Structural-Affect and Evaluation in First and Second Language Storytelling[1)]

(Received November 29, 1996)

George RUSSELL

Abstract

Ten Japanese speakers of English as a second language and ten native speakers of American English told stories while looking at a Garfield cartoon, with the Japanese telling stories in both their first and second languages. Russell (1996) analyzed the three sets of stories according to a story grammar model, and the current paper examines them using two other models: Brewer's (1985) structural-affect component and Labov's (1972) evaluation. Stories from all three sets seem to follow one of affective structures noted by Brewer, that of surprise. A comparison of devices used to signal surprise found in different subject and language groups reveals variations in the use of word or syllable stress and syllable length which seem to be accounted for by linguistic differences between English and Japanese. The original cartoon, however, seems to be the prime influence upon the choice of a surprise structure. All three of types of evaluation noted by Labov are found in the sets of stories; nonetheless, most instances of evaluation seem to point to two basic problems in the storytelling task: a misunderstanding by some Japanese subjects of the task itself and/or the cartoon. In consideration of the flaws in the data, further story collection and analysis is recommended.

Introducution

Telling a story is an important language skill, and researchers in the field of second language (L2) acquisition have much to learn about how L2 learners develop this skill and how L2 speakers' first language (L1) storytelling standards affect their attempts to tell stories in their L2. The project to be discussed in this paper was designed with these two questions in mind. The project required ten adult Japanese speakers of English as a second language and ten adult native speakers of American English to tell stories while looking at a Garfield cartoon with speech balloons blanked out. The Japanese speakers first told a story in L1, and then in L2 one week later. A previous paper (Russell, 1996) examined the resulting stories in terms of story grammar, using a model derived primarily from Johnson and Mandler (1980), but also influenced by Mandler and Johnson (1977) and Mandler (1987). Not all stories were analyzable according to the grammar, primarily because some Japanese speakers seemed to interpret the task as one of supplying the missing dialogue and/or had trouble understanding the last panel of the cartoon. The paper concluded by mentioning other possibilities for analyzing the stories, particularly Brewer's (1985) structural-affect component and Labov's (1972) evaluation. The current paper attempts to examine

the stories according to Brewer's and Labov's ideas.

The Storytelling Task

To avoid possible copyright problems, the Garfield cartoon used as an elicitation instrument is not reproduced in this paper. However, Appendix A presents three example stories from the project data (with transcription conventions listed in Appendix B). These stories should help the reader imagine the original cartoon. Further, Subject 5's exclusive use of first person in both her stories exemplifies an approach to the task as one of adding dialogue, and her Japanese story illustrates the problem of not understanding the conclusion of the cartoon.

The Japanese subjects told stories in two languages because it had been decided that L1 data from these subjects was needed in addition to data from native English speakers. Kellerman, Ammerlaan, Bongaerts, and Poulisse (1986) criticize studies which compare L2 speech to speech from native speakers of the target language only. In such a case, the study may be evaluating L2 behavior according to norms which the L2 speaker had not followed. The stories under consideration in this paper seem to confirm such an observation. Comparing the stories in Appendix A, one notices that Subject 5's L1 and L2 stories are similar in length, and both are considerably shorter than the story of Subject 17. Without the Japanese data, one might be tempted to conclude that Subject 5 told such a short story in English because of a lack of ability in the language as compared with that of the native speaker Subject 17. Her Japanese story, however, reveals her original intention to tell a short story.

The use of a cartoon as stimulus for storytelling may be criticized as likely to produce artificial stories. Indeed, the misunderstanding of some Japanese subjects of the task as a dialogue-completion task supports this criticism, and, further, all of the stories told by the subjects in this project are likely to be different from the stories they tell in the course of conversation. A cartoon was chosen, however, because the use of one stimulus helps to control the subject matter of the stories, and thus facilitates comparisons across speakers and language. It is not unusual to employ such a stimulus in a project of this nature; one should consider the success of the massive "frog story" project (Berman & Slobin, 1994), which asks subjects to tell stories after looking at a wordless picture book about a boy and his pet frog. Berman and Slobin's introduction provides an example of how the task allows for interesting comparisons: when comparing frog stories told by English and Hebrew speakers, they found that the different groups of speakers expressed time relations in ways which reflected linguistic differences between English and Hebrew (p. 3).

Brewer's Structural-Affect Component

Description

After an analysis of the stories in this project according to story grammar, an analysis according to Brewer's structural affect component seems to be a promising way to learn more about the stories, because Brewer criticizes the inadequacies of story grammars and offers an alternative. Story grammars, Brewer says, fail to explain what makes a story a unique mode of discourse. Brewer distinguishes story from narrative, and claims that grammars such as that of Johnson and Mandler are really concerned with the structure of narrative. When defining stories, one needs to consider that their purpose is for entertainment; a speaker tells a story to incite the emotions of an audience. Brewer finds that stories elicit two basic emotional responses: an increase in arousal, which he terms "arousal boost," and a release of arousal, which he terms "arousal jag." In conceptualizing the structural-affect component, Brewer states that stories are structured around inciting arousal boosts and arousal jags, and the time and manner in which these two responses occur create an affective state. Brewer delineates three types of affective state: surprise, suspense, and curiosity.

In telling a story structured around surprise, a speaker withholds some information important to the story from the beginning, and the audience does not receive this information until the end. When the speaker reveals the information, the audience is surprised. The structure of the story can be described as an unexcited emotional state until the end, when there is a sudden arousal boost followed by an arousal jag.

Brewer offers brief examples of stories which are intended to arouse the affective states, using a recurring character of a stalking killer. This paper will give examples featuring the same character, but placed into the setting of the cartoon used in the project. The following is an example of a story intended to arouse surprise:

> Jim woke up, and thought it was a great day for a picnic, so he went to the bathroom, combed his hair, got his clothes together, made sandwiches, and put the sandwiches into a picnic basket. Then he opened his closet door to get his jacket, and there was a killer waiting for him. He hit the killer with his picnic basket and ran outside.

This story does not tell the reader about the hidden killer, and so it proceeds at an unremarkable emotional level until the killer is mentioned. Then there is an arousal boost. Jim's reaction to the killer leads to an arousal jag.

In the case of suspense, the storyteller mentions an event at the beginning of the story that makes the audience believe that the story may have a disturbing outcome. When the outcome is finally told, the suspense is released. In this structure, there is a gradual arousal boost from the beginning of the story, and a sudden arousal jag at the end.

Here is a story intended to arouse suspense:

> A killer came into Jim's house, went into his closet, and waited for him. Soon after, Jim woke up. He thought it was a great day for a picnic, so he started to get ready. The killer waited silently as Jim went to the bathroom, combed his hair, got his clothes together, made sandwiches, and put the sandwiches into a picnic basket. Then Jim walked to the closet. He opened the closet door to get his jacket. Then he saw the killer. He hit the killer with the picnic basket and ran outside.

This story mentions the killer at the beginning, and when Jim's ordinary actions are described, the audience listens to them while waiting for the killer to strike. The arousal boost increases as Jim moves closer to the killer's hiding place. When Jim sees and reacts to the killer, the suspense is released, inciting an arousal jag.

In the structure of curiosity, as with surprise, the teller withholds some information, but, unlike surprise, the audience is told enough to know that something is missing, and anticipates the revelation of this information. A mystery is a type of story structured around curiosity. Curiosity has an arousal pattern similar to that of suspense; there is a gradual arousal boost from the beginning, when the audience realizes that something is unknown, and an arousal jag at the end, when the unknown is revealed.

Here is a story intended to arouse curiosity:

> Jim woke up feeling that something was wrong. He had dreamed that someone had come into his house. When he looked in his bathroom, his toothpaste and toothbrush were in the wrong place. Then he looked in his drawers, and found his clothes messed up. In the kitchen, there were cookie crumbs on the floor. He saw that the cookie crumbs led to the closet door. He opened the door, and saw a killer. He hit the killer and ran outside.

This story, in its first sentence, tells the audience that there may be trouble but does not say what it is. Then it gives clues that show that there really is something wrong: the misplaced toothpaste and toothbursh, the messed-up clothes, the crumbs. The arousal boost increases as each clue is revealed. The clues lead Jim to discover what is wrong: a killer is inside his house. When the killer is revealed, the curiosity is sated, and there is an arousal jag.

Brewer argues for the validity of the structural-affect component by claiming that an audience perceives a piece of discourse as a story according to emotional arousal, or, at least, the perception of an intent to arouse emotions. In previous research reported by Brewer, subjects read various texts, and were stopped at certain points and asked what they felt, or what they thought the text was supposed to make them feel. Generally, the subjects reported the types of arousal patterns, or lack of arousal, around which a given text had been designed. Later, subjects were asked to judge if the texts they had read were stories or not, and, they tended to judge as stories only those texts which had been written with the purpose of inciting one of the three affective states.

Brewer admits that in his research he made use of Western stories. He discusses possibilities of cross-cultural variation in storytelling, although he does not confront the issue of whether or not the structural-affect component is applicable to different cultures. The current project compares storytelling across languages and cultures, and so an analysis of the stories told according to the structural-affect component may be useful for determining the applicability of the concept in different cultural contexts.

Analysis

If one compares the story of Subject 17 with the three stories which exemplify Brewer's three afective states, one can see that Subject 17's story resembles the "surprise" story more than the others. Indeed, the original cartoon seems to be structured to create surprise, with the last panel revealing a piece of information -- the amount of time the main character had actually taken to prepare for the picnic -- not specifically stated in the previous panels. Since the elicitation instrument seems to be designed for surprise, the stories elicited also seem to follow the surprise structure. Even so, it may be illuminating to note how the subjects used language to create surprise.

When telling her story, Subject 17 pauses before giving the audience the missing information. Further, she stresses certain words before the pause, and the stresses seem to signal the revelation that is to come:

> so harry GRABS the picnic basket, (.) and garfield and he (.) TEAR out of the house (.) and as they get out, (1) it's already nightfall ((laugh)) ... {17}[2]

This pattern of a pause before revelation of the key information and stressed words signaling the approach of the revelation is found in seven of the stories told by the American English speakers. Of the remaining three, one story contains stressed words but no pause:

> they GET their stuff, he PACKS a picnic lunch he HAS his bathing suit on, (.) ((click)) and garfield and-henry run out the door:: .hh BUT as soon as he gets outside the door he realizes that he's taken too:: long .hh to get ready all day and now it's night time ... {15}

In this story, the stressed word "but" seems to take the place of the pause found in most of the stories told by American English native speakers. One more English L1 story, while lacking stressed words, does have a noticeable pause before revelation of the missing information:

> by the time he walks out to go on his picnic (1) night has fallen already. {18}

Only one English L1 story, that of Subject 14, seems to lack this stress/pause pattern.[3]

While English is a stress-timed language, Japanese is syllable-timed, and therefore stress is not as significant a prosodic element in Japanese as it is in English. Given this difference between the two languages, one might expect the Japanese subjects to

make less use of stress in their stories, and indeed, the use of a stressed word to signal the coming revelation is found in only one Japanese L1 story:

SATE, dekakeyoo, (.) nianko ikuzoo::? (.) tte (.) detandakedo, are (.) okashii na (1) asa da to omotta kedo (.) .hh mada yo ga akete nai, (.) mada yoru da nee ...

["Well now, I'm off. Let's go, kittycat," but thinks, "How strange ... I thought it was morning, but dawn hasn't broken yet. It's still night."] {1J}

In addition to using stress, Subject 1 also makes use of a lengthened syllable (zoo::) to signal the revelation. Syllable length is important in Japanese, and, indeed, four Japanese L1 stories make use of length in signaling the surprise to come.[4]

Two of the Japanese L1 stories seem to use code switching, rather than stressed words, as a signaling device, as shown in the L1 story of Subject 5:

let's go (1) are:: (.) okashii naa dooshite yoru nan daroo.

[Let's go ... wait a minute, something's strange here. I wonder why it's night ...] {5J}

As for the use of a pause before revealing the surprise, it is difficult to determine how frequently the Japanese speakers made use of this device, since three of the Japanese L1 stories had many pause at the end. The extract from Subject 1's story shows such a proliferation of pauses. Note that Subject 1 has trouble understanding the last panel of the cartoon, and the other two speakers who used many pauses at the end also had a problem of comprehension.

Speculation that the Japanese speakers did not use stressed words or syllables in their L1 stories because of the nature of Japanese has supporting evidence in the English L2 stories. In as many as seven of these stories, there are stressed syllables before the revelation, as shown in the L2 story of Subject 5:

LET'S GO:: (.) oh my god it's already NI::ght ((laugh)) {5E}

Eight of the L2 stories, including the three without stressed syllables, use lengthened syllables to signal the surprise:

a::nd he rushed out ((tongue click)) bu::t ((laugh)) it was already ni::ght ... {2E}

One might view this use of a lengthened syllable as transfer from Japanese. Several observations, however, tend to go against this view: the Japanese speakers did use the kinds of stressed syllables found in the English L1 stories when telling a story in English; the use of lengthened syllables was not unknown in the English L1 stories; and lengthened syllables before the revelation were more common in the L2 stories than in the Japanese L1 stories, which preceded them. The last observation suggests that the L2 stories show a learning effect; when the subjects told a second story, they were more aware of a need to signal the surprise that was coming, whether through stressed or lengthened syllables. However, there is no second set of stories from the English L1 speakers, and so it is unknown whether these speakers would have exhibited

a similar tendency or not.

As for a pause before the surprise, there seems to be no noticeable one in four of the English L2 stories, as is illustrated by the above-quoted excerpt from Subject 2's story. However, Subject 2's "bu::t" resembles the "BUT" of Subject 15 in thet it seems to take the place of a pause.

The preceding analysis has revealed some differences between groups of speakers and languages concerning linguistic devices used in the stories. However, the stories themselves may be criticized as overly determined by the cartoon; the subjects might not have employed a surprise structure if asked to tell a story under different conditions. Because of this relationship between story and stimulus, the analysis can draw no conclusions larger than those concerning the devices, and thus offers no evidence as to the validity of the structural-affect component across cultures.

Labov's Evaluation

Description

An important contribution made by Labov is his focus on personal stories told in conversation, rather than on the traditional tales which have often been the basis for story grammar models (e.g, Johnson & Mandler). Labov adds an element to his concept of story structure which, he says, was not present in previous story grammars: evaluation.[5] Evaluation is, basically, what storytellers say to justify the telling of story --that is, to keep an audience from saying, "So what?" (p. 366).

Labov classifies evaluation according to its relationship with the context of the story involved. The first type he notes is external evaluation, in which a storyteller leaves the context of the story and makes a direct comment to the audience about his or her attitude toward the story. Since Labov often analyzes stories about fights, this paper will give examples of the types of evaluation as instances in the telling of an imaginary fight story. An example of external evaluation might occur when a speaker, describing how a fight is about to start, directly says to the audience, "I was really in trouble then!" Embedded evaluation is the second type of evaluation. In this case, a storyteller places a comment reflecting his or her own attitude into the story, giving the comment to him or herself in the midst of the action or to another character. An example of such a comment might be a storyteller, when describing how a fight is about to begin, saying, "I told myself, 'You're really in trouble now.'" or "My friend said to me, 'You're really in trouble now.'" The third type of evaluation is evaluative action. In this case, a storyteller includes an incident in the story that is specifically intended to show his or her attitude. An example is a storyteller, when describing how a fight is about to begin, saying, "I never prayed so hard in all my life," or "I looked at my friend and he was praying."

Labov says that evaluation can occur throughout a story, and therefore it may be difficult to diagram evaluative elements according to a story grammar model. Anticipating the argument that it may be impossible to define exactly which part of a story is evaluation, especially in the case of evaluative action, Labov counters by claiming that narrative syntax is basically simple, and deviations from this syntax often signal evaluation. While this assertion may not solve all the problems of picking out evaluative elements, an analysis of stories according to Labov's evaluation may indicate aspects of the stories not touched upon in an analysis according to story grammar.

Further, Labov's concept may be useful in the study of cross-cultural variation in storytelling. Labov notes cultural differences in the use of evaluation within American storytellers: middle class speakers tend to favor external evaluation, while working class speakers are more likely to employ embedded evaluation. The two groups of subjects under consideration in this paper constitute a wider cultural variation, that between Americans and Japanese, and so an examination of their stories according to Labov's evaluation may illuminate some cross-cultural differences.

On the other hand, Labov claims that evaluation is a particularly important characteristic of personal stories[6], and may not be so important in what he terms the "narrative of vicarious experience" (p. 367). He contrasts a child's summarizing of an episode of the TV program "The Man from UNCLE" with a child's story about a fight, and finds the former lacking in evaluation. The tast of telling a story while looking at a cartoon seems to more closely resemble talking about a TV program than talking about a personal experience, and so the stories under consideration may not be the most suitable for examination according to evaluation.

Analysis

Despite the misgivings expressed in the previous paragraph, all three types of evaluation seem to be present in the stories. External evaluation occurs when the subjects make comments about the cartoon or the task which indicate a view of the cartoon or task from outside of the story. Examples of such comments are found in all three sets of stories:

i:: guess he's probably going on a (.) hike or trip or something like that ... {1I}
this is so funny {15}
kore wa (1) zenzen yoku wakaranai
[I don't get this one at all.] {2J}
nan deshoo ne (.) kore wa (.) ha o migaitari nanka soo yuu (.)
[I wonder what this is. This is something about brushing his teeth or something.]
{3J}
cause first time i couldn't understand it. {2E}
i::m sorry this is wrong. {7E}

These kinds of comments were not considered when the stories were analyzed according to Johnson and Mandler's story grammar, and the current analysis tends to support Labov's claim that his element of evaluation accounts for an aspect of storytelling not considered by story grammars. All of the comments by Japanese speakers listed above, however, concern problems understanding the cartoon. In a task where the stimulus was better understood, there might have been fewer examples of external evaluation.

Embedded evaluation seems to occur with the extensive use of first person by some Japanese speakers. It is possible that the expression of confusion in the first person indicates not only the characters' confusion but also that of the storytellers themselves. Such expression is found in four Japanese L1 stories and three English L2 stories. Here are examples from the two stories of Subject 4:

nanda kore. (1) yoru ka::? ((laugh))

[What is this? Is it night?] {4J}

wha::t? what HAPpened (.) it's still ni::ight? ((laugh)) finish. {4E}

As with the Japanese speakers' examples for external evaluation, these comments express trouble with the task, and, if the task had been less troublesome, such comments may have not been made.

As noted earlier, it may be difficult to determine whether a part of a story may be termed evaluative action, and one needs to look at changes in a basic syntax for evidence of such evaluation. One such change in a shift in viewpoint, and such a shift occurs in the story of Subject 17, where there is a change from the view of the boy to that of the cat:

by THIS time garfield, (.) who at first was unimpressed (.) is now really excited about going. {17}

The reader will recall that this story was described as following Brewer's structure of surprise; the cat's eye view summarizes the routine emotional state which starts to accelerate just before the surprise is revealed, and so it may reveal the storyteller's own understanding of the change in emotions which structure the story.

Subject 13 makes an even more interesting use of the cat's eye view:

and he had to do all these things like brush his tee::th and (.) sha::ve and, garfield was just kind of watching and probably thought it was stupid. {13}

Of course, the joke of the cartoon is that the boy did something "stupid" by spending all day preparing for the picnic and thus having no time to enjoy it. Subject 13 seems to comment on the stupidity of the situation through the viewpoint of the cat.

Seven of the English L1 stories make use of the perspective of the cat character. Since first person narration is so common in the Japanese stories, the cat is not used this way. However, the speech of the boy is directed toward the cat in three, maybe five, Japanese L1 stories, and four, maybe six, English L2 stories (in some stories, it is difficult to determine whether the boy is speaking to the cat or to himself). An

effective use of the cat as the listener is found in the L2 story of Subject 1:

hu::h how come it's still dark. i thought it's:: you know:: morning (1) do::n chu think so? cat? ((laugh)) [1E]

Once again, there is an expression of confusion. In any case, since the extensive use of first person by many of the Japanese subjects may have been the result of misinterpreting the task, there might have been less use of the first person if such a misinterpretation had not occurred, and, subsequently, more use of devices such as switching to the perspective of the cat.

Conclusion

Continuing the analysis of L1 and L2 stories begun in Russell (1996), the present paper has discussed the stories according to Brewer's structural affect component and Labov's evaluation. In the case of the structural affect component, it was found that the original cartoon had an important influence on the type of structure employed, surprise. However, the use in English of stressed words or syllables and the use in Japanese of lengthened syllables to signal the coming surprise showed an influence of a particular language on how the surprise structure was developed. Nonetheless, because of the cartoon's influence, the analysis was unable to offer any higher-level evidence for the validity of the structural-affect component across cultures. As for evaluation, the three types of Labov's evaluation were found in the stories, but the appearance often reflected the two main problems in the data collection: a misinterpretation of the task by some Japanese subjects as that of merely adding a character's missing utterances, and a misunderstanding of the last panel of the cartoon found in the same group of subjects. Given the weakness in the data for this story analysis project, more stories needs to be collected, using a variety of elicitation methods, and analyzed according to story grammar, the structural affect component, and evaluation before firmer conclusions can be made.

Notes

1) This paper is a revised version of two thirds of a presentation given at the 12th Annual Convention of the Kyushu-Okinawa Chapter of the Japan Association of College English Teachers (JACET), Kurume University, Kurume City, Fukuoka, October 26, 1996.
2) Excerpts from stories in this paper will conform to the transcription conventions in Appendix B. Excerpts are followed by subject numbers in upper case brackets, with J and E used to diffentiate the L1 and L2 stories of the Japanese subjects. Japanese L1 story excerpts are followed by English translations in lower case brackets.
3) This story is an anomaly in several ways; see Russell (1996), p. 50.
4) It should be noted, however, that American English speakers also used lengthened syllables; see the excerpt from Subject 15's story.

5) In fact, Johnson and Mandler's grammar, which comes after Labov's research under discussion here but which resembles his structural model in many ways, lacks the element of evaluation.
6) For a discussion of evaluation as used by a Japanese speaker of English as a second lauguage when telling a personal story in conversation, see Russell (1995).

References

Berman, R. A., & Slobin, D. I. (1994). *Relating events in narrative: A crosslinguistic developmental study.* Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Brewer, W. F. (1985). The story schema: Universal and culture-specific properties. In D. R. Olson, N. Torrance & A. Hildyard (Eds.), *Literacy, language and learning* (pp. 167-194). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Johnson, N. S. & Mandler, J. M. (1980). A tale of two structures: Underlying and surface forms in stories. *Poetics 9*, 51-86.

Kellerman, E. , Ammerlaan, T. , Bongaerts, T. & Poulisse, N. (1986). System and hierarchy in L2 compensatory strategies. In R. Scarcella, E. Andersen, & S. Krashen (eds.), *Developing communicative competence* (pp. 163-178). New York: Harper & Row.

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

Mandler, J. M. (1987). On the psychological reality of story structure. *Discourse Processes 10*, 1-29.

Mandler, J. M. & Johnson, N. S. (1977). Remembrance of things parsed: Story structure and recall. *Cognitive Psychology 9*, 111-151.

Russell, G. (1995). Approaches to second language storytelling. *Bulletin of the Kyushu Institute of Technology (Humanities, Social Science) 43*, 81-100.

Russell, G. (1996). Story grammar and first and second language storytelling. *Bulletin of the Kyushu Institute of Technology (Humanities, Social Science) 44*, 45-59.

Appendix A Transcripts of Three Stories

Subject 17 (L1 English)

I: 'kay please look at this cartoo::n and think of a story, (.) you will have a minute to prepare before you begin, (.) you may take as long as you want to tell the story. (.) 'kay ready, begin.

S: .hh hh (28) ((laugh)) um:: (34)

I: okay

S: 'kay (.) .hh hh shall I start?

I: yes please

S: okay, .hh hh ((cough)) (.) .hh it was saturday an-and harry woke up and looked out the window (.) and there was a BEAUtiful sunrise and he decided ah:: (1) been waiting for saturday (1) .hh and it's such a beautiful day (1) we should go on a PICnic (2) he talks to garfield and says GARfield (.) look outside it's a beautiful day (.) let's go on a picnic (5) (and so) harry ((laugh)) .hh he says o::kay we'll get out my picnic clothes. (1) tears through his drawers, looking for his picnic clothes, finally finds them, (.) gets dressed. (.) goes into the bathroom he says (1) o::kay, let's:: uh ((laugh)) let's get sha::ved and ready to go, (.) and then we'll-then we'll go to the picnic-then we'll go on our picnic (1) so he tears through the-the:: um (1) um (1) medicine cabinet, gets ready, shaves (1) next he goes into the kitchen, says (.) okay we just have to make (.) sandwiches for our picnic (.) something good to eat so he gets out the peanut butter and jelly and makes (.) sandwiches (1) a::nd uh:: (1) packs the picnic basket, says Okay garfield we're ready we're ready let's go let's go. by THIS time garfield, (.) who at first was unimpressed (.) is now really excited

about going. (.) so harry GRABS the picnic basket, (.) and garfield and he (.) TEAR out of the house (.) and as they get out, (1) it's already nightfall ((laugh)) and they spent their whole day getting ready to go on the picnic and (1) now (1) they can't go. (1)

I: um, (okay).

Subject 5 (L1, Japanese)

I: mazu (.) kono manga o goran ni natte kudasai. .hh soshite (1) .hh kono e ni yotte, (.) ippun inai de (.) nanika suji no tootta ohanshi o kangaete mite kudasai. .hh:: (1) ohanashi suru ni taishite (.) jikan no seigen wa arimasen. (1) dewa (.) yooi, (4) sutaato. (62) yoroshii des ka? =

S: = un =

I: = hai (1) doozo (2)

S: a (2) asa da:: (2) kyoo mo ii tenki ni nari soo dakara pikunikku ni ikoo (1) yooshi (.) jaa kigaete:: (1) ha o migaite:: (.) hige o sotte:: kao o aratte:: (2) sorekara:: (.) sandoichhi o tsukutte (.) let's go (1) are:: (.) okashii naa dooshite yoru nann daroo.

(English translation)

I: First of all, please look at this cartoon, and within one minute, try to think of a story with a plot, corresponding to these pictures. There is no time limit on telling the story. Well, ready?

S: Yeah.

I: Begin.

S: Ah, it's morning. It looks like today will also be a nice day, so let's go on a picnic. Okay, well, I'll get dressed, brush my teeth, shave, wash my face ... and then make some sandwiches. Let's go ... wait a minute, something's strange here. I wonder why it's night ...

Subject 5 (L2, English)

I: 'kay look at the cartoo::n,

S: um//hm

I: //try* to think of a story,

S: (yeah::,)

I: you'll have one minute to plan the // story,

S: //umhm*

I: and then you can take as long as you want to tell the story.

S: Okay.

I: okay::, begin. (64) okay

S: okay. (1) WA::OW it's a (morely) BEAUtiful day so let's go to (.) PICnic. let's get some clo::thes and sh:::: and (.) brush my too::th, and (.) sha::ve, and let's make so::me peanuts butter and jelly sandwich and LET'S GO:: (.) oh my god it's already NI::ght ((laugh))

I: o:: ((laugh)) kay thank ((laugh)) you.

Appendix B Transcription Conventions

okay	normal utterances.
GRABS	utterances spoken with a noticeable increase in stress.
(and so)	utterances guessed at.
::	extended speech sounds.
?	rising intonation, such as that suggesting a question.
,	slightly rising intonation, such as that suggesting the continuation of an utterance.
.	falling intonation, such as that suggesting the conclusion of an utterance.
(1)	pauses of one second or more.

(.)	pauses of less than one second.
//	the start of overlapping speech.
*	the end of overlapping speech.
=	uninterrupted speech from one speaker to another.
-	a glottal stop.
((click))	tongue click by a speaker.
((cough))	coughing by a speaker.
((laugh))	laughter by a speaker.
.hh	the audible in-breath of a speaker.
hh	the audible out-breath of a speaker.