some had same-age host siblings with whom they shared a friendly relationship, others did not have same-age siblings or did not get along with them. They may also have lived remotely and, therefore, could not join in many extra-curricular free time and social activities. The impact of such differences in language contact is discussed in detail in Chapter ten, but is used to explain some results in this chapter.
8.3 Interpersonal markers (GES10, GS)

After ten months of living in Australia, GES10 showed significantly higher use of interpersonal markers than GS ($p = .000$, $ES = 1.5$). In stark contrast to GES10 (Chapter seven), GS’s use of interpersonal markers did not show any significant increase (Figure 8-1) over the ten month period ($p = .179$). This minimal increase in interpersonal markers in GS was somewhat surprising considering four GS participants indicated considerably increased speaking contact with native speakers during the ten months (AM, MR, AE and KG). AM and MR went on two to three week exchange programmes to the USA. MR also hosted Finnish students at her home in Germany with whom she spoke English. AM successfully completed a Cambridge Certificate in Advanced English in 2006, for which he had been studying intensively since October 2005, sang in English in a band each week for two to three hours and spoke to the American host family of his girlfriend who was on exchange to the US. He had also voluntarily worked as a farmhand in Gallway, Ireland over the summer holidays in 2005 and had spent two weeks at a British English language school in 2003. AE had attended a bilingual German-English Gymnasium since 1999, where a number of teachers were native speakers of English. During the data collection period, she also met her boyfriend from Lebanon with whom she spent most of her time and conversed in English. Finally, KG had little experience living in a native-English-speaking environment during the data collection period, but was in regular weekly telephone contact with a friend and her host family in the USA. Although the friend’s native language was German, they decided to speak English
with each other while the friend was on exchange in the USA. KG also prepared for her Cambridge Certificate in Advanced English during the ten months of data collection and actively sought out opportunities to speak and practise her English in Germany (e.g. writing poetry in English, speaking English with German friends). Prior to the data collection period, KG had been on a short two week exchange to England and her best friend in 2003 was an American exchange student with whom she conversed in English. Despite higher levels of native-speaker contact than other GS participants, MR, AM, AE and KG were not outliers in terms of high total interpersonal marker use at ten months and only KG and AM appeared in the top five for use of interpersonal markers after ten months (KG = 1, AM = 4). There was only one extreme outlier for high use of interpersonal marker use in GES10 (RHI). RHI was highly active in an adolescent community and an integral member of her host family. This is discussed in detail in Chapter ten.

### 8.3.1 Attitude (GES10, GS)

After 10-months, higher use of attitude markers by GES10 compared to GS was significant and large ($p = .000$, $ES = 1.59$). Increased use of attitude marking was not significant ($p = .048$) in GS, but was significant and large ($p = .001$, $ES = 2.0$) for GES10 over the ten month period. There were no outliers in attitude marking in GS. In GES10, RHI showed extreme outlier behaviour in her high use of attitude markers, which was related to her high level of social integration (Chapter ten).

Of the three subtypes of attitude markers, approximation increased significantly in GS (Figure 8-2), but effect size was only medium ($p = .005$, $ES = .6$). There was no significant change in either intensification ($p = 1.0$) or knowledge marking ($p = .073$). This differed considerably from GES10 who showed significant and large increases in both approximation ($p = .001$, $ES = 2.0$) and intensification ($p = .001$, $ES = 1.4$), but not knowledge marking ($p = .084$) over the ten months. Such differences in acquisition meant that higher use of approximation markers by GES10 compared to GS at ten months was significant and large ($p = .001$, $ES = 1.3$) as was higher use of intensification ($p = .000$, $ES = 1.0$). After ten months there continued to be no significant difference in use of knowledge markers ($p = .071$) between the two groups. This meant that GS showed no significant change in knowledge marking from zero to ten months and GES10 showed no significant change in knowledge marking from zero to five months, five to ten months (Chapter seven) or zero to ten months.
This might indicate that these markers were not considered important for the expression of adolescent identity by either group or that the level to which knowledge markers had been acquired prior to the exchange was adequate in native-speaker language environments. These ideas are explored further in comparisons of GES10 and AES in Chapter nine.

*Figure 8-2 Attitude markers, 0 & 10-mth interview (GES10, GS)*

In GS, KG was an outlier for high use of intensification and knowledge markers, but this behaviour was not extreme. LSC in GS was also a non-extreme outlier for her high use of approximators and knowledge markers. Comparatively, RHI in GES10 showed extreme outlier behaviour in her high use of intensifiers. To some degree this tallied with their language contact experiences, which is explored in Chapter ten.

### 8.3.1.1 Approximation (GES10, GS)

#### 8.3.1.1.1 Individual markers (GES10, GS)

After ten months of living in Australia, GES10 used ‘all’ (p = .000, ES = 1.8), ‘and/or stuff’ (p = .000, ES = 1.4), ‘a bit’ (p = .008, ES = 1.0), ‘like’ (p = .000, ES = 1.0), ‘not really’ (p = .000, ES = 1.4) and ‘not too’ (p = .033, ES = .9) significantly more than GS (Figure 8-3). After ten months, GS also used ‘not very’ significantly more than GES10 (p = .017, ES = 1.1). There was also significantly more use of ‘kind of’ (p = .015), and less use of ‘not so’ (p = .025) in GES10 than GS, but effect sizes were below .8 (ES = 0.6 and ES = 0.5, respectively).
Significantly higher use of ‘not really’ and lower use of ‘not very’ by GES10 compared to GS tallied with the results reported in Chapter seven. GES10 showed significant and large increase in ‘not really’ (p = .001, ES = 1.38) in the first five months and ‘not really’ superseded the more formal variant ‘not very’. Increased use of ‘not really’ and decreased use of ‘not very’ continued throughout the ten months of the exchange and a comparison of the zero and ten month data showed that increased use of ‘not really’ remained significant and large (p = .001, ES = 1.7). Comparatively, GS increased use of both ‘not really’ and ‘not very’, but not to significant levels.

*Figure 8-3 Significant differences in approximation, 10-mth interview (GES10, GS)*

While there were ten approximation markers that increased significantly with a large effect size from zero to ten months in GES10 (Table 8-1), there were no individual approximation markers that increased significantly with a large effect size in GS. The only significant increase in GS was ‘not much’, but effect size was just at .8 (p = .019, ES = .8). Increased use of ‘not really’ was only marginally significant (p = .049) in GS.

This meant that those approximation markers that increased the most in the GES10 zero to five and five to ten month data (Chapter seven), did not increase to a significant level in GS. As discussed in Chapter seven, the approximators ‘all’, ‘and/or stuff’ and ‘not really’ all increased to significant and large extents in GES10 within the first five months of the exchange and increased use remained significant and large when comparing the zero and ten month data (Table 8-1). A number of other markers increased in the first five months, but not to either significant or effect
size levels (e.g. ‘like’ in GES10 increased with only a medium effect size in the first five months). However, these markers increased significantly with a large effect size when the entire zero to ten month period was taken as the basis of comparison (Table 8-1).

Table 8-1 Significant approximation changes, 0 to 10-mth interview (GES10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>+/-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>all</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and/or stuff</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and/or thing</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and/or whatever</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a bit</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kind of</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>like</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not much</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not really</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pretty much</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Those approximation markers that showed the most change in the first five months of GES10’s exchange were concurrently the ones that most clearly differentiated GES10 and GS at the ten month stage of data collection. Increased use of these markers in GES10 was most likely due to changes in the language acquisition context and native-speaker contact. In support of this argument, ‘and/or stuff’ and ‘like’ were also used by those speakers in GS who had contact with native-speakers outside the classroom during the ten month period. ‘And/or stuff’ was only used by AE, AM, LSC and SB in GS all of whom had been in direct speaking contact with native-speakers of British or American English. Similarly, ‘like’ was used by AM, LSC and SB in GS. However, it was also used once by NH (Example 8-1) who had not travelled to any English-speaking countries and had only increased her native-speaker language contact through a new penfriend in Australia.

Example 8-1 (GS, 10-mth, interview)

AG: do you have a movie theatre and things here + or
NH: ah yep @ it's um @
AG: @ yeah + @
NH: in Wende +
AG: ok
NH: and there are also um (.) **like** in Jetta + Aurich +
AG: hmhm
NH: and so on
Example 8-2 (GS, 10-mth, interview)

AM: um (.) but my favourite movie is (.) [ don't know ] / perhaps you know it + goodbye lenin +
AG: no
AM: that's a very ah (.) famous german movie + I think it was produced **like** four years ago + or something +
AG: ahha

NH’s use of ‘like’ (Example 8-1) was coded as an approximator as it headed a list of random examples in a ‘like’ + noun + general extender sequence and, in doing so, appealed to the mutual knowledge of the participants concerning towns in the area which were similar to the towns of Jetta and Aurich. While adhering to the coding rules for approximator use, it was preceded by ‘um’ and the sentence in which it appeared was disjointed, indicating that it could also have been an editing marker. This contrasted directly with the use of ‘like’ by other GS participants who had increased their native-speaker contact over the ten months. For these speakers, the context in which ‘like’ was used was less disjointed and the role of ‘like’ was clearly one of approximation (Example 8-2).

8.3.1.1.2 Repertoire (GES10, GS)

Figure 8-4 Approximation marker repertoire, 10-mth interview (GES10, GS)

After ten months of living in Australia, GES10 showed not only significantly higher use of a number of key approximation markers, but also a broader repertoire than GS (Figure 8-4). At the ten month data collection stage, GES10 used seven approximation markers that did not appear in the GS ten month interviews. Of these, six appeared after the GES10 participants embarked on their exchange and never appeared in either the GS zero or ten month data (i.e. those marked with an asterisk in Figure 8-4). This suggests that increased repertoire in GES10 was mostly due to their
high exposure to native-speakers.

Example 8-3 (GES10, 10-mth, interview)

MAM: [...] like the per-personalities of my friends +
AG: yep
MAM: and like the people that come to you + (1.0) like here when you're new they don't come to you and ask what's your name where you come from + **like this** and they're all like oh you want to do

Example 8-4 (GS, 0-mth, interview)

HR: it was very cool
AG: where did you stay +
HR: in [X] +
AG: yep
HR: in a / in a um youth hostel +
AG: hmm
HR: [ camp ] hostels **like that** +
AG: yep
HR: er like / like um you (.) can ah say it was like a / like a (1.0) / like a travel with your class +

The one remaining token (i.e. ‘(and/or) like this’) was only used by one speaker in one instance in GES10 (Example 8-3) and once by HR in the GS zero month data (Example 8-4). While rates of use were low, the two instances of ‘(and/or) like that’ provided a clear example of how approximation markers were often used for different interpersonal purposes by the two groups. HR’s use of the extender without a conjunction rendered the terms ‘camp hostels’ or ‘youth hostels’ vague because she did not know or could not access the correct term for the place she wished to describe: a Landschulheim for which the direct translation into English would be a ‘country school home’. A closer translation into current Australian English would be a youth or school sport and recreation centre. The main focus of ‘like this’ was to highlight imprecise use of a term and not necessarily appeal to mutual knowledge. Note that HR continued with a description of a German Landschulheim, indicating she did not actually know whether her Australian interlocutor was familiar with the concept. Arguably, ‘like’ in this particular instance could have been classified as a preposition, but was coded as a general extender as the full construction ‘like that’ could be extracted without impacting on syntactic integrity and rendered use of the preceding term vague. Comparatively, MAM’s use of ‘(and/or) like that’ in the GES10 ten month data (Example 8-3) was clearly a general extender and was not associated with lexical access issues. It marked a random example of questions that new exchange
students would be asked in Australia, but not in Germany. Use of the general extender appealed to the interlocutors’ mutual knowledge of questions belonging to this category.

Analyses of changes within GS over the ten months also indicated very little increase in the approximation marker repertoire (Figure 8-5).

*Figure 8-5 Approximation marker repertoire, 0 & 10-mth interview (GS)*

Similar to GES10 (Chapter seven), in GS the non-idiomatic marker ‘I say it’ was only used in the zero month data. There were also two general extenders (i.e. ‘or what’ and ‘(and/or) like that’) that were used exclusively in the zero month GS data. However, they were each only used once by one speaker (KG and HR respectively). ‘Or what’ was never used by AES or GES10 and was most likely a non-native-speaker form (Example 8-5).

*Example 8-5 (GS, 0-mth, interview)*

AG: yep
KG: and um the house was very old and ah yeah beautiful and I think that was the first time that I did not know anything
AG: hmm
KG: so it was very exciting and I was seven years old **or what**
AG: hmm
KG: so I did not understand anything

The three markers appearing exclusively in the GS ten month data were each used once by one speaker (AM, AE, HR). ‘Not quite’ and ‘stuff’ were used by two speakers (AM, AE) who had more English speaking contact during the ten month period than other GS participants. Since these two markers only ever appeared in the post-departure data of GES10, they were most probably acquired through contact with native-speakers in both groups. After ten months in Australia, GES10 speakers understood rules for use of ‘not quite’ and there were no cases in which the marker
was used differently to AES. Comparatively, the context in which the construction was used in GS was semantically and grammatically incorrect (Example 8-6). AE did not realise that in negative contexts, ‘quite’ is not a scalar modifier, but a totality modifier meaning ‘not completely’. This means it cannot be combined with the scalar adjective ‘good’ (Paradis, 2001). It is possible that through her limited exposure to native speakers, AE had acquired ‘not quite’ as a means of approximation, but had not yet fully understood the rules governing its use.

*Example 8-6 (GS, 10-mth, interview)*

AE: […] no no we just um (. ) shoot ah balls / we don't really play against each other +
AG: hmmh
AE: yeah (. ) well I don't my / my boyfriend does but I / I don't really like to do that + because I / I'm **not quite** good in basketball +
AG: ahha
AE: (laughs)

For approximation marking, there was very little evidence to suggest that GS acquired any key markers of adolescent identity. Approximation marking in GS remained constant throughout the ten month period in terms of average rates of use, choice of individual markers and marker repertoire. Moreover, many of the small changes that did occur were due to those individuals who had sought out the most English native speaker contact opportunities during and before the ten month period. These results indicated that the changes over ten months in GES10 (Chapter seven) were due to the exchange experience and direct native-speaker contact.

### 8.3.1.2 Intensification (GES10, GS)

#### 8.3.1.2.1 Individual markers (GES10, GS)

Compared to GS, GES10 made significantly higher use of the intensification markers ‘all’ (p = .033, ES = 0.9), ‘even’ (p = .033, ES = 0.9), ‘just’ (p = .000, ES = 1.5), ‘like’ (p = .000, ES = 1.4), ‘pretty’ (p = .000, ES = 1.4) and ‘really’ (p = .001, ES = 1.1) after ten months of living in Australia. GES10 also made significantly less use of ‘very’ (p = .000, ES = 1.5) and ‘only’ (p = .039, ES = .7) than GS, although effect size was only large for ‘very’. As reported in Chapter seven, ‘just’, ‘like’ and ‘really’ increased significantly with a large effect size and ‘pretty’ with a medium effect size after GES10 embarked on their exchange. ‘Really’ gradually replaced
‘very’, which decreased significantly and largely within the first five months of the exchange in GES10. As similar patterns were not found in GS, increased or decreased use of these four markers was most likely due to the change of language acquisition environment. Average rates of use of the two remaining intensifiers that were used significantly less by GS compared to GES10 (i.e. ‘all’ and ‘even’) were low in both groups. The significant difference in use of ‘all’ and ‘even’ by the two groups was due to range of speakers. In GS, ‘all’ and ‘even’ were used by no more than two speakers compared to $7/14$ for ‘all’ and $12/14$ for ‘even’ in GES10. There was no discernable relationship between native speaker contact and use of ‘all’ or ‘even’ in GS.

Comparisons with AES indicated no significant differences with either GS or GES10 in the use of these two markers. AES, GES10 and GS all used ‘all’ and ‘even’ to a limited extent, indicating that the two intensification markers were unlikely to be key markers of adolescent identity.

*Figure 8-6 Significant difference in intensification, 10-mth interview (GES10, GS)*

Finally, GS showed significant decrease in the use of ‘no’ ($p = .021$, ES = .5) and significant increase in ‘only’ for intensification ($p = .039$, ES = 0.54), but effect sizes were below .8. This was in stark contrast to statistical comparisons of the GES10 zero to ten month data in which GES10 showed significant change in ten markers, of which five had a large effect size (Table 8-2).
Table 8-2 Significant intensification changes, 0 to 10-mth interview (GES10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>+/-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>just</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>like</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>really</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>even</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actually*</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not at all*</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pretty</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>so</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all*</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* not in 0-mth interview

8.3.1.2.2 Repertoire (GES10, GS)

While the two groups shared a repertoire of twenty-one intensifiers (Figure 8-7), GES10 used an additional six markers in the ten month data. Again, the majority of these (i.e. those marked with an asterisk in Figure 8-7) only appeared after participants in GES10 embarked on their exchange and never appeared in the GS zero or ten month data.

Figure 8-7 Intensification marker repertoire, 10-mth interview (GES10, GS)

GS used three intensifiers (‘well’, ‘not in any way’ and ‘God’) that were not used by GES10 in the ten month data. ‘Well’ for intensification was used only once by one GS speaker (Example 8-7). It also appeared once in the GES10 five month data (Example 8-8) and was used by $^4/_{13}$ native-speakers in five instances in AES. While average rates of intensifier ‘well’ were low in all three groups, its use warrants some further explanation. Despite extensive literature on ‘well’ as a pragmatic marker (e.g. Jucker, 1993; Müller, 2005; Schiffrin, 1987; Svartvik, 1980), its use for intensification has barely been discussed. To date, the focus of research has mainly been on ‘well’ as marking insufficiency, confrontation, hesitation or separation of
discourse units (e.g. Jucker, 1993; Müller, 2005). However, Svartvik (1980) mentioned that ‘well’ could be used as a qualifier to mark ‘reinforcement’ and, in this function, would be paraphrasable with ‘as a matter of fact’, ‘actually’, ‘certainly’ or ‘really’. While the examples he provided were only of ‘well’ in initial position, it seems logical to assume that ‘well’ for reinforcement could also appear in the same syntactic positions as the words with which it could be paraphrased. Indeed, in this study, intensifier–‘well’ appeared in both sentence-initial and medial positions. It also appeared in sentence final position, but only as part of the collocation ‘oh well’.

Example 8-7 (GS, 10-mth, interview)

KG: when you have break or whatever so it's really hard / really hard work they have to warm up two hours and after that I have / um:: I could do the warm up with them
AG: ahha
KG: and after that I was so **well** tired and could not do anything
AG: ahha

Example 8-8 (GES10, 5-mth, interview)

RHI: so they are really (.) yeah and they are so open + every australian is so open +
AG: ahha
RHI: and when they are drunk they are much more open
AG: (laughs)
RHI: and that's really (.) **well** funny
AG: (laughs)
RHI: everything is wow

In Example 8-7 to Example 8-10, there was nothing to suggest insufficiency, confrontation or delay. Instead, ‘well’ placed particular emphasis on the item it preceded (Example 8-7 to Example 8-9) or indicated emotive involvement and attitude to the discourse (Example 8-10). In Example 8-10, the collocation ‘oh well’ was in sentence initial position and highlighted the speaker’s attitude to the entire phrase. In Example 8-7, Example 8-8 and Example 8-9 it was sentence-medial and added emphasis to the following adjective or noun phrase. Note that the pause preceding ‘well’ in Example 8-8 was less than a second and there were no signs of hesitation or processing difficulty in the context in which ‘well’ appeared. This indicated that the pause was actually further accentuating the lexical item highlighted by ‘well’ (Svartvik, 1980), rather than indicating any degree of non-fluency. In GES10 ‘well’ only appeared after participants had embarked on their exchange, but it
was present in both the GS zero month and ten month data.

*Example 8-9 (AES, 10-mth, interview)*

LDE: [...] have it so easy at the moment + I'm only going in like three times a week +
AG: oh
LDE: and yeah just happen well / you get [ X ] doing education down here +
AG: cool
LDE: and monday I've only got **well** an hour a lesson + so I just say I basically

*Example 8-10 (AES, 10-mth, interview)*

APO: yeah I don't really know I'm going to manage it but um (.)
AG: (laughs)
APO: study might get yeah [ well ] I just won't tell my dad that study's getting pushed aside (laughs)
AG: (laughs)
APO: but **oh well** it's (.) only for a year and (.) like last year

The second marker that was exclusive to the GS ten month interviews (‘not in any way’) was only ever used once in GS (Example 8-11). Similar to ‘not at all’ (Example 8-12), which was used in GES10 and AES but not GS, ‘not in any way’ reinforced a strong negative opinion. ‘God’ was used by GES10 in the five month data and rates of use in GS were low, so it was not explored further.

*Example 8-11 (GS, 10-mth, interview)*

KG: as just after (.) two months or whatever she just said well I can't stand this job I I have to do something else because the / well she she was not very (.) / well the um pupils did not respect her **in any way**

*Example 8-12 (GES10, 10-mth, interview)*

SJ: [...] little bit shocked I thought oh is Australia like that you know that that s- / strict and that Christian
AG: yep
SJ: thought it would be more laid back and (2.0) and this community is **not laid back at all** (laughs)
AG: (laughs)
SJ: but yeah

Both ‘well’ and ‘not in any way’ were used by KG in GS, who reported high levels of English native-speaker language contact during the ten month data collection
period. However, KG’s exposure to native-speakers of English was not necessarily with other adolescents but through intensive Cambridge certificate language courses and speaking on the phone to the American parents of her friend’s host family. This may indicate that the two markers were acquired through native speaker contact, but were not necessarily markers of adolescent English speech. This would account for the fact that they were used only sparingly by GES10 in the five and ten month data. However, rates of use in GS were low and the one instance of ‘well’ as an intensifier in the GS zero month data was used by NH, who, as previously mentioned, had little direct contact with native-speakers.

*Figure 8-8 Intensification marker repertoire, 0 & 10-mth interview (GS)*

Analysis of GS’s repertoire changes over ten months showed that five new markers appeared in the ten month data. All of them were also used by GES10 in the five or ten month data. Rates of use and number of speakers for ‘completely’, ‘God’ and ‘right’ were low in both GES10 and GS. In GS ‘completely’ was used at an average rate of .0028/minute, ‘God’ at .0057/minute and ‘right’ at .0054/minute. The number of speakers was never greater than two and number of instances never exceeded three. ‘God’ was not used at all in the GES10 ten month interviews and rates of use in GES10 for ‘completely’ (.0083/minute) and ‘right’ (.0168/minute) were comparable to those of GS. In GES10 ‘completely’ was used by three speakers in four instances and ‘right’ (Example 8-13) by four speakers in four instances.

*Example 8-13 (GES10, 10-mth, interview)*

NS: oh shit so we picked him up and ran to the hospital and said he was bitten by a b- / ah brown snake give him (.)
AG: anti-venom
NS: anti-venom right now
AG: yep
NS: and they just / they had it like **right** there +
AG: hmmhm
Example 8.14 (GS, 10-mth, interview)

AM: and so you just read that text out (.) and look at the sheet and mark everything and then ah (.) you get ten out of ten points (laughs)
AG: wow (laughs)
AM: that's (.) and some people **like** got five points + and we just tried it once

However, as discussed at the start of this section, GES10 used ‘like’ significantly more than GS with a large effect size (p = .000, ES = 1.4). After ten months of living in Australia, $\frac{12}{14}$ speakers used ‘like’ for intensification at an average rate of $0.2507/\text{minute}$ in GES10 compared to only $\frac{1}{22}$ speakers at a rate of $0.0053/\text{minute}$ in GS. In GS intensifier ‘like’ was used by the participant (AM) who had the most extensive contact with native speakers before and during the ten month period (Example 8.14). This closely resembled the zero month data for GES10 in which only the speaker who had the most pre-exchange language contact (MK) used ‘like’ for intensification (Chapter seven). So use of ‘like’ as an intensifier in the GS ten month data closely resembled that of GES10 at zero months, while GES10 ten month use of intensifier ‘like’ matched that of AES (p = .793). Logically, the differences between GS and AES at both the zero month (p = .000, ES = 1.7) and ten month data collection (p = .000, ES = 1.5) were significant and large.

There was only one marker (the exclaim ‘ah’) that was used exclusively in the zero month data by GS. ‘Oh’ was used in the same contexts as ‘ah’ and appeared in both the GS zero and ten month interviews. These two exclaims were often difficult to distinguish in the recordings and rates of usage were low, so further analysis was not conducted.

Similar to the results for approximation, analysis of changes in GS’s use of intensification markers provided little evidence in support of the hypothesis that GS increased their use of markers that are typical of adolescent speech. The analysis of intensification did, however, indicate that the changes from zero to five and five to ten months reported in Chapter seven were most likely due to embarking on a ten month student exchange.

8.3.1.3 Knowledge (GES10, GS)

Even though overall use of knowledge markers did not show any significant change in either GES10 or GS over the ten month period, individual marker and repertoire analyses were conducted to ascertain whether changes still occurred at the
individual marker level.

8.3.1.3.1 Individual markers (GES10, GS)

Table 8-3 Significant knowledge marker change, 0 to 10-mth interview (GES10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marker</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>+/-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘I don’t know’</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘I’m (not) sure’</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘probably’</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After ten months of living in Australia, GES10 showed significantly higher use of ‘I don’t know’ (p = .003, ES = .9) and ‘probably’ (p = .000, ES = 1.3) than GS. While no individual knowledge markers increased to a significant and large extent in GS, three items increased significantly with a large effect size in GES10 (Table 8-3), including ‘I don’t know’ and ‘probably’.

8.3.1.3.2 Repertoire (GES10, GS)

GES10’s repertoire of markers was also larger than that of GS at the ten month data collection point (Figure 8-9). There were no markers used exclusively by GS, sixteen were used by both groups and five were used exclusively by GES10. The four markers marked with an asterisk in Figure 8-9 did not ever appear in GS or in the GES10 zero month data. This indicated they were most likely acquired during the exchange to Australia. While none changed to significance or effect size levels in GES10, significant increase in ‘I (don’t) reckon’ was just below the .8 effect size cut off (p = .043, ES = .7).

Figure 8-9 Knowledge marker repertoire, 10-mth interview (GES10, GS)

There was very little change in GS’s repertoire of knowledge markers from zero to ten months (Figure 8-10). ‘I (don’t) think’ showed significant increase but
effect size was below .8 (p = .030, ES = .5). Comparatively, in GES10 use of ‘I (don’t) think’ decreased, albeit not to significance levels.

*Figure 8-10 Knowledge marker repertoire, 0 & 10-mth interview (GS)*

![Knowledge marker repertoire](image)

This indicated that while knowledge markers as a whole did not increase significantly in either GS or GES10 over the ten month period, GES10 showed more activity and change within knowledge marking than GS. GS did not show significant increase in any knowledge markers associated with adolescent speech.

### 8.3.2 Management (GES10, GS)

*Figure 8-11 Management markers, 0 to 10-mth interview (GES10, GS)*

![Management markers](image)

There was no significant difference in the rate of management marker use between the two groups at the end of data collection (p = .245). Despite a slight increase in GES10 (Figure 8-11), management marking did not change significantly from zero to ten months in either GS (p = .737) or GES10 (p = .683). However, as
discussed in Chapter seven, this may have been due to the fact that management marking in GES10 increased significantly \((p = .009, \text{ES} = .7)\) from zero to five months, but decreased from five to ten months. This meant that average rates of use at ten months \((3.5576/\text{minute})\) were slightly higher than those of zero month \((3.3731/\text{minute})\). It was not possible to ascertain whether GS showed similar patterns of increase and decrease as no five month data was collected for the control group.

Within management markers, there were no significant changes from zero to ten months in any of the subcategories (i.e. involvement, turn-taking and reformulation) in either group. It follows that the ten month interviews showed no significant differences between GES10 and GS’s use of involvement \((p = .104)\) or turn-taking \((p = .666)\) markers. However, similar to results for knowledge markers, significant differences between the two groups were still found at the individual marker level (Sections 8.3.2.1 and 8.3.2.2).

8.3.2.1 Involvement (GES10, GS)

8.3.2.1.1 Individual markers (GES10, GS)

*Figure 8-12 Involvement markers, 10-mth interview (GES10, GS)*

After ten months of living in Australia, GES10 made significantly more use of ‘yeah’ \((p = .000, \text{ES} = 1.4)\) and less use of ‘yes’ \((p = .000, \text{ES} = 1.7)\) than GS for involvement marking. Despite significantly higher use of ‘you know’ in GES10 compared to GS \((p = .036)\), effect size was less than .8 \((\text{ES} = .7)\). This was due to
exceptionally high outlier use of ‘you know’ by two participants in GES10 (RHI and SJ) and four participants in GS (AE, AM, LSC, SB). As discussed below, all participants with outlier use of ‘you know’ in GS had intense periods of a native-speaker contact within the 10-month data collection period.

Finally, there were no individual involvement markers in GS that showed significant and large change. In GES10 there was a significant and large decrease in the use of ‘yes’ (p = .003, ES = 1.3) from zero to ten months. This ties in with the results reported in Chapter 7, whereby GES10 showed a preference for ‘yeah’ and ‘yep’ over the more formal variant ‘yes’ after five months of the student exchange.

### 8.3.2.1.2 Repertoire (GES10, GS)

*Example 8-15 (GES10, 10-mth, interview)*

AG: it’d be cold wouldn’t it +
GH: yeah but I go in like (.) wetsuits + it's not too bad
AG: yep (.) yep (.) oh cool so you spent most of your time / free time surfing I guess +
GH: um (.) yeah **you can say that** but I went to a lot of parties as well

Despite these differences, after ten months of living in Germany and Australia, the two groups shared a very similar repertoire of involvement markers. There were no involvement markers that were used exclusively by GS and only one marker (‘you can say that’) that was used by GES10, but not GS. ‘You can say that’ (Example 8-15) was only used once in GES10 and concurrently expressed agreement and disagreement with the interlocutor in order to save the face of the other. It was not used in AES and may have been transferred from the German token agreement phrase ‘das kann man (so) sagen’ / ‘one can say it that way’.

*Figure 8-13 Involvement marker repertoire, 0 & 10-mth interview (GS)*
The involvement marker repertoire of GS showed some change with the disappearance of ‘alright’ and ‘true’ and the addition of ‘definitely’, ‘exactly’, ‘I know’ and ‘you know’ (Figure 8-13) in the 10-month data.

*Example 8-16 (GS, 10-mth, interview)*

AE: we clicked a little bit but (.I (. actually (. / because he (. played a little bit around with my friend + and so I was quite (. / I needed to be angry at him + @ **you @

AG: @ ahha @

AE: know** +

AG: yep

AE: but I / I liked him + I could

‘You know’ was always coded as an involvement marker as it focused on the relationship between the interlocutors and an interest in securing cooperation and understanding (Example 8-16). In Example 8-16, AE was talking about how she met her boyfriend. She explained that they met at a party but the boy seemed more interested in her friend. After saying that she ‘needed to be angry with him’, she appealed to AG with ‘you know’ to ensure a level of mutual understanding and comprehension before continuing with her story. In this particular case, ‘you know’ was used to make sure that both AG and AE felt that it was possible to be attracted to the boy, but at the same time express anger at him. ‘You know’ may also have appealed to the two females’ understanding of social rules and techniques involved in forming male-female relationships. From a female’s perspective, AE’s anger ‘needed’ to be felt and expressed for the securing of the boy in a future romantic relationship.

In the GS ten month data ‘you know’ was used by $\frac{4}{22}$ participants in nine instances at an average rate of .0248/minute. Once again, the four participants who used ‘you know’ were those who had direct native-speaker contact over the ten-month period (AE, AM, LSC and SB). In the GES10 ten month data, ‘you know’ was used by $\frac{8}{14}$ participants in 77 instances at an average rate of .2913/minute. At the end of the ten month data collection period, use of ‘you know’ in GS resembled its use in the GES10 zero month data. In the GES10 zero month data it was used by $\frac{3}{14}$ speakers in five instances at an average rate of .0292/minute. As discussed in Chapter nine, despite such increased use by GES10 from zero to ten months, levels of ‘you know’ were still significantly lower than AES with a large effect size ($p = .017$, ES = 0.9).

While ‘you know’ was easily coded as an involvement marker, the involvement, intensification or knowledge marking functions of the remaining three
markers that were exclusive to the GS ten month data were often difficult to distinguish. ‘Definitely’, ‘exactly’ and ‘I know’ were coded as involvement markers when the emphasis was on marking mutual agreement and understanding rather than degree of personal knowledge or reinforcement of an opinion. In Example 8-17, ‘I know’ clearly marked KG’s own state of knowledge and was therefore coded as a knowledge marker. However, in Example 8-18, AG and US were talking about friends’ reactions when exchange students return to their countries of origin. AG had already mentioned that she had also gone on an exchange as a teenager and the two speakers shared the same experiences regarding the reaction of friends upon their return. In using ‘I know’ in Example 8-18, the emphasis was not on US’s own knowledge state but the fact that she and AG shared the same experiences and she was in full agreement with AG’s previous statement. It was, therefore, coded as an involvement rather than a knowledge marker, even though it inherently contains information about the speaker’s knowledge base.

Example 8-17 (GS, 10-mth, interview)

KG: […] at home but I don't watch it at home I just watch it at cinema +
AG: yep
KG: at the cinema but not at home because it I don't think it's a film for (/) / for th- / for the home it's just (/) good at cinema (laughs) **I know** it's strange but um / but some films are (/) only made for the cinema +
AG: yep
KG: and not / when you look them at home + it’s not the same +

Example 8-18 (GES10, 10-mth, interview)

US: and they make just stupid comments about that and stuff
AG: oh
US: so (/)
AG: yeah that makes it difficult because then you're really can't talk @ about @
US: @ yeah @ **I know**
AG: and it was a big part of your life + the

‘Definitely’, ‘exactly’ and ‘I know’ were already present as knowledge but not as involvement markers in the GS zero month data. In other words, they already existed as interpersonal markers in the zero month data and over the course of ten months their function expanded to include at least one additional interpersonal
function. Rates of use were low ('definitely' = .0029/minute, ‘exactly’ = .0033/minute and ‘I know’ = .0028/minute) and the number of speakers or instances never exceeded one in GS (They were used by JSE, JP and SB, respectively.). The three markers were used more in GES10 than GS, but these differences were not significant and no further analysis was conducted.

While these analyses also indicated more change in GES10 than GS in the use of individual involvement markers over the ten month period, differences between the two groups were less prominent and extensive than those for approximation and intensification markers. This ties in with the results reported in Chapter seven, where the greatest areas of change in GES10 were in attitude marking (especially approximation and intensification), but not in management marking (including involvement). GS showed little change in either area.

8.3.2.2 Turn-taking (GES10, GS)

8.3.2.2.1 Individual markers (GES10, GS)

After ten months of living in Australia, GES10 made significantly more use of ‘oh’ (p = .025, ES = .6), ‘yeah’ (p = .000, ES = 1.8) and less use of ‘yes’ (p = .000, ES = 1.4) for turn-taking than GS. Effect sizes were only above .8 for ‘yeah’ and ‘yes’, which once again reflects the results reported in Chapter seven, whereby ‘yeah’ was preferred over ‘yes’ after the students embarked on their exchange.

There were no individual turn-taking markers in GS that increased or decreased significantly over the ten month period. Comparatively GES10 showed significant and large increase in ‘oh’ (p = .026, ES = 1.1), ‘well’ (p = .018, ES = 1.1) and ‘yeah’ (p = .003, ES = 1.4) and a significant decrease in ‘yes’ (p = .005, ES = 1.3) for turn-taking over the ten months. As mentioned at the outset of this section, these changes meant that after 10-months, the two groups used ‘oh’, ‘yeah’ and ‘yes’ at significantly different rates of use.

8.3.2.2.2 Repertoire (GES10, GS)

After ten months of language acquisition, there continued to be a large overlap in turn-taking marker repertoire between GES10 and GS, despite three markers that were exclusive to GES10 and four markers that were only used by GS (Figure 8-14).
As discussed in Chapter five, it was decided that any marker that began a new turn would be classified as a turn-taking marker, regardless of the number of pauses and hesitation devices that preceded or followed it. In all cases of ‘er’ and ‘pf’ in GS, the item primarily marked the beginning of a turn (Example 8-19) and, at the same time, a degree of difficulty on the part of the speaker.

**Example 8-19 (GS, 10-mth, interview)**

AG: (1.0) ok (1.0) can you tell me about a holiday that you've been on + that you really enjoyed +
EB: (1.0) **er** um on last holidays + (laughs)
AG: your last holidays + @ yep @
EB: @ yeah@

‘Er’ was used by six speakers in eleven instances at an average rate of .0320/minute and was also present in the GS zero month data, where it was used by six speakers in eighteen instances at an average rate of .0865/minute. This meant that ‘er’ decreased from zero to ten months in GS, but not to significance levels. GES10 or AES never used ‘er’ for turn-taking.

In the GS ten month data, ‘pf’ it was used by two speakers in five instances at an average rate of .0159/minute. It was also was used by GES10 at zero months at an average rate of .0064/minute, but did not appear in either the GES10 five or ten month data. It was never used by AES which indicated non-native use by GS and explained its disappearance in the GES10 five and ten month interviews.
Example 8-20 (GS, 0-mth, interview)
AG: wow what did you enjoy most about that holiday +
CR: hm +
AG: what was your favourite (.) @ part @
CR: @ my favourite @
AG: of the hospital + / the hospital / the (.) holiday + (laughs)
CR: in generally + [ or ] just of =
AG: = that one the one you went on with the @ church @
CR: @ **ok** @ (1.0) hm (.) hm (4.0)
AG: or what did you s

Example 8-21 (GS, 10-mth, interview)
AG: when you go to the club that's nearest + you will see so many
people from / from jetternich +
AG: yeah
LSC: it's / it's kind of boring because there are always the same people +
AG: yep
LSC: but / but **ok**
AG: yep yep (.) oh that's cool (.) but / and

Example 8-22 (AES, 10-mth, interview)
AG: yep (laughs) have you got a favourite one +
JL: um Brother Bear cause it's very emotional and like how it um (.) /
have you seen it +
AG: no I haven't
JL: **ok** well in the story um it's about this man +

AES did, however use ‘ok’ for turn-taking. ‘Ok’ was only used by two
speakers in three instances at an average rate of .0090/minute in the GS ten month
data and was also used in the zero month data by two speakers in three instances at an
average rate of .0042/minute. Use of ‘ok’ for turn-taking therefore increased over the
ten month period, but not significantly. GES10 used ‘ok’ in the zero month data at
rate of .0187/minute, which then decreased to .0093/minute in the five month data,
before it disappeared completely at ten months. While the number of instances was
only small it is interesting to note that while in GS and the GES10 zero month data,
‘ok’ was used to both initiate (Example 8-20) and end a turn (Example 8-21), it was
never used to end a turn in AES.

Additionally, when used as a turn-initiator in AES (by only two speakers in
two instances at a rate of .0046/minute), the speaker used ‘ok’ to begin the turn and to
mark receipt of information from AG that would impact on the propositional content of the ensuing speech (Example 8-22). In GS, ‘ok’ for turn-initiation also followed negotiation of information with AG. However, the negotiation in GS was usually due to lack of clear comprehension of a question that had been posed by AG (Example 8-20).

Continued use of ‘ok’ as a turn-taking marker in the GS ten month data, but not the GES10 interviews, may be indicative of changes not only in language proficiency, but also in the interpretation of the speech event. In the GES10 and GS zero month interviews, the participant may have interpreted the semi-structured interview as a language testing task, rather than an open opportunity to chat. This resulted in asymmetrical contingency, whereby the participant expected the interviewer to conduct and control the conversation according to a pre-devised plan (van Lier, 1989). As such, participants prefaced or ended their turns with ‘ok’ to indicate comprehension or completion of a task set by the interviewer. Following this argument, after ten months of living in Australia, GES10 no longer interpreted the interview according to a strict asymmetrical question-answer format, but as a conversational involving both reactive and mutual contingency (van Lier, 1989). Due to increased proficiency and understanding, they may no longer have felt a need to clearly express their comprehension of a question before it was answered and were more proactive in the co-construction of discourse. This may have resulted in the disappearance of ‘ok’ for turn-taking in favour of other more idiomatic, informal and flexible turn-taking markers, such as ‘nah’, ‘yeah no’ and ‘yep’ (Figure 8-14).

Increased familiarity with the interviewer (AG) could not explain changes in the use of ‘ok’ in GES10 as familiarity also increased between AG and the GS participants.

The fact that ‘nah’, ‘yeah no’ and ‘yep’ were exclusive to the GES10 ten month data supports the findings reported in Chapter seven. In GES10 ‘nah’ and ‘yep’ gradually replaced their more formal variants ‘no’ and ‘yes’, but this change did not occur in GS over the ten month period. GES10 also acquired ‘yeah no’ for turn-taking purposes, but GS did not. ‘Yeah no’ has been highlighted as a new marker in Australian English and includes a range of variant forms including ‘yep no’, ‘yes no’, ‘yeah nah’ and the less usual expression ‘no yeah’ (Burridge & Florey, 2002). In this study, ‘yeah no’ had a range of interpersonal and discourse functions. As an interpersonal marker it was used to show agreement or comprehension of the interlocutor’s speech (involvement) or to negotiate turns (turn-taking). In its discourse
functions, ‘yeah no’ was predominantly used for topic continuation purposes. When used for turn-taking it initiated or ended the turn (Example 8-23) or showed non-interest in taking up the turn during periods of turn negotiation (Example 8-24). It often had an additional politeness function whereby it softened disagreement with the interlocutor. As was the case for most markers that did not already appear in the zero month data (Chapter seven), average rates of use of ‘yeah no’ for turn-taking were low. It was only ever used for turn-taking twice by two speakers at an average rate of .0079/minute in GES10. Average rates of use in AES were only slightly higher, where ‘yeah no’ was used for turn-taking at an average rate of .0195/minute by four speakers in four instances. Such low levels of use were not surprising due to its relatively new status as a pragmatic marker and more typical use by speakers between 35–49 years of age (Burridge & Florey, 2002). ‘Yeah no’ never appeared in the GS data, nor the GES10 pre-exchange interviews. Considering it has been identified as a feature of Australian English, it was most likely acquired through contact with Australian native speakers.

Example 8-23 (AES, 10-mth, interview)

JB: oh well (laugh) at least I don't have to listen to this (.) are you / you
AG: you don't have to listen to it + no
JB: **no yeah** @ so it'll @
AG: @ yep @
JB: it'll be you

Example 8-24 (GES10, 10-mth, interview)

RHI: oh yeah really because otherwise I could have never done these things +
AG: no @ yep @
RHI: @ **no @ yeah**
AG: wow
RHI: yeah
AG: hm what did you sort of do after school to pass the time + if you were

Over the ten month period, GS showed very little change in terms of turn-taking marker repertoire. There were no markers that appeared exclusively in the zero month data and only two new markers appeared in the ten month data, namely ‘pf’ (Example 8-25) to start a turn and the phrase ‘we’ll see’ (Example 8-26) to end the turn.
Example 8-25 (GS, 10-mth, interview)

AG: what do like most about the soccer +
AP: (.) pf I don’t know the whole atmosphere + in the (.) stadium and
AG: hmhm
AP: yes I don’t know it’s (.) **pf**
AG: yep (.) have you done that for a long time + or

Example 8-26 (GS, 10-mth, interview)

SB: we had but (.). it (.). did not go off + (.). anyway so um (.). well now
we don't have anybody (laughs)
AG: (laughs)
SB: and um (.). yeah
AG: yep
SB: **we'll see**
AG: what sort of music do you play +

As discussed above, ‘pf’ was only used in a small number of instances and
concurrently indicated a degree of difficulty in answering a question. ‘We’ll see’ was
also only used by two speakers in two instances at an average rate of .0055/minute. It
was never used in GES10 or the native-speaker data and was perhaps due to transfer
of the informal phrase ‘schau’n wir mal’, which can be used to end a turn or topic in
German.

Similar to the results for knowledge and involvement markers, while the
overall rate of turn-taking markers did not change significantly in either group,
GES10 showed more change in choice of individual markers and expansion of marker
repertoire than GS. These changes were most likely due to increased proficiency in
English and immersion in an Australian English language environment.

8.3.3 Summary of results (GES10, GS)

This comparison of GS and GES10 indicated that GES10 would not have
shown as much development and change of interpersonal marker use had they not
embarked on a ten month exchange. While some GS participants were able to increase
their language contact with native speakers, seeking out such contact was highly
dependent on their own resources and resourcefulness. Even with increased speaking
contact through, for example, short home-stay programmes or the hosting of
American and British exchange students, interpersonal marker did not increase
significantly with a large effect size when the context of acquisition was Germany.
The pattern of minimal change in GS applied to all subcategories of interpersonal markers used in this study (Chapter five). Analysis of repertoire development supported these findings, whereby GS showed very little acquisition of new interpersonal marker tokens over the ten month period.

The areas of interpersonal marking that most differentiated the two groups after ten months were those most associated with adolescent language, i.e. attitude markers, especially those of approximation. This supported the findings reported in Chapter seven, whereby the greatest impact of a ten month exchange to Australia was found in increased use of attitude markers and its subcategory of approximation. The exchange experience played a much smaller role in the development and acquisition of knowledge, involvement and turn-taking markers, where significant and large differences between GES10 and GS were only ever found at the individual marker level.

These results provided more evidence to support the hypothesis that a ten month exchange to Australia gave language learners the opportunity to acquire those markers most associated with the expression of adolescent identity. However, there was little evidence to support the second hypothesis of this study. German adolescents learning English in Germany did not acquire any new interpersonal markers to a significant or large extent, let alone those most associated with the marking of adolescent identity.

Having established that the changes in GES10’s interpersonal marker use were most likely due to the exchange experience and that GS participants showed very little acquisition of interpersonal markers, we now move on to the third hypothesis of the study. Chapter nine explores whether use of interpersonal markers by GES10 closely resembled that of native speaker’s in AES after ten months of living in Australia.
Chapter 9  
Comparison with native speakers (GES10, AES)

9.1 Introduction (GES10, AES)

This chapter compares changes in GES10’s use of interpersonal markers over the ten months with the interpersonal marker use of native-speakers (AES). This provided answers to the third hypothesis of this study, namely that GES10 exchange students matched native speaker usage of a number of key adolescent markers after spending ten months in Australia. As acquisition in AES was not an issue, native speaker data was not longitudinal. It comprised of native speakers participating in the same sociolinguistic interview as the one used for the non-native speaker ten month data. As explained in Chapter four, each AES participant was chosen by a GES10 exchange student. The selection criteria were that the individual was an Australian teenager with whom the exchange student had spent a lot of time and who, according to the exchange student, had contributed a great deal to their English language acquisition. Unfortunately, an interview with a matched native speaker for one of the GES10 participants (MD) was not possible\(^{18}\).

Since interview times and group sizes were slightly different (GES10 n = 14 and AES n = 13), percentage and average per minute rates were used for comparisons. Similar to analyses reported in Chapters seven and eight, differences were only analysed in detail if a Wilcoxon Signed Rank or Mann-Whitney U test was significant (p < .05) and Cohen’s d effect size was greater than .8. The analysis began at the top of the hierarchical order of pragmatic markers (Chapter five) and moved down to the individual marker level.

9.2 Interpersonal markers (GES10, AES)

At the outset of the study, GES10 used significantly fewer interpersonal markers than AES (p = .000, ES = 2.5). After ten months of living in Australia, the difference between the two groups reduced, but GES10 continued to use significantly fewer interpersonal markers than AES (p = .043, ES = .9).

\(^{18}\) At the time of AES recruitment, MD’s father fell gravely ill and the researcher felt it would be inconsiderate to insist on recruiting a matched native-speaker participant for the study.
As shown in Figure 9-1, this was due to more frequent use of both attitude and management marking by AES, although only the greater frequency of management markers in AES was significant and large (p = .038, ES = .9).

*Figure 9-1 Interpersonal markers (GES10, AES)*

9.2.1 Attitude (GES10, AES)

Use of attitude markers increased continuously in GES10 over the ten month period (Figure 9-1). At the outset of the study AES used significantly more attitude markers than GES10 (p = .000, ES = 2.8). After five months, effect size decreased, but GES10 continued to use significantly fewer attitude markers than AES (p = .033, ES = .9). It was only after ten months that levels of attitude markers were no longer significantly lower in GES10 than AES (p = .076).

Focusing on the subcategories of attitude marking, before embarking on their exchange to Australia, GES10 used significantly fewer approximation (p = .000, ES = 3.4) and intensification markers (p = .000, ES = 2.3) than AES (Figure 9-2), but there was no significant difference in the frequency of knowledge markers (p = .720).

Despite large and significant increases in approximation marking by GES10 in the first five months of the exchange (see Chapter 7), GES10 still used significantly fewer approximation markers (p = .006, ES = 1.1) than AES in the five month interviews. Effect size was, however, much lower than for differences at zero months. As discussed in Chapter seven, changes in GES10’s use of approximation markers from
five to ten months was minimal \( (p = .510) \) so it is not surprising that differences in AES and GES10 continued to be significant and large \( (p = .017, \text{ES} = 1.0) \) at ten months and that effect size remained almost exactly the same.

*Figure 9-2 Attitude markers (GES10, AES)*

Similarly, even though there was a significant and large increase in intensification over the first five months of living in Australia (Chapter seven), GES10 continued to use significantly fewer intensification markers than AES in the five month interviews \( (p = .017, \text{ES} = 1.06) \). However, the slightly lower use by GES10 at ten months was no longer significant \( (p = .094) \).

Finally, the two groups continued to show no difference in their use of knowledge markers in the five month data \( (p = .116) \) and the ten-month interviews \( (p = .202) \). As mentioned in Chapter eight, GS and AES also showed no significant difference in their use of knowledge markers at either zero months \( (p = .110) \) or ten months \( (p = .703) \), nor were there ever any significant differences in knowledge marking between GES10 and GS. This indicated that the GES10 and GS participants had already learnt to use knowledge markers in English at rates that were equivalent to those of adolescent native speakers of English before data collection commenced. Differences between the three groups were only ever found in the type of knowledge marker used (Chapter eight and Section 9.2.1.3). It is to a discussion of individual marker use in approximation, intensification and knowledge that we now turn.
9.2.1.1 Approximation (GES10, AES)

Before embarking on their exchange, GES10 used eleven approximation markers significantly less than AES and one (‘not so’) significantly more (Table 9-1). Effect size was large for 9/11 of these differences and was just on the .8 cut off for use of ‘bit’ and ‘sort of’.

Table 9-1 Significant difference in approximation (GES10, AES)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marker</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>Used more in ...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-mth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>about</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>AES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>AES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and stuff</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>AES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and thing</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>AES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bit</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>AES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kind of</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>AES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>like</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>AES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not much</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>AES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not really</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>AES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not so</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>GES10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pretty much</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>AES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sort of</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>AES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-mth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>about</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>AES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and/or stuff</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>AES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pretty much</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>AES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-mth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and/or stuff</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>AES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pretty much</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>AES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>like</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>AES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After five months, of the eleven markers used differently in the zero month data, only three continued to be used significantly more by AES than GES10 (Table 9-1). Effect size grew for ‘about’ but declined for ‘and/or stuff’ and ‘pretty much’. By ten months, ‘pretty much’ was still used significantly more with a large effect size by AES (Table 9-1) and ‘like’ re-appeared as being used significantly more by AES with a large effect size. ‘And/or stuff’ also continued to be used significantly more by AES, but effect size was just on .8.

While detailed analysis of ‘and/or stuff’ by AES and GES10 at ten months was not conducted due to effect sizes being on or below .8, the continuing gap between the two groups was of interest as ‘and/or stuff’ was one of the markers that increased significantly with a large effect size in GES10 from zero to five months (Chapter seven). ‘And/or stuff’ also belonged to a set of markers typically associated with
adolescent speech, namely that of general extenders. As discussed in Chapter seven, general extenders were phrases usually beginning with ‘or’ or ‘and’ that indicated that the preceding discourse was inaccurate or an illustrative example of a more general case (Dines, 1980; Overstreet, 1999). They included a range of different forms such as ‘(and/or) like that’ and ‘and/or so on’ (Figure 9-3). The categories ‘and/or stuff’ and ‘and/or thing’ in this study included a range of different phrases taking ‘stuff’ or ‘thing’ as their base noun.

*Figure 9-3 General extenders, 10-mth interview (GES10, AES)*

As shown in Figure 9-3, AES and GES10 used 7/8 forms of general extenders to a similar degree, with ‘and/or stuff’ and ‘and/or thing’ being the most frequent forms in both groups. Focusing on general extenders as a group, there was no significant difference in levels of use between GES10 and AES at the ten month data collection point (p = .116). Similarly, no large differences were found in the use of adjuncts or disjuncts in the general extender. After ten months both groups showed a preference for general extenders with the adjunct ‘and’, which constituted 65% (156/240) of all general extenders in GES10 compared to 63% (156/249) in AES. General extenders headed by ‘or’ were used in 31% (74/240) of general extenders in GES10 and 25% (62/249) in AES. General extenders without an adjunct or disjunct constituted the remaining 4% (4/240) of instances in GES10 and 12% (31/249) in AES.
In the ten month data, AES also made significantly more use of ‘pretty much’ and ‘like’ (Table 9-1). Unlike differences for ‘and/or stuff’, effect sizes were large and detailed analysis of use of the two markers by GES10 and AES was conducted (Section 9.2.1.1.1 and 9.2.1.1.2).

Figure 9-4 Approximation marker repertoire, 10-mth interview (GES10, AES)

Finally, analysis of GES10 and AES’s repertoire of approximation markers in the ten month data showed a fairly similar range of lexical items (Figure 9-4). The two groups shared a repertoire of 32 approximation markers. Four approximation markers were exclusive to AES and three were exclusive to the GES10 ten month data. Of the four only found in AES, ‘and what not’ and ‘mainly’ were used in the GES10 five month data. This meant only ‘not all’ and ‘not exactly’ were exclusive to AES. However, ‘not all’ was only used by one AES participant twice and ‘not exactly’ was also only used by one participant. Similarly, ‘and so on’, ‘not even’ and ‘what’ (Example 9-1) were each used by one participant in one instance in GES10. Such low rates of use indicated that the core repertoire of the two groups was highly similar at the end of the ten month exchange programme.

Example 9-1 (GES10, 10-mth, interview)
GH: always (laughs)
AG: (laughs) yeah cool and did you go like a lot with your mates to the cinema and stuff + or
GH: hm I did went with my dad often to the cinema +
AG: hmm
GH: it was **what** three times I reckon in ten months
AG: yep
9.2.1.1 ‘Pretty much’ (GES10, AES)

Example 9-2 (GES10, 10-mth, interview)

AG: yep (. ) wow so you were into (. ) yeah horse riding and you did / like when you went in Australia + you came home from school and then you rode all afternoon + or was it different
LN: yeah **pretty much** because it got dark like fairly early

Example 9-3 (GES10, 10-mth, interview)

MM: and um yeah and then she came back here after six months and yeah it was just nice
AG: yeah
MM: to have her around and then other friends around and just yeah we had **pretty much** the same friends so
AG: yep

Example 9-4 (AES, interview)

AG: and where did you get your design brief from
KW: well you just make your own design @ brief @
AG: @ oh @ (laughs) okay
KW: it's anything you want to do **pretty much**
AG: yep yep and you'd like to do / fo

‘Pretty much’ was classified as an approximator when it could be extracted from the syntactic context in which it appeared and rendered the preceding or upcoming discourse vague. It appeared in initial (Example 9-2), medial (Example 9-3) or post position (Example 9-4). It could also appear on its own, especially as a response to a yes/no question or statement by the interlocutor. When appearing on its own, it often collocated with ‘yeah’ (Example 9-2).

As discussed in Chapter seven, ‘pretty much’ first appeared in the GES10 five month data, but increased use was not significant from zero to five months or five to ten months. However, using the entire zero to ten month period as the basis of calculation, ‘pretty much’ increased significantly with a large effect size (p = .043, ES = 1.24). Despite such a large increase over the ten month period, average rates of use remained significantly lower than those of AES (Figure 9-5).
In AES, 3.2% ($\frac{1}{31}$) of instances were clause initial, 38.7% ($\frac{12}{31}$) were clause medial and 22.6% ($\frac{7}{31}$) were clause final. 12.9% ($\frac{4}{31}$) of instances occurred in an ellipted structure (Example 9-5), rendering it impossible to determine syntactic position. The final 22.6% ($\frac{7}{31}$) appeared as a set phrase in response to a statement or yes/no question from the interlocutor (Example 9-6). In 85.7% ($\frac{6}{7}$) of these responses, ‘pretty much’ collocated with ‘yeah’, which appeared either directly before or after the approximation marker.

**Example 9-5 (AES, interview)**

KW: yeah I worked pretty hard  
AG: yep yep did you study on your own or with friends or +  
KW: um **pretty much** on my own not many not many of my friends

**Example 9-6 (AES, interview)**

AG: yep do y- / do you or your mates drive + or  
BH: yeah I got my license +  
AG: oh okay  
BH: got my p's anyway so  
AG: oh that makes it handy (.) yep (.) so you can just get up and go +  
BH: **pretty much**  
AG: yep  
BH: just chuck the swag in

Comparatively, in GES10, ‘pretty much’ never appeared in clause-initial position. 36.4% ($\frac{4}{11}$) were clause medial, 9.1% ($\frac{11}{11}$) were clause-final and 27.3% ($\frac{3}{11}$)
occurred with ellipsis. The remaining 27.3% ($\frac{3}{11}$) were responses to AG’s questions or statements and these always collocated with ‘yeah’. In GES10, ‘yeah’ always preceded the marker. While it is difficult to draw any concrete conclusions due to the small number of instances in GES10, this analysis indicated that the syntactic position of ‘pretty much’ in AES and GES10 was fairly similar after GES10 had spent ten months in Australia. However, AES tended to use ‘pretty much’ in clause-final position more than GES10.

In both GES10 and AES, ‘pretty much’ had an additional mitigating or politeness function. In Example 9-7, PN provided a negative response to a positive yes/no question. Throughout his response to the question he expressed his concern for the face of his interlocutor by using hesitation and approximation devices such as ‘not much’, ‘not really’ and ‘pretty much’. Both AES and GES10 used the approximator ‘pretty much’ with a politeness overlay to the same degree: 35.5% ($\frac{11}{31}$) of instances of ‘pretty much’ in AES and 27.3% ($\frac{3}{11}$) of those in GES10 after ten months were with an additional politeness mitigating function.

*Example 9-7 (GES10, 10-mth, interview)*

AG: yep (.) yep (.) oh that’s cool and is it / was it / like the way you spent your free time + was that very different to here + how you’d spend @ your @
PN: @ hm @
AG: time +
PN: (.) not much different +
AG: no +
PN: not much ~ ne ~ / no not really
AG: ahha
PN: here I’m going to the movies + or meet up with friends + go play soccer or (.) **pretty much** the same +
AG: yep
PN: don’t have a pool though (laughs)

In sum, the two groups employed ‘pretty much’ for similar purposes in similar syntactic positions and environments. The main difference was in the higher frequency of ‘pretty much’ in AES compared to GES10 at the end of the ten month data collection period.
9.2.1.1.2 ‘Like’ (GES10, AES)

‘Like’ was classified as an approximator when it rendered a quantity, item or concept vague. In doing so, it reduced the speaker’s commitment to the literal truth of the utterance (Andersen, 2001, 1998) and appealed to the shared knowledge of the participants. When used to approximate a quantity (Example 9-8), the speaker indicated that not only did he/she not know the exact quantity, but that precision was not important or necessary in the particular context of speech. In Example 9-8, ER was unsure about the exact release date of the movie she was discussing. By prefacing ‘the 80s’ with ‘like’ she indicated lack of precise knowledge as well as her opinion that knowing whether the film was produced in 1988, 1982 or even the early 90s was not important to the discussion at hand.

Example 9-8 (AES, interview)

ER: so they [ X ] it's very sweet (laughs)
AG: so it has a happy end
ER: yeah
AG: yep
ER: I like happy endings
AG: so that must be quite old + @ is it cause the @
ER: @ yeah it was @ made in **like** the 80s I think + (laughs)
AG: oh yeah

Approximator-‘like’ also marked the use of a random example (Example 9-9) or a vague expression (Example 9-10) and, in doing so, appealed to the mutual knowledge of the speaker and hearer. In Example 9-9, NA was talking about a company that sponsored her indoor netball team. She prefaced a list of items the company was prepared to pay for with ‘like’. Use of ‘like’ indicated that the items mentioned by NA were random examples of a larger class of potentially relevant items that remained unmentioned (Terraschke, 2008). By not providing a more accurate description, NA assumed shared interlocutor knowledge, whereby both interactants knew that the approximate group of items covered by the sponsorship money did not include jewellery, shoes or oranges to eat at half time. Similarly, in Example 9-10, MF prefaced

19 The quantities approximator 'like' rendered vague included expressions of quantity, time periods and frequencies, some of which did not actually contain an ordinal number (Müller, 2005).
the vague term ‘normal animals’ with ‘like’. In doing so, she highlighted her expectation of shared knowledge concerning which animals both interlocutors considered to be ‘normal’.

Example 9-9 (AES, interview)

NA: [...] then (.) um this year + I think we got our sponsorship from the deerpark hotel + and we're playing in newtown now +
AG: hmhm
NA: so we're going in there to play in there and they giving us $2,000 to **like** buy bags + shirts + our uniforms + all that

Example 9-10 (GES05, 5-mth, interview)

LN: (1.0) I really don't know like the big elephants with the big teeth +
and
AG: the mammoths +
LN: yeah
AG: yeah
LN: about this (clears throat) they / they are in the film + (.) yeah there are **like** normal animals + @ in there + @
AG: @ ahha @

As discussed in Chapter seven, increased use of ‘like’ for approximation in GES10 from zero to five months was significant, but only with a medium effect size (p = .001, ES = .7). Use decreased from five to ten months (Figure 9-6), but this was not statistically significant. Using the entire zero to ten month period as the basis of calculation, ‘like’ increased significantly with a large effect size (p = .003, ES = 1.5).

Figure 9-6 Approximator ‘like’ (GES10, AES)
Having lived in Australia for ten months, GES10 used approximator ‘like’ at an average rate of .2266/minute, compared to only .0109/minute in the zero month data. The highest average rate of use was .3439/minute at the five-month data collection stage. It was used by $\frac{1}{14}$ speakers in the zero month data, $\frac{14}{14}$ in the five month and then $\frac{12}{14}$ in the ten month interviews. In AES it was used at an average rate of .5534/minute by $\frac{13}{13}$ native speaker participants and, as discussed above, higher use by AES compared to GES10 after ten months was significant with a large effect size ($p = .005, ES = 1.0$). This means that even though GES10 use never reached rates of use in AES, the two groups’ use of ‘like’ was more similar at five months than at ten. Indeed higher use of approximator-‘like’ by AES than GES10 after five months was not statistically significant ($p = .085$). It would be difficult to argue that this was due to a pattern of over-extension and relativisation because rates of use in GES10 never exceeded those of AES. It may have been due to the different topics of the five and ten month interviews, although it did not seem logical that discussions of parties and celebrations (five months) and free-time activities (ten months) would elicit highly divergent marker use. Perhaps the most salient explanation of increased and decreased use of ‘like’ as an approximator in GES10 is that its use was still in a state of development and flux. Given the highly idiosyncratic nature of interpersonal markers and the fact that ‘like’ is a key marker of adolescent identity, after five and even ten months of their exchange, GES10 participants may still have been working out levels of use that would best express the individual identities and attitudes they wished to project.

9.2.1.2 Intensification (GES10, AES)

Eight intensification markers in the zero month data were used significantly more in AES with large effect sizes (Table 9-2). ‘Very’ was the only intensifier that was used significantly more by GES10 than AES at the zero month stage. After five months of living in Australia, only two markers (‘just’ and ‘pretty’) were used significantly more in AES than GES10 and only the effect size for ‘just’ was above .8 (Table 9-2). After ten months of the exchange, AES used ‘oh’ as an intensifier significantly more than GES10, but effect size was just at .8 (Table 9-2), so it was not explored further.
Table 9-2 Significant difference in intensification (GES10, AES)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marker</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>Used more in …</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-mth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>just</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>AES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>like</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>AES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not even</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>AES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oh</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>AES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pretty</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>AES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quite</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>AES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>really</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>AES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>so</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>AES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>GES10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-mth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>just</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>AES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pretty</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>AES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-mth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oh</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>AES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AES and GES10 had twenty-six intensification markers in common at the ten month data collection point (Figure 9-7) and there were five markers exclusive to the AES ten month data: ‘well’, ‘yes’, ‘fairly’, ‘mind you’ and ‘way too + adj’. As discussed in Chapters seven and eight, ‘well’ was used in the GES10 five month data and ‘yes’ was used in both the GES10 zero month and five month data for intensification. ‘Yes’ was an intensification marker when used repetitively and, in doing so, reinforced the preceding ‘yes’ or variant thereof. The remaining three intensifiers used exclusively by AES were never used by more than two speakers in five instances. As was the case for approximation, this indicated that the two groups shared a similar repertoire of intensification markers in the ten month interviews.

Figure 9-7 Intensification repertoire, 10-mth interview (GES10, AES)
9.2.1.3 Knowledge (GES10, AES)

Even though there was never a significant difference in the overall use of knowledge markers by GES10 and AES, three markers were used significantly more by AES than GES10 at the outset of the study (Table 9-3). Effect size was large for ‘I guess’ and ‘probably’. It was just on the .8 cut off for ‘definitely’. ‘I think’ was used significantly more by GES10 than AES in the zero month data with a large effect size.

Table 9-3 Significant difference knowledge markers (GES10, AES)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marker</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>Used more in …</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-mth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>definitely</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>AES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guess</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>AES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>probably</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>AES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>GES10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-mth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t know</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>GES10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-mth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t know</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>GES10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After five months and ten months of living in Australia, the only significant difference between the two groups was higher use of ‘I don’t know’ by GES10. Effect size was more or less the same at five and ten months. This is explored further in Section 9.2.1.3.1.

Analysis of GES10 and AES’s knowledge marker repertoire at ten months (Figure 9-8) revealed little difference between the two groups. While there were four markers used exclusively in AES and three that were exclusive to GES10 in the ten month data, the number of speakers for these never exceeded two and the number of instances was five or less.

Figure 9-8 Knowledge marker repertoire, 10-mth interview (GES10, AES)
9.2.1.3.1 ‘I don’t know’ (GES10, AES)

Example 9-11 (AES, interview)

AWH: but I never planned to go to uni this year + I was only (.) going to go (.) / I was always going to defer + and take a year off + and (.) / and even when I went over to germany I (.). um (.). was going to take a year off +
AG: yep
AWH: I changed my mind like (.) half way through germany +
AG: did you +
AWH: yep @ and @
AG: @ why @
AWH: changed my mark and what course I wanted to do and everything
AG: (laughs)
AWH: what uni that I was going to go to +
AG: wow
AWH: yeah (.). **I don’t know** ** I just changed my mind (laughs)

Example 9-12 (GES10, 10-mth, interview)

RHI: and you could actually feel that and you know like every person has their own way how to say goodbye and stuff @ so they @
AG: @ yeah @
RHI: actually yeah started to (.). be a bit (.). / **don't know** ** a bit (.). yeah too (.). / too family + do you know what I mean + like they @ actually @
AG: @ no @
RHI: didn’t want to um (.). lose me + like I / they actually didn’t want me to go (.). out with friends + and stuff +

‘I don’t know’ was classified as a knowledge marker when it provided an indication of the speaker’s degree of knowledge and could be extracted from the context of speech with no disruption to its syntactic or grammatical integrity. This meant that the marker had to appear without a complement. The marker ‘I don’t know’ did not literally mean the person knew nothing about the subject at hand, as the phrase was usually followed or preceded by information relating to the subject. Rather ‘I don’t know’ indicated a lack of commitment to the truth-value of the proposition. Since ‘I don’t know’ could also be used as a hesitation marker, to qualify as a knowledge marker it had to appear in contexts that were free of any signs of hesitation such as long pauses, use of ‘um’ and disjointed sentences. Accordingly, ‘I don’t know’ in Example 9-11 was
a knowledge marker and in Example 9-12 a hesitation marker. Comparatively, in Example 9-13 ‘don’t know’ was a non-marker as it could not easily be extracted from the context in which it appeared.

Example 9-13 (AES, interview)

AG: yep yep (.) where did the helicopter thing come from + has that always been a / (.) something you want to do +
BH: yeah pretty much (.) I don't know wh- / **I don't know** where it came from + it just st- / (.) came

As shown in Figure 9-9, ‘I don’t know’ showed steady increase in GES10 from zero to five to ten months. Rates of use of ‘I don’t know’ by AES and GES10 were highly comparable at zero months. Both GES10’s and GS’s use of ‘I don’t know’ at zero months was similar to that of AES (p = .870). However, by five months, GES10’s use was more than double that of AES and by ten months GES10 used ‘I don’t know’ almost three times more than AES.

Figure 9-9 Knowledge marker ‘I don’t know’ (GES10, AES)

Since GES10 and AES used ‘I don’t know’ at a similar rate in the zero month data, it would be difficult to argue that this was due to over-extension. Again, the most likely explanation would be based on issues of personal choice and the idiosyncrasy of marker usage. German exchange students in Australia may simply have been more likely to use ‘I don’t know’ than AES speakers for the expression of epistemic stance and their own identities as German adolescent exchange students in Australia. This
argument is strengthened by the fact that knowledge marking did not increase as a whole in GES10 and the only changes were on the level of choice of knowledge marker. The choices made by GES10 participants did not match those of AES. Higher use of ‘I don’t know’ may have simply been a feature of GES10 interlanguage, which included features from the native or target language as well as its own features that were not present in either German or Australian English (Selinker, 1992).

9.2.2 Management (GES10 vs. AES)

As discussed in Section 9.2 and shown in Figure 9-1, management markers were used significantly more in AES than GES10 at ten months (p = .038, ES = .9). However, at the zero month data collection, there was no significant difference in the frequency of management markers (p = .061) in GES10 and AES. This initially seemed surprising considering the overall frequency of management markers at zero months (average of 3.4/minute) and ten months (average 3.6/minute) in GES10 was remarkably similar. However, the descriptive statistics of the GES10 zero and ten month data compared to the AES data, revealed that management markers in the GES10 zero month data were more widely distributed than in the GES10 ten month data (Figure 9-10 and Figure 9-11). These changes in standard deviation from zero to ten months meant that GES10 and AES were actually less similar in their use of management markers at the end of data collection than at the beginning.

Confusing matters further, while management marking increased significantly in GES10 from zero to five months (Chapter seven), rates of use decreased from five to ten months, albeit statistically insignificantly. This meant that GES10’s use of management markers was more similar to that of AES at both zero months (p = .061) and five months (p = .650) than after ten months of living in Australia.
Focusing on subcategories of management marking, there were no significant differences between AES and GES10 in use of involvement (p = .220) or turn-taking markers (p = .105) after GES10 had spent ten months in Australia (Figure 9-12). Before beginning the exchange, there was also no significant difference in GES10’s and AES’s
use of turn-taking (p = .061) or involvement markers (p = .402). Comparisons of the two groups at the five month stage were also insignificant for both turn-taking (p = .402) and involvement (p = .519). Similar to knowledge markers, the only significant and large differences between GES10 and AES after ten months were at the level of choice of individual marker. It is to a discussion of these differences that we now turn.

*Figure 9-12 Management markers (GES10, AES)*

9.2.2.1 Involvement (GES10, AES)

‘Yes’ as an involvement marker was used significantly more in AES than GES10. ‘You know’ was used more by GES10 at the zero month stage of data collection (Table 9-4). After five months, both ‘oh’ and ‘yeah’ were used significantly more by GES10 than AES with large effect sizes. GES10 also used ‘ok’ significantly more than AES but effect size was just at the .8 cut off. After ten months there were no involvement markers that were used significantly differently by either group.

*Table 9-4 Significant difference in involvement markers (GES10, AES)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marker</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>Used more in …</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-mth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>GES10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you know</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>AES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-mth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oh</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>GES10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ok</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>GES10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yeah</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>GES10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-mth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This tied in with the patterns of decreased use of ‘yes’ in favour of ‘yeah’ in GES10 reported in Chapter seven. Such changes were not found in GS (Chapter eight) and there were no differences in the use of ‘yes’ or ‘yeah’ between AES and GES10 after ten months, indicating that replacement of ‘yes’ with ‘yeah’ was due to contact with native speakers. Additionally, significantly higher use of ‘yeah’ and ‘ok’ by GES10 than AES at five months, but not at zero or ten months provided some evidence for over-extension from zero to five months followed by a period of relativisation from five to ten months.

‘You know’ was also most probably acquired through contact with native speakers. Its use in GES10 increased significantly with a medium effect size from zero to ten months (\(p = .038, ES = .7\)) and significantly lower use by GES10 compared to AES disappeared after five months of the exchange. As discussed in Chapter eight, GES10 used ‘you know’ significantly more than GS after ten months with a medium effect size (\(p = .036, ES = .7\)). It was not present in the GES10 or GS pre-exchange data. After only five months of the exchange, GES10 acquired ‘you know’ to the same levels as AES. However, it remained unclear as to whether it was a key marker of Australian adolescent language and identity.

*Figure 9-13 Involvement marker repertoire, 10-mth interview (GES10, AES)*

The repertoire of involvement markers used by AES and GES10 was fairly similar (Figure 9-13). The two groups shared nineteen marker types. An additional three markers were exclusive to AES and four to GES10 in the ten month data. However, the back channel ‘ah’ was used in the GES10 zero and five month data. The question tag ‘…, eh?’ was only used by one speaker in one instance in AES. ‘Obviously’ was used by \(\frac{4}{13}\) speakers in six instances at an overall rate of .0284/minute in AES. It was never
used by GS, GES05 or GES10. However, the difference between AES and GES10 was not significant and it was not explored further.

The back channel ‘alright’ and agreement markers ‘I think so (too)’ and ‘you can say that’ were each only used by fewer than two speakers in two instances in GES10. The agreement marker ‘(that’s) true’ was used more widely by three speakers in ten instances. These low rates of use indicated a similar core repertoire of involvement markers in GES10 and AES.

9.2.2.2 Turn-taking (GES10, AES)

Table 9-5 Significant difference in turn-taking markers (GES10, AES)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marker</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>Used more in …</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-mth</td>
<td>well</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>0.9 AES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>yeah</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.4 AES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-mth</td>
<td>um</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>0.8 AES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-mth</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Before embarking on their exchange to Australia, GES10 used ‘well’ and ‘yeah’ significantly less than AES with a large effect size (Table 9-5). Five months into their exchange, these differences were no longer apparent, indicating increased use due to native-speaker contact. At the five month stage, AES used ‘um’ significantly more than GES10 for turn-taking. By ten months there were no turn-taking markers that were used significantly differently by GES10 or AES. Although effect size was only .8, significantly higher use of ‘um’ for turn-taking in the five month data may indicate that over-extension can also operate in the opposite direction to that described for ‘yeah’ and ‘ok’ in Section 9.2.2.1.

As shown in Figure 9-14, GES10 used ‘um’ for turn-taking more than AES at zero months, albeit not to significant levels (p = .325). This was most likely a reflection of their lower levels of proficiency and perhaps lack of more idiomatic lexical items for marking turns. Over the course of the next five months, GES10 reduced levels of use of ‘um’ to below those of AES. Then in the ensuing five months, GES10 increased use of ‘um’ for turn-taking purposes until it was similar to that of AES by the end of their student exchange.
There was very little difference in the repertoire of turn-taking markers used by GES10 and AES in the ten month interviews (Figure 9-15). There were no markers that were used exclusively by GES10 and only two markers, each used by no more than two speakers in two instances, that were exclusive to the AES ten-month interviews. ‘Ok’ was used by GES10 for turn-taking in the zero and five month data.

9.2.3 Summary of results (GES10, AES)

This analysis of GES10 and AES only partly supports the hypothesis that GES10 matched native speaker use of key adolescent markers after ten months in Australia (Hypothesis three). After ten months in Australia, GES10 used significantly fewer interpersonal markers than the native-speakers, which was mostly due to lower use of approximation markers. Approximation markers are concurrently those markers
most associated with adolescent language. Additionally, two of the three approximation markers that continued to show significantly lower use in GES10 than AES after ten months have been highlighted as being key markers of adolescent speech, namely, the general extender ‘and/or stuff’ (Norrby & Winter, 2002; Stenstrom & Jørgensten, 2009;) and ‘like’ (Gare, 2006; Terraschke, 2008). The third approximation marker that was used significantly less by GES10 (‘pretty much’) has not been identified as a marker of adolescent language in research to date.

In support of hypothesis three, GES10 used a range of typically adolescent intensification markers at native speaker levels at the end of their ten month exchange. These included ‘just’ (Erman, 1997), ‘like’ (Gare, 2006; Terraschke, 2008) and ‘really’ (Tagliamonte, 2005). Additionally, the one subcategory of attitude markers that is not necessarily associated with adolescent speech (i.e. knowledge marking) showed little or no change. Management markers have also not been identified as markers of adolescent language and their use in GES10 over the ten month period did not indicate a move towards Australian adolescent native-speaker use.

AES and GES10 also shared a highly comparable repertoire of interpersonal markers in the ten month interviews. Analysis of repertoire consistently showed that exclusive use of markers by one or the other group was usually due to idiosyncratic use by a small number of individual speakers. There were no key markers of adolescent identity that were not shared by AES and GES10.

Comparisons of AES and GES10 after only five-months of the exchange, highlighted that, despite the low number of significant changes in the second half of the exchange (Chapter seven), there was a far greater gap between GES10 and AES at five months compared to ten months. This indicated that learning of interpersonal markers did actually continue from five to ten months. After the second half of the exchange, GES10 participants were not only more likely to match native speaker use of some markers, but they started adapting levels of use to suit their own idiosyncratic needs and identities. This leads us to the third and final analysis chapter of this study, which focuses on differences in interpersonal marker acquisition between a five and ten month exchange programme.
Chapter 10  Comparison of five and ten month exchanges (GES10, GES05)

10.1 Introduction (GES10, GES05)

This chapter focuses on the relationship between social integration and interpersonal marker acquisition for students on a five month exchange (GES05) and those on a ten month exchange (GES10) after five months of living in Australia. This provides answers to the fourth hypothesis of this study, i.e. that exchange students on a five month exchange use fewer interpersonal markers than those on a ten month exchange due to lower investment and integration in the Australian adolescent community.

Degree of integration in the imagined community (Kanno & Norton, 2003) was based on information students provided concerning their host families, friends and free time activities in the language contact profiles (LCP) and interviews. As discussed in Chapter six language contact scores were not considered reliable and were, therefore, not used for correlations with interpersonal marker use.

As per all analyses so far (Chapters seven, eight and nine), due to differences in group size (GES10 n = 14, GES05 n = 12) and interview times, frequencies are reported as average markers per minute. Differences between the two groups are discussed in detail if a Wilcoxon Signed Rank was significant (p < .05) and Cohen’s d effect size was greater than .8. The analysis began at the top of the hierarchical order of interpersonal markers (Chapter five) and moved down to the individual marker level.

As discussed in Chapter six, there were no significant differences in interpersonal marker use by GES10 and GES05 at the outset of the study and degree of English language contact was similar before the students’ embarked on their exchange. This meant that any significant differences after five months were most likely due to the fact that GES10 and GES05 participants intended to stay in Australia for different lengths of time.

This chapter begins with an overview of differences in GES10 and GES05’s investment in the imagined community during the first five months of the exchange. It then relates this investment to statistically significant differences in interpersonal marker use by GES10 and GES05 at the end of the five month period.

10.2 Speaking contact and integration (GES10, GES05)

Participants in GES10 and GES05 all arrived in Australia on the same plane in July 2005 and, upon arrival in Sydney, were disseminated to their respective host
families where they were expected to stay for the duration of their exchange. They were also enrolled in Year eleven at an Australian high school, which was chosen by the host family.

Students were able to change host families when the family, student and/or exchange organisation felt it was in the best interests of the family and student. In the first five months of the exchange, \( \frac{3}{14} \) GES10 participants and \( \frac{2}{12} \) GES05 participants changed host families. However, an additional \( \frac{3}{12} \) of the GES05 students (HB, LK and MF) expressed discontent with their host family relations, but decided to simply endure difficulties as they would soon return home. For example, in the five month interview, LK indicated she was pleased to be going home because she was “finished with her host family”. She did not get along with her host sister and could not speak freely with her host mother or father. She had decided to simply stay with them till the end of the exchange rather than try to ameliorate relationships or change families. One of the two GES05 students who changed families (CL) said she would have stayed with her family despite the fact she did not get along with them and only really “slept there and […] ate there”. Her relocation was instigated by the exchange organisation after the host mother was diagnosed with breast cancer. In GES05, one additional student (YF) claimed to have a very good relationship with her host mother and same-age host sister in her five month interview and questionnaire. However, after the exchange, the researcher contacted the host sister who indicated she did not actually get along with YF. It is possible that YF was not prepared to talk about difficulties in the five month interview as it took place in the host family home and, although the doors were closed, both the host mother and sister were in the adjoining room. This meant that half of the GES05 participants changed or were unhappy in their host families during the five months of their exchange.

A decision not to invest in family relations or initiate change was not apparent in the GES10 five month data. After five months, many GES10 students indicated they had experienced difficulties with host families, but had either attempted to patch up relations or, if this was not possible, changed families. Only one participant in GES10 expressed ongoing difficulties with his host family (SJ) after five months of the exchange. Unlike LK, SJ was determined to invest in his relationship with the family, despite extreme differences in beliefs, opinions and lifestyle needs. SJ came from an atheist background in Germany but was placed in a “very very Christian” family and Christian private school. His nine year old host brother had behavioural
issues and he did not get along with his fourteen year old host sister. The family were against SJ attending any parties, wearing shorts for sport or socialising with friends who were not of the same religious belief. SJ was also expected to complete set chores after school, which meant he did not have any free time until about 7pm at night (Example 10-1).

Example 10-1 (GES10, 10-mth, interview)

SJ: after school I went home I did my homework and then (3.0) pf (.) what did do + yeah helping in the house doing the dishes setting the table
AG: yep
SJ: watering the plants every night half hour @ so they @
AG: @ half an hour + @
SJ: yeah you saw it was big / big garden +
AG: yep
SJ: so I did quite a bit and after that / night / at 7 o’clock (1.0) I did some running or I’ve met a friend but then I had to come home
AG: yep
SJ: and then that’s about it and th-they were complaining about that that I was doing quite a bit but they were complaining about every little thing you know if you for / if you / I don’t know if you / if you forget to (3.0) to switch off a light
AG: yep
SJ: they / they would I don’t know they would / would be angry with you

SJ and his host family had a number of altercations, many of which were based on the strict Christian rules of the family, e.g. SJ’s personal religious beliefs and going on holidays over Christmas with his paternal father. Rather than choose to “simply eat and sleep” at the host family’s house, SJ was prepared to discuss these issues and work them out with the family.

Example 10-2 (GES10, 5-mth, interview)

AG: oh wow (.) yeah (.) then do you / like with your mates around here + do you usually sort of spend time with them after school + and
SJ: hm yeah I mean after school it’s (. )/ there’s / (. ) yeah sometimes I was running + I was ah practising for the city to surf run + (. ) um (. ) and ah (2.0) yeah but it’s four o’clock then + and (. ) then they / then I have to study a little bit + and yeah and you do stuff with your family because they come home and you know
AG: yep
SJ: you want to do / do something with them +
He felt it was important to spend time with them after school (Example 10-2), but also used all available opportunities to socialise with friends. Having finished his chores by 7pm, he went running with a friend who lived just down the road. Whenever possible on the weekends, he went to the cinema or played golf on the local sports oval with friends who lived near his host family’s home. However, he expressed a degree of ostracism from the adolescent community and their associated families due to differences in religious beliefs (SJ remained atheist throughout the ten months of his exchange). This meant that despite all efforts to spend free time with other adolescents, his ability to be an integral part of an adolescent community with which he fully identified remained low.

Low levels of free time activity with friends outside of school was more apparent in GES05 than GES10. In GES05, $\frac{3}{12}$ (25%) participants indicated they spent the majority of their free time with friends, compared to $\frac{7}{14}$ (50%) in GES10. Similarly, $\frac{6}{12}$ (50%) GES05 participants reported low extra-curricular social activities, compared to $\frac{4}{14}$ (29%) in GES10. GES05 participants mentioned the difficulty of joining sporting clubs because sporting seasons had already begun when they arrived or commenced shortly before their departure. Some indicated that low social activity was due to living remotely or lack of public transport facilities. However, availability of transport was directly linked to host family relations and the willingness of the student and family to organise travel arrangements. As discussed above, GES05 students were more likely to simply put up with tenuous host family relationships than GES10 participants. Since the logistical organisation of transport inevitably involved negotiating with host family members, GES05 participants may have simply been less likely to ask host parents to drive them to and from various social activities than participants in GES10. For example, in GES10, RHI “lived in the middle of nowhere” and the only means of getting to and from her house was by school bus or driving a car. In order to pursue her various extracurricular sporting and social interests, she often stayed overnight with friends or organised transport with her own host family or with friends’ families. She emphasised that this was only possible due to her positive and open relationship with her host family and said “otherwise I could have never done these things”. Similar to RHI, MF in GES05 lived twenty-seven kilometres out of town and relied on the school bus or her host family for transport. However, she only had sleepovers at friends’ places “a few times at the weekends” and mostly only socialised with friends during breaks at school. She
complained that she had no social interaction at home and said she only stayed with her host family because she did not want to risk being transferred to another school and losing her friends (Example 10-3). She “never really spoke” to her two host brothers and spent most of her time watching DVDs or jogging on her own down the driveway. Lack of communication in the family meant she was hesitant to ask favours of the family, such as driving her to and from extracurricular social activities.

Example 10-3 (GES05, 5-mth, interview)

MF: I did not really get along with my host family very well + [...] and um in in the end I really just stayed um with my host family because of my friends

The most likely explanation for lower levels of social investment in GES05 compared to GES10 was differences in the length of stay. The closer students were to returning home, the less they felt it useful or necessary to integrate in the community or invest in host family relations and friendships. For example, if after the third month of a student exchange, host family or friendships were complicated, a GES05 participant might simply decide to try and get through the remaining two months without discussing issues with the host family or investing in friendships with adolescent Australians. Comparatively, a GES10 participant would have to endure a further seven months of tension and would, therefore, be more willing to initiate change. Similarly, as mentioned by AW in GES05, participants on a five-month exchange could simply put their own hobbies or interests on hold for five months until they returned to Germany. Comparatively, ten months of low social and sporting activity would have a more negative impact on the individual’s life.

Keeping in mind issues of reliability discussed in Chapter six, it was not surprising that the GES05 overall English language contact speaking score was lower than that of GES10 (Figure 10-1). The hours per week reported by GES05 for listening, reading and writing in English for pleasure were also consistently lower than those reported by GES10. Again, this may indicate that GES05 participants invested less in the English language than GES10 participants, e.g. read novels in German rather than in English.
Having established lower social investment and integration in GES05 compared to GES10 in the first five months of data collection, we now need to consider whether such differences in integration and language contact impacted on the acquisition of interpersonal markers.

10.3 Interpersonal markers (GES10, GES05)

There were no significant differences in overall interpersonal marker use (p = .374) in GES10 or GES05 after five months (Figure 10-2). Within interpersonal markers, GES05 used fewer attitude markers than GES10, but this was not statistically significant (p = .106). There was no difference in the frequency of management markers (p = .560) in GES10 and GES05.
10.3.1 Attitude (GES10, GES05)

Within attitude markers, no significant differences were found between GES10 and GES05 for the subcategory of intensification ($p = .860$) and lower use of the subcategory of knowledge markers was only marginally significant ($p = .05$) (Figure 10-3). Lower use of approximation markers by GES05 compared to GES10 was significant with a large effect size ($p = .013$, $ES = 1.02$).

*Figure 10-3 Attitude markers, 5-mth interview (GES10, GES05)*

10.3.1.1 Approximation (GES10, GES05)

Approximation markers were used by GES10 at an average rate of 3.04/minute and GES05 at 2.04/minute. Standard deviation for GES10 (SD = .98) was higher than that of GES10 (SD = .77) indicating greater data spread over a larger range of values in GES10 than GES05. In GES05, a large number of cases were contained within a low range of scores in 50% of the data (Figure 10-4), while rates of use in GES10 were more widely spread.

Figure 10-4 also shows the difference between approximation marker use in GES05 and AES was larger than the difference between GES10 and AES after five months. Indeed, while approximators were used significantly less than AES after five months by both GES10 ($p = .006$, $ES = 1.1$) and GES05 ($p = .000$, $ES = 2.2$), effect sizes for the difference between GES05 and AES was double that of the difference between GES10 and AES. As discussed in Chapter nine, the difference between GES10 and AES remained after a further five months of living in Australia ($p = .017$, $ES = 1.0$).
There was one outlier (JU) for high use of approximators in GES05 (JU). JU was very active during the five months of her exchange. She had “a really lovely host family” and travelled extensively with them. She regularly camped out at her friend’s property and did a lot with her fourteen year old host brother (e.g. watching movies, going to the gym and jogging along the beach). She played touch football every Wednesday, was in the drama club and played the piano. JU used approximators at an average rate of 3.55/minute (Figure 10-4), which was just below the AES median. Additionally, three of the approximation markers most used by JU in the five month data also appeared in the top five markers used by AES (Table 10-1).

*Figure 10-4 Approximation outliers, 5-mth interview (GES10, GES05, AES)*

![Image of a box plot showing approximation outliers across different groups, with an outlier marked as 'JU'.](image)

The only other GES05 participant who used approximators above an average rate of 3.0/minute was CLO (3.33/minute). CLO changed host families after two months because of relationship difficulties. He mentioned that these difficulties meant that he was not as socially active as he was in the second host family. In the second host family, CLO got on very well with his host parents and sixteen and eighteen year old host brothers. He travelled extensively with one of his host brothers and was very active in his free time. He did kickboxing, played tennis and was a member of the local community band and a rock band. However, only two of the five most frequent approximation markers in CLO’s five month interview overlapped with the top five markers used by AES (Table 10-1). This may partly be explained by the fact that he
was not socially active and was experiencing host family difficulties in the first two
months of his exchange to Australia.

Table 10-1 Top approximators, 5-mth interview (GES05-JU/CLO, AES)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AES</th>
<th>GES05 - JU</th>
<th>GES05 - CLO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 'like'</td>
<td>'kind of'</td>
<td>'all'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 'and/or stuff'</td>
<td>'not really'</td>
<td>'bit'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 'all'</td>
<td>'all'</td>
<td>'not really'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 'bit'</td>
<td>'and/or stuff'</td>
<td>'and/or thing'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 'kind of'</td>
<td>'and/or thing'</td>
<td>'and/or whatever'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The two GES05 speakers who used approximation markers the least were less
integrated into their families and adolescent community. AW and HP both reported
having no hobbies or interests outside of school. They each had same-age siblings but
did not spend their free time with them due to differences in interests and personality.
HP’s best friend was another German exchange student with whom he spoke German
and spent most of his free time. HP’s low levels of integration were not only
apparent in his low use of those approximation markers most associated with
adolescent language, but also his linguistic and mental separation of exclusive ‘them’
(Australians) and inclusive ‘us’ (German adolescents) in his five month interview
(Example 10-4).

Example 10-4 (GES05, Interview, 5-mth)

HP: um yeah it’s pretty much different cause um (.) like the school +
decides a lot of the time cause we go to school to one and have the day
doff +
AG: yep
HP: and they go to school to three
AG: yep
HP: and then have to travel home
AG: yeah
HP: and they’re home at four + and it doesn’t make sense to do
anything else then
AG: @ yep @

In GES10, there were no outliers for high use of approximators and a much
higher standard deviation than GES05, indicating more variation in GES10 than
GES05 (Figure 10-4). In GES10, 3/14 participants used approximators at an average
rate of more than four approximation markers per minute (PN = 4.69/minute, NS =

20 HP’s reported German language contact score was the highest for GES05 at 10.64 hrs/wk.
4.58/minute and SJ = 4.14/minute) and \(\frac{1}{14}\) (MM) at an average rate of 3.65/minute.

NS and MM were very socially active. NS spent most weekends partying and spending time with friends. He joined a surf lifesaving club and often went surfing with friends after school. One close friend with whom he went surfing was a German exchange student, but he reported speaking German for only half an hour per week. This may have been because the two German exchange students generally socialised in a large group of Australian adolescent friends. Similar to native-speaker adolescents in AES, the two most frequently used approximators in NS’s five month interview were ‘like’ and ‘and/or stuff’ (Table 10-2). NS used ‘like’ at an average rate of .628/minute, which closely matched average rates of use in AES (.506/minute). He used ‘and/or stuff’ at 1.507/minute, which was more than double the rate used by AES (.473/minute).

The participant who showed the fourth highest rate of approximation marking in GES10 was MM. He played competition basketball, tennis and Australian rules football. He had “an awesome host family” with whom he went camping and on beach holidays. He also spent a lot of time with his host brother and sister with whom he shared a number of friends. Four of the five most frequently used approximators in his five month interview were also amongst the five most used approximators in AES (Table 10-2) and, as was the case for NS, rates of use were either higher or similar to those of AES.

However, the remaining two GES10 participants (PN, SJ) who showed high rates of approximation were not socially active after school. PN did not make many friends or go out much due to difficulties in his initial host family - an elderly Dutch couple with no children of their own – with whom he stayed for the first 4.5 months of his ten month exchange. He did, however, join a soccer club where he met most of his friends. While he used approximation markers frequently, the lexical items he employed were not ones that especially marked adolescent identity. Of the five most frequent approximation markers in PN’s five month interview (Table 10-2), only ‘bit’ was also one of the five most frequently used markers in AES. As discussed in Section 10.2, SJ’s contact with other adolescents after school was limited despite his use of every possible opportunity to meet up with friends. Three of the five most frequently used approximation markers in his five month interview also appeared in the top five in AES. Rates of use of these three markers (i.e. ‘bit’, ‘and/or stuff’ and ‘all’) were slightly higher or the same as AES.
The two participants with the lowest use of approximation markers in GES10 were LN and MD. LN spent most of her afternoons riding horses on her own on her host family’s farm. She did not have a same-age host sibling and was bored on weekends. She mentioned if she hadn’t had the horses she “would be just sitting around on the computer or in front of the TV”, which indicated low levels of interest or investment in socialising with the local adolescent community. MD’s low use of approximation markers did not entirely match her levels of social activity. While she had no particular extracurricular hobbies, she went to parties and hung out with friends at the river most weekends. She also sometimes went shopping and watched DVDs with her fourteen year old host brother. She had a fifteen year old host sister but never discussed their relationship in the interview or LCP.

With the exception of ‘all’ (p = .060), all those markers that showed significant and large increase in GES10 from zero to five months (Chapter seven) also showed significant and large increase in GES05 for the same period (Figure 10-5).

Increased use of ‘and/or stuff’ was significant and large (p = .043, ES = .9), as was increased use of ‘and/or thing’ (p = .003, ES = 1.0) and ‘not really’ (p = .006, ES = .9).
However, excluding ‘not really’ which was used at similar rates by GES10 and GES05 at five months, average/minute use of those markers that showed large and significant increase in GES10 from zero to five months (Chapter seven) were generally lower in GES05 than GES10 (Figure 10-6).

Figure 10-6 ‘All’, ‘and/or stuff/thing’, ‘not really’, 5-mth interview (GES10, GES05)

Even though average rates of use of ‘and/or stuff’ and ‘and/or thing’ were much lower in GES05 than GES10, the difference between the two groups was not significant (p = .076 and p = .193, respectively). For ‘and/or stuff’, this was due to higher variance in GES10 (SD = .41) compared to GES05 (SD = .1) and high outlier usage by NS in GES10. Similarly, GES10 showed a somewhat higher degree of variance for use of ‘and/or thing’ (SD = .3) compared to GES05 (SD = .2). There was one outlier for high use of ‘and/or thing’ in GES05 (LF) and very few data points in the upper 75\(^{th}\) percentile, indicating that the GES05 data was negatively skewed, while the GES10 showed a positive skew. The AES data was also positively skewed and GES10 data resembled the AES native speaker data more than GES05 (Figure 10-7).
The only individual approximation marker that showed significantly lower use with a large effect size in GES05 than GES10 after five months was ‘like’ (p = .009, ES = 1.2). There were no approximation markers that showed significantly higher use in GES05 than GES10.

**10.3.1.1.1 ‘Like’ (GES10, GES05)**

*Figure 10-8 Approximator ‘like’, 0 & 5-mth interview (GES10, GES05)*
As reported in Chapter seven, increased use of approximator ‘like’ from zero to five months in GES10 was significant and large (p = .001, ES = 1.7). However, increased use of ‘like’ for approximation in GES05 for the same period was not significant (p = .086).

Example 10-5 (GES05, 5-mth, interview)
CLO: the mum actually allows me to take her car to drive to the bus stop
AG: wow
CLO: cause up to the road it's **like** a k or so
AG: yeah
CLO: so drive there every day

Example 10-6 (GES10, 5-mth, interview)
MM: […] have to put on shoes + or like (. ) your perfect clothes +
AG: yeah yeah
MM: that's / (. ) like you just go +
AG: yep
MM: and in germany where I live in the city + you always have to dress up + and get **like**
AG: yep
MM: fitting jeans and t-shirt + and you dress (.)
AG: yep
MM: like and here you just / it’s more laid back +

Example 10-7 (GES10, 5-mth, interview)
LN: and here it's like (. ) without alcohol and not so many people + @
and @
AG: @ ahha @
LN: everything **like** normal +
AG: yep
LN: and (. ) yeah
AG: yep

In both GES10 and GES05, ‘like’ was used to approximate a quantity (Example 10-5), indicate use of a random example (Example 10-6) and to highlight use of a vague concept or render it vague (Example 10-7). The relative weighting of these three contexts of use were similar. Vagueness was the most frequent context and made up for 49.4% (38/77) of instances in GES10 compared to 50% (9/18) in GES05. Approximation of a quantity accounted for 37.7% (29/77) instances in GES10 and 33.3% (6/18) in GES05. Finally, 12.9% (10/77) and 16.7% (3/18) of instances highlighted
use of a random example in GES10 and GES05 respectively. This indicated that the difference between the two groups was only in terms of overall frequency and not context of use.

In the GES10 five month data, \(\frac{14}{14}\) participants used ‘like’ for approximation, compared to \(\frac{9}{12}\) participants in GES05. The three participants in GES05 who did not use ‘like’ for approximation were AW, HB and YF. As discussed in Section 10.3.1, AW did not pursue any hobbies or after school activities in Australia and, although she got along well with her sixteen year old host brother, she spent very little time with him. HB did not get along with his seventeen year old host brother and spent little time pursuing interests or socialising with other teenagers after school. He usually went fishing with his host father (but listened to music while fishing), worked on his own in the garden or cleaned the pool. There were two German exchange students in his class, but he did not socialise with them after school. As mentioned in Section 10.2, YF’s relationship to her host family was ambivalent, but it is possible there were relationship difficulties between YF and her host sister. YF was not in any clubs or organised activities because she was always too tired to do anything after school. Her main social event was attending her host family’s church every Sunday and youth group on Friday nights, although she mentioned she was not a Christian.

There was one GES05 outlier (JW) and one GES10 outlier (MAM) for high use of approximator ‘like’ (Figure 10-9). JW spent a lot of time with friends from school and his ten year old host brother. He played competition cricket and went to watch cricket and football matches with his friends on the weekends. Similar to JW, MAM played football with friends, spent a lot of time with his fourteen and nineteen year old host siblings and had a large group of Australian friends. There was another German exchange student in his class at school, but MAM was conscience of not spending too much time speaking German with him. Another male in GES10 (MM) made frequent use of approximator ‘like’ (average rate of .82/minute), although this did not represent outlier levels of use. MM was very active with friends and family outside of school. He spent a lot of time with his fourteen and sixteen year old host siblings, played basketball, went on holidays with his family and usually spent his weekends going out with friends.

Somewhat surprisingly, two of the participants who showed the highest use of approximation markers in GES10 (PN and SJ) concurrently used approximator ‘like’ the least. As discussed above, for the first 4.5 months of his exchange, PN did not
socialise much with other teenagers outside of school and the approximation markers he chose to use were not necessarily those most associated with adolescent language. Low use of approximator ‘like’ by SJ may be linked to the difficulties he experienced in his host family and his restricted ability to pursue social activities and hobbies with other adolescents (see Section 10.2).

Similar to all comparisons of GES10 and GES05 so far, GES10 showed higher standard deviation (SD = .3) than GES05 (SD = .1), higher central tendency and larger data spread than GES05 (Figure 10-9). Figure 10-9 also illustrates a much greater difference in use of approximator ‘like’ between GES05 and AES than GES10 and AES after five months of living in Australia. As discussed in Chapter nine, there was no significant difference between use of ‘like’ as an approximator by GES10 and AES (p = .085) in the five month interview data. However, lower use by GES05 compared to AES at five months was significant and large (p = .000, ES = 1.7).

*Figure 10-9 Approximator ‘like’ outliers, 5-mth interview (GES10, GES05, AES)*

These results indicated that lower use of approximator ‘like’ by GES05 may be related to lower levels of investment in host family relations, friendships and social activities outside of school. This meant that use of approximator ‘like’ was not only higher in GES10 than GES05, but that GES10 rates of use more closely resembled use by AES than did rates of use in GES05.
10.3.1.2 Intensification (GES10, GES05)

As discussed in Section 10.3.1, after five months of living in Australia GES10 and GES05 used intensification markers at the same average/minute rate (p = .860). However, differences were apparent in choice of lexical items for intensification.

All those intensification markers that showed significant and large change in GES10 from zero to five months (Chapter seven) also showed significant and large change in GES05 for the same period (Figure 10-10). In GES05, ‘just’ increased significantly with a large effect size (p = .003, ES = 2.0), as did ‘like’ (p = .018, ES = 1.1) and ‘really’ (p = .003, ES = 1.2). Decreased use of ‘very’ was also significant and large (p = .010, ES = 1.2) in GES05.

Figure 10-11 ‘Just’, ‘like’, ‘really’, ‘very’, 0 to 5-mth interview (GES10, GES05)
Unlike results for intensification, GES05 did not necessarily use those markers that increased significantly from zero to five months less than GES10 (Figure 10-11). This was only the case for intensifier ‘like’, for which lower use by GES05 compared to GES10 was significant and large (p = .023, ES = .9). In fact ‘like’ was the only individual intensification marker that showed significantly lower use with a large effect size in GES05 than GES10 after five months. There were no intensification markers that showed significantly higher use in GES05 than GES10.

10.3.1.2.1 ‘Like’ (GES10, GES05)

Intensifier ‘like’ increased significantly in the first five months for both GES10 (p = .002, ES = 1.2) and GES05 (p = .018, ES = 1.1). However, as shown in Figure 10-12, despite significant and large increases in both groups, GES05’s use of intensifier ‘like’ was much lower than that of GES10 at the five month data collection point.

Figure 10-12 Intensifier ‘like’, 0 to 5-mth interview (GES10, GES05)

The two groups used intensifier ‘like’ for similar purposes in similar contexts. It was used to intensify the subjective stance of the speaker and his/her emotional involvement (Example 10-8). In this context it often co-occurred with other intensifiers such as the degree adverb ‘really’. Intensifier ‘like’ also highlighted hyperbole, jokes or sarcasm (Example 10-9) and was used to mark surprising information (Example 10-10). In some cases, surprising information included numbers, whereby the use of ‘like’ before the number did not primarily indicate approximation of that figure, but highlighted a quantity that was surprising.
Example 10-8 (GES10, 5-mth, interview)

AG: when you get home + you're mum's going to go +
JP: I can cook @
AG: yeah
JP: yeah I can cook cause she's really excited about it
AG: yep
JP: and my grandma as well because I have um (.) started to (. / I cooked um (. the (. blackforest cake +
AG: here +
JP: yeah

Example 10-9 (GES10, 5-mth, interview)

MD: [...] canberra really strange (. it's got no like / it's got no really soul + the city +
MD @ yeah yeah @
AG: you know
MD: and it looks all the same + kind of +
AG: yep
MD: yeah
AG: yep
MD: it's just the politicians over there and no one else +
AG: yep yep
MD: yeah

Example 10-10 (GES05, 5-mth, interview)

AG: yeah oh cool what did you do then like with your friends + did you do lots of free time sort of stuff + and
MF: hm not really because I live twenty seven ks out of town +
AG: oh @ really +
MF: and so @ it’s half an hour trip +
AG: yep
MF: and so I did not really get to go into town often but just in school at lunchtime and at recess it was just like um hm I can talk with them about everything

Comparisons of the context of use of intensifier-'like’ were similar. Use of intensifier ‘like’ to highlight surprising information was the most frequent context in both groups, i.e. 45.8% (27/59) in GES10 and 64.3% (9/14) in GES05. The second most frequent context was ‘like’ for hyperbole, jokes or sarcasm, i.e. 32.2% (19/59) in GES10 and 28.6% (4/14) in GES05. All remaining instances marked subjective stance and emotional involvement, i.e. 22% (13/59) in GES10 and 7.1% (1/14) in GES05.
Given the small number of instances in GES05, differences in GES05 and GES10’s use of ‘like’ for subjective stance and surprising information were not explored further. However, it may indicate less interest in the projection of the self in English-speaking contexts in GES05 compared to GES10.

In the five month data, intensifier ‘like’ was used by 85.7% (12/14) of speakers in GES10 and 66.7% (8/12) of speakers in GES05. Qualitative analysis indicated some links between the exchange students’ level of social integration and the use of ‘like’ for intensification. In GES10, intensifier ‘like’ was not used by SJ or PN, which, as discussed in Sections 10.2 and 10.3.1.1.1, may be linked to low degree of integration in the native-speaker adolescent community. In GES05 it was not used by AW, CL, RH and LK, all of whom indicated low contact with adolescent native speakers outside of the classroom. As discussed in Section 10.3.1, AW had little or no extracurricular interests or activities. CL “did nothing” after school for the first four months because her host family showed little interest in her. She lived remotely and her friends all worked after school. RH also lived out of town on a farm and after school she usually went home on the bus, ate something, had a rest, fed the farm animals and ate dinner. She also wrote stories in German in her room and watched TV. She complained that she “can’t um (4.0) go so often out + […] because um (1.0) we have a lot of work here + and […] my host parents haven’t time (.) so often”. She also mentioned she “was a bit silent at the beginning” of the five month exchange.

Finally, LK reported low speaking contact in GES05. Her host parents spoke Arabic as their mother tongue and she felt this impacted negatively on her own acquisition of English. She did not get along with her same-age host sister, felt isolated in her host family and spent much of her free time alone (e.g. jogging or going for evening walks along the beach). She complained about not being able to join sporting teams in Australia or to meet up with friends as her school was in a different area to where she lived.
As per all comparisons so far, variation was higher in GES10 (SD = .3) than GES05 (SD = .1). As shown in Figure 10-13, there were two outliers in GES10 for high use of intensifier ‘like’ (MM, NS) and one in GES05 (HP). MM was an extreme outlier and, as previously mentioned, was a well-integrated member of his host family and adolescent friendship group. Higher frequency and variation in the use of intensifier ‘like’ in GES10 compared to GES05 in the first five months of the exchange meant that differences between AES and GES10 after five months of living in Australia were not significant (p = .867). However, the difference between GES05 and AES remained significant and large (p = .016, ES = 1.1).

Similar to differences in use of the approximator ‘like’, this analysis indicated that GES05 not only used ‘like’ as an intensifier less than GES10, but that this was connected to lower integration in the host family and local adolescent community. Differences in degree of integration with native-speaker adolescents meant that GES10 resembled native-speaker use of intensifier- ‘like’ more than GES05.

10.3.2 Management (GES10, GES05)

There were no significant differences in GES10 and GES05’s use of the two management marker subcategories of involvement (p = .560) and turn-taking (p =
.131) after five months of living in Australia (Figure 10-14). There were also no individual management markers that showed any significant difference in use between GES10 and GES05.

Figure 10-14 Management markers, 5-mth interview (GES10, GES05)

10.4 Summary of results (GES10, GES05)

The analysis reported in this chapter supports the hypothesis that students on a five month exchange were less integrated in the adolescent community than those on a ten month programme and this resulted in lower use of those markers most associated with adolescent speech. While use of interpersonal markers and integration increased from zero to five months in GES05, acquisition and integration were consistently lower than in GES10 for the same period of time. The greatest difference between the two groups was in approximation and the use of the pragmatic marker most associated with adolescent speech, namely ‘like’ in both of its interpersonal functions.

Lower integration in the imagined adolescent community was not simply due to lower levels of motivation in GES05 compared to GES10, but to a range of other factors, including lower abilities to invest in establishing positive and open host family relations. Lower levels of investment in host family relations during a five month exchange may be apparent in both the student and host family. However, for this study, data from the host families was not collected. Without a positive relationship with the host family, the abilities of the student to socialise with other adolescents were restricted. In turn, this impacted on their acquisition of markers of adolescent language. Since such markers are used to create and signal in-group
membership, a cyclic pattern may develop whereby lower use of the markers of adolescent speech may further inhibit their ability to become in-group members of adolescent communities. These ideas are discussed further in Chapter eleven.
Chapter 11 Discussion and conclusion

11.1 Introduction
This chapter summarises the major results of this research and relates these to previous findings in the fields of adolescent language, pragmatic markers, study abroad and second language acquisition. It outlines some methodological issues that may impact on further research in pragmatic markers and second language acquisition and includes a discussion of limitations and suggestions for continued research. The chapter ends with a short summary and conclusion.

11.2 Major research findings
This thesis focused on the acquisition of interpersonal markers by German adolescent students on a ten month (GES10, n = 14) or five month (GES05, n = 12) exchange to Australia. It also included a control group of German adolescents (GS, n = 20) who did not partake in an exchange to Australia and a group of Australian adolescent native speakers (AES, n = 13). Analyses aimed to answer four hypotheses.

The first hypothesis was that GES10 would learn those interpersonal markers most associated with adolescent language in the first five months of the exchange. As reported in Chapter seven, comparisons of the GES10 zero to five month and five to ten month data fully supported this hypothesis. In the first five months, the greatest increases were in attitude markers, which included the two subtypes of attitude markers most associated with adolescent speech, i.e. approximation and intensification. Many individual lexical items showing the greatest increase in the first five months were also key markers of adolescent speech, e.g. general extenders for approximation, ‘just’ and ‘like’ for intensification. GES10 participants also developed a more informal adolescent register by replacing formal markers with less formal near-equivalents (e.g. ‘very’ was replaced with ‘really’). The analysis in Chapter eight indicated that these changes were due to the GES10 exchange experience as they were not apparent in participants who did not go on exchange to Australia (GS). As reported in Chapters nine and ten, even though changes in interpersonal marker use from five to ten months were not as significant or large as those in the first five months, continued development of interpersonal markers in the second half of the exchange was necessary for attaining more native-like levels of use.

The second hypothesis of this study was not supported. In order to understand whether adolescents learning English in Germany (GS) also acquired a number of key markers of adolescent language, changes from zero to ten months in GS were
analysed and compared to changes in GES10 (Chapter eight). GS participants did not acquire any new interpersonal markers to a significant or large extent over the ten month period, despite continued learning of English at school and some increased contact with native speakers. The English as a second language curricula of the German States where GS students lived (i.e. Lower Saxony, Hamburg and North Rhein-Westfalia) were all based on an intercultural and communicative competence approach to foreign language learning and teaching. However, the curricula and textbooks were written by adults and the students were taught by adult speakers of English, so communicative competence in adolescent-to-adolescent interaction was unlikely to be the focus of teaching.

Analyses for answering hypothesis three involved comparing GES10 with native-speakers of Australian adolescent English (AES). They aimed to ascertain whether GES10 matched AES on a number of key adolescent markers after the ten month exchange (Chapter nine). Hypothesis three was only partly supported as even after ten months there was significantly lower use of interpersonal markers in GES10 than AES, including some key adolescent markers of approximation, i.e. ‘and/or stuff’ and ‘like’. In support of hypothesis three, the overall frequency of intensification markers in GES10 was similar to that of AES, including those individual intensification markers most associated with adolescent speech. Additionally, the repertoire of individual markers used by GES10 and AES after ten months was highly comparable.

Finally, as reported in Chapter ten, the fourth hypothesis of the study was fully supported. This analysis involved comparing German adolescents on a five month exchange to those on a ten month exchange after five months of living in Australia. Lower levels of interpersonal markers in GES05 than GES10 was both hypothesized and found. This was most likely due to less personal investment and social integration in GES05 than GES10. We will now discuss how these findings tie in with previous research in the fields of adolescent language, pragmatic markers, study abroad and second language acquisition.

11.2.1 Major research findings and previous research

As discussed in Chapter six, care needs to be taken when comparing the results of different interpersonal marker studies, especially those based on structured retellings and unstructured or semi-structured data. Other contextual issues such as
age, gender and interlocutor constellations may also render different interpersonal marker studies incomparable.

Additionally, as discussed in Chapters two and three, no clear definition or classification system for pragmatic markers exists. This means that the basis on which a marker in one study has been classified may be highly divergent from that used in another. In the following review, care is taken to avoid comparing studies based on entirely different data or classification systems.

11.2.1.1 Interpersonal markers in Australian adolescent English

This study indicated that interpersonal markers were used prolifically by adolescent speakers of Australian English. The thirteen Australian adolescent native speakers in this study used interpersonal markers at an average rate of fifteen markers per minute. This means on average one interpersonal marker was used every four seconds. The lowest individual native speaker average was just under ten markers/minute and the highest per minute average was twenty-two.

The native-speaker data also provided support for previous findings that adolescent English is typified by high use of intensification (Stenström, 2000; Tagliamonte, 2005) and approximation (Gare, 2006; Stenström & Jørgensen, 2009), both of which allow the speaker to implicitly express his/her own subjectivity. In the AES data, attitude markers were the most frequent type of interpersonal markers and, of the three subtypes of attitude marking, approximation and intensification markers were the most frequent. Approximation markers were used at an average rate of four markers/minute and intensification at an average of five markers/minute. Comparatively, the third subtype of attitude markers (i.e. knowledge markers) was used sparingly (average of one marker/minute). While no research has been conducted on the use of knowledge marking by adolescents, this data suggested that they are not key aspects of Australian adolescent English.

Management markers were not widely used in AES (average five markers/minute) and there was no clear acquisitional pattern of management markers by GES10 or GES05. This indicated that use of management markers, in particular those used to indicate turn-taking, may indeed still be in a state of flux in adolescence (Kyratzis & Ervin-Tripp, 1999; Poulson, 1996 in Andersen, 2001).

Finally, the acquisitional patterns of GES10 and marker use by AES indicated there may be a number of key markers of Australian adolescent English that have not
previously been identified. These included the approximators ‘all’, ‘not really’ and ‘pretty much’ and the intensifier ‘really’.

11.2.1.2 Interpersonal markers and study abroad

As found in previous studies, the non-native speaker learner varieties of English were poor in the use of interpersonal markers at the outset of this study (Nikula, 1996, 1993; Rost-Roth, 1999). The large discrepancies between the native speakers and exchange students at zero months decreased considerably after five months of living in the target language culture. However, in line with Guillot (2005), even after ten months of living in the target culture, the overall frequency of interpersonal markers remained below that of native speakers. Supporting the results of Aijmer (2004), non-native speakers also made higher use of the knowledge marker ‘I don’t know’ than Australian native-speakers, even after ten months of living in Australia. While there was some evidence of overuse (Lorenz, 1997; Siepmann, 2005), the exchange students generally used key markers of adolescent identity less than native speakers after ten months.

This study and Aijmer (2004) both found a large overlap in the core marker repertoire of second language learners and native-speakers after the non-native speakers had been immersed in the target language. Comparatively, for those who were not immersed in the language (GS), both frequency and repertoire of interpersonal markers remained low. Nikula (1996) indicated that such low levels of interpersonal markers in a foreign language teaching environment would not have changed with general increased grammatical proficiency.

Finally, it was clear from this and previous studies that the learning of interpersonal markers was by no means easy (DeKlerk, 2005a, 2005b) and was dependent on a number of highly complex contextual factors (Perdue et al., 2002). In line with the findings of Guntermann (1995), Huebner (1995) and Regan (1995), after both five and ten months of the exchange there were higher levels of variation in marker use by study abroad students than those studying in the home country. While there were not enough data points to ascertain a developmental order of acquisition (Barron, 2003; Hays, 1992, in Müller, 2005; Sawyer, 1992), the results did suggest a possible functional order of acquisition. For example, ‘like’ as an intensifier was

\[\text{Comparisons with the results of Müller (2005) were not made as Müller’s study was based entirely on retelling data.}\]
acquired to AES levels within the first five months of GES10’s exchange, but ‘like’ as an approximator was not. This would require further research.

In sum, both previous research and this study clearly indicated that non-native speakers did not necessarily reach native-speaker-like use of interpersonal markers after even ten months of immersion. There seemed to be a relationship between time spent abroad and ability to approximate native-speaker use (Félix-Brasdefer, 2004), whereby the gap between non-native speakers and native-speakers was smaller after ten months of study abroad than after five months.

However, as pointed out by Barron (2003), while researchers tend to assume a native-speaker base-line, it remains uncertain as to whether the non-native speakers actually strive towards these so-called native-speaker levels of proficiency. Given the close connection between interpersonal markers and the expression of self, native-speaker comparisons are particularly problematic in the field of pragmatic marker research. There is, in fact, no reason to assume that German adolescent exchange students in Australia wish to entirely shed themselves of their identities as German adolescent exchange students. Indeed, maintaining and expressing a German adolescent identity could be advantageous for the speakers’ ability to gain access to native-speakers of Australian English. For example, in Pellegrino Aveni (2005) an American study abroad student in Russia explicitly mentioned how she could use her non-native expertise in the Russian language to “impress” (p. 54) native speakers. In doing so, she could boost both her own ego and her ability to speak to native-speakers. In certain contexts, being foreign or German or European could have cultural and linguistic capital (Norton, 2000) and grant the non-native speakers rights and privileges to which an adolescent native-speaker may not have access. This cultural capital of the non-native speaker has not been fully recognised in current theories of social identity and investment in second language acquisition (e.g. Norton, 2000). In this light, while frequency of interpersonal markers may indicate degree of integration and acculturation (Sankoff et al., 1997), it is problematic to interpret any non-native-like use of interpersonal markers as an indication of fluency (Olynyk et al., 1999). It is to a discussion of the complex relationship between integration, identity and interpersonal markers to which we now turn.
11.2.1.3 Interpersonal markers and social integration

In support of Sankoff et al. (1997), interpersonal marker use in GES10 and GES05 was related to levels of social integration and investment (Chapter ten). Host families were found to be an “integral component of the study abroad experience” (Knight & Schmidt-Rinehart, 2010, p. 76). It was likely that positive host family relationships validated the students’ perceptions of self, increased their exposure to informal English and promoted a positive attitude to the host culture and language (Jackson, 2008). More importantly for this study, the more at home students felt in their host family environments, the more able they were to invest in relationships with other teenagers outside of the home and the more adolescent-like their use of interpersonal markers became. If students did not feel at ease within their host families, they had the power to limit their communicative environments by opting to screen themselves from Australian English speaking host family members and even members of adolescent social networks (Kinginger, 2009). This was especially the case for students on a five month exchange. However, as will be discussed below, it was not the quantity of time spent with native-speakers, but the quality of interaction that most impacted on both integration and interpersonal marker use.

In this study, most of the factors that are known to impact on the acquisition of sociolinguistic competence were held constant. Age, mother-tongue, initial level of interpersonal marker use, study abroad programme design and length of stay were similar for all non-native speakers in GES10, GES05 and GS. Wherever possible, exchange students in GES10 and GES05 were matched with German non-exchange students (GS) and native-speakers (AES) of the same gender. Finally, while native speaker sociolinguistic norms may have varied from one region, suburb or even school to another, the context of acquisition was Australia for GES10 and GES05. Two principle variables that were not controlled were quantity and quality of contact with native-speakers and range of individual characteristics (e.g. interests, motivation and attitudes).

Tying in with Spolsky (1989) and Wang (2010), despite the fact that all exchange students in this study were on a WALKABOUT exchange, arrived on the same plane, lived in host families and attended mainstream Australian schools, there were large differences in the opportunities they experienced for second language learning. This was due to the complex nature of language contact and the multifaceted
and dynamic identities of the exchange students as well as members of the Australian English speaking community (Kinginger, 2008, 2009; Norton, 2000). While the language learners’ motivations to create and respond to opportunities to speak English undoubtedly played a role (Isabelli-Garcia, 2006; Menard-Warwick, 2005), even the most strenuous efforts for contact on the part of the participant may not have resulted in quality interaction. As discussed in Chapter ten, this was clearly the case for SJ who, despite high levels of motivation and flexibility, was not able to fully access adolescent native-speaker communities due to conditions of marginalization (Norton, 2000).

Members of the target language community also played a decisive and powerful role in enabling individual participants to become both integrated members of the adolescent community and proficient in adolescent speech (Norton, 2000). As was also the case for participants in Jackson’s research (2008), the most powerful gatekeeper to integration was the host family. Exchange students arrived in Australia knowing only the other exchange students they had met at a short orientation programme in Germany and/or on the plane to Australia. Their first point of contact with Australian culture and language was their host family. The host families provided students with easier access to new social networks and, at least initially, the students were reliant on this family for contact with other speakers of Australian English. For example, shortly after one of the GES10 participants (MAM) arrived in Australia, his school principal rang his host family to enquire about his personality in order to allocate him to a group of like-minded Australian adolescents. Based on their limited knowledge of MAM, the host family told the principal that he was quietly spoken and shy. He was then introduced to a group of studious and quiet adolescents. However, the host family’s assessment was based entirely on MAM’s limited ability to express his own identity and personal needs in English (Pellegrino Aveni, 2005). In fact, he was outgoing, gregarious and enjoyed partying and, therefore, was poorly matched to the group of adolescents to which he was assigned. Fortunately, MAM eventually found a group of adolescents with which he was better matched. JP in GES10 was, however, less able to integrate and find a group of friends with whom she connected. Her host family decided to send JP to the local high school while their own two daughters attended a private girls’ school because the standard and socio-economic levels of students at the local high school were poor. JP never found a group of like-minded friends at school, except for other German and Danish exchange
students. She also spent little time with her own two host sisters due to the fact that they went to a different school. Despite all efforts to attend another school, JP was not able to reverse the decision that had been made for her by the host family and both her integration and level of adolescent interpersonal marker use remained low (Chapter ten). The host family’s decision to send JP to a school that they clearly considered substandard for their biological daughters also raises issues of classed identities between host family members and exchange students and how these may impact on the individual’s language learning experience (Dörnyei & Malderez, 1997; Norton, 2000).

Even though reliance on the host family for contact with other Australian English speakers decreased over time, degree of access remained highly dependent on the ways in which the relationship between the host family and student developed and evolved over time (Isabelli-Garcia, 2006; Jackson, 2008). As discussed in Chapter ten, without a positive communicative relationship with host siblings or host parents, interaction with teenagers outside of school could be limited. In situations where relationships between host family and student were tenuous, the family could (and in some cases, did) restrict the students’ access to the cultural and linguistic capital necessary for adolescent language acquisition. For example, on a day-to-day level, host parents had the power to set rules and regulations concerning extra-curricular activities, including going to parties, going to friends’ places and joining organised sporting activities. Due to the high costs of living and less likelihood of host families with a spare bedroom for exchange students in the inner-city, most exchange students lived in rural or outer suburban areas and relied on their host parents for transport to and from activities with other teenagers. If the host family was not prepared to help arrange or provide transport, daily informal contact with same-age native-speakers could be restricted to half an hour at recess, one hour of lunch and perhaps ten to fifteen minutes while waiting for the bus after school. Some host families included same-age siblings, who, again, could act as gatekeepers to interaction with other teenagers or adolescent language use within the host family setting. While a students’ social network had to develop from the uniplex network of the host family to a muliplex network in order to approximate the second language faster (Isabelli-Garcia, 2006), the students’ ability to extend networks was hampered by factors beyond his or her control. The only recourse available to the student would be to communicate openly with the host family or request a change of family through the exchange
organisation. However, with a change of family, the exchange student risked returning to a uniplex level of social interaction (Isabelli-Garcia, 2006). Indeed, it was the risk of losing friends in multiplex social networks that prevented some students in this study from negotiating with their host families or initiating host family change (Chapter ten).

Even if students spent large amounts of time with adolescent native-speakers, it was not necessarily the case that higher frequency of contact with native speakers resulted in more native-like use of interpersonal markers (Hellermann & Vergun, 2007; Müller, 2005). This was due to large differences in not only the quantity but also the quality of interactions experienced by the exchange students. If the quality of input was poor, acquisition or use of interpersonal markers remained low. For example, the input may not have been representative of adolescent English, included high levels of foreigner talk, entailed speaking with individuals with whom the learner felt anxious or uncomfortable (Pellegrino Aveni, 2005) or represented a threat to their personal sense of status, security or self esteem (Dörnyei & Malderez, 1997; Ehrman, 1996). Such differences in the quality of interactions help explain high levels of variation in GES10, GES05 and AES compared to low variation in GS, whose contact with native-speakers was low in terms of both quality and quantity over the ten month period. This distinction between the quantity and quality of target language contact further indicated a need for increased focus on the complex nature of communicative interactions available to language learners (Segalowitz et al., 2004).

Access to high levels of quality interaction also depended on the abilities and willingness of the exchange students to seek out opportunities for adolescent contact. A large amount of personal investment was required to integrate into the imagined community of adolescent speakers and such investment could entail initiating conversations with a high threat to face, e.g. discussing issues with the host family and requesting favours of host family members and friends. As discussed in Chapter ten, motivation to invest in the community depended not only on individual characteristics, but the perceived necessity for the expression of self in language. For GES05 participants, the necessity of expression of their adolescent identities in English may have been less than that of GES10 due to the fact that the time they expected to stay in Australia was lower. For many GES05 students it was possible to simply postpone their identity and social needs for five months or less, whereas a perceived ability to do this over ten months was less likely in GES10. In other words,
length of endurance impacted on an exchange students’ evaluation of whether the benefits of speaking outweighed the potential harm (Pellegrino Aveni, 2005). For those participants who did not go on exchange (GS), low levels of interpersonal marker acquisition may also simply have been due to low levels of motivation to express adolescent identity in English. It was assumed all GS participants were fluent speakers of adolescent German and could simply postpone expression of adolescent identity when speaking English to the researcher or to their teachers at school. Despite the use of curricula focusing on intercultural and communicative competence, it was highly unlikely that use of those interpersonal markers most associated with adolescent identity were tested or even considered desirable in German English language classrooms. Indeed, after returning to Germany from Australia, one GES05 participant (LK) mentioned that she was marked down in her oral exams for persistent use of the interpersonal and discourse marker ‘like’.

Increased variation in interpersonal marker use by GES10 and GES05 may not only be indexical of social integration, but also the individuals’ abilities to express the multiplicity of their identities in English. As previously mentioned, any analysis of variation of those language items closely associated with the expression of self, must take the variability of the self into account. For second language speakers, different frequencies of one marker over another or one type of marker over another may not be indicative of language aptitude, motivation, learning strategies, integration or anxiety (Ellis, 2002; Norton, 2000; Pellegrino Aveni, 2005), but simply an expression of individual language choice. At any given time in any given context, an adolescent may wish to imply non-adolescent qualities in their speech. For example, one GES05 participant (RH) was particularly studious and did not seem to enjoy those activities we (as adult researchers) associate with adolescents. RH preferred to study maths and write short stories in her room rather than spend time with her adolescent friends. This studious and seemingly non-adolescent identity was reflected in her low use of those interpersonal markers most associated with adolescent language.

The results also showed that GES10 participants acquired most of their adolescent interpersonal markers in the first five months of the exchange. This may indicate that initially the exchange students were most concerned with learning to express a core self-conception of adolescence. Core self-conceptions are those aspects of self that are chronically active and lend stability to the self (Andersen, Reznik & Chen, 1997). In the second half of GES10’s exchange, there were no significant or
large changes in terms of typically adolescent interpersonal marker use, but variation increased. GES10 participants seemed to customise their use of interpersonal markers to fit a range of other more peripheral identities, e.g. sportspersons, German native speakers or academically successful pupils. These peripheral identities were less central self-conceptions. Such less central self-conceptions are not always chronically accessible and vary according to context and motivation (Andersen et al., 1997). The interplay between core and peripheral self-conceptions would also explain the existence of key adolescent markers but large degree of variation in AES participants’ use of interpersonal markers.

In sum, the results clearly indicated that study abroad provided a primary opportunity for language learners to acquire pragmatic knowledge (Barron, 2003; Matsumura, 2001; Miller & Ginsberg, 1995). Had the exchange students not gone abroad for an extended period, few, if any, markers of adolescent English would have been acquired. However, as is the case for most other aspects of second language acquisition, the exchange students in this study did “not magically become fluent speakers simply by being surrounded by the target language” (Isabelli-García, 2006, p. 231). Four primary factors influencing acquisition were the quality of native-speech contact, the decisions made by host families and other gatekeepers to the target language culture, students’ abilities to seek out quality language opportunities and the students’ individual identity needs. Contrary to the belief of many previous researchers, it was not simply the case that an individual had to be willing to make an effort (DeKeyser, 1991; Willis Allen, 2010) in order to become as proficient in adolescent interpersonal marker use as he/she desired.

11.3 Methodological findings

This study also included a number of important methodological analyses which may impact on future research. It is to a brief overview and discussion of these that we now turn.

11.3.1 Pragmatic marker coding systems

The coding system was a five-tiered hierarchical system that moved from the overarching category of pragmatic markers down to individual lexical items and phrases (Chapter five). In this study, pragmatic markers were divided into discourse and interpersonal markers. The subcategories of discourse markers were not explored fully, but included editing markers, quotatives, topic and coherence markers.
Interpersonal marker subcategories were fully defined as they were the focus of this study. They were subdivided into attitude and management markers. Attitude markers were further separated into approximation, intensification and knowledge markers. Management markers were again divided into involvement, turn-taking and reformulation22. Below these subsections, were individual lexical items and phrases. Any individual item could also have a politeness mitigating or boosting function.

The coding system gave added support to the large amount of research that divides pragmatic markers into those that focus on textual coherence (discourse) and those that focus on interpersonal relations (interpersonal). It also gave credence to Hasund’s (2002) understanding of politeness as a higher meta-level of discourse, although this would need to be developed further with conversational data that inherently involves a high threat to face.

Not only did this coding system bring together a range of different approaches and findings on pragmatic marker classification, but intercoder reliability tests were highly successful. The coding system and functional classification of pragmatic markers based on identification of the primary role of the marker in the context in which it appeared was a viable and fruitful approach to the analysis of pragmatic markers.

### 11.3.2 Interview and retelling data

Comparison of non-native speaker use of interpersonal markers in the semi-structured interviews versus structured retellings indicated that the two modes of data collection impacted on interpersonal marker use. This may have been due to fewer opportunities to interact in the retellings (e.g. less turn-negotiation) and the fact that the story being told was familiar to both interlocutors. Higher processing loads in the retellings as well as different interpretations of the two types of speech events may also have played a role.

Most importantly, these results questioned comparisons of studies based on retellings (e.g. Müller, 2005) with those based on less structured interaction (e.g. Aijmer, 2004). They also indicated that semi-structured or non-structured casual conversations are more appropriate than retellings if the focus of research is on the frequency, repertoire and acquisition of interpersonal markers.

22 Reformulation markers were barely used and were often difficult to distinguish from editing markers in the non-native speaker data so they were not included in this study.
As discussed in Section 11.3.4, it was, however, advantageous to include a structured task in data collection as it shifted attention and anxiety away from language performance and production in the semi-structured interviews. Even though the retelling data were not used, inclusion of them in data collection may well have increased the authenticity of language in the less structured recordings. Participants may have interpreted the semi-structured interviews as an informal opportunity to talk before the real task of retelling commenced. As such, inclusion of a placebo-like structured task is recommended for data collection, but not necessarily analysis.

11.3.3 Language contact profiles (LCP)

Having calculated a language contact score based on the language contact profiles (LCPs) developed by Segalowitz & Freed (2004), analysis of the reliability of exchange student responses was conducted. The analysis indicated that the LCPs were not suitable for assessing language contact in an immersion situation over a period of five or more months. The LCPs were also not able to take issues of quality of contact into account, which were found to impact on interpersonal marker acquisition.

This meant that hesitation should be employed in using LCPs in study abroad research. It did not, however, indicate that the LCP should not be used in other language contact situations for which it was also designed, e.g. academic classrooms and intensive domestic immersion (Freed et al., 2004).

11.3.4 Limitations of the study

In order to reduce the number of variables impacting on interpersonal marker use and acquisition, recruitment of participants and collection of data were tightly controlled in this research. While this may have increased internal and construct validity, it decreased the generalisability of results to other populations and situations. However, increased generalisability could be achieved by replication of the methodology and analysis with other non-native speaker populations (e.g. Japanese adolescent exchange students to Australia). Additionally, although this study focused on German students in Australia on a specific exchange programme, issues of language acquisition, identity and investment are undoubtedly of concern to second language speakers in a wide range of other contexts (Jackson, 2008).

GES10 and GES05 were pre-existing groups of individuals who volunteered to participate in the project. German adolescents opting to go on exchange may be
more motivated, self-confident and financially secure than those adolescents who choose not to apply for an overseas exchange. On the other hand, some less financially able students received scholarships and the motivation to go on exchange may not have been that of the student, but his/her family. This was most likely the case for at least one participant in this study, whose parents’ desire for him to go on exchange meant they had to re-mortgage the house. GS participants were also not necessarily representative of German adolescents who choose not to go on exchange, as they were chosen by the exchange students themselves and the matched pairs were often friends. Similarly, AES participants were close friends of GES10 participants and may have represented a particular type of adolescent who was interested in befriending individuals from Germany and had highly developed levels of intercultural competence (Pellegrino Aveni, 2005). However, the exchange situation was authentic as were the friendships developed between exchange students and Australian adolescent native-speakers. They were never initiated or moulded by the researcher.

In terms of the data itself, it is not certain that semi-structured interviews fully represented interpersonal marker use in non-structured authentic conversations. However, since all participants were recorded in the same conditions, this did not impact on the validity of the results themselves, but did impact on generalisability as well as comparability to other research and other contexts of interaction, e.g. use of interpersonal markers might have been different had the participants been speaking to another adolescent. Even though semi-structured interviews can elicit conversational language use (van Lier, 1989), in any comparison to other research, the context of the interaction must be taken into account.

Related to issues of the authenticity of semi-structured data collection are changes in the participants’ interpretation of the speech event with increased fluency. In the GES10, GES05 and GS zero month data as well as the GS ten month data, participants may have been more likely to interpret the recordings as a test or structured interview, in which the speakers adhered to clearly defined interactional roles and goals. However, with increased proficiency as well as familiarity with the interviewer, GES10 and GES05 participants may have re-interpreted the recording situation as a less hierarchical, non-threatening opportunity for conversation. As such, their language use was more conversational and included more of a focus on interpersonal relations in the five and ten month recordings than in the zero month
data. However, the researcher did not change her interpretation of the speech event and any changes in participants’ interpretations were most likely due to having been on exchange. Changes in levels of familiarity between GS and the researcher were the same as for GES10 and GES05 throughout the ten months of data collection, so could not explain low levels of change in GS compared to high degrees of change in GES10 and GES05. By including the retelling task as a distractor, many participants believed the true data was not the semi-structured interview, but the structured retelling task. As a result, many participants did not actually interpret the semi-structured interview as a task, but simply as a conversation before the real task of retelling was conducted.

The coding system was based on the data and previous research in pragmatic markers. All the same, interpretation of the primary role of interpersonal markers remained subjective and it was not possible to ratify researcher classifications of function with the participants themselves. High intercoder agreement was the only means of reducing the salience of this limitation.

11.3.5 Possibilities for further research

This study could be extended to include not only the interpersonal functions of pragmatic markers, but also their discourse marker functions. To do this the subcategories of discourse marking would need to be more clearly defined.

With more time and resources, the native-speaker data could be extended to include AES speakers matched to GES05 participants. The resulting increase in group size would allow investigation of regional variation in Australian adolescent native-speaker pragmatic marker use and reliable comparisons between GES05 and AES. Native-speaker data for the zero month and five month interview and retelling topics could also be collected, allowing in-depth native vs. non-native speaker comparisons of the zero and five month data. Increased technical and personnel resources would also mean that detailed transcriptions could be made, which might allow for more sophisticated analysis and calculation of frequency, e.g. inclusion of paralinguistic features, analysis of the impact of the researchers’ marker use (McNamara, 1997) and marker per intonation unit calculations (DuBois et al., 1992). The often disjointed nature of the non-native speaker data may, however, hamper any attempts to use intonation units or different bases for frequency calculations.

Finally, methods of ascertaining both the quantity and quality of language contact could be developed and extended to include language contact classroom
dynamics within the mainstream high school context (Churchill, 2006). A more systematic synchronic collection of information concerning the quality of native-speaker language contact is recommended for further research, e.g. e-journals as researched and suggested by Aguilar Stewart (2010). Interviews with host family members and friends as well as and observations of interactions within the home could be included.

Another issue deserving further attention is whether the same results would be found for non-native speakers of different linguistic and cultural backgrounds, e.g. adolescent French exchange students to Australia, adolescent Australian exchange students to Germany. Such research would not only extend our knowledge of the impact of first language and culture on integration and interpersonal marker acquisition, but provide essential information concerning the generalisability of results.

11.3.6 Contributions to the field

This study contributed new insight to the fields of second language acquisition in a study abroad context. Using both qualitative and quantitative methods, it added support to many (but certainly not all) previous findings. It provided much needed information concerning the mechanisms which facilitate or inhibit the acquisition of pragmatic competence in study abroad (Barron, 2003; Regan, 1998), shed light on assessing and measuring the amount of time spent using the target language (Freed, 1995a) and shifted the focus of pragmatics to development rather than simply use of interpersonal markers by non-native speakers of English (Kasper & Rose, 2002). This shift may help pave the way for developing second language classroom curricula that recognise the needs of high school students to express their adolescent subjectivity in a second language. By linking acquisition of interpersonal markers with social integration, this study indicated the importance of cohesion and group identification both within and outside of the language learning classroom (Dörnyei & Malderez, 1997). It also highlighted the fact that any analysis of motivation and agency in language acquisition must take not only the language learner into account (e.g. Willis Allen, 2010), but also the motivations, actions and beliefs of all those individuals with whom the learner interacts. The study also provided further evidence to our understanding of the inextricable link between interpersonal marker use and expression of adolescent identity, regardless of whether the speakers are conversing in
their first, second or even third language.

One major contribution of this study to the field of pragmatics was its coding system. For the fruitful continuation of pragmatic marker research, it is paramount that a clear definition of pragmatic markers and a stable system of functional classification be developed. Without such consensus, pragmatic marker research will continue to be hampered by the incomparability of research based on often highly divergent classification and coding systems. This study represents a step towards a coding system that can encompass a wide range of different marker types. It is hoped that it may be used as a launching pad for continued pragmatic marker research.

Finally, in terms of the implications for exchange programs, this study highlighted the importance of selection and matching of host families and exchange students’ beliefs, expectations and needs. However, even with the most rigorous selection and matching of families and students, relationships may fail, which will then impact on the students’ investment in the target language and culture. At best exchange organisations should make host families, exchange students and even target language adolescents aware of the complex nature of second language acquisition in a study abroad context (Jackson, 2008). Central to this is the inclusion of exchange students as well as a range of potential interactants in training sessions, on-going support (e.g. Jackson, 2008, 2010) or tasks (e.g. Aguilar Stewart, 2010; Knight & Schmidt-Rinehart, 2010) designed to raise awareness and enhance interaction between learners and native speakers. The actions of each individual can and do have a considerable impact on the success of any intercultural or language learning endeavour.

11.4 Conclusion

This study focused on the interpersonal marker acquisition of two groups of German exchange students to Australia. GES10 participants were on exchange to Australia for ten months and GES05 participants were in Australia for five months. It was found that German exchange students acquired a number of adolescent interpersonal markers during a five or ten month exchange to Australia. Acquisition mostly occurred in the first five months of the exchange and reflected the non-native speakers’ needs to express their adolescent identities in English.

However, after five and even ten months in the target language environment, non-native speakers did not reach native speaker levels of interpersonal marker use and there was higher variation after embarking on the exchange than before. It was
not possible to link differences between native-speakers and exchange student use to pragmatic proficiency, as they may simply have been due to differences in the individual identity needs of native and non-native speakers.

Both acquisition of adolescent interpersonal markers as well as variation in the two exchange student groups was much greater than that of non-native speakers who did not participate in an exchange. This clearly indicated the role of a student exchange in acquiring the ability to express adolescent identity through use of interpersonal markers in English. However, the exchange experience was not a recipe for immediate pragmalinguistic success and there were a number of variables impacting on interpersonal marker acquisition, including the quality of interaction and length of stay. Those students who were on a five month exchange showed lower levels of interpersonal marker use than those who were on a ten month exchange after five months of living in Australia. This was most likely due to differences in the exchange students’ and target language speakers’ investment and motivation in establishing successful interpersonal and intercultural relations.

While some groundwork still needs to take place in terms of pragmatic marker classification and the collection of language contact data, there is no doubt that the acquisition of pragmatic markers in a study abroad setting is a highly productive area for future research.
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## Teenage conversation topics

*Please fill in the table below by noting down the details of conversations you have over the next three days. An example is provided for help.*

Your initials: ___________  
Your age:  
Type of school: □ private  □ public  □ catholic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Age/gender/mother-tongue of person/people spoke to</th>
<th>Relationship of person/people spoke to</th>
<th>Topic(s) of your conversation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 12pm  | At school during break | 17/M/English 17/F/ English                        | Best friends                          | • Avril Lavigne concert last weekend  
• English homework |

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2-A: Language contact profile – zero month (GES10, GES05, GS)

Note: The Sprachkontaktprofile were distributed in German to ensure comprehensibility. They were translations with minor adaptations of Segalowitz & Freed’s (2004) Language contact profiles.

SPRACHKONTAKTPROFIL (PRE-TEST)

Gruppe 1

PROJEKT: „ERZÄHL MIR EINE GESCHICHTE“


Die Informationen, die Sie zur Verfügung stellen, werden uns helfen, das Umfeld der Schüler zu verstehen, die Englisch im Klassenzimmer oder als Austauschschüler lernen. Ihre aufrichtigen und detaillierten Antworten werden sehr geschätzt.

Vielen Dank für Ihre Mitarbeit.

Name: _____________________________

Teil 1: Hintergrund- Informationen

1. Geschlecht: _____ weiblich _____ männlich

2. Alter: _____

3. Geburtsort (Land): ____________________________________________

4. Was ist/sind Ihre Muttersprache(n)? ____________________________
5. Welche Sprache(n) sprechen Sie normalerweise zu Hause?
   Falls mehr als eine Sprache, mit wem sprechen Sie welche Sprache?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Welche Sprache?</th>
<th>Mit wem?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6a) In welchem Schuljahr sind Sie gerade oder welches haben Sie vor Kurzem beendet? ___
6b) Welchen Schultyp besuchen Sie?
   ______ staatliches Gymnasium
   ______ Gesamtschule
   ______ Sonstiges (z.B. Internat, Waldorfschule), bitte erläutern:
   ______________________________________________________________________

7. Gibt es bei Ihnen in der Schule Fächer, ausser dem Fach Englisch, die auf englisch unterrichtet werden (z.B. Biologie auf englisch)?
   _____ ja (➡ weiter mit dieser Frage)  _____ nein (➡ zur nächsten Frage)
   Falls ja, nennen Sie bitte die Fächer und geben Sie bitte die ungefähre Anzahl der Jahre an, in denen Sie an diesem Unterricht teilgenommen haben.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fach</th>
<th>Anzahl von Jahren</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Sind sie je zu einer Schule gegangen, in der die Unterrichtsprache grundsätzlich nicht deutsch gewesen ist?

   _____ ja (⇒ weiter mit dieser Frage)  _____ nein (⇒ zur nächsten Frage)

Falls ja, nennen Sie bitte die Sprachen und geben Sie bitte die ungefähre Anzahl der Jahre die sie diese Schule besucht haben.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sprache</th>
<th>Anzahl von Jahren</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Waren Sie jemals im englischsprachigen Ausland, zu dem Zweck, englisch zu lernen?

   _____ ja (⇒ weiter mit dieser Frage)  _____ nein (⇒ zur nächsten Frage)

Wenn ja, erläutern Sie bitte Ihre Erfahrungen in folgender Tabelle (Falls Sie mehr als vier dieser Erfahrungen gemacht haben, benutzen Sie bitte auch die Rückseite dieses Blattes).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wann?</th>
<th>Wo?</th>
<th>Wie lange im Ganzen?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. Ausser der Erfahrungen, die sie in Frage 9 geschildert haben, gibt es weitere Erfahrungen im fremdsprachigen Umfeld (e.g. zweiwöchiger Austausch in Frankreich)?
____ ja (→ weiter mit dieser Frage)       ____ nein (→ zur nächsten Frage)
Wenn ja, erläutern Sie bitte Ihre Erfahrungen in folgender Tabelle (Falls Sie mehr als drei dieser Erfahrungen gemacht haben, benutzen Sie bitte auch die Rückseite dieses Blattes.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Erfahrung</th>
<th>Erfahrung 2</th>
<th>Erfahrung 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sprache</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zweck</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Von wann</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bis wann?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. In folgender Tabelle, bewerten Sie bitte Ihre sprachlichen Fähigkeiten in allen Sprachen, die Sie sprechen. Bitte benutzen Sie die folgende Bewertungsskala:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sprache</th>
<th>Hören</th>
<th>Sprechen</th>
<th>Lesen</th>
<th>Schreiben</th>
<th>Wie viele Jahre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deutsch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Englisch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andere</td>
<td>__________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andere</td>
<td>__________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. In welchen Schulstufen wurden Sie auf englisch unterrichtet?

12a) Grundschule (1. bis 4. Klasse):
   ___ ja (⇒ weiter mit dieser Frage) ___ nein (⇒ zur nächsten Frage)
   Wenn ja, wie lange?
   ___ weniger als 1 Jahr ___ 1–2 Jahre ___ mehr als 2 Jahre

12b) Weiterführende Schule (5. bis 10. Klasse):
   ___ ja (⇒ weiter mit dieser Frage) ___ nein (⇒ zur nächsten Frage)
   Wenn ja, wie lange?
   ___ weniger als 1 Jahr ___ 1–2 Jahre ___ mehr als 2 Jahre

12c) Weiterführende Schule (11. bis 12./13. Klasse):
   ___ ja (⇒ weiter mit dieser Frage) ___ nein (⇒ zur nächsten Frage)
   Wenn ja, wie lange?
   ___ weniger als 1 Jahr ___ 1–2 Jahre ___ mehr als 2 Jahre

12d) Andere (bitte erläutern): ____________________________________________:
   ___ ja (⇒ weiter mit dieser Frage) ___ nein (⇒ zur nächsten Frage)
   Wenn ja, wie lange?
   ___ weniger als 1 Jahr ___ 1–2 Jahre ___ mehr als 2 Jahre

13. Welche Zensuren haben Sie in den letzten beiden Jahren im Fach Englisch bekommen?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schulklasse/Jahrgangsstufe</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Bitte nennen Sie alle Englischsprachkurse, die Sie außerhalb der Schule besucht haben (z.B. Sprachkurse, Nachhilfeunterricht).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kurs</th>
<th>Kurze Beschreibung</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15. Bitte erläutern Sie alle weiteren positiven und negativen Erfahrungen, die Ihre Fähigkeit, die englische Sprache zu lernen, beeinflusst haben könnten (z.B. Probleme zu Hause, Austauschstudent aus den USA in Ihrer Familie, usw.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jahr</th>
<th>Beschreibung der Erfahrung</th>
<th>Einfluss (+ oder -)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Warum haben Sie sich entschieden, an einem Austausch nach Australien teilzunehmen? Bitte ordnen Sie die Gründe nach Wichtigkeit (1 = Hauptgrund, 2 = zweitwichtigster Grund, usw.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grund</th>
<th>Beschreibung</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teil 2: Sprachkontakt

Die folgenden 12 Fragen beziehen sich auf Ihr Leben in Deutschland. Bevor Sie anfangen, die Fragen zu beantworten, denken Sie bitte über Ihr tagtägliches Leben nach, insbesondere wieviel englisch und/oder deutsch Sie verwenden.

ENGLISCH

Fragen 1 bis 6 betreffen den Gebrauch der englischen Sprache ausserhalb der Schule in Deutschland. Wenn Sie Fragen mit “ja” beantworten, geben Sie bitte auch an, wie oft Sie englisch mit den genannten Personen bzw. in den genannten Situationen verwenden. Wenn Sie mit “nein” antworten, gehen Sie bitte direkt zur nächsten Frage.

1. ENGLISCH SPRECHEN: Gesprächspartner

1a) Sprechen Sie englisch mit Ihren Lehrern in der Schule (z.B. auf dem Schulhof, in der Innenstadt) ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts?
   ja (⇒ weiter mit dieser Frage) nein (⇒ zur nächsten Frage)
   Wenn ja, wie oft?
   < monatlich monatlich wöchentlich täglich
   Jeweils wie lange?
   <10 Min 10 Min-1 Stunde 1-2 Stunden 2-4 Stunden 4+ Stunden

1b) Sprechen Sie englisch mit Freunden oder Mitschülern, die Englisch-Muttersprachler sind oder fliessend englisch sprechen ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts?
   ja (⇒ weiter mit dieser Frage) nein (⇒ zur nächsten Frage)
   Wenn ja, wie oft?
   < monatlich monatlich wöchentlich täglich
   Jeweils wie lange?
   <10 Min 10 Min-1 Stunde 1-2 Stunden 2-4 Stunden 4+ Stunden

1c) Sprechen Sie englisch in ihrer Familie?
   ja (⇒ weiter mit dieser Frage) nein (⇒ zur nächsten Frage)
   Wenn ja, wie oft?
   < monatlich monatlich wöchentlich täglich
   Jeweils wie lange?
   <10 Min 10 Min-1 Stunde 1-2 Stunden 2-4 Stunden 4+ Stunden

1d) Sprechen Sie englisch mit Fremden ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts (z.B. mit englischen Touristen in Deutschland)?
### 1e) Sprechen Sie englisch mit Servicepersonal (z.B. im englischen Produktdaten, in der australischen Botschaft)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ja (➡ weiter mit dieser Frage)</th>
<th>nein (➡ zur nächsten Frage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wenn ja, wie oft?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; monatlich</td>
<td>monatlich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wöchentlich</td>
<td>tägliche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeweils wie lange?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 10 Min</td>
<td>10 Min - 1 Stunde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 2 Stunden</td>
<td>2 - 4 Stunden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4+ Stunden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1f) Sprechen Sie englisch mit weiteren Personen außerhalb des Schulunterrichts?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ja (➡ weiter mit dieser Frage)</th>
<th>nein (➡ zur nächsten Frage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wenn ja, wie oft?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; monatlich</td>
<td>monatlich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wöchentlich</td>
<td>tägliche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeweils wie lange?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 10 Min</td>
<td>10 Min - 1 Stunde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 2 Stunden</td>
<td>2 - 4 Stunden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4+ Stunden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2. ENGLISCH SPRECHEN: Gesprächssituationen

#### 2a) Benutzen Sie englisch, um Fragen zur englischen Sprache (z.B. Grammatik, Vokabeln, Redewendungen auf English) mit Englisch-Muttersprachlern außerhalb des Schulunterrichts zu diskutieren?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ja (➡ weiter mit dieser Frage)</th>
<th>nein (➡ zur nächsten Frage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wenn ja, wie oft?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; monatlich</td>
<td>monatlich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wöchentlich</td>
<td>tägliche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeweils wie lange?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 10 Min</td>
<td>10 Min - 1 Stunde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 2 Stunden</td>
<td>2 - 4 Stunden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4+ Stunden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2b) Benutzen Sie englisch für „Smalltalk“ (z.B. „Hi, how are you?“, „Please pass the salt.“) mit Familienmitgliedern oder Freunden außerhalb des Schulunterrichts?
ja  (➔ weiter mit dieser Frage)  nein  (➔ zur nächsten Frage)
Wenn ja, wie oft?
< monatlich  monatlich  wöchentlich  täglich
Jeweils wie lange?
<10 Min  10 Min-1 Stunde  1-2 Stunden  2-4 Stunden  4+ Stunden

2c) Führen Sie ausführliche Gespräche / Diskussionen auf englisch **ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts**?
ja  (➔ weiter mit dieser Frage)  nein  (➔ zur nächsten Frage)
Wenn ja, wie oft?
< monatlich  monatlich  wöchentlich  täglich
Jeweils wie lange?
<10 Min  10 Min-1 Stunde  1-2 Stunden  2-4 Stunden  4+ Stunden

2d) Sprechen Sie englisch, um Wegbeschreibungen oder sonstige Informationen **ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts**, zu bekommen bzw. zu geben (z.B. einem englischen Touristen den Weg zum Bahnhof zu beschreiben)?
ja  (➔ weiter mit dieser Frage)  nein  (➔ zur nächsten Frage)
Wenn ja, wie oft?
< monatlich  monatlich  wöchentlich  täglich
Jeweils wie lange?
<10 Min  10 Min-1 Stunde  1-2 Stunden  2-4 Stunden  4+ Stunden

2e) Führen Sie Telefongespräche auf englisch **ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts**?
ja  (➔ weiter mit dieser Frage)  nein  (➔ zur nächsten Frage)
Wenn ja, wie oft?
< monatlich  monatlich  wöchentlich  täglich
Jeweils wie lange?
<10 Min  10 Min-1 Stunde  1-2 Stunden  2-4 Stunden  4+ Stunden
3. ENGLISCH LESEN

3a) Lesen Sie englischsprachige Zeitungen ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts?
   ja (➔ weiter mit dieser Frage)  nein  (➔ zur nächsten Frage)
   Wenn ja, wie oft?
   < monatlich  monatlich  wöchentlich  täglich
   Jeweils wie lange?
   <10 Min  10 Min-1 Stunde  1-2 Stunden  2-4 Stunden  4+ Stunden

3b) Lesen Sie Romane auf englisch ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts?
   ja (➔ weiter mit dieser Frage)  nein  (➔ zur nächsten Frage)
   Wenn ja, wie oft?
   < monatlich  monatlich  wöchentlich  täglich
   Jeweils wie lange?
   <10 Min  10 Min-1 Stunde  1-2 Stunden  2-4 Stunden  4+ Stunden

3c) Lesen Sie englischsprachige Zeitschriften ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts?
   ja (➔ weiter mit dieser Frage)  nein  (➔ zur nächsten Frage)
   Wenn ja, wie oft?
   < monatlich  monatlich  wöchentlich  täglich
   Jeweils wie lange?
   <10 Min  10 Min-1 Stunde  1-2 Stunden  2-4 Stunden  4+ Stunden

3d) Lesen Sie Webseiten auf englisch ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts?
   ja (➔ weiter mit dieser Frage)  nein  (➔ zur nächsten Frage)
   Wenn ja, wie oft?
   < monatlich  monatlich  wöchentlich  täglich
   Jeweils wie lange?
   <10 Min  10 Min-1 Stunde  1-2 Stunden  2-4 Stunden  4+ Stunden

3e) Lesen Sie Briefe oder E-mails auf englisch ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts?
   ja (➔ weiter mit dieser Frage)  nein  (➔ zur nächsten Frage)
   Wenn ja, wie oft?
   < monatlich  monatlich  wöchentlich  täglich
   Jeweils wie lange?
   <10 Min  10 Min-1 Stunde  1-2 Stunden  2-4 Stunden  4+ Stunden
4. ENGLISCH SCHREIBEN

4a) Kommunizieren sie über das Internet auf englisch (z.B. in Chatrooms, via E-mail oder Messenger) ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts?

ja (⇒ weiter mit dieser Frage) nein (⇒ zur nächsten Frage)

Wenn ja, wie oft?
< monatlich monatlich wöchentlich täglich

Jeweils wie lange?
<10 Min 10 Min-1 Stunde 1-2 Stunden 2-4 Stunden 4+ Stunden

4b) Schreiben Sie ein Tagebuch auf englisch?

ja (⇒ weiter mit dieser Frage) nein (⇒ zur nächsten Frage)

Wenn ja, wie oft?
< monatlich monatlich wöchentlich täglich

Jeweils wie lange?
<10 Min 10 Min-1 Stunde 1-2 Stunden 2-4 Stunden 4+ Stunden

4c) Schreiben Sie Briefe auf englisch ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts?

ja (⇒ weiter mit dieser Frage) nein (⇒ zur nächsten Frage)

Wenn ja, wie oft?
< monatlich monatlich wöchentlich täglich

Jeweils wie lange?
<10 Min 10 Min-1 Stunde 1-2 Stunden 2-4 Stunden 4+ Stunden

5. ENGLISCH HÖREN

5a) Schauen Sie englischsprachige Programme im Fernsehen ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts an?

ja (⇒ weiter mit dieser Frage) nein (⇒ zur nächsten Frage)

Wenn ja, wie oft?
< monatlich monatlich wöchentlich täglich

Jeweils wie lange?
<10 Min 10 Min-1 Stunde 1-2 Stunden 2-4 Stunden 4+ Stunden
5b) Hören Sie sich englischsprachige Radiosendungen (ausser Musik) **ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts** an?

Ja (➡ weiter mit dieser Frage) nein (➡ zur nächsten Frage)

Wenn ja, wie oft?

- < monatlich  
- monatlich  
- wöchentlich  
- täglich

Jeweils wie lange?

- <10 Min  
- 10 Min-1 Stunde  
- 1-2 Stunden  
- 2-4 Stunden  
- 4+ Stunden

5c) Wenn Sie englischsprachige Musik hören **ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts**, versuchen Sie aktiv die Texte zu verstehen?

Ja (➡ weiter mit dieser Frage) nein (➡ zur nächsten Frage)

Wenn ja, wie oft?

- < monatlich  
- monatlich  
- wöchentlich  
- täglich

Jeweils wie lange?

- <10 Min  
- 10 Min-1 Stunde  
- 1-2 Stunden  
- 2-4 Stunden  
- 4+ Stunden

5d) Schauen Sie sich englische Filme, DVDs oder Videos **ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts** an?

Ja (➡ weiter mit dieser Frage) nein (➡ zur nächsten Frage)

Wenn ja, wie oft?

- < monatlich  
- monatlich  
- wöchentlich  
- täglich

Jeweils wie lange?

- <10 Min  
- 10 Min-1 Stunde  
- 1-2 Stunden  
- 2-4 Stunden  
- 4+ Stunden

5e) Versuchen Sie Unterhaltungen anderer Leute, die gerade englisch sprechen, **ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts** zu verstehen?

Ja (➡ weiter mit dieser Frage) nein (➡ zur nächsten Frage)

Wenn ja, wie oft?

- < monatlich  
- monatlich  
- wöchentlich  
- täglich

Jeweils wie lange?

- <10 Min  
- 10 Min-1 Stunde  
- 1-2 Stunden  
- 2-4 Stunden  
- 4+ Stunden
6. **ANDERE AKTIVITÄTEN AUF ENGLISCH**

Bitte benennen Sie alle zusätzlichen Aktivitäten, die Sie auf englisch **außerhalb des Schulunterrichts** unternehmen. Geben Sie bitte auch an, wie oft Sie diese Aktivitäten betreiben.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aktivität</th>
<th>Wie oft und wie lange?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wie oft?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; monatlich</td>
<td>monatlich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wie lange?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 10 Min</td>
<td>10 Min-1 Stunde</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DEUTSCH**

Fragen 7 bis 12 betreffen den Gebrauch der deutschen Sprache **außerhalb des Schulunterrichts** in Deutschland. Wenn Sie Fragen mit “ja” beantworten, geben Sie bitte auch an, wie oft Sie deutsch mit den genannten Personen bzw. in den genannten Situationen verwenden. Wenn Sie mit “nein” antworten, gehen Sie bitte direkt zur nächsten Frage.

7. **DEUTSCH SPRECHEN: Gesprächspartner**

7a) Kennen Sie Englisch-Muttersprachler oder deutschsprachige Mitschüler, die fliessend Englisch sprechen?

ja (⇒ weiter mit dieser Frage)  nein  (⇒ zur nächsten Frage)

Wenn ja, sprechen Sie deutsch mit diesen Freunden oder Mitschülern **außerhalb des Schulunterrichts**?

ja (⇒ weiter mit dieser Frage)  nein  (⇒ zur nächsten Frage)

Wenn ja, wie oft?

< monatlich  | monatlich  | wöchentlich | täglich |

Jeweils wie lange?

<10 Min  | 10 Min-1 Stunde | 1-2 Stunden | 2-4 Stunden | 4+ Stunden
7b) Sprechen Sie deutsch in Ihrer Familie?
ja (➤ weiter mit dieser Frage) nein (➤ zur nächsten Frage)
Wenn ja, wie oft?
< monatlich monatlich wöchentlich täglich
Jeweils wie lange?
<10 Min 10 Min-1 Stunde 1-2 Stunden 2-4 Stunden 4+ Stunden

8. DEUTSCH SPRECHEN: Gesprächssituationen
8a) Benutzen Sie deutsch, um Fragen zur englischen Sprache (z.B. Grammatik, Vokabeln, Redewendungen auf English) mit Englisch-Muttersprachlern, die deutsch fließend sprechen, ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts zu diskutieren?
ja (➤ weiter mit dieser Frage) nein (➤ zur nächsten Frage)
Wenn ja, wie oft?
< monatlich monatlich wöchentlich täglich
Jeweils wie lange?
<10 Min 10 Min-1 Stunde 1-2 Stunden 2-4 Stunden 4+ Stunden

9. DEUTSCH LESEN
9a) Lesen Sie deutschsprachige Zeitungen ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts?
ja (➤ weiter mit dieser Frage) nein (➤ zur nächsten Frage)
Wenn ja, wie oft?
< monatlich monatlich wöchentlich täglich
Jeweils wie lange?
<10 Min 10 Min-1 Stunde 1-2 Stunden 2-4 Stunden 4+ Stunden

9b) Lesen Sie Romane auf deutsch ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts?
ja (➤ weiter mit dieser Frage) nein (➤ zur nächsten Frage)
Wenn ja, wie oft?
< monatlich monatlich wöchentlich täglich
Jeweils wie lange?
<10 Min 10 Min-1 Stunde 1-2 Stunden 2-4 Stunden 4+ Stunden
9c) Lesen Sie deutschsprachige Zeitschriften **außerhalb des Schulunterrichts**?

ja (⇒ weiter mit dieser Frage)  nein (⇒ zur nächsten Frage)

Wenn ja, wie oft?
< monatlich  monatlich  wöchentlich  täglich

Jeweils wie lange?
<10 Min  10 Min-1 Stunde  1-2 Stunden  2-4 Stunden  4+ Stunden

9d) Lesen Sie Webseiten auf deutsch **außerhalb des Schulunterrichts**?

ja (⇒ weiter mit dieser Frage)  nein (⇒ zur nächsten Frage)

Wenn ja, wie oft?
< monatlich  monatlich  wöchentlich  täglich

Jeweils wie lange?
<10 Min  10 Min-1 Stunde  1-2 Stunden  2-4 Stunden  4+ Stunden

9e) Lesen Sie Briefe oder E-mails auf deutsch **außerhalb des Schulunterrichts**?

ja (⇒ weiter mit dieser Frage)  nein (⇒ zur nächsten Frage)

Wenn ja, wie oft?
< monatlich  monatlich  wöchentlich  täglich

Jeweils wie lange?
<10 Min  10 Min-1 Stunde  1-2 Stunden  2-4 Stunden  4+ Stunden

10. DEUTSCH SCHREIBEN

10a) Kommunizieren Sie über das Internet auf deutsch (z.B. in Chatrooms, via E-mail oder Messenger) **außerhalb des Schulunterrichts**?

ja (⇒ weiter mit dieser Frage)  nein (⇒ zur nächsten Frage)

Wenn ja, wie oft?
< monatlich  monatlich  wöchentlich  täglich

Jeweils wie lange?
<10 Min  10 Min-1 Stunde  1-2 Stunden  2-4 Stunden  4+ Stunden

10b) Schreiben Sie ein Tagebuch auf deutsch?

ja (⇒ weiter mit dieser Frage)  nein (⇒ zur nächsten Frage)

Wenn ja, wie oft?
< monatlich  monatlich  wöchentlich  täglich

Jeweils wie lange?
<10 Min  10 Min-1 Stunde  1-2 Stunden  2-4 Stunden  4+ Stunden
10c) Schreiben Sie Briefe auf deutsch ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts?
ja (➡ weiter mit dieser Frage) nein (➡ zur nächsten Frage)
Wenn ja, wie oft?
< monatlich monatlich wöchentlich täglich
Jeweils wie lange?
<10 Min 10 Min-1 Stunde 1-2 Stunden 2-4 Stunden 4+ Stunden

11. DEUTSCH HÖREN

11a) Schauen Sie sich deutschsprachige Programme im Fernsehen ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts an?
ja (➡ weiter mit dieser Frage) nein (➡ zur nächsten Frage)
Wenn ja, wie oft?
< monatlich monatlich wöchentlich täglich
Jeweils wie lange?
<10 Min 10 Min-1 Stunde 1-2 Stunden 2-4 Stunden 4+ Stunden

11b) Hören Sie sich deutschsprachige Radiosendungen (ausser Musik) ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts an?
ja (➡ weiter mit dieser Frage) nein (➡ zur nächsten Frage)
Wenn ja, wie oft?
< monatlich monatlich wöchentlich täglich
Jeweils wie lange?
<10 Min 10 Min-1 Stunde 1-2 Stunden 2-4 Stunden 4+ Stunden

11c) Schauen Sie sich deutschsprachige Filme, DVDs oder Videos ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts an?
ja (➡ weiter mit dieser Frage) nein (➡ zur nächsten Frage)
Wenn ja, wie oft?
< monatlich monatlich wöchentlich täglich
Jeweils wie lange?
<10 Min 10 Min-1 Stunde 1-2 Stunden 2-4 Stunden 4+ Stunden
Appendix 2-B: Language contact profile – five and ten months (GES10, GES05)

SPRACHKONTAKT PROFIL (MID & POST-TEST)

Gruppe 1

PROJEKT: „ERZÄHL MIR EINE GESCHICHTE“


Vielen Dank für Ihre Mitarbeit.

Name: __________________________________________

Teil 1: Hintergrund Informationen

1. Bitte beschreiben Sie die Personen, mit denen Sie in ihrem australischen Haushalt wohnen. Falls Sie in mehr als einer Gastfamilie in den letzten 6 Monaten gewohnt haben, bitte eine Tabelle pro Familie ausfüllen und die Zeit in der Sie mit der verschiedenen Familien gewohnt haben benennen.

Gastfamilie 1: von ______________________ bis ______________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personen im Haushalt (z.B. Mutter, Sohn, Au-pair, andere Austauschschüler)</th>
<th>Alter</th>
<th>Muttersprache</th>
<th>Deutschkenntnisse (bitte einkreisen)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(F = fliessend, SG = sehr gut, G = gut, S = schwach, K = keine)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gastfamilie 2: von ______________________ bis ______________________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personen im Haushalt (z.B. Mutter, Sohn, Au-pair, andere Austauschschüler)</td>
<td>Alter</td>
<td>Muttersprache</td>
<td>Deutschkenntnisse (bitte einkreisen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(F = fliessend, SG = sehr gut, G = gut, S = schwach, K = keine)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gastfamilie 3: von ______________________ bis ______________________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personen im Haushalt (z.B. Mutter, Sohn, Au-pair, andere Austauschschüler)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2a) Wie heisst ihre australische Schule? _________________________________

2b) In welchem Schuljahr sind Sie gerade in der australischen Schule? ________________

2c) Welchen Schultyp besuchen Sie in Australien?
   _____ Staatliche Schule
   _____ Katholische Schule
   _____ Steinerschule
   _____ andere Privatschule
2d) An welchen Fächer nehmen Sie in der Schule teil?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fach</th>
<th>Seit ....</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Sind weitere deutsche Austauschschüler in Ihrer Schulklasse?
   ____ ja (➔ weiter mit dieser Frage)  ____ nein (➔ zur nächsten Frage)
   Wenn ja, wie viele? ____________________________

   ____ ja (➔ weiter mit dieser Frage)  ____ nein (➔ zur nächsten Frage)
   Wenn ja, bitte erläutern:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kursname</th>
<th>Kursinhalt</th>
<th>Gesamtanzahl der Unterrichtsstunden</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Bitte erläutern Sie alle weiteren positiven und negativen Erfahrungen während der vergangenen 6 Monate, die Ihre Fähigkeit die englische Sprache zu lernen, beeinflusst haben könnten (z.B. Probleme mit der Gastfamilie, andere deutsche Austauschschüler in der Familie, usw.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kurze Beschreibung der Erfahrung</th>
<th>Einfluss (+ oder -)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Was sind bisher die wichtigsten Sachen, die Sie während des Austausches gelernt haben (und die Sie ohne Austausch nicht gelernt hätten)? Bitte ordnen Sie nach Wichtigkeit (1 = wichtigste Sache, 2 = zweitwichtigste Sache, usw.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beschreibung</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teil 2: Sprachkontakt
Die folgenden 12 Fragen beziehen sich auf die vergangenen fünf Monate ihres Aufenthalts in Australien. Bevor Sie anfangen, die Fragen zu beantworten, bitte denken Sie über die vergangenen fünf Monate ihres Lebens nach, insbesondere wie viel englisch und/oder deutsch sie verwendet haben.

ENGLISCH
Fragen 1 bis 6 betreffen den Gebrauch der englischen Sprache während des Aufenthalts in Australien. Wenn Sie Fragen mit “ja” beantworten, nennen Sie bitte auch wie oft Sie englisch mit den genannten Personen bzw. in den genannten Situationen verwenden. Wenn Sie mit “nein” beantworten, gehen Sie bitte direkt zur nächsten Frage.

1. ENGLISCH SPRECHEN: Gesprächspartner
1a) Sprechen Sie englisch mit Ihren Lehrern in der Schule ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts (z.B. auf dem Schulhof, in der Innenstadt)?
   ja (➡ weiter mit dieser Frage) nein (➡ zur nächsten Frage)
   Wenn ja, wie oft?
   < monatlich monatlich wöchentlich täglich
   Jeweils wie lange?
   <10 Min 10 Min-1 Stunde 1-2 Stunden 2-4 Stunden 4+ Stunden

1b) Sprechen Sie englisch mit Freunden oder Mitschülern, die Englisch-Muttersprachler sind oder fliessend englisch sprechen ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts (z.B. in der Mittagspause, am Wochenende)?
   ja (➡ weiter mit dieser Frage) nein (➡ zur nächsten Frage)
   Wenn ja, wie oft?
   < monatlich monatlich wöchentlich täglich
   Jeweils wie lange?
   <10 Min 10 Min-1 Stunde 1-2 Stunden 2-4 Stunden 4+ Stunden

1c) Sprechen Sie englisch in ihrer australischen Gastfamilie?
   ja (➡ weiter mit dieser Frage) nein (➡ zur nächsten Frage)
   Wenn ja, wie oft?
   < monatlich monatlich wöchentlich täglich
   Jeweils wie lange?
   <10 Min 10 Min-1 Stunde 1-2 Stunden 2-4 Stunden 4+ Stunden
1d) Sprechen Sie englisch mit Fremden ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts (z.B. mit Mitfahrern in der Straßenbahn)?

ja (⇒ weiter mit dieser Frage) nein (⇒ zur nächsten Frage)

Wenn ja, wie oft?

< monatlich monatlich wöchentlich täglich

Jeweils wie lange?

<10 Min 10 Min-1 Stunde 1-2 Stunden 2-4 Stunden 4+ Stunden

1e) Sprechen Sie englisch mit Servicepersonal (z.B. mit dem Busfahrer/der Kassiererin)?

ja (⇒ weiter mit dieser Frage) nein (⇒ zur nächsten Frage)

Wenn ja, wie oft?

< monatlich monatlich wöchentlich täglich

Jeweils wie lange?

<10 Min 10 Min-1 Stunde 1-2 Stunden 2-4 Stunden 4+ Stunden

1f) Sprechen Sie englisch mit weiteren Personen ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts?

ja (⇒ weiter mit dieser Frage) nein (⇒ zur nächsten Frage)

Wenn ja, bennennen Sie bitte die Personen:

_______________________________________________________________________

________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________________

Wie oft insgesamt?

< monatlich monatlich wöchentlich täglich

Jeweils wie lange insgesamt?

<10 Min 10 Min-1 Stunde 1-2 Stunden 2-4 Stunden 4+ Stunden

2. ENGLISCH SPRECHEN: Gesprächssituationen

2a) Benutzen Sie englisch, um Fragen zur englischen Sprache (z.B. Grammatik, Vokabeln, Redewendungen auf English) mit Englisch-Muttersprachlern ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts zu diskutieren?

ja (⇒ weiter mit dieser Frage) nein (⇒ zur nächsten Frage)

Wenn ja, wie oft?

< monatlich monatlich wöchentlich täglich

Jeweils wie lange?

<10 Min 10 Min-1 Stunde 1-2 Stunden 2-4 Stunden 4+ Stunden

2b) Benutzen Sie englisch für „Smalltalk“ (z.B. „Hi, how are you?“, „Please pass the salt.”)
mit Gastfamilienmitgliedern oder Freunden **ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts**?
ja  (➔ weiter mit dieser Frage)  nein  (➔ zur nächsten Frage)
Wenn ja, wie oft?
< monatlich  monatlich  wöchentlich  täglich
Jeweils wie lange?
<10 Min  10 Min-1 Stunde  1-2 Stunden  2-4 Stunden  4+ Stunden

2c) Führen Sie ausführliche Gespräche / Diskussionen in englisch **ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts**?
ja  (➔ weiter mit dieser Frage)  nein  (➔ zur nächsten Frage)
Wenn ja, wie oft?
< monatlich  monatlich  wöchentlich  täglich
Jeweils wie lange?
<10 Min  10 Min-1 Stunde  1-2 Stunden  2-4 Stunden  4+ Stunden

2d) Sprechen Sie englisch, um Wegbeschreibungen oder sonstige Informationen zu bekommen (e.g. „Where is the post office?“, „What’s the time?”)?
ja  (➔ weiter mit dieser Frage)  nein  (➔ zur nächsten Frage)
Wenn ja, wie oft?
< monatlich  monatlich  wöchentlich  täglich
Jeweils wie lange?
<10 Min  10 Min-1 Stunde  1-2 Stunden  2-4 Stunden  4+ Stunden

2e) Führen Sie Telefongespräche auf englisch **ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts**?
ja  (➔ weiter mit dieser Frage)  nein  (➔ zur nächsten Frage)
Wenn ja, wie oft?
< monatlich  monatlich  wöchentlich  täglich
Jeweils wie lange?
<10 Min  10 Min-1 Stunde  1-2 Stunden  2-4 Stunden  4+ Stunden
3. ENGLISCH LESEN

3a) Lesen Sie englischsprachige Zeitungen ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts?
   ja (➔ weiter mit dieser Frage)                nein (➔ zur nächsten Frage)
   Wenn ja, wie oft?
     < monatlich       monatlich       wöchentlich       täglich
   Jeweils wie lange?
     <10 Min  10 Min-1 Stunde  1-2 Stunden  2-4 Stunden  4+ Stunden

3b) Lesen Sie Romane auf englisch ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts?
   ja (➔ weiter mit dieser Frage)                nein (➔ zur nächsten Frage)
   Wenn ja, wie oft?
     < monatlich       monatlich       wöchentlich       täglich
   Jeweils wie lange?
     <10 Min  10 Min-1 Stunde  1-2 Stunden  2-4 Stunden  4+ Stunden

3c) Lesen Sie englischsprachige Zeitschriften ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts?
   ja (➔ weiter mit dieser Frage)                nein (➔ zur nächsten Frage)
   Wenn ja, wie oft?
     < monatlich       monatlich       wöchentlich       täglich
   Jeweils wie lange?
     <10 Min  10 Min-1 Stunde  1-2 Stunden  2-4 Stunden  4+ Stunden

3d) Lesen Sie Webseiten auf englisch ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts?
   ja (➔ weiter mit dieser Frage)                nein (➔ zur nächsten Frage)
   Wenn ja, wie oft?
     < monatlich       monatlich       wöchentlich       täglich
   Jeweils wie lange?
     <10 Min  10 Min-1 Stunde  1-2 Stunden  2-4 Stunden  4+ Stunden

3e) Lesen Sie Briefe oder E-mails auf englisch ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts?
   ja (➔ weiter mit dieser Frage)                nein (➔ zur nächsten Frage)
   Wenn ja, wie oft?
     < monatlich       monatlich       wöchentlich       täglich
   Jeweils wie lange?
     <10 Min  10 Min-1 Stunde  1-2 Stunden  2-4 Stunden  4+ Stunden
4. ENGLISCH SCHREIBEN

4a) Kommunizieren sie über das Internet auf englisch (z.B. in Chatrooms, via E-mail oder Messenger) ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts?

ja (➔ weiter mit dieser Frage)     nein (➔ zur nächsten Frage)
Wenn ja, wie oft?
< monatlich    monatlich    wöchentlich    täglich
Jeweils wie lange?
<10 Min    10 Min-1 Stunde    1-2 Stunden    2-4 Stunden    4+ Stunden

4b) Schreiben Sie ein Tagebuch auf englisch?

ja (➔ weiter mit dieser Frage)     nein (➔ zur nächsten Frage)
Wenn ja, wie oft?
< monatlich    monatlich    wöchentlich    täglich
Jeweils wie lange?
<10 Min    10 Min-1 Stunde    1-2 Stunden    2-4 Stunden    4+ Stunden

4c) Schreiben Sie Briefe auf englisch ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts?

ja (➔ weiter mit dieser Frage)     nein (➔ zur nächsten Frage)
Wenn ja, wie oft?
< monatlich    monatlich    wöchentlich    täglich
Jeweils wie lange?
<10 Min    10 Min-1 Stunde    1-2 Stunden    2-4 Stunden    4+ Stunden

5. ENGLISCH HÖREN

5a) Schauen Sie englische Programme im Fernsehen ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts an?

ja (➔ weiter mit dieser Frage)     nein (➔ zur nächsten Frage)
Wenn ja, wie oft?
< monatlich    monatlich    wöchentlich    täglich
Jeweils wie lange?
<10 Min    10 Min-1 Stunde    1-2 Stunden    2-4 Stunden    4+ Stunden
5b) Hören Sie sich englischsprachige Radiosendungen (ausser Musik) **ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts** an?

   ja (->{weiter mit dieser Frage})     nein (->{zur nächsten Frage})

   Wenn ja, wie oft?

   < monatlich   monatlich   wöchentlich   täglich

   Jeweils wie lange?

   <10 Min  10 Min-1 Stunde  1-2 Stunden  2-4 Stunden  4+ Stunden

5c) Wenn Sie englischsprachige Musik **ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts** hören, versuchen Sie aktiv die Texte zu verstehen?

   ja (->{weiter mit dieser Frage})      nein (->{zur nächsten Frage})

   Wenn ja, wie oft?

   < monatlich   monatlich   wöchentlich   täglich

   Jeweils wie lange?

   <10 Min  10 Min-1 Stunde  1-2 Stunden  2-4 Stunden  4+ Stunden

5d) Schauen Sie sich englischsprachige Filme, DVDs oder Videos **ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts** an?

   ja (->{weiter mit dieser Frage})   nein (->{zur nächsten Frage})

   Wenn ja, wie oft?

   < monatlich   monatlich   wöchentlich   täglich

   Jeweils wie lange?

   <10 Min  10 Min-1 Stunde  1-2 Stunden  2-4 Stunden  4+ Stunden

5e) Versuchen Sie Unterhaltungen anderer Leute, die gerade englisch sprechen, **ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts** zu verstehen?

   ja (->{weiter mit dieser Frage})   nein (->{zur nächsten Frage})

   Wenn ja, wie oft?

   < monatlich   monatlich   wöchentlich   täglich

   Jeweils wie lange?

   <10 Min  10 Min-1 Stunde  1-2 Stunden  2-4 Stunden  4+ Stunden
### 6. ANDERE AKTIVITÄTEN AUF ENGLISCH

Bitte benennen Sie alle zusätzlichen Aktivitäten, die Sie *außerhalb des Schulunterrichts* auf englisch unternehmen. Benennen Sie bitte auch wie oft Sie diese Aktivitäten unternehmen.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aktivität</th>
<th>Wie oft und wie lange?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wie oft?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; monatlich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>monatlich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>wöchentlich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>täglich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wie lange?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; 10 Min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 Min-1 Stunde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-2 Stunden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-4 Stunden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4+ Stunden</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DEUTSCH

Fragen 7 bis 12 betreffen den *Gebrauch der deutschen Sprache während des Aufenthalts in Australien*. Wenn Sie Fragen mit “ja” beantworten, nennen Sie bitte auch wie oft Sie deutsch mit den genannten Personen bzw. in den genannten Situationen verwenden. Wenn Sie mit “nein” beantworten, gehen Sie bitte direkt zur nächsten Frage.

#### 7. DEUTSCH SPRECHEN: Gesprächspartner

7a) Sprechen Sie deutsch mit Ihren Lehrern *außerhalb des Schulunterrichts* (z.B. auf dem Schulhof, in der Innenstadt)?

- ja ([➡️ weiter mit dieser Frage])
- nein ([➡️ zur nächsten Frage])

Wenn ja, wie oft?

< monatlich  monatlich  wöchentlich  täglich

Jeweils wie lange?

<10 Min  10 Min-1 Stunde  1-2 Stunden  2-4 Stunden  4+ Stunden
7b) Kennen Sie Freunden oder Mitschülern die Englisch-Muttersprachler sind und fliessend deutsch sprechen (z.B. Australier, der Austauschschüler in Deutschland gewesen ist)?
ja (⇒ weiter mit dieser Frage)  nein (⇒ zur nächsten Frage)
Wenn ja, sprechen Sie deutsch mit diesen Freunden oder Mitschülern **ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts**?
ja (⇒ weiter mit dieser Frage)  nein (⇒ zur nächsten Frage)
Wenn ja, wie oft?
< monatlich  monatlich  wöchentlich  täglich
Jeweils wie lange?
<10 Min  10 Min-1 Stunde  1-2 Stunden  2-4 Stunden  4+ Stunden

7c) Sprechen Sie deutsch mit anderen Austauschschülern die Deutsch-Muttersprachler sind oder fliessend deutsch sprechen?
ja (⇒ weiter mit dieser Frage)  nein (⇒ zur nächsten Frage)
Wenn ja, wie oft?
< monatlich  monatlich  wöchentlich  täglich
Jeweils wie lange?
<10 Min  10 Min-1 Stunde  1-2 Stunden  2-4 Stunden  4+ Stunden

7d) Sprechen Sie deutsch mit Fremden **ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts** (z.B. mit deutschen Touristen in der Strassenbahn)?
ja (⇒ weiter mit dieser Frage)  nein (⇒ zur nächsten Frage)
Wenn ja, wie oft?
< monatlich  monatlich  wöchentlich  täglich
Jeweils wie lange?
<10 Min  10 Min-1 Stunde  1-2 Stunden  2-4 Stunden  4+ Stunden

7e) Sprechen Sie deutsch in ihrer australischen Gastfamilie?
ja (⇒ weiter mit dieser Frage)  nein (⇒ zur nächsten Frage)
Wenn ja, wie oft?
< monatlich  monatlich  wöchentlich  täglich
Jeweils wie lange?
<10 Min  10 Min-1 Stunde  1-2 Stunden  2-4 Stunden  4+ Stunden
7f) Sprechen Sie deutsch mit Servicepersonal (z.B. im deutschen Konsulat)?
ja (weiter mit dieser Frage) nein (zur nächsten Frage)
Wenn ja, wie oft?
< monatlich monatlich wöchentlich täglich
Jeweils wie lange?
<10 Min 10 Min-1 Stunde 1-2 Stunden 2-4 Stunden 4+ Stunden

7g) Sprechen Sie deutsch mit anderen Personen ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts?
ja (weiter mit dieser Frage) nein (zur nächsten Frage)
Wenn ja, bennennen Sie bitte die Personen:
_______________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________
Wie oft insgesamt?
< monatlich monatlich wöchentlich täglich
Jeweils wie lange insgesamt?
<10 Min 10 Min-1 Stunde 1-2 Stunden 2-4 Stunden 4+ Stunden

8. DEUTSCH SPRECHEN: Gesprächssituationen

8a) Benutzen Sie deutsch, Fragen zur englischen Sprache (z.B. Grammatik, Vokabeln, Redewendungen auf English) mit Englisch-Muttersprachlern die deutsch fleissend sprechen, ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts zu diskutieren?
ja (weiter mit dieser Frage) nein (zur nächsten Frage)
Wenn ja, wie oft?
< monatlich monatlich wöchentlich täglich
Jeweils wie lange?
<10 Min 10 Min-1 Stunde 1-2 Stunden 2-4 Stunden 4+ Stunden

8b) Bentzen Sie deutsch für „Smalltalk“ (z.B. „Na, wie schaut’s?”) mit Gastfamilienmitgliedern oder Freunden?
ja (weiter mit dieser Frage) nein (zur nächsten Frage)
Wenn ja, wie oft?
< monatlich monatlich wöchentlich täglich
Jeweils wie lange?
<10 Min 10 Min-1 Stunde 1-2 Stunden 2-4 Stunden 4+ Stunden
8c) Führen Sie ausführliche Gespräche / Diskussionen auf deutsch ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts?

ja  (→ weiter mit dieser Frage)  nein  (→ zur nächsten Frage)

Wenn ja, wie oft?
< monatlich  monatlich  wöchentlich  täglich

Jeweils wie lange?
<10 Min  10 Min-1 Stunde  1-2 Stunden  2-4 Stunden  4+ Stunden

8d) Sprechen Sie deutsch um Wegbeschreibungen oder sonstige Informationen ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts, zu bekommen bzw. zu geben (z.B. deutschsprachige Mutter in der Gastfamilie fragen, wo die Post zu finden ist od wie spät es ist)?

ja  (→ weiter mit dieser Frage)  nein  (→ zur nächsten Frage)

Wenn ja, wie oft?
< monatlich  monatlich  wöchentlich  täglich

Jeweils wie lange?
<10 Min  10 Min-1 Stunde  1-2 Stunden  2-4 Stunden  4+ Stunden

8e) Führen Sie Telefongespräche auf deutsch ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts?

ja  (→ weiter mit dieser Frage)  nein  (→ zur nächsten Frage)

Wenn ja, wie oft?
< monatlich  monatlich  wöchentlich  täglich

Jeweils wie lange?
<10 Min  10 Min-1 Stunde  1-2 Stunden  2-4 Stunden  4+ Stunden

9. DEUTSCH LESEN

9a) Lesen Sie deutschsprachige Zeitungen ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts?

ja  (→ weiter mit dieser Frage)  nein  (→ zur nächsten Frage)

Wenn ja, wie oft?
< monatlich  monatlich  wöchentlich  täglich

Jeweils wie lange?
<10 Min  10 Min-1 Stunde  1-2 Stunden  2-4 Stunden  4+ Stunden
9b) Lesen Sie Romane auf deutsch ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts?
   ja (⇒ weiter mit dieser Frage)  nein (⇒ zur nächsten Frage)
   Wenn ja, wie oft?
   < monatlich  monatlich  wöchentlich  täglich
   Jeweils wie lange?
   <10 Min  10 Min-1 Stunde  1-2 Stunden  2-4 Stunden  4+ Stunden

9c) Lesen Sie deutschsprachige Zeitschriften ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts?
   ja (⇒ weiter mit dieser Frage)  nein (⇒ zur nächsten Frage)
   Wenn ja, wie oft?
   < monatlich  monatlich  wöchentlich  täglich
   Jeweils wie lange?
   <10 Min  10 Min-1 Stunde  1-2 Stunden  2-4 Stunden  4+ Stunden

9d) Lesen Sie Webseiten auf deutsch ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts?
   ja (⇒ weiter mit dieser Frage)  nein (⇒ zur nächsten Frage)
   Wenn ja, wie oft?
   < monatlich  monatlich  wöchentlich  täglich
   Jeweils wie lange?
   <10 Min  10 Min-1 Stunde  1-2 Stunden  2-4 Stunden  4+ Stunden

9e) Lesen Sie Briefe oder E-mails auf deutsch ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts?
   ja (⇒ weiter mit dieser Frage)  nein (⇒ zur nächsten Frage)
   Wenn ja, wie oft?
   < monatlich  monatlich  wöchentlich  täglich
   Jeweils wie lange?
   <10 Min  10 Min-1 Stunde  1-2 Stunden  2-4 Stunden  4+ Stunden

10. DEUTSCH SCHREIBEN
10a) Kommunizieren Sie über das Internet auf deutsch (z.B. in Chatrooms, via E-mail oder Messenger) ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts?
   ja (⇒ weiter mit dieser Frage)  nein (⇒ zur nächsten Frage)
   Wenn ja, wie oft?
   < monatlich  monatlich  wöchentlich  täglich
   Jeweils wie lange?
   <10 Min  10 Min-1 Stunde  1-2 Stunden  2-4 Stunden  4+ Stunden
10b) Schreiben Sie ein Tagebuch auf deutsch?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ja (weiter mit dieser Frage)</th>
<th>nein (zur nächsten Frage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wenn ja, wie oft?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; monatlich</td>
<td>monatlich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wöchentlich</td>
<td>wöchentlich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>täglich</td>
<td>täglich</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jeweils wie lange?

| <10 Min | 10 Min-1 Stunde | 1-2 Stunden | 2-4 Stunden | 4+ Stunden |

10c) Schreiben Sie Briefe auf deutsch ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ja (weiter mit dieser Frage)</th>
<th>nein (zur nächsten Frage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wenn ja, wie oft?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; monatlich</td>
<td>monatlich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wöchentlich</td>
<td>wöchentlich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>täglich</td>
<td>täglich</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jeweils wie lange?

| <10 Min | 10 Min-1 Stunde | 1-2 Stunden | 2-4 Stunden | 4+ Stunden |

11. DEUTSCH HÖREN

11a) Schauen Sie deutsche Programme im Fernsehen (z.B. Deutsche Welle) ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts an?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ja (weiter mit dieser Frage)</th>
<th>nein (zur nächsten Frage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wenn ja, wie oft?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; monatlich</td>
<td>monatlich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wöchentlich</td>
<td>wöchentlich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>täglich</td>
<td>täglich</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jeweils wie lange?

| <10 Min | 10 Min-1 Stunde | 1-2 Stunden | 2-4 Stunden | 4+ Stunden |

11b) Hören Sie sich deutsche Radiosendungen (ausser Musik) ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts an (z.B. Radio aus Deutschland über Internet)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ja (weiter mit dieser Frage)</th>
<th>nein (zur nächsten Frage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wenn ja, wie oft?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; monatlich</td>
<td>monatlich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wöchentlich</td>
<td>wöchentlich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>täglich</td>
<td>täglich</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jeweils wie lange?

| <10 Min | 10 Min-1 Stunde | 1-2 Stunden | 2-4 Stunden | 4+ Stunden |
11c) Schauen Sie sich deutsche Filme, DVDs oder Videos ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts an?

ja (⇒ weiter mit dieser Frage)       nein (⇒ zur nächsten Frage)

Wenn ja, wie oft?
< monatlich       monatlich       wöchentlich       täglich

Jeweils wie lange?
< 10 Min 10 Min-1 Stunde 1-2 Stunden 2-4 Stunden 4+ Stunden

12. ANDERE AKTIVITÄTEN AUF DEUTSCH

Bitte benennen Sie alle zusätzlichen Aktivitäten, die Sie auf deutsch unternehmen. Benennen Sie bitte auch wie oft und wie lange Sie diese Aktivitäten unternehmen.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aktivität</th>
<th>Wie oft und wie lange?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wie oft?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; monatlich       monatlich       wochentlich       täglich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wie lange?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 Min 10 Min-1 Stunde 1-2 Stunden 2-4 Stunden 4+ Stunden</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aktivität</th>
<th>Wie oft und wie lange?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wie oft?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; monatlich       monatlich       wochentlich       täglich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wie lange?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 Min 10 Min-1 Stunde 1-2 Stunden 2-4 Stunden 4+ Stunden</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aktivität</th>
<th>Wie oft und wie lange?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wie oft?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; monatlich       monatlich       wochentlich       täglich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wie lange?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 Min 10 Min-1 Stunde 1-2 Stunden 2-4 Stunden 4+ Stunden</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vielen Dank für Ihre Mitarbeit.

Name: ______________________________________________

Teil 1: Hintergrund-Informationen

1. Geschlecht: _____ weiblich _____ männlich

2. Alter: ________________

3. Geburtsort (Land): ________________________________

4. Was ist/sind Ihre Muttersprache(n)? ________________________________
5. Welche Sprache(n) sprechen Sie normalerweise zu Hause? _______________________
Falls mehr als eine Sprache, mit wem sprechen Sie welche Sprache?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Welche Sprache?</th>
<th>Mit wem?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6a) In welchem Schuljahr sind Sie gerade oder welches haben Sie vor kurzem beendet? ____
6b) Welchen Schultyp besuchen Sie?
   ______ staatliches Gymnasium
   ______ Gesamtschule
   ______ Sonstiges (z.B. Internat, Waldorfschule), bitte erläutern:
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________

7. Gibt es bei Ihnen in der Schule Fächer, ausser dem Fach Englisch, die auf englisch unterrichtet werden (z.B. Biologie auf englisch)?
   ____ ja (➔ weiter mit dieser Frage)  ____ nein (➔ zur nächsten Frage)
Falls ja, nennen Sie bitte die Fächer und geben Sie bitte die ungefähre Anzahl der Jahre an, in denen Sie an diesem Unterricht teilgenommen haben.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fach</th>
<th>Anzahl von Jahren</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Sind sie je zu einer Schule gegangen, in der die Unterrichtsprache grundsätzlich nicht deutsch gewesen ist?
   _____ ja (⇒ weiter mit dieser Frage)       _____ nein (⇒ zur nächsten Frage)
Falls ja, nennen Sie bitte die Sprachen und geben Sie bitte die ungefähre Anzahl der Jahre die sie diese Schule besucht haben.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sprache</th>
<th>Anzahl von Jahren</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Waren Sie jemals im englischsprachigen Ausland, zu dem Zweck, englisch zu lernen?
   _____ ja (⇒ weiter mit dieser Frage)       _____ nein (⇒ zur nächsten Frage)
Wenn ja, erläutern Sie bitte Ihre Erfahrungen in folgender Tabelle (Falls Sie mehr als vier dieser Erfahrungen gemacht haben, benutzen Sie bitte auch die Rückseite dieses Blattes.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wann?</th>
<th>Wo?</th>
<th>Wie lange im Ganzen?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. Ausser der Erfahrungen, die sie in Frage 9 geschildert haben, gibt es weitere Erfahrungen im fremdsprachigen Umfeld (e.g. zweiwöchiger Austausch in Frankreich)?
   _____ ja (➜ weiter mit dieser Frage)  _____ nein (➜ zur nächsten Frage)
   Wenn ja, erläutern Sie bitte Ihre Erfahrungen in folgender Tabelle (Falls Sie mehr als drei dieser Erfahrungen gemacht haben, benutzen Sie bitte auch die Rückseite dieses Blattes.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Erfahrung 1</th>
<th>Erfahrung 2</th>
<th>Erfahrung 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sprache</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zweck</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Von wann bis wann?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. In folgender Tabelle, bewerten Sie bitte Ihre sprachlichen Fähigkeiten in allen Sprachen, die Sie sprechen. Bitte benutzen Sie die folgende Bewertungsskala:
   0 = mässig  1 = gut  2 = sehr gut  3 = muttersprachlich
   Bitte vermerken Sie auch, wie viele Jahre (wenn überhaupt) die Sprache in der Schule unterrichtet worden ist.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sprache</th>
<th>Hören</th>
<th>Sprechen</th>
<th>Lesen</th>
<th>Schreiben</th>
<th>Wie viele Jahre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deutsch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Englisch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>________</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>________</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. In welchen Schulstufen wurden Sie auf englisch unterrichtet?

12a) Grundschule (1. bis 4. Klasse):

ja (weiter mit dieser Frage)  nein (zur nächsten Frage)

Wenn ja, wie lange?

weniger als 1 Jahr  1–2 Jahre  mehr als 2 Jahre

12b) Weiterführende Schule (5. bis 10. Klasse):

ja (weiter mit dieser Frage)  nein (zur nächsten Frage)

Wenn ja, wie lange?

weniger als 1 Jahr  1–2 Jahre  mehr als 2 Jahre

12c) Weiterführende Schule (11. bis 12./13. Klasse):

ja (weiter mit dieser Frage)  nein (zur nächsten Frage)

Wenn ja, wie lange?

weniger als 1 Jahr  1–2 Jahre  mehr als 2 Jahre

12d) Andere (bitte erläutern):

ja (weiter mit dieser Frage)  nein (zur nächsten Frage)

Wenn ja, wie lange?

weniger als 1 Jahr  1–2 Jahre  mehr als 2 Jahre

13. Welche Zensuren haben Sie in den letzten beiden Jahren im Fach Englisch bekommen?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schulklass/Jahrgangsstufe</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Bitte nennen Sie alle Englischsprachkurse, die Sie außerhalb der Schule besucht haben (z.B. Sprachkurse, Nachhilfeunterricht).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kurs</th>
<th>Kurze Beschreibung</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bei allen weiteren positiven und negativen Erfahrungen, die Ihre Fähigkeit, die englische Sprache zu lernen, beeinflusst haben könnten (z.B. Probleme zu Hause, Austauschstudent aus den USA in Ihrer Familie, usw.), sollten Sie bitte die folgende Tabelle ausfüllen.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jahr</th>
<th>Beschreibung der Erfahrung</th>
<th>Einfluss (+ oder -)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Teil 2: Sprachkontakt**

Die folgenden 12 Fragen beziehen sich auf Ihr Leben in Deutschland. Bevor Sie anfangen, die Fragen zu beantworten, denken Sie bitte über Ihr tagtägliches Leben nach, insbesondere wieviel englisch und/oder deutsch Sie verwenden.

**ENGLISCH**

*Fragen 1 bis 6 betreffen den Gebrauch der englischen Sprache ausserhalb der Schule in Deutschland.* Wenn Sie Fragen mit “ja” beantworten, geben Sie bitte auch an, wie oft Sie englisch mit den genannten Personen bzw. in den genannten Situationen verwenden. Wenn Sie mit “nein” antworten, gehen Sie bitte direkt zur nächsten Frage.

1. **ENGLISCH SPRECHEN: Gesprächspartner**

1a) Sprechen Sie englisch mit Ihren Lehrern in der Schule (z.B. auf dem Schulhof, in der Innenstadt) *ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts*?

   ja (weiter mit dieser Frage) nein (zur nächsten Frage)

   Wenn ja, wie oft?

   < monatlich   monatlich   wöchentlich   täglich

   Jeweils wie lange?

   <10 Min   10 Min-1 Stunde   1-2 Stunden   2-4 Stunden   4+ Stunden
1b) Sprechen Sie englisch mit Freunden oder Mitschülern, die Englisch-Muttersprachler sind oder fließend englisch sprechen ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts?

ja (⇒ weiter mit dieser Frage) nein (⇒ zur nächsten Frage)
Wenn ja, wie oft?
< monatlich monatlich wöchentlich täglich
Jeweils wie lange?
<10 Min 10 Min-1 Stunde 1-2 Stunden 2-4 Stunden 4+ Stunden

1c) Sprechen Sie englisch in ihrer Familie?

ja (⇒ weiter mit dieser Frage) nein (⇒ zur nächsten Frage)
Wenn ja, wie oft?
< monatlich monatlich wöchentlich täglich
Jeweils wie lange?
<10 Min 10 Min-1 Stunde 1-2 Stunden 2-4 Stunden 4+ Stunden

1d) Sprechen Sie englisch mit Fremden ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts (z.B. mit englischen Touristen in Deutschland)?

ja (⇒ weiter mit dieser Frage) nein (⇒ zur nächsten Frage)
Wenn ja, wie oft?
< monatlich monatlich wöchentlich täglich
Jeweils wie lange?
<10 Min 10 Min-1 Stunde 1-2 Stunden 2-4 Stunden 4+ Stunden

1e) Sprechen Sie englisch mit Servicepersonal (z.B. im englischen Produktladen, in der australischen Botschaft)?

ja (⇒ weiter mit dieser Frage) nein (⇒ zur nächsten Frage)
Wenn ja, wie oft?
< monatlich monatlich wöchentlich täglich
Jeweils wie lange?
<10 Min 10 Min-1 Stunde 1-2 Stunden 2-4 Stunden 4+ Stunden
1f) Sprechen Sie englisch mit weiteren Personen ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts?

ja    (⇒ weiter mit dieser Frage)    nein    (⇒ zur nächsten Frage)

Wenn ja, bennennen Sie bitte die Personen:
_______________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________

Wie oft insgesamt?
< monatlich  monatlich  wöchentlich  täglich

Jeweils wie lange insgesamt?
<10 Min  10 Min-1 Stunde  1-2 Stunden  2-4 Stunden  4+ Stunden

2. ENGLISCH SPRECHEN: Gesprächssituationen

2a) Benutzen Sie englisch, um Fragen zur englischen Sprache (z.B. Grammatik, Vokabeln, Redewendungen auf English) mit Englisch-Muttersprachlern ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts zu diskutieren?

ja    (⇒ weiter mit dieser Frage)    nein    (⇒ zur nächsten Frage)

Wenn ja, wie oft?
< monatlich  monatlich  wöchentlich  täglich

Jeweils wie lange?
<10 Min  10 Min-1 Stunde  1-2 Stunden  2-4 Stunden  4+ Stunden

2b) Benutzen Sie englisch für „Smalltalk“ (z.B. „Hi, how are you?“, „Please pass the salt.“) mit Familienmitgliedern oder Freunden ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts?

ja    (⇒ weiter mit dieser Frage)    nein    (⇒ zur nächsten Frage)

Wenn ja, wie oft?
< monatlich  monatlich  wöchentlich  täglich

Jeweils wie lange?
<10 Min  10 Min-1 Stunde  1-2 Stunden  2-4 Stunden  4+ Stunden

2c) Führen Sie ausführliche Gespräche / Diskussionen auf englisch ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts?

ja    (⇒ weiter mit dieser Frage)    nein    (⇒ zur nächsten Frage)

Wenn ja, wie oft?
< monatlich  monatlich  wöchentlich  täglich

Jeweils wie lange?
<10 Min  10 Min-1 Stunde  1-2 Stunden  2-4 Stunden  4+ Stunden
2d) Sprechen Sie englisch, um Wegbeschreibungen oder sonstige Informationen ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts, zu bekommen bzw. zu geben (z.B. einem englischen Touristen den Weg zum Bahnhof zu beschreiben)?

ja (➔ weiter mit dieser Frage) nein (➔ zur nächsten Frage)
Wenn ja, wie oft?
< monatlich monatlich wöchentlich täglich
Jeweils wie lange?
<10 Min 10 Min-1 Stunde 1-2 Stunden 2-4 Stunden 4+ Stunden

2c) Führen Sie Telefongespräche auf englisch ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts?

ja (➔ weiter mit dieser Frage) nein (➔ zur nächsten Frage)
Wenn ja, wie oft?
< monatlich monatlich wöchentlich täglich
Jeweils wie lange?
<10 Min 10 Min-1 Stunde 1-2 Stunden 2-4 Stunden 4+ Stunden

3. ENGLISCH LESEN

3a) Lesen Sie englischsprachige Zeitungen ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts?

ja (➔ weiter mit dieser Frage) nein (➔ zur nächsten Frage)
Wenn ja, wie oft?
< monatlich monatlich wöchentlich täglich
Jeweils wie lange?
<10 Min 10 Min-1 Stunde 1-2 Stunden 2-4 Stunden 4+ Stunden

3b) Lesen Sie Romane auf englisch ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts?

ja (➔ weiter mit dieser Frage) nein (➔ zur nächsten Frage)
Wenn ja, wie oft?
< monatlich monatlich wöchentlich täglich
Jeweils wie lange?
<10 Min 10 Min-1 Stunde 1-2 Stunden 2-4 Stunden 4+ Stunden

3c) Lesen Sie englischsprachige Zeitschriften ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts?

ja (➔ weiter mit dieser Frage) nein (➔ zur nächsten Frage)
Wenn ja, wie oft?
< monatlich monatlich wöchentlich täglich
Jeweils wie lange?
<10 Min 10 Min-1 Stunde 1-2 Stunden 2-4 Stunden 4+ Stunden
3d) Lesen Sie Webseiten auf englisch ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts?
ja (➡ weiter mit dieser Frage) nein (➡ zur nächsten Frage)
Wenn ja, wie oft?
< monatlich monatlich wöchentlich täglich
Jeweils wie lange?
<10 Min 10 Min-1 Stunde 1-2 Stunden 2-4 Stunden 4+ Stunden

3e) Lesen Sie Briefe oder E-mails auf englisch ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts?
ja (➡ weiter mit dieser Frage) nein (➡ zur nächsten Frage)
Wenn ja, wie oft?
< monatlich monatlich wöchentlich täglich
Jeweils wie lange?
<10 Min 10 Min-1 Stunde 1-2 Stunden 2-4 Stunden 4+ Stunden

4. ENGLISCH SCHREIBEN
4a) Kommunizieren sie über das Internet auf englisch (z.B. in Chatrooms, via E-mail oder Messenger) ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts?
ja (➡ weiter mit dieser Frage) nein (➡ zur nächsten Frage)
Wenn ja, wie oft?
< monatlich monatlich wöchentlich täglich
Jeweils wie lange?
<10 Min 10 Min-1 Stunde 1-2 Stunden 2-4 Stunden 4+ Stunden

4b) Schreiben Sie ein Tagebuch auf englisch?
ja (➡ weiter mit dieser Frage) nein (➡ zur nächsten Frage)
Wenn ja, wie oft?
< monatlich monatlich wöchentlich täglich
Jeweils wie lange?
<10 Min 10 Min-1 Stunde 1-2 Stunden 2-4 Stunden 4+ Stunden

4c) Schreiben Sie Briefe auf englisch ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts?
ja (➡ weiter mit dieser Frage) nein (➡ zur nächsten Frage)
Wenn ja, wie oft?
< monatlich monatlich wöchentlich täglich
Jeweils wie lange?
<10 Min 10 Min-1 Stunde 1-2 Stunden 2-4 Stunden 4+ Stunden
5. ENGLISCH HÖREN

5a) Schauen Sie englischsprachige Programme im Fernsehen **ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts** an?
   ja (⇒ weiter mit dieser Frage)  nein (⇒ zur nächsten Frage)
   Wenn ja, wie oft?
   < monatlich  monatlich  wöchentlich  täglich
   Jeweils wie lange?
   <10 Min  10 Min-1 Stunde  1-2 Stunden  2-4 Stunden  4+ Stunden

5b) Hören Sie sich englischsprachige Radiosendungen (ausser Musik) **ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts** an?
   ja (⇒ weiter mit dieser Frage)  nein (⇒ zur nächsten Frage)
   Wenn ja, wie oft?
   < monatlich  monatlich  wöchentlich  täglich
   Jeweils wie lange?
   <10 Min  10 Min-1 Stunde  1-2 Stunden  2-4 Stunden  4+ Stunden

5c) Wenn Sie englischsprachige Musik hören **ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts**, versuchen
   Sie aktiv die Texte zu verstehen?
   ja (⇒ weiter mit dieser Frage)  nein (⇒ zur nächsten Frage)
   Wenn ja, wie oft?
   < monatlich  monatlich  wöchentlich  täglich
   Jeweils wie lange?
   <10 Min  10 Min-1 Stunde  1-2 Stunden  2-4 Stunden  4+ Stunden

5d) Schauen Sie sich englische Filme, DVDs oder Videos **ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts** an?
   ja (⇒ weiter mit dieser Frage)  nein (⇒ zur nächsten Frage)
   Wenn ja, wie oft?
   < monatlich  monatlich  wöchentlich  täglich
   Jeweils wie lange?
   <10 Min  10 Min-1 Stunde  1-2 Stunden  2-4 Stunden  4+ Stunden
5e) Versuchen Sie Unterhaltungen anderer Leute, die gerade englisch sprechen, ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts zu verstehen?

ja (➔ weiter mit dieser Frage) nein (➔ zur nächsten Frage)

Wenn ja, wie oft?
< monatlich monatlich wöchentlich täglich

Jeweils wie lange?
<10 Min 10 Min-1 Stunde 1-2 Stunden 2-4 Stunden 4+ Stunden

6. ANDERE AKTIVITÄTEN AUF ENGLISCH

Bitte benennen Sie alle zusätzlichen Aktivitäten, die Sie auf englisch ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts unternehmen. Geben Sie bitte auch an, wie oft Sie diese Aktivitäten betreiben.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aktivität</th>
<th>Wie oft und wie lange?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wie oft?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; monatlich monatlich wöchentlich täglich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wie lange?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; 10 Min 10 Min-1 Stunde 1-2 Stunden 2-4 Stunden 4+ Stunden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wie oft?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; monatlich monatlich wöchentlich täglich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wie lange?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; 10 Min 10 Min-1 Stunde 1-2 Stunden 2-4 Stunden 4+ Stunden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wie oft?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; monatlich monatlich wöchentlich täglich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wie lange?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; 10 Min 10 Min-1 Stunde 1-2 Stunden 2-4 Stunden 4+ Stunden</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DEUTSCH

Fragen 7 bis 12 betreffen den Gebrauch der deutschen Sprache ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts in Deutschland. Wenn Sie Fragen mit “ja” beantworten, geben Sie bitte auch an, wie oft Sie deutsch mit den genannten Personen bzw. in den genannten Situationen verwenden. Wenn Sie mit “nein” antworten, gehen Sie bitte direkt zur nächsten Frage.
7. **DEUTSCH SPRECHEN: Gesprächspartner**

7a) Kennen Sie **Englisch**-Muttersprachler oder deutschsprachige Mitschüler, die fliessend Englisch sprechen?

   ja (⇒ weiter mit dieser Frage)  nein (⇒ zur nächsten Frage)

   Wenn ja, sprechen Sie **deutsch** mit diesen Freunden oder Mitschülern **außerhalb des Schulunterrichts**?

   ja (⇒ weiter mit dieser Frage)  nein (⇒ zur nächsten Frage)

   Wenn ja, wie oft?

   < monatlich  monatlich  wöchentlich  täglich

   Jeweils wie lange?

   <10 Min  10 Min-1 Stunde  1-2 Stunden  2-4 Stunden  4+ Stunden

7b) Sprechen Sie deutsch in ihrer Familie?

   ja (⇒ weiter mit dieser Frage)  nein (⇒ zur nächsten Frage)

   Wenn ja, wie oft?

   < monatlich  monatlich  wöchentlich  täglich

   Jeweils wie lange?

   <10 Min  10 Min-1 Stunde  1-2 Stunden  2-4 Stunden  4+ Stunden

8. **DEUTSCH SPRECHEN: Gesprächssituationen**

8a) Benutzen Sie deutsch, um Fragen zur englischen Sprache (z.B. Grammatik, Vokabeln, Redewendungen auf English) mit **Englisch**-Muttersprachlern, die **deutsch** fliessend sprechen, außerhalb des Schulunterrichts zu diskutieren?

   ja (⇒ weiter mit dieser Frage)  nein (⇒ zur nächsten Frage)

   Wenn ja, wie oft?

   < monatlich  monatlich  wöchentlich  täglich

   Jeweils wie lange?

   <10 Min  10 Min-1 Stunde  1-2 Stunden  2-4 Stunden  4+ Stunden

9. **DEUTSCH LESEN**

9a) Lesen Sie deutschsprachige Zeitungen **außerhalb des Schulunterrichts**?

   ja (⇒ weiter mit dieser Frage)  nein (⇒ zur nächsten Frage)

   Wenn ja, wie oft?

   < monatlich  monatlich  wöchentlich  täglich

   Jeweils wie lange?

   <10 Min  10 Min-1 Stunde  1-2 Stunden  2-4 Stunden  4+ Stunden
9b) Lesen Sie Romane auf deutsch **ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts**?
   ja  (➔ weiter mit dieser Frage)  nein  (➔ zur nächsten Frage)
Wenn ja, wie oft?
   < monatlich  monatlich  wöchentlich  täglich
Jeweils wie lange?
   <10 Min  10 Min-1 Stunde  1-2 Stunden  2-4 Stunden  4+ Stunden

9c) Lesen Sie deutschsprachige Zeitschriften **ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts**?
   ja  (➔ weiter mit dieser Frage)  nein  (➔ zur nächsten Frage)
Wenn ja, wie oft?
   < monatlich  monatlich  wöchentlich  täglich
Jeweils wie lange?
   <10 Min  10 Min-1 Stunde  1-2 Stunden  2-4 Stunden  4+ Stunden

9d) Lesen Sie Webseiten auf deutsch **ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts**?
   ja  (➔ weiter mit dieser Frage)  nein  (➔ zur nächsten Frage)
Wenn ja, wie oft?
   < monatlich  monatlich  wöchentlich  täglich
Jeweils wie lange?
   <10 Min  10 Min-1 Stunde  1-2 Stunden  2-4 Stunden  4+ Stunden

9e) Lesen Sie Briefe oder E-mails auf deutsch **ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts**?
   ja  (➔ weiter mit dieser Frage)  nein  (➔ zur nächsten Frage)
Wenn ja, wie oft?
   < monatlich  monatlich  wöchentlich  täglich
Jeweils wie lange?
   <10 Min  10 Min-1 Stunde  1-2 Stunden  2-4 Stunden  4+ Stunden

10. **DEUTSCH SCHREIBEN**

10a) Kommunizieren Sie über das Internet auf deutsch (z.B. in Chatrooms, via E-mail oder Messenger) **ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts**?
   ja  (➔ weiter mit dieser Frage)  nein  (➔ zur nächsten Frage)
Wenn ja, wie oft?
   < monatlich  monatlich  wöchentlich  täglich
Jeweils wie lange?
   <10 Min  10 Min-1 Stunde  1-2 Stunden  2-4 Stunden  4+ Stunden
10b) Schreiben Sie ein Tagebuch auf deutsch?

ja (weiter mit dieser Frage)  nein (zur nächsten Frage)

Wenn ja, wie oft?

< monatlich  monatlich  wöchentlich  täglich

Jeweils wie lange?

<10 Min  10 Min-1 Stunde  1-2 Stunden  2-4 Stunden  4+ Stunden

10c) Schreiben Sie Briefe auf deutsch ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts?

ja (weiter mit dieser Frage)  nein (zur nächsten Frage)

Wenn ja, wie oft?

< monatlich  monatlich  wöchentlich  täglich

Jeweils wie lange?

<10 Min  10 Min-1 Stunde  1-2 Stunden  2-4 Stunden  4+ Stunden

11. DEUTSCH HÖREN

11a) Schauen Sie sich deutschsprachige Programme im Fernsehen ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts an?

ja (weiter mit dieser Frage)  nein (zur nächsten Frage)

Wenn ja, wie oft?

< monatlich  monatlich  wöchentlich  täglich

Jeweils wie lange?

<10 Min  10 Min-1 Stunde  1-2 Stunden  2-4 Stunden  4+ Stunden

11b) Hören Sie sich deutschsprachige Radiosendungen (ausser Musik) ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts an?

ja (weiter mit dieser Frage)  nein (zur nächsten Frage)

Wenn ja, wie oft?

< monatlich  monatlich  wöchentlich  täglich

Jeweils wie lange?

<10 Min  10 Min-1 Stunde  1-2 Stunden  2-4 Stunden  4+ Stunden
11c) Schauen Sie sich deutschsprachige Filme, DVDs oder Videos ausserhalb des Schulunterrichts an?

ja (weiter mit dieser Frage) nein (zur nächsten Frage)

Wenn ja, wie oft?
< monatlich monatlich wöchentlich täglich

Jeweils wie lange?
<10 Min 10 Min-1 Stunde 1-2 Stunden 2-4 Stunden 4+ Stunden
PROJECT: “TELL ME A STORY”

The responses that you give in this questionnaire will be kept confidential. This cover sheet is to allow the researcher to associate your responses with your name if needed. However, a pseudonym will be used in place of your name when referring to your responses in publications. Every effort will be made to keep your responses confidential.

Your honest and detailed responses will be greatly appreciated.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Name: __________________________________________
Address: ____________________________________________________________________________

Part 1: Background Information

1. Gender: _____ male  _____ female

2. Age: _________________  D.O.B. ________________

3. Country of birth: ____________________________

4. How long have you lived in Australia? __________________________

5. What is/are your native language(s)? _____________________________

6. What language(s) do you usually speak at home? __________________________
   If more than one, with whom do you speak these languages?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Who I speak to in this language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


7a) Which year in school are you in? __________________________
7b) Please give a brief history of your school education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School year(s)</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Language of instruction</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(e.g. Year 10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>public</td>
<td>co-ed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to Year _____</td>
<td>private</td>
<td>boys only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year ________</td>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>girls only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year ________</td>
<td>public</td>
<td>co-ed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to Year _____</td>
<td>private</td>
<td>boys only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year ________</td>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>girls only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year ________</td>
<td>public</td>
<td>co-ed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to Year _____</td>
<td>private</td>
<td>boys only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year ________</td>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>girls only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year ________</td>
<td>public</td>
<td>co-ed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to Year _____</td>
<td>private</td>
<td>boys only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year ________</td>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>girls only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year ________</td>
<td>public</td>
<td>co-ed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to Year _____</td>
<td>private</td>
<td>boys only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year ________</td>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>girls only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. In the boxes below, rate your language ability in each of the languages that you know. Use the following ratings:
0 = poor 1 = good 2 = very good 3 = native / native-like
Include information on how many years (if any) have you studied this language in a formal school setting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Listening</th>
<th>Speaking</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>Years of study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3: Interpersonal markers in this study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpersonal Markers</th>
<th>Additional Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>about</td>
<td>hopefully</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actually</td>
<td>in some respects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ah</td>
<td>I’m (not) sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ahha</td>
<td>I don’t mind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all</td>
<td>I figure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(and) all that</td>
<td>I (don’t) find</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all this/that (sort of) stuff</td>
<td>I guess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alright</td>
<td>I hope (not)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and everything</td>
<td>I (don’t) know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and nothing</td>
<td>in other words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and something (like this/that)</td>
<td>I (don’t) reckon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and stuff (like this/that)</td>
<td>I say (it)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and (like) (all) the/this/that (sort of) stuff</td>
<td>(you) see</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and all the stuff like this</td>
<td>I suppose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and other stuff</td>
<td>I (don’t) think</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and so (on)</td>
<td>just</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and that kind of thing</td>
<td>kind of (that thing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and things like that</td>
<td>kind of thing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and what not</td>
<td>like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and whatever</td>
<td>(a) little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anyway</td>
<td>mainly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apparently</td>
<td>maybe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>basically</td>
<td>mind you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bit</td>
<td>more than anything</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bla</td>
<td>mostly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>certainly</td>
<td>much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completely</td>
<td>my end</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>definitely</td>
<td>nah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>doubt</td>
<td>nah yeah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eh</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>er</td>
<td>no yeah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>even</td>
<td>(I have) no idea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>everything (like that)</td>
<td>not exactly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>everything and anything</td>
<td>not much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exactly</td>
<td>not really</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fair(ly)</td>
<td>not so</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for/to me</td>
<td>not very</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>full on</td>
<td>not quite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God</td>
<td>obviously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gosh</td>
<td>of course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hah</td>
<td>oh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heaps (of stuff)</td>
<td>ok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hm</td>
<td>only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hhmhm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

23 This list contains all interpersonal markers found in the data, including some only found in the non-native speaker data.
Appendix 3: Interpersonal markers in this study cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Markers</th>
<th>Chinese Markers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>or all this (things)</td>
<td>the odd + NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or anything (like that)</td>
<td>(type of) thing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or nothing (like that)</td>
<td>too</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or something (like that/this)</td>
<td>totally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or (all) (this/that) (kind/sort of) stuff</td>
<td>um</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or so (on)</td>
<td>very</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or that</td>
<td>we’ll see</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or what</td>
<td>well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or whatever (it is/was)</td>
<td>whatever</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whatsoever</td>
<td>yeah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perhaps</td>
<td>yeah no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pf</td>
<td>yep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pretty (much)</td>
<td>you can/could say (it/that)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>probably</td>
<td>true</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quite</td>
<td>(sort of) things like that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>real(ly)</td>
<td>(not) specifically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>right</td>
<td>way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>say</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seriously</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>so</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>somehow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>something (about)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>something like (that)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sort of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sort of thing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stuff (like this/that)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that kind of/ sort of stuff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that kind of thing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that’s a good question</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that’s all</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that’s all I can say</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that’s alright</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that’s (about) it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that’s how I see it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that’s how it is</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(that’s) (just) off the top of my head</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that’s ok</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that’s right</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that’s the one</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that’s true</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 4-A: Internal validity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Threat</th>
<th>Alleviation of threat</th>
<th>Caveats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Events outside the laboratory</td>
<td>• An LCP was included.</td>
<td>• Exchange students may have matured more quickly than those at home (e.g. accelerated self-dependency).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Topics were chosen that were relevant to all participants (e.g. not focused on an exchange and culturally neutral).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Maturation</td>
<td>• All participants were the same age at the outset of data collection.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Testing&lt;sup&gt;24&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>• Participants completed the same tasks so the testing effect was the same for each individual.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A distractor retelling task was included.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• General topic areas were changed from zero to five to ten months to avoid repetition.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Participants were not aware of the focus of the study (e.g. many thought it was about humour or memory).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Biases in the relationship between researcher and participants</td>
<td>• There was some standardization of the testing procedure, i.e. semi-structured interviews rather than completely unstructured data.</td>
<td>• The researcher was not entirely blind to the purpose of the study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Initially the focus of the research was on storytelling, so the researcher was not aware of the importance of pragmatic marker use in the recordings.</td>
<td>• Familiarisation between the researcher and participants increased over the ten months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Regression effect</td>
<td>• A regression effect was not applicable as test scores were not generated and the measurement of data was the same for all of the interviews.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Selection</td>
<td>• Groups were matched as closely as possible using a matching pair technique.</td>
<td>• Random assignment was not possible due to the use of a pre-existing group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Attrition&lt;sup&gt;25&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>• Recordings took place in the private homes of the students (i.e. less effort required for participation).</td>
<td>• The researcher had no control over participants returning home early from the exchange.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The researcher corresponded with participants throughout data collection.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• GES10 and GES05 were given a book as an incentive to stay.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>24</sup> Includes test-wiseness, expectations of role demands and experimental bias.

<sup>25</sup> Those who drop out are different to those who complete the study.
Appendix 4-B: Construct validity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Threat</th>
<th>Alleviation of threat</th>
<th>Caveats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Loose connection between theory and method  | • All instruments were piloted.  
• An extensive literature review was conducted.  | • Participants may have tried to speak their ‘best’ English and use less markers, which have historically been considered ‘bad’ English (Brinton, 1996). |
| • Ambiguous effects of independent variables 26 | • All instruments were piloted.  
• A distractor retelling structured task was included to lower anxiety and focus on form in semi-structured conversations.  |  |
| • Good subject tendency | • Participants were not aware of the focus of the research.  
• A distractor was included in data collection (e.g. many participants thought it was a test of humour or memory due to use of Mr Bean). |  |
| • Evaluation apprehension | • All participants were informed that test scores would not be generated and that the study was not about proficiency or their personal attitudes and beliefs.  
• Participants were guaranteed anonymity. |  |
| • Hawthorne effect | • A Hawthorne effect was not applicable as it was the same for all participants. |  |

26 For example, participants might have perceived the task differently to the researcher.
## Appendix 4-C: External validity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Threat</th>
<th>Alleviation of threat</th>
<th>Caveats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Applicability to other subjects | • GES10 and GES05 were small pre-existing groups that represented a large number of exchange students who came to Australia from Germany each year.  
• There were no pre-requisites set by the researcher for participation in GES10 or GES05. | • The results were not generalisable to exchange students of other nationalities or other exchange destinations. |
| • Applicability to other times | • The topics were not highly influenced by political, social or current events.       | • Adolescent language is characterised by rapid change.                |
| • Applicability to other settings | • The topics were non-culturally specific and did not focus purely on study abroad situations.  
• Data collection was not laboratory-based. |                                                                        |
Appendix 4-D: Statistical conclusion validity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Threat</th>
<th>Alleviation of threat</th>
<th>Caveats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Improper use of statistics in analysing the data</td>
<td>• Non-parametric statistical methods were used due to the small sample size and data descriptives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• SPSS software was used for all statistical testing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Consultation with statistics manuals were made before conducting any statistical tests (e.g. Salkind, 2007).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improper reporting of statistical tests of covariation</td>
<td>• Both p-value and effect size were used to report covariation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>