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The Heart of Korean Immigrants
by Seo Chong Ju

산까지 우지짓는 아름다운 아침의 나라
그 밝은 조국의 햇빛을
우리 어 느 면 그대로 있음간가?

그 밝은 햇살로서
우리는 태평양 건너
여기 미국까지 빨아 왔나니

그 햇빛의 사랑으로
맑에 나는 품 한포기까지
우리는 못생명을 도와 기르고

어느 어두운 구석에서도
악이 다시는 발붙여지 못하게
세상을 밝히고 맑혀 나가자

우리 자손의 영원을 이어
내 조국의 열을 심어 기워 나가자
이 세상이 두루 다 밝는 날까지 …

Beautiful morning land of chirping magpies
Clear sunlight of our homeland
Could we ever forget even for a moment?

On those bright sun rays
Across the Pacific Ocean we came
And reached far here to America

By those sunbeams’ love
As with one blade of grass on earth
We strive for all life to grow

In even one dark corner
Evil can never set foot again
Lighting the world and making it pure

For our children’s eternal future
Planting and nurturing the spirit of my homeland
Until the day the whole world is bright

(translation provided by The Korea Times of Honolulu)
THE HEART OF KOREAN IMMIGRANTS

Poem by Korean poet Seo Chong Ju (1915-2000)

engraved on a statue carved in the image of the map of Korea, commemorating the lives of Korean immigrants in Hawai‘i (erected in 1995 on the property of the Waikiki Resort Hotel in Waikiki)
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ABSTRACT

Based on a corpus of seventeen English conversational narratives recounted by six adult long-term Korean immigrants in Hawai‘i, this study argues for the consideration of prosody as a core linguistic resource. Under normal circumstances of language use, prosodic resources primarily play a supporting role for lexico-syntactic constructions. However, when lexical and syntactic resources are unavailable to serve communicative demands, as is often the case with fossilized adult immigrants, prosody emerges to play a leading role.

The initial analysis of prosody’s role in second language narratives relied on auditory perceptions, supplemented by discourse analytic and interactionist approaches to meaning co-construction using prosodic contextualization cues as proposed by Gumperz (1982) and developed in Couper-Kuhlen and Selting, eds. (1996), Auer and di Luzio, eds. (1992), and Auer, Couper-Kuhlen and Müller (1999). Prosodic features of perceptively salient tokens were subsequently verified acoustically.

The narrators’ creative use of prosody at both the local (lexico-syntactic) and global (discourse) levels is examined. Similar uses of prosody by adult immigrants have been alluded to but never examined in depth (Perdue 1984, 1993a, 1993b, Kumpf 1986). Other major studies of second language discourse prosody treat its target-like acquisitional aspects rather than its creative applications (Wennerstrom 1994, 1997, 1998).
At the local level, this study finds that prosody contributes to lexical expansion (through intentional rhythmic reduplication of basic vocabulary and segmental lengthening) and to syntactic complexity (signaling relativization, conjunction, subordination, indirect discourse, and temporal relations by means of amplitude changes, pitch contrasts and pauses) in the texts. At the global level, principles of information structure (Chafe 1987, 1994) and narrative structure (Labov 1972a) are invoked to examine prosody's contribution to discourse coherence, text cohesion and development.

In sum, this study focuses not on explaining second language acquisition phenomena but, rather, on discovering the components of the language faculty and principles of language use through the lens of learner language phenomena. The study's focus on verbal communication as a dynamic process which impels limited proficiency speakers to make use of untapped linguistic resources during the communicative process draws attention to the interactionally-driven nature of language.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbr.</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AME</td>
<td>American Mainstream English (Kozasa 2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAT</td>
<td>Codes for the Human Analysis of Transcripts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESF</td>
<td>European Science Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAE</td>
<td>General American English (Vanderslice and Shun Pierson 1967)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAE</td>
<td>Hawaiian American English (Vanderslice and Shun Pierson 1967)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSE</td>
<td>Hawai‘i Standard English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCE</td>
<td>Hawai‘i Creole English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>interlanguage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>first, or native, language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td>second language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>native language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAE</td>
<td>Standard American English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLA</td>
<td>second language acquisition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL</td>
<td>target language</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Abbreviations for Korean Morphosyntactic Elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbr.</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Morpheme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>accusative marker</td>
<td>(-ul/lul)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AH</td>
<td>addressee honorific</td>
<td>(-p/sup-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>declarative suffix</td>
<td>(-ta)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>genitive particle</td>
<td>(uy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>indicative mood</td>
<td>(-ni-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT</td>
<td>intimate speech level marker</td>
<td>(-a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM</td>
<td>nominative marker [alt: SM]</td>
<td>(-i/-ka)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>plural marker</td>
<td>(-tul)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POL</td>
<td>politeness marker</td>
<td>(-yo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td>propositive sentence-type suffix</td>
<td>(-ta-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PST</td>
<td>past tense suffix</td>
<td>(-ss/ess-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>question, e.g. interrogative sentence-type suffix</td>
<td>(-ni)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QT</td>
<td>quotatative particle</td>
<td>(lako)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RH</td>
<td>honorific</td>
<td>(-nim)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RL</td>
<td>relativizer</td>
<td>(-n/-nun)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ</td>
<td>requestive mood suffix</td>
<td>(-si-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH</td>
<td>subject honorific</td>
<td>(-si-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC</td>
<td>topic-contrast particle [alt: TM]</td>
<td>(-un/-nun)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(following Sohn 1994; Sohn 1999)

---

*This list is not exhaustive. Included here are only the abbreviations used in examples cited in the text, Chapter Two, as part of the overview of the Korean language. For a more complete list, see Sohn (1994) and Sohn (1999).*
## KOREAN ROMANIZATION SYSTEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>비</td>
<td>/p/</td>
<td>[p,b]</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p,b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>비</td>
<td>/ph/</td>
<td>[ph]</td>
<td>ph</td>
<td>p'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>뽀</td>
<td>/p'/</td>
<td>[p']</td>
<td>pp</td>
<td>pp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>뱀</td>
<td>/t/</td>
<td>[t,d]</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t,d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>뱇</td>
<td>/th/</td>
<td>[th]</td>
<td>th</td>
<td>t'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>뱓</td>
<td>/t'/</td>
<td>[t']</td>
<td>tt</td>
<td>tt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>뱔</td>
<td>/s/</td>
<td>[s, ъ]</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>뱕</td>
<td>/s'/</td>
<td>[s', ъ']</td>
<td>ss</td>
<td>ss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>뱞</td>
<td>/c/</td>
<td>[c, џ]</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>ch, ch’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>뱟</td>
<td>/ch/</td>
<td>[ch]</td>
<td>ch</td>
<td>ch’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>뱙</td>
<td>/c’/</td>
<td>[c’]</td>
<td>cc</td>
<td>tch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>뱠</td>
<td>/k/</td>
<td>[k,g]</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k,g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>뱡</td>
<td>/kh/</td>
<td>[kh]</td>
<td>kh</td>
<td>k’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>뱳</td>
<td>/k’/</td>
<td>[k’]</td>
<td>kk</td>
<td>kk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>뱴</td>
<td>/m/</td>
<td>[m]</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>뱵</td>
<td>/n/</td>
<td>[n,n]</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>뱶*</td>
<td>/ŋ/</td>
<td>[ŋ]</td>
<td>ng</td>
<td>ng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>뱷</td>
<td>/l/</td>
<td>[l,r]</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>l,r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>뱸</td>
<td>/h/</td>
<td>[h]</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* In initial position, this letter is a place-holder and has a null value; in syllable-final position, it has the value indicated.
Korean Romanization Systems, cont’d.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VOWELS AND DIPHTHONGS:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/i/</td>
<td>[i]</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/wi,y/</td>
<td>[wi,y]</td>
<td>wi</td>
<td>wi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/e/</td>
<td>[e]</td>
<td>ey</td>
<td>e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/je/</td>
<td>[je]</td>
<td>yey</td>
<td>ye</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/we/</td>
<td>[we]</td>
<td>wey</td>
<td>we</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/we,ø/</td>
<td>[we,ø]</td>
<td>oy</td>
<td>oe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ɛ/</td>
<td>[ɛ]</td>
<td>ay</td>
<td>ae</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/je/</td>
<td>[je]</td>
<td>yay</td>
<td>yae</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/we/</td>
<td>[we]</td>
<td>way</td>
<td>wae</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/i/</td>
<td>[ɨ]</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>ū</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ɔ/</td>
<td>[ɔ]</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>ō</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/jə/</td>
<td>[jə]</td>
<td>ye</td>
<td>yō</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/wə/</td>
<td>[wə]</td>
<td>we</td>
<td>wō</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/a/</td>
<td>[a]</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ja/</td>
<td>[ja]</td>
<td>ya</td>
<td>ya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/wa/</td>
<td>[wa]</td>
<td>wa</td>
<td>wa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/u/</td>
<td>[u]</td>
<td>wu</td>
<td>u</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ju/</td>
<td>[ju]</td>
<td>y(w)u</td>
<td>yu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/o/</td>
<td>[o]</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/jo/</td>
<td>[jo]</td>
<td>yo</td>
<td>yo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ij/</td>
<td>[i,][j], i.e]</td>
<td>uy</td>
<td>ŭi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[following Sohn 1999]
CODING SYSTEM FOR WRITTEN TRANSCRIPTS
AND LOCATING DIGITIZED AUDIO FILES
ON ACCOMPANYING CD-ROMS

References to transcripts
Segments from the corpus, when used as examples in the text, will normally not include all of the prosodic or other annotations, as this information can be consulted in the more exhaustively marked transcript to be found in Appendix E, Narrative Transcripts. An identifying code is provided with each example in the text, to facilitate identification of its location in the transcripts in the appendix. The identifying code is as follows: name of speaker, abbreviated title of narrative text in brackets, number of narrative text, line(s) of the transcript which were excerpted for use as an example in the text, e.g.,

(Sun-Ja [JunkJob]8:1-5, 104-106)

The above citation refers to Sun Ja’s narrative entitled ‘Junk Job’, which corresponds to narrative text number 8 in Appendix E. The lines cited as an example correspond to lines 1-5 and 104-106 in narrative text 8.

Locating digital audio versions of the narrative texts on CD-1
The main corpus of narrative texts 1-12 has been digitized and the individual narratives can be heard in their entirety on CD-1, without separation into individual segments. The audio version of the full narrative texts 1-12 can be located by searching for the title of the narrative inside the folders on CD-1. Note, however, that texts 13 and 14, containing Young-Eun's comments on Modern Times, are available in digital format only on CD-2 as segments. Texts 15-17, Sun Ja's comments after viewing Modern Times, can be found on CD-1 in the folder labeled 'MTBread'.

References to digitized audio segments on CD-2
Most of the segments discussed in the text have been digitized. These are available in audio version on CD-2. If a digitized audio file is available for a particular segment being discussed in the text, an additional reference to the location of that digitized segment on CD-2 will be provided, in brackets. For example, the reference

(Young-Eun [Waif]13:11,13-14;[YELsegs: ccwhrliv, ccNMhse])

refers to Young-Eun Lee’s story 'The Waif', narrative text number 13 in Appendix E, which contains the transcripts of the narratives. The lines cited as an example correspond to lines 11 and 13-14 in narrative text 13. The information following the semicolon (;) refers to the location of the digitized segments on CD-2. In this case, under the folder entitled YELsegs, there are two digitized audio segments (ccwhrliv and ccNMhse), corresponding to the data in the example.
PREFACE

FROM SILENCE TO SOUND
—AND BACK AGAIN

Who's speaking whose language? Contact signing between deaf and hearing co-workers
M.A. Thesis 1994

Making do with what you've got: The use of prosody as a linguistic resource in second
language narratives
Ph.D. Dissertation 2003

Can a conceptual thread be found to link the issues involved in my earlier study of
a native signer's code-switching between English and American Sign Language and those
invoked in this study's investigation of immigrants' creative uses of prosody? How can
phenomena found in a language expressed in the visual mode without sound illuminate
issues related to prosodic phenomena in spoken languages? How could knowledge about
the sound patterns in spoken languages inform sign language studies? Can linguistic
study slip so easily between silence and sound?

Edward Klima and Ursual Bellugi, authors of the The Signs of Language (1979),
clearly thought there was potential for interesting cross-linguistic and cross-modal
insights when they began their research on American Sign Language:...'[I]f sign
languages are autonomous languages, then they would constitute an experiment in nature
allowing us seriously to address fundamental issues about the human capacity for
language and the form of language' (3). Klima and Bellugi soon discovered that
'American Sign Language ...[is]...in fact a complexly structured language with a highly
articulated grammar, a language that exhibits many of the fundamental properties
linguists have posited for all languages. But the special forms in which such properties are manifested turn out to be primarily a function of the visual-gestural mode' (4).

One of the lines of linguistic inquiry most spectacularly illuminated by investigations into both spoken and signed languages is thus the nature of language itself and the universality of many properties of language as it has evolved as a communicative tool in the course of human development.

Given the conclusive evidence from sign language studies which demonstrate the human propensity to seek ways to linguistically encode thoughts in an alternative modality, utterly distinct from the sound modality of spoken languages, it should not be surprising to discover that long-term immigrants, who are similar to deaf people in that they have ongoing communicative needs yet possess limited access to the linguistic resources of the language of their surrounding communities, quite instinctively make use of the most readily accessible alternative resources to meet those communicative needs. In the case of the deaf, the most visually accessible alternative resources are body movements, facial expressions and gestures. Organized into linguistically meaningful patterns, over time and through conventionalized use in a speech community, these visual resources eventually constitute a recognizably separate language.

I submit that it is this quintessential human instinct to seek to express cognitive processes under any circumstance which drives the long-term immigrants' creative use of prosody to linguistically encode meaning in their narratives when the usual resources are unavailable.
[Noting that sign language studies have substantially contributed to establishing
the ability of the human mind to encode meaning in linguistic form independent of
modality, it becomes quite evident that one of the essential features of the mind is its
ability--its drive, one might even say--to find a way to express human cognitive processes
in a linguistic code.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION:
APPROACHES TO THE STUDY OF ADULT LEARNER LANGUAGE

[Discourse tasks are universals of human interaction. An understanding of how relational signs function to signal these tasks can provide basic insights into how interpretations are agreed upon and altered in the course of an interaction by differentially foregrounding, subordinating, and associating various information carrying items. If conversational involvement is to be maintained, higher level relational signs must be shared although participants may disagree on the meaning of words and idioms...

Cross-cultural analysis of how discourse tasks are signalled—that is, how focusing, phrasing, coreferentiality and other aspects of cohesion are signalled—can form the basis for empirical investigations of pan human features of communicative competence.

Gumperz (1982b:329)

1.1 Introduction

This study takes as its terrain of inquiry a series of spontaneous, unrehearsed oral narratives recounted in English by six adult Korean long-term immigrants to Hawai‘i who have had only minimal formal instruction in English. Such learners are referred to by second language acquisitionists (see Ellis 1994:12) as 'uninstructed' language learners and the learning of the language of the host community through naturally occurring interaction rather than through explicit instructor intervention or mediation is known as 'naturalistic' acquisition, or, alternatively, 'spontaneous second language acquisition', as opposed to 'instructed language acquisition' or 'guided language learning' (see Perdue 1984:3 and passim; Klein 1986:16-19 and passim; Krashen 1976). Over long years of residency and employment in a nominally English-speaking community, the Korean immigrants whose narratives upon which this study is based have developed a basic grammar and a simple lexicon which serve their everyday communicative needs. However, by any standard test of syntactic complexity, or if evaluated by measures of
target-like phonological or lexical accuracy, they would without doubt be labeled ‘low proficiency’ English speakers by linguists or educators. And I, too, would concur with this assessment, if such measures as syntactic complexity or lexical accuracy and diversity are the measuring sticks.

Yet the narratives these immigrants manage to tell in English to a reasonably sympathetic listener are full of humor and drama, emotional highs and lows, insights into their lives as immigrants, reflections on the human condition, and portrayals of a multitude of characters who have peopled their lives, not to mention the rendering of cognitively and syntactically complex cause and effect relationships and the sequencing of multiple layers of chronological events.

The question which immediately imposes itself on the observer who contrasts the apparent paucity of the speakers' linguistic resources with the richness and complexity of their narratives is the following: How can individuals who dispose of such apparently limited linguistic resources manage to communicate so effectively, so compellingly, and with such spontaneity? Discovering the linguistic and communicative resources used by these ‘low proficiency’ speakers of English to accomplish such relatively sophisticated narratives is the focus of this study.

This quest has led in many different directions. After considering and subsequently rejecting various approaches, what ultimately emerged as the most salient and potentially the most fertile line of investigation from a linguistic perspective was the second language speakers’ seemingly instinctive, in any case, untutored, use of prosody to organize lexically elliptical and syntactically incomplete propositions into coherent
discourse. Upon close examination, it became apparent that it is reliance on prosodic contours which enables them to organize the flow of their narrative discourse, a discourse almost entirely lacking overt lexical discourse markers or conventionally realized English syntactic cohesion. This study will thus focus on the prosodic features serving to provide discourse structure and cohesion, and ultimately coherence, in the spontaneous narratives related by these speakers. The focus on the communicability of the narratives also entails, necessarily, a consideration of the listener's reliance on these prosodic cues to process the narrative as it unfolds and on the listener as co-participant in the construction of the narratives.

In the process of searching for the discourse organizational features of the narratives recounted by these users of English as a second language, the study touches upon many still obscure areas of both second language acquisition phenomena and the nature of human language: What does 'natural second language' look like when acquired with a minimum of formal instruction by adult learners? What linguistic or para-linguistic resources are available to a cognitively and communicatively mature adult who disposes of limited lexical and syntactic knowledge of the target language? What are the redundant features of language and under what conditions can these redundancies be exploited by the language user? How are the various components of language interrelated? These questions and more are raised by the analysis of the narratives recorded for this study. Answers to all of these broader questions will not be attempted, but it is hoped that the data examined here and the explanations proposed might at least provide partial answers and point in the direction of fruitful research in the future.
Lest the essential message be lost in the pursuit of answers to a myriad of questions, however, let me reiterate what I take to be one of the fundamental points of this study. The efficacy demonstrated by these untutored adult immigrants throughout the communicative task of recounting personal narratives could be called a kind of competence—a competence which I shall refer to as 'communicative competence'\(^3\).

Referring to the interpretive framework of the term proposed by Hymes (1972a, 1979), definitions of communicative competence usually refer to a relatively extensive knowledge of the lexical and syntactic components of a language as well as pragmatic rules for applying them appropriately in actual language use, in contrast to and as an extension of Chomsky's narrowly defined use of the term 'linguistic competence' with reference to an idealized speaker's unconscious knowledge of language. Hymes explicitly sought to extend Chomsky's notion of grammatical competence to encompass a socialized speaker's ability to make use of a particular speech community's extensive verbal repertoire, including recognizable speech acts and pragmatic and poetic uses of language. Here, however, I will use the term not to refer to a speaker's competence in the verbal repertoire of a specific speech community, but rather to an adult immigrant's ability, despite lexical and syntactic lacunae, to draw on his or her knowledge of an array of social and verbal repertoires in order to cross the hurdle of exolingual communication.

Keeping in mind Hymes' (1972a) most basic description of competence as 'dependent upon both (tacit) knowledge and (ability for) use' (Duranti 2001 reprint:64), my interpretation is inspired by the general parameters if not the letter of Hymes' original conceptualization. Milroy and Milroy (1991), although speaking of communicative
competence with respect to native speakers of a language, similarly define communicative competence in functional terms as 'ordinary individuals who use language appropriately in a variety of circumstances' (99). Thus defining communicative competence as the use of available linguistic resources to achieve pragmatically desired effects in the course of communicative interactions, this study could be classified, among other things, as a profile of communicative competence. The citation from Gumperz (1982b:329) at the head of the chapter, situating communicative competence in the broad context of 'discourse tasks' and indicating that the manner in which speakers signal 'focusing, phrasing, coreferentiality and other aspects of cohesion' within a discourse task can 'form the basis for empirical investigations of pan human features of communicative competence' is a perspective which I take in this study. This study will, then, investigate the use of prosody as a major linguistic resource available to low proficiency, long-term resident immigrant second language speakers in the expression of their communicative competence.

1.2 Previous studies of adult second language learners

In order to appreciate the contribution which an analysis of this study’s corpus can make both to the study of second language acquisition phenomena and to the study of language in general, this section will provide a brief review of previous approaches to and insights obtained from the study of adult second language learners. What will become apparent is that the nature of the questions asked as well as the speaker/learner
profiles in those previous studies were, for the most part, quite different from those of the current study.

1.2.1 Good language learner and individual differences studies

Beginning in the 1960s and throughout the 1970s and 1980s, a number of American and Canadian studies attempted to ascertain the attributes of 'good language learners', with the ultimate goal of finding a way to translate these findings into improved instructional methods for the benefit of large numbers of learners. (See, inter alia, Carton 1966, 1971; Chastain 1975; Rubin 1975, 1981; Stern 1975; Tucker, Hamayan & Genesee 1976; Bialystok & Fröhlich 1978; Brown 1977; Neufeld 1979; Krashen 1981; Nation & McLaughlin 1986; Politzer 1983; Politzer & McGroarty 1985; Oxford, Nyikos & Ehrman 1988; Skehan 1989, 1991; Gardner 1991, Diller, ed. 1981). The dedication of the researchers in this line of inquiry to improving language learning efficiency through the study of individual differences can perhaps be traced to the post-World War II international geopolitical situation of the 1960s. In the U.S. in particular, increasing priority was placed on native-born American English speakers' acquisition of proficiency in foreign languages in order to serve the economic and geopolitical interests of the emerging superpower abroad. As a result of the geopolitical ideology of the era, most universities maintained entrance requirements which specified a minimum of two years of high school foreign language instruction and graduation requirements which included the equivalent of two years of college-level foreign language instruction. These requirements, combined with an influx of students, due in no small part to the
democratization of access to higher education for returning personnel of the armed forces under the provisions of the so-called GI Bill, led to a burgeoning of enrollment in foreign language classrooms at both the secondary and tertiary level. As the educational system was faced with an influx of enrollment in foreign language classes that was producing less-than-spectacular results in terms of language proficiency, language specialists began searching for the 'magic formula' to successful language learning.

In Canada, on the other hand, which was the locus of many of these early studies, the impetus behind the 'good language learner' and other studies of successful language learning (e.g., Naiman, Fröhlich & Stern 1975; Naiman, Fröhlich, Stern & Todesco 1978; Lambert & Gardner 1972) was also the result of a particular socio-political conjuncture. On the one hand, paralleling global trends, there was an increased interest among the general public in improving second language learning efficiency. These expectations were not being met through existing programs such as the FLES (Foreign Languages in the Elementary School). (See Stern 1973 for a review of attitudes toward bilingualism in Quebec during this period.)

On the other hand, there was a highly charged socio-political climate regarding the status of Quebec, the debate centering on whether Quebec should become independent or whether it should remain part of the Canadian confederation, with or without arrangements for special status. The period witnessed what became known as the "Quiet Revolution", which brought in its wake increased visibility for the French language and ultimately obtained official recognition for the French cultural and linguistic heritage of the Province of Quebec. The political climate of the 1960s aroused a
high level of involvement among the general public, both Anglophone and Francophone, regarding the role of language education in forging political and cultural identities. Canadian Francophones were worried that their language and culture would be overwhelmed by English, the majority language, while politically progressive Anglophones were seeking a way to contribute to the creation of a more tolerant and culturally diverse society, with a simultaneous view to ensuring their children's competitiveness in a country which was declared officially bilingual in 1969 after passage of the Bilingualism Act. The conjuncture of these concerns led to the launching, in 1965, of the first French language immersion class for Anglophone children in St. Lambert, a suburb of Montreal with a population which was approximately 50% French-speaking and 50% English-speaking. The St. Lambert experimental program produced good results in terms of bilingual French-English proficiency and in terms of overall academic performance in both English and French, a record which generated a surge in enrollment of monolingual English speakers in French language immersion programs not only in the province of Quebec but throughout Canada. (See Lambert & Tucker 1972 for details on the original project at St. Lambert, and Crawford 1999: 139-142 for a brief overview and information on subsequent developments.)

In Canada, the St. Lambert project was followed with great interest by language pedagogues and researchers, and a number of language learning studies were conducted over the years with the participation of the students in the St. Lambert project. Indeed, the parents who collaborated on the project sought guarantees that student performance would be continually and carefully monitored. Necessarily, all of these studies were
conducted with school-age children in instructional settings, although acquisition of the second language was achieved in an immersion setting rather than through explicit instruction in the target language.


Building on the prior research which established taxonomies of the attributes of individual successful language learners and the strategies they used, a second phase of studies began to synthesize the typology of language learning strategies by both children and adults and to examine their potential applications (Rubin & Thompson 1982; O'Malley et al. 1985a, O'Malley et al. 1985b; Oxford 1985; Faerch & Kasper 1984; Chamot et al. 1988; Watanabe 1991; Nizegorodcew 1993; for collections which include
several important papers on language learning strategies, see Wenden & Rubin, eds. 1987, Faerch & Kasper, eds. 1983 and Parry & Stansfield, eds. 1990). While a large number of individual factors and an array of strategies, most commonly grouped into social strategies, cognitive strategies and metastrategies, have been identified by increasingly sophisticated research programs, consistently significant correlations between these factors and successful language learning have yet to be established.

This lack of correlation notwithstanding, the deployment of strategies makes intuitive sense and appeals to both classroom language teachers and to language learners. As a result, publications designed for the language pedagogue, promoting overt classroom instruction in the use of learning strategies, began to gain considerable favor throughout the 1990s. Today the idea of ‘coaching’ language learners into both conscious and unconscious use of language strategies informs many widely adopted language teaching textbooks and curricula. (See, inter alia, Oxford 1989, 1990; Oxford, Lavine & Crookall 1989; Wenden 1991; O’Malley & Chamot 1990; Reid 1995).6

A final example of both the socio-political impetus underlying various research agenda on language learning as well as the powerful appeal of the cognitively-based differentiated learning styles approach is provided by the Australian experience. In the 1970s, after the Americans and Canadians were well launched into their research programs of second language acquisition, Australia for the first time in its history began to see a large increase in immigration from non-English-speaking countries. This phenomenon in turn spawned the creation of specially-tailored English language programs for people who were referred to at the time as ‘migrants’ (the term ‘immigrant’
is now in common use (Willing 1988:viii, ed. note). Faced with a sizeable population of
adult English language learners of various ethnicities and cultural backgrounds and aware
of the ongoing North American research programs which demonstrated that individual
differences can contribute to substantially different learning outcomes, and, furthermore,
sensitive to the learner-centered curriculum concerns of the times, Australian scholars at
the Adult Migrant Education Service (AMES) of New South Wales determined that there
was a need for research which would combine findings on individual differences with
data on culturally-conditioned cognitive styles, learning styles and the use of learning
strategies.

Willing (1988) reports on the findings of the AMES learning styles project and
provides a list of the recommendations for the instruction of adult immigrant learners
which resulted from the research, the fundamental one being that 'in the setting-up and
running of any learning arrangement the needs of the individual as a learner should be
weighted equally with the needs of that individual as a language-user' (167), as a
consequence of which '[l]earning style should be as important as speaking proficiency
level in assigning learners to learning arrangements' and '[o]vert indications of learning
preference should be accommodated if at all possible even if such preferences conflict
with the teacher's belief about what constitutes effective learning' (168). Contrary to
initial hypotheses, the Australian research found no significant differences regarding
learner preferences based on ethno-cultural origins and other biographical factors such as
educational level and urban vs. non-urban background (150-151). It was an individual's
predisposition toward one cognitive style or another which outweighed the biographical
factors in the distribution of learning preference styles. The report concluded that
'...learning style or cognitive style should be legitimate criteria for allocating students to
particular learning arrangements' (170) and that '...in principle it should at least be
recognized that the aim of helping learners "learn how to learn" is quite as important as
impacting language skills' (172). Thus, for the instructed adult language learning situation
with which it was concerned, the AMES project recommended evaluation of learners'
cognitive styles as part of the placement process and its placement policies were
accordingly extensively reformulated to explicitly support a learner-centered approach,
allowing adult learners considerable leeway in selecting their own learning targets and
classroom teaching modes, 'even if such preferences conflict with the teacher's belief
about what constitutes effective learning', as cited above.

In sum, while the early investigations into good language learners and the closely
related studies of individual learner differences examined a variety of learner attributes,
very few of these dealt with untutored language learners. The ultimate applications of the
findings of these studies have essentially been in the field of language pedagogy for post-
adolescent instructed language learners. The learning strategies employed by uninstructed
learners during acquisition and their communicative strategies in the target language
remain, for the most part, under-investigated and undescribed within this research
tradition.

1.2.2 Interlanguage and fossilization studies

Another major line of inquiry in second language acquisition, known as the
'interlanguage hypothesis' or the 'interlanguage framework', also originated in what can
be called a classroom-based research approach (e.g., Selinker 1969, 1972). These studies trace their intellectual roots back through the contrastive analysis and error analysis approach, originating with Fries (1945) and Lado (1957), and continued in the work of Corder (1967). (See Selinker 1992 for a detailed overview of the intellectual and research antecedents of the interlanguage hypothesis.) The interlanguage approach developed rather independently of the studies focusing on individual attributes of learners, and in contrast to the more descriptive, pedagogically-motivated approach of the good language learner and strategy use studies, it is more often driven by theoretical concerns such as discovering the nature of the language faculty and the cognitive processes involved in acquiring a second or subsequent language. The interlanguage hypothesis therefore served as an underlying cornerstone of many of the studies on developmental sequences in second language acquisition by both children and adults, among which were important ones conducted by Dulay & Burt (1974); Bailey, Madden & Krashen (1974), and Larsen-Freeman (1976). (See Huebner 1983 and Ellis 1994 for overviews of the results of these studies.)

Although it does not appear to have originated with him, the term ‘interlanguage’ (IL) gained currency in the field of second language acquisition research as a result of Selinker’s use of the term in his influential 1972 paper by that name. Simply phrased, interlanguage refers to a language learner’s (presumably temporary) point on a continuum between native language and target language. Without digressing into the theoretical and methodological battles which have ensued from various interpretations of the term, the thrust of the interlanguage hypothesis is that a learner’s interlanguage at any
given moment is assumed to reflect the learner’s interiorized rules regarding the target language; the state of the learner’s interiorized rules in turn reflect the learner’s hypotheses regarding transferable first language rules, as well as partly or imperfectly learned rules from the target language and overgeneralization of language data encountered in the acquisition process. Interlanguage studies are thus primarily concerned with the cognitive processes involved in language acquisition, including transfer phenomena from the learners’ native language but also attending closely to the various processes of learner hypothesis testing. (See Ellis 1986: 47-54 for a concise overview of the early interlanguage theory.)

The concept of ‘interlanguage’ applies equally to both tutored and untutored learning environments, although the mechanism for moving from one plateau to another (or from one point on the continuum to another) may be quite different in the two situations and may not occur in the same order. Selinker (1992) in fact hypothesizes that instructed language learning may actually ‘interfere’ with the natural language acquisition process by retarding or impeding natural language acquisition by withholding input data at the point when the learner is ready for it.9

In his retrospective discussion of the development of the interlanguage framework, Selinker (1992) explains how the work of S. Pit Corder stimulated a paradigm shift:

One of the original breakthroughs, in my view, was ...[Corder (1967)’s] insight that reframed our conception of ‘errors’ from something negative showing lazy unmotivated students to something normal and important for learning to occur, a ‘window’ on the learner’s internal grammar, a learning strategy perhaps necessary to promote SLA (Selinker 1992:144).
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The interlanguage framework is invoked here as a relevant antecedent to this study not only because the learners whose narratives form the corpus of this study are obviously speakers of an interlanguage, but also due to the impact which this framework has had on the formulation of research approaches in second language acquisition. In particular, several important investigations into language acquisition by adult naturalistic acquirers have been either inspired or supported by the perspective taken by the interlanguage framework's view of naturalistic acquirers as highly valued sources of data permitting an examination of natural processes of acquisition. (See, *inter alia*, Schmidt 1983; Huebner 1979, 1983; Meisel, Clahsen & Pienemann 1981 and Clahsen, Meisel & Pienemann 1983 regarding results from the German guest worker language acquisition project [Zweitsprachenerwerb italienischer und spanischer Arbeiter (ZISA)]; Perdue1993a regarding the European Science Foundation's longitudinal study of immigrant workers from six source languages acquiring five target languages.) Although it is incidental to this study, it should be mentioned that the interlanguage framework has also profoundly affected language teaching practices and classroom-based research through its re-conceptualization of non-target-like learner production not as 'errors’ but as valuable data requiring analysis by both researchers and classroom teachers.10 (See Selinker 1992 for extensive commentary on this point.)

Although there have been distinct differences in the theoretical orientations in the plethora of studies inspired by the interlanguage framework which appeared after the publication of Selinker's (1972) paper, they can be roughly categorized into two groups: (1) those designed by researchers who view interlanguage as an imperfect version of the
target language, located somewhere on a continuum between source language and target language (e.g., Meisel 1983; Meisel, Clahsen & Pienemann 1981), and (2) those designed by researchers who focus on interlanguage as a unique natural language in its own right, developing according to its own internal system, not as a defective form of a target language (L2), nor pre-determined by the system of the source language (L1) (Corder 1967, 1976, 1981; Nemser 1971; Selinker 1984, 1992, 1993; Selinker & Lakshamanan 1992; Long and Sato 1984; Adjemian 1976; Bley-Vroman 1983; for collections which include several important papers in this framework, see Gass & Selinker, eds. 1983 and Davies, Criper & Howatt, eds. 1984).  

Despite what might appear to be the case in this brief characterization, the differences between the two lines of thought are not always starkly drawn, however. Researchers of both persuasions, for example, must inevitably attend to and account for the role of both L1 and L2, which exert, at one time or another in the language learning process, differentiated effects on the learner’s output. Faced with contradictory evidence supplied by language learners in their studies, researchers of both persuasions must acknowledge that interlanguage, i.e., learner language, exhibits erratic behavior: at times it behaves as if it were being inexorably drawn (or driven) toward a target, and at other times it seems to behave as if it had a mind of its own. The fact that both tendencies can be observed is, in part, responsible for the development of the two quite different approaches to the study of the phenomenon.

In general terms, it can be said that researchers of the first persuasion applying the interlanguage framework to studies of second language acquisition tend to focus on
analyses of variation within the interlanguage (see, *inter alia*, Tarone 1979, 1983, 1989; Schachter 1986; Huebner 1983) and on the developmental sequences located along that continuum (see, *inter alia*, Andersen 1991; Meisel 1983, 1987; Meisel, Clahsen & Pienemann 1981). On the other hand, studies informed by the second conceptualization of interlanguage, i.e., interlanguage as a natural language with its own internal logic, tend to take the learner language itself as the object of investigation, the assumption being that interlanguage is of interest to the linguist for what it can illustrate about the organization of the human language faculty and the ability to acquire language. (For examples of studies carried on within the second approach, see details of the research program and findings of the European Science Foundation and the Heidelberger Research Project in, *inter alia*, Heidelberger Forschungsprojekt 'Pidgin-Deutsch' 1975 [1978]; W. Klein 1981a; Klein & Dittmar 1979; Klein & Perdue 1997; Klein & Perdue 1992; Perdue 1991; Perdue, ed. 1993a, 1993b; Perdue, ed., 1984; Perdue & Klein 1992; Perdue 1996). 12

In historical perspective, then, the relevance of the interlanguage framework to the current study is that it provides the theoretical grounding for a paradigm shift in approaches to the study of second language acquisition by proposing that the study of learner ‘errors’ or non-target-like production could fruitfully be turned from a deficit, non-target-like perspective to an investigation which seeks to glean evidence for learners’ cognitive processes from non-standard productions. This study adopts a similar approach, investigating non-standard learner language not so much for what it can tell us about second language acquisition, but what second language acquisition phenomena can tell us about the language faculty.
The validity of the investigative method which seeks information on cognitive processes associated with the language faculty through a study of non-standard output is further buttressed by an important corrective critique of interlanguage research methodology, proposed by Bley-Vroman (1983). Bley-Vroman critiques research which employs what he terms ‘the comparative fallacy’ (1), i.e., ‘the mistake of studying the systematic character of one language by comparing it to another’ (6), resulting in obscuring the nature of the interlanguage. Bley-Vroman argues against the practice of ‘employing analytical concepts defined relative to the target language...’, deeming this a practice which constitutes ‘a serious obstacle to the investigation of crucial questions about the nature of learners’ languages’ (1). In his critique, Bley-Vroman points out the distorted logic of the comparative fallacy pervading most interlanguage studies of that era, including one of the most rigorous in which Selinker himself participated (e.g., Tarone, Frauenfelder & Selinker 1976). As Bley-Vroman (1983) put it,

[t]he comparative fallacy can have very serious effects on the validity of empirical studies in the way that it influences the interpretation and classification of data....[A]ny study which classifies interlanguage (IL) data according to a target language (TL) scheme or depends on the notion of obligatory context or binary choice will likely fail to illuminate the structure of the IL. Of course any study which uses a target language scheme to preselect data for investigation (such as a study which begins with a corpus of errors) is even more liable to obscure the phenomenon under investigation (15).

Criticizing some of the interlanguage research falling in the first category described above, Bley-Vroman (1983) goes on to say that ‘variation theory may perhaps be a reasonable way to describe certain facets of an interlanguage system, but variability must be measured against internally constructed systematic rules, not against the rules of
the target language—rules which may indeed be unknown to the learner and in principle irrelevant to any description...of the learner’s interlanguage’(14).

Influential as the interlanguage hypothesis has been, and important as it is as an historical antecedent for the current study in terms its theoretically-motivated approach to the study of learner language as a window into the cognitive processes involved in second language acquisition, a major distinction between the interlanguage research program and the goals of this study should be pointed out.

Contrary to the focus of most of the interlanguage research which seeks to analyze acquisition processes in early stages of acquisition and which attempts to capture change-in-progress or snapshots of language learning progress at successive stages of acquisition\(^{13}\), the current study is concerned with principles of language usage at the end-stage of the acquisition process. It is neither the process of acquisition nor is it the end-product \textit{per se} which is analyzed in this study, but, rather, the dynamics of the communicative process as it is engaged in by speakers with limited linguistic resources who are accustomed to 'making do' with these resources in their every day communicative acts.

Indeed, the aspect of 'making do', and the fact that these arguably stabilized, fossilized speakers have learned to 'make do' over a long period of time is a significant contributing factor to the dynamics of the communicative process. Instructed language learners, who experience relatively short-term lack of proficiency while attempting to use the target language in sheltered situations such as the language classroom, tend to develop quite different strategies in their communicative encounters. The experiential
difference can lead to quite different outcomes. There are some fossilization researchers who claim, in fact, that the pressure to speak and use the target language for communicative purposes while receiving feedback from one's interlocutor that communication has been successfully accomplished before knowledge of target language structures is fully mature can actually contribute to learners' early fossilization. (See Ellis 1994: 354; Vigil & Oller 1976; Higgs & Clifford 1982.)

This study starts from the assumption that the long-term resident immigrants whose narratives constitute the data for this study have stabilized for quite some time at their current stage of language acquisition, i.e., the assumption is that they are fossilized language learners, fossilization being loosely defined as the cessation of substantial progress in the process of acquiring a target language. Selinker and Lamendella (1978) define fossilization 'in terms of a permanent cessation of IL learning before the learner has attained TL norms at all levels of linguistic structure and in all discourse domains in spite of the learner's positive ability, opportunity and motivation to learn and acculturate' into the target (187). There exists, however, a certain amount of confusion in the field regarding fossilization.

There is, first of all, confusion in the definition and usage of the term. Selinker (1992) provides a somewhat technical definition:

Fossilizable linguistic phenomena are linguistic items, rules and subsystems which speakers of a particular NL [native language] will tend to keep in their IL [interlanguage] relative to a particular TL [target language], no matter what the age of the learner or amount of explanation and instruction he receives in the TL (353).
In his review of the various usages made of the word, Ellis (1994) settles on a more
general definition: ‘...the term fossilization has been used to label the process by which
non-target forms become fixed in interlanguage’ (353).14

Beyond terminological disputes, however, are two further conceptual
disagreements relating to fossilization and which bear on the current study. The first has
to do with determining precisely what language phenomena, measured under which
conditions, should be taken as evidence of fossilization and whether or not the
phenomenon is inevitable. The second has to do with explanations for the phenomenon.
Selinker raised some of these puzzling questions in his 1972 paper, and a number of
subsequent studies have taken up the issues. (See Selinker 1993; Selinker &
Lakshamanan 1992; Selinker & Lamendella 1978, 1979a, 1979b; Coulter 1968;
Tollefson & Firn 1983; Vigil & Oller 1976; Schmidt 1983; Zuengler 1989; Long 1997;
Lardiere 1998). Fossilization is generally presumed to occur in virtually every case of
post-adolescent language learning. Indeed, Selinker (1972) demonstrates the centrality of
fossilization phenomena to the interlanguage framework when he says that

[a] crucial fact,...which any adequate theory of second-language learning
will have to explain is this regular reappearance or reemergence in IL
productive performance of linguistic structures which were thought to be
eradicated. This behavioral reappearance is what has led me to postulate
the reality of fossilization and ILs (216) [cited in Long 1997].

Long (1997), however, based on his long-term study of ‘Ayako’, including data
collected and analyzed at the ten-year interval mark, argues that such analyses of long-
term immigrant learner language reveal synchronic variability ‘within and across
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tasks...and change over time’ and that the term ‘fossilization’, strictly speaking, is therefore a misnomer. Perdue, ed. (1984), on the other hand, explains that the decision of the ESF team to conduct their investigation over a 30-month period was based on the results of a study within the earlier Heidelberg project which had correlated factors such as length of residence and type and intensity of contact with speakers of the target language with 'linguistic performance, measured by a syntactic index' and had found that 'length of stay in the target community played no significant role after the first two years' (249). Selinker (1985-6) states that the ESF approach 'provides further evidence that...early fossilization is indeed the norm. Permanent fossilization is of course hard to demonstrate...[and] many researchers operationally establish a five year cut-off point’ (580).

Setting aside issues of nomenclature and appropriate measurement for the moment, it should be mentioned that the search for explanations of the conditions which contribute to the persistence of interlanguage structures (i.e., non-target-like structures) in learner production--e.g., ‘fossilization’--is another subject of much discussion in the field of interlanguage research. (See Van Buren 1988; Scovel 1988; Preston 1989; Zuengler 1989a, 1989b, 1989c; Coulter 1968; Schumann 1976, 1978a, 1978b; Schmidt 1983; Bean 1988; Sims 1988; Davies 1984; Schachter 1990; Klein 1984, 1986; Perdue, ed. 1984; see also, however, Ioup et al. 1994 for a study of an exceptional untutored adult language learner who appears not to have fossilized and who has achieved all-but-nativelike proficiency in Egyptian Arabic while remaining illiterate in the target language.)
This brief excursion into issues of fossilization within interlanguage studies has been introduced because the narrators whose narrative texts constitute the corpus of this study speak an interlanguage which is arguably fossilized by most commonly accepted definitions of the term. Whether the claim of their having attained a fossilized state is tenable, using the criteria established by Long (1997), (e.g., observation of incidental synchronic or even systematic diachronic variation), is actually irrelevant to the question examined here, however. I stress that the syntactic structures and the lexicon of the interlanguage of these speakers is ‘arguably’ fossilized, i.e., it has become stabilized at a low level of syntactic and lexical knowledge after periods of residency in the target language community ranging from nine to 25 years. The essential point is that in practical terms, the learners themselves, while continuously ‘hoping’ for improvement in their English language proficiency even after such long periods of residency and despite experiencing a lack of noticeable progress, have learned to cope with their communicative needs in the target language community and in interaction with target language speakers by devising oral communication strategies which compensate for their lack of proficiency.

The essential claim of this study is that discourse level prosody serves as a primary linguistic resource for low proficiency speakers who have 'stabilized' (if one wishes to avoid the term 'fossilized') at that low proficiency level after a considerable amount of time spent in a community speaking that target language (measured in years) and who have consistently experienced the need to communicate exolingually with speakers of [at least two varieties of] the target language over an extended period of time.
This claim is explicitly not made for low proficiency speakers who are still actively engaged in the acquisition process nor for those who learn the language without having to regularly undergo the necessity of communicating regularly in the target language in situations where they are the consistent 'underdog' in terms of language proficiency (e.g., the claim is not made for instructed learners who use the target language in 'sheltered' classroom communicative activities, nor for learners with only short term or intermittent contact with the target language). Therefore, the robustness of the claim for 'arguable' fossilization (in common sense terms) and the speakers' own perception of their target language proficiency is of theoretical import for the underlying premise of this study.

While it is not within the scope of this study to investigate the factors responsible for the development of the observed prosodic phenomena, the ethnographic material collected in the course of this study leads to a tentative hypothesis that it is the cumulative effect of a consistent lack of syntactic and lexical resources, plus an accumulation of communicative pressures and communicative needs, over time, which has induced these language learners to rely on alternative resources for communicative purposes. The term 'fossilized' is being used here not according to Long's (1997) proposed definition, which stipulated that a period of at least ten years with no change must be measured. Here I apply a non-quantified definition, but one sufficient for the questions relevant to this study, under which fossilization, or perhaps more accurately, 'stabilization', can be said to occur when no substantial progress can be noticed in terms of lexical acquisition or syntactic complexity, even if a limited number of individual lexical items may be acquired in the course of daily life and even if a limited number of
syntactic structures of a given speaker display inter-utterance variation, or variation from one data collection session to the next. This common-sensical definition of fossilization as stabilization is deemed sufficient for the questions relevant to this study, as the term is being used not to express a precise measurement of an interlanguage acquisition stage. Rather, it is being used as a general descriptive term covering both the dynamics (cessation or near-cessation of development) and, implicitly, the ultimate proficiency level attained (low) in the target language acquisition experience of these immigrants. A key feature of the fossilized language of the long-term immigrants' studied here, it should be noted, is a high degree of fluency, in the sense that they are able to sustain a running flow of conversation seemingly without limit.

1.2.3 Uninstructed adult immigrant learner studies

For a variety of reasons, the overwhelming majority of studies of second language acquisition phenomena referred to above have--with the exception of those so noted under the section on the interlanguage framework--relied on measurements obtained within instructed language learning situations. There are, first of all, practical considerations which underlie this reliance on instructed language learners: classroom learners are relatively easily accessible to researchers and research designs of many different types can be pursued within the framework of normal classroom procedures. Furthermore, incalculable investments of both mental and material resources around the world are devoted to classroom-based language learning, sanctioned in most cases by a formal testing system operated by the central government or by local
educational authorities. It is therefore entirely appropriate that research programs be
designed whose results will inform classroom language teaching and which will
ultimately benefit learners in these formal instruction situations. Indeed, the results
obtained by research programs conducted with learners receiving classroom instruction
have greatly contributed to an understanding of the process of language acquisition, both
in general terms and with respect to instructed language acquisition specifically. There is
no question but that research programs conducted with classroom learners are essential.

There are, however, numerous questions regarding the human faculty to acquire
second (or third, and subsequent) languages which remain unanswered by research
programs which provide results obtained only from instructed language learners. Indeed,
many issues regarding the human language faculty remain unaddressed when only data
obtained from instructed learners constitute the primary research material available to
investigators. In fact, some researchers argue that instructed language learning should be
informed by findings on natural acquisition processes from uninstructed language
learners. Larsen-Freeman and Long, for example, citing Corder (1981:7), who observed
that ‘efficient language teaching must work with, rather than against natural processes,
facilitate and expedite rather than impede learning’ (cited in Larsen-Freeman and Long
1991:3) argue in favor of discovering the characteristics of natural acquisition processes
as a preliminary step to the improvement of classroom instruction.

Because naturalistic, uninstructed learners often attain only rudimentary
command of the target language, they have been deemed uninteresting subjects by some
researchers in pursuit of the keys to successful language learning. For researchers
interested in pursuing their understanding of the nature of language and of the human language faculty by means of observable phenomena occurring throughout the process of second language acquisition, however, adult uninstructed language learners provide an ideal natural laboratory. In such learners, results will not be complicated by the effects of maturational stages of cognitive development (as is the case in second language acquisition studies of children), nor by the effects of instruction and such factors as the instructional sequence (as is the case in classroom-based studies). The variables which remain will be individual cognitive, psychological and social factors and their interaction with the linguistic material. 16

Wolfgang Klein, one of the principal investigators in the ambitious European Science Foundation’s cross-linguistic study of immigrant language learners which was conducted in the 1980s, argues that both researchers and language pedagogues have ‘a lot to learn from unguided learners’ (1986:18). Elaborating on this view, he explains:

There exists...the natural expectation that the study of guided learning (i.e. language instruction) would yield evidence of considerable value to the language teacher—more so at least than the study of spontaneous acquisition ever could. Hence the temptation to restrict investigations in SLA to the learning of a second language in the context of instruction.

This is a deplorable fallacy. It appears that any attempt at aiding the process of language acquisition must be based on a sound knowledge of the underlying mechanisms, or the laws that govern the process. It seems quite problematic to try to identify these mechanisms when their operation is modified by the application of a particular method of instruction (no matter whether its effect is positive or negative). The human mode of language processing—including first and second language acquisition—has evolved over millennia; organized instruction is a recent innovation historically. Human beings have thus acquired the ability to learn a language and, as a special case, a second language in actual communication, and we have no reason to assume that this ability can be freely manipulated, although there are surely points at which successful
intervention is possible. Granted this, we may also assume that the human language learning ability resists the various methods of instruction to varying degrees...[S]pontaneous language acquisition ought to be granted some 'logistic priority' in research; which is not to say that there is no need to investigate guided language learning... (18-19).

Selinker (1985-6) also weighed in on this issue, stating that '[$t]he linguistic problems of immigrants are of interest to SLA theory because by-and-large these are untutored learners. It has been claimed many times that because such learners are unfettered by classroom constraints, they can provide insights into the acquisition process which may be more basic than the intuitions of classroom informants' (569).\(^{17}\)

Thus, despite the preponderance of studies having been conducted in the context of instructed language learning, largely for reasons of practicality, the investigation of uninstructed adult immigrant language learning does enjoy strong theoretical support from leading scholars of language acquisition and bilingualism. In the extant literature on adult immigrant uninstructed language learning, there are basically three types of studies:

(1) those taking a longitudinal, individual case study approach to examine developmental stages as well as socio-psychological factors affecting language acquisition;

(2) those taking a socio-critical, ethnographic approach to examine factors such as ethnic relations and socio-economic status of immigrants as factors in their language acquisition and overall assimilation into target cultures; and, finally

(3) the large-scale, cross-linguistic, longitudinal studies undertaken by the European Science Foundation which analyzed the development of syntactic
structure and time and spatial references within the first two to three years of the learners' contact with the target language and culture.

Studies of the first and third categories have been briefly mentioned above in the earlier discussions of good language learners and interlanguage, but will be elaborated upon in the sections below. The socio-critical studies mentioned in the second category emanate primarily from the Anglo-Canadian research context and will also be reported on briefly below.

1.2.3.1 Developmental and socio-psychological perspectives: Individual case studies

In the United States, a country which has probably absorbed, in terms of sheer numbers, more adult speakers of languages other than the dominant language of the society than any other country in the world, it is quite remarkable that language researchers have devoted scant attention to phenomena associated with untutored language acquisition processes and the ultimate attainment of these immigrants. Only a handful of studies of adult immigrant language learners have been conducted in the United States and not all of them have focused on untutored learners. (See *inter alia* Krashen & Seliger 1975; Pica 1983; Coulter 1978; Hanania & Gradman 1977; Hatch, ed. 1978; Schumann 1975, 1978; Huebner 1983, Schmidt 1983.) Three longitudinal investigations have become classic case studies of syntactic and lexical development and general communicative competence of adult learners of English (e.g., Schumann's (1975, 1978) study of Alberto, a Costa Rican Spanish-speaking immigrant on the East Coast; Huebner's (1983) study of Ge, a Hmong-and Lao-speaking Laotian immigrant in
Hawai‘i; Schmidt's (1983) study of Wes, a Japanese artist who visited Hawai‘i for extended periods of time and eventually obtained permanent residency status). These case studies of adult learners focused on interlanguage features and variation in the learners' interlanguage over time, and attempted to examine the acquisition phenomena of these learners through interactional dynamics and psycho-socio-cultural factors.

Schumann's case study of Alberto, one of the six learners involved in the Cazden, Cancino, Rosansky and Schumann (1975) study who appeared to fossilize at a low level of proficiency after 14 months residency in an English-speaking community despite instructional intervention as well as on-going daily opportunities for contact in the community, formed the basis for his Acculturation Model, learner acculturation being determined, according to Schumann, by factors of social and psychological distance from the target culture and its speakers. The Acculturation Model was presumed to apply to second language acquisition of adult immigrants in majority language situations, based on a series of resemblances Schumann noted between Alberto's case and processes of pidginization in other language contact situations. Ellis (1985) summarizes the Schumann findings in the following terms: 'Schumann attributed the fossilization ... to the same social and psychological circumstances that typically contribute to a pidgin's emergence'...i.e. the learner "feels disconcerted by confrontation with a dominant culture and language and finds it necessary to adjust to a certain extent in order to survive"...but "he nevertheless avoids anything that could endanger social, cultural, and linguistic identity" (31).
Schmidt's three-year study was initially designed to produce evidence for Schumann's acculturation model. The learner was a Japanese artist who had exceedingly low social and psychological distance vis-à-vis the target culture and both strong intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, as well as opportunity, to learn the language through ongoing and meaningful communicative interactions with a large number of target language speakers. The prediction of the acculturation model is that such an individual would prove to be an ideal naturalistic language learner. The corpus of the Schmidt study consists of 18 one-hour recorded monologic diary-style audio reports 'concerning business and daily activities' (Schmidt 1983:145), self-recorded by the learner for authentic communicative purposes. This data is supplemented by interviews, the researcher's field notes and recordings of informal interactions with speakers of the target language.

Ultimately, the results of Schmidt's study falsified the acculturation model, however, as the learner did not give evidence of advanced morphosyntactic development even after three years, despite the presence of a considerable number of factors thought to favor such acquisition. As Schmidt (1983) states in the conclusion to his study, 'the idea that if affective factors are positive then cognitive processes will function automatically, effortlessly, and unconsciously to put together conclusions about grammar is overly optimistic' (173). By the end of the period of study, Schmidt and other expert interlocutors judged Wes to be highly competent at a communicative level, but significantly deficient in terms of morphosyntactic complexity and accuracy. Schmidt's
conclusion—that a learner's actual communicative competence cannot be measured in traditional, formal linguistic terms—is a premise which also underlies the current study.

The corpus material for the Huebner (1983) study is composed primarily of spontaneous conversational data collected through one-on-one interaction between the
language learner and the researcher over a one-year period, a period of data collection which began almost immediately upon Ge's arrival in Hawai'i. Huebner investigated the progressive development of emerging syntactic structures and the systematic changes in the learner's interlanguage. Huebner took a form-function analytic approach, proceeding with a detailed analysis of the uses to which early emergent forms (e.g. 'waduyu' [what do you], 'da' [determiner-like form] and 'isa' [e.g., is a] used as topic-comment boundary marker) were put. Huebner found evidence of internal systematicity in the way the learner made use of non-target-like forms to realize a variety of different functions, e.g., the form 'isa' initially functioned as a topic marker and 'waduyu' [what do you] functioned as a generalized question marker, substituting for any of the wh-question words.

One of the significant contributions of Huebner's study is that he convincingly demonstrates that non-target-like learner interlanguage forms, which, when analyzed from an obligatory-context, target language perspective may appear to be random and meaningless, can be seen to be performing multiple functions, compensating for the learner's lexical and syntactic gaps, when analyzed in a broader discourse context. Much the same will be claimed in this study for the use of prosody by long-term immigrant naturalistic acquirers observed after years of residence in the community.

In addition to these three 'classic' studies of adult language learners, two longitudinal case studies of adolescent school-age immigrants and three studies of adult Korean long-term immigrants' ultimate language acquisition deserve mention. Sato (1990) published the results of a longitudinal (ten-month) study of naturalistic acquisition
by recently arrived adolescent ten- and twelve-year old Vietnamese immigrant brothers in Philadelphia, focusing on the emergence of various syntactic structures in the learners' interlanguage and sought explanations for the observed development patterns in the contextual, discourse structure of conversation. E. Klein's (1981) study of Korean immigrant adolescents enrolled in local public Hawai'i schools acquiring English verbal morphology also took a developmental approach.

Finally, while both their descriptive and analytical focus differs from that of my study, three other previously published analyses of untutored Korean immigrants in Hawai'i should also be mentioned, as they provide, to my knowledge, the only other sources of linguistic description and analysis of untutored adult Korean immigrant acquisition of English. In a book devoted to variation in Hawai'i Creole English, D.J. Lee (1972) contributed a chapter analyzing the phonological, syntactic and lexical features of the basilectal pidgin English spoken by a long-term resident elderly female Korean, Mrs. Kim, who had immigrated to Hawai'i as a young woman in 1916 and who had acquired her knowledge of English naturalistically. Both the phonological and morphosyntactic features of the language contained in the transcript of an interview with the woman conducted by her granddaughter which forms the corpus of the Lee study closely resemble that of several of the speakers in the current study.

Sohn 1986 [1980] also studied the syntactic and lexical features of a middle-aged female Korean immigrant after seven years of residence and employment who had had limited, sporadic classroom instruction (amounting to approximately 150 hours) but quite substantial contacts with English speakers in social and work contexts. Sohn argues that
his subject should be considered to have acquired English primarily naturalistically through her community contacts. The goal of the Sohn study, conducted in an era when considerable research was being devoted to attempts to establish the validity of the claim that second language acquisition resembles first language acquisition, was to analyze the syntactic and semantic errors made in English by a Korean adult immigrant, 'with particular reference to errors caused by interference as compared with developmental errors' (1986:472). The corpus consisted of 280 English utterances which contained errors, i.e., deviations from standard English, from which Sohn eliminated local Hawai‘i Pidgin English patterns. Although the language of the speaker analyzed in the Sohn study is considerably more acrolectal than that of the speakers in the current study in terms of lexical and syntactic development, resemblances can be found in the data at both the phonological and morphosyntactic levels.

The final source of documentation on Korean immigrant language in Hawai‘i is a 75-page handwritten transcript of a life history interview conducted around 1974 with Mrs. Lee, a 79-year-old Korean woman who had also immigrated as a 21-year-old picture bride to Hawai‘i in 1916. She had been living in Hawai‘i continuously for almost 60 years at the time of the interview and had borne nine children, all but two of whom were living on the Mainland at the time of the interview. The interview was conducted by E. Klein and later transcribed by him. All Korean-English (or 'pidgin') utterances of Mrs. Lee are transcribed phonetically. Standard English and Korean were also used during the interview and these were transcribed in their respective standard orthographies. Bickerton and Givón (1976) presented this text as a Stage I pidgin and characterized its syntactic
structure as 'chaotic'. Givón (1984), however, revises this analysis, and finds 'striking cross-language similarities' (125) with respect to topic-marking devices used in this text and in two other texts collected from rudimentary speakers of English as a second language. In his words, 'Once one divests oneself of syntactic prejudice and proceeds to investigate the use of discourse-pragmatic devices, a greater measure of systematicity and universality begins to emerge' (129). The discourse analytic framework proposed by Givón, based partly on a thorough analysis of the discourse features of this text, will be taken up again in section 1.3.3.

The rudimentary lexical and syntactic development but fluent stabilized interlanguage of the speaker in the Bickerton materials [1974] are, once again, extremely reminiscent of that of the speakers whose narratives form the corpus for this study. The full transcript of Mrs. Lee's interview can be consulted among the Bickerton archival materials at the University of Hawai'i. (See citation to Bickerton archival materials [1974] in references for full information.)

The robust resemblances across several profiles of adult Korean immigrant naturalistic acquirers would seem to argue for the strong view of the role of interference from the native language, although the hypothesis of a universal naturalistic learner 'Basic Variety', as proposed by Klein and Perdue (1997) should by no means be excluded. (See discussion of the Basic Variety in section 1.2.3.3, below.) Furthermore, the relatively low proficiency level of all these speakers after extended periods of residence and relatively intensive exposure to the target language in the case of the speaker studied by Sohn, all argue against the strong view for the role of universal grammar in adult
second language acquisition and for something closer to O'Grady's (1996) Partial Access Hypothesis. As a result of the analysis of his data, Sohn (1986 [1980]) proposes that language teaching programs for adult second language learners speaking typologically distant native languages should provide more explicit and systematic instruction in the syntactic and semantic differences between the native languages, to ensure the 'successful linguistic assimilation' (485) of such learners.

1.2.3.2 Critical social perspective from Canada and Europe

In addition to an exploration of socio-psychological differences at the individual level and in addition to the concepts of stabilized interlanguage and fossilization, a body of work conducted in Canada is also relevant to the current study for the questions it has raised regarding the conditions of disempowerment under which immigrants (primarily women) acquire the language of the host country. Peirce (1993,1995) investigated the practices of language use and English language acquisition of five immigrant women of varying social status as they dealt with their new lives in Canada through a longitudinal case study consisting of diaries, questionnaires, interviews and home visits. Peirce approached adult immigrant women's language learning from the dual perspective of the relationship between social identity and language learning and the inequities associated with social class and the implications of these inequities for immigrants’ opportunities for social interaction leading to language learning. Noting that the field of SLA lacks a comprehensive theory of social identity which incorporates both the language learner and the language learning context, Peirce (1995) faults theorists searching for the
characteristics of the good language learner for their uncritical positioning of the individual without questioning 'how relations of power in the social world affect social interaction between second language learners and target language speakers' (12). She argues that many SLA theorists 'have assumed that learners can be defined unproblematically as motivated or unmotivated, introverted or extroverted, inhibited or uninhibited, without considering that such affective factors are frequently socially constructed in inequitable relations of power, changing over time and space, and possibly coexisting in contradictory ways in a single individual' (12). Peirce argues that 'SLA theory needs to develop a conception of the language learner as having a complex social identity that must be understood with reference to larger, and frequently inequitable social structures which are reproduced in day-to-day social interaction' (13). Central to Peirce's reformulation of the language learning problem of immigrants is the concept of 'investment', as opposed to motivation. Based on an analysis of her data, Peirce concludes that

a language learner's motivation to speak is mediated by investments that may conflict with the desire to speak...An understanding of motivation should therefore be mediated by an understanding of learners' investments in the target language--investments that are closely connected to the ongoing production of a language learner's social identity (Peirce 1995:19-20).

Several other Canadian research projects have also studied immigrants' language acquisition from a critical social perspective, seeing the status of disenfranchised immigrant as highly correlational with language acquisition, or the lack thereof. (See the collection edited by Burnaby & Cumming 1992; Peirce, Harper & Burnaby 1993; Boyd 1992; R. Cohen 1986; Klassen 1992; Jones 1992; Sandhu 1984; Paredes 1987; Cumming
& Gill 1992). Language practices at the worksite, which constitute a primary source of
target language input for many immigrants who maintain their native language in the
home, have again been studied primarily in Canada and again from a critical social
perspective (see Bell 1982; Burnaby & Bell 1990; Burnaby 1992; Burnaby & Cumming
also Clyne 1994 regarding interethnic workplace communication in Australia).

The European Science Foundation (ESF) project also incorporated consideration
of immigrant learners’ social status on the ultimate language learning results under the
rubrics of ‘propensity factors’ and ‘right to speak’ (Perdue 1984:10-11). In identifying
factors relevant to immigrant language acquisition, propensity factors were assumed to
derive from learners’ needs, attitudes and motivations, with ‘needs’ being understood ‘in
a broad sense, ranging from the wish to buy a loaf of bread to the wish to act as a normal
and non-conspicuous member of society, or, on the contrary, to achieve communicative
In addition to propensity factors and cognitive, perceptual and motor factors, the ESF
project identified a third set of factors, e.g., exposure to the language, which included 'the
right to speak’ (Perdue 1984: 10-11). According to Perdue (1984), the ESF project
designers gave serious consideration to the impact of the immigrant’s social status on the
entire language learning experience and thus planned ‘to examine in some detail the
“right to speak” of [the project] informants in linguistic interactions, and its effect on
acquisition’ (12). Specifically, the ESF project identified the low social status of the
learners as being a potentially significant factor in the early onset of fossilization to the
extent that it can lead to hostile interactions and misunderstandings between learners and native speakers, potentially engendering an avoidance reaction on the part of the learner, 'thus provoking early fossilization' (Perdue 1984:18).

Among scholars who attempt to make explicit the relationship between social status and linguistic practices and policies, Skutnabb-Kangas is one of the most outspoken. She is noted for her publications which attempt to give voice to the linguistic minorities of Europe who otherwise might not be heard by the academe. In her critical review (1981) of immigration policies in Scandinavia and guest worker policies in Germany, she interprets the statistics regarding lack of language proficiency in the language of the host country and higher than average early school leaving tendencies of the children of 'migrant' workers as being the result of a convergence of the socio-economic and political circumstances of the era, combined with a lack of sensitivity to the exploitative dimensions in the daily lives of the immigrant labor force on the part of authorities.

It is well-known that during the European economic boom of the 1960s, Sweden and Germany, along with other highly industrialized northern European countries, began importing cheap foreign laborers, primarily from more agrarian, southern European countries where access to education was not as widespread and where illiteracy was more prevalent, in order to support rapid industrial expansion. By the late 1970s these host countries were facing a decline in the demand for industrial employment, however, and, according to Skutnabb-Kangas (1981), they found it convenient that the immigrant
population could serve 'as a buffer at the lowest layer of society... by being at the receiving end of the worst shocks (for instance high unemployment...)' (95).

Skutnabb-Kangas (1981) provides an illustration of the socio-critical approach to disempowerment of immigrant language learners when she maintains that in order for Sweden and Germany to continue to profit from immigrants as a 'cheap, flexible, badly organized labour force... the second and third generation of immigrants must also be kept in the same weak position which the first generation had educationally, socially, economically and, above all, politically' (95-96). In Skutnabb-Kangas' view, educational and language policies which produced poorly educated immigrant children served the needs of the majority society and its economic development. The disempowerment of the immigrants by denying full access to the linguistic capital of the host countries called for a drastic revision in educational policies. Skutnabb-Kangas advocated a policy of integration of the immigrant children into the majority social fabric through full integration into the schools of the host countries, a policy which would ensure their linguistic and educational rights. She advocated such a policy in conjunction with a revision of social and labor polices which extended additional civic rights to the foreign laborers and their families, in recognition of their status as de facto permanent residents which they had become, effectively removing them from the category of transient migrant laborers under which they had heretofore been classified.

A similar critical social examination of the role played by social identity and status could no doubt be fruitfully explored with respect to the language learning experiences of these immigrant narrators in Hawai‘i and their long-term employment at
the low end of the status scale of workers in the Hawai‘i tourist industry. Indeed, the Waikīkī hotels where the Chinese, Korean and Filipino hotel maids and custodians report for duty on a daily basis have been depicted by others as the modern-day equivalent to the sugar cane plantations where earlier generations of Asian immigrants labored under exploitative conditions.22

Jasso-Aguilar's (1999) investigation of the daily working conditions of Waikīkī hotel maids and the conditions under which English communication takes place documents the hotel workplace reality. Jasso-Aguilar's study was conducted as a critical review of methods used to assess workplace English language needs. She stressed the importance of qualitative research techniques and ethnographic inquiry to establish both a learner-driven as well as an institution-driven analysis of language learning needs before implementation of a workplace language teaching curriculum. She refers specifically to ways in which social status and roles within the hotel employee hierarchy can affect the determination of needs and priorities:

...[I]t was found that the language necessary for the current tasks that these hotel maids must perform in their job is very limited, and the lack of English language skills does not affect their performance. In spite of this, institutional representatives perceive a need for the housekeepers to develop better language skills that will allow them to engage in "chit-chatting" with the guests to show the company's "aloha", a strategy geared towards increasing business. That such an institutional need can be the driving force in creating a task force, a curriculum, and a course, is a clear example of how power is exercised in decision-making. In doing NA [Needs Analysis], it is necessary to critically examine the social context in which the actors live their lives, and the power differential involved...Ethnographic research is further suggested to determine other language and literacy needs that the housekeepers have outside the workplace, to create a curriculum that will truly engage them in language learning, so as to allow them to become active and functional members of an English-speaking society (Goldstein, 1992), as opposed to just cheap
labor who can report cleaning discrepancies in their rooms and greet guests in standard English (45)²³.

While further excursions into socio-political conditions which might explain the low English proficiency (when conventionally defined as lack of lexical and morphosyntactic complexity) exhibited by the learners whose narratives figure in this corpus lie beyond the scope of this study, it should be remembered that these conditions do crucially underpin all of the language phenomena which will be the focus of this study. The sum of these socio-political conditions is present, first of all, as a factor which has affected and continues to affect the language acquisition achievements of these long-term immigrant narrators. Furthermore, the historical and contemporary socio-political conditions of the past 100 years which determined Korean emigration patterns and Hawai‘i’s evolution from an independent Pacific Island kingdom, through the stage of a lucrative plantation-based economy of strategic military and corporate importance to the United States, to the tourism-based economy it is today, provide an unavoidable context to the narratives. This background is sometimes made explicit in the narratives, but the reader should remember that the context is always present as a well-understood if unacknowledged given between the interlocutors, all of whom are players in the contemporary history of Hawai‘i.

1.2.3.3 Linguistic development perspective: European longitudinal, cross-linguistic studies of syntactic development and references to time and space

Around the same time as the North American research programs were focusing heavily on the attributes contributing to successful language learning in the classroom,
European researchers began devoting substantial attention and resources to the investigation of language acquisition phenomena among adult uninstructed language learners.

In contrast to other studies’ focus on the attributes of ‘good language learners’ and the search for social factors affecting rate and path of acquisition and ultimate attainment, the European research programs devoted their attention primarily to the insights which adult uninstructed language learners can provide into the psycholinguistic aspects of language and language acquisition. The European Science Foundation’s longitudinal, cross-linguistic immigrant language learner project has been referred to at various points above, but the origins of the project and the research questions it investigated will be given a somewhat fuller treatment here. (For more comprehensive treatments of the various European research programs, see Klein & Dittmar 1979; Klein & Perdue 1992; Klein & Perdue 1997; Perdue 1984, 1993a, 1993b; Perdue & Klein 1992; Meisel 1980; Meisel 1987; Meisel 1991; Meisel 1997; Giacomi & Véronique 1986a and 1986b; Blanc, Le Douaron & Véronique 1987; Noyau & Porquier 1984; von Stutterheim 1991a).

As was the case in North America, the European language acquisition research programs also had their impetus in the facts of the post-World War II geopolitical situation. Under the umbrella of integration and economic re-construction, post-war Europe began to witness profound social changes occasioned by large population migrations, predominantly from southern European countries (i.e., Italy, Spain, Portugal) and other countries along Europe’s Mediterranean periphery (i.e., Yugoslavia, Turkey,
Algeria, Tunisia, and Morocco). As mentioned above, the massive influx of foreign laborers into the factories of northern Europe contributed considerably to the rapid post-war development of the host economies. The migrants, for their part, were lured to seek improvement in their personal fortunes in the economic powerhouses of post-war northern Europe by the lack of employment opportunities and low wages in the less industrialized economies in their countries of origin.

While European countries in general were well accustomed to dealing with a wide array of regional dialects and even with political and linguistic demands from minority language speakers of traditional ethnic groups indigent to their national territories (e.g., Basques, Occitanians, Bretons and Catalans), most modern European nation states, with the notable exceptions of Belgium, Luxembourg and Switzerland which provided for constitutional recognition of the linguistic diversity of their national populations, subscribed to and promoted an ideology of one nation = one language, i.e., an ideology of linguistic homogeneity (Wright 2000). The massive post-war influx of migrants, primarily manual laborers, who could not speak the national language and who were not part of the traditional ethnic make-up of the host nations, began to create disruptions in the social fabric of the host nations. The burden of dealing with humanitarian issues of this migrant population called for a reconsideration of established policies and practices regarding basic education, adult education and social welfare institutions. In the forefront among the issues seen as contributing to the emerging social problems was the lack of linguistic competence in the language of the host nation on the part of the migrant populations (Perdue 1984:1-2, passim; Perdue 1993a: 43; W. Klein 1981a). The
European studies as a whole looked at a variety of features of adult second language acquisition and specifically at interlanguage features, including language transfer from the L1, developmental sequences, the generalizability of interlanguage features, the role of affective/socio-cultural factors in language acquisition and the role of interaction in the development of grammatical structures.

The first of the migrant language acquisition research projects in the European context was initiated in Germany, which was, at the time, probably not coincidentally, the country whose population of foreign ‘guest workers’ was among the highest in Europe. This first German language acquisition project, conducted between 1974-1979 with data collected from 24 Italian and 24 Spanish migrant workers, was known as HPD, e.g., the Heidelberg Research Project on Pidgin German (Heidelberger Forschungsprojekt ‘Pidgin Deutsch’ 1975 [1978]; Klein & Dittmar 1979, Klein 1981b; Perdue 1993a, Meisel 1975a, 1975b). The Heidelberg Research Project started from the premise that the learner variety being spoken by the ‘guest workers’ of Germany was a pidgin. In addition to collecting samples of learner language for analysis, the German researchers also investigated factors related to the migrant workers' social integration into German society and hypothesized that the relatively restricted quantity and domains of interaction between the migrants and their German counterparts contributed to the migrants' lack of success in acquiring the target language.

A subsequent German research cross-sectional, longitudinal study, known as the ZISA (Zweitsprachenerwerb italienischer und spanischer Arbeiter [Second language acquisition by Italian and Spanish workers]) project investigated developmental

The Heidelberg and ZISA projects were precursors to the most ambitious study of immigrant, untutored learners yet undertaken: the cross-linguistic, longitudinal study conducted by the European Science Foundation (ESF) from 1982 to 1988. In his description of the scope of the project, Perdue (1993a), the principal editor of the volume of findings on the project, stated the following:

As far as second language studies are concerned, this project goes beyond previous research in the number of languages--both source and target--which are simultaneously studied, in the organisation of co-ordinated, longitudinal studies in these different linguistic environments, and in the range and type of linguistic phenomena investigated (xii).

The ESF project deployed six teams of researchers in five countries over a period of 33 months to record the stages of language acquisition of twenty-six recently arrived immigrants speaking six source languages (Punjabi, Italian, Turkish, Moroccan Arabic, Spanish and Finnish) and five target languages (English, German, Dutch, French, Swedish). The study was designed so that four learners from two different source languages were followed for each target language, and to the extent possible, learners from a given source language were followed in the acquisition of two separate target languages, permitting numerous cross-linguistic comparisons (i.e., Italian and Punjabi learners of English, Italian and Turkish learners of German, Turkish and Arabic learners...
of Dutch, Arabic and Spanish learners of French, and Spanish and Finnish learners of
Swedish\textsuperscript{24}.

Both in terms of the amount of raw data gathered and in terms of the lines of
inquiry pursued, the body of work produced by the European Science Foundation
constitutes a major resource for the analysis of processes of second language acquisition
as well as features of interlanguage in uninstructed language learners.\textsuperscript{25} Six areas of
linguistic competence in these nascent language acquirers were selected for analysis by
the ESF team (Perdue\textsuperscript{1993a: xiii}). These can be grouped into three categories: (1)
interactional and communicative functions, which included, in the ESF terminology,
'ways of achieving understanding' (e.g., ways of achieving successful communication
during interaction between exolingual speakers) and 'the role of feedback in adult
language acquisition'; (2) framework for utterance organization (e.g., utterance structure
and lexical repertoire, along with word formation processes), which resulted in the
development of a model of a basic learner variety [BV] (Klein \& Perdue 1992, 1997); (3)
means for referring to people, places and time, which resulted in a set of principles for the
expression of temporal and spatial relations. (Extensive discussion of the rationale behind
these research areas can be found in Perdue (1984), Klein and Perdue (1992) and Dietrich,
Klein and Noyau (1995); Perdue (1993b) contains the summary of results of the ESF
research program.)

Of the many findings of the ESF project, for present purposes I will restrict
myself to mentioning the model of a 'basic learner variety' [BV] developed by Klein and
Perdue (1997), based on the voluminous cross-linguistic data accumulated in the course
of the ESF project. Klein and Perdue posit that adult learners acquiring a second language naturalistically will acquire a basic variety determined by four components: (1) the lexical repertoire, (2) a framework for utterance organization consisting of phrasal constraints (i.e., syntax), semantic constraints and pragmatic constraints (i.e., constraints relating to the organization of information), (3) principles for expressing temporality, and (4) principles for expressing spatiality. It is interesting to note that the features of the emergent basic learner variety derived from the ESF study of untutored language learners--learners who spoke native languages belonging to distinct language families (Germanic, Romance, Indic, Finno-Ugric [Uralic] and Semitic) and whose language development was documented for a period of 30 months beginning from a point shortly after their arrival in the host country--correspond generally to the features found in the utterances of the fossilized (e.g., 'stabilized') Korean-speaking immigrants in Hawai'i whose language production was documented after long-term residence of well over ten years which are the focus of this study. Kumpf (1984, 1986) also documents the occurrence of forms similar to those described in the Klein and Perdue Basic Variety in the basilectal English L2 utterances of long-term resident immigrants who were native speakers of Spanish and Japanese. Although ultimate attainment after long years of residence was not the focus of their research, Klein and Perdue (1997) mention in passing that some learners fossilize at the BV level, and they argue that 'the organizational constraints of the BV belong to the core attributes of the human language capacity, whereas a number of complexifications not attested in the BV are less central properties of this capacity' (301). (For detailed reports on the methodology, data, analyses and

The ESF study deserves special mention here for its ambitious, multi-layered approach to the study of 'spontaneous acquirers' of a second language in adulthood. Furthermore, there are strong parallels between the conditions of acquisition as well as the educational and socio-economic backgrounds of the ESF project's immigrant worker informants and the Korean immigrants in Hawai‘i profiled in my study. However, the current study differs from the ESF project in two important ways. First, in focussing on the use of prosody in untutored, non-native speakers' conversational oral narratives, this study attempts to analyze an aspect of second language use which the ESF project had intended to study but which it was ultimately only able to treat cursorily (Perdue 1999, pers. comm.). Second, the ESF project studied processes and features of emergent second language acquisition, whereas this study focuses on the features of the end product, i.e., of the interlanguage ultimately attained after a period of long-term residency.

1.3 Previous studies of uninstructed second language learners' narratives

1.3.1 Interactional and communicative perspectives: the European Science Foundation's project on second language acquisition by adult immigrants

The European Science Foundation's project on second language acquisition by adult immigrants devoted considerable attention to the patterns, processes and
achievements of exolingual conversations, conversations which included both
informative narratives of personal experiences and elicited narratives in the form of re-
tellings of film episodes. As might be expected in a research project which evolved at
least partially out of a concern for the redress of an imbalance of linguistic resources in
the socio-political context sketched above in 1.2.3.3, the ESF research on interactionally-
situated narratives is strongly influenced by a view of both native and non-native speaker
interactants as socially-embedded actors. (See, inter alia, Klein & Perdue 1986; Py 1986;
Arditty & Coste 1987; Dittmar & von Stutterheim 1985; Deulofeu 1986; Giacomi 1986;
Mittner 1987, 1989.)

The goals of the ESF project with respect to conversations and narratives
embedded in conversations were primarily two-fold: (1) obtain extended segments of
discourse in order to investigate the ways in which interaction and interlocutor
scaffolding affect the process and path of second language development, and (2)
investigate the linguistic means used by their informants to encode references to persons,
places and time within a discourse context. Their focus was not on the narratives directly,
but, rather, on the narrative context as the locus for the other research questions which
they were pursuing.

1.3.2 Other perspectives on adult second language learners' narratives

Other than those who were involved in the ESF project or its precursors, most
researchers who have investigated discourse organization and narratives in adult second
language learners have dealt with instructed learners. The bulk of this work on instructed
second language speakers' use of language in interactional settings has been devoted to the development and use of communicative strategies and to pragmatic aspects of L2 language usage such as the acquisition of speech acts appropriate to the target-culture. (See Faerch & Kasper 1983; Tarone 1977, 1980; Scarcella 1983; Hatch 1984; Poulisse, Bongaerts & Kellerman 1987, 1984; Kasper 1989; Kasper & Dahl 1991; Kleifgen 1989; Kellerman 1991; Bardovi-Harlig & Hartford 1995.) The fact that these studies deal with instructed learners and have a different research focus than the current study is not to say that these studies cannot provide useful insights which have a bearing on the current study, but as the literature more directly related to uninstructed second language learners' use of discourse organizational principles is already voluminous, these studies have not been retained as frameworks for the current study. Larsen-Freeman & Long (1991: 71-73) provide a useful bibliography and summary of SLA studies within a discourse analytical framework.)

Several exceptions to this exclusion of the research with instructed learners will be noted, however, for the interesting analytical frameworks of second language narrative structure which they developed. Bardovi-Harlig (1995) used both written and oral elicited retellings of a film segment (based on an excerpt of the same film segment used in the ESF study) by 37 instructed adult learners of English (with Arabic, Korean, Japanese, Spanish and Mandarin L1 backgrounds) at different stages of L2 development. She found that proficiency, as measured by appropriate use of the simple past tense, is the primary predictor of adult second language learners' use of tense and aspect forms in the accomplishment of narrative coherence. The studies conducted by Wennerstrom (1994,
1997, 1998, 2000, 2001a, 2001b) explicitly incorporate prosodic analysis into the analyses of second language speakers' narratives and will be reviewed in some detail in Chapter 2. Finally, Kumpf's (1986) treatment of adult uninstructed learners' narratives from a rhetorical structure perspective is discussed in the following section, although the framework is ultimately rejected for this study, for reasons which will be explained below. Givón's proposal for a universal of topic-marking hierarchy is also considered.

1.3.3 Structural perspective: Rhetorical Structure Theory

One of the more focused studies of uninstructed second language learners' oral narratives is that of Kumpf (1986), who made use of the Thompson and Mann (1987) Rhetorical Structure Theory, as explained in Fox (1984)\textsuperscript{26}. Rhetorical Structure Theory is a discourse analytical approach based on hierarchical relations and Kumpf (1986) used it to look at 'narrative macrostructures' as well as the inter-propositional and inter-sentential hierarchical relations of second language narratives, Kumpf (1986) analyzed the grammatical and discourse/pragmatic features of interlanguage narratives collected from three adult native speakers of Japanese and three adult native speakers of Spanish, all of whom were long-term immigrants with a stable and fluent interlanguage. Kumpf divided her six speakers into three groups and organized her analysis of their narratives according to the range of developmental interlanguage features displayed by the speakers, i.e., she established a grouping based on 'the degree of elaboration of verbal morphology, and extent of lexico-grammatical resources' (38). The personal and linguistic profiles of several of the individuals in Kumpf's study bear a strong resemblance to those of the six
subjects in the current study. While several of the narratives in the Kumpf corpus appear to be produced by speakers of a more acrolectal interlanguage than the six included in my study, the two low-level speakers out of the six studied by Kumpf (i.e., Maria from Guatemala, age 40, minimally literate, U.S. resident for 14 years, and Taro from Japan, age 53, who had been living in the U.S. for 27 years) made use of limited lexicon and demonstrated only ‘minimal verbal morphology’ (e.g., ‘the base form of the verb’ and the –ing verbal suffix) (38) and thus can be said to correspond roughly to the developmental stage displayed by at least four out of the six narrators in my study.

Using the Thompson and Mann framework, Kumpf (1986) set out to show 'first, that and second, how the narratives are understandable, cohesive texts' [emphases in the original] (33). She examined clause combining phenomena from the narratives, under the assumption that 'the signals of "clause combining" (adverbials and conjunctions) do more than relate two clauses: they are factors in the cohesion of the discourse, and elements which communicate story structure to the interlocutor' (31). Kumpf found ‘tremendous diversity among the speakers in the ways that they are able to marshal their resources for the discourse purpose at hand’ (xv), but similar to my study, Kumpf concluded that even ‘second language speakers with limited lexical and grammatical resources are capable of creating whole, coherent narratives’ (xv).

Kumpf (1986) considered Chafe’s (1980) model of cognitive constraints on propositional cohesion which determine 'intonation units, extended clauses and perhaps paragraphs' (Kumpf 1986: 12-13). However, while noting that prosodic criteria play a role in determining the structure of the second language narratives in her corpus, Kumpf
opted to eliminate prosodic criteria as the primary basis for determining interpropositional cohesion in her study, since she felt that the recognition of paragraphs 'on the basis of prosodic criteria of pause and disfluency, along with interlocutor response', i.e., according to Chafe's (1980) criteria, would be problematic for her study, since 'disfluency occurs for other reasons' (13) in the utterances of second language narrators. Ultimately, Kumpf (1986) decided to 'proceed with the interpretation of paragraphing with a judicious combination of prosodic and text-semantic criteria' (13). An example of her use of prosodic criteria in determining propositional cohesion is provided in her analysis of the following utterance from her mesolectal Japanese speaker, an utterance which was lacking the conditional 'when' in the first adjunct clause:

he come home
he was real surprise [sic]

In commenting on this example, Kumpf states:

In the above, I posit a circumstance relation, even though no signal (WHEN in the adjunct) is given. Admittedly, this assumed connection is open to argument. However on the basis of (1) the patterns in the speakers' data of conjunctions and adverbials and (2) the prosodic links between the clauses (here, fall-rise intonation at the end of the adjunct and lack of juncture) makes it plausible to consider the two clauses as joined hypotactically (32) [emphases added].

The current study asks essentially some of the same questions as Kumpf, i.e., 'How are second language narratives structured?' and 'Which signals are important for defining the parts of, and showing cohesion in, the narratives?' (Kumpf 1986:2). The theoretical framework adopted for her investigation into the structure of second language narratives led Kumpf to look primarily for lexical and morphosyntactic signals of narrative cohesion in her corpus, whereas in the current study, it was the striking lack of
such lexical signals of cohesion in the corpus which led me to the discovery of the narrators' reliance on prosodic phenomena as signals of narrative structure.

Givón (1984:128) has proposed a universal hierarchy of topic-marking, based on an analysis of spoken texts from both native speakers and uninstructed second language learners with stabilized interlanguages at a rudimentary proficiency level, as discussed briefly in section 1.2.3.1, above. Givón's primary claim is that contrary to his own earlier thinking and 'unlike what has been prevalent in the literature for decades, topic-comment is not the unmarked universal word-order. Rather, it is the marked universal word-order, the one used when the topic is discontinuous, surprising, less obvious, less predictable' (128). Based on the assumption that 'more continuous topics are the less-marked case in language', Givón proposes the following Universal Hierarchy of Topic-Coding Devices, for which he posits the underlying psychological principle of 'Attend first to the most urgent task' (128):

\[
\text{COMMENT} > \text{COMMENT-TOPIC} > \text{TOPIC-COMMENT} > \text{REPEATED TOPIC} \\
\text{(zero topic)} \quad \text{(zero comment)}
\]

In Chapter Four, when the narrative structure is analyzed, we shall see to what degree this hierarchy holds for this study's corpus. It is likely to be supported, as Givón found it to be in the narrative of the Korean female immigrant of nearly 60 years' continuous residence discussed above, if, as Givón points out, 'discourse universals tend to be "more universal" than syntactic structure' and if it is natural to expect that 'when communication is under severe stress, speakers of varying linguistic background revert to this more common communicative mode' (129).
1.4 Discovering the role of prosody in adult immigrant second language narratives

This study was originally designed as an investigation of interlanguage phenomena found in the utterances of adult immigrants to the U.S. who have learned English almost exclusively through naturalistic means, i.e., through interaction with the local community and without a significant amount of instructional input, and who have attained only a low proficiency level after long periods of residency.

By examining the features of language acquisition of these long-term immigrants, I had originally hoped to shed light on two questions to which linguists seek the answers in the field of uninstructed second language acquisition: (1) What are the minimal features of naturally acquired second language grammar, and (2) What explanations can be given for the wide variation in proficiency attained by adult second language learners? If the answers to these questions could be found, they would reveal much about the human language faculty, which is why these questions are persistently raised by linguists.

The study's findings with respect to the first question were to have constituted a complement to the findings of the European Science Foundation project on second language acquisition by immigrants and other studies of uninstructed adult language learners. In searching for an answer to the second question, the study would have constituted a mirror image to the earlier 'Good Language Learner' studies, i.e., in a complementary ethnographic investigation into the language learning practices of individual learners, the study was to have presented a profile of what could be termed
'unsuccessful language learners' and the strategies leading to less-than-successful language learning that should be avoided.

In the course of ongoing encounters with the research subjects and during the period of preliminary collection of data, however, I realized that it was not primarily the analysis of the features of end stages of naturalistic acquisition nor was it explanations for ultimate low proficiency attainment after long years of residence which posed the interesting questions. Rather, it was the almost 'virtuosic' uses of their extremely limited linguistic resources made by these low proficiency (arguably 'fossilized'), long-term residents which constituted an overlooked terrain of inquiry and which promised to be a more fertile line of inquiry.

In short, by pursuing my initial research agenda, I found myself entangled in the very process Bley-Vroman (1983) had warned about in his critique of the 'comparative fallacy', i.e., 'the mistake of studying the systematic character of one language by comparing it to another' (6), referred to in section 1.2.2, above. Reflecting on Bley-Vroman's point reinforced my instinct to undertake a study of the 'what is' rather than the 'what isn't'.

Thus, rather than focusing on an inventory of emergent learner grammar, which, interesting as it might have been for its potential contribution to knowledge about the syntactic component of the human language faculty, I shifted to a study of the observable features of communicative accomplishments of these learners at the discourse level. Although I am in fact philosophically committed to a discourse level and contextually-
situated analysis of language, in this case the shift in focus was not originally theoretically-motivated.

The shift was, rather, the result of listening, quite literally, to the data. Upon repeated listenings, with each attempt to discern the shades of meaning contained in the speakers’ utterances, the role of the speakers’ use of prosodic features became increasingly salient to the making of meaning. The utterances themselves often consisted of mere strings of lexical tokens without conventional syntactic structure. Reading the early transcriptions made of these recordings, only the most creative analyst could piece together a meaning from many of the strings. Even I, having been a participant in the narrative event and having therefore a number of shared contexts with the narrators, could often not 'interpret' the meaning of certain utterances after the fact in a categorical manner. Yet I knew that at the scene, during the recountings, when I had been involved as an active participant, I had been able to 'make sense' of most of the utterances, at least at a global level. Ultimately, I realized that it was the speakers’ manipulation of volume, pitch, and intonational contours which had allowed them to successfully accomplish their communicative goals during the recounting of these personal anecdotes. When a perusal of the literature revealed that there was virtually no study which focused on the prosodic discourse features of uninstructed second language learners, I became even more convinced that it was these features and the communicative accomplishments of the narrators which should become the focus of my investigation.

The German language used by a 47-year-old Spanish quarry laborer after living in Germany for a period of five years which is discussed by Klein (1981a) exhibited many
of the same characteristics as that of the Korean immigrant hotel workers whose English language use is discussed here. What follows is Klein's description of the Spanish worker's linguistic inventory:

His German is extremely poor: half of his utterances have no verb whatsoever, he never uses an auxiliary or a modal together with a verb form, he never uses a copula. Most of his noun phrases consist of names or simple nouns, which are occasionally completed by a determiner or a quantifier. He has no inflection whatsoever. His vocabulary is very restricted, too; during the whole interview, he used about 12 different verbs, about ten different adjectives, four or five adverbs, and two prepositions (82).

Faced with such a minimal inventory, Klein asks the question which confronts anyone examining the data collected for this study, namely, 'What can you say with such a repertoire?' (82). Klein's answer is equally applicable to the six Korean immigrants profiled here:

A lot, if you know [how] to use it. In the case of our informant, it suffices for a two-hour conversation, in which he gives a lot of information about his life, his feelings, his opinions, in which he talks about what happened, what could happen, and what he would do, if this and that happened; and in which he even tells a number of complex and admirable stories (82).

In examining the data from the Spanish worker in Germany, Klein came to a realization similar to mine regarding the role played by prosody in the organization of discourse in the speech of naturalistic second language learners. When analyzing the Spaniard's use of German, Klein and his fellow researchers noted that there was 'a considerable gap between mastering the formal means of a language--richness of vocabulary, knowledge of syntax, correct pronounciation [sic], etc--and communicative efficiency. The learner seems to be able to develop certain strategies to express himself in the absence of those expressive devices the language to be learned provides (81)'. After
noting that his Spanish informant ‘has no copula, ...no verb in half of the cases, and often omits the subject...’,' Klein goes on to say that ‘the usual rules of German syntax can’t apply to his language. The principle by which he organizes his utterances is completely different; his elementary sentence pattern is a kind of ‘theme-rheme-structure’, where both components are marked by intonation and are interrupted by a break: theme – break – rheme’ (83). Klein notes that in the German utterances of this Spanish worker ‘[t]he first part is in general marked by high pitch at the end; the second part is marked by falling pitch’ (83).

We shall see later to what extent this basic pitch pattern holds for the Korean immigrants when speaking English in Hawai‘i, but for now the key point is to take note of Klein’s observation that the two structural components of the Spanish language learner’s basic utterances were ‘marked by intonation’, which contributed to communicative efficacy far exceeding what might be expected given the learner’s near total lack of command of target language syntax and vocabulary. Ultimately, my study also found that it is primarily these second language speakers’ seemingly instinctive, in any case, untutored, use of prosody which allows them to communicate extended and complex narratives with relative efficiency when target language syntactic and lexical resources are lacking.

Klein offered a poetic description of the Spanish worker’s linguistic competence in German, a description which I would also apply to the linguistic performances of the Korean immigrants in Hawai‘i whose English narratives figure prominently in the later sections of this study: ‘[His] verbal repertoire in terms of vocabulary, syntax and
inflectional means is, after five years, still extremely restricted, but ...[he] is playing his one-string harp with remarkable skill’ (75). Observations such as these in the context of the Heidelberg project, augmented by the findings produced by the ESF adult immigrant language learner project, formed the basis of the Basic Variety framework subsequently developed by Klein and his collaborators for the analysis of nascent grammar.

In exploring a line of inquiry not previously investigated, namely the role of prosody in the structuring of oral narratives recounted by long-term immigrant second language speakers with low target language proficiency similar to the case described by Klein, I find myself following Bley-Vroman’s (1983) lead in the conclusion to his discussion of the comparative fallacy when he asserted that

\[ \text{If researchers are to make serious progress in the investigation of interlanguage, then the comparative fallacy must be avoided and attention must be concentrated on the construction of linguistic descriptions of learners’ language which can illuminate their specific properties and their own logic. It is possible—even likely—that techniques and formal models of existing linguistic theories will prove to be insufficient for the task (16).} \]

In short, in deciding to focus this study on the contribution of prosody to the structure of oral narratives produced by uninstructed second language speakers, I am lending support to the proposal advanced by Larsen-Freeman and Long (1991), echoing Bley-Vroman (1983), who recommended that ‘...researchers should not adopt a normative TL perspective, but rather seek to discover how an IL structure which appears to be non-standard is being used meaningfully by a learner’ (Larsen-Freeman & Long 1991:66).
That the interlanguage ‘structure’ in question here should turn out to be prosody rather than any number of structures from a classic list of syntactic components requires some justification. It is precisely this examination of the role of prosody and the subsequent argument that prosody should be considered a core component of linguistic structure which will be taken up in the next chapter, before proceeding with an analysis of the essential structural role played by prosody in the narratives of the uninstructed second language speakers.

After defining and differentiating the overlapping and often confusing concepts invoked in the study of prosody, and after a brief presentation of some of the essential prosodic features for two of the less commonly known languages relevant to this study, e.g., Korean and Hawai‘i Creole English, Chapter Two reviews the literature on the use of prosody in the making of meaning. The main body of the chapter discusses form-based analyses and discourse-based approaches to the study of intonational meaning, two distinct approaches which have come to characterize the field. At the conclusion of the chapter, a prosodic framework for the analysis of second language oral narratives will be proposed, based on Wennerstrom's four-point conceptualization of prosody as compositional, cohesive, interactional and expressive, a framework which is compatible with both Chafe's model of the functions of intonation in discourse and Labov's model of narrative structure.

Chapter Three presents the methodological issues and explains the data collection and analysis procedures which were used in this study. In Chapter Four, the prosodic framework elaborated in Chapter Two is combined with data from the study to show how
prosody is used by the narrators in the realization of their personal narratives. The
prosodic building blocks of narrative discourse are presented at both the local level (e.g.,
lexico-syntactic prosodic devices to manage information status and flow at the sentence
level) and at the global (discourse) level, where it is shown how both Labov's narrative
structure and Chafe's discourse cohesion framework are adhered to by these narrators.
Chapter Five, the concluding chapter, summarizes the main results of this study and
points to potential future directions of research.
CHAPTER TWO
WHAT PROSODY MEANS AND HOW PROSODY MAKES MEANING

Intonation, like everything else in language, is one instrument in an orchestra...

Pitch is like any other clearly audible characteristic of speech sound: it is there to be used, and almost certainly will be used, though in varying proportions for different purposes.

Dwight Bolinger (1972a:12-13)

‘Quoth the raven, “Nevermore”’...

[T]his expression’s value is not entirely accounted for in terms of its purely semantic value, narrowly defined, i.e., its general meaning plus its contingent, contextual meanings...[I]t is...certain that variation of its phonic qualities, such as modulation of tone, stress and cadence, the detailed articulation of the sounds and of the groups of sounds, that such variations allow the emotive value of the word to be quantitatively and qualitatively varied in all kinds of ways....[O]nly a small number of vibratory motions are necessary for the word to be heard. In short, only minimal phonic means are required in order to express and communicate a wealth of conceptual, emotive and aesthetic content. Here we are directly confronted with the mystery of the idea embodied in phonic matter, the mystery of the word, of the linguistic symbol, of the Logos, a mystery which requires elucidation.

Roman Jakobson (1978:2)

The theory that we hold...is that the pitch conveys messages which are parallel to and independent of the text, and which may even be at variance with the text.

Menn and Boyce (1982:368)

The prosody of an utterance adds an expressive dimension to the communication process; by modifying the prosodic features the speaker can supplement his utterance with elements of meaning that are not explicitly contained in its lexical and syntactic make-up.

't Hart, Collier and Cohen (1990:1)

Examining speech only via written records on flat surfaces is something like trying to learn about the human body only by dissecting cadavers on marble slabs. Indeed, much of importance can be learned that way—but one also learns some things that aren’t so. Eventually it is imperative to return from research in vitro to research in vivo.

2.1 Introduction: The problem with prosody

As the above citations indicate, prosody, variously referred to under the rubrics of 'intonation', 'pitch' and 'phonic quality' (a terminological confusion which will be dealt with below) is widely acknowledged to be an important component of both the language production and the language parsing faculty. That prosody contributes conceptual, emotive and, yes, aesthetic content, as Jakobson (1978:2) attests, is fairly universally accepted. That prosodic qualities can supplement the lexical and syntactic content of messages as 't Hart, Collier and Cohen (1990: 1) claim is undeniable. That prosody can even 'be at variance' with the referential meaning of a text as Menn and Boyce (1982:268) assert is also true, although this point is most often noted only in studies of particular literary categories such as irony. In short, the fact that prosody is central to the making of meaning is not really a contentious issue. What is less clear is how to study it, how to decompose it. What are, exactly, its component parts? How do these parts interact and how do they interact in turn with other components of the language faculty? What is the precise role of prosody in the making of meaning?

These questions and many more bedevil the study of prosody. Findings are often contradictory. In fact, there is no consensus even as to which of the many features of prosody fall within the domain of linguistic study. Where one author deems it to be a core linguistic phenomenon, another classifies it dismissively as a paralinguistic phenomenon.

Cutler (1983) succinctly summarizes the nature of the problem:

The place of prosody in language is...one of the most regularly disputed topics in linguistics. The question at issue is: must prosody be reckoned an integral aspect of linguistic structure, or is it in some sense overlaid upon an independent linguistic form? (79).
Freese and Maynard (1998) provide a more recent overview of the situation, indicating that fifteen years later, scant progress has been made in resolving the fundamental issues:

Prosody has long been something of a neglected child in both linguistics and the sociology of language. In part, this is because prosodic research has been stunted by continual debates over foundational issues and by numerous efforts to restart inquiry from scratch. Researchers have had trouble reaching consensus on the relationship between prosody and the system of words in which it is embedded; some would like to see prosody grafted onto structuralist grammars (Liberman 1979, Pierrehumbert 1987, Pierrehumbert & Hirschberg 1990), while others contend that dimensions such as intonation are systems *sui generis*, having 'more in common with gesture than with grammar' (Bolinger 1986:viii) (196).

The acknowledgement of its importance by serious scholars notwithstanding, Couper-Kuhlen and Selting (1996) in their book *Prosody in Conversation* paint a clear picture of the neglected place which prosody occupies in modern linguistics and offer some credible explanations for the source of the problem:

If prosody is understood to comprise the 'musical' attributes of speech—auditory effects such as melody, dynamics, rhythm, tempo and pause—then it is surely no exaggeration to state that a large part of this field has been left untitled by modern structural linguistics. Only a few scholars at the most have considered prosody, intonation in particular, worthy of their attention.

...In retrospect, it is doubtless the overwhelming influence of literacy on thinking about language which has been responsible for the neglect of prosody...Given that prosodic phenomena (i) are not segment-based, referential units, (ii) are gradient rather than discrete, and (iii) lack systematic codification in writing, it is perhaps not surprising that they are so often ignored (11-12).
In sum, prosodic phenomena have not yet been sufficiently studied to justify a categorical classification, but there are indications that, like syntax and other components of language organized by human cognitive faculties, prosody should be analyzed as having layers, with different layers accessible for different purposes. If accurate, this analysis would at least partially account for the wide disparity of opinions as to the 'true' nature of prosody.

Speaking to this issue, Hirst (1983) says:

Intonation, what Bolinger has called the 'greasy part of language', is notoriously difficult to describe. One of the reasons for this elusiveness is of course the essentially spoken character of intonation; a deeper reason, however, comes from the fact that an adequate description of intonation needs to take into account not simply the phonology of the language, but also the syntax and the semantics, as well as the interfaces between the grammar and the 'real world', constituted by phonetics and pragmatics.

One of the fundamental questions that linguists have long asked concerns the way in which intonation contributes to the 'meaning' (in the widest sense) of an utterance. That no satisfactory simple answer to this question has so far been forthcoming is in itself an indication of the complexity of this issue (93).

In recent times, Freese and Maynard (1998) noted this trend toward multiple levels of analysis in their discussion of whether inherent meaning is assigned to a specific prosodic contour, stating that 'prosodologists are becoming increasingly wary of attempts to match intonational contours with single or straightforward semiotic interpretations; thus Local (1996:202) warns strongly against “a simplistic assigning of meaning to pitch contours independently of the interactional, lexical, and grammatical contexts in which they occur” (200).
Crystal (1969), early on, distinguished between symbolic use of the 'extremes' of the intonational spectrum and conventionalized, language-specific use of the 'inner core':

While it is the case that the 'extremes' of intonational movement have more of a directly symbolic, or naturalistic (and hence international) reference, the 'inner core' of intonation is conventional and has little if any symbolic function...It is not difficult to point to non-universals in intonational form and function—for example, languages which have no falling-rising tone, in which statements do not end in a falling tone, or where a particular intonational pattern carries markedly different semantic value. One can show the existence of comparably fundamental differences between any two languages, of course; and what one must avoid is allowing one's own awareness of shared, cross-cultural features (for example, fortissimo as a function of anger) to obscure them (291-292).

Crystal’s view of prosody as being composed of naturalistic, 'international' [the term was presumably chosen to avoid making claims of 'universality'] symbolic intonational contours as well as conventionalized, language-specific uses of intonation can be contrasted to that of Couper-Kuhlen and Selting (1996), who combine conversation analytical procedures with an interactional approach to the study of prosody, particularly of German and English as spoken by native speakers, and assert that

...there appears to be, on the one hand, little or no constancy between intonational form and meaning: in the worse [sic] case, the same tune 'means' something different with each different lexico-syntactic carrier. On the other hand, there is no final proof....that pitch ultimately functions by way of nurture (cultural convention) and not by way of nature. As long as intonologists pursue a grammar-based, structuralistic approach, there is little hope of solving such problems...[In the] interactional approach...intonation is linked up to functions which derive from the situated use of language to accomplish interactional goals....In an interactional perspective, analysts are consequently not looking for minimal pairs and distinctive functions. Instead they typically find that intonation and prosody have a contextualizing function (Gumperz 1982; Auer 1986, Auer and di Luzio 1992)...In other words, they constitute how something is said, not what is said, and they ultimately influence only what participants infer is the meaning. Prosodic contextualization cues are not referential, but indexical, signs (Silverstein 1992). They stand in a
reflexive relationship to language, cueing the context within which it is to
be interpreted and at the same time constituting that context (20-21).

To further situate the nature of the problem we are dealing with in discussing
prosody, I turn to a characterization of the field by Bolinger. Bolinger also rejects the
structuralist view of a direct relation between the lexico-syntactic level and the intonation
system, but in contrast to Couper-Kühlen and Selting, who see prosody primarily as a
contextualizing factor, Bolinger sees its role essentially as a system for expressing
emotion.¹ The nature of the controversy over prosody as he described it in 1972 is much
the same thirty years later:

There is wide agreement among linguists on the units of sound that
make distinctions in word meanings. There is no such agreement on
the units of intonation. Some have argued that an intonation contour
consists of a succession of levels, others that it is a succession of
changes in direction. The disagreement reflects the difficulty of
treating intonation independently of all the other events that tend to
colour it. A classic example of complexity is the argument over
'question intonations'. We recognize questions as grammatical
entities by such characteristics as inversions... and interrogative
words... Is the intonation of a question to be counted as part of its
grammatical identity? ... However important intonation may be to
what a grammar classifies as question, it seems to lead an existence
of its own. The disagreements are the result of our knowing so little
about that existence and what it means to language as a whole
(Bolinger 1972:14-15).

What is it about prosody which leads to such an array of contradictory and
strongly-held opinions? The fact is, the precise features of prosody are elusive, as elusive
as the transitory speech signal. Furthermore, prosodic features appear to be multi-
functional and can be used for different purposes. All of this contributes to the fact that
prosody has traditionally been an extremely difficult entity to 'pin down' and an even
more difficult phenomenon to categorize and describe. Before the advent of recording
devices and speech analysis programs, precise measurements of prosody were difficult to undertake for practical reasons, even though sound phenomena were clearly of paramount theoretical importance to early linguists (e.g., witness the development of phonetic alphabet systems in order to represent the sounds of language). Indeed, a central concern of early linguistic research was with sound change and the role it played in the diversification of languages. Ironically, as Auer, Couper-Kuhlen and Müller (1998:8) have noted, now that sophisticated recording and speech analysis equipment is readily available, many of the theoretical concerns about language have moved in other directions.

These ‘other directions’ of linguistic inquiry have been labeled ‘marble slab grammar’ by Hockett (1986 [1961]) in a colorful passage in which he contrasts the differences between analyzing spoken language, with its fleeting nature, and the work of the ‘grammarian’, whose object of study is language ‘reduced to writing’:

The grammarian can view a sentence as an enduring structure, to be scanned at leisure and repeatedly, and as easily from right to left or upside-down or inside-out as from left to right. He can do this because he deals not directly with a sentence, but only with a representation thereof, spread out before him like a cadaver on a marble slab to be dissected at his convenience. The hearer has none of these advantages. He is exposed to an utterance just once, and is forced to register its ingredients in just the temporal sequence in which they reach him (49-50).

Much research has been devoted to issues of intonation in the intervening years, and while many of the same disagreements and uncertainties evoked earlier by Bolinger (1972) and Cutler (1983), as well as others, are still on the table, Ladd (1996) discerns an emerging trend in contemporary studies of prosody, based on the work of Pierrehumbert
(1980) in intonational phonology, which he asserts it is 'only slightly premature to characterise as a standard theory of intonational structure' (1):

Research on intonation has long been characterised by a number of unresolved basic issues and fundamental differences of approach. Until recently, these have precluded the emergence of any widely accepted framework for the description of intonational phenomena, or even any general agreement on what the interesting phenomena are. Since the mid-1970s, however, several lines of research have converged on a set of broadly shared assumptions and methods and studies on a variety of languages are now yielding new discoveries expressed in comparable terms (1).

The Pierrehumbert (1980) intonational framework, which emerged from within the autosegmental and metrical framework (see Beckman 1996:19), was subsequently further developed in Beckman and Pierrehumbert (1986) and in Pierrehumbert and Hirschberg (1990). According to Ladd (1992), 'the most important tenet of the new phonological descriptions [referring to Pierrehumbert 1980 and its antecedents; see Ladd 1992:321] is that fundamental frequency (F_o) is best understood as a sequence of discrete phonological events, rather than as a continuously varying contour characterizable by overall shape and direction' (322, emphases in the original). The Pierrehumbert framework's innovation was to postulate two levels of intonational structure for English utterances and to provide a hierarchical framework for the analysis of each level independent of the other, i.e., utterances consist of (1) an intonational phrase (IP), set off by either a low or high 'boundary tone' (H% or L%), the tone being determined by the relationship among the constituents as well as by the information/discourse structure; and (2) an intermediate phonological phrase level (ip) expressed as a high or low phrase accent (H- or L-), and realized over the sequence of syllables following the nuclear pitch
accented word. Each ip contains at least one word and one pitch accent, which is associated with the stressed syllable(s) of lexical item(s). (This pitch accent is expressed as H*, L* and combinations thereof, e.g., L+H*, L*+H). (For further details on the Pierrehumbert model, see Section 2.4, below, and Pierrehumbert 1980, Beckman & Pierrehumbert 1986; Jun 1996, 1998; Jun, ed. to appear; Schafer 1997; Ladd 1992, 1996; Wennerstrom 2001b; for details of the Pierrehumbert framework's proposal of intonational meaning, see Jun 2001 and Pierrehumbert & Hirschberg 1990).

The Pierrehumbert and Hirschberg model is important in that its relative simplicity and underspecification has spawned many new lines of research in intonation, not only for English but also for several other languages. However, while the framework does allow the intonational structure to be specified by discourse and information structure to a certain degree, most research being done within the framework remains, in the praxis, confined to the utterance (understood as 'sentence') level. This is due to the fact that the model emanates from the acoustic measurement tradition, a model which does not project intonation units beyond the intonational phrase level. Engendered as it was from within the field of phonological theory, the model does not emphasize analysis or interpretation of intonation at rhetorical junctures. (For models of intonational meaning beyond the intonational phrase, see Chafe 2000, 1994, 1993, 1987, 1988) While the model does provide for the incorporation of interpretive factors deriving from both auditory perceptions by the listener and pragmatic issues such as speaker's (S) and hearer's (H) mutual beliefs (Pierrehumbert & Hirschberg 1990; Jun 2001), its adherents
usually address issues related to intonational meaning at the discourse level only incidentally, if at all.

As Hirst (1983) says, it is extremely difficult to develop one theory of intonation which will provide a framework to address all of the relevant components, and it is primarily the interactionally-situated, pragmatic component which is lacking in the Pierrehumbert and Hirschberg model. Interestingly, and crucially, however, the insights obtained from the framework are not incompatible with a more interactionist-driven discourse level of analysis, and in fact, scholars such as Wennerstrom (2001b), for one, argue that it behooves discourse analysts to make the effort to understand the prosodic model proposed by Pierrehumbert and Hirschberg and to let it inform their discourse analyses:

Although phonologists and phoneticians have gone a long way in the investigation of prosody, their research goals have generally led them to rely on idealized speech samples out of context. They have usually placed a low priority on extended discourse beyond the level of the single utterance. The challenge is now for discourse analysis to apply the work on prosody in theoretical linguistics to meet their own research goals (263).

Despite the difficulties in adequately describing its processes, let alone in elaborating satisfactory cross-linguistically valid explanatory theories, one indication of the essential role of prosody in the human language faculty is the number of fields which are converging to devote attention to prosodic phenomena. It is not only theorists of intonational structure who are concerned with these phenomena. Scholars in such diverse areas as language acquisition and development, social discourse and medicine are pursuing their own prosody research agenda. And as mentioned earlier, even
commercially driven interests of speech engineers are also involved in basic prosodic research, with the goal of developing user-friendly products meeting communication needs of the electronic era. Speaking of prosody in first language acquisition, for instance, Price et al. (1991) note that '[first] language learners appear to master its production and perception very early. There is evidence, for example, that infants only 4 days old can roughly distinguish familiar from unfamiliar languages on the basis of prosody (see, e.g., Mehler et al. 1988) and that 7- to 10-month-olds are sensitive to the prosodic appropriateness of pause location (Hirsh-Pasek et al. 1987)' (2956). Peters (1977, 2001) has shown convincingly that for some children at least, learning 'the tune' of utterances and employing prosodic fillers [proto-speech] are strategies which precede actual morpheme development and seem to be necessary precursors to the development of language. Rossi (2001), citing Konopczynski (1998), states that infants at the stage of protolanguage, when they have acquired some vocabulary but do not yet have command of morphology or syntax, 'begin to communicate with what are apparently paratactic segments, structured in fact by a pragmatic intonational grammar... The weight of this pragmatic grammar, of which the two traditionally recognized basic constituents are the theme and the rheme, is so strong that adult spontaneous speech is largely shaped by it' (107) [tr. by the author]. (See also Jusczyk et al. 1992 and Jusczyk & Nelson 1993.)

Bolinger (1978), referring to child language acquisition processes and the intonation of vocalizations in deaf infants, also argues that intonation should be considered innate:

There is no proof, as yet, that intonation, or a strong predisposition to it, comes packed in our genes; but all indications are that it does. The child
reacts to it first and controls it first. Its semantic domain is that of meanings that are most important to very young children: attention-getters, requests, inquiries, complaints--which function alone at first and then become an illocutionary counterpoint to words. The forms used resemble vocalizations that infants--even deaf ones--use in their first months. The most natural intonation, from the standpoint of speech production, is the one learned most easily...[Intonation] is essential to the learning of the rest of the language. Parents and others use exaggerated prosodic features with very young children...Pause assists in the fixing of intonation patterns. Intonation patterns and pause in turn assist in the learning of words, then syntax...But once the repertory of words and syntactic patterns has been mastered, intonation is free to embrace larger stretches of speech, up to paragraphs, carrying on both an organizing and an illocutionary role. What the child has learned with words in isolation now becomes the prime cue to the utterance. If it is distorted, intelligibility suffers (511).

Studies of patients with Wernicke's aphasia, and others with a type of aphasia known as conduction aphasia, where retrieval of content words is impaired but where expressive prosodic abilities and spontaneous, fluent speech are left relatively intact, also provide some evidence for the locus and role of prosody (see Caplan 1987, cited in Hirst & Di Cristo:2). Studies with such patients have shown that in certain cases, depending on the area of the brain affected, these patients are able to discern and expressively use prosodic features despite specific language impairments in other areas.3

Hirst and Di Cristo (1998) affirm that 'the prosodic characteristics of a language are not only probably the first phonetic features acquired by a child (Kaplan 1970, Crystal 1973, Lieberman 1986, Levitt 1993) but also the last to be lost either through aphasia (Caplan 1987) or during the acquisition of another language or dialect (Cruz-Ferreira 1984, Touati 1990)' (2). Gerken (1996), working in the prosodic phonology framework, finds that two-year-old children make use of prosodic structure independently from their developing understanding of syntactic structures.
With such mounting evidence of the central role which prosody plays in the human language faculty from earliest infancy, indicating that humans seem to come ‘wired’ for discrete linguistic applications of prosody, it is surely not inconceivable then that highly socialized adults with minimal lexico-morphosyntactic proficiency in a naturalistically acquired second language would have recourse to prosody to ‘fill in’ these gaps in the target language when faced with communicative exigencies. There is in fact already a small body of evidence, from scattered references in the few studies which have addressed the interlanguage of naturalistic acquirers, that such learners do have recourse to prosody in structuring their utterances (e.g., Kumpf 1986, Klein 1981a).

However, with respect to instructed learners’ ability to acquire ‘target-like’ prosody and intonation in a second language, expert opinions are strongly divided. (See James & Leather 1987 and Leather & James 1992 for collections of papers on the topic.) Some researchers conclude that it is extremely difficult to acquire native-like intonation patterns. (See inter alia Lenneberg 1967; Scovel 1969; Flege 1987; Flege & Hillenbrand 1984.) Other researchers have conducted studies which demonstrate the opposite effect, e.g., that people can achieve an accent virtually indistinguishable from that of native speakers. In an experiment in which he submitted English speaking subjects to a short period of training in Japanese, Chinese and Eskimo, Neufeld, for example, found that subjects with no prior exposure to a language can quite accurately reproduce the tunes of the language in a laboratory setting (Neufeld 1977, 1978; Neufeld & Schneiderman 1980). (See also Gilbert 1980, reporting on similar experiments on the acquisition of prosody, with mixed results, and Neufeld 1980, which found virtually no foreign accent
in highly successful English-speaking adult learners of French.) A substantial number of studies have investigated the effect of L1 phonetic features and phonemic categories on L2 perceptual abilities. (See Leather & James 1996 for a review of these studies.) Still others have found correlations between a range of factors such as social distance and an L2 learner’s degree of motivation to sound nativelike and the actual approximation of that goal (See Leather & James 1996 for a review of relevant studies; see also Wennerstrom 2000.)

Faced with this array of competing claims and a clear lack of general consensus with respect to the acquisition of target-like mastery of prosodic features, one must then ask the question: Are second language prosodic rules to be grouped with the aspects of language which are no longer accessible to the adult (post-adolescent) acquirer (if one assumes that there is a 'critical period' beyond which certain linguistic features cannot be acquired with native-like competency)?

The evidence from naturalistic uninstructed second language acquirers also leads to contradictory conclusions regarding the status of prosody within the language faculty. On the one hand, the central argument of this study, based on data collected from actual use, is that prosody is employed by second language speakers in the service of essential linguistic functions when lexical and syntactic resources of the target language, normally deemed crucial for the realization of these linguistic functions, have not been acquired by the mental grammar. Essential linguistic functions are defined here as core functions of human language such as introducing logical relations between propositions (i.e., establishing coherence and cohesion), making abstract references to non-present entities
and concepts, and creating propositional content. On the other hand, the very fact that naturalistic acquirers are able to make 'instinctive' use of (possibly universal) prosodic features, as documented here and in Klein (1981a) and Kumpf (1986), might be taken as an argument against the fact that prosody is essentially a linguistic feature, and that it is, rather, a psycho-physiological evolutionary trait.

In this regard, one quite tantalizing fact which is evident in my corpus is that the six speakers could be classified into two types (or three types, possibly, if one wished to create an isolate, in order to account for one speaker with distinctive patterns). The two types could be classified as (1) low proficiency and highly communicative and (2) low proficiency and minimally communicative. It is among the type 1 highly communicative speakers that the most linguistically creative uses of prosody are found.

Analyzed from a lexical and syntactic point of view, the low proficiency and minimally communicative speakers of type 2 clearly have more limited means at their disposal, but the gap between them and the highly communicative speakers in terms of lexicon and syntax is not great. What is striking, however, is that the three minimally communicative speakers do not draw upon prosodic resources to supplement their lexical and syntactic gaps to the extent that the highly communicative speakers do. It could be argued that this limited use of prosody is simply a function of personality factors. Or, more interestingly from a theoretical linguistic perspective, it could be argued that people with a highly developed communicative drive create more communicative pressures for themselves, which in turn leads them to reach further into their 'bag of language tools' to find the right tool for the job. Not finding the lexical or syntactic tools, they 'make do'
with the prosodic tool, adapting and exploiting its unique properties to the
(communicative) needs of the moment. In other words, in this view, it is the demands of
language-in-interaction and language-in-use which is the motor driving the development
of the prosodic devices.

In sum, the fact that prosody, a definition of which will be attempted in the next
section, constitutes a core component of interpersonal communication is undisputed.
What remains an open question is whether it should be considered central to the human
language faculty. Interestingly, there is a growing body of work in sign language
linguistics which is uncovering extensive linguistic functions of prosodic phenomena
(Grosjean 1979; G. Coulter 1990, 1993) in the visual modality as well. These studies
exclude the aural and vocally-produced features of prosody, obviously, but include other
components such as rhythm, stress, pausing and timing. Several recent studies have
examined the role of prosody in narrative structure (Wilson 1996) and phonological
variation (Hoopes 1998; Lucas et al. 2001). Such evidence of systematic use of prosody
from language in the visual modality in ways that parallel its use in the oral modality
argues strongly for the inclusion of prosody in the core phenomena of language.

The position I take is that prosody is one of the built-in redundancies of the
human language faculty. When lexical and syntactic devices are available to encode the
linguistic message--and here I am referring to speech production in both one's native
language as well as in a second language--prosody fades into the background,
relinquishing its linguistic functions but retaining what could be called its paralinguistic
role as contextualizing agent. When other devices for linguistic encoding are lacking,
however, prosody re-emerges to assume its more central linguistic role in making meaning. That prosody should be classified as a redundant feature of language in no way detracts from the argument in favor of its centrality, as the numerous attested redundancies in all natural languages prove.

To amplify upon this point, I would like to cite a passage from Ladd (1996), describing the state of the art in contemporary studies of intonation, in which he speaks of tone languages having ‘captured’ pitch in order to make phonemic distinctions:

The heart of this theory [of intonational structure] is the idea that intonation, and pitch in particular, has a phonological organisation. This idea requires some justification, since pitch seems to pose problems for phonology. For one thing, pitch is somehow more relative than other phonetic properties....we find only a simple sliding scale of up and down, which can differ conspicuously from speaker to speaker and from occasion to occasion...We know, however, that in...tone languages ...pitch has been captured for use in the phonemic system...

Yet pitch in tone languages also serves ...paralinguistic functions...This means that pitch per se has no intrinsic properties that prevent us from ascribing to it a phonological structure. Rather, the principal peculiarity of pitch in language is that, in addition to any phonological organisation it may have, it is also universally used for paralinguistic functions as well (1-2; emphases in original).

Ladd’s reference to the dual nature of prosody and the ‘capturing’ of pitch invokes the image of ‘taming’ a wild horse for human domestic purposes, an imagery which supports the picture I am trying to draw of the use of what might be termed ‘interlanguage prosody’. In Ladd’s terms, I see prosody, with its panoply of features, as being ‘captured’ and domesticated by interlanguage speakers, not only for its well-known expressive and paralinguistic functions, but also for use in exolinguistic communication situations where at least one speaker's knowledge of the lexical and syntactic features of
the common language are insufficient to allow them to express their propositions by any
other means. It is as if the interlanguage speakers, unschooled in linguistic theory but
experts at exolingual communication, draw on an intuitive notion that 'prosody speaks
for me when words cannot'.

In short, the data analysis presented in Chapter Four of this study leads one to
consider the possibility that prosody becomes one of, if not the, central linguistic
component which serves communicative demands of the naturalistic second language
acquirer, when other linguistic resources are lacking. Even the so-called paralinguistic
functions of prosody (e.g., expressing such things as emotional stance and affect) seem to
take on a linguistic function in communicative situations when the speaker's
interlanguage is on the low end of the proficiency continuum. Whether these linguistic
applications draw on psycho-physiological universal properties, or whether
‘interlanguage prosody’ draws primarily on language-specific prosodic features of the
source and/or target languages will remain an unanswered question deserving follow-up
work. This study sets itself the more modest agenda of describing a heretofore
understudied phenomenon: prosodic features serving linguistic functions in fluent,
stabilized interlanguage.

2.2 Prosody and intonation: concepts defined and differentiated

2.2.1 Terminological proliferation

In the literature on the contribution of sounds to meaning in language, one
regularly encounters both the term ‘prosody’ and the term ‘intonation’, often used in
reference to phenomena which can be distinguished from each other only by the finest of technical definitions. Terminological confusion is rampant in the scholarly literature and one could easily get the impression that the two terms, intonation and prosody, are used almost interchangeably. As Ladd (1980), one of the leading investigators of intonation and prosody himself confessed, 'I have often loosely used "intonation"...to refer to prosodic features in general. Where I needed an explicit cover-term to distinguish all phenomena of intonation, prominence, etc., from segmentals, I have used supra-segmentals, but I disown any theoretical baggage that may come along with that term' (Ladd 1980:x; emphases in the original).

One has only to compile a list of the terms used by specialists in the field referring to more or less the same bundle of features to be convinced of the extent of the overlap in terms. One finds, for example, all of the following: 'prosodic dimensions' (Johns-Lewis 1986:200), 'prosodic features' (Johns-Lewis 1986: 209; Cruttenden 1986:1-6; Edwards 1993), 'intonational patterns' (Beckman 1996:19), 'prosodic categories' (Beckman 1996:18), 'prosodic devices' (Couper-Kuhlen and Selting 1996:25). Even if one narrows the focus to more precisely defined features, one is again confronted again with alternating references to seemingly identical phenomena, as in 'intonation contour' (Ladd 1980:150), 'intonational contour' (Pierrehumbert & Hirschberg 1986:1), 'intonational phrase' (Beckman & Pierrehumbert 1986; Beckman 1996), 'prosodic structure' (Price et al. 1991:2956; Beckman 1996: 64 and passim) and 'prosodic cues' (Venditti, Jun & Beckman 1996; Price et al. 1991).
Furthermore, some scholars define prosody as a component of intonation (i.e., Crystal 1969; Cruttenden 1986). Many other scholars, on the other hand, take intonation to be subsumed under prosody, which is defined as a grammatical system (Bing 1980; Beckman 1996; Warren 1996; Wichmann 2000; Cutler 1997; van Donzel 1999). Others eschew the use of the term prosody altogether and use the term intonation to refer to the same set of features elsewhere labeled prosody.6

To illustrate this conflation of terms, I will cite Cruttenden (1986), who, while not directly contrasting intonation and prosody, holds a view that seems to equate ‘intonation’ with phenomena which fall under the rubric of prosody in others’ analyses: ‘Intonation concerns which syllables are prominent, how they are made prominent, and to what extent they are made prominent... (7-8)’. According to Cruttenden ‘intonation involves the occurrence of recurring pitch patterns, each of which is used with a set of relatively consistent meanings, either on single words or on groups of words of varying length’ (9).

Cruttenden distinguishes tone from intonation in the types of meaning each conveys in the following way: ‘While tone is used for contrasts in lexical meaning or to produce modifications of meaning of the sort conveyed by case or tense, the meanings conveyed by intonation are often less concrete. Intonation may indicate a discoursal meaning like inviting a listener to make a contribution to the conversation, or an attitudinal meaning like being condescending’ (10).

Selting (1992) opts for a similar use of the term intonation: '[Intonation is used here as a means to differentiate and establish specific kinds of cohesive relations with
story telling and in the embedding of story telling into a preceding argumentation.

Intonation contextualizes different parts of the story telling and their relations to each other as well as the relation of the entire activity of story telling to the prior activity of arguing' (244). Wichmann (2000), however, is less categorical, saying that 'although I refer mainly in this book to intonation, I occasionally also make reference to "prosody". Prosody is the complex set of features which together make up what we commonly perceive as "tone of voice". Intonation--or pitch--is just one component' (1).

A proliferation of variations on definitions introduced by researchers to meet the needs of their own analytical framework, in addition to the elusive nature of the phenomena itself, are responsible for this state of affairs. Hirst and Di Cristo (1998) provide one of the most detailed explanations of the situation:

The term intonation has often been used interchangeably in the literature with that of prosody. When a distinction is made between the two words, this is often not explicit. The difference of usage...can, in our opinion, be traced to a double ambiguity in the use of the term intonation itself.

The first ambiguity depends on whether or not intonation is defined in a broad sense, that is as including factors such as word-stress, tone and quantity which can be an essential part of the lexical identity of words, or in a narrow sense, as excluding such factors. The term prosody, like that of suprasegmentals can be reserved for the broad sense as opposed to intonation proper which is then restricted to what are sometimes called supralexical, postlexical or simply non-lexical characteristics, consisting of such phenomena as the overall form of pitch patterns, declination, boundary phenomena, etc...

The second ambiguity depends on a distinction between levels of analysis and description. In phonetics, as in all sciences, a distinction may be made between the physical level, that of observable and measurable physical parameters, and the formal level, which is a rather more abstract level of representation set up as a model in an attempt to describe and explain the observed data. (Hirst and Di Cristo 1998:4; emphases in the original)
Hirst and Di Cristo's (1998) clarification of their own use of the two terms illustrates the choices faced by researchers:

We propose, then, to continue to use the term prosody in its most general sense to cover both the abstract cognitive systems and the physical parameters onto which these systems are mapped. On the abstract, phonological level, prosody consists of a number of lexical systems (tone, stress and quantity) and one non-lexical system: intonation. We also propose to use the term intonation with a second meaning, to refer to a specifically phonetic characteristic of utterances, a construction by which the prosodic primitives on the lexical level and the non-lexical level,...are related to acoustic prosodic parameters (7).

Wichmann (2000) provides another useful perspective on the source of the definitional dilemma, citing differences between British and American coinages:

The term prosody has meant different things at different times. From its origins as the study of Greek and Latin versification, it has come to refer (especially in British phonetics) ... to the linguistic patterning of pitch, loudness, timing (including pauses) and voice quality, in other words to speech patterns which operate above the level of the phoneme. (In American phonetics this is generally known as suprasegmental phonology, and the term prosody is reserved for the 'grammar' of intonation) (8).

Importantly, Wichmann (2000) goes on to note that 'not all these prosodic components are included in abstract models of sentence intonation, but all may play a part in the signalling of discourse structure' (8).

The above-noted tendency for various scholars to create idiosyncratic definitions with respect to 'intonation' and 'prosody' extends to the technical definitions of the features which compose them. It is with respect to the terms 'stress' and 'accent' where the greatest divergence of use is to be observed, as a perusal of a few sample excerpts in the notes will amply illustrate.8 (For further discussion of the distinctions, see Ladd 1996; Crystal 1997 [1991].)
2.2.1.1 Components of prosody specified

That so many discrepancies could arise reflects both the multifaceted nature of the phenomenon and the multiplicity of speech phenomena which are of interest to scholars, as well as the numerous approaches which can be taken to examine their properties and their interaction with other linguistic features. An attempt to provide some basic terminological definitions and to define the scope of the terms used in this study is perhaps appropriate at this point.

The term 'prosody' refers to a set of features which are also sometimes referred to as supra-segmentals, that is, they are features which 'extend over stretches of utterances longer than just one sound' (Cruttenden 1986:1). One commonly speaks of the 'prosodic contour', which is the 'tune' the listener perceives when prosodic features come into play. The features which constitute prosody include pitch, loudness, and length, as well as rhythm, pausing, rate of speech, voice quality and others which may or may not subsume one of the above phenomena, e.g., stress or accent, depending on the theoretical framework of the particular analyst.

One of the clearest definitions of prosody is that provided by Edwards (1993), who states that prosodic features are 'properties that correlate to some degree with physically measurable dimensions: perceived pitch with the fundamental frequency of the voice; perceived loudness with amplitude; and perceived duration (e.g. length of segments, duration of pause, speech rate) with actual time (21)'.

Pitch is perhaps the feature most commonly associated with prosody. Strictly speaking, 'pitch' is the term used to refer to the auditory perception of sound frequency by
the human ear. As might be expected, however, the term is often used in a second sense; namely, it is used to refer to the acoustical measurement of the vibrations (frequency, referred to as 'F_o') which produced the sound. The acoustical measurement of sound frequency is expressed in a unit of measurement known as Hertz (Hz), which corresponds to the number of repetitions of the regular waveform within one second, repetitions which are produced by the vibrations of the vocal cords. Auditorily—that is, as heard by the naked ear—the listener perceives a voice as being high pitched or low pitched. According to Cruttenden (1986:3-4), adult male voices typically fall within the 60Hz-240Hz range, averaging around 120Hz. (There are slight disagreements on the upper and lower boundaries, however, as Crystal 1969 and Couper-Kuhlen 1996 both state that male voices tend to fall in the 80-200Hz range.) There is general agreement that adult female voices typically fall within the range of 180-400Hz, with an average around 225Hz. Children average around 265Hz.

In practical terms, only voiced consonants and vowels can be measured for their fundamental frequency, a fact which will become evident later when the acoustic measurements are introduced. Two further facts relating to the acoustic measurements which will be presented later should be kept in mind: (1) a vowel following a voiceless consonant has a higher frequency (F_o) than a vowel following a voiced consonant; (2) different vowels have inherently different high and low frequencies, e.g., an open vowel such as [a] will have a lower frequency (F_o) than a close vowel such as [i]. (See Ladefoged 1993:184-187, 1996: 20,75 for further discussion.) One final consideration with respect to pitch (the auditory perception) and frequency (the acoustic measurement,
expressed as \( F_0 \) needs to be introduced here. As Couper-Kuhlen (1996) quite correctly points out, '[t]he acoustic analysis of fundamental frequency...is not a wholly satisfactory representation of the way these contours are perceived (see also 't Hart, Collier and Cohen 1990). For one, the Hz scale is linear but we hear pitch logarithmically. That is, we need larger intervals at higher frequencies than at lower frequencies in order to hear equivalent pitch steps' (372). The effect of this mis-match between acoustic measurements and auditory perceptions will be discussed in further detail later as it relates to the interpretation of the narrative data collected for this study.

Pitch contour and pitch range are two other related concepts which need to be explained. 'Pitch contour', already mentioned above, refers to the sequence of pitch movements which alternate between the higher and the lower reference level of what is known as the declination line. 'Pitch range' refers to the minimum and maximum frequencies produced by any given speaker, a phenomenon which will be illustrated later.

Length, as used in prosodic studies, refers to both the absolute, measurable duration of sounds as well as to their relative duration with respect to the surrounding material. The term 'length' is used for both auditory and acoustic descriptions of sound.

A final set of terms requiring explanation are the ones relating to loudness, or volume. According to Ladefoged (1993), the loudness of a sound 'depends on the size of the variations in air pressure that occur' and is 'usually measured in decibels ... (dB) relative to the amplitude of some other sounds. When one sound has an intensity 5 dB greater than another, then it is approximately twice as loud' (187). 'Loudness' is the term
used for the auditory perception of a sound, while 'intensity' or 'amplitude' is the term used for its acoustic measurement. (See Cruttenden 1986: 2 for further details.)

Other essential terms for the discussion which follows, including tune, intonational phrasing, phrase boundaries and intonational units will be explained below in section 2.4.2, which discusses intonational components of discourse organization.

A cautionary note sounded by Edwards (1993) should be borne in mind, however. This is that ‘...[t]he correlations between acoustically measured values and perceptually and linguistically significant categories are complex and far from perfect’ (21), a fact which we will see borne out in our subsequent data analysis.

Although the explanations provided above regarding the components of prosody may sound relatively straightforward, in actual practice, the terminological boundaries, once again, tend to become quite blurred. Faced with such terminological diversity, then, it is important to select a set of terms which will be employed in this study and to specify what will be meant by them.

2.2.1.2 Delineation of terms used in this study

Although the terms and the usage I make of them may at times conflict with its usage elsewhere, I will opt for the definition which best fits the purposes of this study and the data to be described. In other words, in making this selection of terms, I am not motivated by adherence to a particular theory of intonation or prosody, but rather by the usefulness of the term in describing the use of prosody in the narratives under discussion.
I use the term 'prosody' in this study to refer to the perceptual tune or melodic pattern of the speech stream which results from the combination of pitch, volume, length (duration in time), and rhythm (including pauses and tempo). The term ‘prosodic features’ refers to any one or a combination of the above-mentioned psychologically salient auditory components of prosody. Influenced as I am by the prevalence of the term, I will on occasion use ‘intonation’ in a loose sense, in alternation with the term ‘prosody’ to describe the tune of an utterance, as above, but the term ‘intonation’ will mainly be used in the context of discussing an information unit, e.g., an intonation unit (see Chafe 1988, 1994, 2000), also known as an intonation contour (Ladd 1980), which serves as a discourse chunking device for on-line processing of the speech stream by both the speaker who is formulating the utterance and the listener who is parsing the utterance.

My approach essentially has been an auditory one, but I draw on the techniques of acoustic measurement and graphic representation of the auditory signal in order to visually illustrate the measurable acoustic correlates of the auditory perception. Before proceeding to deal more directly with data from the study, I will now briefly discuss the points of contention with respect to auditory and acoustic approaches to the study of prosody.

2.2.2 Acoustic vs auditory approaches to study of prosody and intonation

As will have become obvious from the above discussion, there is considerable theoretical disarray with respect to how to deal with intonation and prosody and the complexity of the phenomenon continues to defy systematization. In addition to
theoretical differences, an additional complicating factor is that there are two quite
distinct methodological approaches, each having their critics and defenders. The two
traditions are often viewed by their respective proponents as competing with each other.
I intend to demonstrate in this study, however, following Schuetze-Coburn, Shapley and
Weber (1991), that the two approaches are, in fact, complementary.

There is, first of all, the acoustic tradition, which employs instrumentation to
measure the physical, acoustic properties of waveforms of recorded speech, usually
focusing on the fundamental frequency obtained from native speakers reading from
prepared protocols composed of isolated sentences. The work of Liberman and Sag
(1974), Pierrehumbert (1980) and Liberman and Pierrehumbert (1984) all fall within this
tradition and share the common trait of attempting to correlate syntactic structure with
prosodic data. The second is the auditory approach which attempts to determine which
sounds in the speech stream are salient to the listeners and are used by listeners to decode
the oral message. Early publications, such as that by Kingdon (1958), and later work by
Lehiste (1979) and Cutler (1983) are illustrative of this tradition.

Ladd and Cutler (1983) note the stances of the two quite impassioned approaches
in the following terms:

There are two broad traditions in the study of prosody that may be
characterized—or caricatured—by their methodological preferences…On
one side of the dichotomy stand instrumental and experimental studies that
seek to quantify acoustic features and investigate perceptual responses. On
the other are descriptive and theoretical studies of prosodic structure and
its relation to other aspects of grammar and phonology. In a great deal of
past work these two traditions have simply ignored one another …
Occasionally, however, the differences between the two traditions have surfaced in explicit [mutual] condemnation...(1).

Ladd and Cutler (1983) differentiate between what they call the 'concrete' approach, by which they are referring to acoustic, verifiable measurements of pitch, duration and intensity, and the 'abstract' approach. They characterize the concrete approach as one which 'conceives of the link between form and function in prosody as a relatively direct mapping between concrete meanings or functions and specific acoustic shapes or variables....' (1-2). According to Ladd and Cutler (1983), '[t]he main aim of 'concrete' research is to identify the correlations between specific messages and specific acoustic parameters' (2). The abstract approach, on the other hand, is one which is less concerned with its physical measurements and more concerned with attempts to conceptualize the role of prosody in overall linguistic structure. The abstract approach, according to Ladd and Cutler (1983), 'tends to class any phenomena that involve phonological organization at levels above the segment' (3).

Swerts and Collier (1992) also provide a description of the perceived dichotomy and a sense of the rancor which the divergence has sometimes provoked:

...many linguistically oriented studies of spontaneous discourse have struggled with some considerable methodological problems that have not yet been solved. For instance, numerous phonetic approaches to spontaneous speech might be criticized for not being rigorous enough, because their techniques of observation and analysis are impressionistic and irreproducible. Indeed, stretches of speech are often analyzed auditorily without a measurable verification of the perceptual transcriptions. Therefore, though the underlying questions may be very interesting as such, the reliability of the empirical data resulting from these studies remains questionable. Another problem concerns the lack of a clear theoretical viewpoint from which the collected data can be looked at (464).
As will be clear in my approach to the data analysis, however, I tend to agree with the position of Ladd and Cutler (1983), who take note of the criticisms leveled at the auditory approach as 'too impressionistic and unscientific' (4), but who in turn criticize the instrumental approach on the grounds that while being scientifically 'respectable' because based on verifiable measurements (although a number of caveats regarding the reliability of such measurements could be raised here, let us leave aside such considerations for the moment), [it] can be faulted for lacking verifiability in the sense that it makes no direct link between the psychological salience, and therefore the linguistic value, of purely acoustic records. The auditory approach, on the other hand, is criticized as being too impressionistic and unscientific (4).

A few previous studies have attempted to make use of both auditory and acoustic approaches in their analyses. Among these can be cited Menn and Boyce (1982), who studied parent-child conversational interactions using a discourse analytical approach combined with an instrumental analysis. Using a combination of auditory and acoustical data, they found a correlation between discourse structure and pitch at the clause level. The most influential study using these 'combined approaches', however, is that of Schuetze-Coburn et al. (1991) who, after comparing acoustic and auditory features of intonation units in natural discourse, concluded that their results 'directly challenge commonly held views on the unreliability of perceptual judgments of intonation by trained linguists' (225). Specifically, they found that a correspondence between DUs [declination units, i.e., acoustically measured pitch contours] and IUs [intonation units, i.e. auditorily salient units] exists. The boundaries of the acoustically and auditorily based units overlap to a large extent...Clearly, the acoustic facts of DUs are directly related to their perceptual equivalents in IUs. In light of this, we can point to a specific acoustic measure which correlates with IU boundaries; that is,
we may infer that Fo reset is a salient cue to an auditory identification of boundaries (225).

The explicit goal of the Schuetze-Coburn et al. (1991) study was to provide 'a controlled arena for testing assumptions and claims concerning the perception of intonation, the viability of auditory analysis, and the domains of intonational phenomena' (211). The original motivation for these analysts of naturally occurring spoken discourse to conduct such a study was that at the time, there was very little data available which could resolve the differences between the two competing approaches, 'especially for larger periods of connected speech in a natural discourse situation' (209). Their research was specifically designed to resolve the debate, and to a large extent, it did accomplish that goal.

Their approach was 'to treat both acoustical and auditory data on equal terms, not to take one kind of data as primary and use the other as a method of verification or corroboration, as has been done in the past' (209). Their corpus consisted of spontaneous conversational speech and their procedure was to 'examine the relationship between an acoustic unit defined in terms of fundamental frequency declination and an auditory unit roughly the size of an intonational phrase, based on parameters which contribute to perceived prosodic coherence' (209).

Their contention was that

if the auditory and acoustic units consistently coincide, then standard assumptions and practices by both auditory and acoustic researchers would be confirmed. On the auditory side, such agreement would lend validity to the use of auditory methods of analysis for discourse data, as it could be inferred that acoustic cues of intonational structure can be reliably perceived. The use of a phrase-level unit as the primary domain of intonation in the analysis of discourse would also be supported. On the
acoustic side, such agreement would prove the applicability of acoustic models to discourse studies and underscore the helpfulness of the auditory dimension as input to acoustic analysis (210).

Schuetze-Coburn, Shapley and Weber (1991) expressed the hope that future studies would include the use of both approaches, cautioning that

The complexity of intonation necessitates simplification of the raw physical data to get at the system. But simplification is a form of abstraction, and, although abstraction is a necessary step in the organization of the data, the ever-present danger of over-abstraction whereby the constructed system acquires an inertia of its own must be vigilantly checked. One way to monitor this is to maintain a close tie to language in actual use (208).

Since the publication of Schuetze-Coburn et al. (1991), several studies have taken the approach they advocated, e.g., the interface between intonational/prosodic features and actual language in use. Of particular note are the papers contained in the volume edited by Couper-Kuhlen and Selting (1996), under the collective rubric of a conversation analytic approach to the analysis of intonational features of naturally occurring conversational data.

Several recent studies, such as those of van Donzel (1999) and Wichmann (2000) have also contributed to a more complementary approach by combining acoustical measurement with independently determined discourse structure to reach conclusions regarding the role of prosody in the making of meaning, although both of these studies are based primarily on retold, rehearsed and/or scripted texts. With the present study, by contributing insights from the use of prosody as a discourse organizational feature in non-native speaker unrehearsed conversational narratives, I hope to add to the body of work in this framework.
The divergence between the two approaches, which were mainly the domain of scholars involved in research for theoretical or pedagogical purposes, is now also being considerably reduced by commercially-driven marketplace concerns which has led to the investment of considerable sums of money into approaches which combine insights and methods from both traditions with a view to developing accurate and user-friendly computerized speech recognition and text-to-speech recognition programs (Edwards 1993: 22-23; Cruttenden 1986: 6-7; Nakatani 1996; van Donzel 1999; Wichmann 2000).

2.3. Cross-linguistic comparisons of prosodic features

2.3.1. The case for [and against] prosodic universals

As with many other aspects of prosody and intonation, the results of the literature review in this field are inconclusive; that is, there are some scholars who argue convincingly for the existence of underlying cross-linguistic universals, while others, equally convincingly, argue that the so-called universals are too vaguely conceived and are described within such widely distinctive frameworks as to make viable comparisons impossible.

Ladd (1996), sketching a generalization of the universalist perspective, says that, '[t]he phenomena generally emphasised by those who assume a universal common core for intonation include declination (and more generally the association of low or falling pitch with completion), the association of high or rising pitch with both questions and non-finality, and the presence of local pitch movements on new or otherwise informative words' (113).
One of the figures most closely associated with the universalist view is Bolinger (1978, 1986, 1989), who grounds his conclusions in cross-linguistic evidence based on a study he undertook of 23 languages, as well as in processes of child language acquisition.

Ladd (1996) provides a succinct overview and characterization of Bolinger's position:

Intonation, according to Bolinger, has direct links to the prelinguistic use of pitch to signal emotion. Broadly speaking, high or rising pitch signals interest, arousal, and incompleteness, while low or falling pitch signals absence of interest and hence finality and rest. This fundamental opposition between high and low...is clearly seen in the use of pitch range for obviously emotional expression—raised voice for active emotions such as anger or surprise and lowered voice for boredom, sadness, and the like (113-114).

The following excerpts, in Bolinger's own words, provide some insight into his view on the topic of intonation universals:

I hypothesized [referring to a 1964 paper] that of the parts of the human vocal system that are used linguistically, intonation corresponds more closely than any other to states of the organism. There is now more reason than ever to believe this and to look at the early stages of language acquisition, and at manifestations of emotion at all stages and ages, for the key to certain almost exceptionless tendencies and the repetition of intonation forms in the most widely separated languages (Bolinger 1978: 474).

Later in the same work, he makes the following assertions:

...Pitch range and pitch height are clearly tied to emotional states. Angry speakers everywhere use the same flights of pitch. Languages described as having 'no intonation'...or 'no contrastive pitch patterns'...are still admitted to have changes in pitch corresponding to the fluctuations of emotion. Intonation is a half-tamed savage. To understand the tamed or linguistically harnessed half of him one has to make friends with the wild half (Bolinger 1978:475).

...Probably the majority of intonational differences from language to language are instances of doing the same things but doing them in
different degrees...If this is the case, then we can think of an intonational core, an innate pattern of the sort envisioned by Lieberman, from which speakers and cultures may depart, but to which some force is always pushing them back (Bolinger 1978: 510).

To buttress his claims of universality of intonational features based on his own data, Bolinger (1978) cites the findings of many other scholars, including those of Hyman (1975) regarding stress, which were based on an even wider sampling of languages, and who says that, 'intrinsic variations which give rise to stress accent are always present, and can become grammaticalized at any time. These intrinsic variations are...intonational..., and are ultimately derived from the articulatory and perceptual universals which characterize human speech (Hyman 1975:19, cited in Bolinger 1978:481).

In concluding his 1978 cross-linguistic study, Bolinger states that

Intonational shapes with predictable meanings are too widely shared not to lead to the conclusion that they come from some 'essentially human trait' (Ultan 1969:45)...Whether to account for the uniformities one should look to some still active physiological mechanism, such as expiration and drop in subglottal air pressure, or relaxation and untensing of the vocal cords, or whether that is past history and we now carry traces in our genetic makeup that compel us to adopt certain definite patterns, the fact is that human speakers everywhere do essentially the same things with fundamental pitch (515).

Bolinger describes the status of linguistic uses of intonation (which he takes to be characterized primarily by pitch movements) as 'clouded' however:

Pitch movement itself is symphonic: even discounting tone, as many as three things may be happening at once: an over-all wide range for a main sentence, an included narrow range for a parenthesis, and further included peaks and scoops for accent. The very integrity of intonation may lead to apparent differences between languages: given the same intonational rule for focus, if focus is partly controlled by syntax, the interaction may produce utterances that are superficially quite different. Yet despite these complications the evidence for a basic uniformity is impressive, and if
they can some day be disentangled, it will probably be overwhelming (515).

Another strong proponent of the universalist view is Lieberman (1967, 1980, 1986), who relates intonational phenomena to breath and subglottal pressure, as mentioned above.12 Ladd (1996), summarizing Lieberman's position, says that 'he [Liebermann] suggested that all linguistically significant uses of intonation in all languages could be reduced to a distinction between 'marked breath group' and 'unmarked breath group' (corresponding roughly to phrase-final rise and fall respectively), plus local prominence for accent on individually informative words; lexical tone was seen as overlaid on the two breath group types' (Ladd 1996:114).

Vaissière (1983, 1995), reviewing evidence from the physical domain which could explain cross-linguistic similarities in the psychological perceptions associated with various prosodic patterns, also takes a cautiously universalist position. Vaissière maintains that 'a large number of similarities in languages may be explained if prosodic patterning is hypothesised to arise from a unique underlying archetypal gestalt', which 'continues the same vein of research exemplified in Jakobson's search for biological causes of cross-language similarities' (1995: 124). Ultimately Vaissière (1995) concludes that 'studies of more languages are needed to confirm or disprove the psychological association of F₀ rise and high values with beginning, F₀ fall and low F₀ values with termination, and of the fall-rise pattern as disjuncture' (129).

Ladd (1996) categorically critiques the universalist view, saying 'while it would be foolish to deny the existence of [their]... broad generalisations about intonation, there are good reasons for scepticism about the universalist view' (115). Ladd (1996) points out
that 'most of its generalisations are so broad or so vague ('high or rising pitch') that it is virtually impossible to falsify them' (115). Ladd (1996) goes on to describe tonal differences between so-called 'intonation' languages, supporting this analysis with several extensive discussions of phenomena such as English question intonations, 'Urban North British' statement intonation, the calling contour in European languages, and what he refers to as the 'French/Italian suspended-fall intonation' (Ladd 1996:39). In his taxonomy, he includes 'semantic' differences (e.g., 'differences in the meaning or use of phonologically identical tunes, 'systemic' differences (e.g., 'differences in the inventory of phonologically distinct tune types', 'realisational' differences (e.g., differences of detail in the phonetic realisation of what may be regarded phonologically as the same tune, and 'phonotactic' differences (e.g., 'differences in tune-text association and in the permitted structure of tunes' (all immediately preceding citations in this paragraph are from Ladd 1996:119).

Hirst and Di Cristo (1998), on the other hand, equivocate on the issue of universality: 'The description of the intonation system of a particular language or dialect is a particularly difficult task since intonation is paradoxically at the same time one of the most universal and one of the most language specific features of human language' (1). They explain this temporizing conclusion, first by explaining what they see as the universal characteristics of intonation, drawing on Hockett's (1963) observation, as well as on many of the features such as those documented by Bolinger and others:

Intonation is universal first of all because every language possesses intonation. Hockett (1963) made this one of his list of ten significant empirical generalisations about languages: generalisations which we should not necessarily want to include in the definition of what constitutes
a language but which just happen to be true. Intonation is universal also because many of the linguistic and paralinguistic functions of intonation systems seem to be shared by languages of widely different origins. It has often been noted, for example, that in a vast majority of languages some sort of raised pitch (final or non-final) can be used in contrast with lower pitch to indicate that an utterance is intended as a question rather than as a statement. In this sense the universal status of intonation is rather different from that observed for other phonological systems such as vowels or consonants for example. While it is true that all languages have vowel and consonant systems, and even that similar patterns of vowels and consonants can be found in languages which are only very distantly related, these systems do not convey meanings directly in the way that intonation seems to. There is, for example, no systematic universal meaning which can be ascribed to the difference between front vowels and back vowels or between stops and fricatives' (1-2).

Hirst and Di Cristo (1998) go on to explain, however, that 'despite this universal character, the specific features of a particular speaker's intonation system are also highly dependent on the language, the dialect, and even the style, the mood and the attitude of the speaker. Experimental research has shown (Ohala & Gilbert 1981, Maidment 1983) that speakers are capable of distinguishing languages in which utterances are spoken on the basis of their prosody alone....' (2).

However, the evidence from the studies by Lieberman and Michaels (1972[1962] and Crystal (1969) of the correlation between emotional labels and acoustical correlates of prosody for adult English native speakers, both of which found widely varying degrees of correlation, depending on the conditions of the experiment and which of the acoustic parameters was altered, constitutes a degree of counter-evidence to any claim of generalized, universal uses of prosody, at least with respect to emotional information, which is often assumed to be one of the candidate domains in which prosodic universals will be established.
Ladd (1996:113), noting the conflicting opinions as to the universality of intonation, is working on and is confident of finding a framework upon which scholars can agree, in order to make meaningful cross-linguistic comparisons. Hirst and Di Cristo (1998) ultimately conclude along the same lines, stating, namely, 'In order to establish a typology of prosodic parameters more firmly, it will, in our view, be necessary to undertake systematic co-operative research on an international basis. The most promising direction would perhaps be to attempt to establish a list of objective procedures making as few theoretical assumptions as possible with a view to establishing empirical evidence for the existence of language specific prosodic parameters' (42-43). In sketching out what they see as future directions of research to be undertaken, Hirst and Di Cristo (1998) advocate research into dialectal variation: 'The study of dialectal variation may provide a valuable source of information as to which parameters of an intonation system are deeply anchored in the system and which are more superficial and hence more susceptible to variation from one dialect to another' (43).

To the extent that an interlanguage can be considered a dialect (a 'learner dialect'), the results of the current study could be seen as a contribution to the research agenda called for by Hirst and Di Cristo (1998).

2.3.2. Intonational features of Korean and Hawai‘i Creole English

The primary focus of this study being the investigation of how interlanguage narratives displaying few if any of the classic markers of cohesion can be understood by a reasonably sympathetic listener/interactant, and my claim being that it is the speakers'
use of prosodic features to organize the discourse which allows the listener to 'make sense' of the stories, it would be reasonable to try to ascertain what prosodic features bear on the narrative event, both for the speakers and the listener.

Although the conversations in which the narratives occurred were clearly exolingual speech events, both narrators and listener had some degree of shared knowledge of each other's respective speech repertoire. As explained in greater detail elsewhere (Chapter One, note #1, and in Chapter Three), the speakers had all been living in Honolulu, Hawai'i for periods ranging from nine to twenty-six years (see personal profiles contained in Table 3.2. Korean narrators' personal data) and the listener (the researcher) was a native speaker of Standard American English who had been living in Honolulu for approximately four years at the time the recordings were made. The fact that the researcher had traveled to Korea on several occasions and was interested in Korean culture and was attempting to learn to speak Korean was well-known to the Korean hotel workers who provided the spoken corpus for this study.

Throughout the ESF project with adult immigrant language learners concern was expressed by the research team that the local dialectal varieties of German available as input to the foreign workers in the towns where they worked deviated quite substantially from the standard norm of the 'target language' syntactic structures against which the they were to be measured. Similarly, this analysis must also acknowledge the potential influence of the prosodic features of the local dialect(s) of Honolulu, as the narrators had all spent quite extended periods of time in the community, time during which they could reasonably be expected to have been exposed to these features. Although the narrators in
this study are not being ‘measured’ against any target language norms, it would be an
interesting aspect of this study of interlanguage prosody to see whether the prosody used
by these speakers seems to derive from phenomena in their native language, from
phenomena of the target language(s), from commonly found ‘universal intonational
properties’, or whether the prosodic contours seem to constitute a unique, even idiolectal,
variety of interlanguage. To attempt even a partial answer to this question, a detailed
analysis of the prosodic features of all the input languages would be required. Such an
analysis not being the goal of this study, I will restrict myself to a basic sketch of the
salient features of the contact languages in question, focusing mainly on those features
which appear in the corpus.

All of the narrators contributing to the corpus are native speakers of Korean who
were between the ages of 30 and 50 when they immigrated to Honolulu, Hawai‘i in the
1970s and 1980s (see Table 2. Korean narrators' personal data). Since their dates of
immigration, they have subsequently spent periods of time ranging from nine to twenty-
six years living in Honolulu. Other than one of the male narrators who had previously
worked in Iran and Saudi Arabia for several years as an expatriate laborer where he had
had occasion to use English as an international lingua franca, the narrators have never
lived in any English-speaking community outside of Hawai‘i. Given their Asian
background and the fact that the narrators would usually be taken for 'locals' based on
their physical appearance, it can be assumed that they would have frequently been spoken
to by actual locals in Pidgin. There are thus good reasons to assume that the narrators
have been exposed to the intonational features of the local Hawai‘i variety of English
(known as Hawai‘i Creole English among linguists, but referred to in local parlance as 'pidgin'). The question then naturally arises as to whether intonational patterns from Hawai‘i Creole English, in addition to their native language, are reflected in their use of English.

It is also the case, however, that over their long years of residency in Hawai‘i, in addition to Pidgin, the narrators have certainly had some exposure to Standard Hawai‘i English (see Carr 1972 and Vanderslice & Shun Pierson 1967, as well as the discussion of this label below in section 2.3.2.2, note #20 and note #21) and to Standard American English. This exposure, hypothetically speaking, would have been gained through the media, through contact with tourists from the Mainland U.S. at work, through contact with corporate managers at staff meetings, and through participation in various community-centered activities where all three varieties of English would be readily encountered among the general public. Examples of such interactions include general service encounters, conversations with their children's local friends, and attending such functions as dance recitals, parent-teacher conferences, adult education English classes and church activities (all of which have been attested either by the informants' self-reports or by the researcher's direct observation). The degree to which these narrators’ English proficiency allowed them to process the language in use around them must, of course, remain an open question. At least some degree of acquisition of local language norms can be inferred from the narrators’ use of salient HCE prosodic features.

The point of these brief language-specific descriptions, then, is to provide a basis for hypotheses regarding the source of the prosodic features found in the narratives.
studied here. Familiarity with the main intonational characteristics of the source language (Korean) and the target languages (which are taken to be Standard English, Standard Hawai‘i English and Hawai‘i Creole English) will therefore be needed. As descriptions of the intonational features of Standard American English (SAE) are presumably widely familiar to most readers, however, and because they are readily available in the literature in any case (see, inter alia, Bolinger 1998), no comprehensive account of them will be given here. Intonational features of SAE will only be mentioned in comparison and contrast with the features of the narrators' native language, i.e., Korean, and of the other English-based languages of the local community in which they live, e.g., Standard Hawai‘i English and Hawai‘i Creole English. Standard Hawai‘i English will also not be given a separate discussion, but will be referred to incidentally in comparison with standard English and HCE throughout, when relevant to the discussion.

What follows, then, is a sketch of some of the key elements of the morphosyntactic structure and prosodic features of Korean, followed by a description of the most important prosodic features of Hawai‘i Creole English (‘Pidgin’) which distinguish it from Standard American English.

2.3.2.1 Korean

While the primary focus in this section will be on phrase-level and discourse-level intonational features of the Korean language, for the benefit of the reader not familiar with Korean, a few of the most salient morphosyntactic features of Korean will be presented first (following Sohn 1994, 1999). The selection of these points was motivated by their potential transferability to the surface forms found in the English used by the
Korean narrators which will be the focus of the subsequent discussion. A second motivation for providing these rather elaborate examples is to provide some insight into the complex morphosyntactic features of Korean and to underscore the fact that the narrators quite competently manipulate these complexities in their native language, contrasting markedly with the reduced morphosyntactic complexity of their English utterances.

The Korean language is spoken by approximately 72,000,000 people worldwide, which, according to Sohn (1999:4), places it in eleventh rank in terms of the number of native speakers, out of an estimated total number of 3,000 extant languages. There are seven geographically based dialect areas, as well as a 'socio-political dialectal difference' between North Korea and South Korea, as a result of their political separation since 1945, according to Sohn (1999), author of two of the most authoritative sources on the Korean language available in English. However, 'despite such geographical and socio-political dialectal differences, Korean is relatively homogeneous, with excellent mutual intelligibility among speakers from different areas' (Sohn 1999:12).

With respect to its typology, according to Sohn (1999) 'Korean is a typical SOV-order language. Objects normally follow subjects, while a verb or adjective always comes at the end of a sentence or a clause. Pre-verbal constituents can be scrambled rather freely for stylistic and other reasons, however, as long as the predicate verb or adjective retains the final position'(7). Or, as he phrased it in Sohn (1999), '[d]ue to the well-developed case-marking system, word order among the major constituents in a sentence is relatively free as long as the predicate-final constraint is maintained’ (293).
As is typologically common in verb-final languages, Korean is a head-final language; thus ‘…particles are all postpositional, and modifiers such as determiners, adverbs, possessive constructions, adjectival (relative) clauses, all types of conjunctive clauses, and verbal complement clauses must precede the modified elements’ (Sohn 1994: 7; see also Sohn 1999:293). In this respect, Korean presents almost an exact mirror image of the usual English word order.

Examples (1-1), (1-2) and (2) illustrate these word order characteristics.18

(1) examples of head-final word order in noun phrases

(1-1) modifying phrase head noun ‘woman’ followed by plural suffix, delimiter particle and genitive particle, preceding head noun ‘golf’

yecca - tul man uy kolphu
woman-PL only Gen golf
‘the golf (played) by females only’

(1-2) relativized adjective clause preceding head noun ‘school’

nay ka tani - nu-n hak.kyo
I NM attend- IN-RL school
‘the school that I attend’

(2 example of head-final word order in verb-final sentences

hyeng i kukcang eyse nay chinkwu lul manna-ss-e.
brother NM theatre in my friend AC meet-PST-INT
‘My older brother met my friend at the theatre.’ (Sohn 1999:279)

The verb, with its numerous suffixes, is particularly prominent in Korean. Sohn (1994) describes the verbal morphology:

‘Korean sentences can be classified into four major types which are formally distinct: declarative…, interrogative…, imperative…, and propositive… The formal distinctions are made by sets of inflectional suffixes, called sentence-enders, which occur at the end of a verbal (verb or adjective). Sentence-enders are so called because, although they are attached to a verbal, they end a sentence, thereby determining its sentence
type. A sentence-ender, consisting of one or more suffixes, denotes not only one of the sentence types but also one of the six speech levels (or styles) and a mood (such as indicative, requestive or retrospective).

...[I]t is sometimes not easy to tell a form indicating a sentence type from a form indicating a speech level in a sentence-ender, in that they frequently form a so-called portmanteau morpheme. ... In intimate, blunt, and polite levels, sentence types may be distinguished by different intonation contours and speech contents, and the suffixes...may be viewed as indicating only relevant speech levels (Sohn 1994:8)

With respect to case marking, Sohn (1999) explains that ‘Korean has several types of transitive sentences, allowing adjuncts and modifiers to occur optionally. The most productive type consists of a subject and an object in the nominative and accusative cases, respectively (279). Example (2), above, illustrates this type of basic sentence pattern. An example of a Korean sentence with a variety of adjuncts and modifiers is given in (3), below:

(3) sentence with several adjuncts and modifiers

appa ka emma hako cakyen ilpon ey pay lo ka-sy-ess-e.yo
dad NM mom with last year Japan to ship by go-SH-PST-POL
‘My dad went to Japan with my mom by boat last year.’ (Sohn 1999:277)

One type of sentence which seems to be quite productive in the interlanguage of the narrators in my study is the one which Sohn labels ‘sensory sentences”, as in the following example:

(4) 'sensory' sentence

no nun musep-ni
you TC scary-Q
‘Are you scared?’ (Sohn 1999:285)

Another type of basic sentence in Korean is the so-called multiple-subject sentence. In that such sentences contain two nominative arguments, they behave suspiciously like ergative sentences. Sohn does not appear to subscribe to the ergative
analysis, opting for the descriptors mentioned, but O’Grady et al. (1997:148) include Korean, along with Turkish, Japanese, Tagalog, Basque, German and several others as languages as examples of languages which display ergative/absolutive case marking. While the classificatory status may remain a debatable point, a learner of Korean at even a basic level quickly gains the impression that this type of sentence is ubiquitous, an impression confirmed by Sohn (1999), who says that ‘Korean abounds in simple sentences where more than one ‘subject’ or ‘object’ appear. These sentences are frequently called multiple-subject (or multiple-nominate) and multiple-object (or multiple accusative) constructions. Multiple-subject constructions are much more prevalent’ (289).

Example (5) illustrates a multiple-subject sentence:

(5) multiple-subject sentence
Waikiki ka kyengchi ka coh-ta
Waikiki NM scenery NM good-DC.
‘Waikiki has nice scenery.’ (Sohn 1999:290)

possible alternative translations:
‘Waikiki’s scenery is good.’
‘The scenery in Waikiki is good.’

In addition to subject particles, which are labeled nominative markers (NM) by Sohn (1999), Korean also has topic contrast particles (labeled TC in Sohn 1999, but sometimes also referred to as topic markers (TM):

(6) topic contrast particle
(6-1) na nun sensaeng nim i coa-yo
I TC teacher- RH SM good-POL
‘I like the teacher.’ [as opposed to someone who doesn't like the teacher]

possible alternative translations:
‘I think the teacher is good.’
‘I think s/he is a good teacher.’
(6-2) kimci nun moko-yo
kimchi TC eat-POL
'I eat kimchi.' [as opposed to the expectation that I don't eat kimchi]

(6-3) suyoil un nola-yo
Wed. TC play-POL
'I don't work on Wednesdays.' [contrary to what is considered the normal work week]

possible alternative translations:
'I'm off on Wednesdays'
'I get Wednesdays off.'

Note that (6-1) is also a multiple-subject type sentence.

It should also be noted that Korean is an agglutinative language, which means that 'a long chain of particles or suffixes with constant form and meaning may be attached to nominals (nouns, pronouns, numerals, noun phrases, etc.) or predicate (verb or adjective) stems' (Sohn 1999:15). Sohn (1999) notes that 'numerous Korean suffixes and particles do not have counterparts in many non-agglutinative languages such as English and Chinese. On the other hand, there are many particles and suffixes in Korean that do correspond to independent words in other languages' (15). Sohn (1994) provides the following description of the agglutinative process in Korean:

[The particles and suffixes] agglutinate with each other in a fixed order and are attached to nominal or verbal stems to perform various syntactic and semantic functions. For example, such syntactic functions as case relation, subordination and coordination, relativization, verbal complementation, passivization, causativization, as well as honorification, tense and aspect, modal and mood, and sentence type are indicated by particles or suffixes. Verbal stems also agglutinate with each other to form long series of compound verbals (7).

Sohn (1994) explains further:

...The agglutinative nature of Korean is most distinctly reflected in the morphological structure of verbals...especially in their inflectional
behavior. There are a number of inflectional slots following a verbal root, which are filled obligatorily or optionally by suffixes that represent various categories. The inflectional category slots are (1) voice, (2) subject honorific, (3) tense and aspect, (4) modal, (5) addressee honorific, (6) mood, and (7) clause type, which occur in the order given. Except for (7), which is the only obligatory slot, all other slots are optional in that the slots are filled in only when semantic needs arise (299).

Observe the following examples from Sohn (1994:300):

(7) agglutinative morphology
ku pwun i cap -hi -si -ess -ess -keyss -sup -ti -kka?
the person NM catch -(1) -(2) -(3) -(4) -(5) -(6) -(7)
‘Did you feel that he had been caught?’

possible alternative translation [proposed by author, in consultation with native speakers of Korean]:
'[to honorific addressee] Do you think that person (hon.) might possibly have been caught?’

In discussing this example, Sohn (1994) says that ‘[t]his is a case of a finite predicate where all the seven slots happen to be filled in by appropriate suffixes, that is, passive -hi, subject honorific -si, past past or past perfect -ess-ess, conjectural modal -keyss, addressee honorific -sup, retrospective mood -ti, and interrogative sentence type -kka (299).

For illustrative purposes, one additional example of a six-slot expanded agglutination is provided:

(8) agglutinative morphology following verb stem
ka - si - ess - keyss - sup - ni - ta
go-SH - PST - presumptive AH- IN- DC
'(a respectable person) may have gone’

In (8), the head verb stem ka ‘go’ is followed by the subject honorific suffix -si, the past tense suffix -ess, the presumptive modal suffix -keyss, the addressee honorific suffix -sup, the indicative mood suffix -ni, and the declarative suffix -ta (Sohn 1999:15).
Korean also has a complex system of honorifics, which includes both addressee and referent honorifics, some examples of which are included above in (7) and (8), as well as speech levels determined by the social and situational factors obtaining in the discourse situation. The details of the honorific system will not be elaborated upon here, as it is presumed to have little if any transferability to the English-based interlanguage of long-term Korean immigrants. However, I do have some anecdotal evidence, based on several years of interactions with these narrators of a strong tendency to transfer features of the Korean address system, as when the informants would use the title of 'teacher', either vocatively or when speaking of me, rather than using my name. Whether they generally have recourse to the Korean convention of using the addressee's title instead of the second person address form 'you' when speaking in English has not been investigated, however.

What is potentially much more directly transferable to the interlanguage of the narrators, however, is the fact that Korean is known as a 'situation- or discourse-oriented language' (Sohn 1999:291), meaning that 'contextually or situationally understood elements (including subject and object) are left unexpressed more frequently than not' (Sohn 1999:15). According to Sohn (1999), '[o]mission of situationally or contextually understood elements is a widespread phenomenon in Korean... This is particularly true with noun phrases in various grammatical cases, the most frequent ones being the subject referring to the speaker in declarative sentence and to the hearer in interrogative sentences' (291; also Sohn 1994:7-8). Relevant to considerations of transferability in the interlanguage, Sohn (1999) specifically mentions that '[a]side from such subjectless
sentences where the subject is omitted but imaginable, real subjectless sentences are rare in Korean’ (292).

Furthermore, Korean is a "macro-to-micro" language, in that the universe is represented in the order of a set (macro) and then its members (micro)' (Sohn 1999:16). Examples of this are the order of names (family name first, followed by the given name and any titles, if relevant, e.g. Sohn Ho-Min pak-sa [Dr. Sohn Ho-min]) and dates (year, month, day). Sohn (1999:16) also points out that the ‘macro-to-micro’ order also affects the multiple subject constructions, which are ubiquitous, as in example (9)

(9) macro-to-micro order in multiple subject constructions
    nay ka kho ka khu-ta
    I NM nose NM big-DC
    ‘I have a big nose.’

There is considerable evidence in our data of interlingual transfer of many of the above-mentioned syntactic properties from Korean in the narratives of the speakers included in this study, particularly with reference to the verb-final structure and preponderance of head-final structures. As this study does not focus on syntactic structures, however, further details regarding Korean morphosyntax will not be provided. Readers interested in more detail should consult Sohn (1994, 1999).

One final and salient aspect of Korean discourse which could conceivably have a direct bearing on structures found in the interlanguage narratives will be touched upon here, and that is the use of direct speech and quoted speech. According to Sohn (1994), in Korean there are

[only] two ways…to report what someone has stated, asked, commanded, suggested, or promised: direct quotation, which reports the exact words spoken or written, and indirect quotation, which reports only essential
points. Thus, there is no difference between a direct speech form and its directly quoted counterpart. Direct quotation is used in Korean much less frequently than in English, and hardly used in colloquial speech, whereas indirect quotation is very prevalent' (10). The indirect quotation forms, as in English, require transformations of 'various deictic elements such as demonstratives, grammatical persons, and time and place adverbials (Sohn 1994:12; 10-15 for quotative forms).

Examples (10-1, 10-2, 10-3, 10-4), below, illustrate these principles:

(10) quotative sentences (Sohn 1994: 11-12)

(10-1) direct speech

nol-le ka-p-si-ta
play-to go-AH-RQ-PR
‘Let’s go to play.’ [sic]
(alternative translation proposed by author: ‘Let’s go play.’)

(10-2) embedded directly quoted speech

na nun “nol-le ka-p-si-ta”-hako/lako malhay-ss-ta
I play-to go-AH-RQ-PR-QT say -PST-DC
‘I said, Let’s go to play.” [sic]
(alternative translation proposed by author: ‘Let’s go play.’)

‘I said, “Let’s go play”.’

(10-3) direct speech

cy apeci ka onul i kos-ey o-si-ess-eyo?
my father NM today this place-to come-SH-PST-POL
‘Has my father come here today?’

(10-4) indirect quotation

minca nun caki apeci-ka ku nal ku kos-ey
Minja TC self father-NM that day that place-to
o-si-ess-n-unya-ko mwul-ess-ta.
come-SH-PST-IN-Q-QT ask-PST-DC
‘Minca asked whether her father came [sic] to that place that day.’

alternative translation [proposed by author]:
‘Minca asked whether her father had come there (that day).’
The prevalence of the colloquial pattern of indirect discourse in Korean contrasts markedly with the English production of the Korean speakers in my data. In their texts, the Korean narrators make frequent use of directly quoted speech, using very simple structures prosodically set off from the main story line. On the other hand, there is not a single token of embedded indirect discourse in the corpus. For second language speakers who use mainly basic nouns and verbs, a small inventory of adjectives and adverbs, and who display virtually no verbal morphology, the transformations required in an indirect discourse structure are far beyond their competency. A typical example from this study’s corpus of a narrator using role shift into the character and ‘impersonating’ direct speech by means of prosody is provided in the following excerpt from Young-Eun’s retelling of a scene from the Charlie Chaplin silent film *Modern Times*, where line (11-1) represents Charlie Chaplin in his persona as The Tramp making small talk with the girl, and lines (11-2 and (11-3) are the girl’s response:

(11)  

(11-1) where do you live?  
(11-2) um,  
(11-3) I no more house.  

(Young-Eun [Waif]11,13-14; [YELsegs: ccwhrliv, ccNMhse])

The narrator Young-Eun here deftly conveys both the alternation of dialogue lines between the two characters as well as the flirtatious aspect of their interaction solely through pitch changes, rather than through explicit verbal elaboration.

Example (12) is excerpted from the ‘memorable event’ series of narratives in which Sang-Ho, one of the male narrators, recounted his arrival at Honolulu airport. Just prior to this, Sang-Ho has been describing his impressions of the airport. Then he begins
to describe the immigration procedure and in this segment he explains the surprise shown by the ‘airport check man’ at the size of Sang-Ho’s family. (Sang-Ho was traveling with several extended family members, including his wife, their three children, his wife’s sister and her three children, all of whom carried the same surname of Park.) In this excerpt, Sang-Ho humorously conveys the immigration inspector’s (‘airport check man’) incredulity at seeing a man arrive with what appear to be two wives and six children.

Sang-Ho is laughing and chuckling at the memory of being interrogated by the immigration office throughout the segment and his own running commentary, spoken in his natural low-pitched voice in lines 1-3, and 5-7, is clearly distinguishable from the sudden extreme pitch rise in line 4, a prosodic cue which signals that he is role-playing, i.e., impersonating the inspector and simultaneously conveying the inspector’s affective stance of incredulity:

(12)
(12-1) All ‘Park’!
(12-2) wife is6 two,
(12-3) children is6 six!
⇒ (12-4) are you all family?
(12-5) no no no separate yeah!
...
(12-6) all of this is mine yeahQ
...
(12-7) good thinking yeahQ

(Sang-Ho [All Park]74-79, 83; [Pkair: allfamQ])

Numerous such examples of direct quote impersonation of others or themselves can be found in the corpus of narratives. Further discussion of the use of this narrative device will be reserved for Chapter Four.
While the use of direct quote for narrative effect obviously cannot be excluded as an option for native or proficient speakers, my sense is that a more proficient speaker of English would be more likely to have used indirect discourse, or at least an attributive device to introduce the immigration official as the source of the quoted speech (e.g., ‘and then he goes…’, or, ‘and then the officer asked me…’, etc.). In any case, the frequent use of such direct quotation strategies has been reported in other studies of low proficiency naturalistic learners of English and other languages (see inter alia Kumpf 1986; Perdue 1993b; W. Klein 1981a, as well as in other publications emanating from the ESF adult immigrant research project with naturalistic acquirers from seven source languages and five target languages). A pattern is therefore emerging from a number of studies which shows that direct quotation, marked prosodically as an ‘impersonation’ of the attributed speaker and separate from the running narrative, is a common strategy employed by naturalistic L2 acquirers with rudimentary morphosyntactic resources, i.e., by speakers of a ‘basic variety’, as proposed by Klein and Perdue (1997). This is a particularly plausible generalization to offer when attestations of impersonated direct discourse are found in the interlanguage of Koreans, since attempts to transfer L1 indirect speech syntactic structures might be expected, given the prevalence of the indirect discourse structure in colloquial Korean, particularly in narrative tasks such as those arranged for this study, where the need for reported speech regarding past events frequently arises.

Turning now to prosodic features of Korean, I again rely on Sohn (1994, 1999) for a succinct characterization of salient features. One aspect of Korean which surfaces in
the interlanguage prosody of the narrators considered here is what Sohn (1994) refers to as emphatic and connotative lengthening of both vowels and consonants:

...[E]mphatic or connotative vowel length is usually longer and varies depending on the speaker's emotional intensity. Emphatic vowel length adds emphatic sense to the lexical items in question, being attached to the first syllable of a word, even to an already long vowel, as shown in /ma:.ni/ 'a great deal' (cf. /ma:.ni/'much'), /no:.phin/ 'very high' (cf. no.phin/ 'high'), and /ki:.l.ta 'very long' (cf. /ki:l.ta/'long').

Connotative vowel length adds to... an utterance a variety of connotational meanings that represent the speaker's subtle feelings, attitudes, and presuppositions Connotative length, usually occurring together with certain intonational contours... occurs on the vowel of the last syllable of an intonational phrase or sentence (453).

Sohn provides the following examples as an illustration of this connotative vowel lengthening process:

(13)
(13-1) /pi.ka o.ket.t'a:/
      rain-NM come-presume-DC
'I don't think it will rain.'

Example (13-1), where /t'a:/ indicates 'the speaker's connotative sense that he believes the opposite of what is said' (Sohn 1994:453), can be compared to the unlengthened version, (13-2):

(13-2) /pi.ka o.ket.t'a/
'I think it will rain.'

Finally, in (13-3), according to Sohn (1994), /ni::n/ may connote the speaker's presupposition that the content of his utterance will stand diametrically opposed to what the addressee has said' (453).

(13-3) /mi.no.ni::n kong.pu.lil a.cu cal he::/
      Minho-TC study-AC very well do
'Minho is very good at his studies.'
Further, with respect to consonants, according to Sohn (1994), '[t]here is no distinctive length in consonants and semivowels, which are all non-syllabics. Only phonetically does a tensed or aspirated consonant tend to be slightly longer than the corresponding lax consonant...' (454). However, very salient to non-Koreans, even to those who do not speak the language, is the tendency of Korean speakers to use consonant lengthening for emphasis. This process is described by Sohn (1994) as follows:

Parallel to vowel lengthening, there is emphatic or connotative consonant lengthening. Any consonant occurring before another consonant in a word may be lengthened for an emphasis of the word, as in /yak::s'ok/ 'promise'...and /is::s'ok/ 'profit' (454).

Another prosodic feature, stress, according to Sohn (1994, 1999) 'plays no substantial role in Korean lexicon, in that...it does not contribute to meaning differentiation in words' (1994:455). He notes, however, that 'a speaker may put stress on any syllable or word which he thinks is relatively important or needs to be emphasized for exclusiveness, contrast, or some other purposes' (Sohn 1994:455).

With respect to the use of pitch in Korean, the picture is somewhat more complicated. According to Sohn (1994),

There are distinctive pitch levels that constitute intonation contours...On the other hand, distinctive pitches or pitch accents (or tonemes) that differentiate lexical meanings do not exist in contemporary Korean, except in the Kyongsang dialect and part of the Hamgyong dialect....The Southern Kyongsang dialect is a pitch-accent or tone language...All the morphemes and words in this dialect have inherent tones, and pitch is used to distinguish lexical items from one another' (455-456).
None of the narrators included in this study originates from Kyongsang province, however, so the details of the Kyongsang intonational patterns will not be dealt with here. Of interest, however, is that reflexes of earlier lexical tone can be found in the Seoul (standard) dialect and several other dialect regions in the form of vowel lengthening where formerly there was rising tone (Sohn 1999:60).

According to Sohn (1994; see also Sohn 1999:197ff), Korean has four significant pitch levels (with 1 being the lowest and 4 the highest), and intonational meaning is effected through a 'recurring pitch pattern' (461). Sohn characterizes Korean as having three basic and frequently used intonation contours, which he describes in the following terms (where #...# encloses an intonational phrase, 2-2 stands for one or more 2 levels and . stands for a syllable boundary) (1994:461; 1999:198-199):

- #2—2.3# (non-final intonational phrases)
- #2—2.31# (utterance-final phrases, expressing sentence type and also the speaker’s modality toward the utterance or addressee)
- #2—2.4# (utterance final, used for yes-no questions; also rhetorical and echo questions.)

According to Sohn (1994), 'these three basic intonation patterns are subject to various modifications, depending not only on the speaker’s insertion or deletion of non-terminal pauses but on his instillation of emphatic, contrastive, emotional, connotational, conjectural, or presuppositional meaning' (461; also Sohn 1999:200). Further, according to Sohn (1994), 'normally, there is at least one pitch level change in an intonational phrase and that change occurs in the nucleus (i.e., the phrase-final syllable). The pitch level may change more than once, especially in final intonational phrases' (463).
Sohn (1994) identifies and describes two uses of pitch in Korean which will be quite evident in the interlanguage data considered subsequently. First, he discusses emphatic intonation, in which pitch levels 'may be slightly altered, with concomitant changes in the shade of meaning. In general, a pitch level goes up or down, usually with a non-phonemic stress accompanied, when emphasis is intended for a particular word or morpheme' (464). Second, he considers contrastive stress on a particular syllable, as a result of which 'the pitch of that syllable is usually raised by one level' (465).

Another well-known scholar of Korean phonetics and phonology, H.B. Lee, adds the following comments to the picture regarding the use of intonation in general and specifically in the Seoul dialect of Korean:

Various overall functions have been ascribed to intonation in non-tone languages...[I]t may act as a syntactic or grammatical marker. Intonation may also have an accentual function: it can be by means of the intonation system that a speaker is able to highlight and hence make more important some part of his utterance rather than other parts. Thirdly, intonation may function to enable a speaker to express his attitude toward his listener, toward what he is saying, or toward the general context in which he is talking. Korean, as spoken in Seoul, is a non-tone language and the main function of intonation in that particular dialect is...to give expression to speaker's attitude (1987:53).

Lee then identifies and explains 17 different tunes and subsets of tunes used in the Seoul dialect and states that 'the unifying feature of all the differing tones which form part of the same tune is the common attitude to which they give expression' (1987:53; see also H.B. Lee 1964).

Among their major findings potentially relevant to this study of Korean immigrant English-based interlanguage prosody are several important similarities, as well as differences, with respect to the prosodic structure of Korean and English. Schafer and Jun (2001), for example, state that Korean accentual phrases are similar to intermediate phrases in English in that they are the level of prosodic structure which is intermediate between phonological words and intonation phrases. However, Korean accentual phrases are arguably less phonetically salient than English intermediate phrases. They also tend to differ in span. Korean accentual phrases generally contain fewer syllables and fewer content words than English intermediate phrases.

In both languages, prosodic phrases can group together material which is closely related syntactically or semantically. This 'chunking' aspect of prosodic phrasing has been captured explicitly in some models of sentence processing to explain prosodic disambiguation effects (2).

Jun (1996) found that in both languages, the rules which trigger both accentual phrasing and intonational phrasing, and the mechanisms for the realization of these phrasings are compatible, e.g., in both languages, accentual phrases and intonational phrase boundaries are indicated by pitch movement, and in the case of intonational phrases by lengthening and the common cross-linguistic device of pausing. Speaking of Korean, Jun (1996) says:

As with the Accentual Phrasing, the Intonational Phrasing is also influenced by the syntactic structure, but it is not fixed by the syntactic structure and instead varies depending on non-syntactic and non-linguistic factors such as focus, given vs. new information speech rate, and weight of the phrase.

An Intonational Phrase boundary is more likely to occur at edges of a maximal category higher in the syntactic hierarchy. An Intonational Phrase boundary is very likely to come between a sentential adverb and the modified sentence, between a topic item and the rest of the sentence, between subordinate and main clauses, and so on. At the same time, the
Intonational Phrase boundary is less likely to occur between constituents that are within the same maximal category low in the syntactic hierarchy—e.g., between constituents within NP or VP close to the bottom of the hierarchy. These tendencies for placing Intonational Phrase boundaries are similar to those in English: the syntactic domain corresponding to an Intonational Phrase in English includes parenthetical expressions, nonrestrictive relative clauses, tag questions, vocatives, expletives, and certain moved elements (see Selkirk 1978, 1984, Pierrehumbert 1980, and Nespor & Vogel 1986, among others) (101-102).

The interesting point about the findings of Jun (1996) is that in her analysis of Korean (using speakers from both Seoul and Cholla dialects, which correspond to the dialects of five of the six speakers in this study), nothing precludes their use of English or English-like prosodic patterns (see Jun 1996: 101-102; 172-173). Furthermore, and most significant for the claim here that prosody is used as a linguistic device when lexico-syntactic resources are lacking in the interlanguage, Jun (1996) is of the opinion that for both Korean and English, 'semantic pragmatics overrides the syntax' (196). It is also noteworthy for the subsequent discussion of interlanguage prosody in immigrant Koreans' narratives that Jun (1996) finds that syntactic structure does not determine prosodic contour: 'Since a phonological rule may apply in a given position when the sentence is uttered with one intonational phrasing but not when it is uttered with another, the resulting constituent, the Intonational Phrase, is not isomorphic to any syntactic constituent' (102).

Differences between English and Korean prosodic structure include the fact that 'pitch accent', which is used to mark prominent syllables in English, is used in Korean to 'delimit a prosodic group of words' (Jun 1996: 30). Schafer and Jun (2001) also note that '...the structure of the prosodic system and its relationship to syntactic and semantic
structure differs for Korean and English in several important respects' (3) and they point in particular to the fact that English and Korean differ in their respective means of encoding information structure:

English has a large number of pitch accents, and marks information structure primarily through the type and placement of these pitch accents. Korean has no pitch accents, and marks information structure primarily by manipulating accentual phrasing. Thus, English is prominence-driven, while Korean is boundary-driven...Korean might therefore show different prosodic phrasing effects from English because of such differences between the two languages in the grammatical constraints on prosodic form (3).

Schafer and Jun (2001), after conducting experiments on native Korean speakers' processing of Korean noun phrases containing ambiguously situated adjectives, conclude that 'the subtle acoustic information which demarcates accentual phrase boundaries in Korean was salient enough to be exploited by listeners during sentence comprehension' (22) and that 'the Korean results are similar to results for English that show effects of acoustically subtle intermediate phrase boundaries on comprehension. The Korean results are also similar to English results in showing that the processor is sensitive not just to prosodic information that occurs at a syntactic choice point, but to the larger contour. The one significant difference that emerged ... was between conditions that were identical at the point that a choice had to be made between attachment sites...[T]he overall naming times failed to show contrasts predicted by each of the hypotheses we considered, and was very different from what might be expected on the basis of English results' (22-23).

Schafer and Jun explain this difference partly by word order constraints of Korean and partly by differences in the prosodic structure itself. Ultimately, however, and significantly for this study, they conclude that 'prosodic phrasing likely has, at an abstract
level, very similar effects on sentence comprehension across languages, but that the specific effects of prosody on the interpretation of particular structures must be interpreted with respect to the grammatical patterns of the language' (25). Schafer and Jun (2001) further note that their finding 'challenges psycholinguistic models of prosody which have effectively treated prosodic boundaries as cues from outside of the grammatical system (e.g. Marcus & Hindle 1990)' (25). Finally, in anticipation of the discussion to be taken up in section 2.4, below, Schafer and Jun (2001) note that the grammatical constraints on prosody, and particularly those governing the relationships between prosodic structure and syntactic, semantic, and discourse structure, are far from being fully understood. It is our hope that continued cross-linguistic psycholinguistic research on prosody will be particularly helpful in specifying more precisely how and when the processor makes use of critical prosodic, syntactic, and semantic information (26).

Having thus briefly reviewed prosodic resources such as the use of vowel and consonant lengthening, stress and pitch contours, all of which are asserted by Korean linguists to be freely used by Korean speakers for the expression of affective and connotative purposes, as well as for syntactic disambiguation and the organization of information in a discourse context, the stage is set to see how these resources will be put to use by Korean speakers in an English-based naturalistically-acquired interlanguage. For further descriptive and theoretical accounts of Korean prosody and intonation, see Cho (1967), H.B. Lee (1987), Hansol H.B. Lee (1989), H.B. Lee (1964), Park (1991), Jun & Oh (1996), and Choo & O'Grady (to appear).

Before considering the prosodic features of the Korean immigrants' interlanguage, however, I turn first to a consideration of prosodic and other features of one of the major
input languages for immigrants in Hawai‘i, namely Hawai‘i Creole English. This review of Hawai‘i Creole English is justified by the fact that the Korean narrators in this study have been exposed to Hawai‘i varieties of English for periods ranging from nine to twenty-five years. This long-term exposure, at the very least, suggests that they may have acquired intonational contours of the local varieties of English which will surface in their narratives, a resource which they will exploit in the co-construction of meaning with a reasonably sympathetic listener whom they know to be likewise familiar with the prosodic features of Hawai‘i varieties of English.

2.3.2.2. Hawai‘i Creole English

*I stay, or I no stay—'ass da question, yeah? (Simonson et al.1981: 'stay')
'To be, or not to be, that is the question.'

The sounds of Pidgin are to be heard everywhere in Honolulu (see Wong 1999; Menacker 1998:7; Vanderslice & Shun Pierson 1967; Carr 1972: 44ff; Reinecke 1969 [1935]; see also Roberts 1997, 1998 and Siegel 2000:202-203 for an overview of the development of HCE from a plantation pidgin to an English lexifier creole).21 (As mentioned earlier, in note # 16, both the term 'Hawai‘i Creole English' (HCE) and the term 'Pidgin', written with an uppercase 'P', are used in this study to refer to one of the local varieties of English in Honolulu. Whether the term 'HCE' or 'Pidgin' is used is a question of perspective. The term 'Pidgin' will be used as a descriptor when the context requires speaking of the variety as it is usually thought of and spoken about by 'locals' in Hawai‘i, and the term 'Hawai‘i Creole English', or HCE, will be used when referring to the scholarly object of linguistic study. The term 'pidgin', written with a lowercase 'p',
will be used to refer to the rudimentary contact language used between interactants who
do not share competency in a common language.

Despite its prevalence in the local community, there is, however, an unfortunate
paucity of published materials on the prosodic features of Hawai‘i Creole English, a fact
noted by Vanderslice and Pierson (1967), who asserted that '[t]he most neglected aspect
of Pidgin has been its suprasegmental or prosodic features' (156). The primary scholarly
sources containing references to HCE's prosodic features are Vanderslice and Shun
Pierson (1967), Carr (1972), Bickerton and Odo (1976), and Odo (1975, 1977). A recent
paper by Kozasa (2000), in which she conducts an instrumental acoustic analysis of
several salient prosodic features of HCE, can now be added to that short list. Kozasa also
notes the paucity of studies on the prosody of HCE: 'Despite the fact that HCE is
distinguished from AME [American Mainstream English] by its unique phonological
features, in particular, its intonation patterns, little study on HCE phonology has been
done' (285). Despite the oft-noted salience of the prosodic patterns of HCE, even to the
untrained ear of the average tourist or visitor, this relative lack of investigation into the
prosodic patterns of HCE might be expected, as it mirrors the relative scholarly neglect of
the many grammaticalized and linguistic functions of prosody in the field of linguistics in
general.

After a brief mention of some of the syntactic and lexical features of HCE, I will
focus on those prosodic features which appear to be most relevant to an analysis of this
study's corpus. The treatment of HCE syntax and lexicon provided here is not intended to
be exhaustive, but, rather, its purpose is to point out some of its more salient features

Carr (1972), in her characterization of the syntax of HCE, noted that ‘[t]he locally developed auxiliaries used by some speakers are as much a mark of this type of speech as is the constantly repeated expression da kine. These 'local' auxiliaries are: *stay*
[phonetically [ste], author's note] to indicate the present progressive, *been* or *wen* to indicate past or present perfect, and *go* to indicate the future tense or intention’ (45). Carr provides several examples of the use of these auxiliaries in HCE: (‘I stay study—no mess wid me’; ‘Las’night I been study ha:d’; ‘Tomorrow I go study da library all morning’) (45) and states that they are known to be among the most salient to non-locals.

Siegel (2000), drawing on Bickerton (1981, 1984), reviews the features of the contemporary tense-modal-aspect system of basilectal HCE and mentions the same three auxiliary morphemes (using the Bickerton transcription system), i.e., ([+anterior] *bin/wen*, [+nonpunctual] *stei* (stay), and [+irrealis] *go* (or *gon*) found in the HCE tense-modal-aspect system (Siegel 2000:217, citing Bickerton 1977a:154). Thus, according to Bickerton (1981:58),

[the tense particle expresses [+Anterior] (very roughly, past before past for action verbs and past for stative verbs); the modality particle expresses [+Irrealis] (which includes futures and conditionals); while the aspect particle expresses [+Nonpunctual] (progressive-durative plus habitual-iterative)... (cited in Siegel 2000:217)
Siegel (2000:218) provides several illustrative examples of the use of the three forms (all examples are cited in Bickerton 1977a:154, who attributes them to the respective sources named in each case; emphases in Siegel 2000), reproduced here as (14-1 through 14-8):

(14) Attestations of HCE tense-modal-aspect morphemes: bin/wen, stei/ste, go

[+anterior]
(14-1) You say you *bin* sell 'im.
       'You say you sold it.' (Reinecke 1969:215)

(14-2) Dass 'cause dey *wen*' paint his skin.
       ['That's because they painted his skin'] (Morales 1988:72)

[+irrealis]
(14-3) *I no* go marry you then.
       'I won't marry you then.' (Reinecke 1969:214)

(14-4) A *gon* get wan difren wan. 23
       'I'm going to get a different one.' (Bickerton 1977a:181)

[+nonpunctual]
(14-5) What you *stay* eat?
       'What are you eating?' (Carr 1972: 150)

(14-6) Wail we stei paedl, Jaen stei put wata insai da kanu.
       'While we were paddling, John was letting water into the canoe.'
       (Bickerton 1981:28)

(14-7) Yu no waet dei stei kawl mi, dakain - *kal mi gad*.
       'You know what they call me, that bunch? They call me God.'
       (Bickerton 1981:29)

Siegel (2000) also notes that 'the nonpunctual marker stei also occurs frequently along with -ing marking on the verb' (218):

(14-8) …my grandpa *stay* listening to his Japanese radio station
Strikingly, not a single token of these three salient HCE auxiliary constructions has been found in the analyzed portions of the corpus of five out of the six Korean immigrants' narratives. Observations by Siegel (2000) and Roberts (1997, 1998) tend to corroborate this pattern, as Siegel (2000) notes: 'Of the eleven key HCE grammatical features that Roberts examined in historical texts, seven occurred in the speech of the locally born, but not the foreign-born' (203). One speaker, Young-Eun, (the one who was characterized as an isolate, above, section 2.1) is notable for her more frequent use of HCE lexicon and occasional use of HCE syntax. While biographical information provided by Young-Eun indicates that she has considerably more opportunities for interaction with locals than the other Korean narrators, owing to the fact that she has a number of extended family members who were born and raised in Hawai‘i, additional investigation into the varieties of English used by her local interlocutors and into her routines of English contact would need to be undertaken to establish a precise explanation for Young-Eun's more frequent use of Pidgin.

The general lack of HCE syntax in the narratives of these immigrants might appear puzzling, given their long years of Hawai‘i residency. My claim is that the Korean narrators, with the exception of Young-Eun, as noted above, in fact do not have many sustained relationships with English-speakers, 'locals' or otherwise, and are therefore not very strongly influenced by Pidgin. The quite limited number of HCE features in their narratives, whether lexical, syntactic or prosodic, is one piece of supporting evidence for this claim. These speakers evolve in a primarily Korean-speaking milieu and have very little exposure to English of any type, whether of the standard mainland, Hawai‘i
standard, or Pidgin variety. (See further details in Chapter Three regarding the language practices of the narrators.) I believe that the language recorded in these narratives is best characterized as an elaborated pidgin (see Le Page 1977; Todd 1974; Mühlhäusler 1986; Romaine 1988; Thomason & Kaufman 1988; Nagara 1972), a fossilized interlanguage, rather than Hawai‘i Creole English. (For information and examples regarding the elaborated syntactic, prosodic and metaphoric features of HCE as it is used by its native speakers in discoursal practice, see Tonouchi 2002; Wong 1999b; Plumlee 1999; Kozasa 2000; Stanwood 1999 and Stanwood 2002.)

The contemporary lexicon of HCE, while containing many tokens from the numerous substrate languages of the immigrant groups in Hawai‘i, has largely been relexified with English words. (See Simonson et al. 1981, 1992, written in a light-hearted vein, but which contains many examples of contemporary Pidgin vocabulary in 'dictionary' format. See also Sakoda & Siegel 2003.) In addition to the non-English lexical items reflecting the story of waves of migration and settlement in the island chain known as Hawai‘i, from the Hawaiians in the distant past to the Filipinos and Samoans of the 20th century, it is the English words which have undergone semantic shifts, as compared with Standard American English, which constitute some of the most interesting features of the HCE lexicon. Among the lexical items used according to their contemporary meanings in HCE found in the analyzed corpus were the following: question tag 'no?', ‘neva’ (e.g., 'never' with the meaning of ‘not’), ‘no mo(a)’ (e.g., 'no more' semantically expanded to express the negative existential or negative possessive, with a meaning similar to ‘no’, ‘not’, or 'don't have’), ‘mo’ bettah’, ‘cannot’, ‘plenny’,
‘bum-by’ (later), ‘give-um’ (e.g., the broadening of the third person singular masculine object form ‘um’, which is a variant of ‘im [him] or ‘em [them], to a generalized third person object pronoun for both masculine and feminine singular as well as the third person plural object [him, them]), the use of ‘tell’ (with the meaning of ‘say’ or ‘talk’, a usage which, incidentally, also occurs frequently in the speech of instructed learners of English as a second language of many language backgrounds) and, of course, the ubiquitous, previously mentioned ‘yeah?’ sentence tag.

Although the tokens are relatively few, I conjecture that what lexical congruence with HCE lexicon can be found in the corpus, confirming the immigrants’ acquisition of these HCE forms, is traceable to the frequency of these forms in local interaction in simplified foreigner talk register, the register which the Koreans would have heard during most conversations with English speakers. (The term ‘English speakers’ here refers to speakers of any of the local varieties of English, e.g., Pidgin, Standard American English, and Hawai’i Standard English, as well as other non-Korean immigrants of low English proficiency who also use an English/HCE lexifier pidgin. The most regular non-Korean immigrant interlocutors of the Koreans in this study would be the Chinese and Filipino hotel housekeepers with whom they work.)

It is also interesting to note that several quite salient HCE lexical items, often singled out by both locals and visitors as being typical markers of Pidgin, (e.g., ‘da kine’ ‘try look’, ‘try come’, ‘try fo’ do’, ‘get’ (meaning ‘have’)) are not attested in the corpus. There is also an almost total absence from the corpus of Hawaiian words used in all local varieties of English that have become a part of the local lexicon even for people who do...
not necessarily speak the Hawaiian language. (Hawaiian words frequently heard in public by the visitor industry in Waikiki for display purposes, as opposed to Hawaiian words in actual usage by locals, are not included in this reference to ‘local lexicon’.) These non-occurrences in the corpus could of course be explained by gaps in the types of data collected and the circumstances under which the data was collected (at the worksite, in conversation with a non-local speaker of Standard English who they related to as the English teacher for the housekeeping department). However, the sample of six speakers, each having quite different communicative styles, and having established a relationship with the researcher dating back approximately two years at the time of the recordings, should have attenuated the factors of distance and formality to some degree. Furthermore, it is the researcher’s distinct impression that this corpus constitutes a fairly representative sample of these speakers’ lexical and syntactic repertoire. (See Chapter Three for further discussion regarding representativeness of the data.) The lack of HCE or Hawaiian lexicon in the utterances of the speakers in this corpus seems to be a function, not so much of the data collection circumstances, but of the relatively limited access these narrators have had to the linguistic components of local culture.

Having briefly looked at syntactic and lexical aspects of HCE, I now consider some aspects of the prosody of HCE. In their overview, Vanderslice and Shun Pierson (1967) note that ‘Hawaiian Pidgin [their label for what is referred to as HCE or Pidgin in this study] differs conspicuously from GAE [General American English] not only in features of voice dynamics but also in segmental sounds, grammar, and vocabulary’ (156-157). Vanderslice and Shun Pierson (1967:166) drew up a taxonomy of ‘the most salient
prosodic features’ of HCE (which they called Hawaiian American English (HAE)) and included many illustrative examples. It should be noted that substantial decreolization has taken place since Vanderslice and Shun Pierson published their findings. However, this decreolization has affected the lexicon more than the prosody, and their 1967 taxonomy provides a useful basis for any discussion of the prosodic features of HCE:

1. Syllable-timed rhythm, modified by emphatic drawl.
2. Wide tessitura (pitch range).
4. Scoop on the rise-fall statement (and special-question) tune.
5. Fluid word-stress and non-information-pointing accent placement.
6. Specific characteristic intonations: especially a general -question pattern with sharp pitch drop contrasting with GAE rise.

To the extent that HCE intonation contours surface in the speech of the narrators in this study of interlanguage prosody, the general characteristics should be noted. However, given that the narrators actually made very little use of ‘typical’ HCE prosody, these features will only be sketched here for reference. When relevant, a fuller discussion of a particular HCE prosodic feature will be provided in the context of commentary on specific examples. Readers interested in a fuller treatment of HCE prosody are referred to Vanderslice and Shun Pierson (1967), Odo (1975, 1977) and Kozasa (2000).

In general terms, suffice it to mention here that HCE is syllable-timed and contrasts with the stress-timed rhythm of standard American English. Pidgin also contrasts with standard American English with respect to stress placement, e.g., in standard American English, stress (or accent) tends to occur on words or syllables associated with new or contrastive information. In HCE, however, as Vanderslice and Shun Pierson (1967) note, there is 'a certain randomness in the location of accent...but a
strong tendency for it to occur at the ends of clauses. In any case, accent location does not perform an information-pointing function in Pidgin... In Pidgin the accent location, usually clause-final, is independent of redundancy or contrast' (159). The interlanguage narratives collected from the Korean narrators, however, do not exhibit this stress pattern which is typical of HCE.

There are, however, three extremely salient aspects of Pidgin intonation which seem to have been acquired by the Korean narrators during their years of local residency and which do occur in the corpus. The first of these is the phenomenon of 'scoop', a particular contour occurring in common declarative statements as well as certain questions, and which is described by Vanderslice and Shun Pierson (1967) as follows:

Pidgin statements usually (and special- or interrogative-word questions sometimes) take a rise-fall intonation which is very like the corresponding contour of GAE except for the phonetic shape of the pitch accent. The accented syllable does not begin at the higher pitch as in GAE; rather the rise, or part of it, as well as the fall takes place during the accented syllable or succeeding ones. For this phenomenon we borrow Hockett’s term *scoop*, extending it to include pitch rise after as well as on the accented syllable (160-161).

The second HCE prosodic feature which occurs in some of the narrative texts is the pitch contour of yes-no questions. Vanderslice and Shun Pierson (1967), commenting on the yes-no question contour in Pidgin, have this to say:

The Pidgin pattern for yes-no question is a very conspicuous feature of the dialect, being markedly different from the GAE pattern of rising or high pitch with rising terminal. The usual form of HAE general questions starts at or quickly rises to high pitch level which lasts until just before the accented ultima or penult, on which there is low pitch with terminal steadying or slight rise: (162)
...[T]he accented syllable is the one after the pitch drop; such a downward pitch intrusion is rare in GAE and mainlanders often have difficulty hearing it as a question-marker (163).

Regarding the particular saliency of the yes-no question contour in Pidgin, Carr (1972) observes: "The form of interrogation called ... "local question pattern" is very widespread indeed. It is probably more quickly imitated by standard speakers than any other Island trait—even by children who have recently arrived in Hawaii from the mainland of the United States" (65). Her contrast of the local question intonation pattern with that of standard American English is quite clear:

The expected final intonation [of questions, e.g. wanna go show tonight? Do you want to go to the show tonight?] is rising. The Island pattern—a high tone (level 3) at the beginning which is sustained until the last syllable and then dropped abruptly to level 1—is a prominent feature of the so-called pidgin intonation... The exact points of difference from standard American English are: the high initial pitch, the sustaining of this high pitch throughout until the last syllable of the question, and the sharp drop from level 3 to level 1 on the last syllable. American speech ordinarily gives this question the 2-3-3- rising intonation pattern...(Carr 1972:52).

The recent article by Siegel (2000) posits that it is the substrate influence from the Portuguese rise-fall intonation of yes/no questions which is at the origin of this distinctive feature not found in any other variety of English.

Finally, Kozasa's (2002) study, which compares the results of an acoustic analysis of the prosodic features of 67 clauses of a commercially produced recording of a narrative containing many examples of HCE, performed by its author who is a native speaker of HCE with a similar analysis of the same story translated into ‘American Mainstream English’ (AME) and read by a native speaker of AME, confirms the earlier
impressionistic, auditory analyses reported by Carr (1972) and Vanderslice and Shun Pierson (1967). Kozasa observes that it is not only the interrogative intonation patterns which differ prosodically from standard American English, but also declarative statements:

There are many HCE sentences that have contrasting intonation patterns to the same structures in AME. The most striking fact I found is the differences in sentence final intonation. According to Pierrehumbert (1980), [standard American English or ‘American Mainstream English’] final falling tone L-L%) is used for declarative sentences and wh-question sentences, while final rising tone (H-H%) is used for yes-no question sentences. However, more than half of [the] declarative sentences in HCE end with H%; all cases of HCE question sentences end with the opposite tone from the AME sentences’ (289), i.e., wh-questions in HCE are uttered with sentence final H%, while in AME they are uttered with L%; and yes-no question sentences in HCE have L%, while in AME H% occurs at the end of the sentences (291).

Kozasa (2000) provides the following table to illustrate the contrasts between the HCE patterns and the 'AME' patterns of sentence final intonation discussed above:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HCE</th>
<th>AME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Final tone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declarative</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wh-question</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes-No ques.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1.
Comparison of HCE and AME percentages of sentence-final intonation
(based on an acoustic analysis of the commercially released audio recording of The Moiliili Bag Man, written and performed by Darrell Lum (1990))

(289)
Finally, mention must be made of the third and most frequently used type of HCE prosody in the corpus narratives: the HCE tag question ending. The form is so ubiquitous in the data and so salient as a marker of local usage, in fact, that I reserved a special code for it in the transcription system used in this corpus, (e.g., ‘yeahQ’). The Pidgin tag ending is described by Vanderslice and Shun Pierson (1967) in the following terms:

Pidgin tags are of interest because of their frequency and their form. The GAE type...is seldom encountered; rather a special set of questioning monosyllables is used....They usually have high pitch, with terminal rise if sentence final...(163).

These tags very often occur in sentence-nonfinal position, followed either by the residue of inverted word order, or by more-or-less redundant material, especially vocatives. In either case, what follows the tag is at low pitch (163).

An example of the use of the tag ending ‘yeah?’ as used in this corpus is given in example (15):

(15) My sister you know, first time banana plenny this one [/] this one [uh?] buy this give um yeahQ
(Sun Ja 3 [1st Month Hard]):6 [FirstMon:Fbanana])

As illustrated here in example (15), as well as in lines 6 and 7 of Sang-Ho’s experience with the immigration inspector in example (12), above, the ‘yeahQ’ tag ending serves as a discourse marker in HCE and it is used in this target-like function by the Korean contributors to this corpus. The frequency of usage surpasses, perhaps, its use by native speakers of HCE or other acquirers of the yeahQ tag, a category which includes locals as well as most of Hawai‘i’s long-term residents. Further discussion of the use of the yeahQ tag as a discourse marker will be taken up in Chapter Four. (Note that line 5 of Sang-Ho’s narrative in example 12 does not carry the characteristic yeahQ tag intonation;
it is used there as a kind of role-played affirmative answer to the ‘off-camera’ inspector’s question, ‘Are these people all together in one family?’ See Transcription Conventions in Appendix D for a somewhat fuller introduction of the discourse uses of ‘yeahQ’ in this corpus.)

In sum, these Korean immigrants do not give evidence of having acquired many features of HCE. As mentioned above, it is primarily in the lexicon where some features of HCE can be found. Syntactically, the interlanguage contained in the corpus analyzed for this study does not include any tokens of the three salient tense-modal-aspect markers for which HCE is noted (e.g., ‘stay’ [sometimes written as ‘stei’ or ‘ste’] as a copula or for the imperfective, been or wen for the past or perfective, or go for future). (See Siegel 2000 for a detailed discussion of the tense-modal-aspect system of Hawai‘i Creole English.) Lacking as it does such syntactic features and containing only infrequent tokens of HCE lexicon, there is no strong evidence in the interlanguage of the narrators which indicates that input from HCE, one of the major contact languages in the community, has notably affected their acquisition of [varieties of] English. The one notable exception to this general lack of HCE features in their interlanguage is the narrators’ abundant use of the prosodically salient local tag ending ‘yeah?’.

Explanations for this lack of acquisition can plausibly be sought in the fact that the personal lives of the narrators revolve for the most part around their work, their families, and participation in activities within the Korean-speaking community of Honolulu. In all of these locales, the narrators manage to ‘get by’ with their English conversational skills, relying on language brokers in more demanding situations, e.g.,
situations which require reading and writing skills. (See Chapter Three for details on the language practices at the worksite, in the community and within their families.)

Having thus briefly sketched some of the major morphosyntactic and prosodic features of Korean and Hawai‘i Creole English, two of the languages which must be considered sources of input to the interlanguage prosody of the Korean immigrants who have been long-term residents in Hawai‘i, I now consider prosody at a more macro-level, i.e., the use of prosody in the making of meaning, before proceeding, in Chapter Four, with an analysis of the linguistic applications of discourse-embedded prosody used by these narrators.

2.4. Approaches to the study of prosody in the making of meaning

A narrative, by definition, is an interactive genre, it is a communicative event, designed and 'performed' with a target audience in mind. Orality is central to the analysis of narratives. Yet its status is contested, and its role often remains unacknowledged in research undertaken by language scholars. In the newly emerging field of natural language processing, considerably more attention is being paid to prosodic effects, but as van Donzel (1999) notes, '[s]o far, most research into the relation between discourse structure and its prosodic realization was done using speech read aloud' (2).

Furthermore, while prosody is readily acknowledged by both lay and expert opinion to contribute to the making of verbal meanings, as we have seen, there has historically been rather serious debate among scholars over its status, one of the issues centering around whether prosody should be considered a linguistic feature or a
paralinguistic feature. The arguments from linguists on both sides are extensively reviewed in Crystal (1969:20-62).

The data from the corpus analyzed for this study supports the argument that prosody should be classified as an essentially linguistic feature of language, even though it clearly also serves a dual role and serves a paralinguistic function as well. I take this position primarily because prosody is shown here to perform linguistic functions such as contributing to lexical productivity and establishing syntactic relations. Furthermore, it plays a crucial role as a cohesive device in the organization of juxtaposed, sequentially arranged utterances, e.g., in discourse organization. This study does not attempt to overstate the centrality of prosody by claiming that prosody alone can carry the entire burden of verbal communication. However, the data does support the view that prosody is one of several core (rather than peripheral) linguistic components and has the potential to play a role which goes far beyond its paralinguistic function of expressing personal affect and attitude. I invoke here the remarks made by Bolinger (1972a), cited at the beginning of this chapter: 'Intonation, like everything else in language, is one instrument in an orchestra...Pitch is like any other clearly audible characteristic of speech sound: it is there to be used, and almost certainly will be used, though in varying proportions for different purposes' (12-13).

In this study, as in many others which have preceded it, prosody seems to be a creature with two faces: At times it plays its default paralinguistic role; at other times, when called upon, it emerges to play a more central role in syntactic and semantic processing. Clearly, its role is far more complex and more important than has
traditionally been granted by mainstream linguistics. As Wennerstrom (2001b) accurately points out, '...[S]ince prosody is always present in spoken discourse, it is not merely an added flourish or superimposed feature but central to a full understanding of any spoken text. Moreover...since prosodic meaning is manifest at the discourse level, discourse analysis as a field is poised to make an important contribution to the understanding of prosodic meaning' (6).

What scholars often do not agree on is the domain or unit to be investigated. Many scholars working on intonation and prosody in discourse contexts use the intonational phrase, based on a combination of declination measurements and idea units (Chafe 1987, 1994). For her study of the use of prosodic cues by both speaker and hearer to signal and detect, respectively, the information structure in Dutch spoken discourse, Van Donzel (1999:4) did an extensive review of various frameworks in an attempt to avoid the circularity of defining focus based on acoustic features, then using the acoustic features to identify the focused elements of the discourse. Among many researchers on natural speech processing and discourse prosody she found quite a number who look at the overall global structure of discourse, e.g., Geluykens & Swerts 1994; Grosz & Hirschberg 1992; Swerts & Geluykens 1994; Terken & Hirschberg 1994. Van Donzel identifies Hirschberg and her colleagues as one research line which is pursuing the analysis of discourse at both a global level (structure of the discourse constituents which form the whole discourse) and a local level (parentheticals, quotations, tags, indirect reported speech). However, van Donzel rejects the Hirschberg approach primarily because it predetermines the discourse boundaries based on the analyst's prior knowledge of the
structure of the performed texts. Van Donzel (1999:10) prefers to look at both global chunks of discourse structure (which she refers to as 'boundary marking') as well as internal focal structure (which she terms 'information structure'). (For a comparison of various scholars' approaches and analytical units see Table 2.2. Intonational Meaning in Discourse at the end of section 2.4.2.1.)

Schafer (1997) has observed, speaking to the nascent status of the study of prosody in discourse contexts:

As sentence processing research broadens from primarily studying isolated sentences to more complete accounts of how language is produced and understood in natural discourse contexts, I suspect we will discover that prosodic structure is far more predictable, and therefore more constraining, or even predictive, than it seems today. Yet even if we find that prosody is never fully predictive of syntactic, semantic or discourse structure, prosodic structure appears to be a necessary component of any model of natural language processing, and an extremely interesting avenue for future psycholinguistic research (35).

Interestingly, it is data from 'low proficiency', 'untutored' immigrant speakers of English as a second language, from 'naïve' language users living in a world far removed from the halls of academe who, by providing evidence that argues for its essentially linguistic properties, have important contributions to make to the debate on the role of prosody.

Before advancing further into an explanation of the prosodic framework to be adopted here, one comment must be made. Much as in the domain of syntactic research where linguists usually make clear their affiliation, or disaffiliation, as the case may be, with the Chomskyan generative paradigm, any contemporary study of intonational phenomena sooner or later must take a stance vis-à-vis the framework proposed by
Pierrehumbert (1980), and built upon by Pierrehumbert and Hirschberg (1990) [hereafter P&H]. The general principles of this framework have been mentioned above at several points, but here I will focus on how the P&H intonational analysis relates to the creation and interpretation of meaning.

First, Ladd (1996) provides some historical perspective on the Pierrehumbertian framework:

Without a doubt the single most influential contribution to current work on intonational phonology has been Janet Pierrehumbert’s PhD. thesis 'The phonology and phonetics of English intonation' (1980)…Pierrehumbert proposed a simple yet powerful theory of intonational phonology that effectively resolved the long-running ‘levels vs configurations’ debate and focused the attention of investigators on certain well-defined questions. Her theory has been directly adopted in more recent work on intonational pragmatics (Ward and Hirschberg 1985; Pierrehumbert and Hirschberg 1990), the syntax-phonology interface (Selkirk 1984), and the relation between word and sentence prosody in Japanese (Poser 1984; Pierrehumbert and Beckman 1988). It has also strongly influenced descriptions of intonation in European languages…’(3)

P&H’s (1990) major contribution is to consider the intonation contour as a series of individual high and low tones, rather than a holistic, indivisible contour. Each component of the intonation contour contributes to the making of meaning, through the hearer’s interpretive efforts to decode the information structure contained in the speaker’s output. This making of meaning is accomplished through the interaction of the two levels of specified intonational hierarchy proposed by Pierrehumbert (1980): intermediate phrases, containing phrase accents, and intonational phrases, set off by boundary tones. Based on Pierrehumbert’s (1980) and Beckman and Pierrehumbert’s (1986) analyses of intonational structure, P&H propose a compositional theory of tune interpretation in the following terms:
We propose that S chooses an intonational contour to convey relationships between (the propositional content of) the current utterance and previous and subsequent utterances—and between (the propositional content of) the current utterance and beliefs H believes to be mutually held. These relationships are conveyed compositionally via selection of pitch accent, phrase accent, and boundary tone (308).

P&H then describe the role played by each of the three components of intonation, e.g.,

pitch accents, phrase accents and boundary tones:

Pitch accents convey information about the status of discourse referents, modifiers, predicates, and relationships specified by accented lexical items. Phrase accents convey information about the relatedness of intermediate phrases—in particular, whether (the propositional content of) one intermediate phrase is to form part of a larger interpretive unit with another. Boundary tones convey information about the directionality of interpretation for the current intonational phrase—whether it is "forward-looking" or not. So, not only do different features of an intonational phrase convey different aspects of its meaning, but the meaning conveyed by each feature has scope over a different phonological domain. Together, pitch accents, phrase accents, and boundary tones convey how H should interpret the current utterance structurally—with respect to previous and subsequent utterances—and with respect to what H believes to be mutually believed in the discourse (308).

Wennerstrom (2001b), in her efforts to render the P&H framework as accessible as possible to a wide range of discourse analysts who are not schooled in phonological theories, explains the model's basic concepts in these terms: 'the intonation of particular lexical items provides information about their role in the coherence of the discourse, while the pitch of the intonation boundaries contributes meaning about how each phrase is interrelated with its neighbors' (27-28).

One of the general insights from the P&H framework for the analysis of intonational meaning, i.e., that prosodic phenomena componentially build meaning over the trajectory of an utterance will be useful in my analysis. However, for the purposes of
this study, there are potentially two limitations to the P&H framework. The first and primary one is that their framework relies on assumptions about prosodic phenomena produced by native speakers of the language in question and judgments by listeners who are also native speakers of that language.

It would be a very interesting question and one well worth pursuing to see whether the P&H framework has explanatory power for interlanguage data (see Wennerstrom 1997, 1998 who used the framework to assess L2 speakers' use of target-like intonational contours), but it is beyond the scope of this study to investigate to what extent the intonational contours in my corpus can be assigned Mainstream American English-based meanings, as the P&H framework would require. However, I will make limited and grounded use of the general meanings proposed by P&H in association with the direction of specific pitch movements and intonation contours in the analysis of my data.

It should perhaps be noted at this point that the P&H framework for the analysis of intonational meaning does not purport to be valid for any language other than Mainstream American English. Indeed, researchers working within that framework who have adopted the ToBI annotation system explicitly point out that an analysis of intonational meaning in any language, and in any variety of any language, must be based on substantial prior research into the language-specific (and variety-specific) intonation system and prosodic structures (see ToBI homepage). The prosodic data under investigation here being a variety of Korean-immigrant-in-Hawai‘i interlanguage for which only four prior descriptions have been attempted (Sohn 1986 [1980]; Bickerton
[1974]; D.J. Lee 1972); and E. Klein (1981), and furthermore only two of which include phonetic information (Bickerton [1974]; D.J. Lee 1972), obviously no such prior analysis of intonational meaning for Korean immigrant interlanguage in Hawai‘i exists. However, if interlanguages are indeed natural languages, exhibiting language patterns attested in other natural languages, the P&H framework should be able to form a basic account for, at a minimum, interlanguage speakers’ use of tones to create a meaning-bearing pitch contour. The specifics of the intonational meaning to be attributed to this interlanguage data, however, cannot simply be directly mapped onto a meaning analysis for either Mainstream American English or Korean. Wennerstrom (1998) argues against any expectation of finding universals in L2 intonation patterns. In particular, from a study of the intonation contours used by highly educated Chinese Mandarin-speaking graduate students in the U.S. when giving academic lectures, Wennerstrom (1998) concluded that 'the intonation system...is not universal. If it were, we would expect to see all subjects associating pitch with text in a similar way, regardless of level of English or language background. Instead, the Chinese speakers differed from each other and from NSs in their use of intonation' (98).

As mentioned above, the Pierrehumbert (1980) and Pierrehumbert and Hirschberg (1990) analytical framework is already being applied to numerous languages beyond English, including Japanese and Korean, and it would be quite interesting to extend that research to discover to what degree L1 Korean speaker interlanguage prosodic phenomena follow patterns attested in the source and input languages. That undertaking will have to wait, however, as the goal here is to discover what prosodic resources these
interlanguage users draw upon and how they manipulate those resources in the course of interaction to create meaning for their interlocutor.

The second limitation of the P&H framework is that it is not, fundamentally, designed for discourse-level analyses and it does not provide for interpretation beyond the utterance/sentence level. For her discourse-based work, this limitation has led Wennerstrom to posit an additional layer, the paratone, a layer which I too will adopt as a necessary unit of analysis. Recipient interpretation being a primary component of any prosody research, P&H do, of course, take into account hearer perceptions and interpretation of speech in their framework, and the framework is not incompatible with discourse level work. But the framework, as originally proposed, cannot accommodate texts of extended discourse.

2.4.1 Form-based analyses of intonational meaning

To maintain the analogy with practices in the generative framework evoked above, it could be said that, similar to syntactic analyses which begin with the surface form, intonational phonology has also spawned several form-based approaches. In this case, the form could be said to be the acoustically measurable and auditorily perceptible pitch contour, but these approaches are also form-based in that they attempt to find a congruence between the pitch contour and lexical, semantic and syntactic structures.

In contrast to these form-based approaches stand the functionally-oriented, discourse-based approaches. Given that one of the main claims of my study is that prosody substitutes for deficiencies in target language lexical and syntactic structures, it
is first of all for purely practical reasons, quite apart from any a priori theoretical orientation, that it is from among the function-based discourse-driven approaches that I will find the appropriate framework for this study. Before outlining the frameworks I will use for my analysis, I will briefly review some of the more traditional form-based approaches to intonation and prosody in order to situate my study with respect to the contemporary questions and issues regarding prosody's role in the creation of meaning.

2.4.1.1. Prosody's role in lexical disambiguation and topic prominence

A study of the functions of prosody include two primary issues regarding the lexicon, both related to the use of pitch. The first is the role of prosody at the lexical level, e.g., distinguishing lexical items of a language by means of pitch associated with syllables or words, as, for example, in tone languages such as Thai or Chinese and in languages with lexical pitch such as Japanese and Swedish. (See Bruce 1977 and Ladd 1996 for a fuller discussion.). The second issue is prosody's role at the post-lexical level as part of the intonational contour of an utterance and the use of pitch on lexical items to make them more salient in the discourse. The first issue, i.e., the role of prosody in making lexical distinctions will not be of major concern in this study, as Korean and Mainstream American English (MAE) appear to have very similar stress patterns at the lexical level. Hawai'i Creole English does have a stress pattern which differs from that of MAE, as seen above in section 2.3.2.2. English also has lexical stress which serves to disambiguate pairs of words in different word classes (e.g., the verb *perFUME* vs. the noun *PERfume*), and it is not uncommon for learners of English to misplace this lexical
stress at times. However, lexical confusion due to differences in lexical stress does not arise in this corpus of interlanguage.

English has no phonemic pitch distinctions, but it does have a complex system of tunes such as 'question intonation'. These tunes, which are created by applying pitch accents to individual words, affect only the pragmatic meaning of the utterance as a whole, however, and they do not change the lexical meaning of the words (Bolinger 1965 [1958]). Korean is similar to English in this regard in that it has neither lexical tone nor pitch in the modern standard dialect, as mentioned above in section 2.3.2.1. With regard to their English lexicon, since the native speakers of Korean who are the narrators in this study have acquired their English vocabulary naturalistically, they have in most cases also simultaneously acquired the lexical stress pattern associated with that word as used in Hawai‘i. In the few cases where non-standard pronunciation of an English word inhibits communication, it is most often at the segmental level rather than at the lexical level (e.g., substitution of /p/ for /f/, a phoneme which does not exist in Korean).

The second function of prosody at the lexical level, i.e., focussing lexical items in discourse and drawing the hearer’s attention to new, foregrounded, or contrasted items, is undisputedly one of the most fundamental functions of prosody. Cruttenden (1986), for example, states that prosodic features (which he specifies as length, loudness and pitch) conspire in varying degrees in many languages to give some syllables prominence when compared with other syllables...Such prominences are often themselves linguistically important: they may be involved in distinguishing different lexical meanings...or they may be involved in making certain syllables stand out in sentences, and hence make the word containing those syllables stand out as more important...They are also important because sequences of prominent and non-prominent syllables
form the framework of connected speech...such patterns are the backbone of intonation (7).

Scholars working on discourse prosody, while differing in scope and approach, generally agree on several basic facts, among which are that prominence (variously determined to be based on 'stress', 'accent', or 'pitch accent', depending on the applicable framework) associated with words at the lexical level, contributes significantly to the encoding of discourse structure by highlighting new vs. given information and by foregrounding and backgrounding information that the speaker wishes the hearer to take as given (Lehiste 1979; Grosz & Sidner 1986; Pierrehumbert & Hirschberg 1990; Swerts & Geluykens 1994; Swerts, Collier & Terken 1994).

Cutler et al. (1997) review a number of studies and summarize their findings by noting that contemporary research is moving in the direction of analyzing the domain of prosodic effects, which is one of the areas which Jun, working in the P&H framework, is investigating for Korean. Another area of contemporary research mentioned by Cutler et al. (1997) is that which investigates 'the availability of the acoustic information which signals prosodic contrasts' (148); in other words, investigating what it is in the acoustic signal which listeners attend to in processing the speech segments. This results of this line of research could be of central concern to this project, but Cutler et al. (1997) admit that 'there are still enormous gaps in our knowledge' (148). In sum, research in lexical prosody at the moment is mainly focussed on discovering at what point in the word-recognition process stress intervenes to play a role in identification of the lexical item. The phenomenon is not yet well understood, but in any case, this aspect of lexical prosody analysis is not of direct concern to this study, given that the corpus consists of
interlanguage and modified foreigner talk data where both speaker and hearer can rely on acoustic signals at the segmental level for only a portion of the lexical identification. Complicated at times by cross-linguistic segmental interference, in addition to ‘creative’ uses of interlanguage lexicon and syntax, both speaker and hearer are clearly relying to a considerable degree on acoustic signals beyond the lexical level in order to achieve mutual understanding. Prosody at the lexical level will be an important consideration in this study, but as explained in Chapter Four, prosody at the lexical level in this interactively-generated interlanguage data plays a role quite distinct from the role it plays in the discourse of native speakers of English.

2.4.1.2. Prosody's role in syntactic disambiguation

In the British tradition of prosodic analysis, there is a strong tendency to think in terms of isomorphism between the syntactic units and the intonational contour, and it is to this British tradition that we owe the major attempts to establish taxonomies of the relationship between sound and meaning. Crystal (1969) summarized this tradition in the following terms:

The traditional view about the functions of intonation (and of prosodic and paralinguistic features in general) is that it signals the speaker's attitude toward what he is saying or towards some part of the context in which he is speaking; and no-one would deny that this is certainly part of what intonation does...The consensus of opinion is quite clearly that this is the primary—to some scholars even the only—function of intonation.

Against this, there is the predominantly structural stimulated approach which sees intonation playing a primarily grammatical role: ‘intonation is pre-eminently a structure-marking system’ (Gleason 1965, p.179)' (286-287).

A major focus of these investigations is to determine whether or not prosody is isochronous with syntax. Schuetze-Coburn et al. (1991) reviewing various studies of the prosody/syntax interface, state that ‘Sorensen and Cooper (1980), for example, found small (‘partial’) F₀ resets between syntactically connected clauses. Research on languages other than English has produced similar results’ (229).

Even scholars who are inclined to search for the autonomy of prosodic phenomena cannot deny what seems to be the obvious, e.g., that ‘intonation-groups correspond typically with major grammatical constituents like simple sentences, or noun-phrase subjects, or predicates’ (Cruttenden 1986:21). Cruttenden goes on to criticize this approach, however, saying, ‘It may indeed be true that many languages do use intonation less for attitudinal purposes than English, but the suspicion exits that an alignment of tunes with sentence-types is merely the easy way to investigate intonation and often more sophisticated attitudinal and discoursal uses remain undocumented’ (10).

In their review article, Cutler et al. (1997) sum up all the evidence and arguments on both sides of the question, and state categorically, ‘Syntax and prosody are closely
related' (159). Which is not to say that one determines the other, however. After conducting her experimental study of prosody's role in sentence processing, Schafer (1997) concludes:

As has often been noted in the literature, prosodic structure and syntactic structure are related, but not isomorphic. The strongest prosodic boundary in a sentence may tend to occur at the strongest syntactic boundary, but it can also be located at a minor syntactic boundary under certain conditions of focus or constituent length. Even when the prosodic structure does reflect the syntactic structure, prosodic boundaries do not always mark the closing edges of syntactic phrases. Thus, hypotheses that limit the effects of prosodic boundaries to cues of syntactic closure are only tenable within accounts that predict that all other effects of prosodic phrasing result from grammatical constraints (116).

Schafer (1997) obtained very interesting results from experiments relating to the interplay between prosodic processing and syntactic parsing, namely that there are arguments for both interface and independence in the way prosody and syntactic constraints work together. She found that 'intonational phrase boundaries lead to further interpretive integration and evaluation of preceding material even though there is no known grammatical constraint that would induce such an effect' (115). Summarizing the results of her experiments, she states that

[t]his is not to say that there is no role for grammatical constraints involving prosody in sentence comprehension—indeed, I assume they are necessary for the construction of the prosodic representation, and it is the existence of grammatical constraints at the syntactic and semantic/pragmatic levels that allows prosodic information to be part of the computational vocabulary of the syntactic and semantic processing modules. However, it appears that grammatical constraints do not account for all of the effects of prosodic phrasing in sentence comprehension (115).
In the following transcription of natural speech, Chafe (2000:395) provides an example of the mismatch between syntax and prosody which frequently occurs:

(16)

(16-1) Her first husband was Jewett Snyder from Cattaraugus Reservation.

The proposition in (16-1), above, was realized prosodically with the following intonation breaks:

(16-2). [Her first hus band was-] [Jewett Sny der from-]

[Catta raugus Reser vation].

Commenting on this example, Chafe (2000) explains how the segmentation of a discourse prosodologist differs from that of a syntactician:

In the entire sequence there were three new ideas: that of the first husband, of his name, and of his place of origin. Because of the one-new-idea constraint they were necessarily expressed in three intonation units, none of which was a clause. A syntactic analyst would not segment the sequence in this way. [This example] provides an excellent example of the difference between the grammar of ordinary spoken language and the kind of grammar we have learned to expect from several millenia of studies based on written language (395).

Chafe (2000) concludes by stating that, 'it happens frequently...that these two devices, the prosodic closure and the syntactic closure, fail to coincide. After finishing a sentence syntactically, speakers often “tack on” clarifications...' (395).

Morel and Danon-Boileau (1998), working on French quite independently of Chafe, report regularly finding similar phenomena, which they label 'disjointed lexical support' (38). Furthermore, when mapping oral segments against syntactic segments, Morel and Danon-Boileau (1998) note that 'the segmentation induced
by intonation does not match that which it is customary to use at the
morphosyntactic level' (22) [translation by the author].

Couper-Kuhlen and Selting (1996), leading scholars on discourse prosody
working in an interactionist framework which draws strongly from conversation analysis,
linguistic anthropology and interactional sociolinguistics, 'on the border', as they say,
'between linguistics and the social sciences' (1), have strongly criticized attempts to
assign one-for-one relationships between prosody and meaning:

The procedure in...grammar-based approaches to intonation is...to associate
tunes with different grammatical sentence-types and to treat exceptions as
conveying attitudinal modifications such as 'indifferent', 'polite', surprised', etc.
[Others] have preferred to segment melodic tunes ...into their component
parts...[where] the pitch of each of the small constituent parts of a melodic whole
is said to create a distinctive meaning opposition [Halliday 1967, 1970; Pike
1945]...The claim is that because such choices are systematically and
distinctively related to meaning, intonation is grammatical in function. However,
as any linguist who has looked seriously at naturally occurring data will know, the
problem is that intonational patterns—in contrast to morphemes, with which they
have been compared—do not always carry this kind of functional load in
language use; in fact they do so so rarely that to treat them as 'intonemes' is
arguably rather meaningless (17-19).

In any case, much of the research on the syntax/prosody interface conducted with
native speaker judgements cannot be applied to the interlanguage data of this corpus.
Many of the arguments invoked in the analysis of L1 speech do not pertain to the
prosodically realized 'creative' syntax produced by low proficiency second language
speakers. Because the speakers providing the corpus for this study lack knowledge of
conventional English syntax, it is rather pointless to speak of the interface between
standard English syntax and their prosodic cues. The domains in which prosody will be
used for syntactic processing correspond, rather, to some which Cutler et al. (1997)
identified in their review of analyses of native speakers' use of prosody, i.e., 'studies suggest that some syntactic information can be extracted from prosodic cues, in particular information about the location of syntactic-constituent boundaries' (163). That is, in the interlanguage examples which follow in Chapter Four, prosody will be used to signal syntactic breaks and constituent groupings.

2.4.2 Discourse-based approaches to intonational meaning

Any discussion of discourse and intonation usually begins with a mention of the functionalist Halliday (1967), who, working on British English, was among the first to propose a description of the meanings attributable to specific intonation contours. Wennerstrom (2001b) also places Halliday first in her ranking of the 'three schools of thought whose influence permeates the literature on intonation, especially as it pertains to topics of interest to discourse analysts' (27). In Wennerstrom's (2001b) estimate, the three most influential frameworks are Halliday's work on the intonation of British English and his analysis of 'the interplay between items being introduced into the discourse as new and those that are already given in context' (27) as well as 'his recognition of rhythm as an underlying structure in spoken language' (27), which has greatly influenced subsequent work. Second in Wennerstrom's (2001b) ranking is Pierrehumbert's (1980) dissertation on intonation and Pierrehumbert and Hirschberg's (1990) subsequent work on the interpretation of intonational meaning. The third approach highlighted by Wennerstrom as significant in the study of discourse intonation is that of Brazil (1997), also explained in Brazil, Coulthard and Johns (1980). She finds similarities between
Brazil's model and that of Pierrehumbert in that they both break up the intonational contour into constituent parts. Wennerstrom (2001b) points out that Brazil contributed, in particular, one significant concept to the analysis of interactional dynamics, namely, the notion of 'key', which is 'an indicator of attitudinal relationships between one intonation unit and the next' (28) and the 'recognition of the importance of pitch range in interaction' (28).

As the preceding section (2.4.1.) will have made clear, form-based approaches to an analysis of intonational meaning are not particularly relevant to the study of interlanguage, which, by definition, consists of non-targetlike surface structures. Whether intonation can be mapped onto syntactic structures is, in any case, a very dubious undertaking. The first alternative I will consider (in 2.4.2.1, below) is the interactionist approach, largely inspired by the work of Gumperz (1982). The second alternative I will consider (in 2.4.2.2, below) is one which could be called the 'idea unit and information structure' approach, best exemplified in the work of Chafe (1987, 1988, 1993, 1994).

2.4.2.1 Interactionist approach to the study of prosody

The name most strongly associated with the study of prosody within the interactionist framework is Gumperz (1982), as it was his conceptualization of prosodic contextualization cues which spawned considerable research in this direction. The term 'interactionist approach' covers both those discourse analysts working in a conversational analytic framework (e.g., Auer 1996; Auer & DiLuzio 1992; Couper-Kuhlen 1992, 1996, Selting 1988, 1992, 1994, 1996, 2000; and Couper-Kuhlen & Selting 1996), as well as
discourse analysts coming from a background in phonological theory such as Coulthard (1992), Brazil (1983, 1997) and Coulthard and Brazil (1982). Freese and Maynard (1998), give a very good description of the conceptualization of prosody within this latter approach:

[Prosodic devices are highly multi-functional and achieve their significance through an interaction with lexical, sequential, and situational information. One can, therefore, never claim a deterministic relationship between prosody and meaning, but rather can only note the utility of particular prosodic structures when employed in particular sequential environments...Abstract descriptions of a characteristic structure cannot by themselves illuminate how prosody is used by conversationalists; instead the task requires a close analysis of real interactional data (199).

Similarly, Coulthard (1992), summarizing the framework proposed by Brazil (1992) says that ‘intonation primarily adds specific interactional significance to lexicogrammatical items and thus enables speakers to refine or redefine the meaning oppositions given by the language system (37). Thus, Coulthard (1992) comments that ‘Brazil argues that intonational divisions that speakers make in their utterances are not grammatically motivated (though for explainable reasons intonation unit boundaries frequently coincide with major grammatical boundaries)—rather they are motivated by the need to add moment-by-moment, situationally specific, intonationally conveyed meanings to particular words or group of words’ (37). Of particular relevance for our analysis are three concepts of Brazil’s (1992) which distinguish him considerably from other intonational phonologists. These are: (a) that there is a ‘closed set of discrete units on the acoustic continuum’ [e.g. high key for contrastive, mid key for additive, and low key for equative] (Coulthard 1992:37); (b) that there is ‘no necessary one-to-one relationship between particular paralinguistic cues and interactional significance (pitch
can carry both general information about emotional state and specific local meaning)
(Coulthard 1992: 37); and, finally, (c) that there is 'no constant relationship between
particular acoustic phenomena and particular analytic categories'; [it is], according to
Brazil (1992) 'contrasts, not absolute values which are important' (Coulthard 1992:37).
We will see in the data how the narrators do, in fact, make use of contrasts rather than
target-like values to achieve their meanings.

According to Auer, Couper-Kuhlen and Müller (1999), contextualization refers
to the process by which conversationalists enable each other to bridge the gap between
what is meant and what is said. They do so, among other things, by the use of indexical
‘contextualization cues’, which provide the contextual embedding indispensable for
construing conversational meaning. Thus, contextualization cues evoke Goffman-like
“frames” or contexts, which in turn are used for the understanding of a given utterance
beyond its propositional content' (27).

Further, Auer et al. (1999) state that

[t]he extraordinary attractiveness of this [contextualization à la Gumperz]
approach lies in the fact that it enables us to come to grips with the
interactional work done by prosodic cues such as intonation, tempo,
loudness and rhythm...by showing how they acquire interpretive
significance. Gumperz makes it clear that prosody is not an accidental or
derivate addendum to the linguistic data proper (which can be safely
neglected) but an essential part of interaction...Prosodic cues only ‘mean’
in context. Analyzing the work done through prosody in interaction
therefore necessitates a new theory of ‘phonological pragmatics’ (28).

The ability to engage in contextualization is, presumably, part of the subconscious
knowledge of adult language users who have acquired this skill over a lifetime of verbal
interactions. One of the potentially interesting aspects of this study of the communicative
use of interlanguage is that because the explicitly verbal, propositional content is maintained at a minimum (arguably at the level of a 'Basic Variety' as posited by Klein and Perdue 1992), we see interlanguage speakers bringing their subconscious understanding of the importance of contextualization to the surface by means of prosody. A study of uninstructed learners' interlanguage prosody such as this could thus be called a study of the 'exposing' of previously 'camouflaged' subconscious language knowledge, to use Auer's terms. The role of the listener/recipient is also critical in this process, for as Chafe (2003) says, '...what our brains do with physical inputs under the influence of context and expectations may in the end be more relevant than the physical phenomena themselves' (2). Taylor's (1986) perspective on the intersubjectivity in the communicative act can usefully be applied here. Namely, Taylor said,

the communality of understanding, and indeed of criteria of understanding, is established in public, observable practice. The intersubjectivity which is the essence of communication is part of communicational interaction itself and not a phenomenon to be explained by the identity of the private, mental events of different individuals. [...] We must learn not to study the public face of verbal interaction simply for the value it supposedly has as a window on the private events of the mind, where the "real" and essential activity is occurring. Communication is not a private, internal process; it is a public, co-operative activity (102-103).

While the narrators whose stories form the corpus of this study may not know the technical term 'intersubjectivity', the language virtuosity visible in their narratives reflects their well-honed sense of communication as cooperation.
2.4.2.2 Idea units and information structure approach to the study of prosody

Chafe (1987) proposed that discourse is organized into idea units, realized in intonation units. He later proposed that discourse coherence relies principally on the flow of ideas in and out of active consciousness (1994). The three core idea units which Chafe (2000) identifies are (1) the foci of consciousness, which he terms the 'minimal units of thought organization' (394) and which are expressed in intonation units; (2) centers of interest, which he terms a kind of super-focus of consciousness that attempts to go beyond the constraints imposed by the evolution of human information-processing abilities (first proposed in Chafe 1994:139-144 and cited in Chafe 2000: 395), signalled by 'falling pitch perceived as sentence-final prosody' (395); and (3) topics, described by Chafe as 'more stable units of mental representation' and 'a way of organizing content that remains stable throughout successive activations and verbalizations of the same material' (396). Chafe (2000) asserts that topics 'differ from the ideas expressed in the smaller intonation units in that they cannot be in fully active consciousness all at once. Most of spoken language consists of speakers navigating through these semiactive topics, illuminating first one area and then another with a series of fully active foci expressed in intonation units' (396).

In Chafe (2000) and in Chafe (2003), he elaborates further on the contributions of prosody to discourse, stating that prosody has four functions and that these are related to the flow of consciousness, not to syntax. As Chafe (2000) explains it:

There is an important sense in which the thoughts have priority over the sounds. It seems obvious, once one stops to think about it, that it is the flow of thoughts that keeps language moving, not the flow of sounds,
whose function is only to express the thoughts. Linguistic form exists in the service of the thoughts, not vice versa' (390).

There seems to be a natural affinity between segmental sounds and certain components of thought, between prosodic sounds and certain other components....If sounds can be divided into their segmental and prosodic aspects, is there an analogous dichotomy in the realm of thoughts? The answer appears to lie in distinguishing the content of thoughts on the one hand from what I will call their infrastructure on the other...The infrastructure of thoughts includes their organization and evaluation.... (390).

Chafe's discussion of the dichotomy between segmental sounds, where he assumes that most content is expressed, and prosodic sounds, where he assumes that the infrastructure is organized, is a very useful and provocative heuristic if applied to the use of prosody in the interlanguage corpus of this study. As will be demonstrated in Chapter Four, there is a striking resemblance to Chafe's segmental/prosodic dichotomy in the way the interlanguage speakers make use of different aspects of prosody. The dichotomy which I establish I have labeled 'local' vs. 'global' rather than segmental vs. prosodic but there are obvious parallels. The prosodic features which appear, in Chafe terms, at the segmental level are those which are realized at what I refer to as the local level in this study, i.e., stress, pitch movements, lengthening and volume all serve as substitutes for lexicon and syntax. Prosodic features at the global level, i.e., rhythm, volume, anacrusis serve as overall organizers of the discourse. The local and the global of course work hand in hand, just as Chafe (2000) asserts:

It is ...interesting to note that the content aspect of thoughts is associated largely with the segmental aspect of sounds, whereas their infrastructure is expressed to a large extent by prosody. Language uses pitch, loudness, duration, and voice quality to convey the organization and evaluation of ideas, though often in concert with segmental phenomena' (390-391).
The essential components of Chafe's model (2000, 2003) for the interface between prosody and discourse functions are presented in Table 2.2. Four Functions of Prosody (Infrastructure of thoughts and their expression through prosody), below. If these categories could be combined with the Pierrehumbert and Hirschberg (1990) model, the resulting framework might have considerable explanatory power.

The analytical units of spoken language discourse analysts and discourse prosody scholars whose work appeared before the P&H framework was published or who have not pursued analyses within the framework can nevertheless be compared with the hierarchical framework proposed by P&H.
Table 2.2.
FOUR FUNCTIONS OF PROSODY
(Infrastructure of thoughts
and their expression through prosody)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISCOURSE ORGANIZATIONAL FUNCTIONS (2) (Units &amp; Signposts)</th>
<th>DISCOURSE EVALUATION FUNCTIONS (2) (Affect &amp; Weights)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>intonation units determined by prosodic criteria expressing foci of consciousness; minimal units of thought; organization constrained by ability to verbalize, not by syntax</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Units Function: delimit words, phrases, sentences &amp; topics as on-line processing organizer</td>
<td>1. Weights Function: show prominence of new, contrast, emphasis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Signpost Function: 'guide the flow of thoughts from one unit to another'; show relations of units to larger contexts (end of phrases, boundaries, etc.)</td>
<td>2. Affect Function: express emotions &amp; attitudes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(following Chafe 2000:390-391; 2003:2)

Table 2.3. Intonational Meaning in Discourse, below, facilitates a rough comparison of various scholars' stands on the issue of idea/information status. By looking at this table, we can see that although not all scholars have the same units of analysis and not all scholars use the same terminology, the P&H framework is compatible with most of the major analysts. At a minimum, we can see that there appear to be no glaring incompatibilities between P&H and the major analyses. The most striking difference is, of course, P&H's componential approach to intonation and their proposed hierarchy. Most of the earlier discourse/prosody scholars worked on only one level, labeled variously the 'intonation unit', 'idea unit', etc. It is the recent generation of scholars who
are beginning to search for evidence of componentially constituted, hierarchically organized features of discourse.

2.5 Conclusion: Analytic framework to be adopted

At this point, it is appropriate to attempt to synthesize all of the preceding strands of research, strands which at times reflect contradictions, at other times simply prove to be incompatible. The goal here is to develop an analytical framework for the study of naturalistically acquired interlanguage prosody which permits the integration of the four major strands evoked so far, e.g., the interpretation of prosodic meanings which incorporates both its paralinguistic and linguistic functions, interactionally-situated discourse analysis, discourse coherence and information structure, all of which need to be integrated within a framework which can account for the structure of oral narratives as well as the particular linguistic features of long-term community residents who are speakers of a stabilized/fossilized interlanguage. With these constraints in mind, the model postulating the four major functions of prosody proposed by Chafe looks quite compatible. Notably, not only is Chafe's intonation unit compatible with Pierrehumbert & Hirschberg's 1990 analysis of the scope of the Intonational Phrase, but it is also compatible with Gumperz' (1982) interaction-sensitive model of contextualization cues. Finally, the Chafe model of prosodic functions can be seen as the prosodic counterpart to Labov's analysis of narrative structure.
Ultimately, I find Wennerstrom’s application of P&H to discourse analysis and to second language speakers’ discourse very useful. I will therefore borrow her paradigm, which is based on the idea that prosody is characterized by four features. It is

a. componential
b. cohesive
c. interactional
d. expressive

In the analysis of prosodic organization of narrative discourse which we will undertake shortly, we will see how these four fundamental features are put to the service of discourse structure and specifically, conversational narrative discourse. With this framework in place, we are now ready to examine substantial excerpts of data to see how well the data fit the framework and how well the framework can explain the data. In Chapter Four, we will be adding an additional component to our framework, namely, the Labovian narrative structure.
Table 2.3.  
INTONATIONAL MEANING in DISCOURSE*  
as addressed by  
(A) Intonational phonologists (B) Phonology/syntax interface scholars (C) Discourse analysts (D) Others

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit of Analysis</th>
<th>PITCH ACCENT</th>
<th>PHRASE PITCH</th>
<th>BOUNDARY TONE</th>
<th>DISCOURSE &amp; INFO ORG. STRUCTURE/ PARATONE &amp; KEY</th>
<th>NON-PHONOCGICAL USE of INTONATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Notation System</td>
<td>(word level)</td>
<td>(phrase level-pitch reset)</td>
<td>(end of utterance)</td>
<td>(increased pitch range at rhetorical junctures to signal topic shift)</td>
<td>(not lang. specific, affective, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proponent/ Meaning attributed</td>
<td>Notation: H*, L*, L*+H, L+H*, H+H*</td>
<td>Notation: intermediate phrase ip (H- or L-)</td>
<td>Notation: Intonation Phrase IP (H% or L%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Pierrehumbert &amp; Hirschberg '90 Beckman &amp; P. '86 Ward &amp; Hirschberg '85</td>
<td>status of discourse referents, modifiers, predicates, relationships; mutual belief space (290)</td>
<td>relatedness of ips, relationship of units to larger interpretive units</td>
<td>directionality of interp.of current IP; 'forward-looking' or not? 4 intonational utterance boundaries w/distinctive meaning re interdep. between utterances. (see Wen2001a:11866)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Gussenhoven '84 Ladd '96</td>
<td>-HL/Fall=basic statmt., intro entity to bkgd, shared knlwdge; -LH/Rise=question; non-commital abt whether entity is bkgd or not; -HLH/Fall-Rise=select entity fn bkgd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit of Analysis</td>
<td>Pitch Accent (word level)</td>
<td>Phrase Pitch (phrase level)</td>
<td>End of utterance Boundary Tone</td>
<td>Discourse &amp; Info Org. Structure/Paratone &amp; Key</td>
<td>Non-phonological use of intonation (not lang. specific; affective, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notation system</td>
<td>H*, L*, etc.</td>
<td>up</td>
<td>(IP H%, L%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proponent/ Meaning Attributed</td>
<td>tone unit</td>
<td>Segment</td>
<td>tone unit</td>
<td>no constant rel. btw. particular acoustic phenomena &amp; analytic category</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Brazil '83, Brazil et al. '80, Coulthard &amp; Brazil '82</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>B</td>
<td>Lehiste'80, Grosz &amp;Hirschberg '92, Swerts '97, Tench '91 (see Wen 2001a:1185; Wen 98:2)</td>
<td>phrase or utterance level not specified constituents are intonationally segmented</td>
<td>utterance level not specified constituents are intonationally segmented</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Halliday (primary unit of int. is clause; no mapping to lex or utterance boundaries (see Wen 98:6)</td>
<td>Reference Substitution Lexical coherence</td>
<td>Conjunction Tone Unit Conjunctives: link chunks</td>
<td>Conjunction</td>
<td>Conjunction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Grosz &amp; Sidner 1986</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit of Analysis</td>
<td>Pitch Accent (word level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notation system:</td>
<td>H*, L*, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proponent/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaning Attributed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Gumperz '82 Gumperz, Kaltman, &amp; O'Connor '84</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Selting '94 CoupKuhl &amp; Selting '96</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Chafe '94, 2000</td>
<td>High pitch on new (focus); deaccent of given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Wen. '94, '98, 2000, 2001a,b</td>
<td>status of items in info. structure w/rel. to assumptions abt H segment discourse hierarchical relations among disc. Constit. at phrase level/ utterance medial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Yule</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Labov</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table is not designed to be an exhaustive analysis of the theories of the authors listed, but rather, a schematic presentation of their analysis of the role of intonation in extended discourse in order to see to what degree the analyses conflict or are compatible. The Pierrehumbert & Hirschberg (1990) framework of intonational meaning and the ToBI notation system are used as a baseline of comparison.
CHAPTER THREE
PROCEDURES AND METHODS

What is the genesis of the problems we study? Somewhere out there lurks ... [the] notion that problems rise up before our eyes in a sort of intellectual equivalent of spontaneous combustion. That is not how it happens.

The 'problem problem' is not embedded within the lives of those whom we study, demurely waiting to be discovered. Quite the opposite: We instigate the problems we investigate [emphasis in the original].

Harry F. Wolcott (1995: 156)

The critical art in all observation is achieved not in the act of observing but in recognizing when something of significance has been observed.

Harry F. Wolcott (1995:162)

3.1 General description of the research project

This is a study of the communicative accomplishments of long-term resident immigrant second language learners with only marginal proficiency in English, based on audio- and video-taped recordings made in 1997 and 1998 of narratives told by Korean immigrants working in the hotel industry in Waikīkī. The analysis demonstrates the important role of intonational and prosodic features in supplementing these narrators' limited English lexico-syntactic resources and in achieving coherence at the discourse level.

It is a study not so much of what the narrators accomplish (that they accomplish the story-telling is taken as a given), but of how they accomplish it despite limited linguistic resources. Several characteristics of the learners and their language learning and language use situate this study within the small collection of studies devoted to
immigrant, untutored adult language acquirers discussed earlier in Chapter One (D.J. Lee 1972; Perdue 1984; Schmidt 1983; Sohn 1986 [1980]; Schumann 1975, 1978; Huebner 1983; Kumpf 1986; Goldstein 1991, 1992; Peirce 1993; Pendakur 1992; Burnaby & Cumming 1992; Peirce, Harper & Burnaby 1993; Long 1997). These characteristics include the following: (1) the six learners are long-term residents of the host community (at the time of the recordings, two of the narrators had accumulated around 25 years of continuous residency in Honolulu, three had around 15 years of residency and the most recent arrival had nine years of residency); (2) none of the six learners has had extensive classroom instruction in English; they all acquired English 'naturalistically', i.e., on the job and through use in the community; (3) they have only a basic educational level (of the six, only one completed high school in Korea; the others completed only middle school). (For specific details on the extent of each learner's formal English language learning experiences, see Table 3.2. Korean narrators' personal data, in section 3.2.2, below.)

These characteristics of the learners and their language learning experiences (long-term resident immigrants who have acquired the target language naturalistically) in turn contribute to several unique aspects of this study: (1) the analysis is based on learners who have received only limited structured input of the type offered in language classes, in contrast to the majority of studies in second language acquisition which study the acquisition of classroom learners; and (2) the analysis is based on data collected from long-term residents, the assumption being that they have reached their maximum attainment in English.
This study thus differs from others conducted with adult immigrant language learners (e.g., Schumann 1975, 1978; the ESF project as explained in Perdue 1984, 1993a, 1993b; Huebner 1982, Schmidt 1983) in that it does not look at developmental processes, nor at the syntactic or lexical inventory. Rather, it takes the paucity of the syntax and lexicon as the starting point and goes on to ask what can be accomplished communicatively with these limited resources and how one accomplishes it. One of the primary goals of this study is thus to document the creativity and reveal the components of the English language communicative competence of immigrants who have not attained ‘proficiency’ or anything remotely resembling ‘target-like usage’ after long-term residency and interaction with the local community. Lacking sophisticated syntax and a rich lexicon, what alternative linguistic resources do they draw on to convey relatively complex story lines and nuances of meaning and affect?

Ultimately, (to give away the end of the story), the study demonstrates that these long-term Hawai‘i residents have learned to use prosodic resources to communicate on a variety of topics in English, despite their incontrovertible low oral proficiency in the English language. The narratives upon which this study is based have a contribution to make to linguistic theory and to the practice of ‘doing linguistics’. There is a quite natural tendency in second language acquisition studies, whether conducted for theoretical or applied purposes, to be dominated by measurements of learners’ acquisition of the ‘target language’ and the attainment of ‘proficiency’ or native speaker-like ‘accuracy’. However, pursuing an ideology which takes target-like production as the unit of measurement creates a ‘deficiency model’ of the language learner and draws researchers’ attention
away from consideration of the overall communicative competence of the language learner who has not attained a high level of 'proficiency' by standard tests of syntactic complexity or phonological or lexical accuracy, but who can nevertheless communicate affectively and cognitively complex ideas. In an effort to discover how it is that language learners such as those whose voices are 'heard' through these pages are able to accomplish complex narrative tasks, this study has explicitly attempted to avoid a proficiency-based approach at every stage of the process, from data collection procedures through transcription and up through analysis and final interpretation.

The narrative excerpts presented here make the extent of the limitations of the linguistic resources of these Korean immigrants quite salient. The interesting story is not their limitations, however, but rather, the resources which these immigrants draw on to tell their tales, resources which are rarely brought to light in proficiency-based analyses.

The study was based on a qualitative approach at several levels. A 'qualitative approach' can imply a range of perspectives and practices, but here I use it to describe an approach grounded in an analytical perspective which holds that language phenomena are the product of language in use, use which is itself socially constructed in complex, interconnected ways. A qualitative approach is admittedly and intentionally subjective, but that subjectivity is circumscribed by safeguards of validity in the form of acts of triangulation, whereby multiple sources are brought to bear on the analysis, and insights from a single informant, or from the researcher, are weighed against insights from other relevant informants. A qualitative approach is not discrete and static; questions are not framed in advance of confrontation with the data in terms of explicit, testable hypotheses.
A qualitative approach assumes that the research, and indeed the research questions themselves, are engendered by and will be informed by an ongoing recursive process of data collection, data analysis, data interpretation, and further data collection, analysis and interpretation. (For extensive discussions of perspectives and research issues in the qualitative approach, see, inter alia, Briggs 1986; Glesne & Peshkin 1992; Wolcott 1995; Coffey & Atkinson 1996; Maxwell 1996; Denzin & Lincoln 1994, 1998a, 1998b, 1998c; Silverman 1997, 2000, 2001.)

These central precepts of the qualitative approach informed this study at all stages, from the conceptualization of the research question, throughout the collection of the data, and on up through the analysis and interpretation of the findings. With respect to the generation of the research question, one of the key pillars of qualitative research is to allow the research to be driven by the data (e.g., as Silverman (2001:x) says, the researcher should be 'challenged, even surprised' by the data), rather than forcing the data into preconceived paradigms. In the narrative analysis sections of this study, I have used primarily a discourse analytic approach, which is essentially a data-driven approach. In addition, however, I have attempted to integrate another key pillar of the qualitative approach, but one which is more interpretive and ethnographic in nature, namely, consideration of the social and intersubjective contexts which affected the nature of the relations between the study's participants (both the researcher and the narrators). These contexts no doubt influenced the conditions under which the data were produced and are therefore deemed highly relevant to a responsible interpretation of the data. In the
description which follows, the aspects of this study which fall within the qualitative paradigm should become apparent.

The study was initially conceived as an ethnography of language use and language learning practices and as a survey of the linguistic attainments of long-term resident immigrants who had learned English naturalistically, e.g., on the job and through accumulated daily living experiences without significant classroom language learning experience and who had 'fossilized' in their language acquisition at a relatively low level. The study was undertaken with the expectation that it would contribute to linguists' understanding of two perennial mysteries: 'What [individual and/or social] factors explain the wide variation in proficiency attained by second language learners?' and 'What does emergent natural grammar look like?'

As the field work, data collection, and preliminary data analysis progressed, however, it became increasingly apparent that several less-frequently asked and even more intriguing questions related to second language discourse could be illuminated by this data, namely: How is emergent second language discourse structured? How do adult speakers of a second language with only limited vocabulary at their disposal and with virtually no formal study of the syntax of the target language manage to communicate? To be successful communicators, what para-linguistic and non-linguistic resources do these adults draw on? In more general terms, how important are such resources in the ultimate communicative achievements of second language learners with limited linguistic proficiency in the target language? As competent adult speakers of their native language, what cognitive resources and what aspects of their communicative repertoire do adult
language learners draw on, e.g., how do they make use of such communicative resources as expectations of shared knowledge with other adult speakers, experience with normal conversational routines such as turn-taking, topic selection, and temporal or causal sequencing of events?

Data collection consisted of eliciting personal narratives on a variety of topics. Despite the obvious paucity of syntactic complexity and the lack of lexical variety, the growing corpus of undeniably moving stories from the field and the experience of having spent hours of what I knew to have been genuine communication at my research site, I was motivated to probe beyond the most obvious linguistic components to discover how these ‘non-proficient’ language learners had managed to communicate their stories so effectively to me. The key question emerged: What enabled the listener to ‘make sense’ of such scrambled ‘sentences’ which fit no predetermined syntactic structures? The answer lies in the prosodic cues.

The vividness, the humor, the poignancy and the affective and referential complexity of the tales told by these Korean immigrants, rendered more salient by their linguistic simplicity, present a compelling argument for an increased focus by language scholars on some of the complex and less accessible aspects of language which do not come under the rubric of ‘formal components’.
3.2 Context of the study

3.2.1 Community environment

In Chapter One (note #1) a rather detailed discussion was provided of the linguistic makeup of Honolulu, where this study was conducted. In both Chapters One and Two, attention was given to the widespread use of the local vernacular, Hawai‘i Creole English, as well as a variety of American English known as Hawai‘i Standard English. The multi-cultural and multi-lingual aspects of the community were emphasized there, and mention was made of the fact that there is a substantial population of Koreans in Honolulu, as is evident to even casual passers-by who cannot help but notice the frequent signs written in Korean. These facts notwithstanding, Honolulu is a community which could nevertheless be considered an English-speaking community, in the sense that most of the public life is conducted in English, or one of the local varieties.

In the section below, details on the Korean community of Hawai‘i will be provided, as the social and linguistic vitality of this community is directly relevant to the context of the narrators' language learning and language use. (See Giles, Bourhis & Taylor 1977; Giles & Byrne 1982; Giles, Coupland & Coupland 1991 for detailed discussions of the concept of linguistic vitality.)

3.2.1.1 Korean presence in the local community

Although there are documents attesting to the presence of a handful of individual Korean traders living in Hawai‘i in the late 1890's (Patterson 1988), the Korean presence in Hawai‘i officially dates back to exactly 100 years ago, 1903, the year in which a group
of 102 Korean plantation workers debarked in Honolulu. Hawai‘i had been annexed to the United States in 1898 and by 1903, the importation of foreign laborers came under jurisdiction of the United States. The Korean laborers had been recruited at the behest of the Hawaii Sugar Planters Association (HSPA), in large part to offset the increasingly important influence of the Japanese laborers and to compensate for the exclusion of Chinese laborers, as specified by the U.S. Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882. (See Patterson 1988, Patterson 1979, Patterson 2000, and Choe (forthcoming) for a full discussion of the conditions surrounding the recruitment of the first Korean plantation laborers and the early years of Korean immigration.) For the past 100 years, Koreans have maintained a relatively small but dynamic community in Hawai‘i, despite a high rate of out-marriage with other ethnic groups (Patterson 1988, 1979, 2000; Rhodes 1998; Nundyke 1988; Yang 1996; Shin & Lee; see Kwon 1999:8-15 for a brief but insightful analysis of the history of the Korean presence in Hawai‘i). In 1990, out of the total population in the state of slightly over 1,000,000 persons, 24,454 persons living in Hawai‘i reported themselves to be Korean, of which 14,820 indicated that they were born abroad (U.S. Bureau of the Census 1990; Hawaii State Data Center 1993; also cited in Manicas 1996). This corresponds to 2.2% of the total population of the state, or 3.6% of the population originating in Asia or the Pacific Islands, figures which can be compared with those for the other ethnic groups from Asia and the Pacific Islands, which in total represented 61.8% of the population of the state. The Asia-Pacific population breaks down into the following percentages: Japanese at 36.1%, Hawaiians at 20.2%, Filipinos at 24.6%, Chinese at 10%, Samoans at 2.2% and 3.3% identified as ‘Other’ (Hawaii State Data
As mentioned above (Chapter One, note #1) according to the 2000 Census, the proportion of Koreans in Hawai‘i declined by 3.7% from 1990, (decreasing in raw numbers from 24,454 persons who reported being Korean in 1990 to 23,537 persons in 2002). However, using the mixed-race category which was introduced in the 2000 census, 41,352 persons in the state reported being of Korean heritage (U.S. Census Bureau, Summary File 1 Hawaii (July 25, 2001), cited in State of Hawai‘i 2001:55).

In the U.S. Census of 1980 (the time period corresponding most closely to the arrival dates of the Koreans appearing in this study, five of whom arrived between 1972 and 1985, with the sixth arriving in 1989), polled a total of 16,287 persons in Hawai‘i stating Korean as their ethnic origin (Hawaii State Data Center 1988:Table 25, page 4.1), and of these, 9,434 stated that they were ‘foreign-born’, the presumption being that for the overwhelming majority of these ‘foreign-born’, Korea was their place of origin (Hawaii State Data Center 1988:Table 27, page 4.3). Of the foreign-born, 3,674 were listed as naturalized citizens and 5,760 as non-citizens (Hawaii State Data Center 1988: DLS725 Table 19, page 3.3; Table 73, page 10.1).

Table 3.1., below, provides an overview of this statistical information, including figures from the U.S. Census 2000, when available.

3.2.1.2 Korean language resources in the local community

Today, first-generation Korean immigrants such as those whose narratives are featured in this study, i.e., immigrants who are not proficient in spoken English and who
have limited literacy in English, access to Korean-speaking resources in nearly every aspect of their daily lives is available in Honolulu. Koreans can obtain health-care

TABLE 3.1.
Statistics on Korean population in Hawai‘i 1980-2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1980(^a)</th>
<th>1990(^b)</th>
<th>2000(^d)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of persons of Korean heritage(^c)</td>
<td>16,287</td>
<td>24,454</td>
<td>23,537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. over age 25</td>
<td>10,631</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Koreans in total population (both U.S.-born and foreign-born)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2.2% (3.6% of all Asia-Pacific groups)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. over age 25 speaking only English</td>
<td>4,426</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. over age 25 speaking other language(s)</td>
<td>6,183</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. foreign-born Koreans(^d)</td>
<td>9,434</td>
<td>14,820</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. foreign-born U.S. citizens</td>
<td>3,674</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. foreign-born non-U.S. citizens</td>
<td>5,760</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koreans 18 and over (N = 12,873) speaking a language other than English at home</td>
<td>7,309</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koreans 18 and over who do not speak English well or not at all</td>
<td>2,846</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Source: Hawaii State Data Center 1988, Tables 19, 25, 27, 28 and 73  
\(^b\) Source: Hawaii State Data Center 1993, no pg. no.  
\(^c\) This number includes foreign-born immigrant residents (both citizens and non-citizens), as well as persons born in Hawai‘i or other U.S. states who identified themselves as being of Korean or part-Korean heritage.  
\(^e\) Number of people in Hawai‘i self-reporting themselves as having Korean heritage in the ‘mixed race’ category of the U.S. Census of 2000.  
\(^f\) This number includes adoptees and others who immigrated at a young age.

services, legal advice, and banking services from native Korean-speaking professionals.

They can consult Korean-speaking real estate agents and travel agents; they can shop in Korean-speaking video stores, bookstores, and grocery stores which prominently feature a wide range of Korean products; they can call one of several Korean-speaking taxi dispatchers and be assured of having a Korean-speaking driver with whom they can communicate; they can go to Korean barbers and hairdressers or to Korean-owned
convenience stores and liquor stores; they can obtain the services of a Korean carpenter, plumber, auto mechanic, tailor, dressmaker, shoe repair, luggage repair shop, or tailor; they can send their children to Korean language classes on Saturdays at one of the Korean Community Schools and to academic tutoring centers run by Koreans; patrons of all ages can check out books from the sizeable Korean language collection donated by local Korean benefactors to the Mo‘ili‘ili branch of the state's library system, they can pursue leisure activities including golf, fitness training, ballroom dance lessons, traditional Korean dance lessons, piano lessons, and karaoke [no-lae bang] evenings in locales where other Koreans congregate. And of course, they can dine in any of the hundreds of local restaurants of all categories owned and run by Korean entrepreneurs. (For extensive, although not exhaustive listings, see annual publications such as the Korean Business Directory 1999-2000, which contains 229 pages of listings of businesses, clubs, churches, and other associations on the island of O‘ahu which are either owned by Koreans or cater to the local Korean population, or the Korean Business Telephone Directory 1998 with 171 pages of such listings.)

In terms of the media, one local television station (KBFD) broadcasts approximately 12 hours a day in Korean, including both locally produced news coverage and commercial advertising from businesses seeking to cater to a Korean clientele, as well as delayed feed broadcasts of morning and evening news, dramas and features directly from Korea. Several of the serialized drama programs received from Korea are subtitled in English, comprising approximately three hours of the daily broadcast fare. These dramas are extremely popular with local residents, to the point that 'Korean drama
fan clubs' have reportedly been organized, the main activity being members gathering at one home to watch the broadcasts together. In addition to their popular appeal and general entertainment value, these dramas serve to familiarize non-Koreans in the Honolulu community with Korean values and contemporary lifestyle. A second local television station (KIKU) is dedicated exclusively to broadcasts in the languages other than English spoken by sizeable minorities in the community. On this channel approximately two hours of Korean language religious programming are broadcast each day, the remainder of the airtime being devoted to Japanese, Cantonese, Mandarin and Filipino language broadcasts.

Since November 1998, there has been a locally-produced affiliate of Radio Seoul, now owned by the Hankook Ilbo publishing company, which transmits Korean language radio programs 18 hours a day. The print media is also relatively well represented. Available on the local newsstands are localized versions of two major Korean language daily newspapers: The Hankook Ilbo (known in English as The Korea Times) is formatted for U.S. distribution in Los Angeles, but contains at least two local pages. The Joong Ang Ilbo publishing company also publishes a localized Korean language daily under the name of Korea Central Daily of Hawaii (also available online at joonganghi.com), along with comparable versions for other North American cities having sizeable Korean populations (e.g., Los Angeles, New York, San Francisco, Chicago, Seattle, Washington, D.C. and Vancouver). Both Joong Ang Ilbo and Hankook Ilbo maintain local offices and locally-based reporters in Honolulu.
In addition to numerous social and fraternal Korean-speaking associations, there are over 140 Korean-speaking religious congregations, among which several of those established early in the century played an exceedingly important role in shaping the social and political fabric of the Korean-speaking immigrant community of Hawai‘i. The Korean government in exile under Japanese occupation was substantially supported by contributions from the plantation workers in Hawai‘i, who were organized for political purposes through church leaders. The first president of liberated Korea after World War II, Syngman Rhee, lived mostly in Hawai‘i for the period from 1913-1941. Holding advanced degrees from both Harvard and Yale, he became a well-known educator and church leader. Both his leading role as founder of a non-denominational church, which became known as the Korean Christian Church of Hawai‘i in 1918 (and which still uses facilities erected on Liliha Street in 1938) and his political activism (through the Dong-ji Hoe Society [Comrade Society]) in the Korean immigrant community helped him establish a strong nationalistic political base which eventually propelled him into the presidency of South Korea. Opposing Syngman Rhee and his activities in Hawai‘i was Park Yong-man, who was affiliated with the Kuk Min Hoe [Korean National Association] and a rival church group based at the Korean Methodist Church (located on Ke‘eaumoku Street), and who argued for a more confrontational and militaristic stance toward Japan and its occupation of Korea. (For further details on the political factions in the Korean community in the early part of the 20th century, see Choe forthcoming; Patterson 2000; Yang 1982; Kwon 1999; the television documentary Hawaii Arirang 2000; Chang’s 1997 film The Legacy of Kuk Min Hur: The Korean
Due to the active role of Korean church leaders in mobilizing their compatriots among the plantation workers, the Korean government in exile under Japanese occupation was substantially supported by contributions from the Korean community of Hawai‘i and the Korean immigrants in Hawai‘i are seen by historians as having played a critical role in the maintenance of the Korean identity during the 36 years of Japanese occupation (1910-1945). Patterson (2000) describes this role in the following terms:

Korea had been an independent country for more than a millennium prior to the twentieth century and had in the course of its long history developed its own unique culture and civilization. For Japan to rob Korea of its independence and identity by annexing it in 1910 was to invite a resistance movement of massive proportions not only among Koreans there, but also among those living outside the country. The Koreans in Hawai‘i were no exception, and they threw themselves into the nationalist movement with a fervor unmatched by any other overseas nationalist movement (100).

After Korea's political independence was restored at the end of World War II, political activism in the affairs of state in Korea substantially diminished among the Korean immigrant community of Hawai‘i. If anything, the support is running in the other direction, i.e., the Korean government and individual Korean citizens endeavor to raise the profile of Korea through contributions of various types to communities numbering substantial Korean immigrants in the U.S. The Center for Korean Studies at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa, for instance, received considerable initial funding for construction costs from the Korea Foundation, an agency of the government of Korea, with the stated goal of fostering research programs contributing to raising awareness of Korean history and culture among the general public as well as among scholars in Hawai‘i.
Many Koreans in Hawai‘i, even after becoming U.S. citizens, maintain strong family ties to Korea and return to Korea for regular visits. Five of the six Korean immigrants in my study have members of their extended family in Hawai‘i or on the Mainland U.S., and one has deep historical roots to Hawai‘i, being married to the grandson of one of the immigrants to arrive in the first wave of Korean plantation workers (see Chapter Two, note #24).

3.2.1.3 Language practices in the Waikiki-based tourism sector

In addition to the existence of a very dynamic and vibrant local Korean community, also relevant to this study and to the language context of the Korean narrators is the fact that it is customary for employees of the visitor industry, which is concentrated in the Waikiki ‘tourist ghetto’, to use Hawaiian words with hotel guests as often as possible, in order to convey ‘a sense of place’ and the spirit of ‘aloha’ and Hawaiian hospitality. Describing a television commercial which appeared in the 1980s urging the local population to ‘keep the aloha spirit’, Kwon (1999) states that ‘this commercial confirmed the commodification of the aloha spirit, blurring the line between a way of life and the need to sell oneself for the sake of the island’s economic survival’ (7).

The contexts in which the Hawaiian language is used in Waikiki contrasts markedly with its use in the general community outside of Waikiki, where Hawaiian words are used primarily by people both familiar with local Hawaiian history and aware of the symbolic impact involved in speaking Hawaiian. When a ‘local’ uses Hawaiian words that are not
part of the HCE lexicon, it implies the assertion of one's own Hawaiian heritage and/or support for the revitalization of the Hawaiian language. If used by a non-Hawaiian, the integration of Hawaiian words into a conversation implies local roots or an affiliation with local values, manifesting itself through symbolic linguistic actions. (See Kwon 1999:6-8 for an insightful discussion of 'local identity' and local culture's 'resistance to tourism'.)

All of the Korean narrators featured in this study are employed in the Waikiki tourist industry and are thus exposed to this sometimes subtle, sometimes explicit 'language policy' of the visitor industry and to the promotion of the Hawaiian language as one of the components of the vacation package in Hawai'i containing 'the aloha spirit' and presumed to be desirable by the hotel's customers, the tourists. (For further information on the promotion of Hawaiian cultural values in the hotel industry, see Kanahele 1991; Lynch 1997; Jasso-Aguilar 1999:45; Ryan 1999.) At the hotel chain which employs the Koreans featured here, 95% of the clientele is reported to come to Hawai'i for leisure activities, and of those a full 40% are repeat visitors. 65% of the guests are from the U.S. or Canada and 20% are from Asia and Japan (Roig 1997:G1). The Korean employees are acutely aware that their jobs depend on hotel occupancy levels, customer satisfaction and the general state of the tourist industry in Waikiki, which has been suffering a decline in recent years (see Kayal 1999:A1, A11). During the period of observation for this study, these Koreans had the sobering experience of witnessing several previously full-time long-time co-workers with less seniority (under 10 years) being put on an 'on call' basis and reduced to being given only sporadic, part-time work,
due to the drop-off in hotel occupancy. That a link existed between general economic
trends, customer satisfaction and job security was clearly reflected in the waxing and
waning attendance numbers at the morning briefings and in the absences of 'on-call'
employees on days when occupancy was low. While the maids are not generally privy to
high level management considerations and decisions, during the morning briefings they
are repeatedly told how important their role is in guest satisfaction and they are made to
feel that they contribute significantly to the overall profitability of the hotel. In general,
the maids are relatively satisfied with their wages and benefits, which are slightly above
par for the hourly wage in the industry, and both in private and in public express loyalty
to the company they work for. They are all long-term employees who hope to work there
until retirement and they do not wish to see their jobs jeopardized. As none of the
employees at this particular hotel, run as a family business, are unionized, job security is
their major concern. Their major complaint (expressed in the form of informal
'grumbling') is the increase in number of rooms they have to clean each day (which was
17 at the time the field work was conducted) and the resultant stress and physical fatigue
they incur.

The maids thus do not lightly dismiss management's encouragements to use
Hawaiian words whenever possible in order to enhance guests' appreciation of the hotel's
sense of hospitality. On the floors and in interactions with non-Koreans they do, in fact,
intersperse simple Hawaiian words into their speech habits (e.g., mahalo 'thank you', pau
'all done, finished', keiki 'child, children'). In the hotels where these Korean narrators
work, simple Hawaiian terms of greeting and appreciation and references to local
customs are used regularly by the members of the housekeeping department management team during daily morning briefings. Hawaiian words are also found in written form in multilingual (English, Japanese, Hawaiian) signs posted on walls and in elevators around the hotels. Hawaiian sayings are also posted in the employee lunchroom, with English translations, and such things as the employees' values statement are titled with Hawaiian words. All hotel employees are expected to attend a minimum number of hours per year of Hawaiian culture appreciation classes which are regularly organized by the hotel management as part of its in-service training. Occasional field-trips to sites of historical importance in Hawai‘i are scheduled at company expense, which employees are encouraged to participate in. Various other public displays of Hawaiian or Polynesian culture are periodically scheduled to which both tourists and hotel employees are invited (e.g., Friday morning employee poolside hula performance for hotel guests, periodic demonstrations of Hawaiian craft techniques in the hotel lobbies, formal Polynesian rituals of gift-giving and inauguration blessings on the occasion of hotel milestones).

Overall, it could be said that the promotion of the Hawaiian language and representations of Hawaiian culture, albeit in token form packaged for tourist consumption, constitute a background context in the working lives of the Korean immigrants employed in Waikīkī.

At the particular hotel chain where I conducted my research, among the multilingual, multinational housekeeping staff consisting of locals, Koreans, Chinese, Filipinos, and occasionally Japanese, one or the other local varieties of English and/or pidgin is the actual lingua franca, however. When housekeeping office staff, all of whom are non-native speakers of English, speak to each other, considerable mutual linguistic
accommodation takes place. They generally use a variety of English-as-a-second-language which reflects both features from their respective native languages and HCE..

On occasions when representatives from corporate management come to the department (e.g., the General Manager to commend the staff for excellent performance on an inspection; the company president to celebrate a long-time employee's retirement; someone from the personnel department to explain health care plan options), as they are all speakers of standard American English, members of the housekeeping staff who can, endeavor to speak a more acrolectal variety of English. In particular, the Executive Housekeeper, a non-native speaker of English, is very conscientious in trying to produce written memos for her superiors in flawless standard English.

When the Filipino, Chinese and Korean housekeepers speak to each other, it is usually in an idiosyncratic pidgin, with occasional code-mixing of words from one or the other interlocutor's language when known, in attempts to show solidarity. The Filipino and Korean terms of address are among the most frequently heard (e.g., from Korean, ajumoni or ajumma 'woman' and ajossi 'man', and from Filipino manong, as a term of address referring to 'man, sir' and manang as a term of address referring to 'woman, ma'am'). Other borrowings frequently heard from the Filipinos and the Chinese are the words ob-so-yo 'there is none' (Korean) and sumi-masen 'excuse me' (Japanese). Within the Housekeeping Department, the nickname 'Sumi-masen' is sometimes used as a playful term of address for one of the female Korean housekeeping clerks who has a Japanese husband. Occasions for exolingual chatting between the Chinese, Filipino and Korean housekeepers include early morning encounters during check-in and while
waiting for the morning briefings to start. Other occasional opportunities arise for informal interaction, as for example, at after-work parties scheduled in honor of a retiring employee, at potluck events on major holidays for those who have to work that day, or during special events scheduled during National Housekeepers Recognition Week. In general, however, I did not observe a great deal of lateral exolingual conversation between the housekeepers themselves, except for the exchange of pleasantries.

Much more frequent and more consequential were exolingual interactions in English between the floor housekeepers and members of the housekeeping office staff regarding matters directly related to daily job performance (e.g., clarification of procedures for using a new type of room key, reactions to issuance of new uniforms, requests for help in filling out forms). The housekeeping office staff, consisting of several clerks who rotate duty hours in order to provide 24-hour-a-day coverage to handle phone requests and queries from guests, as well as one Assistant Executive Housekeeper, two Assistant Housekeepers, and several employees at the rank of Housekeeper, are all non-native speakers of English. They are generally themselves former floor housekeepers who have moved up the ranks of responsibility and, crucially, who have a sufficient command of English to be able to handle any face-to-face or phone interaction with hotel guests in English.

The Executive Housekeeper, a member of the corporate management team, is responsible for the housekeeping departments at several hotels, but her head office was located at my primary research site. The Executive Housekeeper is a native speaker of Korean; under her direct supervision at the time I conducted my research were the
various office staff members mentioned above, among whom were one Chinese and two
Koreans. Several Filipinos, who switch easily between pidgin, HCE and Hawai‘i
Standard English as the communicative situation requires, were also members of the
housekeeping management staff, working as assistant housekeepers or clerks. This
multinational and multilingual composition of the office staff is by design. The linguistic
resources of the housekeeping office means that housekeepers, who in general have a
much more limited proficiency in English, can call on one of these bi-/multi-lingual staff
resources should any problem arise in oral communications with guests or if there is a
need to read or write English (e.g., to fill out a request for an unscheduled day off for
personal reasons, to choose a health care plan, to file a report about a lost and found item
from one of the rooms, etc.).

Furthermore, as an additional accommodation to its multilingual staff and in
recognition of their limited English literacy, the hotel corporate office provides Chinese
and Korean translations of the weekly company newsletter, averaging eight pages in
length, which consists of items such as the corporate perspective on political issues
related to the tourism industry (e.g., a pending state legislature vote on visitor taxation),
company news (e.g., upcoming health fair, hiring of new staff at the corporate level,
retrospective account of significant moments of company history and development),
encouragement of employees to participate in local civic affairs (e.g., reminders to vote in
upcoming elections, exhortations to participate in making the company float for a local
parade), Hawaiiana (Hawaiian legends or historical facts related to Hawai‘i), recognition
of employee achievements and significant milestones, notices of retirement, births and
deaths, in-house employment opportunities and letters of commendation from satisfied guests. While the company newsletter is, of course, an organ through which the company can convey any desired corporate policies, providing the newsletter in Chinese and Korean undeniably contributes to employees' loyalty to the company and constitutes a not insignificant practical and psychological gesture of accommodation in terms of the housekeepers' sense of 'ohana, or inclusion. In terms of potential for language learning opportunities for the immigrant housekeepers, having a translated version of the newsletter also eliminates one other potentially significant domain in the work experience for which English language proficiency would be required.

3.2.1.4 Language practices outside of Waikīkī

In the larger community of local residents beyond Waikīkī, where the Koreans spend their lives when they are not working, both Hawaiian and Hawai‘i Creole English play important roles. Significant strides are being made by community and university activists to increase the use of the Hawaiian language in domains of both practical and symbolic importance to the supporters of the Hawaiian language revitalization movement (see, inter alia, Silva 1989; Viotti 1998; Wilson 1998; Wilson and Kamanā; Warner 1996, 1998, 1999a, 199b, 2001; Wong 1999a). Hawaiian is now the medium of instruction at all grade levels for families who opt to send their children to Hawaiian language schools and the first cohort of eleven students to be educated entirely in the Hawaiian language in over 100 years graduated from high school in 1999 (see Whitney 1999). There are currently nine Pūnana Leo preschools and 16 immersion schools, with a total of 5,000 to
6,000 students and family members committed to speaking Hawaiian (Heckathorn 1999). Although the domains in which English dominates currently far outnumber those in which Hawaiian is used and this will continue to be the case into the foreseeable future (in the 1990 U.S. census, for example, only 8,872 persons reported speaking Hawaiian in the home (State of Hawai‘i 1998:52), and Wilson (1998) estimates that there are less than 1,000 ‘highly fluent speakers of Hawaiian’ still alive (125)), the resurgence of the Hawaiian language in community and public spheres is nevertheless a significant element in the overall picture of the linguistic situation in Hawai‘i.

A significant proportion of the population of Hawai‘i also speaks the language of local identity as its first language in the home and in everyday social interactions. For many island residents, it is their primary spoken language throughout most of their lives. In local parlance, this language is referred to as ‘pidgin English’ or simply ‘pidgin’, carrying over the term by which it was initially known. The pidgin has now creolized and is, in fact, no longer a ‘pidgin’. Linguists have given it the designation ‘Hawai‘i Creole English’ (HCE), to reflect its origins and current typology. (See fuller discussion in Chapter Two, section 2.3.2.2.) In addition to influences from Japanese, English, and languages of other immigrants to the islands since the 1820s, HCE incorporates many structures and terms inherited directly from Hawaiian. (See Siegel 2000 for a discussion of substrate influence in HCE.) Although in the 1990 U.S. census only about 1,000 people in Hawai‘i reported speaking Pidgin (48 reported speaking 'Hawaiian Pidgin' and 968 reported speaking 'Pidgin'), as noted above, this is far from a reflection of actual reality. According to Grimes (2002), Hawai‘i Creole English counts ‘600,000 speakers or
more, half of the state population...including 100,000 to 200,000 who have limited control of Standard English and near Standard English’ [online Ethnologue, citing 1986 M. Forman as source]3. This under-identification on the census by half of the state’s population is due in large part to the social status of ‘Pidgin’ as a denigrated form of English not considered to be a language in its own right and therefore not deserving of mention on an official government document. (See Sato 1985, Sato 1991 and Wong 1999:205-209; 220 regarding the status and local denigration of the status of Pidgin; see also Kwon 1999:6.) Pidgin, in fact, enjoys considerable prestige in the local community, albeit covert prestige.

The Korean immigrants whose narratives figure prominently in this study have ample opportunity to be exposed to local Pidgin English and in fact, it would not be unreasonable to make the case that they have more exposure to Pidgin English than to standard English in their everyday lives. (See discussion on this point in Chapter Two, section 2.3.2.) Readers familiar with Hawai‘i Creole English will no doubt recognize some features of local Pidgin in the narratives presented here. Whether these HCE features are representative of the speakers’ own idiosyncratic varieties of a pidgin or whether they are indicative of at least partial acquisition of local Pidgin remains an open question. (Recall that the term 'pidgin' is capitalized when it is used as the local designation referring to Hawai‘i Creole English, but it is given in lowercase spelling when referring to the generic linguistic definition of a pidgin language. See Chapter 2, Note #16.) However, the relatively limited number of HCE features in the narratives (frequent examples of which are yeah?, the ubiquitous tag question and
discourse marker already to signify completed past action; no more to signify 'no' or 'none'; and 'em'/um as the generalized third person singular pronoun), along with the near total absence of significant and salient formal HCE features, as discussed in Chapter Two, would seem to support the argument that these speakers have simply incorporated some frequently heard HCE lexical items into the repertoire they use when speaking English.

3.2.2. Profiles of the Korean narrators

The six Korean immigrants whose narratives constitute the corpus of this study each have quite different personalities, lifestyles and narrative abilities. They do have a number of traits in common, however. They are all long-term immigrants, the duration of their stays ranging from nine to twenty-six years at the time the recordings were made. They all immigrated as adults to Hawai‘i between the ages of 34 and 50 and their ages at the time of the study ranged from 51 to 63. None were highly educated at home in Korea. Of the six, five have only a middle-school level of education. One, the most recent, arrival, is a high school graduate. All of their children are at least high school graduates however, and many of their children have gone on to higher education. Five of them have American citizenship. All are married with children, although two of the women are now widows. All but one have members of their extended family living in either Hawai‘i or the Mainland U.S. They are all long-term employees and have worked at the same hotel in Waikīkī; the women work as housekeepers ('room maids') and the men as custodians and general maintenance personnel (called 'housemen' at that particular hotel, presumably
by analogy with the term 'housekeeper'). Individual profiles of each of the narrators follow, with their ages at date of arrival in Hawai‘i and at the time of the recordings, respectively, listed in parentheses.

**Young-Eun** (31/57)

Many details were provided in Chapter Two regarding Young-Eun’s language usage, her family composition and the long history of the family’s ties to Hawai‘i, dating to the first boatload of Korean immigrants who arrived in 1903. Young-Eun is a native of Seoul who immigrated to Hawai‘i in 1972. She began working at the hotel in 1981 and because of her accrued seniority (18 years), she does not anticipate being laid off in the wake of Hawai‘i’s economic downturn; she hopes to continue working full-time for the same employer until her retirement in a few years. Young-Eun is a very vivacious, talkative woman who has a flair for dramatic storytelling and frequently peppers her conversations with HCE terms, indicating that she is accustomed to interacting with locals. Her overall proficiency is quite low, however, and most of her utterances consist of isolated words strung together in a telegraphic style.

**Sun Ja** (34/58)

Of the six narrators, Sun Ja is the one whose English literacy skills are the most limited. However, she is a very verbal and loquacious informant, who loves to ‘talk story’. It required very little if any prompting to elicit elaborate narratives from her and most of Sun Ja’s narratives which appear in this study were comments she contributed
without specific prompting. During a background interview conducted for this study, her college-age daughter stated that during high school all her friends 'loved' to come over to the house because her mom was always friendly and talkative.

Sun Ja is originally from one of Korea's major cities, Kwangju, South Cholla province. She immigrated to Hawai'i in 1974 with her husband and two small sons. A third child, her daughter, was born in Hawai'i. Family members preceded them to Hawai'i, so they had a network to help them get settled in their early months. Times were difficult and money was scarce, however, as they had used all of their family resources to pay for the plane tickets for four people to come to Hawai'i. Sun Ja’s husband immediately found work in Honolulu at an automobile body repair shop when they first arrived, but Sun Ja held several different jobs between 1974 and 1983, when she started her job as a hotel housekeeper. Some of the details of her job search and previous employment experiences are given in the ‘First Month Hard’ and ‘Saimin House’ narratives. (See Appendix E.)

Sun Ja and her family have worked hard and have saved up enough over the years to purchase their own home in Hawai'i Kai, one of the more upscale residential neighborhoods in Honolulu. Sun Ja’s husband is active in promoting an amateur folk dance group within the local Korean community of Honolulu which often performs in local parades and at other local events commemorating local ethnic cultures. Sun Ja’s daughter has taken Korean dance classes and regularly participates in public performances of traditional Korean dances given by the Halla Huhm Dance Studio, the legacy of a professional Korean dancer who immigrated to Hawai'i. As an undergraduate
student, Sun Ja’s daughter also studied Korean at the University of Hawai‘i. This daughter reads and writes Korean the best of Sun Ja’s three children and it is she who often serves as translator or interpreter for her mother.

Until she started her hotel job, Sun Ja reports that she had very little occasion to use English, as all her previous employers, as well as her co-workers, were Koreans. Despite her limitations in English, Sun Ja speaks flowingly in English and rarely codeswitches between Korean and English in conversations with me or other non-Koreans. As a narrator, she is very attentive to her listener’s receptive abilities and she constantly monitors the give and take of a conversation, making sure that her utterances are comprehensible to her listener.

Won-Ja (41/54)

Won-Ja is a widow who frequently talks about her daughter and young school-age grandson. She is originally from a pocket of land on an estuary around Incheon\(^5\) International Airport which has since been reclaimed for the construction of the new airport which opened in 2002. Her hometown as such thus no longer exists on contemporary maps of Korea. Won Ja immigrated to Hawai‘i in 1985 and began working for the hotel in 1986.

Although Won-Ja has had more formal ESL instruction than any of the other learners (one year at an adult education center, with classes held five days a week for two hours a day, compared with fewer hours per week and durations of six months or less for the other narrators), she has quite limited English and frequently code-switches between
Korean and English, relying to a great extent on her listener’s ability to ‘fill in’ through background knowledge and contextual setting. As an English learner in a classroom setting, Won-Ja was quite energetic and diligent when given tasks to do. She was often the first to complete small scale in-class written tasks or to provide oral answers. This eagerness in an organized instructional setting, however, does not seem to transfer to the naturalistic learning situation, which constitutes by far the majority of her English language learning experiences. Her ability or willingness to carry on a sustained conversation totally in English is quite limited, compared to that of her co-workers.

Sang-Hee (36/51)

Sang-Hee is also a widow, whose husband died of a lung-related illness ten years before the fieldwork took place. Sang-Hee is originally from Kunsan, in North Cholla province, and immigrated to Hawai‘i in 1983. She had been employed as an office worker by an insurance company in Korea before immigrating and she told me with some pride that her unmarried younger sister has obtained an M.A. degree and teaches at a Korean teacher’s college.

Sang Hee’s three children were all born in Korea, and her husband preceded her to Hawai‘i. He was employed by a fishing company in Incheon and even after Sang-Hee and the children came to live in Hawai‘i, he apparently had to spend most of his time at sea, living on a large commercial fishing boat. She began working for the hotel almost immediately after her arrival in 1983, when one of the other housekeepers who attends
the same church learned that she was looking for work and arranged for her to be offered a job as a hotel room maid.

Sang-Hee now lives with her married son, who is an assistant pastor at one of the local Korean churches. Sang-Hee is very active in her church as a Bible study group leader. Another son works for an airline in Honolulu, which allows her to take advantage of inexpensive tickets to Korea. She travels to Korea at least once a year. Of the six narrators, Sang-Hee is the only one who has not obtained American citizenship. Sang-Hee often expresses the sentiment that she has had a very hard life in Hawai‘i and she seems to be the most socially isolated among the six narrators. Her outlook on life is rather pessimistic. Although she is the youngest of the six narrators, she frequently has health concerns and feels tired. She is anxiously waiting to turn 65 so that she can retire with benefits.

Of the six narrators, Sang-Hee has the most limited English and speaks in short phrases composed of a few words, code-switching frequently to Korean. She quite warmly welcomed me and any opportunities to communicate that were offered by the circumstances of this research project, but due to her limited English and her shy temperament, she does not usually pursue communication opportunities very aggressively, and when speaking in English, she tends to rely primarily on her interlocutor to make interpretive guesses as to her meaning and to fill in large amounts of context.

Sok-Hyon (50/63)
‘Sok’ loves to talk and he is one of the most fluent of the narrators included in this study. He is the oldest of the narrators, but he is very dynamic and appears to be in excellent physical condition. His general demeanor could be characterized as ‘young-at-heart’ and he is given to frequent spontaneous outbursts of enthusiastic chuckles and laughter. His life story is a reflection of the last 50 years of South Korea’s political and economic situation. Born in 1935 in Seoul under Japanese occupation, Sok received only a middle school education. After the Korean war, along with many of his compatriots, he contracted with the Korean government to work as a laborer in a paper factory in Iran in the 1960s. After the overthrow of the Shah of Iran’s regime, he returned to Korea, working briefly for the American military forces there. Subsequently, he contracted with the Korean government to work overseas again as a laborer and this time he was sent to Saudi Arabia where he worked in the vehicle maintenance department for an American company in the Riyadh area. Sok and I discovered in the course of our conversations that we had both lived in Saudi Arabia at the same time (late 1970s), which created a special bond between us. After immigrating to Hawai‘i in 1985, Sok worked for an auto parts store for a few months. In all of these previous jobs, he used English to communicate with his superiors and other non-Korean co-workers. By the time he began working at the hotel, he therefore had a quite well-honed ability to communicate exolingually using English as a lingua franca.

Sang-Ho (45/54)

Sang-Ho is one of the two male narrators contributing to this study. He is the most recent arrival, and as a high school graduate, he is also the one with the highest education
level. In Korea, he had been employed as an X-ray technician in the medical field. Sang-Ho and his family live in a middle/upper middle-class high-rise apartment building in Honolulu with a view over the Pacific, an apartment which they have purchased with their hard-earned savings. In addition to his salaried job at the hotel, Sang-Ho and his wife have an entrepreneurial spirit, and have been involved in several local business ventures which produce souvenir articles to be sold to tourists in Waikiki.

Sang-Ho is very proud of the fact that his two college-age children were admitted to engineering school at a prestigious mainland U.S. university. He has, however, been worrying about how he and his wife will cope if their last child opts to go off to college on the Mainland, as they depend on her as a family translator/interpreter in myriad ways.

In general, Sang-Ho exudes an air of self-confidence and competence. He frequently assists the Korean women he works with, particularly the widows who have no male family member to help them, e.g., he serves as a sounding board for solutions to problems in daily living or he drives them to doctors’ appointments after work in his car.

In demeanor, the term ‘debonair’ perhaps best describes Sang-Ho. Over the years, I had several chance encounters with Sang-Ho around Honolulu (e.g., on shopping trips to local malls, in the parking lot at a local grocery store). On these occasions, he was invariably well-dressed in a local style aloha shirt, often wearing fashionable sunglasses, and he always appeared to be in high spirits, thoroughly enjoying his life in Hawai‘i.

With respect to his knowledge of English, Sang-Ho falls generally within the same range of low proficiency but fluent interlanguage as the other narrators. However, as mentioned above, during the course of the fieldwork and during the focused data
collection sessions, as well as in subsequent encounters over the years, Sang-Ho gave the impression that he was continuing to make progress in terms of command of conversational gambits and additional lexicon. During our most recent interaction, in February 2003, for example, we were able to sustain an animated, light-hearted conversational interaction in English with no major breakdowns in communication for well over half an hour.

Information related to the individual narrators' personal profiles is summarized in Table 3.2., below:

Table 3.2. Korean Narrators' Personal Data*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Place of origin</th>
<th>Date of Birth</th>
<th>Year arrv'd HI</th>
<th>Age arrv'd HI</th>
<th>Age at date of recording</th>
<th>No. yrs. in HI when recorded</th>
<th>Current Occupation</th>
<th>Yrs. at current employment (start date)</th>
<th>Highest educ. Level</th>
<th>Formal English classes (comm. adult ed.)</th>
<th>Marital status</th>
<th>No. children</th>
<th>Birthplace (K=Korea) (HI=Hawai‘i)</th>
<th>Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SJL Sun-Ja Lee</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Kwangju, S. Cholla</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>hotel maid</td>
<td>(1983)</td>
<td>middle school</td>
<td>few mos.</td>
<td>married</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2K, 1HI</td>
<td>all K-12 in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WJL Won-Ja Lee</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Yong-yu-myoun (Incheon)</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>hotel maid</td>
<td>(1986)</td>
<td>middle school</td>
<td>1 yr. 2hr/day 5 day/wk</td>
<td>widow</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2K</td>
<td>Middle/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHY Sang-Hee Yi</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Kunsan, N. Cholla</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>hotel maid</td>
<td>(1983)</td>
<td>middle school</td>
<td>6 mos. 1hr/day 5 day/wk</td>
<td>widow</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3K</td>
<td>all HS &amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEL Young-Eun Lee</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Seoul (Kangnam)</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>hotel maid</td>
<td>(1981)</td>
<td>high school</td>
<td>6 mos. 2 hr/day 1 day/wk</td>
<td>married</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2K, 1HI</td>
<td>all K-12 in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHP Sang-Ho Park</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Tangjin (S. Chungchon (to S.@age 20) 1944</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>hotel custodian</td>
<td>(1989)</td>
<td>middle school</td>
<td>2 mos. (tested out; sent away)</td>
<td>3K</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6K</td>
<td>all 3 HS in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOK Sok-Hyon Kim</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Seoul (Yongsan)</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>hotel custodian</td>
<td>(1990)</td>
<td>middle school</td>
<td>3 mos. 2 hr/day 5 day/wk</td>
<td>married</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6K</td>
<td>5K; youngest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Schooling Information

| Schooling | HI; 2 univ. grads; 1 UH grad. | HS in HI; 1 UH grad; 1 HS grad. | univ. in HI; 2 univ. grads; 1 HS grad. | HI, all 3 now at U.S. mainland university | went to HS in HI; 1 univ. grad. |

*All names are pseudonyms. The information reported here was provided by the narrators themselves on a written questionnaire, supplemented with information provided orally in conversations with the researcher, particularly regarding the amount of formal English language classes each attended. All questionnaires were provided in Korean, except for Sun-Ja, who requested the English version of the questionnaire, which she filled out with her college-age daughter.*

With respect to general language practices and language use of the narrators, several comments can be made. Overall, when using English to communicate with non-Koreans (with immigrant co-workers as well as with locals or with native speakers of standard English) the speakers featured in this study appear to use their own idiosyncratic pidgin rather than fluent HCE. Despite their long years of residency in the community, which might be presumed to guarantee significant exposure to the two dominant languages in the community (HCE and standard English), these immigrants live primarily in a Korean-speaking world, with relatively little need for either Pidgin or standard English. When daily living or job-related situations do require a more extensive knowledge of written or spoken English (as, for example, when voting in American elections, when making decisions on health plan options or when filling out other work-related forms, or when it is necessary to provide extensive explanations to hotel guests in problem situations), bilingual family members or co-workers serve as language brokers and facilitate these tasks. Indeed, at the hotel during the daytime, there is always someone available in the housekeeping office to serve as language broker, whether it be the dispatcher on the phone or the department manager.

#### 3.3 Data collection methods
The on-site research for this study can be divided into two main stages, with a supplementary third stage. The first of these stages consisted of preliminary familiarization with the research site, the participants, and the Korean community of Honolulu. The second stage was the focussed data collection. The third stage was background observations and maintaining contacts with the principal people involved. The third stage continues to this day. The first two stages will be discussed in some detail below in sections 3.3.1 and 3.3.2, respectively.

3.3.1 Preliminary familiarization with research site and local Korean community

In this section I will deal with the following issues:
(a) Entree to research site
(b) Establishing rapport with participants and familiarization with the local Korean community
(c) Negotiation of services with research assistants (translators/interpreters/consultants)

(a) Entree to research site

My original introduction to the research site was in the capacity of English language teacher, hired by a locally owned hotel chain whose executive headquarters is located in Waikiki. I taught English once (initially twice) a week to the (mostly female) employees of the Housekeeping Department at the hotels in Waikiki in 1996-1997, with periodic breaks from English lessons during tourist high seasons. The housekeeping staff of several hotels are grouped together under the supervision of one Executive Housekeeper and I initially taught in the base hotel of two different Executive Housekeepers. My students, the housekeepers, worked in several different hotels within
a block or two of each other. As I began to focus my research ideas, I was able to arrange to conduct interviews and observations with the executive housekeeping staff of the two hotel 'groups', which contrast quite markedly with each other in terms of their English language usage practices. The Executive Housekeeper of one group was a native Hawaiian and the housekeeping office at her base hotel was staffed with Filipinas. The housekeepers on the individual floors in that hotel were primarily Filipina and Chinese women. The housekeepers in that hotel used English (in some form) when dealing with their Executive Housekeeper and other office staff. The Executive Housekeeper of the other group was a native speaker of Korean who uses Korean with the Korean housekeepers and various registers of English with the Chinese and Filipino housekeepers under her supervision. The housekeeping staff at her base hotel was staffed with a bilingual Filipino/English Assistant Housekeeper (male), one bilingual English/Chinese-speaking clerk (female) and one bilingual English/Korean-speaking clerk (female).

The company-sponsored English program in which I taught was subsequently discontinued due to the economic downturn in the local tourist industry, but by that time I had decided that I wanted to focus my research on the second hotel group which employed primarily Chinese and Korean housekeepers and where the Executive Housekeeper herself was a long-term Korean immigrant.

In preparation for my research, I conducted a lengthy interview with the Hawaiian Executive Housekeeper in the first hotel where I taught English. In my capacity as English teacher for the hotel, I reported directly to the training department at the
executive headquarters and I constantly kept that department apprised of my plans to conduct research on site. The coordinator of the English language programs, herself an M.A. holder from the University of Hawai‘i's Department of Second Language Studies [formerly ESL], gave her support and ‘blessings’ for pursuing my research. At a later stage the language program coordinator provided me with access to a training videotape used by the hotel for assessment purposes. I was able to incorporate that videotape into my elicitation procedures (see below). While on site to do general observations or to teach English language courses, I would occasionally be introduced to executives of the hotel chain at various functions (annual Housekeeper Recognition Day potluck meal, Hawaiian blessing ceremony, employee retirement ceremony, Hawaiian culture orientation and day trip excursion, etc.). I took advantage of such serendipitous encounters to inform the managerial and executive staff of my upcoming research plans. For a totally separate project, I also arranged for three of the hotel executives to be guest speakers at an English training program for Korean middle-level managers which I was coordinating at the time. At the early stages, I thus had considerable interaction with the hotel personnel at the managerial and executive level, including one member of the founding family. Informing them of my plans and having received their general ‘blessing’ for my project had important repercussions for the subsequent focussed research stages. First, it allowed me to have support in practical matters such as access to a variety of company employees at the research site for observation, interview and survey completion, setting up an interview schedule with the housekeepers/narrators which was not only approved but actually coordinated by the housekeeping office staff, and
occasionally, even, allocation of unoccupied guest rooms to do audio and/or videotaping of interviews with the housekeepers. Secondly, having the visible and explicit support of upper and middle management, as well as their direct supervisor, imbued the whole undertaking with an air of legitimacy in the eyes of the narrator-participants, a condition which no doubt greatly enhanced their willingness to cooperate with me over an extended period of time.

During the English program’s operation, I also taught as a substitute teacher on several occasions for one of the other hotel English teachers, which provided me natural access to approximately 15 more Korean housekeepers from two more hotels in the same chain. At the time I taught them, I asked them if they would be willing to participate in my research project and distributed my project description in Korean and English to them.

(b) Establishing rapport with participants and familiarization with the local Korean community

At the exploratory stages I began by investigating language usage patterns in two hotel groups within the chain, but as I ultimately focused only on Korean housekeepers at the second hotel group, I will now speak primarily of the relations and research preparation which I undertook at that hotel and in the community at large.

After explaining my research project to the Executive Housekeeper and receiving her approval and wholehearted support for pursuing my project, I wrote up a project description to be shared with hotel employees at all hierarchical levels. After drafting an English version, I asked Korean-speaking graduate-student friends in linguistics to
translate the project description and consent forms into Korean. I cleared my project with the coordinator of English language services at the executive training and development department at the executive offices of the hotel chain, and shared the forms with her, as well as with the Assistant Housekeeper at the primary investigation site, with the housekeeping office clerks, and with the other English teachers at the hotel chain.

While I was going regularly to the hotels as an English teacher, I had endeavored to establish good rapport with the Executive Housekeepers in both hotels where I taught. Among these good-will gestures was providing, upon request, some in-kind services such as English editing for work-related memos for the Korean Executive Housekeeper. These in-kind services helped me develop reliable 'allies' for my research needs in the person of the Executive Housekeeper and the Assistant Housekeeper at the hotel where I had taught for approximately one year before undertaking the focused research stage.

Having their support was crucial because it allowed me to visit the site at opportune moments, even when I was not scheduled to be there to teach English classes. If I happened to be there at the time of the morning briefings of the housekeepers (8:00 a.m.) in order to socialize, to observe or to make recordings of the morning briefing sessions, the Executive Housekeeper or Assistant Housekeeper would usually ask me to say a few words of greeting to the group, which always enhanced my legitimacy, I felt, even though I usually didn't have anything specific to say to them as a group.

I also established a friendly relationship and began an exchange-of-services relationship (English/Korean lessons) on our own time with one of the more fluent English-speaking Korean 'Inspectresses' (a supervisory position which has since been
Both this Korean 'inspectress' and the male Filipino Assistant Housekeeper were long-time employees of the hotel chain, and both were keen observers and fluent in English, which enabled me to solicit their help in interpreting some of my observations. They were also able to provide insights into language use habits at the main research site (from quite different perspectives, i.e., from both management and non-management perspectives).

In addition to on-site observations and interview at the primary research site, I continuously and conscientiously made the rounds of the Korean shopkeepers around town with whom I had established rapport. I make it a point to drop in as a regular customer and to give my trade in gas, groceries, snacks and dinner at several Korean-owned family businesses. On occasion, I also patronized other Korean-owned small businesses (a seamstress, various beauty shops, a travel agency) and identified several other first-generation immigrant shopkeepers with varying degrees of English proficiency, some of whom I eventually approached to ask for their cooperation in either filling out the survey form of Korean language use in the local community or to consent to being interviewed about their language learning and language usage practices. The fact that I was studying Korean at the university and that I was able to say a few more things each day besides basic greetings seemed to open doors and these various shop owners would enthusiastically serve as my language tutors whenever I came in, 'forcing' me to speak Korean.

In the cultural sphere, I also enrolled in Korean dance classes at the Halla Huhm Studio for a few weeks, which is one of the places which attracts some adult women of
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the first-generation of Korean immigrants. Korean immigrant families interested in maintaining their children’s affiliation with the culture of their homeland often send their children there for dance lessons for several years throughout their youth. I didn’t reach performance level quality in my few short lessons, but I did attend a recital put on by the studio, an event which attracted several hundred local Koreans, including Sun Ja, one of my principal narrators, who was there to watch her daughter perform.

Thanks to the generosity of one of my fellow graduate students at the university who was teaching there, I attended Korean language and literacy classes a few times at one of the local ‘Saturday schools’ for the offspring of Korean immigrants. I also arranged language exchange meetings twice a week with several newly-arrived Korean spouses of graduate students at the university.

In addition to these contacts which gave me a sense of some of the cultural activities in the Korean community, for a few weeks I also had a regular weekly scheduled exchange of language services (Korean/English lessons) with a woman and her family who run a Korean BBQ restaurant in downtown Honolulu. The family had lived in Honolulu for five years and their teenage son was fluent in English, albeit with many lexical gaps, and attended local high school. The teenage son was quite friendly and talkative, and voluntarily gives me numerous insights about how his mother and father handle customers and other English language needs. Whenever I would go to their BBQ shop, I was also able to observe how the son serves continuously as a language broker for his parents, primarily handling phone orders from customers and other business-related calls.
In sum, I worked relatively systematically at both maintaining and expanding my contacts within the Korean first-generation immigrant community. I pursued these various contacts out of genuine interest, but each contact had the added benefit of enriching my store of knowledge and familiarity with the local Korean community and made me a more credible researcher to other members of the local Korean community. The conversations I engaged in with a variety of members of the local Korean immigrant community provided a foundation for the questions I asked in the survey of Korean language use in the community which I conducted at a later stage.

One trend noted in the responses of the survey respondents as well as in the comments heard from the various members of the Korean immigrant community regarding their language learning experiences and language use patterns should be mentioned at this point, as these comments come from immigrant peers of the six narrators featured in this study. This is the fact that all of the immigrants with whom I talked expressed frustration at not being able to speak better English. Despite this expressed desire, which in several cases was a quite heartfelt and yearningly expressed desire, all of the long-term immigrants had either accommodated or resigned themselves to their status quo in terms of English skills and consequently perceived themselves to be locked into a lifestyle which does not allow them to make substantial progress. A variety of factors, such as time spent on the job and lack of opportunity to interact with English speakers at the workplace, the need to work full-time for a living, and an explicit decision to provide their offspring with exposure to the native language at home, were cited as hindrances to making progress in their own English skill development.
(c) Negotiation of services with research assistants
(Translators/interpreters/consultants)

For translation of my project description into Korean, I called on personal friends who were graduate students in the University of Hawai‘i Linguistics and ESL (now Second Language Studies) departments. My major 'exchange service' for this help was English language editing and proofreading of their own dissertations and miscellaneous term papers.

3.3.2 Focussed data collection

After several months of preliminary familiarization, I decided upon the principal site at which I would conduct my research and the main speakers upon whom I would focus my data collection efforts. The site was the housekeeping department of one of the major hotel chains in Waikiki, as described above. All of the language data was collected at one of the hotels of the chain. For the selection of speakers, I originally cast my net a bit widely and at each stage of data collection, I progressively narrowed the number of people involved, based on their general availability and willingness to cooperate as well as the quality of the data I obtained, until I finally settled on the six represented in the corpus presented in this study.

3.3.2.1 The participants

The primary participants were four female Koreans employed as hotel housekeepers and two male Korean men employed as general custodians (called 'housemen'). The personal profiles of these six individuals, who are the narrators who
contributed the language data analyzed for this study, are given in section 3.2.2, Profiles of the Korean narrators, above. These six individuals are identified in the data extracts by pseudonyms which they chose for themselves and by their pseudonymous initials in the transcripts. The four women are Sun Ja Lee (SJL or SJ), Won Ja Lee (WJL), Sang-Hee Yi (SHY), Young-Eun Lee (YEL). The two men are Sang-Ho Park (SHP) and Sok-Hyon Kim (SOK).

In addition to the six primary contributors, the narrators, I also observed the daily work routines and interviewed other people with whom the six primary contributors interact on a regular, daily basis. Most of the people in this network of secondary participants had worked for many years with the primary participants. The secondary participants include clerks of the housekeeping department and other housekeeping personnel, as well as the immediate supervisors of the primary participants, the Executive Housekeeper and the Assistant Housekeeper. A third tier of hotel staff who interact with the primary participants on an occasional basis were also interviewed for insight on language practices. This third tier include front desk staff, development and training office staff, safety trainers, various members of the management team, and other English teachers employed by the hotel.

3.3.2.2 Types of data collected

In addition to collecting language data from the six primary participants, I made notes based on first-hand observations of both their oral and written language use and needs on the job in a variety of situations. The primary sources for these notes were the
daily morning oral briefing sessions, which I attended on numerous occasions. I frequently made audio tapings of the oral briefing sessions and I also video-taped them on several occasions. On-site observation of procedures in the housekeeping office and on the guest room floors were also made. Samples of written language materials in regular use at the hotel in both English and Korean were also collected. As this study focuses on an analysis of the oral narratives produced by the six primary participants, however, a comprehensive description of these materials will not be provided at this time. When relevant to an interpretation of points in the narratives, information and background knowledge obtained from these on-site observations will be integrated into the commentary on the narratives.

The narrative data which appear in the corpus of 17 narratives were collected through three separate procedures, conducted in the following order:

(a) open-ended, casual conversations, conducted on the floors where the Koreans were assigned to work;

(b) semi-structured conversations to obtain personal narratives of 'Memorable Events'. These conversations were based on the six questions listed below. As I felt that neither the housekeepers' English nor my Korean proficiency was sufficient to communicate the exact content of the questions I wanted to ask, I opted to provide a Korean translation of the questions. After pointing to the question in Korean, and explaining further, as needed, I would interact with the narrator as appropriate to the content of the unfolding events. (See transcripts for details of interactive feedback.)

1. Can you recall a memorable event from your school days in Korea?
2. Can you recall a memorable event that happened to you in Hawai‘i?
3. Can you tell me what you remember about your first day in Hawai‘i?
4. Can you recall a memorable event at work?
5. Can you tell me about a memorable family event (a special family memory)?
6. Can you give me some examples of cultural differences you noticed here or on the Mainland, if you’ve been there (culture shock examples).

The selection of these six memorable events was inspired by the 'danger of death' elicitation methodology proposed by Labov (1972b), a strategy he devised in order to elicit casual speech (defined as 'the everyday speech used in informal situations, where no attention is directed to language') (Labov 1972a:86) or spontaneous speech, referring to 'a pattern used in excited, emotionally charged speech when the constraints of a formal situation are overridden' (Labov 1972a:86). Field workers using Labov's 'danger of death' methodology are instructed to pose a very specific question to informants: 'Have you ever been in a situation where you thought you were in serious danger of being killed--where you thought to yourself, "This is it?"' (Labov 1972a:93). Labov (1972a) elaborates on the procedure and the reasons he has used it so successfully to elicit unmonitored casual and spontaneous speech styles from a number of informants in the U.S.:

If the informant answers yes, the interviewer pauses for one or two seconds, and then asks, "What happened?" As the informant begins to reply, he is under some compulsion to show that there was a very real danger of his being killed; he stands in a very poor light if it appears that there was no actual danger. Often he becomes involved in the narration to the extent that he seems to be reliving the critical moment, and signs of emotional tension appear (93).

In designing my study, it was not primarily a concern for casual style per se which prompted me to take inspiration from Labov's 'danger of death' technique for this cycle of data collection. Rather, I was looking for a prompt with
intrinsic interest for the specific pool of speakers I was working with, and a prompt which would have enough emotional value to reduce any self-consciousness or embarrassment at speaking English on the part of the narrators, given their limited language proficiency. I also wanted to foster an emotional commitment to the topics in order to obtain narratives of a length and complexity sufficient to allow discourse level analysis of linguistic features. I did not have the luxury of being able to eliminate subjects who might not have had a danger of death story. Furthermore, I wanted to offer a series of prompts, knowing that some people would respond more enthusiastically to one prompt over another. Ultimately, I settled on the six questions listed above, of which the third, describing their memories of their first day as an immigrant to Hawai‘i, proved to be the most successful with the participants. While the third question never failed to elicit lengthy narratives, full of details well remembered, each of the other questions was used successfully with several of the speakers. (See Milroy and Gordon 2003: 65-66 for an overview of alternative casual speech elicitation techniques and an interesting discussion of situations in which the danger of death question has been used with less success for the elicitation of extensive, casual language data.)

(c) Semi-structured conversations after viewing two different video clips, i.e., the film retellings. The first clip used was a 16-minute edited segment from a hotel housekeeper training film (American Hotel & Motel Association 1995). The second clip was a 12-minute edited montage of scenes from the silent film Modern Times (1936),
with Charlie Chaplin. (See description of the scene contents in Appendix E, page 418.)

The clip from *Modern Times* covers approximately the same sequences as those used in
the European Science Foundation's elicitation materials for film retellings. Roughly the
same clips were used by Bardovi-Harlig (1995), who also modeled her elicitation on the
ESF project. The decision was made to use the same sequences in the hope of generating
comparable texts from a different population of uninstructed second language learners.
(See Appendix B for specifics of the guidelines used in the elicitation of memorable
events evocations and the film retellings.) Consideration was also given to using Chafe's
filmed material which produced *The Pear Stories* (Chafe 1980) as an elicitation tool.
However, due to its more familiar urban setting, the boy-meets-girl content, and the
chance to watch a performance by the world-famous Charlie Chaplin, I deemed the
*Modern Times* scenes to be of more intrinsic interest to the Korean immigrants from
whom I hoped to elicit extensive comments and narratives.

Data collected during the focused data collection cycle were collected in both
audiotape and VHS videotape formats. At the time the data were collected, I did not
anticipate undertaking a prosodic analysis. Therefore, audio data from interviews and
elicitation sessions at the hotel, the primary fieldwork site, as well as the recordings of
most of the interactions which took place within the housekeeping department (e.g., daily
morning briefings, conversations in the housekeeping office), were recorded on a
consumer quality tabletop portable tape recorder (Sony cassette recorder, Model CFM-
10) on standard cassette tapes. When observing other events around the hotel or
elsewhere (e.g., Housekeepers' Recognition Week ceremonies, interviews 'on the fly' with
hotel employees) where it was more practical to use a smaller, battery-powered recorder, I used a Panasonic cassette recorder, Model RQ-L309. A few audio recordings at morning briefings were also recorded on an Olympus Pearlcorder L400 microcassette recorder. Most of the early transcription drafts of the audiotaped segments were done using a Panasonic variable speech control (VSC) Standard Cassette Transcriber, Model RR-830, equipped with foot pedal. Subsequently the narratives selected for analysis for this study were digitized with Sound-Edit, version 2.0.1 and converted to .wav files. 'Toast' software was used to transfer digitized recordings to a CD-Rom for archival and review purposes. Video recordings were made with a Panasonic VHS Reporter camera, Model AG-187. Selected video images were captured and digitized with Adobe Premiere, version 5.0.

3.4 General description of the data collected

In terms of generating stretches of extended discourse, some of the narratives produced from the Memorable Events series (Narratives 1-4, 'Arrival and adjustment to Hawai‘i' and Narratives 5-8, 'Significant memory from a working day') were among the most successful. The contents are extremely spontaneous and rich in terms of personal experiences. On several occasions during the telling of these stories, the female narrators became so involved in reliving the memories that they had to reach for a tissue to wipe tears from their eyes, either from merriment or from the pain of the memories. The men did not actually weep, but in the case of their narratives included here in the corpus, their emotional involvement was also high, as evidenced by physical gestures and extreme
ranges of pitch variation. As the recipient of these stories, I was often quite genuinely
moved myself, and I made no attempt to hide my own personal and emotional reactions
to their stories. I did attempt to refrain from interrupting the flow of the narration, except
when asked to provide a vocabulary word or when a narrator would seek confirming
feedback that I had understood a point. At the conclusion of the narratives, I would,
however, make it a point to give the narrator a personal comment or reflection of my own
on what they had just told me.

The material obtained from the two video clips is of mixed quality. In some cases,
where I had anticipated that complex story structure would emerge, the narrators
provided only minimal answers. Other times, reacting spontaneously to scenes in the
clips, or as a result of a question probe from me, the narrators would suddenly provide
long stretches of extended discourse and moving narratives. An example of this is the
background to the elicitation of Narrative 8, 'Junk Job', by Sun Ja. The topic is a work
experience, but this narrative was not actually produced as a result of the 'memorable or
significant event at work' question. Sun Ja began this compelling and complex story quite
unexpectedly after viewing the housekeeper training video while we were in the middle
of a much more prosaic section of the post-viewing questions which had been designed to
elicit her evaluative comments on the film and the life of a hotel housekeeper portrayed
there.

In general, watching the excerpts from Charlie Chaplin's *Modern Times* was an
activity quite well received by the participants and the one-on-one discussions between
the participants and me which followed the viewings ultimately produced quite
significant amounts of language data, including several extended narratives. As I had hoped, the participants visibly and audibly seemed to enjoy watching the film clips and quite unexpectedly, several of them saw parallels between their struggles as immigrants and the 1930s Depression era scenes depicted in the film. That affective connection to the film generated several interesting narratives, not all of which are included in the corpus of transcribed materials appearing in this study.

In another way, however, the use of the Charlie Chaplin film sequences tended to be disappointing. In general, the elicitation procedures did not obtain very satisfactory results in terms of extended re-tellings of the scenes of the films. The scenes had been selected in order to induce the narrators to make use of their available language resources to reconstruct a fairly complex interweaving of multiple characters, time frames and locations.

In retrospect, there seem to be three possible explanations for this disappointing result. The first possible explanation is that the instructions were not clear. I had anticipated this problem and in order to minimize the potential for misunderstanding due to the participants' low level of English language proficiency, I provided the instructions in written form in Korean (see Appendix B). Even when the written instructions were supplemented by my oral promptings during the elicitation session, however, the subjects seemed much more interested in discussing their reactions to the clip with me than in reconstructing the events in any kind of structured way. When they did attempt to retell the story, there were significant gaps in the sequence of events, quite unlike the experience
other researchers such as the ESF research team and Bardovi-Harlig 1995 (using school children writing in an L2) apparently obtained with this particular film sequence.

A second possible explanation is that the story structure in the montage of film clips was not clear. While considering this possibility for quite some time, I ultimately rejected this explanation after using the same film montage as an instrument to elicit narratives from deaf Korean college students in Korea and obtaining clear, accurate and exceedingly detailed retellings in Korean Sign Language. It remains a possibility, however, that the Korean immigrants in Hawai‘i were not accustomed to the genre of a silent film where they needed to rely primarily on visual observations in order to interpret the story line. *(Modern Times* is a silent film, which includes inserted 'information panels' at appropriate moments. As these 'information panels' all appear on screen in English, I sat beside the television screen during the narrators' viewings and flipped through a set of panels translated into Korean at the appropriate moments.)

The third possible explanation for the narrators' lack of effort to provide comprehensive retellings is that for them, the re-telling of a film sequence might be considered some kind of pointless 'school oriented' activity to which they are not accustomed. This was contrary to my expectation, as I had established, during my familiarization process with these narrators and with the local Korean immigrant community, that the extremely popular Korean dramas shown nightly on local Honolulu television are avidly recounted to friends and family members who miss an episode. I had therefore predicted that being asked to retell the Charlie Chaplin scenes would be a very familiar activity. It is of course plausible that the contrived nature of the procedure (being
asked to re-tell the story to the researcher, with whom the narrators had just finished viewing most of the film together) was not conducive to eliciting a comprehensive retelling. Unfortunately, the originally planned procedure of asking the viewer/narrator to re-tell the scenes to a second non-native speaker interlocutor had to be abandoned due to practical considerations. (The elicitation sessions were conducted at the narrators' work site and it would have required keeping two housekeepers at a time from performing their work duties in order to participate in a two-part sequence of film viewing and retelling.) I had hoped that the fact that I had been the narrators' English teacher and that they were accustomed to having me ask them to complete tasks which would serve the purpose of learning or practicing English would minimize the impact of the artificiality of the activity. However, this does not seem to have been the case.

When this problem arose during the elicitation sessions, I opted to maintain an atmosphere of naturalness and communicative spontaneity rather than steer the session into a more researcher-directed activity according to my pre-established procedures. Maintaining the participants' interest and involvement in the elicitation sessions and obtaining a sizeable number of emotion-laden comments from the narrators during the *Modern Times* post-viewing elicitation sessions compensates, to my mind, for the lack of systematicity and comparability of the data collected. Ultimately, the Charlie Chaplin film sequences, while not serving their intended purpose of eliciting extended re-tellings which would have allowed for a strict control of the narrators' abilities to produce anaphoric references to persons and places and references to sequential events, did serve a quite useful purpose in the overall scheme of the elicitation sessions by introducing an
element of enjoyable entertainment and thought-provoking material into the setting of the narrators' place of employment. The unusualness of watching a clip from a classic, world-class film and the opportunity to spend time speaking English to discuss it during working hours contributed substantially, I feel, to the narrators' willingness to open up and talk expansively on a variety of topics. Although viewing the film clips did not spark many examples of extended discourse in the form of re-tellings as such, several quite interesting discussions were sparked by the scenes viewed in *Modern Times*. One of the narrators in fact told me that in all her years in Hawai'i, and as well as she could recall, she had never spent so much time speaking English to a native speaker as when she did the elicitation sessions for this study. (Recall that lack of opportunity to speak English with native speakers was cited by members of the Korean immigrant community as one of the primary reasons for not being able to make substantial progress in English.)

3.5 *Data analysis methods*

Although I had initially planned to conduct an analysis of the lexical and syntactic complexity of the narratives collected for this study, I later decided to use only the longer stretches of narratives produced and to analyze the use of prosodic devices in the structuring of those narratives. This decision was based on the fact that, as explained above in Chapter One, continuous review of the recordings of the narratives and the transcripts showed that the interesting picture was not the deficit analysis of what is lacking in the narrators' linguistic repertoire, as initially anticipated, but the opposite, as reflected in the title of this study, e.g., 'making do with what you've got'.
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Another point relevant to the analysis is that although some of the transcripts were initially coded for interactional detail, I ultimately opted not to expand my analysis to include these details in the current study. This topic remains a tantalizing option for future research.

The language data were transcribed in normal English orthography, with a system of transcription conventions determined to be relevant for this project. Phonetic transcriptions were not needed, as a general rule, since the study looked at global, suprasegmental discourse features rather than narrow phonetic ones. Although there are definitely 'non-target-like' pronunciations recorded by the speakers, their utterances can basically be understood as English. In using normal English orthography rather than phonetic transcription, I wanted to avoid exoticizing my data and to underscore the point that these learners do communicate in English, albeit in a rudimentary, 'basic variety'. Phonetic transcriptions were used only when the speaker appears to be saying a foreign word or any string of sounds that is not decipherable as English. The transcripts were coded using an adaptation of the CLAN system devised for CHILDES.

An approach grounded in discourse analytic methods is used for a textual analysis of the data. The Labovian (1972) framework for narrative analysis (Labov and Waletzky 1997 [1967]) is used to examine the narrative structure of the texts.

The digitized texts were also analyzed acoustically using the Summer Institute of Linguistics (SIL) Speech Analyzer program which produces a variety of measurements. For this study, to illustrate prosodic phenomena, I opted to display a wave form, a pitch track showing fundamental frequencies, and a record of amplitude for selected examples.
What follows is an explanation for the uninitiated reader on how to make use of the graphic presentations of prosodic features and intonation contours which appear in Chapter Four.

The program used for the graphic display of acoustic features is Speech Analyzer (version 1.6, test version 10.6[July 24, 2001: 1.5 15.3]), downloadable from the Summer Institute of Linguistics website (http://www.sil.org/computing/speechtools/index.htm) (updated August 2002), which analyzes mono recordings of .wav files at a sampling rate of 22,050 kHz using 16-bit samples. The conventions used and the format selected for the presentation of these acoustic measurements of the narratives will be explained at this point in order to facilitate the reader's use of these graphic representations in the discussions which follow. Please refer to Figures 3.1. and 3.2., below, for illustrations of the relevant points.

First, note that in order to visually display its prosodic features, each utterance is plotted in three different formats on the acoustic graphs: raw waveform, amplitude (volume) and pitch.

Along the horizontal axis of each graph appears a series of small numerals. These numbers indicate the elapsed time in increments of 0.200 of a second. Dotted vertical lines are aligned through the three graphs, facilitating the reading of the plots at any point along the elapsed time segments. The elapsed time of the utterances graphed for this study vary in length from a minimum one second to a maximum of five seconds.

For analytical purposes, each utterance has also been divided into intonational/informational units, based on a combination of auditory prosodic features
such as pausing, pitch contour and volume. These intonational/informational units are indicated by the graph cursors which appear as two continuous vertical lines aligned across all three graphs. Thus, for Figure 3.1, the three intonational units are

(a) this man (b) me off day come back (c) # going already

and for Figure 3.2, the three intonational units are

(a) oh (b) Sun Ja (c) you good

In the uppermost box is found the raw waveform which records the flow of continuous speech. Since voiceless consonants as well as pauses do not register on the raw waveform, a flat waveform appears when they occur in the stream of speech. (For an example of the graphic representation of a pause of approximately one-half second, see Figure 3.1 between 2.100 and 2.600.)

The center box displays the acoustic measurement of the volume, or magnitude, of an utterance. The volume is presented as a continuous line. The minimum is always 0, but the maximum can vary considerably, as can the gradations displayed, according to the volume peaks registered in each utterance. Most of the utterances in this study lie in the range of 0-24, but individual utterances can register in much narrower ranges. The magnitude graph also displays an overlay of pitch contour; the pitch contour is seen as a broken line and the amplitude is seen as a continuous line.

The lowest box displays the pitch contours of the utterance, presented either as smoothed pitch, or as autopitch. In most cases, smoothed pitch provides the details which correspond most closely to the auditory perception of the listener, and which are thus the most salient for the analyst. In cases where the program allows an overlay of autopitch on
volume, the segment under analysis in this study will be displayed in autopitch. This is a useful mode of display when volume and pitch diverge substantially and when this divergence is particularly salient to the point under discussion.

For the analyst, there are five important dimensions to note on the graphic representations of the acoustic features of an utterance, as these four dimensions correspond to those which listeners unconsciously attend to when they are parsing speech-in-progress (also known as 'on-line processing').

First, within an intonation contour, it is the relative value of peaks to one another rather than the absolute values within the contour which are significant and which provide shades of meaning.

Second, listeners compare both the relative and absolute levels of volume and pitch of a given utterance with the pitch and volume of previous utterances and what they perceive to be the baseline 'norm' for a given speaker to help interpret the speaker's intended meaning of an utterance.

Third, the analyst must note the direction of movement of both pitch and volume, i.e., from high to low, from low to high.

Fourth, the range of both volume and pitch, of a particular utterance, as well as its relative position to the surrounding material and to the norm for a given speaker, are significant.

Finally, the occurrences of pauses can indicate information/intonation unit boundaries, as well as syntactic boundaries.
A comparison of the acoustic representations of the first two figures below, both based on utterances from the same female speaker, will illustrate these points. Considering volume first, note that in Fig. 3.1. the volume attains 24, whereas the range for Fig. 3.2. only attains 8. Thus, the utterance whose features are displayed in Fig. 3.1., on an absolute scale, can be said to be much louder than Fig. 3.2. (The utterance in Figure 3.2. could, however, be perceived as ‘louder’ by the listener if it was preceded by utterances spoken more softly or if it was uttered in a pitch range which differed markedly from the surrounding material, which is in fact the case for this particular utterance.) Turning now to pitch, the range for autopitch in Fig. 3.1. was from 50-350, whereas the range in Fig. 3.2. was only 60-180, indicating much more variation for the utterance represented in Fig. 3.1. Fig. 3.1. was plotted with autopitch and an overlay of the volume and pitch in the middle box, whereas Fig. 3.2. was plotted with smoothed pitch. Note also the flat line in Fig. 3.1. around 2.500 sec, indicating a pause at that point in the utterance.

There are of course inter-speaker differences which will be apparent on their respective acoustic representations. In general, males tend to have a narrower range of volume and pitch. According to Crystal (1969:4) the normal pitch range for men is a fundamental frequency (F₀) of 60Hz-240Hz, with an average of 120Hz and for women 180Hz – 400Hz, with an average of 225 Hz. Children average around 265 Hz. According to Cruttenden, the normal male range is around 200Hz, and the normal female range is 350-400Hz.
Numerous variations can appear in such acoustic measurements. Acoustic measurement is not entirely accurate, and as noted by Matsunami (1995), no pitch extractor is error free. Indeed, both amplitude and fundamental frequencies of the data segments presented vary when analyzed with different parameter settings. It is important to remember that in prosodic measurements such as these, it is the relative relationships rather than the absolute relationships which are crucial. In particular, Matsunami states that time domain analysis, such as that done here, 'is very sensitive to irregularities usually present in natural speech data such as temporary voice perturbation, phase distortion, and signal degradation .... Such distortions can be corrected by using a filter to eliminate high frequencies' (3). The data analyzed here were not filtered, however, as the acoustic measurements presented here are not the primary basis for the analysis of the data. The acoustic graphs of the fundamental frequency and amplitude measurements are provided simply as a supplementary channel of information by which to read the data. In other words, the acoustic graphs are provided as an additional assist to the reader. The primary analytical approach throughout the data analysis has been the perceptually salient auditory data.

There is also variation due to intrinsic F_o effects of both vowel and certain consonantal segments (Lehiste & Peterson 1961). This is the phenomenon whereby the high vowels [ii] and [u] have higher intrinsic pitch than low vowels such as [a] and [o]. Similarly, voiceless consonants seem to raise the F_o of the following vowel while voiced consonants lower it. This effect is said to be stronger at the vowel onset and for this reason, when accurate acoustic measurements are essential, acoustic phoneticians are
advised to take the measurement of the vowel in the middle. Matsunami states that 'it seems that the $F_o$ perturbation effect of the prevocalic consonant appears to be more salient to the listener's perception compared with the vowel intrinsic $F_o$ difference, while both phenomena are observable in the pitchgram analysis' (5). (See Pierrehumbert 1980, chapter 1 for discussion of intrinsic $F_o$ effects.)

For the analysis undertaken in Chapter Four, it should be noted that the displays of wave forms, pitch tracks and measures of amplitude constitute only one piece of evidence in the argumentation. These acoustic measurements serve primarily as a visual support in confirmation of the listener/researcher's auditory perception of salient, meaning-bearing tokens and utterances. This 'noticing' by the listener/analyst was in turn only the beginning of the actual analytic and interpretive process. A prosodic analysis of narrative segments from the corpus was initiated based on the observation that despite obvious limitations in the exolingual communication situations caused by the lack of a rich mutual repertoire of lexical and syntactic forms, meaningful communication was nevertheless taking place between the interactants. The instantaneous, 'on-line' interpretive work being done by both interactants, including the researcher as co-participant, in the production of the narratives constitutes one piece of evidence that meaning was being generated in the course of the interaction. Whether the meaning ascribed by each party to the event in general or to the specific verbal content cannot be ascertained to a degree of absolute certainty, of course, but the fact that the two interactants were able to derive what was for each of them a satisfactory interpretation of the events leads one to conclude that meaning of some sort was being achieved. As
Hanks (1996) says, in discussing communicative practices, 'what makes communication possible is not the perfect sharedness posited by Saussure and Chomsky but the modes of cooperation among different actors. Moreover, one corollary of this premise is that a given word has more than one possible meaning, depending upon the public to which it is directed or the participants who produce it' (217). Hanks (1996) also emphasizes that 'language is permeated by human experience and that the kind of mediation basic to linguistic relativity is a reflexive one in which verbal practices routinize ways of experiencing (201).

In the preceding sections and chapters, the purpose of providing extensive background on Korean immigration and settlement patterns as well as information on the ethnic, linguistic and cultural practices of Honolulu, Waikiki and the hotel itself was not only to provide context for the reader, but also to establish that the narrator and researcher, co-participants in these conversations, both residents of the same community in a sense, shared a certain number of experiences and expectations about the norms of that community. These shared community norms were often explicitly brought into play during the development of the narrative sequences, as will be seen in Chapter 4. These shared norms and expectations certainly contributed to the researcher's ability to infer meanings with some degree of confidence in cases where the expected lexical or syntactic cues were lacking.

At a second level, working later with the recorded data within a qualitative analytic framework, the listener/researcher was able to achieve a more refined interpretation of the event, noting, through the transcription process and the replaying of
the audio- and videotaped data, the fine-grained aspects of the interaction. A qualitative approach to data analysis is explained by Seliger and Shohamy (1989) in the following terms:

Typical of all qualitative analyses is that...the researchers identify, delimit, and sort the relevant segments of the text according to an organizing scheme. They look for commonalities, regularities, or patterns across the various data texts...Sometimes categories emerge from the data themselves rather than a specific analysis being imposed on the data; at other times, the researchers approach the data with predetermined categories...in mind. They then need to be validated and verified either by independent reviewers, who will obtain their own categories from the data, or by the researchers themselves when they return to the data in order to examine whether the same patterns and categories emerge again (205).

Seliger and Shohamy (1989) go on to distinguish two types of analytical techniques in the qualitative tradition, one being the application of a system of pre-existing categories, and the other an inductive procedure, which establishes '(a)...a set of categories for dealing with text segments from the text itself' (205), after which the categories discovered are applied to the data at hand, leading to 'refinement of the categories and the discovery of new commonalities or patterns' (205).

It is primarily the inductive procedure described by Seliger and Shohamy which is used in the analysis of the data collected for this study. The ESF project on immigrant language learners took a similar 'bottom up' approach and I was guided in my analysis of the narratives by many of the same considerations as the ESF team. In Chapter 4, section 4.1, details on the discovery and analytical methods proposed by the ESF team are provided in some detail by Perdue (1984). It is perhaps appropriate to anticipate on those considerations at this point:
We assume that there will be patterns and rules of use of pitch and rhythm emerging that have definite identifiable discourse functions in L2 use and the analyst can begin to suggest what those patterns and functions might be. For example, are particular pitch or rhythmic changes or patterns used to signal important or new information; is pitch used within the clause to indicate focus; does pitch have a referential function, binding different parts of the discourse together? (293)

Similarly, in the case of my study, it was the accumulation of observed detail over several speakers and over a number of different speech events which allowed me to notice emerging patterns, and thus to propose a picture of general tendencies.

Specific applications of these interpretive and analytical procedures will be illustrated in Chapter 4 in the course of data discussion.
Figure 3.1. Acoustic representation of raw waveform, volume waveform, volume (magnitude), autopitch and pitch overlay on volume ‘this man, me off day come back, # going already (laugh)’

Figure 3.2. Acoustic representation of raw smoothed pitch and pitch overlay ‘oh, Sun Ja you good!’
CHAPTER FOUR

PROSODY IN SECOND LANGUAGE USERS' NARRATIVES

Maybe we are constantly guessing what a speaker will say next, using every scrap of conscious and unconscious knowledge at our disposal, from how coarticulation distorts sounds, to the rules of English phonology, to the rules of English syntax, to stereotypes about who tends to do what to whom in the world, to hunches about what our conversational partner has in mind at that very moment.

Steven Pinker (1994:184)

Perhaps the most important, and surely the most perplexing, concept associated with the role of the hearer in verbal interaction is that of understanding. Indeed, it might be argued that how theorists conceptualize what it is for a hearer to understand an utterance constitutes one of the fundamental pillars supporting the edifice of modern linguistic thought. For on the concept of understanding depend the related notions of communication and language; and it is these notions which serve a foundational role in determining the goals and methods of modern language study.

Talbot Taylor (1986:91)

4.1 Introduction

The various functions of prosody as currently understood were briefly reviewed in Chapter Two. Recall that one of the essential facts about prosody is that it seems to have a dual face: what appear to be paralinguistic functions can also be interpreted as linguistic functions, and vice versa. At the core of all debates on prosody, then, is the question of which of its functions are to be considered linguistic and which are to be deemed paralinguistic, and on what basis the classifications are to be made. Features and functions labeled paralinguistic by one student of prosody may be deemed to be linguistic by another, using quite different criteria. A case in point is the prosodic tune of utterances commonly called ‘affect’. Intonational phonologists working on English and related languages (e.g., Ladd 1996, Gussenhoven 1984; Gussenhoven & Rietveld 1991; Ward & Hirschberg 1985, Hirschberg & Ward 1991, Pierrehumbert 1980; Pierrehumbert &
Hirschberg 1990) claim that these tunes are linguistic, and scholars of this persuasion attempt to associate specific pitch tunes with specific meanings and nuances. Others, e.g., Crystal (1969), observing the same prosodic phenomena, see in such tunes purely paralinguistic functions. Whether prosody is to be classified as a linguistic function or as a paralinguistic function is not merely a classificatory debate over scholarly minutiae. Its classification goes to the heart of what is to be considered language. For those whose investigation of language is framed by a cognitivist agenda, prosody will most likely remain a 'paralinguistic' feature. For those who conceptualize 'language' from a functional perspective and who seek to analyze language as a communicative activity, however, prosody is increasingly emerging from the supporting role to which it has long been relegated. It is among the company of those who would pursue the contributions of prosody to language functions that this study is situated.

Another area of debate is whether to classify the post-lexical functions of prosody such as focus and prominence on specific lexical items for purposes of information processing as linguistic or para-linguistic. Also open to classificatory debate is the status of prosody's role with respect to syntax, the debate here centering on the degree to which syntax is isochronous and isomorphic with prosody (Cutler et al. 1997; Bolinger 1978; Nespor & Vogel 1983; Hirst 1993; Gee & Grosjean 1983; Lehiste 1979; Swerts & Geluykens 1994; Swerts, Collier & Terken 1994; Grosz & Sidner 1986; Shattuck-Huffnagel & Turk 1996; Schafer 1995; Schafer, Carter, Clifton & Frazier 1996; Chafe 2000).
Subsequently, we saw that interactionally-oriented discourse analysts, inspired by the framework of conversation analysis and the role of contextualization cues, e.g., *inter alia* Gumperz, Couper-Kuhlen, Selting, Auer, and Wennerstrom, who examine the use of prosody at both the utterance and the discourse level, see the role of prosody as central in the speaker’s shaping of overall discourse design. In the perspective of interactional discourse analysts, discourse organization is interactionally-driven and the constraints of listener-oriented verbal action are considered a primary function of language. It follows that in this view prosody is coming to be seen as having clear linguistic functions.

In this section, the focus is on a quite different aspect of prosody that has not been noted in the phonological literature, where the focus has primarily been on an analysis of prosody used by native speakers. One notable exception to this orientation is the work of Wennerstrom (1994, 1997, 1998, 2000, 2001a, 2001b), who focuses on prosody as used by non-native speakers. However, Wennerstrom's analyses have all been conducted with instructed learners who were highly educated non-native speakers (e.g., graduate students in U.S. universities) using English in academic settings. Because of these fundamental differences in both manner of acquisition and proficiency, Wennerstrom's analyses of non-native speakers cannot necessarily be generalized to the 'creative' uses of prosody found in my corpus contributed by naturalistic acquirers.

In this chapter, I analyze spontaneous oral narrative texts produced for a listener who was a native speaker of English in an interlanguage composed (mostly) of English lexicon by native speakers of Korean living in Hawai‘i. The goal will be twofold: (1) to determine what features of these skeletal texts enabled the listener to 'make sense' of the
narration at the time, and (2) to determine post hoc what resources the narrators relied on to supplement their rudimentary English lexicon and syntax, in order to achieve the listener’s understanding. A preliminary analysis revealed that it was primarily the use of prosodic features which allowed the successful accomplishment of the narrative interaction. We will therefore turn our attention to isolating the role played by prosody in the interactionally-motivated construction of these oral narratives.

As might be expected, we shall see that there are domains in which prosody is employed by the Korean narrators in ways that seem to be universal. What we shall primarily examine here, however, are the unexpected, ‘creative’ uses of prosody by these narrators, i.e., we shall examine how they use prosodic resources to serve lexical, syntactic and discoursal purposes when their limited knowledge of English does not allow them to draw on the large reservoir of lexical and syntactic resources available in English to accomplish their communicative goals. Whereas for proficient second language speakers, prosody is a complementary channel of information (Wennerstrom 1998), serving primarily discourse organizational functions, for low proficiency but communicatively motivated speakers, it is often a primary resource.

That prosody should be employed for ‘multi-task’ linguistic purposes should not be surprising, given that its essential duality as both a paralinguistic and linguistic feature has been previously well-documented. Similar uses of prosody have previously been observed by those few researchers who have worked with interlanguage narratives. Wennerstrom (1998), for example, noted that ‘intonation is not only a stylistic component of accent but also a meaning-bearing grammatical system’ (1).
The ‘creative’ aspect of prosody we are dealing with here has also been noted in other reports of naturalistic language acquirers, such as those analyzed by the ESF adult immigrant second language acquisition research project, the study most directly comparable to this one in terms of speaker profiles and language tasks accomplished for the purposes of data collection. Perdue (1984) reports that the English research team also found that ‘prosodic features are frequently substituted for syntax, not supplementary to it as in English-English (EE)’ (292). Perdue then explains in some detail the methods originally proposed by the English team for the analysis of the narratives collected:

It emerged that in attempting to map the EE tone group system onto different SL [source language] speech, we were distorting our perceptual experience to fit our preconceptions and indeed overlooking patterns that might emerge if we had tried to derive them from the L2 speaker’s discourse itself (292).

... As a guideline we assume that there will be patterns and rules of use of pitch and rhythm emerging that have definite identifiable discourse functions in L2 use and the analyst can begin to suggest what those patterns and functions might be. For example, are particular pitch or rhythmic changes or patterns used to signal important or new information; is pitch used within the clause to indicate focus; does pitch have a referential function, binding different parts of the discourse together?

This process of noting and interpreting patterns is a ‘bottom up’ process in which one is attempting to derive ‘rules’ from the data.

We can also begin to suggest whether these signals are being read by the other party to the interaction, and whether the L2 speaker is picking up on the prosodic signals of the TL [target language] speaker (293).

Unfortunately, the ESF project’s goal of pursuing a detailed prosodic analysis of the narrative data collected from adult immigrants in five target languages (English, German, Dutch, French and Swedish) from six source languages (Punjabi, Italian, Turkish, Arabic, Spanish, Finnish) was never realized (Perdue 1984, 1993a, 1993b).
In the next section, (4.2), I will examine the uses of prosody as lexico-syntactic devices at the local (phrasal and sentence) level. In the subsequent section, (4.3), I will examine the contribution of prosody at the global level, i.e., at the level of narrative structure. There are substantial overlaps and interfaces between the two roles, obviously, as the prosodically-realized lexical and syntactic components are embedded in discourse functions, and, similarly, the discourse cannot be constituted without a minimum of lexical and syntactic input, but for purposes of analysis of the different functions, I will attempt to present, to the extent possible, the various prosodic functions as being relatively discrete.

4.2 Local level infrastructure: prosodic contributions to lexicon and syntax

In this section, we will be examining primarily what might be termed ‘creative’ uses of prosody at both the lexical and syntactic levels in order to ‘make meaning’ in an interactive context when the narrators lack extensive knowledge of the target language. That is to say, both of the processes to be described in this section (lexical expansion and syntactic elaboration) are driven by the goals and constraints of interaction and communicative needs.

At the lexical level, the narrators have recourse to prosody as a means of circumlocuting their limitations in vocabulary. At the phrase level, they prosodically shape their propositions, achieving syntactic elaboration, in order to render the information structure of their narratives comprehensible to their listener.
Recall that in Chapter Two, section 2.4.1.2, in the course of the literature review of 'prosody's role in syntactic disambiguation', Cutler et al. (1997) concluded that prosodic signaling of boundaries can be seen either as signaling a syntactic break or a constituent grouping. It is precisely this function of 'signaling of a constituent grouping' which will become apparent in the interlanguage uses of prosody for purposes of syntactic organization within a discourse context examined here.

The use of prosody by these narrators seems almost instinctive, as the output appears to be only incidentally influenced by prosodic conventions of either the source language or the target language(s), one obvious exception being the extremely frequent use by all of the narrators of the salient local Hawaiian discourse marker chunk yeah if, which takes the form of an easily inserted 'tag question/connective'. Whether the narrators are relying on prosodic universals and 'remixing' the elements in order to create a unique interlanguage is an essential but unanswered question. Similar 'creative' uses of prosody by adult immigrant language learners have been alluded to but never reported on in depth in other studies (Perdue 1984, 1993a, 1993b). As discussed at some length in Chapter One, attention to the interlanguage features of uninstructed, low proficiency, arguably fossilized adult second language learners has not heretofore been a priority for acquisitionists working within most of the dominant paradigms.

Indeed, even the few previous studies of the role of prosody in the speech of second language learners have, in one format or another, compared native speaker production with output by learners situated within academic institutions who are the product of instructed language learning (Wennerstrom 1994, 1997, 1998, 2000, 2001a,
In seeking to identify naturalistic acquirers’ instinctive [i.e., unobstructed through instructional intervention] recourse to creative uses of prosody for communicative and information-structuring purposes, the approach used in this study is as radically distinct from comparative studies using 'target-like' models of assessment as were the interlanguage studies distinct from the earlier studies of learner errors under the Contrastive Analysis framework. Indeed, if labels are needed, this study could be said to be an examination of the nature of interlanguage prosody, which situates it in the field of 'phonological pragmatics' (a term coined by Auer 1996:28).

In section 4.3, Global level narrative structure and cohesion, below, examples of various uses of prosody for purposes of discourse organization will be presented. Indeed, it will be claimed that for low proficiency speakers of English, prosody plays a much greater role in discourse organization than it does for proficient speakers, who can also rely on lexical and syntactic resources in addition to prosodic ones.

What will be demonstrated throughout this section, however, is something quite different with respect to prosody. Here it will be shown that prosody plays a qualitatively different role for low proficiency but highly fluent naturalistic acquirers of a second language with long-term exposure to the target language. It should be noted that here the term 'fluent' is not used in the sense of 'highly accurate' but in the sense of 'flowing'. Upon initial examination of the written transcripts, the narrative texts appear to be composed of rather disjointed juxtapositions of stream-of-consciousness linear propositions. However, when their co-occurring prosodic features are included in the analysis, the texts acquire both syntactic sophistication and narrative coherence.
Prosody serves a triple role in these narratives:

1. it substitutes for gaps in the narrators' lexicon,
2. it conveys syntactic relationships to the hearer when the narrators' knowledge of needed forms in English is insufficient, and
3. it organizes the discourse by marking a variety of segment boundaries in the narrative thread and by disambiguating the meaning carried by the minimal lexicon.

None of these functions could be said to fall far outside the normal set of functions of prosody. There are two striking aspects to this corpus which do, however, make it noteworthy: (1) the number and frequency of marked prosodic occurrences; and (2) the leading role (as opposed to supplementary role) which prosody plays in the construction of these texts, at the local (segmental and phrasal) level as well as at the global (discoursal) level.

The specific prosodic devices by which these three functions are realized will be explained by means of illustrative examples. The first two functions, i.e., the lexical expansion and syntactic elaboration functions, are commented on in sections 4.2.1 and 4.2.2, respectively. Prosodic contributions to the organization of narrative discourse will be dealt with in section 4.3 and the following subsections.

It should be noted that there is some unavoidable overlap between lexical and syntactic categories, as well as between lexico-syntactic devices and discourse structure organizing devices, and some of the devices treated here will be taken up again in section 4.3 in order to discuss their role in narrative organization in greater depth.

Standard English morphosyntax, usually considered indispensable to the realization of coherent English narratives, plays almost no role in the narratives of these
six speakers. Because this is not a study of developmental stages of interlanguage, nor is it a comparison of learner language with target-like utterances based on error analysis, a systematic inventory of the morphosyntactic features of these narrators’ language was beyond the scope of this study. However, even a brief perusal of the narrative transcripts will reveal a paucity in the morphosyntactic complexity, as well as in the lexicon.

One additional point to be emphasized is that while the lexicon undeniably does contribute to the listener’s understanding of these narratives, the relative weight of the load carried by prosody in disambiguating or adding meaning is considerable, given the syntactic and lexical limitations of these narrators. In other words, while the analysis does not seek to downplay the contribution to the overall comprehensibility of the texts made by the English lexical cues and the syntax which are present in the narratives, the extreme paucity of this inventory will be assumed. It will then be shown that these speakers rely extensively on prosodic resources when their knowledge of the lexicon and syntactic structures prove insufficient to accomplish the narrative task at hand.

The study thus lends support for the attribution of a more central role for prosody, despite its sometimes being considered ‘secondary’ or ‘redundant’, implying a second-class status. Here it will be seen that prosody actually plays a central role in supplementing the propositional content when speakers are faced with lexical and syntactic lacunae. Prosody also contributes to scaffolding the overall discourse structure, allowing speakers to enhance the comprehensibility of the texts for their listener while deploying a minimum of lexis and syntax.
4.2.1 Lexical expansion: rhythmic reduplication and segmental lengthening

In the lexical domain, we find prosodic features of two types used to expand the lexical repertoire:

(a) intentional rhythmic reduplication of basic vocabulary, and

(b) segmental lengthening of basic vocabulary.

Both intentional rhythmic reduplication and segmental lengthening occur abundantly in the corpus. To convey the flavor of contexts in which these prosodic manipulations tend to occur, I have selected six one-line utterances from Sun Ja’s ‘Saimin House’ narrative in which both of these lexical expansion devices co-occur. The excerpted segments are taken from various points in the narrative in which Sun Ja describes her work history prior to being hired at the Waikiki hotel in 1983, but they are topically linked in that all of them refer to a recurrent theme in this narrative: the difficult working conditions at a saimin restaurant,5 which was her first ‘real job’ in Hawai’i, a job which Sun Ja remembers with great distaste. Among other complaints, she had to work the late shift from 6:00 p.m. until 2:00 a.m. and the boss was always complaining and shouting orders at her in a very gruff manner to the point of making her cry. Ultimately she left the saimin restaurant to work in a ceramics factory because working conditions there were better. [The full transcript may be consulted in Appendix E, narrative text 5, Saimin House.]

(1) Lexical expansion strategies: intentional rhythmic reduplication and syllable lengthening (often co-occurring)

(Sun-Ja, female, age 54, 24 years in Hawai’i)
In the four utterances (1-1) – (1-4), there are but three main lexical items (more, hard, job), with 'hard job' occurring as a collocation in each of the utterances. More appears to be Sun Ja's word of choice for expressing 'extreme degree', although she obviously knows the word very and its target-like usage as an adverbial modifier of adjectives, as attested in its one occurrence, e.g., (1-2) very hard job. Note that very and more do not co-occur, however, providing further support for the idea that more has lexicalized in Sun

---

a In all data examples, the initial 'M' refers to the researcher/listener and the other initials are the designations assigned to the Korean narrators. In this case, the narrator is Sun Ja (SJ).

b The reference codes in brackets following text or graphically displayed examples correspond to the .wav sound files which can be accessed on the accompanying CD-2, 'Narrative Segments'. The number indicates the line in the narrative transcript which corresponds to that segment. For a full explanation of coding conventions referring to the transcripts and the audio files, see page xxiv.

c A prosodic and pragmatic description of this term and the motivation for its transcription as 'yeahQ' rather than 'yeah?', which is found frequently throughout the transcripts, is explained in the Transcription Conventions in Appendix D. The saliency of this term in HCE is also discussed in Chapter Two, section 2.6.2.2, and in Vanderslice and Pierson (1972 [1967]).
Ja’s vocabulary in an adverbial usage of ‘great extent’, roughly equivalent to *very*. The entire corpus contains no tokens of Sun Ja using the comparative degree marker ‘-er’ and the grammar of HCE, to the extent that it has been available as input, would have led Sun Ja to generalize the use of *more* as an intensifier, according to HCE usage, as in ‘*mo* bettah’, *mo ha:d* [hard], frequent and salient idiomatic expressions in Hawai’i Pidgin (also frequently heard are *mo easy, mo hot, mo angry*).

Although Sun Ja obviously knows the word ‘very’, as attested in (1-2), her preferred means of expressing adverbs of degree (extremely, very) seems to be repetition of the word ‘more’. When she needs to increase the degree of intensity, this is realized prosodically through syllable lengthening. In (1-2), where she uses ‘very’ as an alternative for ‘more’ (which she had used in 1-1), she then uses a repetition of ‘hard’, again prosodically lengthened, to convey the degree of difficulty, lacking as she does a range of lexical alternatives to help her convey her ideas (e.g., ‘extremely’, ‘unbelievably’, ‘incredibly’ as adverbial substitutes for ‘more hard’, or any number of alternatives which might have occurred to a native speaker or to a more proficient second language speaker.)

Such repetition, or reduplication, is of course a common phenomenon, found in all natural languages, albeit with certain constraints. English, for example, licenses reduplication of certain adverbs, e.g., (2-1) and (2-2), below. Certain adjectival reduplications, e.g., (2-3) and (2-4), are clearly more marginal, and other collocations, e.g., (2-5) would probably be judged outright ungrammatical.

(2)  
(2-1) I am very, very hungry.
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(2-2) I am really, really sorry.

(2-3) ?We had a hard, hard time getting through the snow.
(2-4) ?He’s a good, good boy.

(2-5) *She’s more, more beautiful [than me].

Sun Ja’s repetitions are clearly ‘ungrammatical’ if judged by norms of usage in either standard English or HCE, but reduplication as a productive process is a well-documented phenomenon in pidgins and creoles around the world as well as in naturalistic second language acquisition. Thus, reduplication, being an easily-available productive lexical expansion process is not particularly noteworthy per se. However, when analyzed as one of several features to arise out of a bundle of resources, and when viewed from the perspective of the contributions of rhythm and prosody to the making of meaning, it takes on more significance as one of a cluster of resources available to second language learners.

In (1-5) and (1-6), ‘plenny’ and ‘line’ are the two words which Sun Ja modifies prosodically to supplement her limited vocabulary. The term ‘plenny’ (derived from ‘plenty’ and which is often heard as [plæːni] in local parlance) is very salient in HCE as the general cover term for ‘a lot of’, ‘many’. Here Sun Ja uses it to good effect three times in the two utterances, prosodically lengthening it to create an adverbial of degree in each repetition. In (1-5) she makes her main argument as to why the boss should pay her wages, and in (1-6), which is the subsequent utterance in the narrative, she not only exaggerates the lengthening of the word ‘ple::nny’, but also produces it with increased volume and at an extremely high pitch, reaching well beyond 300Hz. In the context in
which it is embedded (using a reconstructed self-quotation to show how she argued with
the saimin restaurant boss who didn’t want to pay her three days wages after she had
started working at the ceramic factory), her repetitive use of ‘line’ in (1-6) is not a simple
retracing or stammer, but rather, a very deliberate emphasis on the long lines of people
waiting to buy cheap saimin (implying that the restaurant boss is getting very rich and
that he should be able to pay her the three days’ wages which he owes her).

Pitch tracks for examples (1-2) and (1-6) are provided as Figures 4.1. and 4.2.
respectively, to illustrate the lengthened syllables ha:rd, mo:re, ple::nny and the co-
occurrence of high pitch points on these lengthened syllables.

One might reasonably argue here that syllable lengthening and higher-than-
normal pitch is an example of prosody being used for emotive or affective reasons. The
situation is undeniably emotionally laden, but given Sun Ja’s limited vocabulary and
limited command of syntax, I submit that her rhythmically patterned utterances, which
might appear to be purely emotional, are, rather, her attempt to 'play her one-string harp
with great versatility', as eloquently proposed by Klein (1981:75).

Studies of rhythm have not yet become central to the study of language, but as
Scollon (1982) explains quite convincingly, it is in fact a very productive way to
approach the organization of talk-in-interaction. Scollon (1982) notes that ‘[m]any of us,
in reading Lenneberg
Fig. 4.1. Lexical expansion strategies: co-occurring intentional rhythmic reduplication and syllable lengthening Acoustic measurements of example (1-2) ‘very hard hard job!’ (Sun-Ja [Saimin 38:very hard])

Fig. 4.2 Lexical expansion strategies: co-occurring intentional rhythmic Reduplication and syllable lengthening Acoustic measurements of example (1-6) ‘(y’know ?) cheap ple::nny people line line line [>] <line line>’ (Sun Ja [Saimin 120:plnnyline])
(1967), were caught by the notion of the critical period for language development and missed his assertion that rhythm was the organizing principle of speech and language’ (335).

Grounded inferencing such as that underlying my proposal with respect to the productive use of prosody to expand the lexicon is a viable procedure and is supported by a process of analysis advocated by Halliday and Hasan (1967), who were quite explicit in suggesting that the interpretation of specific lexical items must be tied to the 'history' of that item within a specific text:

Every lexical item may enter into a cohesive relation, but by itself it carries no indication whether it is functioning cohesively or not. That can be established only by reference to the text. Without our being aware of it, each occurrence of a lexical item carries with it its own textual history, a particular collocational environment that has been built up in the course of the creation of the text and that will provide the context within which the item will be incarnated on this particular occasion. This environment determines the 'instantial meaning', or text meaning, of the item, a meaning which is unique to each specific instance (288-289).

In reading or listening to text, we process continuously, and therefore by the time any given lexical item is taken in, its context has already been prepared; and the preceding lexical environment is perhaps the most significant component of this context. It frequently provides a great deal of hidden information that is relevant to the interpretation of the item concerned (289).

Speaking of the speaker's construction and the listener's interpretation of rhythmic gestalts, Auer, Couper-Kuhlen and Muller (1999) argue for the centrality of rhythm in the interpretative process:

Rhythm...is not a property of physical signals such as acoustic waveforms...It is the human mind which perceives certain physical cues as forming a rhythmic pattern or gestalt...To speak of rhythm therefore necessarily implies an interpretation of the physical data, a constructive process in the course of which these data become part of a holistic scheme,
which is then able to incorporate further details from the incoming signal. Sonnenschein (1925) gave a definition that comes close to this view of rhythm: 'Rhythm is that property of a sequence of events in time which produces in the mind of the observer the impression of proportion between the durations of the several events or groups of events of which the sequence is composed' (Sonnenschein 1925: 16; cited in Auer et al. 1999: 23).

In sum, I interpret the rhythmically realized repetitions of these utterances to be much more than expressions of emotion. I perceive them as tokens of productive, creative lexical processes. They are, in short, exemplars of the human faculty to create language with bare bones resources and they are as relevant to the study of the properties of language as are the ill-formed utterances of toddlers learning their first language.

It is important to note at this point that prosodically marked reduplication and segment lengthening as lexical expansion devices are not idiosyncratically produced by one speaker, but are, rather, found throughout the corpus. These lexical substitutes tend to be found in much greater abundance, however, in the narratives of speakers in which two conditions are met: low proficiency, coupled with an other-centered, highly social approach to communicative tasks which results in the speaker’s use of a multiplicity of communicative strategies. On the other hand, when a speaker with limited proficiency makes more use of strategies which rely on the interlocutor’s ability to provide communicative scaffolding (e.g., nominating a topic, then allowing the NS interlocutor to ‘guess’ the point or provide either/or options which the low proficiency speaker repeats or resolves by insertion of L1 vocabulary), it appears to correlate with that speaker having less recourse to productive prosodic lexical expansion strategies. With increased proficiency, of course, a speaker’s need to rely on such lexical expansion
strategies is reduced. An example of a low proficiency speaker seeking scaffolding from the interlocutor occurred when Sang-Ho was searching for the word 'fall' or 'autumn' in the course of telling his school picnic narrative. Thinking that I might know the names of the seasons in Korean, he went through the list of seasons in Korean until I gave him the English word.

For purposes of comparison and contrast with the previous example, I will provide several additional examples of intentional rhythmic reduplication and syllable lengthening from other narrators, both male and female. The first examples are excerpted from an episode in Sang-Ho's narrative recounting his memories about arriving in Hawai'i. Sang-Ho was 54 years of age at the time of the recording and of all the narrators in the corpus, he had been in Hawai'i for the shortest amount of time, i.e., nine years at the time the recordings were made. Although Sang-Ho has a much lower emotive key than Sun Ja, as well as the least variation in pitch range of any of the six narrators in the corpus, within his characteristic range, he makes use of the same prosodic devices of intentional rhythmic reduplication and segment lengthening in order to compensate for his limited descriptive lexicon.

In the narrative entitled 'All Park!', Sang-Ho is recalling what happened at the immigration checkpoint the day in 1989 he first arrived at Honolulu airport as an immigrant from Korea. Other aspects of this text will be analyzed later, but for the moment, I will focus on Sang-Ho's use of the lexical expansion devices under consideration: intentional rhythmic reduplication and segment lengthening. In this humorous episode punctuated by laughter on the part of both the speaker and listener,
Sang-Ho is describing his astonishment upon arriving in 'America', where he expected everything to be large and imposing, to find that Honolulu's airport is much smaller than he had imagined it and much smaller than the international terminal in Seoul with which he was familiar. The main examples of prosodic manipulations used for lexical expansion are found at lines 3-12 (rhythmic reduplication) and 3-13 (lengthened segment):

(3) Lexical expansion strategies: co-occurrence of intentional rhythmic reduplication and syllable lengthening (Sang-Ho, male, 9 years in Hawai'i)

(3-1) SHP: Korea you know this airport yeahQ. [AP 3]
(3-2) SHP: air[/] airport this house\(^d\) # ver:y nice, very big yeahQ! [AP 4]
(3-3) M: yes. ver:y big, yeah . [AP 5]
(3-4) SHP: Hawai'i this6 coming yeahQ. [AP 6]
(3-5) SHP: oh my god! [AP 7]
(3-6) SHP so big xx xx (American?) [AP 8]
  %pro: incredulity in voice
(3-7) M: laughing [AP 9]
(3-8) SHP: yeah? [AP10]
(3-9) SHP: small kine yeahQ. [AP11]

(3-10) SHP: little bit [?] small this one yeahQ. [AP16]

(3-11) SHP: small kine xx xx [AP21]
(3-12) SHP: small, small small yeahQ [Pkair:Smlsml][AP22]
  %pro: repetition in rapid succession

(3-13) SHP: I thinking yeah ve:::ry nice, big, very big yeahQ airport xx	house yeahQ. [Pkair: APbig][AP24]

(3-14) SHP: my god! [AP27]
(3-15) SHP: is Hawai'i ok? [AP28]
  %par: laughing
(3-16) M: laughing
(3-17) M: but Honolulu is sma:ll!
  (Park [All Park] 3-11,16,21-24,27-28; [Pkairseg: Smlsml, Apbig])

\(^d\) The word 'house' at lines 2 and 13 should be glossed here as 'building'.
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Sang-Ho had introduced the contrast between his expectations of a large airport in line 3-2, and in lines 3-9, 3-10 and 3-11 he has already repeatedly employed the descriptive adjective 'small'.

Subsequently, in line 3-12, Sang-Ho repeats the word 'small' three more times. The word is not simply repeated, however. Sang-Ho uttered it with a rhythmic pattern which prosodically cued me, as interlocutor, to attend not only to his emphasis on his affective, emotive condition of astonishment at the size of the airport, which he had previously established in lines 3-9 through 3-11, particularly as he adroitly set up the contrast of his first impression of 'smallness' with his expectation of 'bigness', expressed in lines 3-2, 3-3 and 3-6. As interlocutor, I was prosodically cued by Sang-Ho's rhythmic repetition to attribute additional meaning to the word 'small'. If he were speaking in his native language, he would be able to select from a panoply of adjectives to describe his impression. Lacking as he does a large lexical stock to select from in English, however, his only option is to continuously repeat the word 'small'. Rather than simply repeat the word he has already used in lines 3-9, 3-10 and 3-11, he casts it in a distinctly different prosodic rhythm under the contour of single accentual phrase. It is admittedly conjectural, but I attribute this to his desire to introduce lexical variation into his narrative.

What is the basis for claiming validity for my conjecturing and other similar interpretations? In answer to this, I appeal to the concept of 'community of practice', defined by Hanks (1996), citing Eckert and McConnell-Ginet (1992:464), as 'an aggregate of people who come together around mutual engagement in an endeavor' (221). As Hanks quite accurately points out, this approach is a particularly fruitful one for the
analysis of ad hoc interactions in which the participants are not following well-known, prescribed codes of interaction, for it 'provides a framework in which to define modes of participation and ways of speaking relative to the processes through which they are constituted' (221), and, furthermore, 'it implies that we are all more or less continuously learning new ways of speaking, even in our own native language, as we enter into collective endeavors of various kinds...Furthermore, it is the overall participation framework as an emergent process that "does the learning," just as...it is the participation framework in which an utterance acquires meaning that "does the talking" (222). Thus, I can say that I feel a reasonable degree of confidence in my interpretations as I was co-participant and engaged in the narrative endeavor at hand.

In line 3-13, Sang-Ho lengthens the vowel segment of 've::ry' and produces it at an extremely low pitch, undoubtedly partially in order to emphasize the contrast between his expectations and what he encountered, but the lengthening and the exaggerated deviation from his normal pitch here, once again, could also be construed as a simultaneous lexical substitution strategy. Note that although he freely injects discourse markers such as 'yeahQ', 'you know', and 'my God!', giving an impression of speaking quite confidently, Sang-Ho's vocabulary is actually quite limited, the descriptive adverbs he uses consisting of only two ('little bit' and 'very') and his adjectives being limited to 'nice', 'big', 'small' and the local Hawaiian expression 'small kine'. Perusing his entire corpus, a few additional tokens of descriptive vocabulary can be found, but it can be claimed with confidence that he does not have mastery over an extremely rich lexical inventory.
Similarly, two other speakers use the same technique. Sok, describing the sand storm he experienced while working as an auto mechanic in Saudi Arabia in (4), below, uses both segmental lengthening \( (a::ll) \) and intentional repetition \( (come \ in) \) to emphasize how the sand was pouring in through every crevice of the building:

\[
\text{(4) Lexical expansion strategies: co-occurrence of intentional rhythmic reduplication and syllable lengthening (Sok-Hyon, male, 13 years in Hawai`i)}
\]

\[
\text{come in come in then you know a::ll you know sand inside}
\]

\[
\text{The sand was really blowing in hard! We had big mounds of it inside the shop!}
\]

\[
\text{(SOK [Dust Storm] 43; [Dustseg:comein])}
\]

I will conclude this section with two examples excerpted from segments related by Sang Hee, one of the lowest English proficiency narrators in the corpus, in her 'Hawaii nobody help' and 'Very, very cry' narratives (texts 4 and 7, respectively, Appendix E). In these narrative produced after viewing the video clip of Modern Times, Sang-Hee is trying to explain to me how hard life was when she first came to Hawai`i with her three children. She had come to Hawai`i to join her husband, who had already been living here for three years, working on a fishing boat for a Korean company based in Incheon.\(^8\)

These examples illustrate the use of reduplication as a simple exclamatory device. The first example (5-4) is Sang-Hee's response to my query about the ways in which the family's local Japanese friend helped them out when they first arrived. The second example (5-6) occurred in the context of Sang-Hee having just told me about her difficulties and that sometimes she went in to the shower stall at work to cry. I inquired whether she talked to her husband about her frustration at not being able to speak English at work and her response is an emphatic repetition.
(5) Simple emphatic, emotive reduplication to express an opinion (5-4) and (5-6) (in contrast to lexical expansion strategy of intentional rhythmic reduplication)

(Sang-Hee, female, 15 years in Hawai‘i)

(5-1) M: how did he help?
[speaking Korean]
(5-2) SHY: uh very yeah yeah nice.
(5-3) M: money or just /+? xxx
→ (5-4) SHY: no no no // no money yeahQ.
'No, no. He didn't give us money.'

(SHY [Hawaii nobody help] 18-22)

(5-5) M: Did you talk to your husband?
→ (5-6) SHY: no no no no! yeah.
'No, no, no!'

(SHY [Very cry] 47-48)

Rhythmic, deliberate repetition conveying the adverbial of degree seen in example (4) contrasts sharply with high-pitched emphatic repetitions of 'no' in rapid succession in (5-4) and (5-6). (The meaning of example (5-6) is ambiguous and interpretable either as 'no, absolutely not, I never talked to him' or 'no way--I wouldn't talk to him about that', but under either interpretation, the repetition of 'no' is clearly meant to be an emphatic denial rather than an adverbial of degree.)

In audible contrast to the intentional rhythmic reduplications presented above as a means of lexical expansion, the narrators in this corpus often have recourse to repetitions (retracings) which are simply hesitation devices or stutters during which time they are engaging in lexical recall or reformulation of an utterance. These can generally be prosodically distinguished from intentional reduplications used as lexical expansion by the fact that intentional reduplication usually occurs under one intonation contour,
whereas the reduplication as hesitation device is usually (although not always) separated by pause boundaries. (See Fig. 4.3. [dustseg: comein, ex. 4] and Fig. 4.4. [dustseg: notwork, ex. 7-3], below, for examples of this contrast.)

At a later point in Sang-Ho’s narrative about his arrival at Honolulu airport, for example, the repetition in (6-1) is clearly perceived by the listener as a hesitation, as I intervene to suggest an alternative word in the overlapped (6-2) utterance. Sang-Ho readily incorporates the suggested word into his narrative in (6-3), and enthusiastically confirms it as the appropriate term in (6-4).

(6) Repetition as hesitation device rather than as lexical expansion device
(Sang-Ho, male, 9 years in Hawai‘i)

(6-1) SHP: I thinking no America is uh <more all> [/] more all [<>nice!
(6-2) M: [big.
(6-3) SHP: all big!
(6-4) SHP: oh yeah yeah!

(SHP [All Park] 36; [pkusbig])

The prosodic features of Sok’s intentional rhythmic reduplication as a lexical expansion strategy, seen above in (4), can be contrasted with his repetitions which were purely hesitation devices allowing him time to retrieve the words he was looking for as in (7), below:

(7) Repetition as hesitation device rather than as lexical expansion device
(Sok-Hyon, male, 13 years in Hawai‘i)

(7-1) //friend <we /can [/] we can not see (In 17 [notsee])
(7-2) we /have to /yeah /glass //on -, /safet(y) glass //on:: -. (In 21 [glasson])
(7-3) <can not // [/<]can not work (In 83 [notwork])

(Sok-Hyon [Dust Storm] 17,21,83;
[Dustseg:notsee, glasson, notwork])
Fig. 4.3. Lexical expansion strategies: intentional rhythmic reduplication

Acoustic measurements of example (4)
‘come in come in then you a::ll you know sand inside’
(SOK [Dust Storm] 43: comein)

Note that the repetitions of 'come in, come in' at the t(sec) markers .200 - 600 and .750 - 1.240 are spoken with very similar high pitch contours (varying from around 200 Hz to 275 Hz) and that this heightened pitch range is sustained over the two utterances. Note also that over the duration of the two repetitions there is no declination. The height of the onset pitch range, the relatively wide variation in pitch over the utterance and the lack of declination are all indices which lead to an interpretation of intentional repetition on the part of the speaker.
Fig. 4.4. Reduplication and stuttering as hesitation device, in contrast to Intentional rhythmic reduplication
Acoustic measurements of example (7-3) 'can not // can not work' (SOK [Dust Storm: notwork])

In Fig. 4.4., the repetitions of 'can not can not' are also produced at almost identical pitch levels with no declination (varying between 150-175 Hz). The flatness of the pitch contour removes the insisting, adverbial quality of the 'come in, come in' utterance. Furthermore, the abrupt pause after the first 'can', at approximately the 1.000 sec. marker, suggests that the speaker is stalling for time. The pause is eventually closed with a simple repetition, as the speaker has not found any lexical alternative.

Although it is no doubt true that the lexical content provides some guidance to the listener as to the parsing which is to be made of the utterance, based on these examples and many others in the corpus, it is proposed that prosodic features serve an important role as cues to distinguishing between a time-stalling hesitation device from an intentional rhythmic reduplication. In the case of the more marked and lexically more
weighted intentional rhythmic reduplication, the speakers endow their repetitions with a rhythmic flow by placing them under the same intonation contour, without pausing, and sustaining the pitch contour.

Numerous repetitions are contained in the segments collected from Won-Ja, one of the narrators who has very low English proficiency. All of the repetitions turned out to be hesitations of the disfluent retracing type, however. The two examples below are from the 'Key No More' narrative collected from Won-Ja when she was asked to describe a memorable day at work. She proceeded to describe how she lost her room pass key the first day on the job as a maid at the Waikīkī hotel. The narrative as a whole will be analyzed later, but an examination of the two excerpted lines below provides further exemplification of the distinction between intentional rhythmic reduplication and narrator hesitation devices:

(8) Repetition as hesitation device
   (Won-Ja, female, 13 years in Hawai‘i)

(8-1) no. first day, somebody [/] somebody together #/together uh.
   (Won Ja [Key No More] 42)

(8-2) >somebody [/] somebody [/] somebody maybe [/] maybe say ="you crazy over there this [in]side.
   (Won Ja [Key No More] 52)

Notable in examples (8-1) and (8-2), and what distinguishes them from a prosodic lexical expansion device, is the fact that there are pause boundaries between retracings, with each token coming under a separate intonational contour. The resulting rhythmicity does not lead the listener to link the concepts.
It is quite striking, in fact, that the two narrators who make the most extensive use of the prosodic rhythmic reduplication devices (Sun-Ja and Sang-Ho) are the two narrators who share the characteristic of having quite limited proficiency but who have very sociable personalities and display a high degree of communicative competency. Sok is also very gregarious and communicative and he does use the two prosodic resources for lexical expansion under discussion here, e.g., prosodic rhythmic repetition and segmental lengthening (as seen in example (4), above), but his overall proficiency and lexical inventory is somewhat higher than that of either Sun-Ja or Sang-Ho, so it appears he turns less frequently to this device. In the corpora provided by Won-Ja and Sang-Hee, the two narrators who are at the low end of the proficiency spectrum and who also rank lower in terms of English communicative effort and English communicative efficiency, no tokens of attempts to use rhythmic repetition to compensate for lexical deficiencies were found in these recordings. A few tokens of segmental lengthening were found, but upon close examination, the few tokens available were found to be primarily affective lengthenings or discourse organizational prosodic features rather than lexical suppletive devices. The distinction between discourse organization device and lexical suppletive device could be considered a fine one, however, in that discourse organization obviously relies to a great extent on lexical tokens. I distinguish between the two in this corpus of low proficiency speakers primarily on the basis of the context in which they occur. An example of segmental lengthening which I classified as serving discourse organization rather than lexical suppletion is shown in (9-7), below. In this case, answering my query...
as to the ways a local Japanese man was helpful to her family (9-1, 9-4), SHY appears to me to be clearly listing:

(9) Segmental lengthening as discourse organizational device

(9-1) MAR: how did he help?
(9-2) MAR: [speaking Korean]
(9-3) SHY: uh very yeah yeah nice .
(9-4) MAR: money or just /+? xxx
(9-5) SHY: no no no // no money yeahQ .
(9-6) SHY: only -, uh uh # no more car .
\rightarrow (9-7) SHY: yeah sho:pping and-, %pro: listing intonation
(9-8) MAR: oh: !
(9-9) SHY: sometime yeahQ sometime oceanside, beach6 .

(SHY [Hawaii nobody help] 18-26)

The sixth narrator in this corpus, Young-Eun, is very low in English proficiency and has an extremely limited vocabulary, but her interactional strategies and communicative patterns do not resemble those of the other five narrators, as discussed earlier in Chapter Two. Examples from her narratives will be presented and analyzed primarily in the discourse structure sections in section 4.3.

Another interesting point to mention with respect to the use of segmental lengthening for core linguistic functions such as lexical expansion is its status as a potential cross-linguistic universal. Recall from Chapter Two, section 2.3.2.1, that Korean allows the lengthening of both vowels and consonants for connotative and emphatic meanings (added to the vowel of the last syllable of an intonational phrase or sentence, usually occurring together with certain intonational contours, and attached to the first syllable of a word, respectively) (Sohn 1994:453). This tendency is quite pervasive in Korean and consonant lengthening for emphatic purposes is, in fact, one of
the salient features of the language noticed by non-Korean speakers when they first come into contact with the language. The degree of interlingual transfer in communicative strategies is of course difficult to determine, and there is, in addition, considerable individual variation in the way second language users choose to interact linguistically in their new environment. The fact that Korean licenses segmental lengthening, however, does create an environment which might favor the use of this resource by Korean narrators.

To sum up this section on lexical expansion devices, I propose to interpret the pervasive use of intentional rhythmic reduplication or repetition in a non-target-like manner as a lexical expansion device, designed to compensate for second language speakers' lack of lexical resources. The examples provided here are typical, rather than idiosyncratic, and illustrate a frequently-used and salient device used by many second language learners. I classify this rhythmic reduplication as a lexical resource, as it is clearly neither a hesitation device nor a filler. Furthermore, a second phenomenon documented here, segmental lengthening of adjectives and adverbs, serves as an additional lexical resource, substituting for adverbs of degree.

Both of these prosodic devices occur most frequently in the flowing speech of low proficiency but highly fluent and communicatively active speakers of second languages. By way of contrast, repetition which occurs as a pure hesitation device or filler does not exhibit the same rhythmic flow, nor are the tokens associated with segmental lengthening [as frequently] as are the intentional reduplications.
4.2.2 Prosodic lexico-syntactic devices for management of information status and flow: introduction of settings, characters and topics

The remainder of this study will be devoted to analyses of utterances and discourse chunks which are, to say the least, subject to multiple and differing interpretations. It is therefore appropriate that I explain the basis upon which, and the procedures by which, I arrived at my interpretations.

As the hearer-recipient-interlocutor at the time of the original recordings, I have relied to some extent on my memory of the situation as a co-participant in the events and conversations recorded for analysis. In my role as post hoc analyst, I of course noticed (and discovered) interactional moves and nuances of interaction which I had not been aware of at the time. A prime example of this is my 'Won Ton' interpretation, an example which will be developed extensively below. The status of the situations or of interpretations to be drawn from the utterances was of course often clarified by repeated replays of the recording in question.

During the interpretive process, I also used a conversation analytic approach, e.g., my analysis can be justified on the basis of empirically observable verbal (or sometimes non-verbal) content and interactional moves accomplished by the participants. That is, I support my analysis by confirming within the interaction itself how a particular sequence was handled by the participants. Such measures for grounding my analysis were not necessarily used only for ambiguous passages, it should be noted. Even passages which at the time may have seemed clear turned out not to have been clearly understood, as the Won Ton example demonstrates. Or, on the other hand, passages which look confusing in
the transcript, appear to have been quite unambiguously processed or at least tolerated by the participants at the time. This tolerance for ambiguity and uncertainty is present on the part of both the native English speaking listener and the non-native English speaking narrators, and in some cases of dubious understanding it will be impossible to determine post hoc whether one or the other of the interlocutors decided at the time to 'let it go' or whether there was, in fact, a reasonable degree of mutual understanding. In general, a review of the recordings shows that in most such cases both interlocutors made quite energetic attempts to clarify ambiguities (through the use of circumlocutions or translations between Korean and English, resorting even to consulting a bilingual Korean-English dictionary on several occasions). After such extensive efforts, when one or the other of the interlocutors decided to 'let it go', there is quite often an explicit, overt comment to this effect. (e.g., 'never mind', 'O.K.').

In the most difficult cases, my analysis is also informed by triangulation, which consisted of checking with appropriate persons, depending on the nature of the ambiguity (e.g., co-workers of the narrators for factual information or background details, various Korean-speaking acquaintances of mine who served as consultants for Korean language and culture issues, other linguists for generating multiple interpretive hypotheses, linguist researchers with extensive experience listening to and interpreting adult immigrant interlanguage utterances as expert consultants, naïve native speakers of English familiar neither with linguistic procedures nor with the Korean language as 'lay listener judges').

The ESF research team was faced with the same dilemma of motivating the analysts’ interpretations of the interlanguage discourse in their corpus. Their proposed
solution was to do several 're-writes' of the interlanguage text into the target language concerned. Perdue's (1984: 293-294) explanation of the methodology and the motivation behind this re-write procedure, which was designed to 'substantiate the hearer's interpretation' is quite instructive:

To begin to look at prosody in conjunction with syntax and other features, it is useful to paraphrase those parts of the informant’s discourse which appear to the TL [target language] observer to lack cohesion and coherence according to the preliminary interpretation of what the speaker meant.

Re-writing will take place in order to provide such information as is understood or elided, but not verbalized, and may involve:

(a) changes and additions in syntax;
(b) additional discourse markers; to make the discourse more cohesive and coherent it may be necessary to experiment with devices such as sequencing feedback markers and connectives...
(c) changes in prosodic features.

The purpose of re-writing is not to set a model for what ‘should’ have been said, but is to alert the researcher to: recurrent features of interest or difficulty, and the kinds of relationship that exist between the formal features of the language used, and the whole communicative interaction.

It is worth re-writing more than one alternative of more than one part of the discourse, and checking these for internal consistency. By re-writing, one is conjecturing what the speaker perspective and goals may have been. One may re-write in different ways to give rise to different hypotheses. This may result in the generation of more hypotheses from which a final selection can be made, rather than narrowing down the range of choice.

In this way one can finally select which of the alternatives has the greater probability of carrying the speaker’s meaning.

At the end of this process one should have a hypothesis of the interaction which is much more detailed than the initial one and which should reflect something of the way in which meaning is being negotiated throughout the interaction (Perdue 1983: 293-294).
The ESF Field Manual (Perdue 1984) goes on to explain how such procedures can serve to motivate analysts' interpretations and conclusions regarding the relationship between syntax, lexis and prosody:

The process of relating prosody to syntactic and lexical features of the discourse involves an examination of the cohesive role they play at the clausal level, the interclausal level and at the discourse level (i.e. the whole interaction).

As relationships between prosody, syntax and lexis emerge they will either support or refute the initial hypothesis formulated by the researcher... and thus act as a bottoming up reality check on this hypothesis. The researcher attempts to derive “rules” from the prosodic and syntactic features that may have definite signalling functions. These “rules” may then support/refute/modify the hypothesis about what is going on in the conversation (Perdue 1984: 294).

Talbot Taylor (1986) provides an interesting theoretical discussion of the 'intersubjectivity of understanding' in oral interaction which bears on the processes of listener interpretation and subsequent speaker evaluation of listener interpretation which not only permeate the interactions contained in the data in this corpus but also inform the analyses which lie ahead. After a review of the influence which John Locke's (1689) An Essay Concerning Human Understanding had on the development of the scientific method and on modern linguistic thought, notably raising doubts about the reliability of the mentalist concept that words and language, communicated from speaker to hearer, can arouse in the mind of the hearer the precise ideas that were intended by the speaker, Talbot concludes that the telementational picture of communication, passed down to us from Locke, takes the understanding of an utterance to be an unobservable, private, mental event. According to this picture...we can never know if
our hearers understand what we say to them. Yet this is manifestly not the case...

If understanding and/or criteria of understanding are private, mental phenomena then we have no way of dispelling doubt whether different individuals possess identical versions of those phenomena. But ordinary speakers and hearers do not share these doubts. What this should teach us is that the communality of understanding, and indeed of criteria of understanding, is established in public observable practice. The intersubjectivity which is the essence of communication is a part of communicational interaction itself and not a phenomenon to be explained by the identity of the private, mental events of different individuals.... Consequently, we must learn not to study the public face of verbal interaction simply for the value it supposedly has as a window on the private events of the mind, where the "real" and essential activity is occurring. Communication is not a private internal process; it is a public, co-operative activity (102-103).

The proposed interpretation of the 'Won Ton' excerpt, extracted from Sun Ja's 'Saimin House' narrative and referred to above, followed by its subsequent re-interpretation, in light of the analyst's serendipitous discovery of relevant facts, will exemplify the processes of triangulation, intersubjectivity, and collaborative meaning construction, as well as the multi-fold increase in potential for hearer misunderstanding when the talk is exolingual talk and draws simultaneously on numerous cross-cultural assumptions.

In order to clearly demonstrate the potential pitfalls of the interpretive process, as well as the channels available for their correction, the presentation of the interpretation of the 'Won Ton' excerpt will be divided into three stages, reflecting the multi-layered interpretive process which actually occurred. The interpretive process thus laid bare reveals, and surpasses even perhaps, the potential problems in communication resulting
from the 'imperfection of words' contemplated by Locke and evoked by Taylor (1986:92), above.

The excerpt in question is the following, in which Sun Ja as narrator, in support of her claim of how badly she was treated at the saimin restaurant, explains the way her boss at the saimin restaurant would speak to her:

(10) 'Wonton'

(10a-1) SJ: and -, this one oh this man xx [mer] more hard more hard give um.
(10a-2) SJ: talking this one oh +”/.
(10a-3) SJ: +"saimin or won+ton?
(10a-4) SJ: won+ton[^] this6 mandoo give um.
(10a-5) M: yeah right right right.
(10a-6) SJ: mandoo xx xx
(10a-7) SJ: xx this one five this one uh five plate over here this one me cook [?]
(10a-8) SJ: +"how come no more mandoo?

(Sun Ja [Saimin House] 40-47; [Saimnseg: ssaiwonq, swonman, smandoo])

Alternative glosses are possible, but based on my first interpretation of this excerpt, I proposed the following:

(10b-1) SJ: This man [i.e., the boss] was really hard to work for.
(10b-2) We would ask politely like this,
(10b-3) 'Do you want saimin or won ton?'
(10b-4) [spoken as an aside to the listener]: 'won ton', this means mandoo.
(10b-5) M: Yeah, right, right, right.
(10b-6) SJ: Mandoo [indistinguishable]
(10b-7) So we would have about five orders backed up and I would be cooking to fill the orders.
(10b-8) Then the boss would come and demand to know, 'How come there's no more mandoo?'

Stage I: Interpretation of 'Won Ton' excerpt

This eight-line excerpt is particularly rich in prosodic features contributing to the management of information status and flow. At lines (10-3) and (10-8), the narrator
introduces a complex alternation of characters through the use of role play. At line (10-4),
the narrator displays her sensitivity to the listener's ability to perform the interpretive
work necessary to ensure comprehension of the text by providing background
information, framed in an 'offstage' voice.

Knowing that I was a Caucasian from the U.S. mainland, Sun Ja assumed
[incorrectly, as it turns out] that I would not be familiar with the food item known in
Hawai’i (and elsewhere) by its Chinese name of ‘won ton’. Relying on her knowledge
that I had many Korean acquaintances, that I often ate Korean food, and that I had been
seen on several occasions by her hotel co-workers shopping in the Korean grocery store
of Honolulu, Sun Ja must have surmised that I would be more familiar with the Korean
name of the product. Therefore, in order to prevent any communication breakdown in the
course of her narrative, immediately after saying the word ‘won ton’ in line (10-3), Sun
Ja quickly supplied the word ‘mandoo’ in line (10-4), the Korean equivalent of ‘won
ton’.

As recipient of the talk and as co-participant in this narrative process, I distinctly
recall that at the time I interpreted the utterance in line (10-4) to mean something like
‘Won ton, that means mandoo, yeah’. Retrospectively, looking at the transcribed line as
an analyst, particularly given the non-standard usage of ‘give um’ at the end of the line,
that interpretation does not seem to be justified. However, when the prosodic contour
conveying the sense of 'I'm giving you some background information here' is taken into
consideration, the interpretation seemed at the time to be unambiguously clear. (See Fig.
4.5., below.)
The pitch contour (140Hz, rising to above 220Hz) sustained across the utterance (the dip in pitch at t0.200 corresponds to the voiceless segment [t]) and reflects the speaker’s topic-comment syntactic organization of ideas at this point. Note that the initial

Fig. 4.5. Narrator’s sensitivity to listener’s cultural knowledge: providing background information

Acoustic measurement of example (10-4)
‘won ton [wan tang] this6 mandoo give um’
(Sun-Ja [Saimin House] 43; [junksegs:swonman])

proposition won ton is realized at a high pitch, indicating introduction of a new idea. The high pitch is sustained over the second propositional comment (this6 mandoo), indicating that there is a connection between the two propositions. Finally, at give um, the pitch begins a gradual declination. This sustained high pitch across two propositions, combined with the lexical content and the pragmatics of the situation, can be interpreted as conveying quoted speech on won ton followed by the speaker’s explanation of what ‘won
ton’ means. Given the above combination of lexical content, background suppositions and prosodic contour, as the listener-recipient I proceeded to interpret the utterance to mean ‘you know that word won ton which I just used, well, that means ‘mandoo’.

Stage 2: Corrected interpretation of the 'Won Ton' excerpt

The commentary up to this point was the original analysis. However, after completion of this analysis based on my own understanding of the linguistic, prosodic and pragmatic cues, I discovered quite serendipitously that I had mis-heard and thus mis-interpreted an important part of the utterance. What follows is the discussion of another, subsequent layer of interpretation and triangulation.

The misunderstanding in question has to do with the word ‘won-ton’. I cannot recall if this word is in common usage on the U.S. mainland, or if it is the designation of a food item I learned in Hawai‘i, but I ‘know’ this word as a reference to small dumpling-like item, stuffed with vegetables or meat, and usually fried, but sometimes served steamed. Reaching into my store of knowledge of European cultures, I always think of it as a Chinese version of Polish pierogi. When, in my [mis]-interpretation of her utterance, I heard Sun-Ja equate ‘won ton’ to ‘mandoo’, that fit perfectly with my general schemata of dumpling-like, stuffed food items. As the interaction continued with no miscommunication based on my [mis]-understanding of those two syllables, I gave it no further thought.

In the final stages of writing this dissertation, to check my understanding of this utterance, I asked a recently immigrated Korean friend living on the Mainland who has
never lived in Hawai‘i if she knew what the word ‘won ton’ meant. She said she only knew the similar-sounding ‘wan tang’, which means soup/broth with ‘mandoo’ in it. (The Korean word for brothlike soup is ‘tang’.) I then checked Sun Ja’s audio recording and found that she was, indeed, saying ‘wan tang’, not ‘won ton’. Suddenly the ‘inappropriate’ and unanalyzable ‘give um’ at the end of the sentence made perfect sense. What Sun Ja was in fact saying in line (10-4) was “‘wan tang’, this is basic saimin, to which you add mandoo’.

Although the propositional content of the sentence must obviously be re-interpreted in light of this corrected version, the prosodic facts for both the original and the revised version remain the same: sustained high pitch on the two syllables of ‘won ton’ [sic.], setting it off for the speaker’s follow-up comment in the second proposition. As participant in the narrative event under discussion, my original interpretation is the one which contributed to the interactional context. Learning, four years after the recording was made, that I had mis-understood one word which entails a new glossing of the sentence does not fundamentally alter the interaction, as it happened at the time.

Stage 3: Re-examination of the 'Won Ton' analysis

My analysis of the propositional content based on a contextualized interpretation which was itself based on a number of incorrect assumptions provides an illustration of the potential for hearer misunderstanding and miscommunication between interlocutors. Examining how this misunderstanding could have come about demonstrates the challenges inherent in everyday communication, but my post facto mis-analysis also
illustrates the potential pitfalls of interpretive analysis and in so doing further underscores the importance of triangulation in any type of qualitative research.

The source of the problem first occurred in the question in line (10-3) in Sun Ja’s account of her experience working at the saimin restaurant (i.e., ‘saimin or won+ton?’). I was not familiar with the menu items at the restaurant, but I did know that Sun Ja worked for a Korean-owned restaurant. Since Sun Ja further spoke of the restaurant using the local term ‘saimin’, I assumed they served a ‘local’ clientele. I further assumed that local customers would be more likely to use the local word ‘won ton’ than the Korean word, ‘mandoo’. This assumption in turn was based on my knowledge of local immigration and cultural assimilation patterns, e.g., Chinese immigration to Hawai’i is of longer time depth than Korean immigration and Chinese or pseudo-Chinese-Hawaiian vocabulary and food products [e.g., ‘manapua’, crack seed] have rather deeply penetrated into local food customs. With all this background, when I heard [sic, i.e., ‘mis-heard’] the word ‘won ton’, I immediately assumed that Sun Ja was adopting the Korean restaurant’s localized designation for ‘mandoo’ on their menu.

In retrospect, Sun Ja was perfectly correct in assuming that I might not know about ‘wan tang’, the term she actually used — in fact, not only was the term ‘wan tang’ unfamiliar to me at the time of the recording, but even at the time of this writing, after I have been living in Korea and eating Korean food for two and a half years, I was not familiar with the term until it was brought to my attention in the context of the analysis of this excerpt. (The more common Korean term for a noodle soup with mandoo in it, and the one I am familiar with, is ‘mandoo kuksu’. The term ‘won tang’ refers to a broth-
based soup with mandoo in it and is commonly assumed by Koreans to be of Japanese origin. It is usually served in restaurants which specialize in Japanese-style cuisine, along with items such as udon ['udong' in Korean].

None of these lexical or segmental misinterpretations which led to incorrect assumptions, however, affects the basic prosodic analysis, for the reasons mentioned above, and I stand by my main argument that the prosodic contour of the utterance, in association with the presumed lexical content and the pragmatics of the situation, led me to assume that Sun Ja was providing me with supplementary background information in the second proposition of the utterance ('this6 mandoo give um'). The important point is that I understood this utterance as a backgrounding contribution rather than as a new theme in the plot line of her narrative.

With the procedures for listener/participant/analyst interpretation clarified, let us now examine some examples of lexico-syntactic devices used for the management of information status from the data. As these lexico-syntactic devices which can be identified at the local [clause] level are embedded in ongoing narratives and thus also serve as components of the overall narrative structure, they will be mentioned only summarily here in section 4.2.2.1. A fuller discussion of their role will be deferred to the relevant sub-section of section 4.3, where prosody at the global level is discussed and where prosody's contributions to narrative structure and cohesion are dealt with more extensively.
4.2.2.1 Relativization devices

To illustrate how prosodic devices can be used to realize syntactic structures, I have opted to use examples from Sun Ja’s *Junk Job* narrative. (The full transcript from which these examples are excerpted can be found in Appendix E, narrative text 8.) In the introduction (or, to use Labov’s terminology, in the 'abstract') to the *Junk Job* narrative (lines 1, 3, 5, and 9 of the transcript of narrative text 8), provided here as example (11), which actually serves as a transition point from the preceding conversational material to the narrative, Sun Ja asserts that being a hotel maid is not such a bad job. As the interaction develops, this initial assertion can be seen retrospectively as the preface to a narrative which recounts a significant incident in justification of this initial assertion. The assertion is thus a key one in the narrative development, as it contains Sun Ja's primary claim and the point of the narrative to follow (the 'abstract' in Labov's terms), e.g., that her job is an important one, despite its low social status. The role these lines play in the prefacing and framing of the narrative will be discussed at greater length in section 4.3.2, below. For now, I cite them solely as an example of prosodic realization of relativization. Standard English glosses are provided at lines 1, 3, and 9, below, to illustrate the syntactic target for which Sun Ja did not possess the necessary standard English lexical or syntactic resources. However, through parataxis and prosodic manipulation (pauses, pitch changes, and intonation contours) to indicate to the listener how to parse the constituents of her utterance, Sun Ja manages to convey the relations among her propositions that would normally be expressed by complex subordinate clauses, as shown in the English glosses for (11-1), (11-3) and (11-9), below.
(11) Prosodic devices to achieve lexico-syntactic complexity: relativization
(Sun-Ja, female, age 54, 24 years in Hawai’i)

(11-1) SJL: I uh think u:h room-mai:d some people # uh junk job you know,-,
<this kine thinking,, yeahQ> [>] so-,
' I think [that] some people think, you know, [that] being a room maid is a low status job, yeahQ.'

(11-2) M: <right -, right -, right -> [<]

(11-3) SJL: I'm:: thinking so-, not bad-, <room maid job > [>]
'But I think [that] being a room maid is not such a bad job.'

(11-4) M: <right -, right -, right -> [<]

(11-5) SJL: yeah -, <room maid job-,> [>] # uh not bad .

(11-6) M: <right -> [<]

(11-7) M: yeah ! and she has a ni:ce boyfriend !

(11-8) SJL: yeah nice xx xx [bo- nice thing?]

(11-9) SJL: room maid OK -, <this kine > [>] thinking maybe,, yeahQ .
'You could say [that] being a room maid is pretty OK, yeahQ.'

(Sun Ja, [Junk Job]1-9)

Fig 4.6. Example of relativization realized through prosodic marking in lieu of complementizer 'that'
Acoustic representation of example (11-1)
'I uh think u:h room-ma:id some people: # uh junk job you know-,' [overlapped section of utterance <this kine thinking,, yeahQ> [>] so-, not digitized]

'I think [that] some people think, you know, [that] being a room maid is a low status job, yeahQ.'

(Sun Ja [Junk Job] 1; [junksegs: somepple])

As Fig. 4.6. visually demonstrates, it is primarily the pauses between the propositions and the rapid falling intonational contours at the end of each thought group which serve to highlight the utterance constituents for the listener. The final segment of the utterance (<this kind thinking,, yeahQ>) was not digitized due to overlap with a listener backchannel remark, thus compromising an accurate acoustic reading. However, the auditory reading of the truncated segment, spoken in one rhythmic group at low pitch, ending with the characteristic HCE rise on yeahQ, clearly marks it as a separate, self-contained constituent.

Later in the same narrative, Sun Ja makes repeated use of similar paratactic and prosodic marking devices, as in example (12), below. Sun Ja's strong tendency to use verb final word order in the dependent clause is quite clear in these examples, a tendency undoubtedly due to L1 influence from Korean.

(12) Parataxis and prosodic marking of topic-comment structure

(12-1) I think uh: # ki:chen: water flow over, maybe toilet flow over -, [SJL Junk Job 32]

'I think [that] maybe the water flowed over in the kitchen, or maybe the toilet was flowing over.'

(12-2) +” I think four two six guest fall down! [SJL Junk Job 53]

'I think [that] the guest in 426 has fallen down.'

(12-3) I think kitchen something floor. [SJL Junk Job 55]

'I think [that] there's something on the kitchen floor.'
In examples (11) and (12), above, it is not primarily the lack of relativizer complement for the dependent clause (which is, in any case, optional even in standard English), but rather the verb-final word order (12-1, 12-2) and the lack of predicate (11-1, 11-3, 11-5, 11-9, 12-3) in the dependent clause which render these utterances syntactically non-standard. The paratactic device of topic-comment form, so salient in these utterances, has been noted elsewhere (Klein & Perdue 1992; Kumpf 1986) as being typical of low proficiency untutored speakers of interlanguages. The easily parsed topic-comment form, supplemented by prosodic cues supplied by the speaker, as discussed above and which include pausing and pitch variation, the most common being high pitch on topics and declination on comments, allows the listener to extract the speaker's intended meaning with a reasonable assurance of accuracy.

4.2.2.2 Direct quote and impersonation

Another device used frequently by all the narrators in the corpus is that of direct discourse and impersonation of characters who appear in their stories. I classify it here as a local device because it is a substitute for sentence-level forms. However, direct discourse is strongly associated with narrative flow and the characters introduced into the narratives, so additional examples will be provided and commented on later in section 4.3.3.3. Two examples, from two different speakers, will suffice for now to illustrate this device:
example of impersonation of character to compensate for absence of lexico-syntactic forms in the target language

"'oh Sun Ja you good'"  (Sun Ja [Junk Job] 99; [junksegs: yougood])

[The person from management told me] 'Sun Ja, you did a great job! Congratulations!'

In this example of reconstructed speech where Sun Ja is trying to impersonate a member of the hotel management, possibly a man, who commended her for her actions when she discovered the man lying on the floor of his hotel room, the pitch readings are all on the low end of the scale and there is an uncharacteristically narrow pitch range. As shown in Figure (4.7.), the pitch ranges from approximately 60Hz up to only 140Hz in the two main segments. This pitch range contrasts with Sun Ja’s characteristic range and pitch pattern, which usually fluctuates much more broadly, typically from 50Hz to 350Hz, and contains frequent sharp drops within one word and sometimes within one syllable.

This example was selected to illustrate the point that, taken in isolation, acoustic measurements of pitch and volume may not be reliably interpretable, but when combined with indications of auditory perception and when compared with a given speaker’s characteristic patterns and when they contrast with preceding contextual material, such measurements do capture in graphic form some of the characteristics of the oral features of spoken discourse.
Fig. 4.7. Example of prosodically marked direct speech (impersonation)

“oh, Sun Ja you good”
Acoustic representation of example (13)

'“oh Sun Ja you good”'
(Sun Ja [Junk Job] 99; [junksegs: yougood])

An excerpt from Young-Eun’s retelling of a scene from Charlie Chaplin’s *Modern Times* provides another illustration of these narrators’ frequent use of creative prosody in constructing attributed speech as a device to introduce characters and manage interaction between personages. One of the characteristics of interlanguage quoted speech, as illustrated here by Young-Eun, is that the quoted material is presented as if it were an actual utterance, often without specific prefatory material and often even without identification of the characters. In this case, because I am familiar with the sequence being invoked from the videotaped segments of the silent film, I can assert that the attributed quotations are in fact reconstructed utterances, which gives further support to
the claim that these interlanguage narrators have recourse to quoted speech as a communicative device rather than as an actual narrative device, although there is no doubt some overlap in the two functions, given that it is quite natural for direct speech to occur in oral narratives. The frequency with which these narrators rely on direct speech and impersonation is conceivably the factor which makes it appear so characteristic of interlanguage prosody. Example (14) illustrates this technique:

(14) quoted speech as interlanguage device for management of characters and interaction in narratives when lexico-syntactic devices are lacking

‘him say, oh “you never" remember?”’
(YEL [Beautiful House] 4; [BTFLHSE: cchimsay])

‘Then he asked her, “Don't you remember me?”’
alternative gloss: 'Then he asked her whether she remembered him.'
alternative gloss: 'Then he asked her if she could remember him.'

In this case, the speaker sets off the quoted material from the surrounding material by means of an extremely high pitch on the interrogative, quoted segment, despite the fact that the speech is clearly attributed to a man (e.g., 'him say'). (Incidentally, I find this token of Pidgin dialogue attributed to Charlie Chaplin in the role of The Tramp particularly charming!)

Impersonation and attributed direct quote is one of the prosodic devices which derives its effectiveness and its essence most directly from the range of prosodic features available to a speaker. What is interesting is that in most cases, as we have seen in the two examples presented here, speakers do not usually attempt an authentic

* In HCE usage, never, usually pronounced /nəvə/ is one of several general negatives in Pidgin. It no longer carries the Standard American English meaning of 'not ever' and is used in Hawai'i to mean simply 'not'.
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rendering of the speech style or vocabulary of the actual person to whom the speech is attributed. Impersonation and attributed direct quotation is, rather, a metaphorical use of prosody in the service of activating the direct presence of one or more characters during a narrative scene.

4.2.2.3 Sequencing devices to supplement limited repertoire of adverbial expressions of time and place

Although the narrators possess a rudimentary command of lexical items which can serve their basic needs for the expression of temporal relations (attested examples in the corpus include the following: later, before, now, after, already, long time, every day, first time [i.e., 'at first', 'in the beginning'], sometime(s), long time) and spatial references (attested examples in the corpus include here, over here, there, over there, inside, [come] back, [fall] down), this repertoire is not extensive. Furthermore, some of the items in the list above, e.g., after, now, later, are used by only one or two of the narrators. As in other lexical and syntactic categories discussed above, these narrators with limited lexicon enlist prosodic features such as intonation, pitch variation, amplitude, pausing, and rhythm to expand their repertoire, particularly in the expression of temporal relations.

A rather simple device for the realization of the passage of time or a sequence of actions is the use of what I term 'listing intonation'. The typical high rising intonation at the end of a thought group, implying incompleteness, forces the listener to assume that other actions are subsequently forthcoming. This device is exemplified in several lines, excerpted from Sok's Dust Storm narrative, provided here as example (15). The listing intonation occurs at the beginning of the Dust Storm narrative. Sok is describing how he
and all the other men had to take cover in the vehicles in the auto repair shop where they worked, after putting on their protective face masks against the onslaught of the sand being whipped inside their building through the cracks.

(15) listing intonation as a device to show passage of time or sequence of actions

(15-1) //friend <we /can> [/] we can not //see -
(Sok [Dust Storm] 17 Dustsegs:notsee])

(15-2) we can /not uh //breathing -,
(Sok [Dust Storm] 18; [Dustsegs:nobreath])

(15-3) oh /so you know -, 
we /have to /yeah /glass //on -, 
/safet(y) glass //on::
(Sok [Dust Storm] 21; Dustsegs:glasson])

Fig. 4.8. Example of listing intonation to show passage of time
Acoustic representation of example (15-3)
'so you know we have to yeah glass on, safety glass on'
(Sok [Dustorm] 21; [dustsegs:glasson])

Listing intonation substitutes for what a speaker with a richer lexicon or mastery of somewhat more elaborate syntactic patterns might express through a series of simple
past tense actions, through adverbials of time and place and affect intensifiers, e.g., 'we couldn't breathe at all, so we decided to put on our safety glasses'.

Interestingly, Sok has somewhat more extensive vocabulary than the other narrators. (He is the only one to use connectives such as then and also, for instance). Even though tokens of these lexical devices for organizing temporal sequences are in his lexicon--they occur in fact in the same Dust Storm narrative where the prosodic feature of intonation listing occurs--Sok nevertheless has recourse to the listing intonation device in the course of his narrative. Sok's reliance on listing intonation as a communicative resource is an indication, perhaps, of the greater accessibility to adult learners of prosodic resources than lexical or syntactic ones.

4.2.2.4 Cohesion devices: conjunction and subordination through parataxis and prosodic features

Some might argue that the prosodic realization of conjunction, subordination and other types of clause combining through intonational parataxis should be classified as a purely lexical device, since the English target structures could in most cases be handled by a simple lexical item requiring only a minimum of syntactic knowledge or restructuring (e.g., and, then, next, after that). I have opted to classify these as syntactic devices, however, as the analysis overlaps to a great extent with prosodic devices substituting for other complex syntactic manipulations required on the part of a language learner and in most cases the lexical item in question is not a simple lexical token, but rather something of phrase length. Furthermore, the role of the lexicon in syntactic constructions cannot always be reliably analyzed componentially, in any case.
A simple but clear example of subordination rendered through pausing and
intonational contour alone is found in Sun Ja's *First Month Hard* narrative, shown in
example (16). In this narrative, Sun Ja describes how she met a Korean woman walking
in her neighborhood who helped her get a job soon after her arrival. Sun Ja is describing
their first encounter in this episode.

(16) example of subordination rendered through pause and pitch change

```
Only me job # fine (Sun Ja [First month] 107; [fjobfine])

'I don't care what kind of job it is, just as long as I can get a job,
that will be fine.'
```

In utterance (16), the pause, indicated by the symbol (#), is used as a syntactic
linker, followed by a lowered pitch on *fine* which marks the change from one constituent
to the next.

In example (17), below, another more complex example of a pause to signal a
subordinate clause is provided. The graphic representation for example (17) is provided
in Figure (4.9), and the lexical transcription with three possible standard English glosses
of the utterance follow:

(17) oh some man kitchen # fall down!12

```
(Sun Ja [Junk Job] 47; [junksegs:manfall])
```

This segment can be optionally glossed as follows:

- gloss a. ‘I was surprised to see [that there was] a man
  [who was] lying on the kitchen floor!’

- gloss b. ‘I was surprised to see that a man had fallen down in the
  kitchen!’

- gloss c. ‘There was a man in the kitchen [who was] lying on the floor!’

(Sun Ja [Junk Job] 41; [junksegs: manfall]
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Fig. 4.9. Example of prosody used to express relativization

oh some man::: kitchen::: # fall down:::

Acoustic representation of example (19)
(Sun Ja [Junk Job] 47; junksegs:manfall])

Note the pause between t1.600 sec. and approximately t1.900 on the graph in Fig. 4.9, preceding the sharp drop in pitch and volume of the third segment (‘fall down’). It is this pause and the accompanying drop in pitch and volume which constitute the salient prosodic features used to render the syntactic relationship between the first proposition ‘some man kitchen’ and the second proposition ‘fall down’.

The use of prosody for both affect and lexical variety are also notable in this segment. In addition to raising the pitch and increasing the volume in the first and second
segments (oh some man::: ; kitchen:::), both devices being associated with a state of emotional excitement, Sun Ja also lengthens the segment-final consonants (‘man:::’; ‘kitchen:::’) to convey her attitude of surprise and consternation at this event.

4.2.3 Summary of findings of prosodic contributions to local-level infrastructure

Two types of prosodic manipulation serve to expand the speakers’ basic lexicon: intentional rhythmic reduplications and segmental lengthening of simple lexical items. Both types occur primarily in the word classes of descriptive adjectives (e.g., big, hard, small, nice) or adverbs of quantity or degree (e.g., all, more, very, plenny [sic]), and occasionally in the class of nouns (e.g., line). In our analyzed corpus, there are no tokens of this type of lexical expansion based on verbs.

Compared with simple lexical expansion, since the realization of syntactic relationships is relatively more complicated, it is expected that they would require correspondingly more complex prosodic means for their realization. Among these more complex prosodic devices found in this study’s corpus are the manipulation of boundary pauses and contrasting intonational contours.

Contrastive pitch contours are used to express whole propositions, to subordinate certain propositions with respect to others, to indicate information status, and to organize the information flow of a narrative which more proficient speakers disposing of a wider lexical range might handle with discourse markers (e.g., ‘I mean’, ‘now that I think about it’, ‘come to think of it’). Another syntactic structure, indirect discourse, a prevalent feature of spoken Korean, is realized in the basic English of these narrators through the
prosodic impersonation of characters as a substitute for the morphosyntactic complexities of indirect discourse.

That these naturalistic learners should have recourse to prosodic devices to convey syntactic structure and lexico-semantic content should come as no surprise, given that, as explained previously in Chapter Two, a vast body of previous research has documented the role of prosody/intonation (tunes) in the creation of meaning. Furthermore, prosody plays an important role in the development of one's first language.

Wennerstrom's studies (1997, 1998, 2001a) of highly educated, instructed learners all tend to show that the degree of appropriate use of word level stress in extended discourse such as lectures or personal narratives correlates with general fluency and high proficiency. Wennerstrom's (1997, 2001a) study conducted with graduate students who were native speakers of Mandarin Chinese, a language which differentiates given/new information status through contrast in ways similar to English, was particularly interesting. Contrasted with English native speakers, the Mandarin speakers' use of other information structuring devices such as paratones at topic shift boundaries and utterance-final prosody, prosodic features which have not been documented for Mandarin Chinese, tended not to correlate as well with overall proficiency and to be further from target-like. From this evidence, Wennerstrom drew the conclusion that when the native language and the target language have similar uses of prosody for discourse features, the prosody seems to be relatively easily transferred to the target language (Wennerstrom 1997, 1998, 2001a), but when the prosodic features are different cross-linguistically, individual differences seem to play a more important role in
acquiring these features productively than does overall proficiency. It is notable that these
findings regarding transfer of prosodic features are reminiscent of the earlier studies
conducted within the Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis framework with respect to
acquisition of syntactic structures.

These findings of Wennerstrom are exceedingly interesting, as they seem to
contradict my findings, i.e., low fluency, limited vocabulary, virtually non-existent
knowledge of syntax, non-target-like pronunciation are all associated with excellent
manipulation of intonation to achieve discourse coherence. In their own way, these low
proficiency speakers can be said to be ‘fluent’ if continuous flow of thoughts and lack of
pause are the criteria for fluency. This study does not allow for a full discussion of
fluency, but in a non-technical sense, these low-proficiency speakers produce a steady
flow of talk and maintain conversational interaction in English for extended periods of
time, and this we are calling ‘fluency’.

Thus, in the narratives recounted by these essentially uninstructed second
language speakers who have acquired their language competency in the course of many
years of interaction in a nominally English-speaking community without substantial
classroom instruction, prosodic features play an important role, not only in providing
affective and evaluative perspective throughout the narratives, as might be expected, but
even more critically, prosodic features substitute for missing lexical items and relate
propositions sequentially and logically when the syntactic devices and lexical cues for
these linguistically complex tasks are lacking. Having shown how immigrant language.
learners supplement/compensate for their lack of syntactic and lexical resources, let us
resources, let us now move on to section 4.3 to examine a more complex task—the organization of narratives.

4.3 *Global level narrative structure and cohesion: prosody in narrative organization*

4.3.1 *Narrative structure and cohesion framework*

What becomes apparent in my analysis of this corpus is that these adult immigrant acquirers of English, lacking as they do nearly all of the syntactic and lexical components of English normally deemed essential for effective narrative cohesion, e.g., verb tenses, subordinators and conjunctions indicating logical relationships between premises, have developed strategies which include a heavy reliance on prosodic features to achieve their linguistically complex communicative goals. These prosodic features serve to organize the narrative discourse into cohesive and coherent chunks for the listener.

Coherence is used here to describe the connections language users make between propositions of spoken [or written] language. To achieve coherence, language users rely on expectations of mutual knowledge of the world and on the interlocutor's ability to make inferences based on this knowledge of the world. In exolingual communication such as that reported on here, where such assumption of coherence cannot be automatically supposed, it is interesting to note that to ensure the coherence of their texts, the non-native speaker narrators frequently seek to activate and confirm the mutual knowledge deemed essential for the listener's understanding.

Cohesion, used contrastively with the term coherence, refers specifically to the surface-level linguistic forms which serve to semantically or syntactically connect the
speaker’s propositions. One of the goals of this study is to demonstrate that intonation patterns should be seen as an integral part of these surface-level forms. Halliday and Hasan (1976) argued in the same direction, when they stated that 'the cohesive function of intonation…is closely related to conjunction and may be considered as expressing forms of conjunctive relation' (271), and further that '[i]ntonation…has a very far-reaching and pervasive function in the grammar of the spoken language…and it is likely that some of the specific grammatical functions of the intonation system derive in the first place from its role in the expression of cohesion within a text' (273).

Gumperz (1982), examining discourse strategies used by native speakers of English, also pointed out that prosody plays a role in both the coherence and cohesion of a text in the course of the interactional construction of meaning:

[A]ccent placement and tune, along with syntax and lexicon, guide the listener in inferring relationships among utterances and supplying nonlexical information.

...Particularly in informal conversation, prosody is a factor which allows participants to use a minimum of lexical specificity to tie together parts of an argument (115).

A slightly edited version of the transcript of Junk Job, one of Sun Ja's narratives, follows. She recounted this incident as a spontaneous comment in the course of answering a series of questions from the researcher relating to the content of a professionally-produced videotape designed to train hotel maids on how to do their jobs efficiently and safely. The written transcript of the narrative is somewhat difficult to follow partly because the narrator does not sequence the events using standard English verb tenses, nor does she use conventional adverbs of time used to organize the flow of
events in discourse (e.g., 'then', 'after that', 'later'). Her primary means of indicating the passage of time are to invoke specific time frames, usually of past events (e.g., 'three year ago', 'five year' 'six year something over long time', as well as a general past marker 'before'). Causal English discourse connectors ('because of, 'due to', 'so'), which the listener might use as clues to the relationship of the events to each other, are also entirely lacking.

The contention of this study is precisely that such bare transcripts are difficult to parse and that it is only with the addition of the prosodic information that a reasonably receptive/sympathetic listener is able to make sense of the text. This extended written transcript is being provided in order to give the reader a sense of the proficiency level of the speakers included in the corpus, as well as to emphasize the role prosody plays in the listener’s ability to interpret the text. An interpretation of the narrative by the listener/researcher is provided immediately in (21). If the assumption that prosodic devices are a universal feature of human language is correct, then it should come as no surprise that non-native speakers also have recourse to prosodic devices to achieve discourse coherence. The role of prosody in the construction of coherence and cohesion in second language discourse has, however, heretofore scarcely been examined. This is largely due to the fact, evoked earlier, that the overwhelming majority of research in second language acquisition has focused on learners in instructed language learning situations. An analysis of uninstructed language learning such as that accomplished by immigrants in the data reported on here has much to reveal about the properties of
language. What may come as a surprise is what the narratives of uninstructed second language users can reveal about the properties of language at the discourse level.

The narrator is Sun Ja. Recall from the narrator information provided in Chapter Three that Sun Ja immigrated to Hawai‘i in 1974 at age 34 with her husband and two young sons, and later gave birth to a daughter in Honolulu. At the time of the recording, she had been living in Hawai‘i for 24 years and was 58 years old. During her first nine years in Hawai‘i she was employed by various Korean small business entrepreneurs; during this period she thus spoke almost exclusively Korean both at home and at work. In 1983 she was hired as a housekeeper (maid) at one of the hotel chains in Waikiki. She had been working continuously as a hotel housekeeper for the same employer for 15 years at the time of the recording. On the job she is encouraged to use English to interact with the primarily English-speaking clientele of the hotel, but those interactions are limited mainly to matters of a transactional nature relating to her housekeeping duties (e.g., ‘more soap please’, ‘please come back later’, ‘I’m going out now, so you can clean the room’). Sun Ja occasionally uses English as a lingua franca to communicate with the Chinese and Filipino housekeepers and with other non-Korean employees of the housekeeping department. Most of these employees with whom she uses English are also immigrant second language users like herself, but on occasion she needs to communicate in English with ‘locals’ who work as custodial or maintenance personnel.

The incident Sun Ja recounts here was a spontaneous reaction to a scene during a discussion we were having after viewing the housekeeper training video. The
presentation of the transcript is presented in (20), followed by an interpretive glossing of
the text in (21).

(20) *Junk Job*

SJ - Sun Ja, hotel housekeeper ('room maid'), narrator
M - Marilyn, researcher/listener

1 SJ: I uh think uh room-maid some people uh junk job you know this kine thinking yeah, so, I'm thinking so, not bad, room maid job, yeah, room maid job, uh not bad. Room maid OK, this kine thinking maybe, yeah?

2 M: Yeah!

3 SJ: Yeah.

4 SJ: Before me uh three year ago some people-- I'm not (no? I don't?) keep anything, I'm going outstair (downstair?), uh-- Why this one uh::: floor over this one here you know.

5 M: Uh huh , uh huh.

6 SJ: Yeah. This hallway all wet! This one.

7 SJ: I, I think five year. Marie not here some people, this over here I think. Six year something over long time, yeah?

8 SJ: Floor me all wet, me housekeeping call. Oh! Hallway this all wet.

9 SJ: 426. I think uh-- kitchen water flow over, maybe toilet flow over, I call housekeeping. Oh--this one, do not sign . 'Do+not' sign. 'Do+not' sign, you know, 'no more touch.'

10 M: Yeah.

11 SJ: No more touch

12 M: Yeah, right .

13 SJ: No more touch

14 SJ: Me, oh I worry! This one before this lanai this one, oh before now this one all lanai, one open all before this one, cannot cut, this kine.

(using hand gestures)

15 M: Oh, I see.

16 SJ: This one me 425 this one 26 I look, room looking over there. Oh, some (?) man kitchen fall down!

17 M: Oh really?

18 SJ: Yeah!

19 SJ: Kitchen fall down! Oh me scare[?], housekeeping call. 'I think 4-2-6 guest fall down! I think kitchen something floor.'

20 SJ: Yeah, oh my God! Uh huh!

21 M: The man heart attack?

22 SJ: I think heart attack.

23 M::: Uh uh uh .

24 SJ: I call housekeeping and housekeeping you know come over here. Inspectress coming check, and this-a call, ambulance coming.

25 SJ: Lunch finishing, I come back. Oh! Police man everybody is come over here!

26 SJ: 'This man you know is I got what time you uh-- this uh you find this [it?]?'

'The full text is edited for illustrative purposes. Most of the backchannel reactions and clarification questions from the researcher/listener have been deleted so as not to impede the flow of the story in this example.
27 SJ: This man, me off day come back, (laughing now) going already!
28 M: What, say what ?
29 SJ: Not die!
30 M: Not die--oh! He came back and checked out?
31 SJ: Yeah! Ambulance come over here. This one down here police car. This one going me, two day off, check out! Already going!
32 SJ: This kine, you know, I thinking, 'Oh me room clean and man later this one die, Oh no!' you know, yeah? This one housekeeping call, ambulance coming.
33 SJ: 'Sun Ja something give+um.'
34 SJ: 'No, that's ok, not die is going ok!' 
35 SJ: me thinking.
36 SJ: This room clean scare. 
37 SJ: This kine. Room maid not, not bad job. Room maid good.

(21) Researcher/listener's interpretation of Junk Job. (Also available in Appendix E, summaries of the narratives in Standard English.)

Some people think that being a hotel maid is a 'junk job'. But personally I don't think it's such a bad job.

One day several years ago as I was getting ready to go out [for lunch], I noticed that the hallway on my floor was all wet. This was about five years ago, before our department head Marie had been hired--maybe six years ago--in any case, quite a while back. So when I noticed the floor was all wet, I called the housekeeping office to report the problem and told them that I thought that water was overflowing in the kitchen sink or in the bathroom in room 426. The room had a 'Do Not Disturb' sign on it, so I went out onto the lanai\(^8\) via the room next door. (I could do that because at that time, the lanai ran continuously along the outside of all the rooms; now the lanai is sectioned off, but at the time, there was one uninterrupted balcony running along the outside all the rooms.) When I looked into room 426 by going onto the lanai through room 425, I saw a man lying on the floor in the kitchenette. I was alarmed and called the housekeeping office again and told them that the guest in 426 was on the kitchen floor. One of the senior housekeepers ('inspectress') came up to check and then called an ambulance.

When I got back from lunch there was a lot of commotion going on. The police were there and asked me some questions about how I found the man. I explained what had happened.

\(^8\) 'Lanai' is a Hawaiian word used by local residents to refer to 'terrace', 'porch' or 'patio'. Here, it refers to the hotel room’s balcony.
The next two days were my days off. When I came back to work, I found out, to my surprise, that the man from 426 had checked out and had left the hotel! I fully expected when I came back to hear that he had died. I was still traumatized by the event, imagining that the man could have died in the very room I had been cleaning. I felt nervous cleaning that room after the incident.

Everybody said I had done the right thing and they wanted to give me some kind of reward. But I said no, as long as the man didn’t die, I was satisfied.

So--this just goes to show that being a hotel maid is not such a bad job. [Being a hotel maid is a very respectable job, and sometimes we even play critical roles in people’s lives.]

With respect to the organization of the narrative discourse, in addition to marking definite opening and closing segments, the narrators whose stories constitute this study’s corpus structure their narratives around three main components, components which are generally found cross-linguistically to characterize narrative structure (Labov 1972a):

(1) advancing the narrative thread, the ‘story-line’;
(2) providing background information for the listener; and
(3) evaluating or commenting on a segment of the narrative.

Because openings and closings, coming as they do at the boundaries of the narratives, are in general more perceptibly salient to the listener and are less problematic, this study focuses primarily on an analysis of the three above-listed narrative components, which are considerably more complex tasks for a low-proficiency second language speaker, particularly when they are embedded in an ongoing narrative. Some attention will be paid, however, to both openings and closings. To render each of the major components of their narratives salient for the listener, long-term resident low-proficiency second language speakers, cognizant of their limitations, have learned not to rely solely
on their production of lexical content. They have learned to supplement the propositional content with a variety of prosodic signaling devices.

Table 4.1., below, summarizes the primary narrative devices which are cued by prosodic features.

Table 4.1. 
Overview of principle narrative components and of narrative devices signaled by prosodic cues 
(adapted from Labov 1972a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NARRATIVE COMPONENT</th>
<th>NARRATIVE DEVICES SIGNALLED BY PROSODIC CUES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>Initiate the narrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distinguish the narrative from other talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story Line/Advancing narrative thread</td>
<td>Introduce complications in the narrative (listing actions, activities, issues)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Signal climax or point of the story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quote self or impersonation of others, with or without identification of the speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recall a date or detail (est. time frame, so leave here in Story Line sec.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backgrounding</td>
<td>Check listener’s awareness of assumed mutual knowledge through questioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decide to supply information after assessing listener’s background on the topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Respond to listener’s request for clarification)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating</td>
<td>Provide commentary or indicate affective orientation of narrator to narrative content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>Concluding the narration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coda following narrative itself</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2., below, presents a comparison of the above Labovian framework with the framework proposed by Chafe for the functions of prosody in discourse and Wennerstrom’s proposed treatment of prosody in discourse, inspired by Pierrehumbert and Hirschberg (1990) theory of intonational meaning as well as by Yule’s (1980)
concept of paratone. These three frameworks are the primary ones which will inform the
analysis of prosody's role in interlanguage narratives which follows.

Table 4.2.
PROSODIC FRAMEWORK FOR DISCOURSE and NARRATIVE ANALYSIS
(compatibility of three paradigms)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHAFE</th>
<th>LABOV</th>
<th>WENNERSTROM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNITS FUNCTION delimit words, phrases, sentences &amp; topics as on-line processing organizer</td>
<td>NARRATIVE THREAD Introduction; Story line, advancing narrative thread; Conclusion</td>
<td>COMPOSITIONAL FUNCTION pitch accents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGNPOST FUNCTION 'guide the flow of thoughts from one unit to another'; show relations of units to larger contexts (end of phrases, boundaries, etc.)</td>
<td>NARRATIVE THREAD (as above)</td>
<td>COHESIVE FUNCTION cohesion through pitch contrasts; constituent connections signaled by final pitch boundaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BACKGROUNDING Check listener awareness of assumed mutual knowledge; Supply info. to listener</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEIGHTS FUNCTION show prominence of new, contrast, emphasis</td>
<td>NARRATIVE THREAD (as above)</td>
<td>COHESIVE FUNCTION (as above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BACKGROUNDING (as above)</td>
<td>EXPRESSIVE FUNCTION timing, pitch, volume and voice quality make text segments more or less prominent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFFECT FUNCTION express emotions &amp; attitudes</td>
<td>EVALUATING Provide commentary or indicate affective orientation of narrator to narrative content</td>
<td>EXPRESSIVE FUNCTION (as above, plus: express emotional priorities)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(following Chafe 2000:390-391; 2003:2; Labov 1972a, Wennerstrom 2001b)
4.3.2 Narrative introduction

One feature which is claimed to be universal for narratives is the existence of some sort of signaling device that a narration has begun (Labov 1972a; Labov & Waletzky 1992; Polyani 1982; Gee 1986, 1989b, 1991; Gee & Grosjean 1983; Kumpf 1986; Wilson 1996; Scollon & Scollon 1982). Often an introductory phrase will serve as this initiation cue, e.g., 'I was just sitting at home one day watching television when...'; 'Did I ever tell you about the time I was...'; 'Do you want to hear a funny story of what happened to me when...'. However, the narratives contained in this study's corpus, given their narrators' lack of extensive English lexicon and syntax with which to shape such introductory phrases, are more often signaled by a combination of minimal lexicon which is prosodically set off from the surrounding utterances in order to indicate that the speaker intends to begin a narrative.

The utterance which actually begins the incident narrated in Junk Job is found at line 13 of the transcript in Appendix E and is presented in example (22), below. The material included in single brackets (i.e., [ ]) in the gloss below the utterance is material which has no explicit lexical equivalence in the speaker's utterance, but which can be inferred by the listener from contextual cues and shared mutual knowledge of what must be included in the introduction to a speaker's conversational narrative. The material included in single braces (i.e., { }) is material which again has no explicit lexical correspondence in the utterance, but which are elicited in the mind of the listener by the prosodic cues provided by the speaker.
(22) Before me, uh # three year ago, some people

'One day, I had [a very unusual experience] [which I’d like to tell you about]
--{I think this happened about} three years ago— {there was} this man…'
(Sun Ja [Junk Job] 13-14; [junksegs:3yrago])

Because the prosodic features of this lexically simple but syntactically complex example are particularly salient, the acoustic measurement and pitch track for this example are provided in Fig. 4.10., below.

Fig. 4.10. Example of narrative introduction
Acoustic representation of example (22)
'Befo:re me uh # three year a go some people M: mm'

'One day, I had this experience [which I’d like to tell you about]—I think this happened about three years ago—there was this man.'
(Sun Ja [Junk Job] 13; [junksegs3yrago])
The first intonational unit 'before me' serves as Sun Ja's attention-getting announcement that she has a story to relate. To convey this first proposition, Sun Ja employs relatively 'aggressive prosody' (increased volume and high pitch peak on 'me') to take control of the conversation and to assert her proposed role of narrator. This prosodic claiming of the floor substitutes for any number of lexical alternatives that could have been used to accomplish this same act, had Sun Ja had these items in her lexicon, among which the following possibilities come to mind: 'that reminds of something that happened to me a few years back...', or 'you know, there was an incident [which happened] about three years ago...'.

Note that the very high pitch sustained on the syllables 'three year' in the second intonational unit ('three year ago') of the utterance is isochronic with only a slight increase in volume [see the second cell of the magnitude row in which pitch and amplitude are overlaid in Fig. 4.6]. The combination of low volume and sustained high pitch, as opposed to a pitch peak accompanied by sharply increased volume, has a double-pronged effect. First, the prosody separates the propositional content of this phrase from the previous and succeeding intonational units. This much can be relatively objectively described. As to the second function of the prosodic contour, namely, the perlocutionary effect, a much more subjective approach is called for. Under the assumption that the prosodic contour is not random, but motivated, it now becomes the task of the hearer to interpret the meaning encoded by the prosodic contour in conjunction with the propositional content with which it is co-terminous. Here, the effect of the sustained high pitch with simultaneous low amplitude create an impression of
tentativeness about the proposition under the high-pitched contour. This analysis is motivated by the listener's previous experience and possibly even to physiologically-based universals of language meaning which stem from the relation between meaning and sound.

In the third intonational unit of the utterance ('some people'), Sun Ja introduces the main character around which the incident's complications will subsequently develop. Since the question of how to interpret 'some people' is somewhat problematic, a few words of explanation for the proposed gloss 'there was this man' is perhaps in order.

In the lexicon of Sun Ja and her immigrant compatriot peers with limited English, 'some' seems to have been acquired as a general indefinite adjective (e.g., see Junk Job, line 41, 'some man kitchen, fall down!'). As for the interpretation to be given to Sun Ja's ambiguous use of the word 'people', there are two possibilities. She could have been meaning to say either 'a person' or 'a man'. In either case, the referent is singular, as the subsequent discourse makes clear. The use of the English irregular plural 'people' with a singular meaning is in widespread use among Koreans, even among instructed Korean learners of English who have a generally quite advanced proficiency level, possibly due to its higher frequency than the singular form 'person'. The cross-linguistic semantics is complicated by two facts pertaining to salam, the Korean word referring to a generic 'human being' or 'person'. The first is that the word salam can be used in Korean with either singular or plural referents, as the plural marker is optional in Korean, e.g., (23) salam 'person' ['man'] with nominative marker in singular (23a) and plural marker
Second, adding to the confusion in the minds of Korean learners of English is the fact that in most of the popular Korean-English dictionaries, the first meaning given at the entry salam is ‘man’ (to the extreme irritation of feminists and others who have been sensitized to the use of gendered language!) (See Si-sa Elite 2000; Hollym Standard English-Korean Korean-English Dictionary for Foreigners, 1991; Dong-A’s MATE English-Korean Korean-English Dictionary, 1998; A-One Pro. AP-85. Korean-English English-Korean electronic dictionary [based on Minjung’s Essence Dictionary]).

It is impossible to say definitively which source of lexical confusion is at the origin of the gloss used by Sun-Ja, but in any case, given this background, as both listener and analyst, I opt for an informed choice of gloss for the third proposition of Sun Ja’s narrative opener as ‘there was a person’, ‘there was this man’, ‘there was this guy’.¹³

Note that once Sun-Ja has claimed the floor and effectively controls the turn, both pitch and volume subside on ‘uh’ as she organizes her next proposition. In the second part of the utterance, the very high pitch on ‘three year’, contrasting with only a slight increase in volume, create an impression of tentativeness. This tentative prosody serves in lieu of possible lexical items such as ‘I think it was about three years ago’, ‘it must have been about three years ago’. All of these prosodic cues are naturally available to the
listener, who then, as interlocutor and co-participant in the conversation, responds to the utterance based on an interpretation of the prosodic cues. Given the information available from the prosodic components, the utterance can now be parsed in standard English as, 'I had a very unusual experience [which I'd like to tell you about]—I think this happened about three years ago—there was this man...'.

It is my contention and indeed, it is one of the main points of this study, that in utterances such as these, where the lexico-morpho-syntactic features give only the most minimal of signposts as to the speaker's meaning, the listener must rely heavily on other clues in order to grasp the speaker's meaning. For the interlocutor/listener, in this case, it is primarily the two salient shifts in pitch and volume, which, by contrasting with the surrounding material, indicate how the utterance and its component segments are to be interpreted and parsed.

4.3.3 Advancing the narrative thread

In example (24), we have an excellent example of Sun Ja's technique of moving the narrative through a sequence of events:

(24) This man, me off day come back (laugh), going already (laugh)!

‘When I came back from my day off (laugh), I discovered the man had already checked out (laugh)!'  
(Sun Ja [Junk Job]31; [junksegs:mango])

The propositional content of this example can be divided into three segments, as shown below on the graph in Figure (4.11):
Fig. 4.11. Example of prosody used to advance narrative thread

Acoustic measurements of example (23)

'this man, me off day come back, # going already (laugh)

(Sun Ja [Junk Job]: 27; [junksegs; mango])

1. enunciation of the subject ('this man');

2. establishment of the narrator’s action, including an indication of a chronological sequence ('me off day come back'); and

3. the culminating proposition, the ‘point’ of the utterance ('going already'), indeed the point of the whole story, i.e., that the man survived his malaise.

Although Sun Ja does not provide any medical details of the man’s malaise in her narrative and gives no indication that she was at any point aware of the medical diagnosis of his problem, his quick recovery was presumably due at least in part to her timely intervention, as her justification for recounting the incident was to support her statement that being a room-maid is not such a ‘junk job’ as some people suppose (Junk Job, line 1). [All line references which follow are to the transcript in example (20),
If one has the written transcript at hand post facto, the utterance can be relatively unproblematically divided into the three propositional segments based on the lexical content. In the flow of the oral narrative, however, the listener does not have the advantage of knowing in advance what the propositional content will be. As a narrator, Sun Ja is well-attuned to this characteristic of oral discourse, and thus she aids the listener's parsing of her story by segmenting her utterance into the three key propositions by means of pauses and pitch contours.

It will be noted that one characteristic of Sun Ja's narrative is her extensive use of quotation and the impersonation of characters appearing in her narratives by means of [real or reconstructed] attributed direct speech to advance the narrative thread. These direct speech segments are marked by highly salient prosodic shifts, as the examples from *Junk Job* illustrate, e.g., lines 19 (Sun Ja quoting herself), 26 (direct speech attributed to the investigating police officer), 32 (Sun Ja citing her thoughts as direct quotation), 33 (attributing direct speech to the hotel management) and 34 (Sun Ja citing her own response as direct speech). The device of using direct speech compensates for the narrators' lack of knowledge of how to structure conventional indirect discourse in English. English indirect discourse, which might be rendered by a syntactically more sophisticated speaker by something such as 'and then the policeman asked me to tell him what happened'. Examples of reconstructed direct speech, a narrative device used frequently by all the narrators in the corpus to advance their story threads was provided earlier in section 4.2.2.2.
4.3.4 Background (interactions during the narrative/listener design)

In example (25), below, illustrated graphically in Figure (4.12), below, the narrative device of checking listener comprehension and providing the listener with background information is employed. The pitch pattern used to distinguish this utterance from the surrounding material is auditorily quite salient and quite uncharacteristic of Sun Ja.

(25) Why this one uh::: floor over this one here you know
   ‘The reason why I did this is because I’m responsible for everything on this floor, as you know.’
   (Sun Ja [Junk Job] 4; [junksegs: floorover])

The graphic representation confirms the marked auditory perception. The initial segment (‘why’), is spoken with increased volume, followed by lower volume when Sun Ja enters an explanatory mode. Most significantly for the listener’s perception of the speaker’s intent, throughout the entire utterance, the pitch pattern is maintained at an uncharacteristically low level and within a very narrow range.

Fig. 4.12. Example of prosodically marked background information
'why this one uh::: floor over this one here you know'
Acoustic representation of example (25)
'The reason why I did this is because I'm responsible for everything on this floor, as you know.'
(Sun Ja [Junk Job] 4; [junksegs: floorover])

In the example illustrated graphically in Figure (4.12.), the narrative device of checking listener comprehension and providing the listener with background information is employed. The pitch pattern used to distinguish this utterance from the surrounding material is auditorily quite salient and quite uncharacteristic of Sun Ja.

Another example of the narrator attending to the presumed information knowledge of the listener is provided in Sang-Ho's narrative of his encounter with the immigration official at the airport upon his arrival at Honolulu Airport in example (26) below:

(26-1) SHP: check man is6 yeah
%pro: continuing the thread
(26-2) SHP: airport check man +"/.
%pro: lower pitch to give explanations/clarification
(Sang-Ho [All Park] 71-72)

The analyst's interlinear annotations, based on auditory saliency, clearly indicate that it was prosodic features (in this case continuing intonation contour in (26-1) and lowered pitch in (26-2) which allowed the listener to interpret the lexical content.

4.3.5 Evaluation: comments or evaluation of narrator's own talk

Finally, example (11), cited earlier in section 4.2.3.1, illustrates the third major type of narrative device prosodically marked by these narrators, namely, evaluation of the
narrator's own talk. In this case, a similar evaluative comment also serves as a closing device to the narrative segment in question.

The auditory perception of this segment is that it has a quality of 'finality'. The acoustic measurements, represented graphically in Figure (4.13.), confirm this perception. There is, first of all, from the first through the third segment, a downward trend in volume. The pitch level and pitch range, again, contrast starkly with this narrator's characteristic variation when in narrative mode. The high pitch on the repetition of 'not', accompanied by an increase in volume, signals the speaker's affect on the propositional content being expressed.

(27) room maid not, not bad job
    'Actually, being a room maid is not such a bad job after all.'
    (Sun Ja [Junk Job]105; [junksegs: maidgood])

Fig. 4.13. Example of prosodically marked narrator evaluative comment
room maid not, not bad job
Acoustic representation of example (27)
'Actually, being a room maid is not such a bad job after all.'
(Sun Ja [Junk Job]105; [junksegs: maidgood])
4.3.6 Narrative conclusion

All but the most minimally proficient narrators in this study provided a 'wrap-up' comment to conclude their narratives. In the case of Sok and his narrative about the dust storm in Saudi Arabia, this concluding comment took the form of asking the listener to believe how strong the wind could be in the desert:

(28) that's [/] that's //true: you know uh //strong you know -, /wind -.  
(Sok [Dust Storm] 96)

Sang-Ho, in his narrative of his first arrival in Honolulu with members of two nuclear families, all named Park, recounting the surprise of the immigration official at seeing a man with what appeared to be two wives and many children, concludes his narrative by laughing at his own wit, with the evaluative comment shown in (29):

(29) good thinking yeahQ  
(Sang-Ho [All Park] 85)

4.4 Chapter Conclusion

The data presented here, excerpted from a larger corpus of unrehearsed narratives recounted by low-proficiency non-native users of English after long-term residence in an English-speaking community, demonstrates that such non-native narrators make extensive use of prosodic features such as pitch and intonational contours not only as a means of expressing syntactic complexities and as lexical substitutions, but also to convey transitions from one segment of their narratives to another and to achieve discourse coherence and cohesion.

What is unique about this corpus is not the structure of the narratives themselves. Quite the contrary: there is a remarkable commonality between the structure of the
narratives of native speakers and that of these narrators with low proficiency in the target language used in the narratives. What is remarkable and of interest is the relative complexity of the narratives, given the paucity of the means available to the narrators to structure their storytelling. Foremost among those means are a combination of prosodic indicators (shifts in narrators’ pitch and/or volume) and lexical items. It should be emphasized that while lexicon does play an important role in these narratives, given the limited nature of the lexicon of these narrators, the relative weight of the load carried by the prosodic features is considerable. The other striking feature about these narratives is that standard English syntax and morphology, usually considered indispensable to the realization of cohesion in English narratives, play almost no role here.

It must be further emphasized that in this corpus there is no inter-speaker characteristic prosodic pattern associated with specific speech acts, nor is there a prosodic pattern associated with a specific narrative structure, nor with any particular function. Each speaker has an idiosyncratic, individual pattern and it is each speaker’s use of contrast within the utterance and within the overall discourse structure which gives significance to the prosodic pattern which emerges.
In Bakhtin's view, the notion of sole, isolated authorship is a bogus one. An essential aspect of his construct of dialogicality is that multiple authorship is a necessary fact about all texts, written or spoken...

Unlike many scholars of language, especially contemporary linguists who concern themselves primarily with linguistic form and meaning abstracted from the actual conditions of use, Bakhtin focused his analytic efforts on the 'utterance', 'the real unit' of speech communication.

(Wertsch 1991: 49-50; emphases in the original)

Bakhtin wrote that 'speech can exist in reality only in the form of concrete utterances of individual speaking people, speech subjects. Speech is always cast in the form of an utterance belonging to a particular speaking subject, and outside this form it cannot exist'.

(Wertsch 1991:50, citing Bakhtin 1986:71)

Rather than view voices and utterances in...chaotic terms, Bakhtin was able to find patterns of organization that derive from the notion of social languages. As Bakhtin wrote, 'the single utterance, with all its individuality and creativity, can in no way be regarded as a completely free combination of forms of language, as is supposed, for example by Saussure (and by many other linguists after him), who juxtaposed the utterance (la parole), as a purely individual act, to the system of language as a phenomenon that is purely social and mandatory for the individuum' (Bakhtin 1986: 81). By employing the notion of social language, then, Bakhtin was able to identify and study the organizing principles of concrete speech communication. His effort was grounded in the assumption that one does not have to examine units that 'belong to nobody and are addressed to nobody' in order to formulate principles of human communication that generalize across utterances.

(Wertsch 1991:58; emphases in the original)

5.1 Introduction

This study has examined the use of prosody as a linguistic resource in the telling of conversationally embedded narratives by six low proficiency, adult Korean immigrant
naturalistic acquirers of English as a second language who had been living in Hawai‘i for extended periods of time ranging from nine to twenty-six years. The study could thus be described as a study of the use of prosody in discourse, or, alternatively, as a study of uninstructed second language acquisition outcomes. It could also be considered a study of narrative structure, based on evidence from second language narrators. Or it could be said to be a study of compensatory communicative devices among fossilized immigrant language learners. The study does, to some extent, fit all of the above descriptors. Certainly the data collected for the study lend themselves to analysis from each of these perspectives. Yet the study does more, or, rather, it has attempted to do something different. The parameters of any single subfield cannot convey the multiple aspects of this study, nor can a compound designation such as second-language-prosody or prosody-in-discourse describe it. The study cannot properly be viewed as the sum of its parts; it is not componential. It is, rather, to use Bakhtin's term, heteroglossic, meaning that it contains multiple voices in dialogue not only with specific designated readers, but it also contains the voices of immigrant narrators in dialogue with a physical interlocutor, with each other, and with 'an indefinite, unconcretized other' (Bakhtin 1986:95, cited in Wertsch 1991:53).

This heteroglossic nature can be discerned both in the primary data—in the sounds of the voices on the tapes—as well as in the comments on the data which should be heard as dialogues with previous studies and analytic traditions—analytic traditions in second language acquisition research, in discourse analysis, in prosodic analysis, in narrative structure. Thus, when listening to the data presented in this study, the linguist will
naturally tend to listen for sound segments from which data for linguistic analysis can be
gleaned. Those segments will likely be heard by the syntactician as evidence of minimal
acquisition of English morphosyntactic structures. The acquisitionist will also most likely
listen for syntactic regularity in the patterns and will attempt to find traits common to
learners with similar profiles. The phonologist will hear tunes familiar from both the
native and the host community languages and will no doubt find evidence of interference
in the articulation of specific phonemes of the target language. The discourse analyst, on
the other hand, looking beyond the segments and sentences to hear chunks of discourse,
is likely to perceive the narrators' voices speaking in thought groups, fashioning coherent
narratives, interacting with and adjusting to the addressee, constantly making adjustments
to satisfy the requirements of meaning negotiation between the interlocutors. The
ethnographer will listen to the recordings for the content, possibly noticing but not
stopping at the discrete segments of interest to the syntactician, the phonologist or the
acquisitionist, moving beyond questions of discourse structure, and listening mainly to
the raw emotions and the candidness of the immigrant's lived experiences expressed in
these fragments.

The data collected here are anchored in the life experiences of an immigrant
generation. The specifics of the tales may differ from family to family, but the themes
will be familiar to all who have grown up in immigrant families. For the second
generation Hawai‘i-born sons and daughters, nieces, nephews and grandchildren of
Korean immigrants, the rhythms and accents of the voices on the tapes and the stories
which constitute the narrative data bring tears to the eyes and warm the heart, as they are
the familiar sounds of home, often recalling memories of now-deceased loved ones.

Finally, to this linguist researcher who leans to both discourse analysis and
ethnography to inform analyses of language in use, the recordings, the sounds and the
tales are sources of data, to be sure, but they have become much more--they have become
constant companions, not only the gist of which, not only the word-for-word citations of
which, but also the inflexions of which can be called up with almost original accuracy.
Living with and constantly working with data from six different narrators has generated
yet another form of heteroglossia for the analyst: intra-narrator patterns in the narrations
have become apparent, creating another type of dialogicality, a dialogicality which is
admittedly a creation of the analyst's own interpretations, yet a dialogicality which
becomes an integral part of whatever it is that this study ultimately contributes to an
understanding of language.

This nature of the data means different listeners and different analysts will hold
different aspects to be salient, leading to variation in the interpretation of the data and to
differences of opinion regarding its significance. These several perspectives constitute the
layers of the polyvocality of the analysis and lend it its dialogic aspects. The possibility
of multiple and potentially conflicting interpretations of the data is not to be evaded, nor
will it be construed as detracting from the researcher's analysis. On the contrary. That the
intended meanings can be heard and even occasionally misheard by analysts and the fact
that they can be variously interpreted constitutes simply another sense in which the texts
are to be taken as heteroglossic.
5.2 Perspectives on the role of prosody in the making of meaning

The essential claim of this study is that prosody serves as a primary linguistic resource for speakers who have 'stabilized' (or 'fossilized') at a low proficiency level after a considerable number of years spent in a community speaking that target language and who have consistently experienced the need to communicate exolingually with speakers of the target language over an extended period of time. This claim is explicitly not made for low proficiency speakers who are still actively engaged in the acquisition process, nor for those who learn the language without having to regularly undergo the necessity of communicating regularly in the target language (e.g., the claim is not made for instructed learners who use the target language primarily in 'sheltered' classroom communicative activities, nor for learners with only short term or intermittent contact with the target language).

To my knowledge, there is no other study which has explored this aspect of prosody, i.e., prosody as a productive linguistic resource (as opposed to paralinguistic) available to second language acquirers lacking extensive lexical and morphosyntactic resources in the target language. Initially, I had not planned to explore prosodic features at all, which is a rather surprising fact, given that the study ultimately focuses on second language speakers' use of prosody in extended narrative discourse. To my mind, the fact that prosody revealed itself as a productive linguistic resource in the course of the study despite not figuring in my original research design only serves to reinforce the claims made here on its behalf.
To be sure, other studies of the role of prosody in second language discourse have been undertaken (Wennerstrom 1994, 1998, 2000, 2001a), but their findings are based on studies of a completely different population, e.g., highly proficient, instructed learners of English who are undergraduate students or graduate student teaching assistants at an American university.

This study could be said to be most closely related to the relatively small body of work devoted to the analysis of the acquisition of target language by immigrant, untutored adult language acquirers, most of which has been conducted in Europe. It is quite remarkable that in the United States, known for its role as a major host country of adult immigrants, language researchers have devoted scant attention to phenomena associated with untutored language acquisition processes and the ultimate attainment of these immigrants. It appears that the linguistic ideology of the U.S., which in its most familiar form lavishes respect on native English speaking learners of truly foreign languages but fails to recognize or to take advantage of the linguistic assets offered by bilingual speakers of heritage languages, has apparently carried over into research traditions. Second language research programs in the U.S. thus focus primarily on issues relating to the teaching and learning of foreign languages in the classroom, but neglect to profit from or to even initiate investigations into the natural processes of second language acquisition, for which hundreds of thousands of immigrants could have served as research subjects over the years.

Despite this general lack of attention to immigrant language learners in the U.S., several exemplary case studies of immigrant language learners have been conducted in
the U.S. which have become well known in the field, e.g., Schumann (1975, 1978),
Schmidt (1983), and Huebner (1983). To this short list can be added Long's 1997
longitudinal analysis of the interlanguage of a Japanese female and three studies of the
English interlanguage features in the speech of Korean adult female immigrants in
Hawai‘i (D.J. Lee 1972; Sohn 1986 [1980]; Bickerton [1974] [and Bickerton & Givón
1976]). Only cursory attention, if at all, is given to intonation or other prosodic features in
any of these studies, however.

Finally, Kumpf's (1986) study of three Japanese and three Hispanic immigrants
focussed on organizational structures in the discourse of long-term resident adult
immigrant naturalistic acquirers with profiles very similar to those of the Korean
immigrants included in this study, but here again, Kumpf makes only passing reference to
prosodic features and the main analysis takes a grammatico-rhetorical approach to the
analysis of discourse structure. (See Chapter Two, section 2.1.)

Measured in terms of number of learners surveyed and in terms of number and
typological diversity of source and target languages, however, by far the most extensive
of the studies of immigrant language learners investigating questions of import to the
study of second language acquisition phenomena have been conducted in Europe (Perdue
1984, 1993a, 1993b; Meisel 1975a, 197b, 1986 [1977], 1987, 1997; Meisel, Clahsen &
Pienemann 1981; Clahsen, Meisel & Pienemann 1983; Heidelberger Forschungsprojekt
As mentioned in Chapter One, section 1.2.3.3., despite their original intention to do so
and despite Klein's (1981a) observation that intonation marked utterance components and that prosody seemed to play an important role in immigrants' linguistic repertoire, the European Science Foundation project teams did not systematically investigate these issues. (See Chapter One, section 1.4.)

It is perhaps partly because of their limited ultimate proficiency that naturalistic, uninstructed learners have traditionally been deemed uninteresting subjects for research programs pursuing the key to successful language learning, at least in the U.S. where the research emphasis has lain with instructed language learning. To better understand the human language faculty, however, documentation of the strategic use of limited linguistic resources by adult uninstructed language learners can provide valuable insights. Despite the preponderance of studies having been conducted in the context of instructed language learning, the investigation of uninstructed adult immigrant language learning does enjoy strong theoretical support from leading scholars of language acquisition and bilingualism. (See Chapter One, section 1.2.3., subsections 1.2.3.1-3.) Klein (1986a), for example, states, 'It appears that any attempt at aiding the process of language acquisition must be based on a sound knowledge of the underlying mechanisms, or the laws that govern the process. It seems quite problematic to try to identify these mechanisms when their operation is modified by the application of a particular method of instruction....The human mode of language processing—including first and second language acquisition—has evolved over millennia; organized instruction is a recent innovation historically' (18).

This study thus has a unique contribution to make to the field of naturalistic language acquisition in that it documents what such learners manage to achieve with a
paucity of resources and how speakers restructure the limited linguistic resources at their
disposal to meet communicative needs. This study investigates non-standard learner
language not so much for what it can tell us about second language acquisition processes,
but what second language acquisition phenomena can tell us about the language faculty.
An important theoretical framework for this study is thus the interlanguage framework, in
as much as this framework constituted a paradigm shift in approaches to the study of
second language acquisition by proposing that the study of learner 'errors' could
fruitfully be turned from a deficit, non-target-like perspective to an investigation which
seeks to glean from non-standard productions evidence for learners' cognitive processes.

However, this study differentiates itself from most of the interlanguage research
which takes the analysis of successive stages of acquisition to be the terrain of inquiry.
Here, let me reiterate, it is neither the process of acquisition nor is it the end-product per
se which is analyzed, but, rather, the dynamics of the communicative process as it is
engaged in by speakers with limited linguistic resources in their attempts to 'make do'
with available resources in the accomplishment of their everyday communicative needs
which is the focus here.

This study starts from the observation that the long-term resident immigrants
whose narratives constitute the data for this study have stabilized for quite some time at
their current stage of language acquisition, i.e., the assumption is that they are fossilized
language learners. These long-term immigrants' fossilized language is characterized by a
high degree of fluency, however, in the sense that they are able to sustain a conversation
for considerable periods of time without communicative breakdowns. The study
investigates the linguistic resources these fossilized but fluent speakers draw upon to create coherent discourse and finds that it is primarily prosodic features which enrich the speakers' limited repertoire, enabling them to achieve their communicative needs.

In any study of prosody's contribution to meaning, an essential question which must be posed and satisfactorily answered is 'how do you know?', i.e., how does the analyst know that the meaning ascribed to a particular utterance is in fact the meaning intended by the speaker and heard by the addressee. In my analysis, I make use of the general insights from the Pierrehumbert and Hirschberg (1990) framework for the analysis of intonational meaning, i.e., that prosodic features (e.g., pitch, stress, volume) componentially build meaning over the trajectory of an utterance. (See Chapter Two, section 2.1 and section 2.4.) A serious limitation of the Pierrehumbert and Hirschberg framework for current purposes, however, is that it relies on assumptions about prosodic phenomena produced by native speakers of the language in question and judgments by listeners who are also native speakers of that language. Inasmuch as the narrators in this study are speakers of an interlanguage, I therefore make only limited used of the general meanings for Mainstream American English proposed by Pierrehumbert and Hirschberg in the analysis of my data.

If, then, the dominant paradigm for the analysis of intonational meaning (Pierrehumbert and Hirschberg 1990) is not appropriate, how do I reliably interpret the prosodic properties and the meanings intended by the speakers and perceived by the listener in the data at hand?
My approach essentially has been an auditory one, working within a discourse analytic/interactionist framework, but I draw on acoustic measurements and computer programs allowing graphic representation of the auditory signal in order to visually illustrate the measurable acoustic correlates of the auditory signal. The auditory and acoustic traditions are often viewed by their respective proponents as competing with each other, but following Schuetze-Coburn, Shapley and Weber (1991), I consider the two approaches to be complementary. As discussed in greater detail in Chapter Two, section 2.2.2, the acoustic (or instrumental) tradition employs instrumentation to measure the physical, acoustic properties of waveforms of recorded speech whereas the auditory approach attempts to determine which sounds in the speech stream are salient to the listeners and are used by listeners to decode the oral message. My data analysis in Chapter Four reflects my heeding of the two-pronged caution of those who criticize the auditory approach as 'too impressionistic and unscientific' (Ladd & Cutler 1983: 4), but who also disapprove of over-reliance on the instrumental approach on the grounds that 'while being scientifically "respectable" because based on verifiable measurements...[it] can be faulted for lacking verifiability in the sense that it makes no direct link between the psychological salience, and therefore the linguistic value, of purely acoustic records' (Ladd & Cutler 1983: 4).

A few previous studies have attempted to make use of both auditory and acoustic approaches in their analyses. The most influential of these 'combined approaches' is that of Schuetze-Coburn et al. (1991) who, after comparing acoustic and auditory features of intonation units in natural discourse, concluded that their results 'directly challenge
commonly held views on the unreliability of perceptual judgments of intonation by trained linguists' (225). Schuetze-Coburn et al. (1991) found a correlation between acoustically measured pitch contours and auditorily salient intonation units and they concluded that 'we can point to a specific acoustic measure which correlates with IU [intonation unit] boundaries; that is, we may infer that $F_0$ reset is a salient cue to an auditory identification of boundaries' (225). (See Chapter Two, section 2.2.2 for a more complete discussion of the Schuetze-Coburn et al. study as well as of the controversy over the auditory vs. acoustic approaches.) Buttressed by the findings of Schuetze-Coburn et al. (1991), I proceeded to use an approach to meaning interpretation which combined both auditory and acoustic measurements in the analysis of the data for this study. (See, for example, Figures 4.1 - 4.10. and the accompanying commentary in Chapter Four.)

However, purely prosodic features were not the only indices used to interpret the intended meanings in the data. Prosodic measurements (in the acoustic tradition) and auditory interpretations were supplemented by discourse analytic procedures within an interactionist framework, based on Gumperz' (1982) conceptualization of prosodic contextualization cues. Freese and Maynard (1998), cited earlier in Chapter Two, section 2.4.2.1, give a very good description of the process of triangulation required of any interpretation which hopes to claim validity within this approach:

[Prosodic devices are highly multi-functional and achieve their significance through an interaction with lexical, sequential, and situational information. One can, therefore, never claim a deterministic relationship between prosody and meaning, but rather can only note the utility of particular prosodic structures when employed in particular sequential environments...Abstract descriptions of a characteristic structure cannot by themselves illuminate how prosody is used by...]
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conversationalists; instead the task requires a close analysis of real interactional data (199).

Because one of the main claims of my study is that prosodic features serve low proficiency fossilized learners by compensating for their deficiencies in target language lexical and syntactic structures during oral communication, it was for primarily pragmatic reasons, quite independent from any theoretical orientation, that this study took an interactionist, discourse analytic approach to the study of the contributions which prosody makes to the creation of meaning. Auer, Couper-Kuhlen and Müller (1999) describe the essentials of this approach:

...[A]ny approach to language that restricts itself to abstract prosodic patterns devoid of contextual embedding will necessarily be unable to capture and analyze its meaning....[I]t is by placement of phonetic prominences within the sentence/utterance/intonation unit that the speaker indicates how the information marked by such means is to be interpreted in a given context. This aspect of prosody then has the function of guiding the listener's attention within the utterance (10).

The interactionist framework is not incompatible with the segmental approach of intonational phonologists such as Pierrehumbert (1980) or Pierrehumbert and Hirschberg (1990), but it is clearly in opposition to any approach which attempts to ascribe intonational meaning to decontextualized language. (See discussion in Chapter Two, section 2.4.)

Scholars do not generally disagree over the fact that prosody is central to the making of meaning, but, as discussed above and at greater length in Chapter Two, sections 2.1 and 2.2, what they do disagree over are its component parts, how these components interact with each other and how to isolate and analyze them. Debates over which aspects of prosody are to be considered linguistic and which are to be considered
paralinguistic phenomenon are rampant in the scholarly literature, and in fact, evidence from naturalistic uninstructed second language acquirers also leads to contradictory conclusions regarding the status of prosody. On the one hand, the language-in-use data collected for this study demonstrates that prosody is employed by second language speakers in the service of essential linguistic functions when lexical and syntactic resources of the target language are lacking. (Among the essential linguistic functions considered here to which prosodic features can unequivocally be claimed to contribute are establishing coherence and cohesion within a text, referring to non-present entities and concepts, and creating propositional content.) On the other hand, naturalistic acquirers' ability to make seemingly 'instinctive' use of prosodic features, as documented here as well as elsewhere (Klein 1981a; Kumpf 1986), might be taken as an argument against the fact that prosody is essentially a linguistic feature.

The six speakers contributing to this corpus have been categorized into two types: (Type 1) low proficiency but highly communicative, and (Type 2) low proficiency and minimally communicative. It is the three individuals classified as Type 1 (low proficiency, highly communicative) who most frequently have recourse to linguistically creative uses of prosody.

Analyzed from a lexical and syntactic point of view, the Type 2 (low proficiency, minimally communicative) speakers clearly have more limited means at their disposal, but the gap between them and the Type 1 highly communicative speakers in terms of lexicon and syntax is not particularly wide. What is striking, however, is that despite the similarities in their proficiency levels, the Type 2 minimally communicative speakers
make only limited attempts to draw upon prosodic resources to supplement their lexical
and syntactic gaps. An interesting speculation raised by this study, and a question which
deserves further research, is whether highly developed communicative behavior leads to
increased communicative pressure for the low proficiency learner, which in turn leads
such learners to delve into and adapt the resources at their disposal, 'making do', as it
were. If so, then one could make the case that it is the demands of language-in-interaction
and language-in-use which are driving the utilization of prosodic devices as linguistic
resources.

Table 5.1. [identical to Table 4.2.], below, presents the major components of three
major analytical paradigms used for framing the study of naturalistically acquired
interlanguage prosody. The table illustrates the overlap and compatibility between the
three paradigms.

The goal was to develop a single framework which allowed for the integration of
the four major functions deemed essential to an analysis of the linguistic and discourse
features realized through prosodic devices in the stabilized interlanguage which
constituted the corpus, e.g., (1) discourse/narrative coherence and information structure;
(2) linguistic functions; (3) paralinguistic (affective) functions; and (4) interactional
achievements.

With these constraints in mind, Chafe's model which postulates four major
functions of prosody (See Chapter Two, Table 2.2.) was considered. Not only was
Chafe's intonation unit found to be compatible with Pierrehumbert & Hirschberg's (1990)
analysis of the scope of the intonational phrase and with their analysis of intonational
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meaning in general, but it is also compatible with Gumperz' (1982) interaction-sensitive model of contextualization cues which underlies most interactional approaches to prosodic analysis. Furthermore, as Table 5.1. illustrates, Chafe's model of prosodic functions can be seen as the prosodic counterpart to Labov's analysis of narrative structure, after consolidating several of the Labovian categories of narrative structure into three (e.g., instituting and continuing the narrative thread, providing background, and evaluative sequences). Finally, Chafe's model, which divides discourse into 'segmental sounds', where content is expressed, and 'prosodic sounds', where infrastructure is organized, is compatible if not identical with the dichotomy I applied to the interlanguage prosodic phenomena, namely 'local' vs. 'global'. In my analysis, prosodic phenomena such as stress, pitch movements, syllable lengthening and changes in volume are employed at the lexical and syntactic level, which I term 'local level infrastructure'.

Prosodic features such as rhythm, volume and pitch serve as overall organizers of the discourse, which I term 'global level'. Wennerstrom's (1994, 1997, 1998, 2000, 2001a, 2001b) work on prosody in second language narratives also provides a useful framework. Ultimately I found Wennerstrom's adaptation of Pierrehumbert and Hirschberg's (1990) model of intonational meaning to explain second language speakers' use of prosody in discourse quite helpful. Wennerstrom (2001b) sees the attributes of prosody as being classifiable into four functions in discourse contexts. Namely, prosody is said to be (1) compositional; (2) cohesive; (3) interactional; and (4) expressive. As Table 5.1. indicates, Wennerstrom's framework is equally compatible with Chafe's analysis of the functions of prosody and with Labov's proposed analysis of narrative structure. This compatibility
across the three paradigms allowed me to draw from the insights of each, as needed, in the analysis of the uses of prosody in interlanguage narratives which compose this study's corpus.

Table 5.1. [identical to Table 4.2.]
PROSODIC FRAMEWORK FOR DISCOURSE and NARRATIVE ANALYSIS (compatibility of three paradigms)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHAFE</th>
<th>LABOV</th>
<th>WENNERSTROM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNITS FUNCTION</strong></td>
<td>1. NARRATIVE THREAD</td>
<td>2. COMPOSITIONAL FUNCTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>delimit words, phrases,</td>
<td>Introduction;</td>
<td>pitch accents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sentences &amp; topics as</td>
<td>Story line, advancing</td>
<td>final pitch boundaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on-line processing</td>
<td>narrative thread;</td>
<td>key</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organizer</td>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>paratones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SIGNPOST FUNCTION</strong></td>
<td>1. NARRATIVE THREAD</td>
<td>2. COHESIVE FUNCTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'guide the flow of thoughts</td>
<td>(as above)</td>
<td>cohesion through pitch contrasts;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from one unit to another';</td>
<td></td>
<td>constituent connections signaled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>show relations of units to</td>
<td></td>
<td>by final pitch boundaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>larger contexts (end of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phrases, boundaries, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BACKGROUNDING</strong></td>
<td>BACKGROUNDING</td>
<td>INTERACTIONAL FUNCTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check listener awareness of</td>
<td>Check listener awareness</td>
<td>Rhythmic inter- &amp; intra-speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assumed mutual knowledge;</td>
<td>of assumed mutual</td>
<td>pitch accents; rate of speech and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply info. to listener</td>
<td>knowledge;</td>
<td>pitch boundary shape inform of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>anticipated turn completion; tone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>concord to indicate integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of turn and attitude w/preceding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WEIGHTS FUNCTION</strong></td>
<td>1. NARRATIVE THREAD</td>
<td>2. COHESIVE FUNCTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>show prominence of new,</td>
<td>(as above)</td>
<td>(as above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contrast, emphasis</td>
<td>BACKGROUNDING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(as above)</td>
<td>(as above)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AFFECT FUNCTION</strong></td>
<td>EVALUATING</td>
<td>EXPRESSIVE FUNCTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>express emotions &amp; attitudes</td>
<td>Provide commentary or</td>
<td>(as above, plus: express emotional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>indicate affective</td>
<td>priorities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>orientation of narrator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to narrative content</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(following Chafe 2000:390-391; 2003:2; Labov 1972, Wennerstrom 2001b)
5.3. *Summing up prosody's role in the panoply of linguistic resources*

Prosody's role as a contextualizing device and as the means for conveying speaker stance and emotional affect is not in question. What *is* the subject of much scholarly debate, however, is whether prosody's functions of contextualizing, conveying attitude and expressing affect lie in the realm of core linguistics. The position a particular scholar takes on the issue of what is ‘in’ and what is ‘out’ of core linguistics unavoidably colors that individual’s view of the role of prosody in all its facets. In this study, in order to focus specifically on the creative uses of prosody in interlanguage discourse, I have, in general, attempted to avoid sparking the fractious debate over the ‘proper’ domains of linguistics. As explained in Chapter Two, section 2.1, and based on the evidence presented in Chapter Four, the perspective I have taken in this study is that prosody is one of the built-in redundancies of the human language faculty. When lexical and syntactic resources are available, speakers have no need to call upon prosody to serve these core functions. When, however, other resources for linguistic encoding are lacking, as is often the case with fossilized long-term adult immigrant speakers of host community languages, prosody emerges to assume a central linguistic role.

While it is beyond the scope of this study to determine the degree to which the linguistic applications of prosody in interlanguage speech such as that described here result from psycho-physiological universal properties of the human being or from prosodic features of the source and/or target languages, nor can generalized claims be made as to whether the linguistic uses of prosody will hold in every case of fossilized interlanguage discourse, the more modest claim which can be substantiated based on the
data presented in Chapter Four is that for Korean native speakers who are fluent, stabilized speakers of an English-based interlanguage, prosody clearly serves linguistic functions. The data analysis presented in this study leads one to consider an even stronger claim, namely that prosody becomes one of, if not the, central linguistic component which serves communicative demands of the naturalistic second language acquirer when other linguistic resources are lacking. Even the so-called paralinguistic functions of prosody (e.g., expressing emotional stance and affect) appear to take on linguistic functions at both the local (lexico-syntactic) and global (discourse organizational) levels in communicative situations when the speaker's interlanguage is on the low end of the proficiency continuum.

These conclusions are based primarily on the evidence presented in Chapter Four. Data presented in section 4.2 demonstrated that prosody performs linguistic functions such as contributing to lexical productivity and establishing syntactic relations. Data presented in section 4.3 demonstrated that prosody also plays a crucial role as a cohesive device in the organization of juxtaposed, sequentially arranged utterances, e.g., in discourse organization.

Basically, I see prosody serving a triple role in these narratives, the first two of which fall under what I have labeled the 'local level' and the third one under what I have labeled the 'global level'.

1. it substitutes for gaps in the narrators’ lexicon (lexical expansion)
2. it conveys syntactic relationships to the hearer when the narrators’ knowledge of needed forms in English is insufficient (syntactic elaboration function), and
(3) it organizes the discourse by marking a variety of segment boundaries in the narrative thread and by disambiguating the meaning carried by the minimal lexicon (narrative organization function).

It is the 'local level' functions which appear so saliently in this data and which particularly characterize interlanguage prosody yet which do not figure in most models of prosodic functions, including those listed in Table 5.1. While all three functions mentioned above could be considered normal functions of prosody, there are two striking aspects to this corpus which do make it noteworthy: (1) the number and frequency of marked prosodic tokens which serve the local level functions of lexical expansion and syntactic elaboration; and (2) the leading role (as opposed to supplementary role) which prosody plays in the construction of these texts, at the local (segmental and phrasal) level as well as at the global (discoursal) level.

To sum up, then, local level functions include both lexical expansion devices (intentional rhythmic reduplication or repetition and segmental lengthening, particularly of adjectives and adverbs, but also nouns (never verbs, however) substituting for adverbs of degree) and syntactic elaboration and signaling of constituent grouping (realized through prosodic parataxis and manipulation of intonational contours and intonational boundary markers to invoke indirect discourse and cohesion devices such as relativization, conjunction and subordination).

This study does not attempt to claim that prosody alone can carry the entire burden of verbal communication, but the data does support the view that prosody is one of several core (rather than peripheral) linguistic components and has the potential, when
needed, to play a role which goes far beyond its generally acknowledged paralinguistic functions. This study's examination of interlanguage narratives has shown that the relative weight of the role played by prosody in contributing to meaning is considerable in the discourse of narrators who have only limited syntactic and lexical repertoires.

In conclusion, this study has presented evidence supporting the claim that prosody is an essential redundancy in human language and contains the potential to play a more central role in core linguistic functions than is generally recognized. Prosodic tunes emerge quite early as a pre-lexical communicative device during infant language acquisition, and reliance on prosody to express emotional affect and to serve as a discourse contextualizing device remains as a constant in the speech of competent adult speakers. What this study has shown is that prosody can re-emerge in the speech of adult interlanguage users to serve quite central linguistic functions (lexical expansion and syntactic elaboration). The fact that fossilized, untutored adult interlanguage users appear to have almost instinctive recourse to prosody as a linguistic resource enhances the argument in support of its centrality. Without prosody, language would lose much of its characteristic expressivity which, ultimately, is perhaps its most crucial feature. Without prosody language cannot satisfactorily function as the tool of human communication for which it evolved—witness the attention which prosodic research is drawing from well-endowed research laboratories in search of commercially viable models of human speech to be incorporated into speech processing devices which currently lie just over the technological horizon. It is an adequate analysis of prosody--its features and its functions,
the questions which have long bedeviled linguistic scholars--which constitutes the most
significant hurdle to commercial applications of these products.

5.5 Directions for future research

While this study attempts to make some modest claims, grounded in evidence
gleaned from interlanguage prosody, as to the central linguistic functions of prosody,
many other issues and questions which could profitably be explored have been raised.

First and perhaps foremost, the issue of listener perspective and the contribution
of listener/audience to the speaker's shaping of the discourse has only been superficially
dealt with here. This was partly by virtue of the design of the study, which focussed
primarily on the extended, uninterrupted narratives which included relatively few overt
comments or interventions by the listener. Here most aspects of the effect of audience-
design can only be inferred from secondary evidence, rather than substantiated, for
example through conversation analytic procedures. Future research into the same corpus
or into newly collected interlanguage corpora could profitably study the more interactive
aspects of exolinguual communication. Although some of the transcripts for this study
were initially coded for interactional detail, I ultimately opted not to expand my analysis
to include these details in the current study. This topic remains a tantalizing option for
future research.

It should also be noted that while most of the main corpus for this study was
recorded in both audio and video formats, the extensive information from the videotaped
data has not been explicitly applied here. Because the study focussed primarily on the
prosodic features, the visual material on the videotaped versions of the narratives was consulted only on occasions where clarification of segments was needed. The videotaped data contain a rich lode of interactional data, which remain to be mined, particularly in the domain of the contribution of gestures to successful communication in exolingual situations.

Another crucial area which could be profitably explored using ethnographic, qualitative methods is that relating to the context of the long-term language acquisition of immigrant narrators such as those figuring in this study. While it did not fall within the scope of this study to investigate the factors responsible for the development of the observed prosodic phenomena in the speech of these immigrants, the ethnographic material collected incidental to this study leads to a tentative hypothesis that it is the cumulative effect of a consistent lack of syntactic and lexical resources, communicative pressures, and communicative needs, over an extended period of time and in a wide variety of communicative situations which has induced these language learners to rely on alternative resources for communicative purposes. A more systematic, longitudinal study of several years' duration, beginning earlier in the period of the immigrants' residency in the host community and documenting the emergence of communicative strategies under conditions of insufficient proficiency, might be able to shed light on this tentative hypothesis.

Finally, another major study which could profitably be undertaken with this or a similar corpus would be to see whether the prosody used by these speakers seems to derive from phenomena in their native language, from phenomena of the target
language(s), from commonly found ‘universal intonational properties’, or whether the prosodic contours seem to constitute a unique, even idiolectal, variety of interlanguage. To attempt even a partial answer to this question, a detailed analysis of the prosodic features of all the input languages would be required, an analysis which lay beyond the scope of this study.

Related to the question of transfer of prosodic phenomena from the native language or the target language into the interlanguage would be a cross-linguistic study of immigrants or long-term sojourners with different source and target language combinations in order to determine whether the claim that prosody emerges as a primary linguistic resource in the interlanguage of fluent but fossilized interlanguage speakers can be generalized beyond the population studied here. It is quite plausible to assume that the emergence of prosody serving linguistic functions in the case of Korean as L1 and English as L2 studied here is not unique, particularly since brief references to such phenomena can be found in the literature with respect to other language combinations.

Finally, one perspective which was regretfully not explored in this data was the ethnopoetic one. Ethnopoetics could be said to be a field of discourse analysis which attends to the culture-specific in the rendering of narratives. The field has been greatly enriched by cross-cultural studies of Native American populations and their oral narrative genres in contact with English-speaking culture (see *inter alia* Hymes 1996; Scollon & Scollon 1981). Culture-specific differences noted in the organization of narrative discourse include such aspects as morphological marking of information structure, and prosodic rhythm and narrative structure. To be sure, as analyst, I was cognizant of the
fact that attempting to analyze interlanguage narrative structure according to the extant paradigms of narrative structure (Labov 1972) or discourse structure (Chafe 1987, 1988, 1993, 1994, 2000) was to risk 'forcing' the data into paradigms which were not illuminating of its essence. As a first analysis of naturalistically acquired interlanguage prosody, however, I opted to use extant paradigms to illuminate the underlying structure which I sensed lay obstructed by the 'messy data' which interlanguage data undeniably is.

Ultimately, I hope that this study contributes to an invigoration of research into interlanguage data. It shall remain the work of other scholars or subsequent studies to analyze data such as these from an ethnopoetic perspective, a perspective which would no doubt reveal many interesting insights.
APPENDIX A
WRITTEN EXPLANATIONS TO PARTICIPANTS AND CONSENT FORMS

LETTER TO PARTICIPANTS

Marilyn Plumlee
Department of Linguistics
University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa
Honolulu, HI 96822

RE: MY STUDY OF LANGUAGE USE AMONG KOREAN IMMIGRANTS IN HONOLULU

TO THE [HOTEL NAME DELETED] HOUSEKEEPERS AND HOUSEMEN
PARTICIPATING IN MY STUDY:

You are all aware that the reason for my frequent presence at the hotel and the reason I have asked you all for interviews to be recorded on videotape and audiotape is that I am conducting research for my Ph.D. dissertation in Linguistics at UH. Since you are the key participants in my study and since it is your conversations with me that I will be analyzing in my dissertation, I would like to explain in more detail exactly how I will use all the information I am collecting, and exactly what I plan to be doing over the next few weeks in order to complete my research.

First of all, I want to thank each of you for so generously allowing me to interview you and for allowing me to spend some time with you during morning briefings and on your floors. I fully realize that the time you spend with me takes away precious time from your daily chores and your lives and I deeply appreciate your willingness to help me on my project. Without your collaboration, I simply could not complete my project. Thank you very, very much!

GOALS OF MY RESEARCH PROJECT AND EXPLANATION OF PROCEDURES

One of the main goals of my study is to demonstrate to the academic researchers who focus on language learning that immigrants who do not speak English fluently are nevertheless able to communicate with English speakers on a wide range of topics. I am very aware that sometimes you feel that your English is not "good enough" to carry on lengthy conversations and that you are sometimes hesitant to have our conversations recorded. The reason I need to record our "talk story" sessions is so that I can listen to and watch those conversations over and over, analyzing exactly what you do and say and what I do and say that allows us to successfully communicate. Mostly we use English words, but sometimes we use a Korean word. Sometimes we use gestures or body language. Describing all the things we do to successfully communicate despite our language barriers
is what I will be writing about in my dissertation. The focus of my analysis is thus on the positive aspects, not on the negative aspects, i.e. what we do to communicate despite our limitation of not being fluent in each others' language.

**PLANS FOR FUTURE SESSIONS**

Up to this point, we have had several "talk story" sessions talking about general topics. The next stage is going to be different and I wanted to let you know what is coming up. I have prepared two short 10-minute video recordings which I will ask you to talk about. The first video is about "A Day in the Life of a Hotel Housekeeper". The second is made up of excerpts from the classic silent film of the 1930s by Charlie Chaplin called Modern Times. I hope you will enjoy watching these video excerpts. Later, I plan to record some short excerpts from one of the Korean dramas from local television and talk to you about that episode. I hope I can count on your continued participation. Each session of viewing and discussing a video segment will be approximately 30 minutes long and we will probably need a total of three sessions, spread out over the next two to three weeks. Because I will need to make advance arrangements for a TV and VCR equipment for each of those sessions, I will need to set up a schedule with each of you. [NAME OF DEPARTMENT HEAD DELETED] is being very helpful in facilitating the scheduling of these sessions for me and we will talk to you individually about the video sessions.

Enclosed with this letter you will find two additional items. One is a "Participant Consent Form", which is a document which the university requires all researchers to provide and have signed by the participants in their research projects. Please read the form and if you agree to the conditions listed there, please sign one copy and return it to me. Keep the second copy for your own records, in case you wish to contact me at a later date.

The second enclosure is a gift certificate to be used at Palama Market, as a small token of my appreciation for your participation in my project.

[Handwritten: "Thank you!" and Signature]
호놀룰루에서의 한국 이민자들 사이에서의 언어사용에 관한 연구

본 연구, 조사에 참여하시는 [xxxx] 호텔 하우스 키퍼 여러분들께:

여러분들께서는 제가 이 호텔에 자주 와서 여러분들을 인터뷰하고 비디오를 찍거나 녹음을 하는 등의 일련의 활동을 하는 이유가 저의 학위논문 연구일 바 부족 논문에 대한 연구, 조사하고 하기 위해서라는 것을 잘 알고 계실 것입니다. 여러분들이 저의 연구에 참가하는 아주 중요한 사람들이라고 제가 본적하고자 하는 것도 여러분과 제가 나누는 대화이기 때문에 제가 여러분로부터 어떻게 정보를 수집하고 다음 수 주간에 제가 무엇을 하려는 지에 대해 좀 더 자세하게 설명해 드리고자 합니다.

우선 여러분들께서 바쁘신 시간에도 불구하고 아침 브리핑시간을 이용해서 저에게 인터뷰를 할 시간을 얻어주시는 것에 대해 여러분들 각자에게 너무 너무 감사하는 말씀을 드리고 싶습니다. 저는 제가 이 조사 때문에 여러분의 생활과 일상 업무에서 아주 귀중한 시간을 빼앗고 있는 것을 잘 알고 있으며 그에 대해서 여러분의 의욕적인 협조에 너무나 감사함을 느끼는 바입니다.

본 연구, 조사의 목표와 절차

제가 이 연구를 통해 하고자 하는 주요한 목표는 영어를 잘하지 못하는 이민자들도 어떻게 해서든 여러 가지 화제에 대해 미국 사람들과 의사 소통이 가능하다는 것을 언어 학습을 연구하는 학자들에게 증명해 보이기 위함입니다. 여러분들이 저와 대화를 나눌 정도로 영어가 충분하지 못하다고 느끼고 있다는 것과 또 제가 여러분들의 대화를 녹음하는 것을 켜리기도 한다는 것을 저는 잘 알고 있습니다. 제가 여러분들에게 이야기하는 것을 녹음하려고 하는 이유는 그것을 나중에 제가 여러 번 반복해서 들어서 분석해서 어떻게 해서 여러분과 제가 의사 소통이 가능하다는 것을 알아내기 위해서입니다. 저와 여러분은 대부분 영어를 사용해서 대화를 진행시키는 것이나 가끔 한국어를 사용하기도 할 것입니다. 또 제가 매스처 (순동작)이나 바디 랭귀지 (몸 동작)을 사용하기도 할 것입니다. 저희들 사이에 놓여 있는 장벽을 넘어서 어떻게 저희들이 의사 소통이 가능하다는 것을 설명하는 것이 결국 저의 논문의 핵심이 될 것입니다. 제가
초점을 맞추는 것은 이와 같은, 다시 말해서 서로 모국어가 다른 어려움 상황과 함께도 불구하고 우리가 대화를 할 수 있다는 긍정적인 면이지 결코 부정적인 측면을 보자는 것이 아님을 주지해 주십시오.

앞으로의 제가 하고자 하는 것들

지금까지 저희들은 일반적인 화제에 대해 이야기하는 시간들을 가졌습니다. 제가 다음에 하고자 하는 것들은 이것이고는 좀 다른 것들입니다. 저는 10 분에 따라 비디오를 두 개 준비했는데, 이 비디오를 보고 그것에 대해 이야기를 저에게 해 주시하시고 부탁하려고 합니다. 첫 번째 비디오의 제목은 "모던 타임 (Modern Times)"라든 것입니다. 두 번째 비디오는 1930년대의 찰리 캐플린 무성영화 "마 לר 타임 (Modern Times)"에서 발췌한 것입니다. 이 두 비디오를 잘 보고 얘기해 해 주시기 바랍니다. 나중에 저는 한국 테레비에서 연속극 장면을 발췌해서 여러분에게 보영드리고 의전을 묻는 것도 계획해 보고 있습니다.

있습니까. 희망찬데, 여러분들이 지속적으로 참여를 해주셨으면 합니다. 비디오를 보고 얘기하는 예 제러는 시간은 각 비디오 당 약 30분 정도로 잡고 있습니다. 또는 이, 삼 주 동안에 비디오 보고 얘기하는 시간을 다 합쳐서 총 80분을 가졌으면 합니다. 저희 TV (테레비)와 VCR (비디오) 장비를 준비해야 하기 때문에 여러분과 제가 면담할 수 있는 시간 (스케줄)을 짜 놓고 실습합니다. ( XXXX 성명)이 스크립트를 짜는데 많이 도와주고 있으며 저와 크리스틴이 여러분들과 개별적으로 만나 스케줄에 대해 논의 할 것입니다.

이 편지가 같이 동봉된 것은 두 가지입니다. 하나는 이 연구, 조사대한 참가 동의서인데 이것은 연구, 조사방법에 대한 연구에서 요구하는 것으로 연구, 조사시 참가자들이 심각하게 편리되어집니다. 이 동의서를 읽어 보시고 모든 조건에 동의하시면 식인을 하시고 저에게 쓰시해 주십시오. 복사본은 여러분이 가지고 제시가 저에게 연락하실 때 참고하십시오. 두 번째 것은 여러분의 참여에 대해 감사를 표하기 위해 제가 고마스게 드리는 말라마 마켓 (Palama Market) 선물 교환권입니다.

고맙습니다

~ 매일旅行社~
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LANGUAGE USE IN THE KOREAN COMMUNITY OF HONOLULU

PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM

Hotel Housekeeping Staff

I agree to participate in the Language Use in the Korean Community of Honolulu research project being conducted by Marilyn Plumlee. I understand that this research is being carried out as part of her doctoral program in Linguistics at the University of Hawai‘i. I have received a copy of this consent form, containing contact information, should I wish to get in touch with her in the future.

I hereby give my consent to be audiotaped and videotaped, with the understanding that all information obtained will be used by the researcher solely for documentation, research and educational purposes, and not for any commercial purpose. I understand that my participation will not in any way affect my employment status at the [NAME OF HOTEL DELETED] and that I may withdraw from participating in this project at any time without repercussions on my employment status. If I withdraw, I may request that information obtained from me be discarded, without any personal consequences.

I understand that in any published or public reports of the conclusions which are drawn from information provided by me, my identity will be disguised through the use of a pseudonym and alterations to significant identifying characteristics. I also understand that I may request the researcher to provide copies of research reports which result from my participation for me to review.

(Participant’s Name) ___________________________ (Participant’s Signature) ___________________________

(Place) ___________________________ (Date) ___________________________

RESEARCHER:
Marilyn Plumlee
DEPARTMENT OF LINGUISTICS, MOORE HALL 569
UNIVERSITY OF HAWAI‘I AT MĀNOA
HONOLULU, HI 96822
HOME TEL/FAX. 808-735-9186 E-Mail: plumlee@hawaii.edu
연구 프로젝트
한국인 이민자들의 호놀룰루시에서의 언어 사용

CONSENT FORM

Marilyn Plumlee
Department of Linguistics, Moore Hall 569
University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa
Honolulu, HI 96822  Email: plumlee@hawaii.edu Home Tel/FAX 808-735-9186

참가 동의서

나는 메릴린 플럼리(Marilyn Plumlee) 씨가 주관하는 호놀룰루시의 한국인 이민자들의 언어사용에 관한 연구 프로젝트에 참가할 것을 동의합니다. 나는 이 조사가 메릴린 플럼리 씨의 하와이 대학 언어학 박사과정의 연구를 위한 것임을 이해합니다. 나는 이 동의서를 받았으며, 만약 훗날에 필요하면 메릴린 플럼리 씨와 연락할 수 있도록, 이 조사자의 주소와 연락처도 받았습니다.

나는 여기에 이 조사자가 하는 연구 목적에 관련된 여러 활동들, 즉 인터뷰에 응하거나, 나의 목소리가 녹음되거나, 조사 장면을 비디오로 활용하는 것 등에 동의하고, 이 모든 조사 자료와 정보는 오로지 학술 연구와 교육의 목적으로만 사용될 것이라는 것을 이해합니다.

나는 이 조사에 참가하는 것을 언제든지 중단할 수 있으며 또한 내가 제공한 자료와 정보들을 폐기하도록 요구할 수 있으며, 이로써 나에게 어떠한 불이익도 오지 않는다는 것을 이해합니다.

나는 또한 내가 제공한 정보가 출판 혹은 보고서에 이용될 때는 나의 신분이 노출되지 않도록 나의 이름이 가명화 될 것이라는 것도 이해합니다. 그리고 나는 이 조사자에게 이 조사를 통해 얻어진 보고서에 대한 복사본을 요구할 수 있다는 것도 이해합니다.

(참가자 이름)

(참가자 사인)

(참가 장소)

(날짜)
APPENDIX B
ELICITATION MATERIALS:
VIDEO POST-VIEWING DISCUSSION QUESTIONS
AND PROMPTS

PROCEDURES FOR VIDEO VIEWING and RETELLING

“A DAY IN THE LIFE OF A HOTEL HOUSEKEEPER”

You will watch a 5-minute excerpt from a training video for hotel housekeepers. The video shows a hotel housekeeper going about her daily job of cleaning hotel rooms. You will be shown the same video two times. After each viewing, you will be asked some questions.

FIRST VIEWING (MEMORY RECALL TASK)

As you watch the video the first time, try to remember everything the housekeeper does. After you watch the video, I will ask you to tell me everything you can remember. You will have paper and pencil to use to take any notes you like (in either Korean or English) while watching the video to help you remember the important points. You will be able to refer to these notes later when you retell me the events.

FIRST RETELLING:

Question 1. Tell everything that you saw in the video, in the order in which it happened, as well as you can remember. Feel free to refer to your notes to help you remember what happened and in which order it occurred.

Now think of the flashback scenes where the housekeeper is daydreaming about her dates with the man:

Question 2. What happens in the “love story” that we see unfolding in the video?

Question 3. Do you think these scenes really happened? Or do you think the woman is just fantasizing?

Question 4. Why do you think she daydreams?

Question 5. OPTIONAL QUESTION (if you don’t mind answering): Do you ever daydream during your working day? If so, what do you daydream about?
PART 2 - Procedures for Video Viewing and Retelling
“A Day in the Life of a Hotel Housekeeper”

SECOND VIEWING: (GIVING OPINIONS)
You will see the video a second time, but as you watch this time, please focus on
the answers to the following questions, which ask you to evaluate both the housekeeper
and the video.

Please look over the following questions before you watch the video the second
time. Feel free to take notes while you are watching the video, if you like. You will be
able to refer to your notes while talking after watching the video.

SECOND RETELLING:
After you watch the video, I would like to hear your opinion on the following points:
1. Do you think the woman you saw in the video is a good housekeeper?
   • Why or why not?
     Does she follow proper procedures in cleaning a room?
     Does she work efficiently and safely?

2. Does she do anything differently than you do? If so, what?

3. Do you think her way or your way is better?

4. If she were hired to work at your hotel and you were asked to train her,
   what advice would you give her?

5. What is different about the hotel room you saw in the video and the rooms at the hotel
   where you work?

6. What kind of hotel does this appear to be?
   Which hotel in this hotel chain is most equivalent to the hotel pictured in the
   video?

7. What do you think of this video as a training tool?
   Would it be good to show this video to newly hired housekeepers at your hotel?
   Would it have been helpful to you personally to see such a video before you
   started to work? Why or why not?
   What are the good points about the video?
   What are the weak points of the video? Is there anything difficult to understand?

8. If Training Department at your hotel asked you to give your input on creating a video
   especially to train housekeepers, what would you change in this video to more
   accurately reflect what a housekeeper has to do in your hotel?
비디오 보기 이야기하기

(Video post-viewing discussion questions)

"호텔 하우스 키퍼의 하루"

("A Day in the Life of a Hotel Housekeeper")

귀하가 다음 보실 내용은 "호텔 하우스 키퍼의 교육용" 비디오에서 발췌한 5분 짜리 비디오입니다. 이 비디오는 하우스 키퍼가 호텔 방을 청소하는 일상의 업무에 관한 것입니다. 이 것을 두 번 보이도록 하겠습니다. 두 번 보니 이 비디오 내용에 대해 몇 가지 질문을 드립니다. 귀하가 보시기 전에 미리 이 비디오를 본, 한국말을 하는 하우스 키퍼가 비디오 내용을 간단하게 요약해 서 얘기해 줄 것입니다.

첫 번째 보기 -(본 내용을 자세히 기억하기)

첫 번째 보실 때, 이 비디오에서 하우스 키퍼가 하는 모든 것을 기억해 보도록 하십시오. 비디오를 다 시청하시고 나서, 제가 귀하가 기억하고 있는 것을 말씀해 주십시오. 그리고 어느 부분을 강조하실 동안 연필과 종이를 사용해서 메모를 하실 수 있습니다. 저에게 비디오에서 보신 내용을 얘기하실 때 이 메모를 참고하실 시오.

첫 번째 이야기하기

질문 1: 기억하실 수 있는 데까지 귀하가 보신 내용을 알아낸 순서대로 이야기해 주십시오.

기억을 돕기 위해 미리 적어 두신 메모를 참고하시십시오.

이제 비디오 속에서 하우스 키퍼가 남자와 대화하는 것을 상상하는 장면을 기억해 보시기 바랍니다.

질문 2: 이 장면에서 어떤 일이 벌어지고 있습니까?

질문 3: 귀하가 생각하시기에 이 장면이 실제로 일어났던 것일까요 아니면 이 여자가 단지 상상하고 있는 것일까요?

질문 4: 왜 이 여자가 웃음을 하게 됐다고 생각하십니까?

질문 5: (이 질문은 여러분의 선택에 따라서 대답을 하셔도 좋고 안하셔도 좋습니다.) 귀하는 일을 하시는 동안 웃음을 할 때가 있습니까? 그렇다면 무엇에 대해 웃음을 하십니까?
두 번째 비디오 보기: (본 내용에 대해서 의견을 말하기)

귀하께서는 비디오를 한번 더 보실 것을 권장합니다. 이 번째 비디오를 보시는 동안, 하우스 키퍼와 비디오에 대한 여러문의 의견을 듣는 다음 질문들에 대해 잘 생각해 보십시오.

비디오를 보시기 전에 다음 질문들은 살펴보십시오. 원하시는 비디오를 보시면서 메모를 하셔도 좋습니다. 비디오를 보시고 나서 말씀을 하실 때 이 메모를 참고하십시오.

두 번째 이야기하기: 비디오를 보시고 나서, 다음 사항에 대해 귀하의 의견을 듣고 싶습니다.

1. 귀하께서는 비디오에서 보신 여자가 하우스 키퍼임을 끝하고 있다고 생각하시나요?
   - 왜 그렇게 생각하시나요?
   - 이 여자가 방을 청소하는데 걸차를 제대로 따랐습니까?
   - 이 여자는 효율적으로 또 안전하게 일을 처리했습니까?

2. 이 여자가 일을 하는 것이 귀하가 하시는 것과 다른 점이 있습니까? 그렇다면, 그것이 무엇입니까?

3. 이 여자가 일을 하는 방법과 귀하가 하는 방법 중 어느 쪽이 더 좋다고 생각하십니까?

4. 만약에 이 여자를 아웃리거 호텔에 고용을 해서 귀하께 교육을 시키고 한다면 어떤 조언을 이 여자에게 하시겠습니까?

5. 비디오에서 본 방의 모습과 아웃리거 호텔의 방의 모습과 다른 점이 무엇입니까?

6. 비디오에서 본 방의 모습을 볼 때, 이 비디오는 어느 호텔에서 촬영한 것이라고 생각되십니까?
   - 그리고 여러 아웃리거 호텔 중 어느 아웃리거 호텔이 이 호텔과 가장 비슷하게 닮았다고 생각되십니까?

7. 교육용으로써의 이 비디오가 어땠다고 생각되십니까?
   - 이 비디오를 아웃리거 호텔에서 새로 막 고용한 하우스 키퍼에게 보여 주는 게 좋다고 생각하십니까?
   - 귀하가 하우스 키퍼임을 시작하기 전에 개인적으로 이 비디오를 보셨으면 도움이 되었을 것이라고 생각하십니까?
   - 대답하신 내용에 대해 왜 그렇게 생각하셨습니까?
   - 이 비디오의 좋은 점이 무엇입니까?
   - 이 비디오의 취약한 (만족도) 점이 있다면 무엇입니까? 이해하기 어려운 부분이 있었습니까?

8. 만약 아웃리거 교육부서에서 아웃리거 호텔의 하우스 키퍼들을 교육하는 비디오를 만들기 위해 귀하께 조언을 구한다면 이 비디오 내용에서 어떤 부분들이 고쳐져야 (시정되어야) 된다고 얘기하시겠습니까?
"MODERN TIMES"

POST-VIEWING QUESTIONS

Please narrate the story of what happened to the man and the woman in as much detail as possible.

What was your favorite scene? Tell me that part.
(For example: "I liked this scene because it is funny, or because it is sad, or because it was very natural.")

Does any scene in this film remind you of any personal experiences you had in Korea or in Hawai‘i? (Is any scene in this video similar to any experience you had in Korea or Hawai‘i?)
If so, please describe.
비디오 장면에서 남자와 여자한테 무슨 일이 일어났는지 가능한 한 자세하게 영어로 얘기해 주시겠습니까?

가장 마음에 드는 장면이 무엇이었습니까?
그 장면에 대해서 얘기해 주시겠습니까?
* 그리고 왜 그 장면들이 마음에 드는지 얘기해 주십시오.
  (보기: "그 장면이 슬퍼서, 재미있어서, 혹은 아주 자연스러워서 마음에 들어요."

이 비디오 장면 중에서 한국이나 하와이에서 직접 체험했던 경험과 비슷한 장면이 있었습니까?
있었다면 그게 무엇이었습니까?
MEMORABLE EVENTS PROMPTS

Questions/prompts to use in asking for narratives and extended discourse:

1. Can you recall a memorable event from your school days in Korea?
2. Can you recall a memorable event that happened to you in Hawai‘i?
3. Can you tell me what you remember about your first day in Hawai‘i?
4. Can you recall a memorable event at work?
5. Can you tell me about a memorable family event (a special family memory)?
6. Can you give me some examples of cultural differences you noticed here or on the Mainland, if you’ve been there (culture shock examples).
MEMORABLE EVENTS PROMPTS
(Korean version)

1. 학창 시절에 기억에 남는 일
2. 하와이에서 기억에 남는 일(또는 추억)
3. 하와이에 도착한 첫 날 기억에 남는 일 또는 사건
4. 직장에서 기억에 남는 일 또는 사건
5. 가정에서 기억에 남는 일(또는 추억)
6. 미국에서 문화 충격, 문화 차이를 경험한 적이 있으면 말씀해 주십시오.
   (예를 들면 미국 문화 중에서 이상하게 느낀 점을 설명해 주시거나,
   혹은 미국 문화에 대해서 놀란 적이 있으면 말씀해 주십시오.)
APPENDIX C
QUESTIONNAIRES AND SURVEYS

PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE

1. NAME ______________________________  2. Date of Birth ______________

3. ADDRESS ____________________________
   IN HAWAI'I

   ______________________________________
   Home Telephone: _______________________

4. DATE OF ARRIVAL IN HAWAI'I (year/month) ______________________

5. EDUCATION COMPLETED:  Middle School  High School
   Vocational Training  University
   Name of School ____________________________
   Location of School (city) ________________

6. MARITAL STATUS  Single  Married  Divorced  Widow

7. YOUR OCCUPATION:
   a. (Full-time job)
   b. (Second/part-time job)

8. SPOUSE'S OCCUPATION
   a. (Full-time job)
   b. (Second/part-time job)

9. U.S. Citizen?  Yes  No  (If so, when naturalized?)

10. Native language  Korean / English / Other
    Spouse's native language  Korean / English / Other

11. What relatives of your family or your spouse's family live in Hawaii?

    In the U.S. Mainland?

12. Language(s) spoken in the home: Who do you speak which language to and when?
    How much of the time do you use Korean?
    How much of the time do you use English?
13. ENGLISH COURSES YOU HAVE TAKEN:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of school or language program</th>
<th>(ex: McKinley High School, Roosevelt High School, etc.)</th>
<th>Other programs:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When (year)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How long did you go?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3 months, 6 months, 1 year?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often did you go?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(once a week? every day?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many hours for each lesson?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1 hour? 3 hours?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments about your classroom language learning experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. EMPLOYMENT IN HAWAI'I

Current employer: ____________________________
Position/Job title: __________________________
Start date: ____________________________

Previous employer: ____________________________
Position/Job title: __________________________
Start date: ____________________________

Previous employer: ____________________________
Position/Job title: __________________________
Start date: ____________________________

Previous employer: ____________________________
Position/Job title: __________________________
Start date: ____________________________
## 15. YOUR CHILDREN:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Son</th>
<th>Son</th>
<th>Daughter</th>
<th>Daughter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Names of your children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of birth/age now</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of Birth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(USA/Korea)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age when arrived in Hawa'ii</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of residence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(HI/Mnld/Kor?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI: Live together?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(HS/Trade/BA MA/PhD/Prof)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS completed where?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College where?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(S/M/D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse's occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children? Ages? M/F?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean language ability:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3=High 2=Med 1=Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What language do you use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to communicate?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-100% English?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50/50 Eng/Korean?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-100% Korean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does this child ever</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>translate English for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
설문지
(Personal Data Questionnaire)

1. 이름 ____________________ 2. 생일 ________________
3. 주소 (하와이)

전화 번호 (집) ____________________

4. 하와이로 온 날짜 (년/월) ____________________
5. 최종 학력
중학교 고등학교 직업훈련 대학교
학교 이름 ____________________
학교 소재지 (도/시/군) ____________________

6. 결혼 여부
미혼 기혼 이혼 배우자 사별

7. 직업
a. (정직);
b. (시간제/파트타임);

8. 배우자의 직업
a. (정직);
b. (시간제/파트타임);

9. 미국 시민인니까? 예 아니오
(언제 시민권을 얻으셨습니까? __________)

10. 모국어 한국어/영어/기타
배우자의 모국어 한국어/영어/기타

11. 어떤 천적이 하와이에 살고 있습니까? (예: 고모/외삼촌/이모...)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5,4</th>
<th>2,8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5,4, 2,8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,4, 2,8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,4, 2,8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,4, 2,8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,4, 2,8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. 다음과 같은 표를 완성하십시오.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5,4, 2,8, 5,4, 2,8</th>
<th>5,4, 2,8, 5,4, 2,8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5,4, 2,8, 5,4, 2,8</td>
<td>5,4, 2,8, 5,4, 2,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,4, 2,8, 5,4, 2,8</td>
<td>5,4, 2,8, 5,4, 2,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,4, 2,8, 5,4, 2,8</td>
<td>5,4, 2,8, 5,4, 2,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,4, 2,8, 5,4, 2,8</td>
<td>5,4, 2,8, 5,4, 2,8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. 다음과 같이 완성하십시오.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5,4, 2,8, 5,4, 2,8</th>
<th>5,4, 2,8, 5,4, 2,8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5,4, 2,8, 5,4, 2,8</td>
<td>5,4, 2,8, 5,4, 2,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,4, 2,8, 5,4, 2,8</td>
<td>5,4, 2,8, 5,4, 2,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,4, 2,8, 5,4, 2,8</td>
<td>5,4, 2,8, 5,4, 2,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,4, 2,8, 5,4, 2,8</td>
<td>5,4, 2,8, 5,4, 2,8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. 다음을 완성하십시오.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5,4, 2,8, 5,4, 2,8</th>
<th>5,4, 2,8, 5,4, 2,8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5,4, 2,8, 5,4, 2,8</td>
<td>5,4, 2,8, 5,4, 2,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,4, 2,8, 5,4, 2,8</td>
<td>5,4, 2,8, 5,4, 2,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,4, 2,8, 5,4, 2,8</td>
<td>5,4, 2,8, 5,4, 2,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,4, 2,8, 5,4, 2,8</td>
<td>5,4, 2,8, 5,4, 2,8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. 다음과 같이 완성하십시오.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5,4, 2,8, 5,4, 2,8</th>
<th>5,4, 2,8, 5,4, 2,8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5,4, 2,8, 5,4, 2,8</td>
<td>5,4, 2,8, 5,4, 2,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,4, 2,8, 5,4, 2,8</td>
<td>5,4, 2,8, 5,4, 2,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,4, 2,8, 5,4, 2,8</td>
<td>5,4, 2,8, 5,4, 2,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,4, 2,8, 5,4, 2,8</td>
<td>5,4, 2,8, 5,4, 2,8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. 다음과 같이 완성하십시오.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5,4, 2,8, 5,4, 2,8</th>
<th>5,4, 2,8, 5,4, 2,8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5,4, 2,8, 5,4, 2,8</td>
<td>5,4, 2,8, 5,4, 2,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,4, 2,8, 5,4, 2,8</td>
<td>5,4, 2,8, 5,4, 2,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,4, 2,8, 5,4, 2,8</td>
<td>5,4, 2,8, 5,4, 2,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,4, 2,8, 5,4, 2,8</td>
<td>5,4, 2,8, 5,4, 2,8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. 다음과 같이 완성하십시오.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5,4, 2,8, 5,4, 2,8</th>
<th>5,4, 2,8, 5,4, 2,8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5,4, 2,8, 5,4, 2,8</td>
<td>5,4, 2,8, 5,4, 2,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,4, 2,8, 5,4, 2,8</td>
<td>5,4, 2,8, 5,4, 2,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,4, 2,8, 5,4, 2,8</td>
<td>5,4, 2,8, 5,4, 2,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,4, 2,8, 5,4, 2,8</td>
<td>5,4, 2,8, 5,4, 2,8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. 다음과 같이 완성하십시오.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5,4, 2,8, 5,4, 2,8</th>
<th>5,4, 2,8, 5,4, 2,8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5,4, 2,8, 5,4, 2,8</td>
<td>5,4, 2,8, 5,4, 2,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,4, 2,8, 5,4, 2,8</td>
<td>5,4, 2,8, 5,4, 2,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,4, 2,8, 5,4, 2,8</td>
<td>5,4, 2,8, 5,4, 2,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,4, 2,8, 5,4, 2,8</td>
<td>5,4, 2,8, 5,4, 2,8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. 다음과 같이 완성하십시오.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5,4, 2,8, 5,4, 2,8</th>
<th>5,4, 2,8, 5,4, 2,8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5,4, 2,8, 5,4, 2,8</td>
<td>5,4, 2,8, 5,4, 2,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,4, 2,8, 5,4, 2,8</td>
<td>5,4, 2,8, 5,4, 2,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,4, 2,8, 5,4, 2,8</td>
<td>5,4, 2,8, 5,4, 2,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,4, 2,8, 5,4, 2,8</td>
<td>5,4, 2,8, 5,4, 2,8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
이전 회사 혹은 직장 이름:
직위/직무:
직장에 다닌 날수: (에서 까지)
15. 귀하의 자녀:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>아들</th>
<th>아들</th>
<th>딸</th>
<th>딸</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>자녀의 이름</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>생년월일/나이</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>태어난 곳</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>몇 살 때 하와이에 왔어요?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>사는 곳 (예: 하와이, 미국, 본토, 한국)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>교육 수준 (예: 하이스쿨, 학사, 석사, 박사,...)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>어디서 하이스쿨 다녔어요?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>어디서 대학 다녔어요?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>직업</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>결혼 여부</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(미혼/기혼/이혼)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>배우자의 직업</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>자식을 갖고 있어요? 나이/성별</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>한국말 실력 (3=상, 2=중, 1=하)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>귀하는 자녀와 대화할 때 어느 나라말을 쓸나요?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-100% 영어?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50/50 영어/한국말</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-100% 한국말?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>자녀가 귀하에게 영어를 한국말로 통역해 줄 때가 있습니까?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SURVEY OF KOREAN LANGUAGE RESOURCES IN HONOLULU (ENGLISH VERSION)

In each of the following categories, please provide the following information:

WHETHER you or members of your household go to that kind of place, and if you go, whether you go to a Korean-speaking place.

HOW OFTEN you or family members go to a Korean place (please mark the corresponding number: 1, 2 or 3).

1 = When I/we go to such a place, I/we sometimes go to a Korean place, but I also go to English-speaking places.

2 = When I/we go to such a place, I/we frequently decide to go to a Korean place, but sometimes I go to English-speaking places.

3 = When I/we go to such a place, I/we always go to a Korean place. I never/almost never go to an English-speaking place.

When you or your family members go to a Korean-speaking place, what are YOUR REASONS for doing so (circle all the reasons that apply).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEVER GO THERE</th>
<th>GO TO KOREAN-SPEAKING</th>
<th>CHEAP PRICES /&amp;/ PRODUCTS</th>
<th>QUALITY OF SERVICES</th>
<th>TO SUPPORT KOREAN BUSINESS</th>
<th>COMFORTABLE ATMOSPHERE / PREFER TO SPEAK KOREAN LANG.</th>
<th>OTHER (PLEASE EXPLAIN)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HEALTH & MEDICAL SERVICES

- DOCTOR
- DENTIST
- *CHINESE HERBAL MEDICINE
- OTHER

OTHER PROFESSIONAL SERVICES

- LAWYER
- ACCOUNTANT
- BANKING
- REAL ESTATE
- COMPUTER CONSULTANT
- OTHER

ENTERTAINMENT/LEISURE/RECREATION/SPORTS

- VIDEO SHOP
- GOLF
- EXERCISE / WORK-OUT GYM / SPA
- *NORAEBANG
- *BAR
- OTHER

*Items which are starred correspond to questions omitted from the Korean version of the questionnaire, mainly due to layout considerations. The Korean consultants for the questionnaire considered some of these questions redundant or non-essential and felt that the information could be obtained or inferred from answers to other questions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEVER GO THERE</th>
<th>GO TO KOREAN-SPEAKING</th>
<th>REASONS FOR GOING TO KOREAN PLACES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CHEAP QUALITY PRICES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>TO SUPPORT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>COMFORTABLE KOREAN BUSINESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ATMOSPHERE/ PREFER TO SPEAK KOREAN LANG.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OTHER (PLEASE EXPLAIN)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RETAIL SHOPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VIDEO RENTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOOKSTORE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECTRONICS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEWELRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIFTS, STATIONERY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROCERIES/RESTAURANTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Palama Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER GROCERY STORES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIQUOR STORE/SMALL CONVENIENCE STORE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAKE-OUT FOOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIT-DOWN RESTAURANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHURCH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TEMPLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPAIR SERVICES/TECHNICIANS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAIR CUT/BEAUTY SALON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAR MECHANIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAR BODY WORK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLUMBER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHOE REPAIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAILOR/SEAMSTRESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRANSPORTATION/TRAVEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TAXI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAVEL AGENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EDUCATION/CULTURE/ART</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC LIBRARY (which branch?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOREAN LANGUAGE SCHOOL FOR CHILDREN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH LANGUAGE SCHOOL FOR SELF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFTER-SCHOOL TUTORING CENTER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANCE LESSONS/DANCE GROUP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUSIC/SINGING LESSONS OR GROUP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OTHER PLACES YOU GO WHERE YOU CAN SPEAK KOREAN OR MEET KOREAN PEOPLE IN THE COMMUNITY

2. Thinking of the Koreans you know, where do most of them live?
   - Kaneohe/Kailua
   - Hawaii Kai
   - Aie'a & Pearl City
   - Ewa
   - Makiki/Mo'ili'iili
   - Manoa
   - Other: ____________________

3. What areas of Honolulu have a high concentration of shops where many Koreans go?

4. Watching TV:
   a. Do you watch Korean TV? Yes No
   b. How many hours a day do you watch Korean TV? (Average per day)
      M-F: ____________________ Saturday: ____________________ Sunday: ____________________
   c. Of the time you spend watching TV, what percentage of the time do you watch Korean programs?
      - 100% more than 50% about 50% less than 50% very little
   d. What are your favorite Korean TV shows? ____________________
      (e.g., Korea news; locally-produced news; singing/entertainment; drama/yok-sik-keuk; "gag men"; religion, documentaries, other)

5. Do you watch TV in English? Yes No
   a. Approximately how many hours a day do you watch English TV?
   b. Of the time you spend watching TV, what percentage of the time do you watch English programs?
      - 100% more than 50% about 50% less than 50% very little
      Please name your favorite English TV show if you have one ____________________
6. Do you read Korean newspapers?  Yes/No  Regularly/Once in a while  *Which ones? __________________________
7. Do you read Korean magazines?  Yes/No  Regularly/Once in a while  Which ones? __________________________
8. Do you read English newspapers or magazines?  Yes/No  Regularly/Once in a while
9. Do you listen to any of the local radio stations in English?  Yes/No  Regularly/Once in a while
10. Do you rent Korean videos in Honolulu?  Yes/No  Regularly/Once in a while
11. Do you rent English videos in Honolulu?  Yes/No  Regularly/Once in a while
12. Do you speak any language other than Korean or English?  Yes/No  If so, what language?
       When do you use this language? ____________________________________________

13. In what situations do you use English in your daily life?  How often?
       Every day*  Once  Several times  Several times  Very rarely
                        a week  a week  a month

       At work
       With customers
       With co-workers
       With managers/supervisors
       Talking with your spouse
       Talking with your children
       Talking with your grandchildren
       Talking with your neighbors
       At church/temple
       Shopping
       Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>Every day</th>
<th>Once</th>
<th>Several times</th>
<th>Several times</th>
<th>Very rarely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With customers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With co-workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With managers/supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking with your spouse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking with your children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking with your grandchildren</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking with your neighbors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At church/temple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. Your occupation/qualification

Where do you work?

16. If you are currently retired or unemployed please list your previous occupation:

17. Age: 17 or under 18-24 25-30 31-40 41-50 51-64 65 or over

18. Is Korean your mother tongue/first language? Yes / No

(If not, when and how did you learn Korean?)

19. How old were you when you moved to the U.S. / Honolulu?

20. How many years have you lived in Hawai‘i?

21. If you have also lived on the Mainland, how long did you live there? *Where did you live?

22. How do you rate your English proficiency?

5 = Very good, I can say almost anything I need to say in English
4 = Pretty good, people always seem to understand me, but sometimes I can’t say what I want;
3 = OK. People usually understand me, but sometimes I have to repeat; I can almost always get my idea across; I use English for social interactions with English speakers
2 = Not very good; it’s hard to carry on a long conversation in English; I use English only when I have to communicate with English speakers; I don’t use English socially very much
1 = Very weak; I can only speak a little English; people don’t understand me very well and I can only say the things I’m used to talking about to get by
23. Do you ever ask other people to help you as translator in English?  Yes  No *
   If so, for what kinds of things do you ask for help?  Reading/ Writing / Speaking
   Examples:

24. Do other Korean people ever ask you to help them as translator or interpreter?  Yes  No
   What kinds of help are you able to give them?

25. How often do you speak ENGLISH at home, or with friends and acquaintances?
   1=I hardly ever/never use English at home; all my friends and family can speak Korean
   2=I have some friends or acquaintances I talk to in English, but mostly I speak Korean
   3=I use English about 50% of the time with my family and/or friends
   4=I use more English than Korean with family/friends
   5=I speak English all the time; I hardly use Korean with my family or friends

26. How often do you speak KOREAN at work?
   *(Please consider all kinds of situations during the work day, e.g. talking to customers, talking to co-workers on your breaks or lunch breaks, talking to supervisors, using the telephone, calling home or talking to friends during the work day, placing orders, handling misc. business calls, writing letters, etc.)

   1= I hardly ever use Korean at work
   2= I use Korean at work once in while with Korean-speaking customers
   3= I use Korean at work regularly
      with co-worker(s) ________
      with customers ________
   4= I use mostly Korean at work; I speak English only with a few people at work
      (Who do you speak English to at work?) _________________________
   5= I use Korean all the time at work; I never/almost never use English at work
27. If you have children, please answer the following questions:
   a. How old are your children? Indicate who lives at home:
      Sons:
      Daughters:
   b. What language do YOU use when speaking TO your children? English / Korean / Mixed
   c. What language do YOUR CHILDREN use when talking TO YOU? English / Korean / Mixed

28. If there are any other members of your household with whom you speak Korean, please list their relations (spouse, mother-in-law, sister, aunt, etc.) and their ages:

29. Do you have extended family in Hawai‘i? If so, which family members?
   In-laws:
   Your family:

30. IF YOU OWN OR MANAGE A BUSINESS, PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS:
    WHAT KOREAN BUSINESS PEOPLE OR WHOLESALERS DO YOU DEAL WITH?
    SUPPLIERS ___________________________
    ASSOCIATION OF BUSINESS PEOPLE (which one?) ___________________________
    WHAT CUSTOMERS DO YOU TARGET? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)
    KOREAN TOURISTS   ALL TOURISTS   LOCAL RESIDENT KOREANS   LOCALS (NON-KOREANS)
    GENERAL PUBLIC   OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)
    WHERE DO YOU PLACE YOUR ADVERTISING?

31. Do you have any further comments about using English and Korean in your daily life in Hawai‘i?
호놀룰루에서의 한국어 사용에 관한 설문조사
SURVEY OF KOREAN LANGUAGE RESOURCES IN HONOLULU

1. 다음에 나오는 활동을 할 때, 당신은 한국말을 쓸 수 있는 곳으로 갈니까? 만일 그럴다면 얼마나 자주 그 곳에 가십니까? (가는 횟수를 나타낼 때, 다음 네모 안에 들어있는 스케일을 참고하세요.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. 전혀 가치 않거나 아주 드물게</th>
<th>2. 가끔</th>
<th>3. 항상은 아니지만 자주</th>
<th>4. 흔히, 혹은 정기적으로</th>
<th>5. 언제나 항상</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. 병원에 갈 때</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>어디로 가세요?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(병원이나 혹은 병원이 위치한 지역 이름을 쓰세요. 예: 퀸스 하스피털, 카이저 병원, 다운타운, 카피올라니, 아이에어)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 치과에 갈 때</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>어디로 가세요?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 안과에 갈 때</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>어디로 가세요?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. 병호사를 찾아갈 때</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>어디로 가세요?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. 화에서 사무소를 찾아갈 때</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>어디로 가세요?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. 은행에 갈 때</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

372
어디로 가세요?

g. 이동원/이동실에 갈 때
   1 2 3 4 5
   어디로 가세요?

h. 이외의 서비스를 받으러 갈 때
   1 2 3 4 5
   어떤 종류의 서비스?
   어디로 가세요?

i. 교회 혹은 절에 갈 때
   1 2 3 4 5
   어디로 가세요?

j. 비디오 가게에 갈 때
   1 2 3 4 5
   어디로 가세요?

k. 식료품 가게에 갈 때
   1 2 3 4 5
   어디로 가세요?

l. 택시를 부를 때
   1 2 3 4 5
   어느 택시회사로?

m. 여행사에 갈 때
   1 2 3 4 5
   어디로 가세요?

n. 음식을 테이크 아웃할 때
   1 2 3 4 5
   어디를 이용하세요?

o. 식당에 가서 먹을 때
   1 2 3 4 5

373
어디로 가세요?

p. 구멍가게 (로컬 가게)에 갈 때 1 2 3 4 5
어디로 가세요?

q. 서점에 갈 때 1 2 3 4 5
어디로 가세요?

r. 주유소에 갈 때 1 2 3 4 5
어디로 가세요?

s. 학생들을 학원에 보낼 때 1 2 3 4 5
어디로 가세요?

t. 한국말을 사용해서 하는 기타의 활동 (사업, 모임, 레저, 봉사활동 등등)이 있다면
어떤 활동

 얼마나 자주 1 2 3 4 5
단체이름이나 혹은 위치한 곳

어떤 활동

 얼마나 자주 1 2 3 4 5
단체이름이나 혹은 위치한 곳

어떤 활동

 얼마나 자주 1 2 3 4 5
단체이름이나 혹은 위치한 곳
2. 귀하가 알고 있는 대부분의 한국 사람들은 어디에서 살고 있습니까?

3. 호놀룰루의 어느 지역에 가면 한국말을 사용할 수 있는 가게나 점포가 많습니까?

4a. 한국 텔레비전을 보십니까? 

예 아니오

하루에 평균 몇 시간 텔레비전 시청하였습니까?

월~금요일: 토요일: 일요일:

텔레비전 보는 총시간 중에서 한국 텔레비전을 보는데 얼마나 할애하였습니까?

100% 50%이상 50% 정도 50% 이하 아주 조금

어느 한국 텔레비전 채널을 좋아하십니까? 채널 4/32(KBFD) 채널 20(한국기독교방송)

위에 선택한 채널을 왜 좋아하십니까?

귀하는 케이블 TV (유선방송)를 이용하십니까? 

예 아니오

만약 예라고 대답하였으면 무슨 채널을 가장 많이 시청하십니까?

한국 텔레비전에서는 무슨 프로그램을 가장 많이 보십시오? 다음 중에서 고르십시오.

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 = 이 프로그램을 전혀 보지 않는다.
5 = 이 프로그램을 정기적으로 본다.

뉴스: 1 2 3 4 5

한국에서 만든 뉴스 (예: 아침이 뉴스) 1 2 3 4 5

하와이에서 제작한 로컬 뉴스 1 2 3 4 5
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드라마 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  
콘테스트 (예: 가요콘테스트) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  
오락/음악 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  
종교 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  
기타 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  
가장 좋아하는 한국 텔레비 프로그램은?

4b. 귀하는 영어 텔레비 방송을 보실니까?
예 | 아니오

하루에 약 몇 시간 정도 텔레비를 보세요?

텔레비를 보는 총 시간 중에서, 몇 프로 정도를 영어로 하는 프로그램을 보는데 할애하세요?
100% | 50%이상 | 0%정도 | 50%이하 | 매우 조금

무슨 영어 프로그램을 귀하는 가장 많이 보세요? 다음 중에서 고르세요.

| 1 = 전혀 이 프로그램을 보지 않는다.  |
| 5 = 이 프로그램을 정기적으로 본다.  |

뉴스: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  
중앙뉴스 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  
지방뉴스 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  
다큐멘터리 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  
야간 토크소 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  
아침토크/뉴스소 (morning shows) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  
뉴스소 (예: Dateline, 20/20, etc.) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  
낮시간의 연속극 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  
저녁시간의 주간 시리즈물 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  
스포츠 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  
쇼핑 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  
종교 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  
영화 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  
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기타

g장 좋아하는 영어 TV 프로그램은?

5a. 한국 신문이나 잡지를 읽으십니까?
   1 2 3 4 5
5b. 영어 신문이나 잡지를 읽으십니까?
   1 2 3 4 5
5c. 영어로 하는 지방 라디오 방송을 들으십니까?
   1 2 3 4 5

6a. 한국 비디오를 빌려 볼니까?
   1 2 3 4 5
6b. 영어로 된 비디오를 빌려 볼니까?
   1 2 3 4 5

7. 한국어와 영어 외에 다른 나라말을 할 줄 아십니까? 
   (예) 아니오
   
   * 에라고 대답했으면, 어느 나라말?
   
   언제 이 언어를 사용하실니까?

8. 한국말을 사용하는 곳에서 어떤 활동을 하세요?
   
   매일 한국말을 하는 곳에서:
   (예: 배우자와의 대화, 자녀들, 친척, 직장 동료, 친구들과의 대화, 텔레비 전화, 
   전화하기 등.)

   일주일에 한 번 하는 곳에서:
   (예: 교회, 사찰, 식료품 소핑, 수업, 비디오 렌트, 가족 모임, 한국에 전화 걸기 등등.)

   한 달에 한 번 하는 곳에서:
   (예: 외식, 가족 모임, 한국에 전화 걸기 등등.)

   아주 가끔:
   (예: 가족 모임, 한국 전화하기, 비디오 렌트, 커뮤니티 행사, 갑의 치명 동등.)

8. 귀하의 직업

   귀하는 일을 갖고 계세요?

9. 나이 17세 이하 18-24 25-30 31-40 41-50 51-64 64이상

10. 한국어는 귀하의 모국어입니까? 
    (예) 아니오
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(그렇지 않다면, 언제 그리고 어떻게 배우셨어요?)

11. 미국/하와이에 이주해 오셨을 때 나이는?

12a. 하와이에 산 지 몇 년이 되셨어요?

12b. 미국 본토에서 산적이 있다면 몇 년 있으셨어요?


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>아주 잘한다. 필요한 맛을 거의 다 영어로 표현할 수 있다.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>꽤 잘한다. 내가 영어로 말하면 대부분의 사람들이 나를 잘 이해한다고 생각한다.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>하지만 가끔 필요한 맛을 못할 때도 있다</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>보통이다. 내가 영어로 말하면 사람들이 보통 이해를 하는 편이다. 하지만 때때로 두 번을 되풀이해서 맛을 해야 될 때도 있다. 그러나, 영어로 내가 생각하는 것을 대충 전달 할 수 있다. 미국 사람들과 어울릴 때 영어를 쓴다.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>잘하지는 못하고 극단적이다. 영어로 내 생각을 전달하기가 쉽지 않다. 미국 사람들과 이야기를 꺼 해야만 하는 경우 영어를 쓴다. 하지만, 사람들과 어울려 영어를 잘 쓰지 않는다.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>아주 악하다. 아주 조금 밖에 하지 못한다. 내가 영어로 얘기하면 사람들이 잘 알아 들지 못한다. 내가 늘 쓰는 표현들 밖에 할 줄 못한다.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. 다른 사람에게 영어로 통역이나 번역해달라고 도움을 요청해 본적이 있습니까?

|   | 아니오 |

만약 그렇다면 어떤 일을 봤으신가요? 읽기/쓰기/말하기

15. 다른 사람이 귀하에게 통역이나 번역해 달라고 요청한 적이 있습니까? 에 아니오

만약 그렇다면 어떤 일을 도와 주셨어요?

16. 가족들이나 친구 혹은 친지들과 얘기할 때 얼마나 자주 영어를 쓰세요? 다음 중 고르세요.
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1. 집에서 영어를 전혀 쓰지 않는다. 나의 친구들이나 가족들이 모두 한국말을 한다.
2. 친구나 친지들 중에서 영어로 얘기하는 사람들이 몇 있다. 하지만 영어보다는 주로 한국말을 사용한다.
3. 가족들과 친구들과 얘기할 때 50% 이상을 영어로 얘기한다.
4. 가족들과 친구들과 얘기할 때 영어를 더 많이 쓴다.
5. 영어를 항상 사용한다. 가족들과 친지들과 대화할 때 한국어를 전혀 쓰지 않는다.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

17. 직장에서 한국말을 얼마나 자주 사용하시니까? 다음 중 고르세요.

| 1 | 한국말을 직장에서 전혀 사용하지 않는다. |
| 2 | 한국인 고객들을 대할 때 가끔 한국말을 쓴 정도이다. |
| 3 | 직장 동료들이 __이나 고객들을 __  대할 때 정기적으로 한국말을 쓰는 편이다. |
|   | (빈칸에 체크하세요.) |
| 4 | 직장에서 대부분 한국말만 쓴다. 영어는 필요할 때만 아주 가끔 쓴다. |
|   | (이 경우에 직장에서 누구와 영어를 쓰세요? _________________________) |
| 5 | 직장에서 항상 한국말을 쓴다. 직장에서는 거의 혹은 전혀 영어를 쓰지 않는다. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

18. 영어나 한국어 사용에 대해 뭐벌일 의견이 있으십니까?
APPENDIX D

TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS
(adapted from the CHAT transcription system for the CLAN program*)

The data is transcribed in standard English orthography, with the following exceptions:

(a) informal spoken utterances for which a written form representing the local Hawai’i Pidgin pronunciation is commonly encountered in written texts produced in Hawai’i (e.g., ‘mo’ bettah’; ‘kine’; ‘plenny’);

(b) the two special cases discussed immediately below for which special symbols have been reserved (i.e., word-final epenthetic vowel characteristic of Koreans speaking English; Hawai’i tag question / discourse marker ‘yeah’);

(c) utterances or examples in Korean, which are transcribed in the Yale romanization system, following the customary practice in the field of Korean linguistics.²

SPECIAL SYMBOLS OTHER THAN IPA:

- 6 the word-final epenthetic syllable ‘uh’ (or sometimes ‘i’ for vowel harmony, e.g. ‘beach-i’), frequently used by Korean speakers (Here the use of ‘6’ is modeled on the use of that symbol for ‘schwa’ in the CHAT transcription system.)

Examples: is6 ‘is-a’, change6 ‘change-a’, beach6 ‘beach-i’

SPECIAL SYMBOL FOR HAWAI’I DATA

yeahQ ‘yeah’ followed by ‘Q’ rather than a ‘?’ represents a speaker’s use of the distinctive local HCE term, characterized by a low-to-high rising intonation which is not a question but rather a discourse marker implying ‘are you with me’, ‘do you follow?’, ‘are we on the same topic here?’, ‘you know what I’m talking about?’ ‘can I go on?’. On the few occasions where ‘yeah’ occurs as an actual interrogative marker, it is followed by the customary ‘?’ symbol.

---

* The acronym CHAT stands for Codes for the Human Analysis of Transcripts; the acronym CLAN stands for Computerized Language Analysis. This program was originally developed for use by the CHILDES project (Child Language Data Exchange System), under the direction of Brian MacWhinney at Carnegie Mellon University (http://poppy.psy.cmu.edu/childes/index.html) (MacWhinney 1995).

The CHAT transcription system is being adopted by an ever-increasing number of researchers working on interactional data with speakers of a variety of profiles. The European Science Foundation project on immigrant language learners, for one, has encoded the major portion of its data in the CHAT format. It was decided to adopt the CHAT format for transcribing the data for this study to allow for complementarity with other research projects and possible later data sharing.

² Note, however, that most contemporary Korean phonologists working on intonation use an IPA transcription system rather than the Yale system, which was designed primarily for morphophonological analysis. (See Jun 1996, 1998, and ‘in press’, Jun and Oh 1996; H.B. Lee 1987). Park 1991, however, uses the Yale system.
UTTERANCE TERMINATORS and UTTERANCE LINKERS

. period marks end of an unmarked declarative utterance. (Rarely used in the coding of this data, as the terminated tone unit symbol (.-) better represented the contours of most utterances)

? question mark indicates end of a question (wh-word, subject-verb inversion, or tag question; also for declarative sentence spoken with rising intonation). Rarely used in the coding of this data, as the symbol terminated tone unit for interrogatives (-?) better represented the contours of most questions.

! exclamation mark ends an imperative or emphatic utterance

, comma is used for syntactic juncture

INTERRUPTIONS & TRAILING OFF & COMPLETIONS

+. trail off; +/ interruption by other; +// self-interruption (cf. to /- false start without retracing)

RETRACINGS/REPETITIONS/FALSE STARTS
[Note: retracing symbols are used for stuttering-type utterances, or for self-corrections; retracing symbols are not used if words are intentionally repeated for emphasis or as a communicative strategy when alternative lexicon is lacking, as in ‘more more more’ to indicate ‘a lot’.]

[/] retracing without correction; used here primarily in ‘stuttered’ utterances, usually when speaker is searching for the correct word. (Retraced material is enclosed in angle brackets <> if more than one word. The material in the angle brackets is the same as the material immediately following the [/] symbol.)

Example: I thinking no America is uh <more all> [/] more all [<>nice!]

(Sang-Ho Park, All Park:36)

[/] retracing with correction (of word choice or syntax, but with originally intended meaning); used in this data mainly in instances of self-correction; differs from ‘false start without retracing’ by degree, i.e., ‘retracing with correction’ involves alternative word choices or minor syntactic changes.

Example: we /have to /yeah /glass //on - , /saf(y) glass //on:: -. (Sok Hyon, Dust Storm:21)
false start without retracing, e.g. speaker abandons an incomplete utterance and makes a fresh start; used here mainly when speaker is unable to complete an utterance due to language barriers; in some cases, the speaker attempts to convey the same idea using a modified approach; in other cases, the speaker gives up on expressing the original idea; also used when speaker switches to Korean or a language other than English to convey an idea.

Example: and all together [-] yeah -, #

(Young-Eun, The Waif:20)

unclear retracing type

OVERLAPS
[Note: instances of overlaps are so indicated, but they have not been exhaustively coded throughout this data; overlapped material was excluded from the spectrographic analyses discussed here.]

Overlapped material is enclosed in angle brackets (< >)

overlap follows
overlap precedes

www untranscribed material
xx unintelligible speech, but presumed to be English
(each set of xx indicates one word)
yy unintelligible speech in language other than English
@k a word spoken in Korean
[= k text] translation of Korean words, when known to researcher at the time of the recording (i.e., when knowledge of these words contributed to researcher’s understanding of the narration at the time of the interaction)

unclear word or words precede this symbol; given words represent transcriber’s best guess
0 no verbal response from listener; actions without speech

PROSODIC FEATURES
[Note: The prosodic features coded in the transcripts are those which were noted by the analyst based on their perceptual prominence. Acoustic measurements of perceptually prominent prosodic cues which were determined to be critical for the analysis of narrative structure are provided elsewhere in the text.]
INTONATIONAL CONTOURS/TONE UNITS

Non-Terminated Tone Units
- , final level contour, as in nonfinality, in place of comma; used when a series of phrases are joined together into a single utterance
- _ low level final contour

Terminated Tone Units
- ? final rising contour. Placed at end of the tone unit, but understood to apply to the tone group clustered about the preceding accented syllable or nucleus (typical of questions).
- . final falling contour (declarative sentences)

PITCH
/ * High (or rising) pitch on preceding word (or phrase, when enclosed in <> angle brackets), compared with the normal range for this speaker.
\ Low or falling pitch on preceding word (or phrase, when enclosed in <> angle brackets), compared with the normal range for this speaker.
/ \ rise-fall pitch in preceding syllable
\ / fall-rise pitch in preceding syllable

RHYTHM
[ha:rd ha:rd jo:b ←] [enclosed material spoken more slowly than normal rate for this speaker]
[this one yeahQ→] [enclosed material spoken more quickly/"anacrusis"]

PROSODY WITHIN WORDS
lengthening
: lengthened syllable, e.g. bana:nas; (not to be confused with pause between syllables, which is (::)).
:- lengthened word

STRESS
CAPITALIZED primary stressed syllable (stress in preceding syllable)
CAPITALIZED unusually emphatic stress on preceding syllable (occurs most frequently in these transcripts as an affect marker, or as a substitute for lexical item such as ‘very’, ‘extremely’
SMALL CAPS secondary stressed syllable

(note that the CLAN system uses the following):

[!] used without angle brackets to indicate that the preceding
WORD (not just syllable) is stressed. If a whole string of words
is stressed, they are enclosed in angle brackets.

PAUSES
[Note: The CHILDES handbook for CHAT coding suggests using #d for disfluent pauses,
but in these transcripts, all pauses are normally considered disfluent pauses; pauses for
affect or discourse effect rather than disfluency are so marked on the %par tier.]

# pause between words or syllables (unfilled pause); silence only, no filler
## longer pause between words or syllables (exact length not measured)
### very long pause between words or syllables (exact length not measured)

NB: pause between syllables not to be confused with lengthened syllable,
which is ( : ), or ( :: ) for extra length.

QUOTATIONS

+"/. indicates narrator prefaced a direct quote (most commonly in the form of
character personification in role play) by identifying the source of the quote;
not used if a direct quote occurs without identification of speaker or without
introductory comments or without preface to quote

+" quoted utterance or role play dialogue, placed at the beginning of an utterance
that is being directly quoted (with or without preliminary introduction); if two
utterances in succession are direct quotes or role played material, each line is
preceded by this symbol. (cf. symbol for metalinguistic quotations, below)

Example of quotation with introduction:
SJL: my husband this say +"/.

Example of quotation without prefatory introduction:
SJL: +"you -, don’t do that _

Example of quotation with introduction:
SJL: +"oh Sun Ja you good !

metalinguistic quotations

[" metalinguistic reference to a word or phrase. Angle brackets are placed around
the metalinguistic reference if it is more than a single word long (cf. symbol
for direct quotations, above)

Example: there is <do+not>"[" sign

MORPHEMES/ MORPHOSYNTAX

As there are relatively few morphological markers in the corpus and as these are not the focus of the analysis,
they have not been systematically coded in this presentation of the data. Where morphemes such as -s or past
tense -ed were clearly audible, they were included in the orthographic representation of the utterance. If such
compound marker (used with rote forms/unanalyzed chunks)
Example: whatchya+gonna+do

**DEPENDENT TIERS**

% indicates a ‘dependent tier’, i.e., a line of transcriber/researcher notes explaining relevant observations

%pro: prosodic or suprasegmental features (intonation and pitch)
When relevant, the illocutionary force of volume and pitch movements are often given as analyst’s notes using standard language descriptions (e.g., surprise, sympathy, listing, lament, excitement, etc.).

[Note: Salient examples of volume and pitch contour shifts were noted in the transcripts for purposes of preliminary analysis. For the final analysis, however, acoustic measurements using the Speech Analyzer program which produced a visual graphic representation of the waveform, pitch and amplitude were used. The transcripts have therefore not been exhaustively coded for ‘impressionistic’ (e.g., auditorily perceptible) volume and pitch changes.]

%act: actions of the speaker or listener (e.g., looking at notebook, checking the time, checking equipment, changing tapes, making notes, getting a tissue, etc.). Does NOT include any paralinguistic actions that facilitate decoding or expressing of meaning (see %par).

%par: paralinguistic behaviors (not exhaustively coded in this data); includes gestures and movement to help convey meaning; e.g., expressive gestures such as nodding, pointing, waving, and shrugging; gestures used to demonstrate how to do something or shape of something, as well as gestures used as a substitute for words or gestures accompanying words; affective gestures such as laughing, smiling, crying, patting interlocutor’s hand; also includes coughing because it is hard to determine if this is emotionally or physically motivated; pauses perceived as due to emotional state of speaker are also noted on this line; (pauses due to language processing or lack of understanding are

---

morphemes are missing in the transcript when standard English pronunciation or orthography would require them, this indicates that they were not audibly produced by the speaker in that utterance.

The reader should be aware that plural -s and past tense -ed were not used systematically, even by the same speaker, i.e., they may occur on some words but not on others, or on a word in one context but not in another (e.g., ‘three years old’ but ‘three year ago’). The patterns for this occurrence have not yet been systematically investigated, but they are possibly linked to speakers’ acquisition of lexical items as unanalyzed chunks. In some cases it was impossible to discern whether a morpheme was produced by the speaker or not, and this is so indicated by a transcriber’s note, (e.g. month (months [?])).
coded directly on the main tier with the symbol #); actions performed in place of speaking (sometimes main tier indicates 0 verbal utterance at this point)

%com: comments by investigator, e.g., ‘not sure of meaning’, ‘note use of plural –s’

%nar: narrative devices used by speaker; the specific type of narrative device is identified by a code following the symbol ($). Details on subtypes, when relevent, follow the $-coded information.
[Note: listener’s co-participation devices not coded in this data.]

MACRO-PROSODIC NARRATIVE DEVICES
In addition to opening and closing segments, the narrators whose stories constitute this study’s corpus appear to organize their narratives around three main structural components, components which are commonly attested as characteristic of narrative structure in a variety of contexts:

(1) advancing the narrative thread (STY);
(2) providing background information for the listener (BGD); and
(3) evaluating or commenting on a segment of the narrative (EVL).

To realize each major component of narrative structure, various narrative devices are used, as indicated in the following coding system.

1. BEG initiate a narrative; set narrative sequence off from other talk

2. STY carrying the story line forward, advancing the narrative thread,
   subtype: new (new topic/new segment of narrative) (lexical & prosodic)
   subtype: lst (list-both lexically and prosodically marked)
       listing; serial enunciation of activities, actions, issues
   subtype: quo (quote) (both lexically and prosodically marked)
       quoting/imitating [stylized imitation] of either self or other (i.e. ‘role play’/impersonation)
       quo:ID [identification/preface/ specifying who’s talking-- sometimes occurs after the quote]
       quo:oth quoting other, an absent third party, i.e. a character in the

*d ‘Advancing the narrative thread’ and ‘carrying the story line forward’ would normally be considered part of ‘foregrounding’, to use a more standard label. The term ‘foregrounding’ is avoided in discussion of this data, however, as it implies a relatively sophisticated manipulation of lexicon, syntax and stylistic devices to achieve prominence and would thus tend to misrepresent the type of narrative devices at the disposal of the speakers considered here.
narrative (prosody)
quo:slf quoting self (prosody)

subtype: cpl (complications) both lexically & prosodically
subtype: cmx (climax or signal that it is main point of story) (lex & pros)
subtype: rec (recall) recall; trying to remember a date or a detail to situate
the narrative (lexically & prosodically)

3. BGD provide relevant background information for [exolingual] listener’s
benefit (both lexically and prosodically marked)
subtype: chk (check or confirm listener’s awareness of assumed mutual
knowledge)
subtype: ass (assess listener background & spontaneously supply info.)
subtype: rep (reply/response to listener request for clarification)

4. EVL comments or evaluation on own talk

5. CON conclude the narrative sequence
subtype: cda (coda/wrap-up)

$aff: affect conveyed by the narrator through pitch and/or volume
(codes for commonly expressed types of affect follow the colon)
:ang (anger, upset)
:aue (awe at impressive fact or event being recalled, conveying a
sense of ‘it was incredible!’, ‘I couldn’t believe it!’ ‘it was
really surprising!’)
:eff (effort, exertion conveyed by voice quality, e.g., grunting or
creaky voice to convey effort of moving a heavy object)
:emp (emphasizing a point of particular relevance to narrator)
:exc (excited)
:frn (frantic)
:fun (playful, joking, fun)
:gen (gentle, soft)
:imi (imitating sound of object, e.g., rocket blast off)
:lam (lamenting, groaning)
:pld (pleading)
:sur (surprise)
:tru (conveying the sense of true, ‘it’s true!’ ‘you better believe it!’)
APPENDIX E

TRANSCRIPTS OF NARRATIVES CITED

1. Introduction and cautionary notes regarding the transcripts

In the transcripts presented here, the main lines containing the utterances of the Korean narrators have been transcribed with as much accuracy and in as much detail as possible. The main lines of the interlocutor/researcher (MAR or M) have not been transcribed and coded to the same level of refinement, however. The MAR/M lines are included here primarily in order to contextualize the narratives discussed and to demonstrate the type of interactional exchanges which accompanied the telling of the narratives.

Since the focus of the analysis is on discourse organizational techniques used by non-native speakers of English with limited lexicon and syntax when telling narratives in English, the segments selected for presentation and discussion here were those which contained relatively long stretches of narrative and relatively limited verbal exchanges between the narrator and the interlocutor/researcher. The corpus contains many more hours of informal ‘talk story’ conversations, as well as conversations and discussions based on the stimulus materials used in the collection of data. I intend to use these additional materials available in the corpus for a subsequent study of the co-construction of conversations and the interactional features of talk between native and non-native speakers.

In the interest of space and because the other transcripts have not been thoroughly coded, dependent tiers (lines preceded by the symbol ‘%’) relevant to the present analysis
have been included for only three segments: 'Hawai‘i Coming', 'Saimin House' and 'Junk Job'. Most of the information appearing on the dependent tiers was done at the time of the initial transcription and during the preliminary stages of analysis and thus served to determine recurrent, salient patterns in the data. Details and additional comments have been continuously added at every review of the data, however. The information noted on the dependent tiers should under no circumstances be treated as an exhaustive encoding of all features under discussion or present in the data.

Despite these caveats and deficiencies, the two examples of transcripts with their dependent tiers have been included in order to demonstrate the usefulness of the CHAT coding system, as well as to illustrate initial observations and preliminary analysis inspired by the data. Information on the dependent tiers also gives an indication of the details in the data and may suggest topics for subsequent studies to other readers.
2. List of transcripts (grouped by content theme)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Narrator</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrival and Adjustment to Hawai‘i</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. ‘Hawai‘i coming’</td>
<td>Sun Ja</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ‘All Park!’</td>
<td>Sang Ho</td>
<td>424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ‘First month hard’</td>
<td>Sun Ja</td>
<td>427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ‘No help--only Korean church’</td>
<td>Sang Hee</td>
<td>434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. ‘Saimin House’</td>
<td>Sun Ja</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. ‘Key No More!’</td>
<td>Won Ja</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. ‘Very very cry’</td>
<td>Sang Hee</td>
<td>444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. ‘Junk Job’</td>
<td>Sun Ja</td>
<td>446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant Personal Memories and Cross-Cultural Experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. ‘Mililani Sleeping’</td>
<td>Sang Hee</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. ‘Dust Storm’</td>
<td>Sok</td>
<td>452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. ‘Moon Walk’</td>
<td>Sok</td>
<td>459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. ‘Divorce’</td>
<td>Sang Ho</td>
<td>465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retelling of Videotaped Excerpt from ‘Modern Times’ (Chaplin silent film)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. ‘The Waif: I no more house’</td>
<td>Young Eun</td>
<td>467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. ‘Beautiful house’</td>
<td>Young Eun</td>
<td>469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. ‘Me Sneaky: Stealing the bread’</td>
<td>Sun Ja</td>
<td>471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. ‘Going lady together:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eating at the restaurant</td>
<td>Sun Ja</td>
<td>472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. ‘Big Junk House: Lady this love not problem’</td>
<td>Sun Ja</td>
<td>473</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Summaries of the narratives in standard English

ARRIVAL and ADJUSTMENT TO HAWAI‘I

Narrative 1. ‘Hawai‘i Coming’ (Sun Ja)
Female narrator Sun Ja recounts immigrating to Hawai‘i from Korea for the first time in 1974 with her husband and two children. The plane had originally been scheduled to make a stop in Japan and she had called ahead to inform her sister and brother, both living in Hawai‘i, that they would be arriving around 9AM. But the plane didn’t make the stop in Japan, so Sun Ja and her family arrived very early in the morning, around 6AM. Her sister and brother were supposed to meet them, but they weren’t at the airport that early. So the family took a taxi to the brother’s house. Her brother had taken the day off from work and had gotten the children all dressed up to meet them, and because he didn’t own a car, he had rented a car for the day for $20. When Sun Ja and her family got to the house by taxi her brother and his family were very surprised to see them so early.

Narrative 2. ‘All Park!’ (Sang Ho Park)
Sang Ho relates a humorous anecdote from the day of his arrival in Honolulu as an immigrant. His family name is Park. And his wife’s family name is also Park. His wife’s sister also married a man named Park. [Customarily Koreans were not allowed to marry someone with the same last name, so it is a noteworthy fact that both Park sisters married men named Park.] Sang Ho arrived at Honolulu airport with his wife, their three children (all named Park), as well as with his wife’s sister and her three children, who were also named Park. That meant the traveling party consisted of a total of six children, two women and one man, all named Park. The ‘check man’ (not specified whether it was customs or immigration officer) at the airport expressed amazement that this one man was traveling with two women and so many children, all named Park.

Narrative 3. ‘First Month Hard’ (Sun Ja)
(Sun Ja’s sister had bought a house in Hawai‘i Kai just prior to Sun Ja’s arrival with her family, so two or three days after arriving in Hawaii in 1974, Sun Ja and her family moved in with her sister at the new house.)

The first couple of months in Hawaii were very, very difficult. They had paid around $1,000 for the airplane tickets and arrived with nothing. In the beginning after paying for their room, they had almost nothing left over. Her sister bought large bunches of bananas for her young children to eat. Otherwise they ate mostly just soyu and rice. Her husband’s first job making cookies (?) paid only $2.10/hour. He decided to get a job that paid more money. He eventually found work in a body shop (?) (‘body bender’). That job paid better but it was very hard work.

Meanwhile Sun Ja was getting worried after she had been here almost two months and still had no job. They were just getting by and she really wanted to have some income.
One day while her children were at school she ran into a Korean lady walking around the neighborhood and struck up a conversation with her. She asked the Korean lady if she could help her find a job, because they didn’t have enough money for food. The Korean lady asked if she would mind cleaning houses. Sun Ja said any job at all was OK. She just needed work. The lady said Sun Ja’s problem was talking [in English] to people and being able to explain her situation and ask for work, so the lady said she would help. The lady then referred her to three families in the neighborhood—a Japanese family, a local Korean family and an immigrant Korean family from Korea. Then one day the neighbor lady gave Sun Ja a name and number at a Korean church and told her that a job had been arranged for her at a saimin house near McKinley High School run by Koreans. Sun Ja took the job and worked nights at the saimin house for nine months.

**Narrative 4. ‘No help--only Korean church’ (Sang Hee)**
When she and her three children arrived in Hawai’i (three years after her husband had come over), they had no other family members to help them. They were pretty much alone. But at the Korean church, people were helpful, especially her friend’s husband who took them shopping and to the beach in his car.

**WORK EXPERIENCES**

**Narrative 5. ‘Saimin House’ (Sun Ja)**
Sun Ja worked at Saimin House run by Korean people but it was very hard work and she wasn’t happy there. The boss was always complaining, and she had to work nights until 2am. A man who owned a ceramic company asked her to come work for him [it is not clear if he was a customer at the Saimin House and saw her being reprimanded by her boss one day and then offered her a job]. She worked at the ceramic company, but also spoke Korean there. Then she went to work for the hotel. That was much better—it gave her a chance to speak English. In the beginning, she was very scared, but after three years, it was fine and she wasn’t scared of talking to people any more.

**Narrative 6. ‘Key No More!’ (Won Ja)**
Won Ja describes her first day on the job as a hotel maid. She misplaces her key because she doesn’t need it to get in the rooms all day [because she’s assisting another experienced housekeeper who is training her]. When she looks for her key, she cannot locate it anywhere. She thinks it must have fallen out of her pocket. She even thinks maybe it fell into the laundry chute so she goes through all the laundry. She’s very upset, because she thinks people will think she’s totally irresponsible—that she has no head on her shoulders. [The narrative never says clearly whether she found the key, but the telling was very emotional and Won Ja laughed and teared a lot from the memory.]

**Narrative 7. ‘Very very cry’ (Sang Hee)**
Sang Hee describes her frustrations at not being able to communicate in English at work. She says she goes into the shower and cries [not clear if she meant the shower in one of the hotel rooms she’s cleaning, or the shower at home].
Narrative 8. ‘Junk Job’ (Sun Ja)
Some people think that being a hotel maid is a ‘junk job’. But personally I don’t think it’s such a bad job.

One day several years ago as I was getting ready to go out for lunch, I noticed that the hallway on my floor was all wet. This was about five years ago, before our department head Marie had been hired—maybe six years ago—in any case, quite a while back. So when I noticed the floor was all wet, I called the housekeeping office to report the problem and told them that I thought that water was overflowing in the kitchen sink or in the bathroom in room 426. The room had a ‘Do Not Disturb’ sign on it, so I went out onto the lanai\(^1\) via the next door room. (I could do that because at that time, the lanai ran continuously along the outside of all the rooms; now the lanai is sectioned off, but at the time, there was one uninterrupted balcony running along the outside all the rooms.) When I looked into room 426 by going onto the lanai through room 425, I saw a man lying on the floor in the kitchenette. I was alarmed and called the housekeeping office again and told them that the guest in 426 was on the kitchen floor. The housekeeping inspectress came up to check and then called an ambulance.

When I got back from lunch there was a lot of commotion going on. The police were there and asked me some questions about how I found the man. I explained what had happened.

The next two days were my days off. When I came back to work, I found out, to my surprise, that the man from 426 had checked out and had left the hotel! I fully expected when I came to hear that he had died. I was still traumatized by the event, imagining that the man could have died in the very room I had been cleaning. I felt nervous cleaning that room after the incident.

Everybody said I had done the right thing and they wanted to give me some kind of reward. But I said no, as long as the man didn’t die, I was satisfied.

So—this just goes to show that being a hotel maid is not such a bad job. [Being a hotel maid is a very respectable job, and sometimes we even play critical roles in people’s lives.]

---

\(^1\) The term ‘lanai’ is a Hawaiian word used by the local residents of Hawai’i to refer to what would be termed in English, depending on regional custom and specific architectural features, a ‘balcony’, a ‘terrace’, a ‘porch’ or a ‘patio’. In this case, it refers to the hotel room’s balcony.
SIGNIFICANT PERSONAL MEMORIES and CROSS-CULTURAL EXPERIENCES

Narrative 9. ‘Mililani Sleeping’ (Sang Hee)
Sang Hee attempts to convey the idea that her husband has passed away. She tells me ‘Mililani sleeping’. [Mililani is a residential area of Honolulu quite far from Waikiki.] I assumed at first that she meant her husband wasn’t working and just stayed home in bed while she went to work at the hotel as a maid. I tried to change the topic, thinking it was rather delicate to dwell on the fact that her husband stayed home loafing while she was working hard. She returns to the topic, however, realizing that I have not understood her point. Finally, I understand that ‘Mililani sleeping’ is her way of saying that he has died and is buried in the large, well-known cemetery in Mililani (at the time I was not aware that there was a cemetery in Mililani, and I was also not aware that ‘sleeping’ is the commonly used euphemistic expression in Korean to say ‘passed away’).

Narrative 10. ‘Dust Storm’ (Sok)
Just prior to the telling of this segment, Sok and I had discovered that we had both been living in Saudi Arabia at the same time. In 1979, SOK went to Saudi Arabia as an expatriate laborer from Korea. He was employed by a large American construction company that was building the international airport in Riyadh, working in the mechanic shop. The managers were American, and there were [300?] other Korean employees, as well as Pakistanis and Filipinos. I also moved to Saudi Arabia in 1979 and lived there for three years. I lived in Jeddah, along the coast of the Red Sea, but we also had occasional dust storms and I visited the central part of the country around Riyadh where Sok worked and where the incident described in this narrative took place so I could easily envisage the scene described by Sok.

In his narrative, Sok describes how he and his co-workers dealt with a big dust [sand] storm. They closed all the doors of the shop, but the sand got in through the cracks and within a very short period of time, it had built up a big mound inside the shop. It was impossible to do any work during the storm. They couldn’t breathe, so they put on masks. But they still couldn’t breathe, so they got in the vehicles and turned on the air conditioning and waited out the storm. After the winds died down, they had to clean everything up, which was a lot of work, because there were piles of sand everywhere!

Narrative 11. ‘Moon Walk’ (Sok)
I was talking with Sok on the day that the veteran 77-year-old astronaut John Glenn was to go up in space and asked him if he had heard about that. Thinking about John Glenn prompted Sok to recall watching the first man walk on the moon. He describes how he had one of only two TVs in his town, so he moved it outdoors so that many people could gather around to watch the event being telecast from the moon.
Narrative 12. ‘Divorce’ (Sang Ho)
Sang Ho expresses his surprise at the way American couples handle divorce. In Korea, a divorced couple have nothing to do with each other after a divorce. He finds it rather strange that American men and women continue to see each other cordially after they have divorced—at functions like their children’s graduations, weddings, etc.

4. Summary of videotape excerpt from Modern Times (for narratives 13-17)
(Silent film, 1936. Produced by Charlie Chaplin; starring Charlie Chaplin and Paulette Goddard. Written tableaux in English appear on screen at critical moments to provide the audience with cues to interpreting the scene. These tableaux were translated into Korean and shown to the Korean viewers by the researcher during the viewing when the English language panels appeared on the screen. The English and Korean texts are included in this appendix.)

The excerpt is set in 1930’s America at the height of the depression. Charlie gets arrested and put in jail because he is mistaken as the political activist who is leading a demonstration of hungry unemployed people demanding food. Charlie enjoys his life in jail, where he is fed three meals a day and gets a private room [his jail cell] where he can enjoy his leisure time. When the warden tells him he is released, he begs to stay in jail, saying he doesn’t know what he’s going to do on the outside.

Meanwhile, there is an attractive young girl who steals a loaf of bread from a bakery delivery truck, thinking no one has seen her. A stern middle-aged lady did see her, however, and reports her to the baker. Charlie Chaplin meanwhile has been released from jail and happens along at that point. He gallantly tries to take the blame for the stolen bread, insisting that he is the one who stole it. The baker calls a policeman, but the stern lady insists it was the girl and gets the policeman to arrest the girl.

Charlie then goes into a cafeteria in the neighborhood and piles his tray high with food. He is penniless, however, and cannot pay for what he has eaten. Before going to the cashier, he deliberately calls over a policeman to witness what he is about to do. He indicates to the cashier that he can’t pay. The cashier wants him arrested. The policeman rings up on a police phone to have the paddy wagon stop by to pick up the vagrant Charlie. Charlie gets in the paddy wagon, and at its next stop, the young woman who stole the bread is boarded. Charlie, ever the gentleman, offers her his seat. Shortly thereafter, the paddy wagon lurches violently and both Charlie, the girl and the policeman on board are thrown out onto the street. Before the policeman can regain consciousness from the fall, Charlie and the girl run away together.

The next scene finds them sitting on the lawn at the curb of a middle class suburban home, dreaming of life in such a nice place. Charlie asks the girl where she lives. She replies: ‘No place in particular -- anywhere!’
Charlie is seen exiting the municipal jail [several passages deleted so that in the excerpt it is not clear that he is coming from jail; it looks like he is simply coming out a big building]. The girl is waiting for him and runs to him and gives him a big hug. She has found a run-down abandoned shack at the edge of a river and she wants them to live together in the shack. She insists that Charlie come with her to see their beautiful new ‘home’.

As they enter the shack, boards tumble down and when Charlie sits down on one of the chairs, one of the floor boards gives way. Charlie and the girl don’t mind the condition of the shack at all and they both agree it is a marvelous place. They are just happy to be together with a roof over their heads. The girl pretends to be a model ‘housewife’, going about preparing food for them to eat. Charlie sits on the dilapidated chair in the dilapidated shack, reading the morning paper, pretending to be a middle class husband waiting for his ‘wife’ to prepare his breakfast. The girl has managed to find a loaf of bread, and when she places it on the table with a twinkle in her eye, Charlie teases her about not stealing bread any more.

In the closing scene, Charlie and the girl walk down a country road, into the sunset, with music in the background suggesting that they ‘live happily ever after’.

After watching the excerpt of Modern Times, in addition to personal comments on the excerpt, each of the Koreans was asked to recall as much of the story as they could. Sample excerpts from these retellings by Sun Ja and Young Eun are included in the transcripts (Narrative texts 13-17).
Narrative 1. ‘Hawai‘i Coming’ (Sun Ja)

@Date of recording: 03-NOV-1998
@Recording modes: audio and video
@Audio tape location: 9/24/98 and 11/03/98 tape, side A
@Video tape location: Housekeeping, Tape #2
@Audio counter: 280-316 (approx. half-way in of side A)
@Time start video: 1:18.45 – 1:20.55
@Length of segment: 2:10

Special features of this narrative:
intonational and prosodic features in evidence to carry narrative thread; stark contrast in
intonational features between explanatory and background speech at request of listener
and the actual narrative thread; narrative contains many “quoted speech” segments of
narrator or others, using high pitch. Stress on ‘early’ to indicate ‘very early’.

@Warning: Overlaps not fully transcribed as such and may not be accurately coded; not
all paralinguistic gestures noted (only major ones used to enhance understanding, or some
to show affect of the utterance)

@Summary of narrative:
Female narrator Sun Ja recounts immigrating to Hawai‘i from Korea for the first time in
1974 with her husband and two children. The plane had originally been scheduled to
make a stop in Japan and they were to have arrived around 9AM. But the plane didn’t
make the stop in Japan, so the family arrived very early in the morning, around 6AM. Her
sister and brother were living in Hawai‘i and were supposed to meet them, but they
weren’t at the airport that early. So the family took a taxi to the brother’s house. Her
brother had taken the day off from work and had gotten the children all dressed up to
meet them, and because he didn’t own a car, he had rented a car for the day for $20.
When Sun Ja and her family got to the house, which was behind the Tamashiro fish
market downtown, her brother and his family were very surprised to see them so early.

1 SJL: first time oh I’m not forgot this
2 first time uh::: 1974 -, me coming over here
3 this my uh sister and my brother over here -, living over there .
4 MAR: uh huh
5 SJL: me uh: airport already call morning time maybe nine o’clock something
yeah for (?) coming -, Honolulu
6 MAR: uh huh
7 SJL: this one not Japan -, over there straight [!] coming out (?) Honolulu .
%pro: emphasis on straight, surprise on Honolulu
hand in air to show plane’s path straight to Honolulu, ‘straight’ spoken quickly
8 MAR: wait -, Japan and then -,
9 SJL: Japan [/] Jap [/] oh this airplane
10 MAR: from Japan ?
11 SJL: first time [?] Japan -, going and -, break time and -, Hawaii coming -, talking yeahQ.

list intonation on going, and, and (‘and’ intonation included in clause as in Korean)
12 MAR: yeah .
13 SJL: this not Japan going you know .
14 go straight .
15 Korean airplane xxx go straight Honolulu over there .

chin shows ‘what do you think of that?’; smiling
16 MAR: uh huh .
17 SJL: six o [/] early morning six o’clock over there !

high pitch on ‘early’ (expressing the extreme earliness)
18 MAR: ah::!
19 so they cancelled -,
20 SJL: not cancel xx +/.
21 MAR: stopping in Japan .
22 SJL: not stopping -, not stop in Honolulu this come over here -, early [!] morning +/

stress on early (but not high pitch)
23 MAR: yeah
24 SJL: and airport come over here .
25 SJL: oh ! my sister -, my brother looking not here !

high pitch on ‘here’

body shift to show role play of the arrival moment
26 SJL: oh me scare -, oh -, whatchya+gonna+do ?

self quoting and high pitch on ‘scare’ to convey emotion
27 SJL: this address yeahQ .

writing in palm of hand to illustrate paper with address
28 SJL: xx now
29 MAR: and you’re alone ? all alone ? or with your husband ?
30 SJL: oh my husband -, me::: -, and three [/] two children .

level, ‘regular’ pitch here while describing facts I asked for which are not in narrative
31 MAR: the two boys ? [>]

showing 2 fingers
32 SJL: <two people - > [<] four boy [/] two boy -, my husband -, me -, four people this come over here .
33 MAR: yeah .
SJL: oh! whatchya+gonna+do?
%pro: uses frantic voice pitch to pick up story thread again
SJL: my sister -, my brother not coming whatchya+gonna+do?
%pro: spoken very rapidly
SJL: oh -, I thinking +"/.
SJL: +"oh -.
SJL: you address over here this a taekshi -, yeahQ ?
MAR: uh::? uh -, uh -, uh -, uh .
%pro: rising intonation as if not certain what she's getting at, then it gets clearer
SJL: taxi -, man this talking -.
%pho taekshi
MAR: you don't have telephone number ?
%par: showing gesture of talking on phone
SJL: oh:: .
MAR: for your brother and sister ?
SJL: 0
MAR: telephone ?
SJL: this kine only scare you know not coming all scare , telephone number I cannot 'member !
MAR: oh , ok .
%par: chuckling sympathetically
MAR: cenhwabono@k [ :=k telephone number] xx
SJL: yeah !
MAR: laughing
SJL: taxi this people before coming -, and -, this one .
MAR: uh huh .
SJL: address give um .
SJL: and now Tamashiro Market over there
MAR: what ?
%par: during the interaction MAR couldn't catch the words 'Tamashiro Market'
SJL: ta mashiro
MAR: 0
SJL: downtown
MAR: yeah -, downtown -. 
SJL: downtown Tamashiro Market .
MAR: 0
SJL: fish-i
MAR: oh yeah -, the fish market-, yeah .
SJL: fish market
SJL: this over there you know -, 
SJL: back side you know li:ving yeah -. 
SJL: oh my brother is no more car -, yeahQ .
%pro: providing background information for next piece of info
SJL: no more car -. 

SJL: this-a car rent.

%pro: 'rent' (new information) spoken louder

SJL: rent.

SJL: one day twenty dollar -.

MAR: yeah -.

SJL: pay.

MAR: twenty dollars <in 1974?> [>]

SJL: <twenty dollar> [<]

SJL: yeah. twenty dollar.

SJL: one day.

MAR: that's expensive!

SJL: all: day.

MAR: now it's twenty-five dollars.

%par: making sign of 'more or less' $25

%com: overlaps not completely transcribed here

SJL: twenty dollar this uh pay already this one oh # airport going -,

%pro: stress and high pitch on 'going'

MAR: yeah -, right -, right -, right.

SJL: airport going this clothes all change, this waiting over there[!] ! [>]

%par: 'prancing' with her body and touching chest to show wearing fancy clothes

MAR:<right -, right -,[<

%pro: increased volume on there; high pitch

SJL: +"oh !

 SJL: +"how come al[ready] coming ?

%pro: high pitch quoting voice; body shift to show interaction

%par: body shift to show role play of brother's talking

SJL: this one uh job this not going -, this children say [?]come over here -, me

%par: stress on 'scare'

SJL: my husband and me together you know ok

MAR: chuckling appreciatively at the story
Narrative 2. 'All Park' (Sang-Ho)

@Date of recording: 11-NOV-1998
@Recording modes: audio and video
@Audio tape location: Sang Ho tape 11/11/98, side a, 111-146
@Video tape location: Park video, Memorable Events
@Audio counter:
@Time start video:
@Length of segment: 3:26
@Warning: overlaps not precisely transcribed

1 SHP: very scary you know.
   %nar: BEG
2 SHP: why?
   %nar: BEG
3 SHP: Korea you know this airport yeahQ.
4 SHP: airport this house # very nice -, very big yeahQ!
5 MAR: yes _ very big -, yeah.
6 SHP: Hawaii this 6 coming yeahQ.
7 SHP: oh my god!
8 SHP: so big xx xx (American?)
   %pro: incredulity in voice
9 MAR: laughing
10 SHP: yeah?
11 SHP: small kine yeahQ.
12 MAR: uh.
13 SHP: maybe Korean is uh yeahQ 6 small [?] # yeahQ.
14 SHP: another co[/]country.
15 MAR: yeah?
   %pro: sounds tentative
16 SHP: little bit [?] small this one yeahQ.
17 SHP: same situation [?] yeahQ.
18 MAR: right uh huh.
19 SHP: I thinking yeah _ .
   %pro: explaining his point (higher pitch)
20 SHP: the same thing (:42)
21 SHP: small kine xx xx
22 SHP: one is [?] small small small yeahQ
   %pro: use of repetition in rapid succession (NB: this is not a retracing—it's intentional usage) use of rhythm for lexical compensation
23 SHP: xx xx wa
24 SHP: I thinking yeah very nice -, big -, very big yeahQ airport xx house yeahQ.
   %com: uses 'house' for building
MAR: uh uh uh.
%pro: low pitch on ‘very’ to indicate emotion
%pro: parenthetical to give background explanation
SHP: I look to xx
%pro: moving narrative thread forward
SHP: my god!
SHP: is Hawaii ok?
%par: laughing
%nar: $STY:quo:slf
SHP: laughing
MAR: but Honolulu is small!
%pro: high pitch on whole sentence with emphasis on ‘small’
SHP: yeah -., I +/.
MAR: Seoul is very big +/.
%pro: stress on Seoul as contrast to Honolulu
%com: some overlaps here not accurately transcribed
SHP: yeah!
%pro: low pitch and emphatic
SHP: is very small yeahQ!
%pro: high pitch
SHP: oh my [-/]
SHP: I thinking no America is uh <more all> [/] more all [<]nice!
MAR: all big.
SHP: all big!
SHP: oh yeah yeah!
MAR: New York -_ have you been to New York # airport -, Kennedy airport?
SHP: only is Hawaii.
MAR: Kennedy is really big!
%pro: emphasis on whole sentence. Stress on K. and big. Low pitch
SHP: uh huh
SHP: and is [?]6 one more this one yeah St Louis # airport.
MAR: oh you’ve been to St Louis?
MAR: oh yeah to see +/ to go to Illinois.
%com: his older children are studying at the Univ. of Illinois
SHP: yeah yeah yeah
MAR: so [/] so what happened then at the airport?
SHP: 0
MAR: so you saw it # um.
SHP: oh yeah.
MAR: and then what happened?
SHP: very interesting yeah one [?] day.
%par: kind of chuckling at beginning of this utterance
SHP: my cousin is6 last name is6 “Park”
%pro: beginning of narration: starts high pitch, steps down
55 MAR: uh huh.
56 SHP: uh my last is6 yeah uh mm husband -, my [/] my wife is6 sister yeahQ
57 MAR: uh huh.
58 SHP: children is6 three.
  %pro: high pitch, rising to end of sentence (beginning of list)
59 SHP: me [?] is6 three.
60 SHP: all # children is6 all is6 six.
  %pro: rising pitch on children, as if restart to reorganize his presentation
61 SHP: yeah ?
62 SHP: wife is6 two yeahQ.
63 SHP: only last name is6 Park.
64 SHP: only me yeah.
65 SHP: my wife is6 sister uh husband is6 Park.
66 MAR: ah:
67 SHP: Korean is all “Park” yeah ?
68 MAR: right !
69 SHP: line line [?]
70 SHP: yeah.
71 SHP: check man is6 yeah
  %pro: continuing the thread
72 SHP: airport check man +”/.
  %pro: lower pitch to give explanations/clarification
73 MAR: uh huh.
74 SHP: +” all “Park” !
75 SHP: wife is6 two -,
  %par: both SHP and MAR laughing heartily at the scene
76 SHP: children is6 six !
  %par: slapping sound; SHP laughing as if he will cry from the funny memory;
  MAR laughing heartily and lengthily
77 SHP: +” are you all family ?
  %com: doesn’t specify who’s talking, but it’s clearly the “airport check man”
78 SHP: huh huh
  %par: SHP chuckling
79 SHP: no no no separate yeah !
80 SHP: thats6 cousin .
  %par: still laughing
81 SHP: xx cousin -, only this a [haole?] 
82 SHP: xx xx smile [?]
83 SHP: all of this is mine yeahQ
84 MAR: yeah yeah yeah !
85 SHP: good thinking yeahQ
86 MAR: yeah !
clarifications continue. SHP uses “Hawaii stay all Park”
Marilyn using some Korean; SHP clarifies the funny point
Narrative 3. ‘First month hard’ (Sun Ja)

@Date of recording: 03-NOV-1998
@Recording modes: audio and video
@Audio tape location: 9/24/98 and 11/03/98 tape, side A
@Video tape location: Housekeeping, Tape #2
@Audio counter: 351-410 (more than half-way in of side A)
@Time start video: 1:23.44 – 1:27.27
@Length of segment: 4:02

Special features of this narrative:
Intonational and prosodic features in evidence to carry narrative thread; narrative contains numerous “quoted speech” segments of narrator, husband and other people she interacted with. Use of pause to mark syntactic juncture. At times very difficult to keep straight who said what to whom. (SJL relies almost entirely on prosody/intonation for change of roles, without lexical identification of speaker.) Interpretation not entirely clear.

Contents summary: Sun Ja asks a neighbor lady in Hawai‘i Kai to help her find work.
@Warning: %nar tier line for narrative coding not completed
Add -? to list of codes; Retracing/restart codes may not be quite accurate according to CHAT codes with respect to self-interruptions/retracings in the middle of a sentence when speaker is searching for a word or reformulating her sentence. Needs to be double-checked if analysis of retracings is important. The symbol [/] (with <> angle brackets around retraced material if more than one word) is supposed to be used if there is retracing without correction and [/] if retracing with correction.

(It was decided not to incorporate all of MAR’s backchannel/feedback “uh huh’s” into the transcript in order to give a better idea of the flow of the narrative. These would be needed for later interactional analysis.)

1 SJL: first one month is very hard, you know -. 
2 this way -, xx xx -, come over here, no more money 
3 this one -uh go before airplane pay this only $1,000 something -, you know -?
4 come over here -, yeahQ .
%nar: $beg
5 SJL: then room pay, no more money: -, and -
%pro: listing intonation
%nar: $lst
%com use of ‘and’ (does this one fit the other patterns?)
6 SJL: my sister you know -, first time banana plenny this one [/] this one buy this give um yeahQ-.
%pro: ‘loud and clear’ while giving new information
%nar: $nar
MAR: uh huh.

SJL: children you know-, young [I] young time-, I-, oh-, three [I] three years old-, one boy five years old.

MAR: uh huh.

SJL: very like this eat.

MAR: uh huh.

SJL: first time uh this6 rent pay-,

MAR: uh-, uh-, uh-, uh-

SJL: and later my husband-, this uh job find.

SJL: uh-, something cookie making-?

MAR: cooking?

MAR: oh

SJL: cheap kine yeahQ.

SJL: only two dollar ten cents one hour.

SJL: this-, yeah.

SJL: this kine pay-, this kine my husband thinking+"/.

SJL: +"oh this kine not enough-, this job change.

SJL: and my husband job change6 this one oh body bender.
SJL:
%pro: increased volume for emotion
%nar: $aff
SJL: this kine mo’ bettah.
%par slight nodding, indicating finalizing comment on that section of the narrative
%nar: $con
SJL: and me first time you know -, no more job # I worry.
%pro: louder on this sentence when switching from description of husband’s work situation to her own; use of pause and juxtaposition (indicated by #) for syntactic organization
%nar: $beg [prep for her sub-narrative which follows re meeting the lady]
%com use of ‘and’ as segment marker. (Compare this usage with rare usage as nominal conjunction: e.g. in ArriveHI ‘my sister, my brother; in JunkJob only used 2x; one usage between nouns in ArriveHI: my husband and me together OK (last line).
34 SJL: this6 my # children this school this going.
%pro: continuation intonation, as if to say “there’s more to come”; this feels like “scene setting”
%nar: $bgd

begin gem [begin quoted dialogue with “Korean old lady”]
35 SJL: Korean uh old lady uh -, this going this walk around[!] .
%pro new information
%nar: $nar
36 MAR: yeah.
37 SJL: this I’m go +”/.
%nar: $quo:ID
%com: note here that she preps the quote to come (more sophisticated storytelling)
38 SJL: +”oh you Korean?
%pro: quoting self
%nar: $quo:oth
39 SJL: I told.
%pro: framing of previous quote
%nar: $quo:ID [here it is actually comment after the quote]
40 SJL: +”oh yeah, I’m Korean.
%pro: quoting the lady
41 SJL: this kine talking +”/.
%pro framing of previous quote
%nar: $quo:ID [or is it preface to next quote below]
42 SJL: +”uh me now no more job[1].
%pro: quoting self
%nar: $quo:slf
43 SJL: yeahQ.
44 SJL: +” this a come over here almost6 two month[1].
%pro: quoting self
%nar: $quo:slf
45 MAR: uh huh.
46 SJL: +" this a no more job.
%pro: quoting self
%nar: $quo:slf
47 SJL: +" any job ok![!].
%pro: quoting self
%nar: $quo:slf
48 MAR: you told who+/+ , walking around?
%com: seeking clarification
49 SJL: walk around this one uh old [//] Korean old lady there I talking.
%nar: $rep
50 MAR: uh uh uh uh.
51 SJL: +" please everything -, any kine job ok[!].
%pro: quoting self
%nar: $quo:slf
52* MAR: uh uh uh
53 SJL: this ol:d lady say +"//.
%nar: $quo:ID
54 SJL: +" you house clean.
%pro: quoting lady
%nar: $quo:oth
55 SJL: +"ok!  
%pro: quoting self
%nar: $quo:slf [note not prep for this switch in quoted speakers]
56 SJL: +"any[/] anything ok!
%pro: quoting self
%nar: $quo:slf
end gem [quoted dialogue with Korean woman walking around]
57 SJL: one day uh house working.
%pro: high pitch, as if the story will continue
%nar: $nar
58 SJL: one day.
%pro low pitch
%nar: $
59 SJL: and somebody talking coming-, me s[-].
60 SJL: oh house over here -, this6 me scare -, yeahQ.
%com: use of 'scare'
61 SJL: this6 uh neighbor house -,  
%pro: intonation of giving explanatory information to the listener
%nar: $bgd
62 SJL: neighbor house you know.  
%pro: giving explanatory information
SJL: this Korean people.
MAR: uh huh.
SJL: and this this Hawaii this born.
MAR: uh huh -, ok.
SJL: yeah.
SJL: this lady this come over here -, my house.
SJL: Korean people -, and Japanese people -, 
SJL: and # Korean -..YeahQ.

SJL: Korean -, two Korean yeahQ.
SJL: one Korean this Korean [this?] come back.

SJL: one Korean this uh this born Hawaii -., this coming.
MAR: ok.
SJL: +" oh -, you lady this one no more money -, no more you know rice xx.

SJL: +"everything no more[!]

SJL: +"yeahQ.

SJL: +"you -, talk story.

SJL: that scare.

SJL: +"everytime lady this stay home -, this kine.

SJL: +"no more money -, something problem this way -, ask talking.

MAR: uh huh.

SJL: I think this only uh.
SJL: +"job ok !
SJL: only husband two dollar ten something -, yeah right now.
%pro:

SJL: my sister this house buy you know.
%pro: change in prosody to indicate change of thread? (check tape)
%nar: Sgd [for listener? or did she tell it to the Koreans then?]

SJL: uh me s/-]170 pay.
MAR: uh huh.
SJL: my uh brother -, my sister.
SJL: thirteen [/] one hundred thirty pay pay yeahQ.
SJL: me only four people.
MAR: oh::.
MAR: a hundred thirty dollars.
SJL: one hundred seventy.
%com: overlaps not accurately transcribed here
SJL: one hundred seventy I pay.
MAR: uh::.
SJL: oh very hard this [/] this lady this coming +”/.
%pro: markedly different intonation, as SJL picks up the story thread
%nar: $nar
SJL: +” on[/] me only job ok.
%pro: quoting self
MAR: which lady coming?
%com: seeking clarification
SJL: lady-, neighbor.
%par: gesture to same place of previously indicated 'neighbor'--is that
significant? (cf ASL use of space--natural?)
MAR: neighbor-, yeah.
SJL: yeah neighbor-, this lady coming +”/.
SJL: +”you no more money and no more rice -, everything no more.
%pro: quoting lady
SJL: +”problem is talking ask this one -, I help you.
%pro: quoting lady
MAR: uh huh -, uh huh.
SJL: +”everything ok.
SJL: +”only me job # fine.
%pro: ‘fine’ is lower pitch, uttered as commentary on finding a job
%com: pause used as syntactic linker
SJL: this one
%pro: pitch marks change of section; end of this section
SJL: +”oh you, uh: this Korean church.
%pro: quoting intonation
%com: changing roles
MAR: uh huh.
Sjl: you know Korean church this one.
%pro: background intonation; change in pitch (? check)
%com: not clear if quote or if she’s checking if I know about Korean church.
112 Sjl: name and telephone number give um.
113 Mar: ah:
114 Sjl: +"this one call -, you everything job.
%com: not sure if this is quote/role play. Why does she use ‘you’
115 Sjl: this lady job find [fine?]
%com: meaning not clear. Is it the neighbor telling the church to find Sjl a job, or
a church lady found a job for Sjl?
116 Mar: uh uh uh uh uh.
117 Sjl: this uh-.
118 Sjl: McKinley High School over there Korean people this saimin house.
%pro: distinct shift in pitch to show that she is clarifying the location for me
119 Sjl: saimin.
%com: repeating because Mar didn’t understand
120 Mar: saimin house!
%com: Mar has just understood
121 Mar: oh oh oh yeah -, yeah.
122 Sjl: this night+time working.
123 Mar: oh -, ok.
124 Sjl: this kine oh nine month [s?] I work
%pro: announcing information
Narrative 4. 'Hawai'i nobody help, only Korean church' (Sang Hee)

@Date of recording: 28-NOV-1998
@Recording modes: Audio and video
@Audio tape location: Modern Times comments, side B
@Video tape location: Modern Times comments, Nov. 26-28, 1998
@Audio counter: past half-way point
@Time start video:
@Length of segment: 1:36

Special features of this narrative: minimal syntax, lexicon; prosody for listing, adverbials

1 SHY: yeah!
2 SHY: only my family yeahQ my husband, me 3 children, me . yeah .
3 SHY: outside, no more [/] no more family. Only my husband, my children, me .
   yeah.
* MAR: in America ?
5 SHY: Yeah, Hawaii -_ nobody help yeahQ
8 SHY: uh #-_ Korean church. Uh
9 SHY: Korean church uh my friend yeahQ
10 SHY: very very nice -, very very nice my friend my friend husband .
12 MAR: oh yeah? Hawaii Japanese ? local ?
13 SHY: local -_ local -_
14 MAR: local Japanese -_ uh huh .
15 SHY: yeah .
17 SHY: yeah - yeah -,
18 MAR: how did he help?
19 [speaking Korean]
20 SHY: uh very yeah yeah nice .
21 MAR: money or just /+? xxx
22 SHY: no no no // no money yeahQ .
23 SHY: only -, uh uh # no more car .
24 SHY: yeah sho:ppping and-,
   %pro: listing intonation
25 MAR: oh: !
26 SHY: sometime yeahQ sometime oceanside, beach6 .
27 MAR: yeah yeah yeah -, yeah .
28 SHY: yeah yeah yeah .
Narrative 5. ‘Saimin House’ (Sun Ja)

@Date of recording: 03-NOV-98
@Recording modes: audio and video
@Audio tape location: 9/24/98, 11/03/98 11/27/98 tape, side A
@Audio counter: 409 - 498 (near end of side A)
@Video tape location: Housekeeping tape #2
@Time start video: 1:27.27 – 1:32
@Length of segment: 5:37
@Transcriber note: Not checked against video.
Not sure if SJL’s quotes of boss and herself are accurately/correctly coded.
Use metalinguistic quotes or direct quotes? (more appropriate to use metalinguistic?)

Special features of this narrative:
Intonational and prosodic features in evidence to carry narrative thread; narrative contains numerous “quoted speech” segments of narrator, husband and bosses she interacted with. Use of pause to mark syntactic juncture. At times very difficult to keep straight who said what to whom. (SJL relies almost entirely on prosody/intonation to change of roles, without lexical identification of speaker.) Interpretation not entirely clear.

@Summary of narrative: worked at Saimin House run by Korean people but it was very hard work and she wasn’t happy there. The boss was always complaining, and she had to work nights until 2am. A man who owned a ceramic company asked her to come work for him (not clear if he was a customer at the Saimin House and saw her get yelled at one day and then offered her a job). She worked at the ceramic company, but also spoke Korean there. Then she went to work for the hotel. It was much better--it gave her a chance to speak English. In the beginning, she was very scared, but after 3 years, it was fine and she wasn’t scared of talking to people any more.

1 SJL: McKinley High School over there Korean people this saimin house.
   %pro: distinct shift in pitch to show that she is clarifying the location for me
2 SJL: saimin.
   %com: repeating because MAR didn’t understand
3 MAR: saimin house!
   %com: MAR has just understood
4 MAR: oh oh oh yeah -, yeah.
5 SJL: this night+time working.
6 MAR: oh -, ok.
7 SJL: this kine oh nine month [s?] I work.
   %pro: announcing information
8 MAR: they pay five dollars?
9 SJL: pay: one -, no.
10 SJL: pay oh two dollar # ten.
11 MAR: uh:: 1974 - _ right - _ long time ago.
12 SJL: this one two dollar ten this give um.
SJL: this one - more -, more -, hard job.

SJL: you know extra uh half an hour - working more.

MAR: right.

SJL: six o’clock working -, five+thirty this ok start.

MAR: uh huh -, uh huh.

SJL: uh two o’clock finishing.

MAR: <in the morning ?>> [>

SJL: <clean> [?] [<]

SJL: no - afternoon!

MAR: ok.

MAR: start in the morning five+thirty?

MAR: ooh!

SJL: no - this afternoon.

MAR: afternoon -, ok.

SJL: yeah.

SJL: afternoon and # +/.

MAR: finish at two o’clock uh night+time -.

SJL: yeah.

MAR: two o’clock night+time.

SJL: night finish _ finish[ing??].

SJL: this coming my husband uh working xx xx [working paper?] working for this [?]

SJL: come over here xx xx xx [get up?].

MAR: oh::.

SJL: he working time he [me? we?] get [catch?] a bus.

SJL: come in.

SJL: very hard time job!

%pro each word stressed and lengthened

MAR: oh yeah.

SJL: and -, this one oh this man xx [mer] more hal more hard give um.

SJL: talking this one oh ”/.

SJL: ”saimin or won+ton?

SJL: won+ton[“] this mandoow give um yeahQ.

MAR: yeah right right right.

SJL: mandoow xx xx

SJL: xx this one five this one uh five plate over here this one me cook [?]

SJL: ”how come no more mandoow?

%com: not clear if the boss is complainting to SJL or SJL is asking the boss. From context and alternation of speakers, it appears to be SJL who is asking

SJL: ”oh this trash can xx [one] throw away!

SJL: hoh! me more more hard job.

%com: ‘hoh’ represents a breathy sigh

SJL: you know first time Hawaii this come over here -.

SJL: this uh restaurant boss this talking ”/.
SJL: +"yes sir -, yes sir -, yes sir -, 
MAR: right -, right -, right .
SJL: this kind way talking +"/
SJL: +"oh sorry -, sorry .
SJL: this kind talk story this a like !
MAR: uh -, the boss . (?)
SJL: yeah -, boss6 like .
SJL: this one plenny people cheap saimin yeahQ ple:ny line over there .
SJL: oh water this chang6 -, boil [?] long time +"/
%pro: “poor me complaining” in voice
MAR: uh . 
SJL: +" how come this boss come .
SJL: +" how come you[+] you # how come? how come? .
%pro spoken rapidly and curtly
SJL: +" hurry up hurry up hurry !
SJL: this kind uh more hard job .
SJL: this one nine month this working .
%pro: out of role play, providing commentary
MAR: oh: . 
SJL: nine month this a working -, and this ceramic this I chang6 .
%MAR: yeah, the[+] but the saimin house, the[/] Korean people there ?
%MAR: he spoke English ?
SJL: yeah - _ this long time this working English very good English .
MAR: he talked Korean with you ?
SJL: yeah -, Korean talking -, uh huh -_ talking Korean .
MAR: uh: uh: .
SJL: and ceramic Korean boss same thing .
MAR: uh: uh: .
SJL: you know Korean boss same thing -, only me children talking English xx xx [little bit?] understand yeahQ
%com: she seems to want to explain her lack of opportunity to speak English
SJL: this almost ten year over there .
MAR: wow !
SJL: yeah - _ ten year # oh no ten yeah one ye[+] uh almost ten month this over there .
MAR: ten /months .
SJL: ten month -, yeah -_ ten month .
MAR: at saimin house .
SJL: yeah - _ nine month .
MAR: nine months at saimin house ?
SJL: yeah - this working and me chang6 .
SJL: saimin boss this come over here .
SJL: ceramic come over here .
91 SJL: me kitchen!
92 MAR: oh: !
93 SJL: +" my house coming you work!
94 SJL: +" I cannot night working.
95 SJL: me three day working -, I don't like.
96 MAR: ok -, so you worked three days at saimin house.
  %com: seeking clarification
97 SJL: three days saimin house6 not pay.
98 MAR: oh -.
99 SJL: this man me pay yeahQ
100 MAR: uh huh.
101 SJL: this one you now my house not coming working -,
102 SJL: cannot give um.
103 SJL: ok!
104 SJL: never+mind.
105 SJL: you not give um ok.
106 SJL: me three day working now not pay.
107 MAR: oh:.
108 SJL: and me ceramic company this one I+/
109 MAR: three days working at ceramic.
110 SJL: yeah. ceramic company this I work.
111 MAR: full time?
112 SJL: yeah -_ this saimin give saimin uh restaurant this one three day # not pay.
113 MAR: you mean you worked but?<>]
114 SJL: yeah -_ before me working job change6.
115 SJL: +"you copy[?] my restaurant working!
116 MAR: o:h.
  %pro: sympathetic tone
117 SJL: I don't like this one!
118 MAR: o:h o:h.
  %pro: sympathetic tone
119 SJL: more more more hard this one job.
120 SJL: you cheap plenny people line line [>] <line line>.
  %pro: high pitch on 'plenny'
121 MAR: <oh oh oh> [<>.
122 SJL: this one only saimin this one oh garbage time [?] at five [?] this all trash
can throw away!
  %pro: expressing disapproval
123 SJL: oh!
124 MAR: what throw away?
125 MAR: trash can?
126 SJL: yeah trash can!
127 SJL: all throw away!
128 SJL: saimin xx mandoo how come no more mandoo over here[?]
129 SJL: all xx throw away.
130 SJL: oh very me cry.
131 SJL: ceramic this man this one ceramic company coming +”/.
137 SJL: +"oh Sun Ja, where -, what time working?
138 SJL: me one day uh day+time house clean a:nd night+time ceramic –,
this night+time working.
139 SJL: my husband this say [?] +”/.
140 SJL: +’you -, don’t do that -_ you[/] you very sick and don’t like this one -_
only day+time this working a:nd household clean # I quit and xx like this.
141 MAR: day+time?
142 SJL: yeah -_ day+time xx working a:nd #
143 SJL: this come over here hotel.
144 SJL: English6 -,
147 SJL: English6 -,
148 SJL: Korean house this working cannot you know yeahQ.
149 SJL: English no understand -_ only Korean speaking.
150 SJL: this Outrigger this 6 come over here this one -, uh.
151 SJL: first time this 6 me sca:re!
152 SJL: no understand yeahQ.
153 SJL: now this 6 working one year -, two year -, this working
%com: how to code an uptalk at end of phrase?
154 SJL: +,somebody talking ‘member I talking +”/.
155 SJL: +” scuse me -, scuse me -, scuse me -, me ten time something talking you
know yeahQ.
156 SJL: this kind sometime you know very writing over here xx housekeeping
going down this one I talk to this one you know.
157 SJL: more o+//.
158 SJL: [name of hotel deleted] xxx come over here three year pass # not scare.
%pro: spoken proudly; high pitch on pass; ‘not scare’ in lower pitch
159 MAR: chuckling
160 SJL: yeah.
161 SJL: before very scare!
Narrative 6. 'Key No More' (Won Ja)

@Date of recording: 10-OCT-1998
@Recording modes: audio and video
@Audio tape location: Won Ja tape, Tape 2, Side A, Memorable Events
@Video tape location: Housekeepers, Part B
@Audio counter: 
@Time start video: last segment on tape
@Length of segment: 1:40

Summary of contents: Won Ja lost her pass key on her very first day on the job; here she recounts how she frantically searched for it.

1  MAR: let me ask you +...
2   MAR: I don't know -, this or this -, something like that .
   %sit: reading the Korean "memorable event" questions in my notebook
3   WSB: [?]
   %lan: reading Korean outloud from notebook
4   WSB: uh, this one over here yeahQ
5   WSB: hotel come in first time, yeahQ ?
6   MAR: yeah!
7   WSB: yeah .
8   MAR: yeah !
9   WSB: detail [?] first time come in, room number room number .
   %com: check if room number repeated? not clear. repetition coding?
   %act: WSB laugh
   %lan: WSB using Korean? (keun-en-de?) English "day?"
10  WSB: come in over here this side #d mmm .
11  WSB: # uh over here inside #d uh first time coming -,
12   key over here inside no-, no need over here inside no[t] -, no[t] need .
13  WSB: pocket inside -, fall down !
   %com: coding of disfluent repetitions and retracings?
   %act: MAR laugh
14  WSB: ahh! looking !
15  WSB: all me -. 
16  WSB: scared [?] #d .
17  WSB: uh #d crazy me, yeahQ +"/.
18  WSB: +" no more, key no more .
   %com: spoken with frantic voice, impersonating herself
   %com: WSB reenacting her own role: is this "quoting"?
(frantic voice continues) ???
19  WSB: ?????? down
20  WSB: ollllll (frantic tone)
21   laundry over here mista::ke .
%sit: standing up and showing her searching for the key
%com: use "sit" or "act" to code such things? -probably "act"

22 MAR: ???
23 WSB: yeah!
24 MAR: you found it?
25 WSB: yeah-.
26 MAR: where?
27 MAR: where was the key?
28 WSB: [??????]
29 WSB: down no more key.
30 WSB: make-make a bed.
31 MAR: yeah yeah yeah.
32 WSB: put down no more key a:::hh!
33 my car (???) xxxx.
34 MAR: oh::: yeah yeah yeah.
35 MAR: you found it -? you found it?
36 WSB: yeah, I can.
37 MAR: oh, my goodness.
38 MAR: first day working?
39 WSB: yeah! o-ma!
40 MAR: first day, how many rooms?
41 MAR: first day, 18 rooms?
42 WSB: no. first day, somebody [/] somebody together #/ together uh.
43 MAR: teaching, yeah.
44 WSB: yeah, take care.
45 WSB: two months.
46 MAR: two months -? together? oh.
47 WSB: yeah.
48 ohh.
%act: WSB wiping eyes with tissue
%act: MAR laughing
49 WSB: ohhh.
50 MAR: oh my gosh, so, so [>]  
51 WSB: >somebody [/] somebody [/] somebody maybe [/] maybe say +"/
52 +" you crazy over there this [: in?] side.
53 WSB: +" you cut!
%com: code as one utterance or several? (see ex. p.49 of B MWh)
%chr WSB takes on role of others
%act: WSB laugh, giggle)
%act: MAR laugh, giggle
54 MAR: cut what?
55 MAR: cut?
56 WSB: yeah!
57 MAR: cut what?
58 MAR: oh -, cut off your head!
%act: WSB giggles
59 WSB: yeah you get [:cut?] it.
60 MAR: yeah yeah yeah.
%act: MAR laugh, WSB laughing
61 MAR: you've lost your head.
62 MAR: head.
%act: MAR gesturing head off, on ground
%lan: MAR making chicken sounds (i.e. chicken with its head cut off)
%com: better way to mark verbalized "explanatory sounds" such as "chickens"
here? use "lan" or something else?
63 WSB: yeah.
64 WSB: I cry -, cry.
65 MAR: oh::
%com: sympathetic backchannel
66 WSB: yeah.
67 MAR: uh, uh, uh.
68 WSB: it's ok.
70 WSB: now [???]
Narrative 7. 'Very, Very Cry' (Sang Hee)

@Date of recording: 21-NOV-1998
@Recording modes: audio and video
@Audio tape location: Side B of 11/21/98, end of talking about Housekeeping Video, retell of Modern Times, plus commentary
@Video tape location: Housekeeping video comments, Tape #1
@Audio counter:
@Time start video:
@Length of segment: 2:26

Special features of this narrative: minimal syntax, lexicon

1  MAR: when did you start here -, working ?
2   SHY: uh 19 # 8:30 uh yeah # # November 17 .
3  *  MAR: oh really?
4   SHY: yeah .
5  MAR: so fifteen years ?
6  MAR: 83 ?
7   SHY: um .
8  MAR: right away # fast ! [speaking Korean: ‘xx shijak hessooyo’]
9  MAR: in 83 and working in 83 ?
10  MAR: ah -, and no English ?
11   SHY: yeah - _ no English .
12  MAR: no:: English -, at all !
13   SHY: yeah .
14  MAR: so you <learned> [>] .
15   SHY: yeah. very, very cry, me yeahQ .
16   SHY: oh come back -, oh:: !

..... www (sections omitted)

Sub-section: 'in shower cry cry' (work)

17   SHY: English not school and worry Korean.
18  MAR: you needed to learn English
19  MAR: did you go to McKinley ?
20   SHY: only 2 months, no more time .
21   SHY: oh: tired .
22  MAR: like me, learning Korean, but no more time .
23   SHY: working time[/] working time lunch yeahQ .
24   SHY: no more English
25   SHY: yeah some time guest complain .
26   SHY: yeah .
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SHY: guest.

SHY: xx xx

SHY: +" I don’t know.

SHY: yeah.

SHY: sometime6 guest yeahQ.

SHY: +” hello!

SHY: mm # talk talk yeah▼.

SHY: I don’t know understand yeah▼.

SHY: me in shower.

MAR: <uh huh .>

SHY: in shower # cry cry

SHY: loud on ‘shower’

MAR: oh: !

SHY: my children uh #

SHY: my mom, sometimes cry cry.

SHY: Korean uh music[//] music every day yeahQ

SHY: my son -, everyday.

MAR: oh - _ reading

SHY: sometime me -, oh me my mom . aigu.

MAR: oh?!

MAR: did you talk to your husband?

SHY: no no no! yeah . uh.

SHY: every day // working time -, yeah -, not English uh…yeahQ

everyday // working .

SHY: Korean // yeah Korean in job . yeah .

SHY: work xx yeah going uh uh.

SHY: po-hom is6 [speaking Korean]
Narrative 8. ‘Junk Job’ (Sun Ja)

@Date of recording: 20-NOV-1998
@Recording modes: audio and video
@Audio tape location: Sun Ja tape, Housekeeping video comments, Side A
@Video tape location: Housekeeping video comments, Tape #1
@Audio counter:
@Time start video:
@Length of segment: 5:13

Special note: There are many versions of this transcript.

Special features of this narrative:
Use of prosodic contours to organize the narrative, which includes beginning and ending narrative of a significant event on her floor, conjectures and asides to establish time frames, backgrounding for the interlocutor, direct quotation of self, indirect quotation of others (housekeeping office, police), evaluation of/comment on the event, conveying deep personal opinion (room maid NOT a junk job, as some people think) A token of nearly every type of prosodic feature being analyzed is found in this text.

@Transcriber comment: check for updated version with CHAT codes, esp. narr. struc. codes

```plaintext
1 SJL: I uh think u:h room-mai:d some peopl:e # uh junk job you know-, <this kine thinking,, yeahQ> [>] so-,
2 MAR: <right -, right -> [<]
3 SJL: i'm:: thinking so-, not bad-, <room maid job > [>] 
4 MAR:<right -, right -, right -> [<]
5 SJL: yeah -, <room maid job->,> [>] # uh not bad .
6 MAR: <right -> [<]
7 MAR:yeah ! and she has a nice boyfriend !
8 SJL: yeah nice xx xx [bo- nice thing?]
9 SJL: room maid ok -, <this kine > [>] thinking maybe,, yeahQ .
10 MAR:<yeah !> [<]
11 MAR:right . right . <right > [>] right .
12 SJL: <yeah > [
13 SJL: +'before me uh <three year ago> [rising intonation] <some people>
[topicalization intonation] , #
%com: beginning of incident narration; striking change in pitch on “three year ago”
%pro: prosodic coding, see chapter 11, p. 81 and pp.87ff; intonation, pp. 52-54; creating new
dependent tiers, p. 64; phrase internal intonational contours, p. 67.
14 MAR:uh -. [rise-fall contour—see p. 45]
15 SJL: I'm not (no? I don't?) keep anything -, I'm going outstair . (downstair?)
16 MAR:uh huh .
17 SJL: -, uh: #
18 SJL: why this one oh # [shift in intonation] floor over this all care you know
%pro: “aside”tone of voice, explaining what she was doing checking the floor
before she goes out for lunch
```
MAR: uh huh -, <uh huh> [>] 
SIL: <", yeah> [>] 
SIL: this hallway all: wet! 
MAR: uh huh. 
SIL: this one. 
SIL: I -, <I think five year>-. 
%com: spoken rapidly, as if “into” the story and encouraging her to tell me more 
%com: spoken here to mark syntactic juncture (see p. 46 of MacWhinney); this is problem 
of syntactic analysis. 
SIL: I call housekeeping. 
MAR: right. 
SIL: # this one, <do+not> ["] sign. 
%syn: use of comma to mark syntactic juncture 
SIL: <do+not> ["] sign. 
SIL: oh xx xx <do+not> ["] sign 
SIL: <do+not> ["] sign, you know <no more touch-> ["] (?) 
MAR: yeah. 
SIL: no more touch 
MAR: yeah -, right. 
SIL: no more touch 
SIL: me -, oh I worry! 
SIL: this one before this lanai this one -, oh before now this one all lanai, one open 
all before this one, cannot cut -, this kine 
%act: check video tape for her hand gestures here about the lanai, cutting 
MAR: oh, I see. 
SIL: this one me 425 this one 26 I look -, room looking over there. 
SIL: oh some man kitchen # fall down! 
%com: previous line is said with surprise, quoting self-talk of the time 
MAR: oh really? 
SIL: yeah! 
SIL: kitchen fall down! 
SIL: oh me scared -, housekeeping call +"/. 
MAR: right. 
SIL: +" I think four two six guest fall down! 
MAR: yeah. 
SIL: I think kitchen something floor. 
SIL: yeah -, oh my God! 
SIL: uh huh! 
%pro: rising intonation (unusual-as if to assert: that’s what happened!) 
MAR: the man heart attack? 
SIL: I think heart at/tack.
intonation on attack to indicate agreement with "diagnosis" I suggested
uh uh uh.
I call housekeeping and housekeeping you know come over here.
inspectress coming check, and this call, ambulance coming.
lunch finishing I come back.
oh my goodness!
oh! police/man everybody is come over here!
high intonation on "everybody", excited tone of voice
xx xx over there.
"+ this man you know is I got what time you uh # this uh you find this (it)?
verify police questioning words and intonation (higher on "what time"
I xx xx hallway xx me housekeeping call
her voice is quivering (reliving the nervousness of being interrogated)
right right right.
and this one over here -, I call housekeeping you know
this man,-
rising intonation, topic marking
me off day come back -,
SIL laughing
go to déjà vu moment from S.J.L.
what - , say what?
not die!
not die.
oh:
he came back and checked out?
yeah! ambulance come over here.
intonation on "yeah" as if to say "you betcha!--and this is what happened"
this one oh xx down here.
police car.
this one going me -, two day off -,
check out -! already going!
coding syntax needs fixing in above two sentences
from this point transcription needs to be rechecked:
" Sun Ja something give+um
no that's ok, not die is going ok: !
me thinking .
lucky you
I/know!
take him quickly to the hospital
(speaking Korean?)
no more money time yeahQ this people, sick people, no more money
oh:
this kine oh
after me room clean, some=/ a little bit small luggage over there
uh uh uh uh.
this kine, you know, I thinking, "oh me room clean and man later this one
die oh no you know .
quoting her own thoughts
yeahQ
this one housekeeping call, ambulance coming -.
99 SJL: "oh Sun Ja you good.
   %pro: deep voice quoting what others said to her
100 SJL: die
101 SJL: this room clean scare
102 MAR: it's not your fault if he dies
103 SJL: this room clean scare
   %gls means she was scared to clean that room after that?
104 SJL: this kine
105 SJL: room maid not, not bad job
106 SJL: room maid good
107 MAR: help people
108 SJL: this one talking
109 SJL: this kine talking
110 SJL: Korean people, English talking
111 SJL: oh you extra toilet paper
112 SJL: this time [kine?] talk story
113 SJL: more talk story
Narrative 9. ‘Mililani Sleeping’ (Sang Hee)

@Date of recording: 12-MAR-1997
@Recording modes: audio
@Audio tape location: Hotel housekeepers, Side A
@Video tape location: n/a
@Audio counter: n/a
@Time start video: n/a
@Length of segment: 1:38

Special features of this narrative: MAR didn't understand SHY's euphemistic way of describing the fact that her husband was deceased by saying 'Mililani sleeping'. Example of how local shared knowledge would have helped clarify the context when narrator had limited means of expression.

* SHY: My husband uh yeahQ from Hawaii..from Korea Hawaii/yeah.30 years.
  %nar: $BEG
  1  MAR: [uh-huh
  2  SHY: uh
  3  MAR: three?? SHY: yeah thirty years ago
  4  SHY: (indisting.) A-tit-chu-ling inside. Noo!
  %nar: $STY:cpl
  5  MAR: what inside?
  6  SHY: lung
  7  MAR: lung?
  8  SHY: yeah!
  9  MAR: so. For your husband, or you? Your husband?
 10  SHY: Mililani sleeping [?] (laughs)
  %nar: STY:cmx
 11  MAR: ohhhhhh (seeming to understand). No more?
 12  SHY: 10 years. Yeah. 10 years...uh. 3 children
 13  MAR: ohhhh. Oh. Ohhhh/Your husband now is not working.
  %com: MAR trying to avoid the subject of discussing the “lazy husband” who sleeps in Mililani while his wife works.
 14  SHY: yeah. English is yeah (indisting.) no more time. yeah
 15  MAR: In Korea, did you learn Korean/uh, did you learn English, before Hawaii?
 16  SHY: No. 2 months miss Korean. My husband she hospital 2 years.
  %nar: $STY:cpl
 17  MAR: Husband 2 years in the hospital in Korea?
  %nar: $bgd:rep
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20  MAR: Here?
21  SHY: Yeah.
22  (indistinct. Korean hospital yeah.Q 30 years
23  MAR: ohhh. And now, no more work.
24  SHY:  Sleeping now
    %nar:  $STY:cmx (clarifying and reiterating for listener)
25  MAR:  Sleeping/you mean--
    %com: MAR finally gets the point.
26  SHY:  yeah. Mililani.
27  MAR:  ...ahh. So he passed away?/
28        I mean/no more husband
29  SHY:  10 years yeahQ. 10 years (laughs)
30  MAR:  ohhhhh
31  SHY:  no more time
32  MAR:  so you're alone? You're alone?/
33        and your daughter lives here with you?
34        Your children live here with you?
35  SHY:  yeah--one boy, two son
36  MAR:  and then next week you go to Korea. Right?
37  SHY:  [laughs. Yeah. My son il-e-a test/church Korea
38  MAR:  Going to be married??
40  MAR:  festival?
41  SHY:  church6
Narrative 10. ‘Dust Storm’ (Sok)

@Date of recording: 28-OCT-1998
@Audio tape Location: Sok tape 1, side b
@Video tape location: Housekeeping, Tape #2
@Audio counter start: end of Sok master tape, Oct. 13, 15 & 28, 1998, side B
@Video time start: 0.57.13 – 1.00.05
@Length of segment: 3:30

@Special features of this narrative: Elaborate narrative; a lot of shared background knowledge between narrator and listener, resulting in a lot of co-constructing of narrative. Numerous uses of prosody to compensate for lack of vocabulary. SOK uses many gestures to supplement his verbal utterances.

@Background:
Just prior to this segment, it had been established by the interlocutors that they had both been living in Saudi Arabia at the same time. In 1979, SOK went to Saudi Arabia as an expatriate laborer from Korea, after having worked several years in Iran before the Shah was overthrown. He was employed by a large American construction company that was building the international airport in Riyadh, the capital city. He worked in the mechanic shop. All the cars were GM cars, because Ford was on the Arab blacklist at that time because it did business with Israel. The managers were American, and there were other Korean employees, as well as Pakistanis and Filipinos.

The researcher MAR had also moved to Saudi Arabia in 1979 and lived there for three years. She lived in Jeddah, along the coast of the Red Sea, which at that time was still the diplomatic capital.

Occasional uses of Korean, Arabic and Farsi are contained in transcripts by this speaker. Korean is romanized according to the “Yale system,” based on morphophonemic principles. Arabic and Farsi are transcribed phonetically.

1 MAR: do you remember anything -, any special memory about Saudi Arabia ? like -, do you remember your first day in Saudi Arabia -, or -, special day when you spend time with Saudi people -, or , I don’t know +...
2 SOK: uhhh -, yeah -, yeah -, /yeah -, %act: readjusting himself in his chair, eye gaze straight ahead
3 SOK: /there is uh you /know uh very /hard /work you /know -,
4 SOK: umm -, /dust6 -, /windy -, //sand you know /sand you know whasa [: what’s that]
%spa: $i: &OTHVoc
%par: makes gestures on dust, wind and squints; on 'sand' begins to make a circle
5 SOK: uh uh like //this -,
%par: moving 2 hands in whirlwind gesture
6 MAR: yeah .
7 SOK: wh -[/] wh -[/] whas i [: what’s it] //call
%spa: $i: &OTHVoc (request lexical input)
8 MAR: uh whirl [/] whirl /wind -, 9 SOK: no -, no -, no -,
SOK: /sand you know /a::ll like //that you know wh uh-,
%par: right hand making strong spiral motion upward with eyes
following the gesture; smiling
%spa: $i:&OTHVoc
MAR: the //name # -.
SOK: you know -, [/you know in (?) //english -.
%spa: $i:&OTHVoc
%pro: sounds like pleading when saying the word 'English'
MAR: whirlwind -, no -?
SOK: like <dust storm> ["]
MAR: like <dust storm> ["]
SOK: //storm -, //storm -, /yeah -!
%par: looking intently and directly at MAR
%pro
SOK: //friend <we /can> [/ we can not //see -.
%mor: neg
%pro: listing (use of “listing intonation to replace connectives)
SOK: we can /not uh //breathing -,
%mor: what to do about -ing
%pro: listing
%par: two hands covering mouth and nose
MAR: oh -!
SOK: oh /so you know -,
SOK: we /have to /yeah /glass //on -, /safet(y) glass //on:: -.
%par: gestures shape of safety glasses covering eye area
MAR: uh huh uh huh
SOK: then //mask6 -,
%par: left hand covering mouth and nose where mask would be
%pro: listing
%mor: connective “then”
SOK: also -, you know -, can /not //breathing you know -, yeah -!
%mor: connective also; ing usage; neg/not
MAR: right -, right -,
SOK: yeah -!
MAR: we had that -, in Jeddah -,
SOK: yeah -.
MAR: I stayed three years and three times we had a dust storm like that -, right -.
%par: holding up 3 fingers on left hand, enumerating ‘3 years, 3 times’ with right hand
SOK: can /not //work -, so you know -, //all:: mechanic shop is you know door
//close -.
%mor: neg/not
%par: 2 hands sweeping (umpire movement “you’re out”) to emphasize completely
closed
MAR: 0
%act: picking up paper coffee cup from table (settling in for a story)
MAR: yeah -.
SOK: then you /know -, //bot:tom /side -, this much you know space /yeah -
%mor: quantifier “this much”
%par: holding thumb and index to show how much space
MAR: right -. 

%pro: backchannel soto voce
%par: collaborating on story-telling by using right hand to “sweep in” dust
36  SOK: get /in -!
%pro: creaky voice on ‘get’
%par: bending forward to the floor to show where the dust got it
37  MAR: getting in under the +/
%pro: spoken softly as self-explanation or rephrasal/recasting of his story line
%spa: &ELABOTH
38  SOK: then -, like //this -!
%mor: connective “then”
%par: 2 arms stretched straight out (as if Superman in flight)
%pro: creaky (grunting?) voice on ‘like this’
39  SOK: /oh -, /no -!
%pro: grunting
40  SOK: yeah -! (?)
41  MAR: pushing the door -?
%lst: $mcl
42  SOK: yeah -!
43  SOK: //come in -, //come in -, then you know //all: you know /sand in/side
%mor: connective “then”
%par: making large “hill” of sand to his right rear
44  MAR: //really -? wow -!
%pro: rising, surprise
%par: jaw drop
45  SOK: /yeah -.
46  SOK: //then -, we can /not stay in uh //shop -, so you know -,
%mor: connective “then”; NEG (not)
%par: hand reach to MAR in “solidarity” gesture; 2-hd emphatic gesture on `shop’
47  SOK: umm -,
48  MAR: how do you go out -?
49  SOK: so we get in #, car -,
%mor: connective “so”
%pro: listing
%par: gesturing forward with index finger, then emphatically pointing to MAR on ‘car’
50  SOK: then close -,
%mor: connective ‘then”
%pro: listing, continued series
%par: rolling up the window by hand
51  SOK: only air con/ditioner //on -. 
%pro: continued series
%par: laughing
52  MAR: 0
%par: nodding head vigorously to show following the story line
53  SOK: all off yeah -!
%par: laughing, hands randomly and alternatively touching face (showing taking off mask, etc.)
%pro: listing, narrative pitch
54  MAR: 0
%par: looking intently, smiling, and shaking head (as if in “wow, what a story!”)
55  SOK: can /not xxx [?] (spleani??) -! [: cannot explain (?)]
%mor: neg/not
56 MAR: oh I see -, inside the shop -, sitting in the car -!
%par: index finger point (shop), rotating finger for 'in the car'
%spa:
57 MAR: wow -!
58 SOK: yeah -.
59 SOK: inside shop -,
%mor: locative inside
%pro: rising
60 MAR: o:h -!
61 SOK: also inside /shop also you know # a::ll you know dust breathing -, like that
%mor: connective also; locative inside; -ing form
%pro:
%par: arms gesticulating in air where dust is (all in the air)
62 MAR: right -, right -, right -,
63 SOK: <can /not> /[can /not -,- # yeah -.
%mor: neg/not
%par: 2-handed thumb twist out; head shaking ("really tough")

PITCH HERE (example of high pitch for storytelling thread)
64 SOK: wow -, so you know //now -, we have to go //in //car you know-.
65 MAR: 0
%par: hearty, extended chuckle; SOK also laughing

NEW SEGMENT: evaluate the event/SOK clarifies not dangers-only 1 ½ hour
66 MAR: but that's dangerous ,,no-?
67 SOK: danger-y
%mor: attempt to create adjective morphology "dangery"
%com: SOK imitates MAR output (solidarity?? why? he hasn’t done it for other MAR output)
%err: dangerous
68 MAR: I mean -, the air conditioning -, if the car motor -?
&par: using right hand to show rotation of motor

NOTE PITCH HERE for next two SOK sequences; pitch in listening mode much lower than in storytelling mode

69 SOK: yeah -, %pro: listening (not in narrative thread)
70 SOK: yeah -, car motor air conditioning on %pro: repeating the factual statement
%com: SOK doesn’t get the point yet that MAR is trying to make about sitting in a car in a closed garage with the motor on
%par: gestures turning ignition on
71 MAR: you can get sick -,# and //die -!
72 SOK: no -, no -, no -, long -, /not /long //time -.
73 MAR: uh -, uh: -.
74 SOK: but /hour: -, hour half like /that you know .
%mor: connective "but"
%err: half pronounced as 'hap'
%pro: listing hour, hour half like that you know
75 MAR: the wind stopped
%pro: barely audible; can be lipread from video tape
NEW SEGMENT: SOK tells what happens after the dust storm dies down

PITCH check here—seems to be at lower level at transition point after climax; later goes into narrative high pitch when he resumes excitement of storytelling

76 SOK: then [ ] then that’s win - , [//] wind’s // go: ne - ,
%mor: connective “then”; PAST/go; wind’s (v:aux/be&3S) — see p. 110
%par: 2-hand slide “all finish” on ‘gone’

77 MAR: uh huh -.

78 SOK: and we have to / open

79 SOK: you know the // a: ll you know / shop you know - ,
%par: shoveling motion

80 SOK: you know // clean // ah:: - !
%par: groaning on ‘ah’

81 MAR: my gosh -.
%par: yaw (listener helping to scaffold

82 MAR: <one time - > [ - ]
%par: holding up one finger

83 SOK: <can not // < can not work
%mor: neg/not
%par: leaning toward MAR (expressing sincerity, “I’m telling you a true story”; “it was really bad”)

84 SOK: all cleaning you know - .
%mor: -ing

85 MAR: yeah - , it’s dust !
%par: showing thickness between thumb and fingers of right hand

86 SOK: // a: ll // dust you know !
%par: motioning to left hand side as if big “hills” of dust

87 MAR: you mean like piles of dust ?
%lst: $ml (meaning clarification)

88 SOK: yeah -.

89 MAR: wow !

90 MAR: this is / ti / yadh !
%par: nodding affirmatively (as if to say “it’s just like I thought it was!”)

91 SOK: this - , come // in you know uh this much uh uh // space / come / in like / that you know
%par: left hand showing amount of space, right hand entering the space to simulate dust;

92 SOK: // a: ll // like this you know - , / mountain - .
%par: it hd holding size of opening; it hd begins to swirl, moves overhead to show it’s everywhere

93 MAR: right (immediately after “space” but does not interrupt the flow

94 MAR: 0
%par: puff cheeks as he describes the mountain of dust; then laughing

95 SOK: wa !

96 SOK: that’s [/ that’s // true: you know uh // strong you know - , / wind - .
%par: thrusting two fists in forward motion on the word ‘strong’
%pro: “grunting” on ‘wa’
%par: laughing

PITCH CHANGE HERE for “true”, background

97 MAR: that’s the desert -.

98 SOK: yeah - , yeah -.

99 MAR: you know desert [“] ?

100 SOK: 0
%Err: $UNP (unfilled pause-see p. 97 hesitation codes)
101 MAR: you know desert [""]?
%spa: &Re (spontaneous repeat after noticing hearer has not understood)
102 MAR: like no trees -, no water -.
%spa: &ELABSELF (elaborate on preceding utterance)
%par: gesturing with flat hand sweep on 'no trees', 'no water'
103 SOK: yeah -, /no //trees -.
%mor: trees/PL (echo?)
104 SOK: /no //trees -, yeah -.
105 MAR: I know -, I know -, I've been there -.
106 MAR: I have pictures -.
107 MAR: the /sand in Ri'ydh is // beautiful -, it's so # like white sand -, 108 SOK: yeah -, yeah -.
109 MAR: I just love it !
110 MAR: I have pictures , but not here in Hawaii -. 111 MAR: wow ! any other special memories of Saudi Arabia ?
Narrative 11. ‘MOON WALK’ (Sok)

@Date of recording: 28-OCT-1998
@Audio tape Location: Sok tape 1, side b
@Video tape location: Housekeeping, tape #2
@Audio counter start: near end of Sok master tape, Oct. 13,15 & 28,1998, side B (before Dust Storm segment)
@Video time start: 0.53.52 – 0.56.25
@Length of segment: 6:37 (including preliminaries)
@Note: actual Moon Walk segment starts 2 pages down

Special features of this segment: large amount of prior material regarding age and experience learning English in school in Korea precedes the Moonwalk segment. Marked transitions here between low-pitched general conversation and high-pitched narratives told with excitement. Many solidarity moves between SOK and MAR: gestures and code-switching to Arabic and Korean. MAR uses some modified ASL [American Sign Language] code-switches. Several overlaps between the speakers. Several negotiated meaning segments: SOK requests lexical input from MAR; MAR misunderstands SOK’s information about high school; SOK has trouble understanding when MAR shifts topic to John Glenn. Several examples of MAR elaborating her utterance to facilitate SOK’s understanding. Syntax: SOK uses plural -s two times (years), but omits it on the same words in other contexts.

‘John Glenn’-preliminary segment to ‘Moon Walk’ (Sok)

1 MAR: oh -, did you see about # the astronaut John Glenn -?
   %par: MAR gestures with hand toward SOK “oh by the way”, then index finger pointing up; smiling on “John Glenn”; smile fades when MAR realizes SOK doesn’t follow
   %com: John Glenn, at age 77, was scheduled to be the oldest man to go up in space the next day and there was major news coverage of that during the week the interview took place.

2 SOK: 0

3 MAR: it was in [?] the news@as [as=asl] -?
   %par: ASL-like body shift toward imaginary tv, with eye gaze on SOK; left hand signs modified “LOOK-AT-LOC” (look-at modified to end with full open palm; TV location was already been set up with body shift but without lexical identification—example of modified code-switching using second language resources when MAR aware that SOK doesn’t actually know ASL)
   %com: code-switching to ASL (communicative strategy)

4 SOK: <John Glenn> [“] -?
   %spa: $i= give this a code (when NNS repeats/echoes but doesn’t understand and seems to seek clarification)

5 MAR: the American #/astronaut -, pssssh !
   %int: MAR makes sound of “blast off”
   %par: MAR spirals index finger upward to represent space ship taking off

6 SOK: yeah -.
   %spa: $i= give this a code (when NNS agrees but doesn’t really understand)
MAR: did you see -?
%com: from previous unconvincing "yeah" MAR deduces that SOK has not really understood her point
%spa: $r$&ELABSELF
SOK: 0
%par: SOK sitting very still without animation, trying to figure out what MAR is talking about
MAR: no -?
MAR: to/morrow -,
%act: setting cup down on the table to better explain
SOK: uh: -,
MAR: John Glenn -, the //first +/
%par: MAR holding up ld index finger, starting to make circling motion forward
SOK: yeah -., yeah -., yeah -., yeah !
%int: "choking" intonation: "I get it!"
%par: SOK [politely and delicately] patting MAR crossed knee to signify "I get it!";
SOK readjusting himself in his chair by putting hands on chair arms and re­settling on seat
MAR: <go around> [>]<yeah -., yeah> [<>] -,
MAR: [t]is a yeah -., yeah -.
MAR: yeah -.
SOK: yeah ! yeah ! the # yeah -., yeah -.
MAR: seventy seven years //old !
SOK: I [/] I saw you know -, tv
MAR: right !
SOK: watch tv -.
MAR: his age is seventy seven -.
SOK: yeah -.
SOK: seventy seven -.
MAR: and he's -, tomorrow he's going into space -.
SOK: yeah -, yeah -.
MAR: right ! so +...
Narrative 11. ‘Moon Walk’ (Sok)

1 SOK: you know #-, uh: -,
%nar: $BEG
%par: SOK speaking with serious face, eyes rolling (trying to get vocabulary to explain his story?)

2 SOK: Ameri/-can: # first time you know moon [/] moon wha(t’)s call?
%nar: $STY:new
%pro: rise on Ameri-"can
%par: SOK’s hands lift from chair arms on “American”; SOK reaching out with left hand as he asks for lexical item “moon walk”
%spa: $i=OTHVoc
%mor: what to do here? “What’s it called?”

3 MAR: <moon walk> [“]
%spa: $ii=
%par: 2 hands flat palms making walking steps

4 SOK: <moon walk> [“] moon walk -, yeah -.
%spa: $ii=

5 SOK: I //saw you know in /Korea -.
%nar: $STY:cmx (cpl?)
%pro: voice a little “trembling”, as if in awe, or an impressive memory; pitch rise on “in Korea”
%mor: see/PAST
%par: smiling gently;
%spa: NNS needs thinking time to organize utterance

6 SOK: yes -.
7 SOK: I #-, mmm -, +/-.
%par: pointing to self with palm

8 MAR: I remember that -.
%par: nodding, pointing to self with index finger

9 SOK: I //have you //know # -.
%spa: NNS needs thinking time to organize utterance

10 SOK: mmm: my [/] my //town is only //two uh tvs //there you know -.
%nar: $STY:cpl
%mor: tv/PL
%com: plural –s on tv’s
%par: SOK spreading flat palms on “my town”; holding up 2 fingers on left hand for 2 TVs; SOK leaning toward MAR, as if to emphasize this fact, then reaches toward MAR with the 2 fingers for further emphasis.

11 MAR: oh: -, really ?

12 SOK: //two /tv/ys -.
13 SOK: my //house in is [?] /tv -.
%par: gesturing to self for “my” and shape of “Christmas tree” when saying “TV”

14 MAR: you had a tv ?

15 SOK: yeah -.

16 MAR: two tvs in the whole town -, and you had //one -?
%par: holding up 2 fingers, then ASL-like sign uninitialized “GROUP”, then 1 finger

17 SOK: yeah -, I have one -.
%par: holding up one finger

18 MAR: because working in Saudi Arabia -.
%par: pointing index at SOK

19 SOK: no -, no -.

20 SOK: I have [/] I’ve working in [/] in uh: United State(s) Army -,
what to do about “have/I’ve working???
“have” is an echo of “have a TV”?

[SOK] in [] in uh: uh: motor pool -.

[SOK]: so -, you know -, making little bit money -, euh -?
%mor: what to do about “making”?
%par: hand gestures; “wink” of modesty when talking about making money

[SOK]: <little bit money> (?)[>]
[SOK]: <so what year> [<] was that -?

[SOK]: the moon -, on the moon -, what year -?
%par: left hand out; looking away from SOK to try to remember the year
uh:
%int: very low pitch

[MAR]: sixty +/.

[MAR]: sixty # eight -, nine -?
%par: rotating left hand in “approximately” gesture

[SOK]: sixty eight -, sixty(y) nine -,
[SOK]: like that -.

[SOK]: eight +.

[MAR]: so you had a tv -,
%spa: NS scaffolding of NNS narrative: clarifying the facts and helping to build sequence

[SOK]: yeah -, yeah -, yeah -,

[MAR]: and many friends came -?
%par: using index finger pointing to space in front of body (place where friends came)

[SOK]: //many friend coming -.
%mor: what to do about “-ing”?  
%par: imitating MAR gesture, using index to represent many friends coming

[SOK]: like that -.

[SOK]: you know -,  
%par: shaking head “in disbelief”

[SOK]: tv is my eh: my //room you know -,
%par: 2 hands shaping square, then emphatic gesture in central space

[SOK]: this /one //take //out -.
%par: 2 arms gesturing in left to right motion that everything came out; looking at MAR

[SOK]: then you know //all: //open -,
%nar: $STY:lst
%pro: list intonation; story continues
%par: gesturing “open doors” (like curtains)

[SOK]: you know uh: //doors //open -,
%par: gesturing with both arms

[MAR]: uh huh -,

[SOK]: yeah -.

[SOK]: //then -, you know -,
%nar: $STY:new
%par: laughing

[SOK]: //garden -, you know -,  
%nar: $STY: new (continuation of previous line)
laughing heartily; to show expanse of the “garden” (yard)

MAR: how many //people were there -?

SOK: ah: lot # [$] lot o(f) people -,

SOK: look likes over hundred!

what to do about “look likes”?

both SOK and MAR laughing

MAR: wow!

MAR: <small tv> [>] or big tv -?

SOK: <yeah> [<] -

SOK: oh -, eighteen inch -.

SOK: eighteen inch -.

MAR: oh-, that’s big -, that time

SOK: <that time you know -> [>] yeah

SOK: <big -, yeah -> [<]

SOK: that’s //big -, yeah -.

MAR: black and white # only -, „yeah -?

SOK: yeah -.

SOK: black and //white -, right -.

SOK: 0

MAR: 0

laughing spontaneously with MAR at the memory

laughing spontaneously with SOK at the memory
Narrative 12. 'Divorce' (Sang Ho)

@Date of recording: 11-NOV-1998
@Recording modes: audio and video
@Audio tape location: Sang Ho Park tape 11/11/98, Side A, 248-294
@Video tape location: Park video, Memorable Events
@Audio counter: Counter 248
@Time start video: 
@Length of segment: 1:57

@Warning: Transcript needs cross-checking and coding
@Transcriber comment: Later version (coded segments version) available?

1 SHP: sometimes, sometimes is uh: Korean people divorce.
2 MAR: uh:
3 SHP: I don't understand.
4 *SHP: if so [?] divorce, sometimes meet
5 SHP: so meet yeahQ
6 SHP: have dinner and then ???
7 MKP: ???
8 SHP: Korean style divorce cannot
9 SHP: after thing [?] 
10 SHP: [can?] not meet
11 SHP: yeah?
12 SHP: American style - , I dunno
13 SHP: after divorce, , yeah?
14 SHP: ???
15 SHP: yeah
16 SHP: divorce whole family drinking - , congratulation coming [: means graduation?] - ,
17 MAR: ???
18 SHP: why this one/ 
19 SHP: why meet - , why this one divorce yeah? huh?
20 MAR: good question, d +/-.
21 SHP: yeah! after[/] after divorce (rising intonation)
22 SHP: get [?] divorce yeah .
23 SHP: sometimes son # meet - , wife meet - ,
24 MAR: weddings
25 SHP: yeah wedd: ing and then xx xx coming .
26 SHP: I don't understand!
27 SHP: Korea xx cannot!
28 SHP: divorce OK go 'way, go 'way, no! no cannot!
29 SHP: I no understand .
30 MAR: do you want me to give you my opinion ?
31 SHP: no!
%par: laugh
32 MAR: no ?
33 MAR: you don't want my opinion ?
34 SHP: no -, I know xx xx ???
35 SHP: ???? around is much business ???
36 MAR: mmm
37 SHP: family is much ???
so -, I guess different yeah 'cause Korean xx xx very different
why do you think?
what is your reason?
why do you think +/-
no:!
ok -, so I understand your question
American very style
Korean very different
I- whon (speaking Korean)
RETELING EPISODES AFTER VIEWING *Modern Times*

Narrative 13: "The Waif: I no more house" (Young Eun)
Narrative 14: "Beautiful House" (Young Eun)
Narrative 15: "Me sneaky: Stealing the bread" (Sun Ja)
Narrative 16: "In the restaurant: Going lady together" (Sun Ja)
Narrative 17. "Big junk house: lady this love not problem" (Sun Ja)

---

Narrative 13: "The Waif: I no more house" (Young Eun)

@Date of recording: 17-DEC-98
@Recording modes: audio and video
@Audio tape location: Housekeeping video & Modern Times comments, Side B
@Video tape location: YEL tape Dec. 12 & Dec. 17, 1998
@Audio counter:
@Time start video:
@Length of segment:

Special features of this narrative:
%Narrative roles of characters (handling the retelling of actions of 2 other characters); %Excellent example of narrator’s reliance on interlocutor’s shared knowledge of conversational competence

1  MAR: so they met in the bus -,
     www
     and then the bus had a crash
2  YEL: yeah .
3  MAR: and they fell out .
   \cchimsay.wav
4  YEL: him say, oh 'you never remember ?
%nar: $sty $quo:ID $quo:oth
%pro: high pitch on interrogative segment
5  YEL: I uh bread [breaking?] kakkum[@k]
%pro: high pitch continues on 'I uh bread', lowers on 'kakkum'
%par: YEL laughing
6  YEL: pang kakkote[?] [@k]
%gls: ‘pang’ = bread
7  MAR: yeah __, ok __,
   \qshe.wav
8  YEL: him say [said?] um __, +”
%nar: $sty $quo:ID
9  YEL: uh __, question __, she __
%nar: $bgd (explanatory background to listener to make sure I understand the ‘set-up’)
%pro: ‘question’ with high-to-falling pitch; she with low level pitch as if explaining who he asked the question to
%com: note YEL’s careful explanation of who is talking to who and metalinguistic explanation ‘question she’

10 MAR: uh uh uh uh
11 YEL: +” where you live?
   %nar: $sty $quo:oth
12 MAR: righ.

→ CCNMHSE.WAV

13 YEL: um -,
14 YEL: +” I no more house.
   %nar: $sty $quo:oth
   %com: note that YEL gives no preface to girl’s answer, whereas she was quite careful to set up the Q&A situation when saying what Charlie was asking the girl (indicates reliance on interlocutor’s knowledge of conversational sequencing?)
   %pro: low pitch on ‘house’, pitch contour portrays affect: rather plaintive statement of the girl
15 YEL: and
   %pro: prominence on ‘and’
   %com: transfer of L1 prosody to L2
16* YEL: house # every room house [?]
   %com: YEL means ‘I live everywhere’, i.e. ‘everywhere is my home’?

17 MAR: yeah .
18 YEL: yeah !
19 MAR: right -, right -, right -.
20 YEL: and all together [/-] yeah -, #
   com: example of false start without retracing, i.e. abandoning because too complex to say in English
21 YEL: live -.
22 YEL: together live -
   %nar: $sty
   %pro: high pitch on these 2 words and rising on ‘live’, as if finding a thread that she can hang the next sequence on
23 MAR: ah ! right -, ri- ri- ri- right -. [>]
24 YEL: [together live and] [<]
   %pro: rising pitch stress on ‘and’
25 YEL: um #### -,  
26 YEL: um #### -,  
   %com: YEL doesn’t seem to know how to continue her narrative thread (forgot? English problems? [check video tape here for actions--good example of why video tape is important in interpretation of meaning]
27 YEL: and -, 
   %pro: drawn out syllable, it feels ‘tentative’, not like the other ‘and’ connectives
   %com: YEL seems to be ‘buying time’, not knowing where to go next in her narrative or how to say what she wants to say
27 MAR: oh -, yeah then [/+]
28 YEL: then him[/-] him and again jail.. [girl?]  
29 MAR: yeah !
Narrative 14: "Beautiful House" (Young Eun)

@Date of recording: 17-DEC-98
@Recording modes: audio and video
@Audio tape location: Housekeeping video & Modern Times comments, Side B
@Video tape location: YEL tape Dec. 12 & Dec. 17, 1998
@Audio counter:
@Time start video:
@Length of segment:

Special features of this segment:
Example of YEL not catching English [micro]-prosodic cues: (beautiful house)

1. YEL: and together oh la la la la
   • %par: YEL and MAR laughing
2. MAR: la la la la right!
   www
3. MAR: yeah la la la la where did they go?
4. YEL: um: # beach!
5. YEL: beachside yeahQ >
6. MAR: <oh -, right -, right> [<].
7. YEL: some house big yeahQ -. 
8. YEL: <some>

→ MKPbtfl.wav
9. MAR: big beautiful house?
   %pro: questioning intonation on ‘beautiful’

→ btflhse.wav
10. YEL: yeah, beautiful house.

→ Mbfhlhse.wav
11. MAR: ‘beautiful’ house?
    %pro: very shrill.
12. YEL: no! first time beautiful house >
    %pro: high pitch on ‘first time’ ‘house’
13. YEL: and >
14. MAR: <first time, yeah > [<]
15. YEL: and husband wife6 yeah -, bye bye yeahQ .
16. MAR: ri ri ri right -. 
17. YEL: looking yeahQ -. 
    %pro: get pitch extraction on yeahQ
18. YEL: laughing
19 MAR: right!
20 MAR: I want -, 
21 YEL: yeah -. 
22 MAR: me too! 
23 YEL: xx xx together yeahQ 
24 YEL: you two together yeahQ 
25 YEL: live yeahQ 
%nar: end of story 
%pro: falling pitch 
26 MAR: oh! 
27 YEL: very nice. 
%rar: evaluative comment at end of narrative segment 
28 YEL: like yeahQ 
29 YEL: xx xx xx[/+]
%com: retraction with correction

→ CCSHESAY.WAV
30 YEL: she said "+
%nar: $sty $quo:ID
31 YEL: "oh yeah! 
%nar: $quo:oth
%pro: very 'sweet, cute' imitation of the girl's personality; replaying the character
32 MAR: yeah! 
%com: MAR joins the role play here; this is not a 'confirmation' yeah but a modified role play
33 YEL: "+" together -, yeah! 
%par: laughing and giggling at her portrayal and at thought of the scene (she had giggled a lot from enjoyment while watching the film clip)
34 MAR: yeah! and she goes [making musical sounds of people skipping off together]
35 YEL: so happy together! 
%nar: $evl (end of one segment)
36 YEL: and # there coming -, 
37 YEL: and all house # 
%com: retraction with time to organize her words
38 MAR: right. 
39 YEL: all house # she say "+
%nar: $sty $quo:ID
40 YEL: "+"oh something # make yeahQ. 
%nar: $sty $quo:oth 
41 MAR: right [>].
42 YEL: bread and -, 

445
%nar:
pro: listing
43 YEL: coffee I think.
44 YEL: something make yeah.
%nar: $aff:gen (and definitive, as if closing this segment) $
Narrative 15: "Me sneaky: Stealing the bread"  (Sun Ja)
@Date of recording: 27-NOV-98
@Recording modes: audio and video
@Audio tape location: Housekeeping video & Modern Times comments Nov. 27, Side B
@Video tape location: Modern Times comments tape (SOK & SHY on same tape)
@Audio counter:
@Time start video:
@Length of segment: 3:30 (entire retell sequence)

1  SJL:  this man you know bread sneaky [?] yeahQ yeah sneak [?]yeahQ
2  SJL:  this going you know together fall down yeahQ
3  SJL:  and this man say this one oh me sneaky [?] this kind yeahQ
4  SJL:  this lady this one not problem
5  SJL:  thinking yeahQ
6  SJL:  oh me problem OK
7  SJL:  this man say 'me sneaky'
     %nar: $sty:quo :oth 'me sneaky'
8  SJL:  this kind over here
9  SJL:  later this one
10 SJL:  each other yeahQ
11 SJL:  is6 good yeah yeah
Narrative 16. "In the restaurant: Going lady together" (Sun Ja)

@Date of recording: 27-NOV-98
@Recording modes: audio and video
@Audio tape location: Housekeeping video & Modern Times comments Nov. 27, Side B
@Video tape location: Modern Times comments tape (SOK & SHY on same tape)
@Audio counter:
@Time start video:
@Length of segment:

Special features of this segment: highlights syntactic and lexical limitations when subject is not familiar one

1. MAR: what about in the restaurant, the man goes in the restaurant
2. SJL: restaurant this one no more money yeahQ
3. SJL: yeah no more money this one plenny food
4. SJL: this eating over here yeahQ
5. SJL: and this one uh lady already kitchen this going yeahQ
6. SJL: yeah this going
7. SJL: this man uh I thinking
8. SJL: this one no more money
%nar: $sty:lst
9. SJL: policeman coming
%nar: $sty:lst
10. SJL: and catch him [catching ?]
%nar: $sty:lst
11. SJL: and this going uh lady this together I think
12. SJL: thinking this man yeahQ
13. MAR: ahh!
14. SJL: each other together thinking
15. SJL: this over there truck this over here man coming
16. SJL: lady already coming
17. SJL: and
18. SJL: together in truck
19. MAR: oh! in the truck! Charlie Chaplin wants to meet the lady
20. SJL: this one yeah
21. SJL: this man I thinking thinking
22. SJL: woman is plenny eating
23. SJL: no more money yeahQ
24. SJL: policeman coming
25. SJL: kitchen this going
26. SJL: and
27. SJL: later lady coming this one xx
Narrative 17: "Big junk house : lady this love not problem" (Sun Ja)

@Date of recording: 27-NOV-98
@Recording modes: audio and video
@Audio tape location: Housekeeping video & Modern Times comments Nov. 27, Side B
@Video tape location: Modern Times comments tape (SOK & SHY on same tape)
@Audio counter:
@Time start video:
@Length of segment:

1  MAR: what about the house?
2  SJL: house, this one oh
3  SJL: this man thinking uh
4  SJL: before you know no time this very good
5  SJL: this house
6  SJL: this old time this broken yeahQ
7  SJL: big junk house
8  SJL: <junk car> this one [/]junk house over here
9  SJL: each other
10 SJL: and
11 SJL: lady this love this one not problem everything yeahQ
12 SJL: not problem
Notes for Chapter 1

1 The qualifying term 'nominally English-speaking community' is used because the research was carried out in Honolulu, Hawai‘i, where the language of public institutions such as schools, government and the press is indeed 'standard' English, but there is also a significant representation of languages spoken in the Asia-Pacific region throughout the island of O‘ahu. Honolulu is a multi-ethnic and multilingual community in which 27.2% of local residents reported on the 1990 U.S. federal census that a language other than English was spoken in the home. (These statistics can be compared with percentages reported in other states which have sizeable numbers of speakers of languages other than English, e.g., Texas 24.7%, California 30.6%, New Mexico 37.4%, New York 23.4%).

Out of a state population of a little over 1,000,000 persons over the age of five, a total of 14,636 individuals reported speaking Korean at home in the 1990 census, of which a little over 10,000 stated that they could also speak English 'very well' or 'well' (State of Hawai‘i 1998:52). Korean thus ranks fifth in order of number of reported speakers of languages other than English in Hawai‘i, after Japanese (69,587), Tagalog (55,341), Ilokano (26,283), 'Chinese' [mostly Cantonese] 25,489, and ahead of Spanish (13,723), Samoan (9,420), and Vietnamese (4,620). (State of Hawai‘i 1998:52; U.S. Bureau of the Census 1990 CPH-L-133). Self-reported figures are of course subject to many caveats, a primary one with respect to language use being whether the speakers of the language consider their 'native tongue' to be a 'language' worthy of mention on a formal census count, or whether they consider their native tongue to be a 'mere dialect' not worthy of mention. (As an illustration of this phenomenon, see comments below regarding the number of Hawai‘i residents who identified themselves in the 1990 census as speakers of local Pidgin (968) or Hawaiian Pidgin (48), out of a total population over the age of five of approximately 1,000,000!)

Another measure of Hawai‘i’s linguistic composition is the fact that the 1990 census reported 38,773 'linguistically isolated' households in the state. The U.S. Bureau of the Census' definition of a linguistically isolated household is 'one in which no person 14 or older speaks English at least very well' (U.S. Bureau of the Census 1990: CPHL-90). The information for this assessment of language ability is based upon respondent’s written answers on the census form, as well as from census takers’ estimation when making home visits to non-respondents. Out of the 38,773 linguistically isolated households identified in Hawai‘i, 562 were Spanish-speaking, 22,677 spoke an Asian or Pacific island language, and 710 spoke another language. Information on the remaining households was not provided (1990 Census of Population and Housing Summary Tape File 3A).

The early results of the 2000 Census demonstrate that the general features of the linguistic pattern of Hawai‘i were maintained over the intervening decade: Out of a total population of 1,100,761 persons over age five in Hawai‘i in 2000, an estimated 286,792 people reported speaking a language other than English in the home (approximately 26% of the population), of which 121,429 were estimated to speak English 'less than 'very
well". Out of the total population speaking a language other than English in the home, 252,820 reported that they spoke an Asian or Pacific island language, and of those, 114,798 reported speaking English less than "very well". (The cited Census 2000 data were obtained from a data sample, with a 90 percent confidence interval. Data were obtained from the Supplementary Survey, which surveyed only household populations and excluded residents of institutional quarters such as college dormitories.) (See http://www.census.gov/c2ss/www/Products/Profiles/2000/Tabular.)

According to an article describing Hawai‘i’s ethnic composition which appeared in the Honolulu Advertiser after the results of the 2000 census were available, ‘[t]he proportion of all Asians in America live [in Hawai‘i], and only California, New York and Texas outnumber Hawai‘i in raw counts of Asian Americans’ (Bricking 2001). Furthermore, overall in the state of Hawai‘i, 21.4% of the population self-identified as mixed race in the 2000 census, and Asians constituted 41.6% of the population (Bricking 2001).

With respect to self-identified ethnic Koreans, according to the 2000 Census, the proportion of Koreans in Hawai‘i declined by 3.7% (decreasing in raw numbers from 24,454 persons who reported being Korean in 1990 to 23,537 persons in 2002). However, for the first time, the 2000 census was revised to allow for self-identification of mixed-race heritage, e.g., ‘race alone or in combination’. Using the mixed-race category, 41,352 persons in the state reported being of Korean heritage. (U.S. Census Bureau, Summary File 1 Hawaii (July 25, 2001), cited in State of Hawai‘i 2001:55).

In terms of in-migration and settlement patterns among Korean immigrants, between 1993 and 1998, the latest date for which published figures are available, 2,495 Korean residents of Hawai‘i were naturalized (State of Hawai‘i 2001:73). In the period 1994-1998, 1,708 immigrants reporting Korea as their country of birth indicated to the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service upon arrival that Hawai‘i was their ‘State of intended permanent residence’ (State of Hawai‘i 2001:72; Source: U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service, Office of Policy and Planning, 1998 Statistical Yearbook at http://www.ins.gov/graphics/aboutins/statistics/imm98.pdf)

In addition to the languages of immigrant groups, the linguistic mosaic of Hawai‘i contains two more significant local components which potentially contribute to immigrants' language repertoire: the Hawaiian language and local ‘Pidgin’, also known as Hawai‘i Creole English.

Since 1978, the state has recognized both English and Hawaiian as official languages (State of Hawai‘i 1993, §1-13: 240-241; see also Lee 1993:192). Hawai‘i is thus the only state of the 50 U.S. states to recognize a language other than English as an official language, owing primarily to the moral weight in contemporary politics of the overthrow of the independent Hawaiian kingdom by American interests in 1893. A Hawaiian language instructor and participant in the movement to revitalize the Hawaiian language, William H. Wilson (1998) wrote, ‘The history of Hawai‘i as a multiracial independent country controlled by an indigenous monarchy has assured the Hawaiian language a symbolic place in representing Hawai‘i to the people of Hawai‘i and the world’ (124). The Committee of the Whole’s 1978 report to the state legislature recommending adoption of the amendment by which Hawaiian became an official
language stated that it had reached this decision ‘...in order to give full recognition and honor to the rich cultural heritage that Hawaiians have given to all ethnic groups of this State...’ and further, ‘to overcome certain insults of the past where the speaking of Hawaiian was forbidden in the public school system, and of today where Hawaiian is listed as a foreign language in the language department at the University of Hawai‘i’ (State of Hawaii 1980:1016). By the same 1978 vote, the residents of Hawai‘i also voted for the establishment of a ‘Hawaiian education program consisting of language, culture and history in the public schools’ (State of Hawai‘i 1993, Art. X, Sec. 4: 155). The full impact of the history of Hawai‘i on the linguistic phenomena of the state, however, lies beyond the scope of this current study and will not be dealt with in further detail.

A significant portion of the population of Hawai‘i also speaks the language of local identity as its first language in the home. For many island residents, it is their primary spoken language throughout most of their lives. In local parlance, this language is referred to as ‘Pidgin English’ or simply ‘Pidgin’, but linguists have given it the designation ‘Hawai‘i Creole English’ (HCE), to reflect its origins and its lexifier language. In addition to influences from Chinese, Japanese, English, and languages of other immigrants to the islands since the 1820s, HCE incorporates many structures and tenus inherited directly from Hawaiian. (See Siegel 2000 for a thorough and well-documented discussion of the substrate languages contributing to the shaping of HCE.) Although in the 1990 U.S. census only about 1,000 people in Hawai‘i reported speaking Pidgin (48 individuals reported speaking ‘Hawaiian Pidgin’ and 968 reported speaking ‘Pidgin’) (State of Hawai‘i 1998: 52), this is far from a reflection of actual reality. This gross under-identification is due primarily to the social status of ‘Pidgin’ as a denigrated form of English not considered to be a language in its own right and therefore not deserving of mention on an official government document.

Arditty and Coste (1987:19), referring to conversations between speakers of different native languages in the European context, offer a description of linguistic repertoire which is also applicable to the Hawai‘i context when they say that ‘the notion of mother tongue is inoperative in certain cultures and in certain individual cases and it would be preferable to speak of language "used" or language "of reference", which implies that an individual may have several languages’ [in one's repertoire].

Further details regarding the language context and the role of both Hawaiian and Pidgin (i.e., HCE), as these related to language usage in the work environment of the Korean narrators is provided in Chapter 3, Section 3.2.1.

2 The term 'implicit' knowledge might also be used here to refer to the phenomenon I am labeling 'instinctive', as discussed in H.Y. Kim (1995), Schmidt (1993a, 1993b, 1994) and Hulstijn and de Graaf (1994), but as the focus of this study is on learners' resources in producing output, rather than on processing of input, the context in which 'implicit' knowledge has been discussed by the above researchers, I will not invoke the concept of 'implicit' knowledge.

3 'Communicative competence' as it is used here is not to be confused with what Schumann, discussing his longitudinal study of the untutored acquisition of English by
Alberto, referred to as the 'communicative function' of language, defined as 'the transmission of referential, denotative information', in contrast with the other two functions of language, the 'integrative' and the 'expressive' (See Perdue, ed. 1984:249-250).

4 For further discussion of competing definitions of 'competence', see Fillmore (1979:87-93).

5 Lambert and Tucker (1972), in explaining the genesis of the St. Lambert French language immersion project, give an excellent portrayal of the socio-political climate which reigned in Quebec at the time, a climate which led not only to the launching of the first bilingual immersion project, but which engendered numerous studies of the factors contributing to the overall success of the program:

What then prompted a group of Canadian parents to offer their children as guinea pigs? Although they had many reservations at the start, they were nonetheless concerned about the apparent ineffectiveness of current methods of teaching foreign languages, not only at the high school level, but also in the elementary schools where FLES (Foreign languages in the Elementary Schools) programs and half-hearted attempts at bilingual training seemed to promise more than was ever actually realized. They were impressed with recent educational research which showed what could be accomplished in teaching science and mathematics in the kindergarten and elementary grades, and they realized how valuable early experience with a foreign language can be, since in bilingual settings young children become bilingual as a matter of course...

As residents of Quebec they were also concerned that political movements were under way to make French the "working language" of the province, meaning that their children would likely encounter strong pressures to learn the language when they finished their schooling. In this sense, these representatives of Canada's majority group were looking a generation ahead with the hope that they could provide their children with a thorough mastery of the present minority group's language. But more than this, these parents and the school authorities who became involved in the project realized that, as residents of a bicultural and bilingual society, they are part of a much larger experiment in democratic coexistence that requires people of different cultures and languages to develop mutual understanding and respect (Lambert and Tucker 1972: 3).

6 For an example of explicit incorporation of language learning strategies into language instruction materials, see the Tapestry textbook series for the teaching of English as a second/foreign language published by Heinle and Heinle, under the general editorship of Rebecca Oxford.

7 Willing (1988:150-151) states this finding in the following terms: 'It should be noted
that none of the learning differences as related to personal variables were of a magnitude
to permit a blanket generalization about the learning preference of a particular
biographical sub-group. Thus, any statement to the effect that "Chinese are X", or "South
Americans prefer Y", or "Younger students like Z", or "High-school graduates prefer Q",
is certain to be inaccurate. The most important single finding of the study was that for
any given learning issue, the typical spectrum of opinions on that issue were represented,
in virtually the same ratios, within any biographical sub-group.'

Selinker himself states that a fellow graduate student at the University of Washington,
Ken Watkin, in an unpublished paper, 'was the first to use the phrase “IL
Hypothesis”’ and further, that Watkin’s (1970) paper ‘seems also to have been the first
empirical attempt to study the phenomenon of fossilization’ (Selinker 1992:xiii).

Regarding his own use of the term, Selinker (1992) provides the following
background: ‘Now here is the crux of coming to the concept of IL. It emerged from years
of experience discussing the experimental language transfer results with colleagues in
two universities, Edinburgh and Washington…The term “interlanguage”, with the
meaning from second language acquisition, appears for the first time in print in General
Linguistics as the write-up of the experimental portions of…[Selinker’s 1966 dissertation]
the language transfer study…'(231). He goes on to cite the definition he provided at the
time:

An ‘interlanguage’ may be linguistically described using as data the
observable output resulting from a speaker’s attempt to produce a foreign
norm, i.e., both his errors and non-errors. It is assumed that such behavior
is highly structured. In comprehensive language transfer work, it seems to
me that recognition of the existence of an interlanguage cannot be avoided
and that it must be dealt with as a system, not as an isolated collection of
errors. (Selinker 1969, fn5) [cited in Selinker 1992:231]

Selinker also acknowledges an intellectual debt to Weinreich, saying, ‘Weinreich
(1953) presented the concept that led me to an initial understanding of language transfer:

Selinker (1992), reflecting on the origins of the interlanguage hypothesis, also
pays tribute to Corder:

‘It is important to note that Corder 1967 [The significance of learners’
errors] is the paper that began current interest in SLA and IL studies.
Whenever I feel that we are not making fast enough progress…I reread
this paper…The study of grammar, for example, is 25000 years old at least,
as is the thinking and talking about language pedagogy. On the other hand,
the study of IL, it is generally agreed, is no more than twenty-five years
old, dating from Corder 1967. I have searched the literature for several
centuries back and there exists no previous systematic study of learner
language, under any name’ (149).

According to Larsen-Freeman and Long (1991:74fn4), the first use of the term
‘interlanguage’ dates from 1935, when it appeared in John Reinecke’s encyclopedic MA thesis entitled *Language and Dialect in Hawaii* [subsequently published as Reinecke 1969]. Larsen-Freeman and Long, paying tribute to Reinecke as a ‘distinguished pidgin/creole scholar, labor historian and social activist’, cite his use of the term ‘interlanguage’ as being the first on record, thus predating its usage by either Selinker or his intellectual mentors, Weinreich and Corder. In discussing language practices among the immigrant laborers on the plantations of Hawai‘i, practices which eventually would give rise to Hawai‘i’s ‘Pidgin’[Creole English], Reinecke said,

[A] makeshift dialect will for the most part be used as the means of communication between the several [immigrant] groups...[which] will tend to pass into a more formal speech—still imperfect as compared with the standard language—as an interlanguage, until finally this more or less standardized lingua franca becomes the primary tongue of nearly the whole body of inhabitants. (1969, p. 115) [cited in Larsen-Freeman & Long 1991:74fn4]

Elaborating on Reinecke’s early use of the term nearly 40 years before the appearance of Selinker’s paper, Larsen-Freeman and Long state that he ‘...always employed “interlanguage” to refer to a non-standard variety of a first or second language, used as a means of intergroup communication, gradually approximating the norms of the standard language of some economically and politically dominant group’ (op.cit.).

Reinecke’s observation of the development of an intergroup language of communication, much as Weinreich’s (1953) discussion of ‘interlingual identifications’ from which Selinker was to draw many valuable insights, in no way contradicts the observations made by later scholars such as Corder and Selinker. Reinecke’s usage, however, just as Weinreich’s terminology, was used for purposes of describing observed phenomena, phenomena which were developed into other lines of reasoning. Reinecke’s usage of the term ‘interlanguage’ did not incorporate the empirical questions of language transfer and the language processing mechanisms such as avoidance strategies, communication strategies, backsliding, rule overgeneralization, simplification, permeability, and fossilization (Selinker 1992: 218 and passim) which are associated with Selinker’s use of the term in his research program within the interlanguage framework.

9 There is, however, the alternative view that formal instruction can accelerate the acquisition of a second language and that formal instruction can also have a ‘powerful delayed effect’ (Ellis 1985: 16) on learners’ ability to hold a conversation. (See discussion in Ellis 1994: 565ff. and especially pp. 621-634 for a discussion of the effects of formal instruction and Pienemann 1985 for a discussion of Pienemann’s teachability hypothesis.)

10 Corder’s own statement regarding the objective of IL studies was that it was to discover ‘the way language learners process the data of language to which they are exposed, whatever the superficially different properties of the data may be, as well as to
discover what the “natural” sequence of development is’ (cited in Selinker 1992: 153 and attributed to Corder 1981:72 [1976]).

With regard to its pedagogical implications, Corder further stated that the findings of IL studies can be applied to the ‘selection, organization and sequencing’ of material for learning in teaching situations’ (Corder 1981, p. 72, cited in Selinker 1992:153).

After more than 30 years of work on interlanguage, Selinker (1992) stated that [preparing teaching materials] ‘is still a powerful motivation for studying IL, for I would maintain that teachers, in order to make intelligent pedagogical decisions, need to have a principled way of contemplating the speech and writing of learners…’ (153).


12 In a review article of Perdue, ed. 1984, the first publication to appear in English reporting on the research program of the European Science Foundation’s longitudinal and cross-linguistic study of untutored immigrant language learners, Selinker (1985-6) states categorically that ‘[t]he volume reviewed here may be the most important book in second language acquisition (SLA) published in the last five years....It is my impression that North American readers in particular are generally unaware of the impressive SLA research being conducted in Europe’ (567). For information on the ESF data base, see European Science Foundation Second Language Acquisition Project http://www.mpi.nl/world/data (maintained at the Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics, Nijmegen, The Netherlands).

13 This was an explicit goal of the European Science Foundation project, for example. See Selinker’s (1985-6) review of Perdue, ed. 1984: ‘The authors stress the importance of studying the SLA process as close to its onset as possible’ (581).

14 See also Ellis (1994:409, note 2) for further citations relating to the use of the term ‘fossilization’ to refer to persistent errors in the target language.

15 Py (1986:344), citing Alber and Py (1984), defines exolingual conversation as ‘all face-to-face verbal interaction characterized by significant differences in the participants’ respective linguistic repertoires’ and he specifies that conversations between native and non-native speakers str but one type of exolingual conversation. Other types of dialogic interaction cited which could be considered exolingual are non-native/non-native, child/adult, layman/specialist, doctor/patient, etc. The essential characteristic of exolingual communication is that ‘the code …that makes communication possible is not shared by both participants’ (Py 1986:345). Arditty & Coste (1987:18-19) state that the term ‘exolingual’ (and its counterpart ‘endolingual’) was first coined by Rémé Porquier (1984) for the purpose of ‘calling into question the common pedagogic practice of attempting to instruct language students on the basis of an ideal communication model between idealized native speakers rather than prepare [students] for concrete situations
where they will face native speakers who are perfectly capable of noticing and taking into consideration their non-native identity' [tr. by author]. See also Baggioni and Py (1987).

16 For a review of methodology used in studies of uninstructed adult language learners, see d'Anglejan & Renaud (1985).

17 Selinker's interest in uninstructed learners was no doubt piqued by Corder's position on the subject. Selinker (1992) acknowledges Corder's influence on his thinking in these terms: 'In a statement that has proved most influential, Corder writes: "Furthermore, I believe that until we...attempt to undertake the longitudinal study of free-learning second language learners, we shall not make much headway with finding out how people learn second languages" (Corder 1981:20 [italics added in Selinker]) This revolutionary suggestion is the first of its kind in the literature and such studies are continually being carried out (e.g. the 'guest-worker' IL studies summarized in Perdue, in preparation.)' (151).

18 The question of whether a learner could arguably be labeled as 'fossilized' after only 14 months' residency in the target language community will not be pursued here.

19 For documentation of 'pidgin English' as spoken by non-immigrant Koreans who have acquired some degree of communicative competence in English in a naturalistic environment, one chapter of Cho's (1992) dissertation provides elicited samples of 'Korean Pidgin English', also referred to as 'Korean Bamboo English', as spoken on and around American military bases in Korea.

Howell and Vetter (1976) also mention the existence of an understudied pidgin developing between U.S. military personnel and local barmaids, and they refer to an earlier work by Webster (1960), which they say indicates a 'remarkable Japanese component in Korean-English pidgin, an artifact of R & R (recreational leave) in Japan for troops stationed in Korea, and of alternate tours of duty done by Americans in Japan and Korea' (296). They explicitly clarify the point that Japanese expressions used in Korean bamboo English must have been introduced by the Americans, not the Koreans, as 'only the older barmaids would have learned any appreciable amount of Japanese under the [Japanese] Annexation [of Korea], which ended in 1945' (296-297).

Finally, a description of basilectal English spoken by adult Koreans who have acquired their knowledge of the language naturalistically can be found in Odlin (1990), who also refers to Korean Bamboo English in his discussion of possible L1 constraints on the acquisition of English word order.

20 It should be noted, however, that the data which informed O'Grady's proposed hypothesis was obtained primarily from instructed learners. To my knowledge, his hypothesis has not been explicitly explored with respect to the conditions of acquisition which tend to prevail in the case of uninstructed language learners.
Perdue (1984), in a brief sketch of the social context in which the ESF investigation of immigrant language learning in five industrialized host European countries was conducted, host countries which included both Sweden and Germany, states the following: 'As a rule, foreign workers do not speak or understand the language of their new social environment when they arrive...Regular adult language tuition is rare, except in Sweden; in Germany, for example, less than 5% of all adult foreign workers ever go to a language course (1)...There is...a general and reciprocal lack of understanding between the host and immigrant communities of the way in which language affects their interaction. This can lead to language problems being evoked by the former as an excuse for direct or indirect discriminatory action, and to strong resentment against the host community on the part of the latter' (2).

It should be noted, however, that this 'plantation class' has been considerably gentrified in the 100 years which have passed since the first Korean immigrants arrived as plantation laborers in 1903. While their jobs are at the low-end of the employment status hierarchy, the payscale of tourist industry hotel maids and custodians compares favorably with other jobs in the local Hawai'i economy, particularly in comparison with other jobs which do not require a high school education or a fluent command of English. (At the time this study was conducted, the pay scale for regular full-time floor maids without supervisory duties was approximately $11 per hour, depending on length of service.) In addition to accruing retirement benefits, a further indication of their socio-economic status is that most of the hotel employees who participated in this study have purchased their own homes or condominium units in desirable middle-class residential areas and/or have paid for a college education for one or more children. Most of them travel to the Mainland U.S. or return to Korea on vacation once a year or at regular intervals. See Patterson (1979) for documentation on the causes of upward mobility of earlier generations of Korean immigrants in Hawai'i, including a reference to the fact that 'by the early 1970s, the Koreans had achieved the highest per capita income and the lowest unemployment rate of any ethnic group in Hawaii, including Caucasians' citing the September 10, 1973 issue of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin.

The Hawai'i hotel chain at which Jasso-Aguilar conducted her study is the same one which employed the Korean immigrant narrators featured in the current study. Jasso-Aguilar's study was conducted in 1996, just one year before the current study was undertaken. Furthermore, her interviews and observations were conducted at some of the same sites and with some of the same individuals as those I encountered in the course of my study. Jasso-Aguilar's descriptions of the working conditions and attitudes of the housekeepers and the institutional representatives can therefore be considered applicable to the context in which this study was conducted.

Speakers of Punjabi and Finnish as source languages, however, were available for the study of only one target language, e.g., English and Swedish, respectively.
A substantial portion of the transcribed data collected in the course of the ESF study has been made available in the form of a computerized corpus (Second Language Data Bank [ESFSLDB]), housed at the Max Planck Institute in Nijmegen, The Netherlands. The corpus consists primarily of interviews, narratives, role plays, picture descriptions and film retellings by second language uninstructed adult learners of English, French, Dutch, German and Swedish collected over a three-year period from 1982 to 1985. The data have been partially annotated using the CHILDES transcription system. The data are available in various formats upon request for use in academic research. Contact information: Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics, P.O. Box 310, 6500 AH Nijmegen, The Netherlands

See also Mann and Thompson (1988).

Notes for Chapter 2

1 Cooper-Kuhlen and Selting (1996) point out, however, that 'the data upon which Bolinger's analysis is based are for the most part constructed by himself. While there can be little objection to the sporadic use of artificial examples for the purpose of argumentation, to build one's intonational theory on the basis of these alone is rather risky...From an interactional perspective, only genuine real-time communication can provide context rich data...[I]t is participants' own handling of prosodic cues within this context that enables empirical proof procedures for the validation of analytic categories. In other words, the theory relies crucially on the way prosody is deployed in real interaction' (23-24).

2 The ToBI [Tones and Breaks Indices] transcription system, based on the Pierrehumbert model, which was designed for prosodic tagging of computerized corpora, is actively being adapted for use by research groups working on a variety of languages. For further information, see the ToBI webpages listed in the references.

3 Reporting on a study conducted with conduction aphasics, Buckingham (1992) claims that they seem better able to retain and reproduce prosodic contours of meaningful phrases than of isolated words, stating that 'phrases from four to eight syllables were much easier to handle for the CA [conduction aphasic] than were single words with four to eight syllables' (99).

4 In a summary of Hoopes' (1998) findings regarding the constraints on 'pinky extension', a phonological variable in American Sign Language, Lucas et al. (2001) state the following:

The findings indicated that the frequency of occurrence of pinky extension did in fact vary and did correlate with linguistic factors (handshape and syntactic category) and the one social factor analyzed (degree of social distance). The most intriguing finding, however, was that pinky extension
tended to co-occur with prosodic features of emphatic stress. Specifically, it tended to occur:

1. with lexemes used repeatedly within a discourse topic;
2. before pauses; and
3. with lexemes lengthened to almost twice their usual duration.

This suggests that pinky extension is itself a prosodic feature of ASL that adds emphatic stress or focus to the sign with which it co-occurs. It is quite analogous to stress in spoken language as indicated by a stronger signal as a result of greater articulatory efforts.

...[A]s Hoopes' study shows, when one searches for factors that constrain, but do not absolutely determine, the occurrence of a linguistic form, the patterning of prosodic features emerges (99).

In the conclusion to his paper, Hoopes (1998) states the following:

An equally important finding of this study was the factors that appear to have no influence upon the occurrence of PE [Pinky Extension]. Topic seems to play no role. Nor does preceding or subsequent handshape seem to have an effect. This is contrary to my initial hypothesis that assimilation would account for much or all of PE (16).

5 I use the term 'built-in' loosely and with caution, subject to the caveats of theories regarding the evolution of the human capacity for language. Whether vocalized communication was an original human endowment, or whether it is the result of evolutionary development, is a topic to be pursued in other contexts.

6 Selting (1992), for example, working in a Gumperz-inspired interactionist framework explains her use of terminology, which includes reference to 'intonation' in the sense commonly used by others to refer to prosody:

Intonation is conceived of here as the perceived temporal organization of predominantly pitch in speech...An intonation contour is a structured pitch configuration or tune which is interpreted as a prosodically cohesive whole on the grounds of (interpreted) rhythm and/or pitch “gestalt”... (234).

The “meaning” and function of intonation is...assumed to be a relational one. Intonation is conceived of as an autonomous signalling system which is mapped onto locutionary textual structures... Intonation in co-occurrence with syntactic, semantic and other locutionary properties is used as a contextualization device in conversational activities to signal the
status and contextual presuppositions of segments and utterances
(Gumperz 1982: cf. esp. chapter 5) (237).

For a detailed discussion of the ambiguity in the use of the terms 'intonation' and 'prosody', see Hirst and Di Cristo (1998:3-7).

A comparison of definitions for the terms 'accent' and 'stress' provided by leading scholars in the field illustrates this divergence:

Crystal (1997 [1991]) has this to say, under the entry for 'accent': '[Accent] is [t]he emphasis which makes a particular word or syllable stand out in a stream of speech... Technically, accent is not solely a matter of loudness but also of pitch and duration, especially pitch... The notion of pitch accent has also been used in the phonological analysis... referring to cases where there is a restricted distribution of tone within words (as in Japanese). A similar use of these variables is found in the notion of sentence accent (also called 'contrastive accent'). This is an important aspect of linguistic analysis, especially of intonation, because it can affect the acceptability, the meaning, or the presuppositions of a sentence, e.g. *He was wearing a red hat* could be heard as a response to *Was he wearing a red coat?*, whereas *He was wearing a red hat* would respond to *Was he wearing a green hat?* The term stress, however, is often used for contrasts of this kind (as in phrases 'word stress' and contrastive stress'). An analysis in terms of pitch accent is also possible (2-3, emphases in the original).

Ladd (1980) has the following to say: 'I argue for a distinction between stress and accent akin to that made by Bolinger: 'stress' at word level, 'accent' at phrase or sentence level--but in many cases where no ambiguity seemed to arise I have loosely used 'stress' to refer to phenomena of syllable prominence in general... Where I have specifically needed a general term to cover both stress and accent, I have used prominence. In the same way, I also argue for the traditional distinction between 'stress' and 'pitch', and have in many cases used intonation... to distinguish pitch phenomena from prominence (x).

Pierrehumbert and Hirschberg (1990) use the two terms as a mirror reflection of the way they are defined by Ladd (1980), e.g., they use the term 'stress' to refer to 'the rhythmic pattern or relative prominence of syllables in an utterance' (271-272), and their model refers to 'pitch accent' at the word level (275).

Of interest, however, is the fact that in Ladd (1996), he subscribes to the Pierrehumbertian analysis, which he labels the 'autosegmental-metrical theory'. Ladd's discussion of the Pierrehumbertian distinction made between pitch accent and stress is as follows: 'pitch accents, in languages that have them, serve as concrete perceptual cues to stress or prominence. However, they are in the first instance intonational features, which are associated with certain syllables in accordance with various principles of prosodic organisation. The perceived prominence of accented syllables is, at least in some languages, a matter of stress, which can be distinguished from pitch accent' (Ladd 1996:42, emphases in the original).
Price, Ostendorf, Shattuck-Hufnagel and Fong (1991:2956) use the term as follows: ‘By “prosody” we mean suprasegmental information in speech, such as phrasing and stress, which can alter perceived sentence meaning without changing the segmental identity of the components.’ However, see Beckman (1996: 64), who says that ‘...prosody is not another word for “suprasegmentals”; rather, it is a complex grammatical structure that must be parsed in its own right.’

Ladefoged (1993:187), however, says that voiceless sounds actually do produce frequencies. However, they are of a very high frequency (and are therefore high pitched) and usually fall above 2000Hz. In the measurements conducted for this study, such high ranges did not register on the speech analysis program. Crystal (1997) also points out that ‘it is possible to hear pitch contrasts in voiceless sounds; and, even in whispered speech, impressions of falling, rising, etc. pitches can be heard…’

The interested reader may consult Bolinger (1978) for examples of similarities in cross-linguistic intonational phenomena drawn from a wide variety of languages.

Bolinger (1978), speaking of the widespread tendency to 'go down at the end', which he claims is the 'the most widely diffused intonational phenomenon' (494), cites the physical explanation provided by Lieberman (1967) in support of this claim: "the infant's hypothetical innate referential breath group" results automatically from an initial build-up of subglottal air pressure, which gradually decreases up to the end of expiration, and then abruptly falls' (Lieberman 1967:47; cited in Bolinger 1978:497). Bolinger agrees with Lieberman's (1967) argument that this fall becomes 'the phonetic marker of complete sentences' (Lieberman 1967:47; cited in Bolinger 1978:497).

The varieties of German which foreign workers are exposed to are so local that other speakers of German find them incomprehensible’ (Perdue 1984).

Eckman (1983), who studied phonological aspects of the English interlanguage of two native speakers of Spanish and two native speakers of Mandarin, found that 'at least some of the IL rules were independent in that they were motivated for neither the NL nor the TL' (195), but he argued that, while not always conforming to either source or target language features, these interlanguage features 'can be correlated with other facts about the NL and TL involved' (216).

The use of the term 'locals' requires some explanation for readers not familiar with the Hawaiian context, as it is not simply a casual label for 'anybody who lives in Hawai‘i'. It is a term reserved for a distinct 'in-group' among the residents of Hawai‘i. What constitutes 'localness' in Hawai‘i is itself a subject for serious sociological investigation, but to characterize it briefly for present purposes, 'local' refers to Hawai‘i-born residents, usually of non-Caucasian ethnic background. The ability to use Pidgin is one important criterion for qualification as 'local'. Some would argue, although there is no universal consensus on this point, that Hawai‘i-born or very-long-term-resident Caucasians can...
also qualify as 'local', at least on certain occasions and in certain circles, by
demonstrating an assimilation to local values through lifestyle, outlook, community
involvement and the use of at least an acrolectal variety of Pidgin under the appropriate
circumstances. It should be added, in this regard, that knowing when the circumstances
call for the use of Pidgin is an important part of demonstrating 'local' insider knowledge.

16 Both the term 'Hawai‘i Creole English' (HCE) and the term 'Pidgin', written with an
uppercase 'P', will be used in this study to refer to one of the local varieties of English in
Honolulu. (A second local and more acrolectal variety of English, known as Standard
Hawai‘i English, will be discussed below.)

The choice of term, (e.g., 'HCE' vs. 'Pidgin') is one of perspective and each time
one or the other of the terms is selected in the text, it will be a motivated choice. The term
'Pidgin' will be used as a descriptor when the context requires speaking of the variety as it
is usually thought of and spoken about by 'locals' in Hawai‘i, and the term 'Hawai‘i
Creole English', or HCE, will be used when referring to the scholarly object of linguistic
study.

The term 'pidgin', written with a lowercase 'p', will be used to refer to the
rudimentary, 'makeshift', 'on the fly' contact language used during exolingual
communication when interactants do not share competency in a common language which
can serve as a lingua franca.

17 As E. Klein (1981) noted, however, 'in a language community such as Hawaii, it is
not always possible to know with certainty what the so-called "target language" is' (244).

18 Following the custom in Korean linguistics, the Yale romanization system is used for
all Korean examples throughout this work, unless otherwise noted. Please consult the list
of Korean Romanization Systems in the prefatory pages to see the equivalences. In the
examples cited in this chapter, the following abbreviations are used to refer to
morphosyntactic elements of Korean (following Sohn 1994, 1999):

AC accusative marker (-ul/lul)
AH addressee honorific (-p/sup-)
DC declarative suffix (-ta)
GEN genitive particle uy
INT intimate speech level marker(-a)
IN indicative mood (-ni-)
NM nominative marker [alt: SM] (-i/-ka)
PL plural marker (-tul)
POL politeness marker (-yo)
PR propositive sentence-type suffix (-ta-)
PST past tense suffix (-ss/ess-)
Q question, e.g. interrogative sentence-type suffix (-ni)
Competence in using indirect quotation structures is deemed so essential for foreigners learning Korean that its mastery is deemed the most important gate-keeping criteria by which students' passage from the high beginner level to the low intermediate level is determined in at least one program teaching Korean as a foreign language in Seoul (Hankuk University of Foreign Studies. 2001. Korean language program, p.c.). Park (1995 [1977]), a classic textbook for the teaching of Korean to foreigners, also introduces indirect discourse in the first level book. The recently published KLEAR series of textbooks (Y.M. Cho et al. 2001), now being widely adopted in Korean language programs at universities in the U.S., introduces indirect discourse early in the first level of intermediate language study (lessons five and six).

Segments from the corpus, when used as examples in the text, will normally not be given with all of the prosodic or other annotations, as this information can be consulted in the more fully transcribed version to be found in Appendix E, Narrative Transcripts. An identifying code is provided with each example in the text, to facilitate identification of its location in the set of transcripts. The identifying code is as follows: name of speaker, abbreviated title of narrative text, line(s) of the transcript which were excerpted. Most of the segments discussed in detail in Chapter Four, as well as a few selected others, have been digitized and are available in audio version on CD-2. Whenever a digitized audio file is available for a particular segment being discussed as an example in the text, a reference to the location of that digitized segment on CD-2 will also be provided. In any case, the main individual narratives (texts 1-12) can be heard in their entirety on CD-1, without separation into individual segments. However, the comments on Modern Times from Sun Ja (texts 15-17) and Young-Eun (texts 13 and 14) are not available on CD-1.

In this case, for example, the transcript from which this excerpt was taken is Young-Eun's story labeled 'The Waif', which corresponds to narrative text number 13. The lines cited here correspond to lines 11 and 13-14 in narrative text 13. There are two digitized audio segments corresponding to the data in the example: ccwhrliv and ccNMhse, which can be searched on CD-2 under the folder entitled YELsegs.

See 'Coding system for written transcripts and locating digitized audio files on accompanying CD-Roms' on page xxiv for further details.

According to Siegel 2000, '[HPE, i.e., Hawaiian Pidgin English, with Hawaiian as the primary lexifier language] was clearly a distinct language by 1910 (Reinecke 1969:166, Roberts 1997:37). Further development of some grammatical features continued in the period from 1910 until the 1920s....Sometime between 1920 and 1930, the number of...
locally born children of immigrants grew to equal the number of foreign-born; it can be
said that this was the time when HCE became fully established' (203).

'...Standard Hawaiian American English [the label used by Vanderslice & Shun Pierson
to refer to what is called 'Standard Hawai‘i English in this study], regionally marked and
distinct from GAE [General American English] particularly in the prosodic features..., is
spoken by many educated Islanders including community leaders, especially those of
non-Caucasian descent' (Vanderslice & Shun Pierson 1967:166).

22 According to Siegel (2000:218) '...The [+Anterior] is bin (been) or wen (went). Bin is
the older form; and wen is now sometimes used to mark the simple past, as a result of
decreolization'. [Siegel 2000 appears to be citing Bickerton 1977a:154.]

23 All of the Bickerton examples are cited in the Odo orthographic system, designed to
provide a phonetic surface level representation of Hawai‘i Creole English in the familiar
Roman alphabet, but avoiding a reliance on English orthographic conventions.

Following the usual convention, examples from other authors will be cited in the
orthography in which they were originally provided by those authors.

24 It is interesting and most likely relevant to her language usage patterns that of all the
narrators, Young-Eun is the only one who has historical ties to the Korean community of
Hawai‘i going back to the first (ilse) generation of Korean immigrants. (See Patterson
1988, 2000 and Choe forthcoming for information on this era.) Most of the other
narrators have extended family in Korea, but all these relatives are first-generation
immigrants who are native speakers of Korean. Young-Eun's relatives, by contrast, are all
local, native speakers of English, with limited knowledge of Korean. Furthermore, of all
the narrators included in this study, only two have children born in Hawai‘i, and Young-
Eun is the only one who reported using mainly English to communicate with any of her
children.

Young-Eun's husband's paternal grandfather was one of the original Korean
immigrants to Hawai‘i in the early 1900s (quite probably with the first group in 1903).
He originally lived on the Big Island of Hawai‘i, but moved to Honolulu after two years
and worked on a plantation on O‘ahu. He and his wife had eight children, five sons and
three daughters, all born in Hawai‘i, including Young-Eun's husband's father, who was
the third son [note: the expression 'third son' possibly to be interpreted as 'third child in
birth order']. This early immigrant and Young-Eun's husband's father, along with several
other relatives, later returned to Korea in the 1930's, but several members of the family
remained in Hawai‘i, including several of Young-Eun's husband's aunts and uncles. Some
of the offspring of the original immigrant who had returned to Korea subsequently made
return visits to Hawai‘i. In general, the family maintained strong ties to Hawai‘i
throughout the years. Of the children of the original immigrant to Hawai‘i, only one 94-
year-old uncle of Young-Eun's husband, still living in Honolulu, remains alive.
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Young-Eun's husband's father was married in Korea and Young-Eun's husband was born there. Based on the fact that his father had been born in Hawai‘i and was therefore a U.S. citizen, Young-Eun's husband later was able to obtain U.S. citizenship upon application to the U.S. embassy in Seoul. Young-Eun thus came to Hawai‘i as the spouse of a citizen in 1972.

She often refers to having an extended family in both Hawai‘i and on the Mainland. (A brother-in-law lived in Arizona, but he has since passed away.) Young-Eun speaks Korean with her husband. Her English is of very low proficiency, but she reports that she uses 'English' with most of the members of her husband's extended family, as they have never lived in Korea, do not speak Korean and are completely 'local' residents in Hawai‘i who attended local schools and then the University of Hawai‘i or a local community college.

In her immediate family, her youngest daughter was born in Hawai‘i and Young-Eun reports that she uses mostly English with this daughter, and both English and Korean with her other two daughters. The youngest daughter's husband is a local Japanese man who does not know Korean, so Young-Eun communicates with him in English.

The introduction to Simonson et al.'s (1981) local best seller *Pidgin to da max* is worth repeating here, not only because it provides a short sample of HCE lexicon, syntax and usage, discussed above, but also because the content expresses some of the communicative values which are prized among users of HCE. The points raised in the introduction, while written in a humorous, informal conversational register, nevertheless raise serious issues such as the connection between local identity and pidgin, as well as individual and social variation and the lack of standardization of HCE.

'Ey! Dis book GOOD FUN, brah! 'Ass why we wen put 'um togeddah you know: so you guys could have good fun too!

But one noddah ting: we get special feeling about pidgin. 'Cause pidgin is special. Local people, dey get togeddah fo' party, wedding, baby luau, whatevahs, dey gotta talk story, yeah? An' how you can talk story wid'out pidgin? Cannot! Pidgin someting from da heart!

You know, we get hahd time fo' put da kine down on paper! An' garans ballbarans, you going look at some da words we get, you going say, "WOW! How dey came up wid' dat? Da guys lolo!" No beeg ting, brah. Mebbe you jus' from one noddah neighborhood! We only can try fo' put down da words people use da most...an' sometimes Waianae pidgin stay real diffrent from Kaimuki pidgin, yeah? So you know, hang loose. Anyway, you gonna like da pictures.
An' you know, we no like insult any particular group of people in da islands--we jus' like kid everybody.

We love Hawaii, an' we love pidgin, an' dass da main ting we trying fo' say.

So kick back, bruddahs, an' relax wit' PIDGIN TO DA MAX!

(Simonson et al. 1981:introduction)

A translation of this text into standard English is provided in Simonson et al. (1981: introduction.).

26 See Carr (1972) for details on the varieties of English spoken in Hawai‘i, which include "Type I", Speech of the Immigrants (based on D.J. Lee's transcription and analysis of the speech of an elderly Korean immigrant who had immigrated to Hawai‘i at a young age in 1916), "Type II", The Early Creole Remnant "Type III", the 'local language', referred to by locals as 'pidgin' (with a lowercase 'p'), "Type IV" Hawaiian Near-standard English, and the acrolectal Hawaiian Standard English, termed ‘Type V’ in Carr. See also Menacker (1998).

27 Vanderslice and Shun Pierson (1967) explain their language labels as follows: ‘We use GAE to refer to the set of American English dialects which share the features under discussion in contrast with Hawaiian American English (HAE), which we define as the English spoken in the state of Hawaii by native or long-term residents whose speech is marked by typical regional characteristics. This latter term thus covers a dialect continuum from standard HAE to broad Pidgin; except after such attributives we use Pidgin and HAE coterminously’ (156).


29 Jun (2001; Lec. 3:3) provides a useful summary table of Pierre Humbert and Hirschberg's (1990) analysis of intonational meaning (for English):

A. Meaning of Pitch Accents  
(P= proposition containing accent item, H=hearer, MB=set of mutual beliefs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pitch Accent</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H*</td>
<td>add P to MB</td>
<td>George likes pie&lt;br&gt; H* H* L-L%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L*</td>
<td>do not add P to MB</td>
<td>George likes pie?&lt;br&gt; L* L* H-H%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L*+H</td>
<td>evokes a scale, conveys a lack of predications</td>
<td>He’s a good badminton player&lt;br&gt; L*+H L-H%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Summary of pitch accents**

L (L*, L*+H, H+L*): For whatever reason, S does not intend to contribute this instantiation to H's mutual beliefs, i.e. not to be added to H's mutual beliefs. The instantiation may already be there; S may not be certain of its appropriateness; S may not wish or be able to predicate the open expression of the accented item, etc.

H (H*, L+H*, H*+L): S does intend to instantiate the open expression in H's mutual beliefs

L+H* and L*+H: identify relevant scale
H+L* and H*+L: identify inference path

**B. Meaning of Phrase Accents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phrase accent</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H-</td>
<td>Current phrase taken as part of larger unit with what follows</td>
<td>George ate chicken soup and got sick H* H* H* H- H* H* L-L%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-</td>
<td>Current phrase treated as separate</td>
<td>George ate chicken soup and got sick H* H* H* L- H* H* L-L%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**C. Meaning of Boundary Tones**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boundary tone</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H%</td>
<td>interpret the current intonational phrase with particular attention to subsequent phrase</td>
<td>yes-no question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L%</td>
<td>interpret the current phrase without reference to subsequent utterances</td>
<td>ordinary declarative statements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes for Chapter 3

1 While the terms 'naturalistic' or 'uninstructed' imply that the learners so described will have received absolutely no formal or systematic instruction whatsoever, it is quite common in the SLA field to apply the term to learners who may have received a limited amount of target language literacy or survival skill instruction (for example coaching or instruction on how to pass a driver's license examination or a citizenship test). The key component of 'uninstructed' language learning is that the overwhelming amount of learning occurs in the course of everyday communication. (See Klein 1986:15-18 and Ellis 1994:38-39 and passim.)

2 It should be pointed out, however, that Sang-Ho, the learner with the shortest residency (nine years), does give the impression of having made some progress over the 18-month span in which recordings of his language use were made. Sang-Ho is also the only high school graduate in the group and his syntax in some ways is the most elaborated. Sang-Ho's progress has not been measured systematically, however, since this is not a study of developmental aspects of second language acquisition, nor of 'fossilization' or de-fossilization, but, rather, of discoursal features of narratives recounted by speakers with limited proficiency.

3 *Ethnologue* (Grimes 2002), a compendium of information on the world's languages, provides the following additional information on HCE usage in Hawai'i:

50% of children in Hawaii do not speak English as mother tongue when entering school. Most of these speak HCE as mother tongue. Used in courts by officers, jurors, plaintiffs, defendants, witnesses. Creative writing in it in some schools. A growing body of serious literature. Used in schools for many explanations, because many students do not control Standard English. There are some communication problems at university level. All ages. Vigorous use by 100,000 to 200,000. The native speech of a large number of those born or brought up in Hawaii, regardless of racial origin. There is a continuum of speech from the distinct creole to Standard English of Hawaii. Different speakers control different spans along the continuum; there are those whose only form of verbal communication is the creole. It is accepted by many as an important part of the local culture, a distinctive local language, but looked down on by others. Some official acknowledgement of it in print and public discussion.

4 'Talk story' is a term used in Hawai'i to refer to 'hanging out and chatting with your friends'. The definition provided in *Peppo's Pidgin to da Max* is the following: 'Talk, gossip, shoot the breeze' (Simonson 1981: 'talk story' [no page number]).

5 This spelling is the one officially adopted in July 2000 by the National Academy of
Korean Language. For full details of the principles underlying the new Romanization system, see www.korean.go.kr/eng/index.html.

Notes for Chapter 4

1 Perdue, personal communication (January 1999). See also the two-volume final report of the ESF project (Perdue 1993a, 1993b).

2 See Appendix D, Transcription Conventions, and Chapter Two, section 2.3.2.2 'Hawai'i Creole English' for a pragmatic and prosodic description of this term.

3 Eckman (1983) reports on a study of the interlanguage phonology of two NS of Spanish and two NS of Mandarin, in an attempt to empirically determine whether the assumptions of Selinker’s interlanguage hypothesis (e.g., that the IL will reflect an internalized system of natural language rules which are distinct from both the source language and the target language) could be empirically investigated.

   Underlying the IL hypothesis is the assumption that interlanguages are systematic enough to enable scientific description. Indeed, the notion of interlanguage loses all of its interest if ILs are beyond such description....'an IL could conceivably be systematic and yet contain rules which are totally unlike those found in the grammars of natural languages (Eckman 1983:214).

   Interestingly, in his conclusion, Eckman argues that the presence of a previously unattested interlanguage rule (e.g., ‘Schwa Paragoge”), although not attested in the grammar of any language acquired as a first language, does not necessarily argue against the fact that ILs are natural languages, (it should not be considered an 'unnatural' (p. 216) rule) because 'its presence in the grammar of an interlanguage can be correlated with other facts about the NL and TL involved'.

   Eckman’s line of reasoning parallels that underlying this study, particularly where he proposes: the claim that such a system may be distinct from both the TL and the NL is of particular interest since it posits a process of “creative construction” (Dulay and Burt 1974) in second language acquisition, rather than a process of simple transfer from the NL. Therefore, part of the interest of the IL hypothesis is that it makes it possible to raise a number of interesting questions concerning the nature of ILs.

   Eckman's evidence argues 'on empirical grounds, for the independently motivated conclusion that ILs are independent systems' (196). It also raises the questions as to the extent to which ILs can differ from other language systems.

4 Wennerstrom (2000), speaking of fluency, described the results of her study comparing prosodic uses in narratives related by American and ESL students: 'These components are not mere stylistic features; they are part of a grammatical system that encodes the
cohesive relationships of a spoken text. Thus it is not longer utterances or shorter pauses per se that lead to a perception of fluent speech; instead, it is the ability to speak phrasally rather than word-by-word, focusing the main idea of each utterance in a coherent manner.

5 'Saimin' is a local Hawai'i term referring to a popular type of noodle soup, the folk history of which assumes it to be of Chinese origin. Saimin in Hawai'i is the approximate equivalent of a popular Korean noodle dish known in Korea as 'ra-myeon' and a Japanese product sold both in Hawai'i and on the U.S. Mainland under the name of 'ramen'.

6 Scaffolding can take many forms, but in the interactions recorded for this corpus, it consists primarily of two types: (1) use of Korean vocabulary, initiated either by the Korean native speakers when the English lexical items could not be recalled, or initiated by the English native speaker (who had a novice level knowledge of Korean vocabulary and a few common expressions at the time of the recordings) who would sometimes insert a Korean word to show 'solidarity' and familiarity with a concept or to facilitate inter-speaker comprehension; (2) native speaker interlocutor taking a guess as to the intended meaning and suggesting an English word to the narrator to express the concept.

An example of scaffolding is shown in the following interaction:

SHY: Korean church uh my friend yeahQ
SHY: very very uh nice, very very nice my friend # my friend husband.
SHY: uh Japanese
M: oh yeah? Hawaii Japanese? local?
SHY: local, local.
M: ...how did he help? [speaking Korean]
   money or just +/?
SHY: uh very yeah nice nice
SHY: no no no money yeahQ
SHY: only, uh uh # no more car
SHY: yeah sho:pping and,
M: Oh:
SHY: sometime yeahQ sometime oceanside, beach^
SHY: sometimes church
M: so in Korea you worked in Korea
    so it was good job
SHY: church-i sometime go church-ii
M: in church you are the leader
SHY: yeah in Hawaii
M: So. and your son is minister
SHY: Joanne [pseudonym]. together.
SHY: I’m study. yeah. me group leader
M: wow. Mmmm. sonsengnim. church sonsengnim

7 In subsequent conversations I have had with him since the research was concluded at intervals of approximately one year, I had the distinct impression that of all the narrators included in the study, Sang-Ho is the only one who could be said to still be making progress in English. While still far from native-like, I had the impression that he had enlarged his vocabulary and had gained in conversational fluency and confidence. Sang-Ho’s English literacy was quite high, compared to the other five, which may be a contributing factor to his continued progress, if in fact there is progress.

I also had an opportunity to interact with three of the other five narrators (Sang Hee, Sok, and Sun Ja) at various times, three to four years after the recordings were made. As no significant changes were noted, they all appear to be fossilized in their English proficiency at the level at which they were recorded for this study.

These are purely anecdotal impressions, however, and I have not undertaken a systematic follow-up study of any of the six narrators whose texts appear here.

8 For this well-known public place name, here I am following the current official romanization policy of the Korean government [revised policy of 2000]. See the website of the National Academy of Korean Language for the latest version of their 'Korean Romanization rules': www.korean.go.kr/englindex.html

9 Sok had been in Hawai‘i for 13 years at the time the recordings were made. Although he was the oldest of the narrators at the time of immigration to Hawai‘i and had the second shortest duration of stay in Hawai‘i, he was very confident in his use of English and made the comment to me that he felt fairly comfortable using English when he first arrived in Hawai‘i since he had worked on an international workforce in Iran where the language of communication was English, and he later had worked for an American company and ‘American bosses’ in Saudi Arabia. Prior to working at the hotel, he had also been employed by a local auto parts business in Hawai‘i, where he used English, or a local variety, rather than Korean.

10 In Ethnic foods of Hawai‘i, a locally published cookbook (Corum 1983), the following definition can be found under the entry for won ton: 'Closely related to the noodles and made from the same water and flour base are the wrappers of skins for
dumplings known as *won ton...* (Corum 1983:30). Under the recipe in the same volume can be found the following mention: 'Variation: Won Ton may be cooked in chicken broth and served as a soup' (Corum 1983:35).

11 There is further confusion in Korea regarding 'won tang', as some restaurants spell it with the aspirated 't' in the onset position [i.e., 't'], while others spell it with a non-aspirated 't'. (Korean has a three-way phonemic distinction between aspirated, unaspirated and tensed voiceless consonants and this distinction is reflected in separate alphabetic symbols for these sounds in Hangeul, the Korean writing system.)

12 Furthermore, one of the standard opening lines of a Korean narrative is

> etten salam...
> one certain person...
> 'there was this person...'

13 As previously noted in Chapter 2, section 2.3.2.1, Korean is a verb final language, which implies the typologically common head-final word order, i.e., 'all modifiers including determiners, genitive constructions, relative and complement clauses, and conjunctive clauses precede their head elements' (Sohn 1999: 293), a fact which suggests that the 'man' - 'kitchen' - 'fall down' word order in this example, as well as many others containing the English verb in final position throughout the corpus, can be attributed to L1 influence.
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