2022

"There's three stores in the whole picture": On the use of the English existential 'there' construction in task-based interactions.

Paige Morgan Roussell
The University of Vermont

"There's three stores in the whole picture": On the use of the English existential 'there' construction in task-based interactions.

Paige M. Roussell

Department of Romance Languages and Linguistics, University of Vermont

The Honors College, University of Vermont

Thesis Advisor: Dr. Guillermo Rodríguez

1. ABSTRACT

This thesis uses the unscripted diapix, spot-the-difference task featured in the Wildcat Corpus of Native- and Foreign-Accented English (Van Engen et al., 2010) to compare the use of the English existential 'there' construction (TC) among three different types of dyad pairings that include English native speakers and Korean non-native speakers of English. The goal of this investigation is to determine if there is a difference in the use of the construction that can help us better characterize foreigner-directed speech (FDS). The three variables of interest are non-concordance TCs, topicalized TCs, and interrogative TCs. The results showed that, when in task-related conversations with non-native speakers, native speakers decrease non-concords, increase topicalization, and increase interrogative use in foreigner-directed speech. These findings help us better describe the nature of FDS when it comes to a crucial discourse function, the expression of existence in English.

2. INTRODUCTION

a. Background

The field of Second Language Acquisition (SLA) is one that primarily revolves around the idea of input, what the learner is exposed to in the target language, and how that is processed for the acquisition of language (Krashen, 1981). Ideally, input must be something that the learner can interpret (uptake) and that has communicative intent (Keating, 2018). If the proper input is provided to the learner, they will be able to use it to develop their own interlanguage, i.e., the linguistic system that language learners use while acquiring a second language. Interlanguage is a systematic construct (Selinker, 1972) and will draw from features of both the learner's native language (L1) and the second language (L2), but also develop independent solutions based on

that same input. The development of one's interlanguage occurs in stages, the order in which learners acquire grammatical features of the second language. These stages are important when considering how input will be received by the learner and what input they may need moving forward. Oftentimes features of language that do not bear meaning or content (function words) are filtered out from the available input in favor of content words. This often leads to difficulty for learners to create form-meaning connections as the grammatical markers are often avoided or ignored (VanPatten, 2015).

Although there have been great gains in understanding how interlanguage develops in the mind of L2 learners, there are still questions to be answered in connection to how input is processed by L2 learners and how interaction benefits or hinders the acquisition of a particular grammatical structure. In the case of second language acquisition, it is important to look into the interactions between the learner and native speakers since these will provide the rawest linguistic data. While many second language learners (L2 learners) interact with a single native speaker (NS) inside the classroom (their teachers), this particular setting does not actually reflect an accurate, unaltered conversation between the two groups. Language teachers receive training that provides them with knowledge on how to best participate in conversations with L2 learners and adjust their language for learning opportunities, therefore, impacting the input the learner is receiving. This is quite different from the average NS who is most likely used to conversing with other NSs. It is this type of interaction that we are most interested in. When we are analyzing these types of conversations, we can consider them from two perspectives: first, how is an L2 learner speaking to a NS as opposed to another L2 learner, and second, how a NS communicates with an L2 learner as opposed to another NS. It is the latter behavior that this investigation will focus on and that will be referred to as foreigner-directed speech.

Foreigner-directed speech (FDS) is an under-researched construct, in which NSs (or fluent speakers) of a language adjust their speech (often simplifying it) so that an L2 learner (or someone of lower language proficiency) can, in principle, better understand, allowing for a successful and productive meaning negotiation between interlocutors (Atkinson, Smith, & Kirby, 2018). An interesting characteristic of this phenomenon is that the NS involved may or may not be conscious of the modifications they apply to their own speech in order to achieve mutual understanding with a non-native speaker. We can observe a similar behavior when looking at infant-directed speech (IDS) where, again, a native speaker is adjusting their speech for the perceived benefit of the lower proficiency speaker, in this case, a developing baby (Uther, Knoll, & Burnham, 2007). In a study done by Aleksandrs Berdicevskis (2020), he sought to find evidence that FDS is simpler than that of native-directed speech (between two native speakers, NDS). To do so he created a corpus compiling data from an online social media forum where the native languages of the posters were able to be identified. There were four possible native languages: English, Spanish, French, and Italian. In this study, Berdicevski used TTR (or type-token ratio, where "the number of distinct words are divided by the total number of words") (Berdicevskis, 2020). The result that they found was that TTR decreases when the person being responded to is an L2 learner, meaning there are fewer unique words being used. This indicates that FDS is simpler on average than NDS (Berdicevskis, 2020).

Another investigation performed in 2021 sought to look into both FDS and IDS (or child-directed speech) in regard to their choice of referential. Typically, NS of English use shorter referentials (like pronouns) instead of longer referents (such as full names or titles) since pronouns make speech quicker, smoother, and less redundant (Tal et al., 2021). Tal et al.'s (2021) research had NSs describe a story in a picture book to children, adult L2 learners, and

adult NSs to see if the proficiency of the interlocutor impacted the referential choices of the storyteller. What they found was that in both the IDS and the FDS scenarios the NS storyteller avoided using pronouns in favor of longer referents (Tal et al., 2021). In both studies discussing FDS and IDS, the purpose, from the perspective of the native speaker, is to make conversation easier for a person with lower proficiency. However, sometimes the NS can underestimate the abilities of their conversational partner and over-adjust their language. This, unintentionally, deprives the language learner of primary linguistic data. The reason for this over-adjustment seems to lie in exposure, as the more experience the NS has speaking with L2 learners the less likely they are to over-simplify their language (Atkinson et al., 2018).

As was mentioned before, FDS is not something that has been widely researched. Part of the reason for this has to do with the circumstances required to collect the data that would be needed. First off, we need to be able to access a large amount of data where our grammatical item of interest (the 'there' existential) is highly productive. One way this could be done is through the use of a corpus, which is a collection of texts (including written texts or transcripts of spoken language). Most available online corpora consist of collections of written output and, while readily available, these data are characterized by a lack of spontaneity and ample time for planning production which are not useful when trying to assess natural language use in conversation. As such, we will need to seek out an unscripted spoken corpus, or create one, for the sake of our research. Additionally, since we are interested in FDS, we need a corpus that has both native speaker-native speaker interactions as well as native speaker-L2 learner interactions. This is because we will need to be able to compare the differences in production in native-directed vs. foreigner-directed scenarios. Additionally, in the case of this particular investigation, it is important that the L2 learners all have the same L1 of Korean. The conversations will also

need to take place in a linguistically controlled environment. One way this can be done is through a task, that way all of the speakers are talking about the same subject and have the same communicative intent (Long, 2016). All of these requirements can make data collection challenging. Fortunately for us, we were able to find a pre-existing corpus that fit all of our needs. Thus, we will be using the Wildcat Corpus of Native- and Foreign-Accented English (Van Engen et al., 2010). This corpus provides us with samples of spoken language used in an unscripted task, spot-the-difference. It features conversations between three different dyads involving native speakers and L2 learners. Each of the pairs must work to complete a diapix (spot-the-difference) task (Van Engen et al., 2010). Due to the nature of this descriptive meaning-making task, there is a higher likelihood of the speakers using the 'there' construction in their conversations. More details regarding the corpus can be found in Section 3a.

This project uses the previously mentioned corpus with the goal of quantifying and comparing the usage of the English existential 'there' construction (TC) in conversations between native speakers of English and Korean L2 learners, with the ultimate aim of better describing foreigner-directed speech when it comes to the expression of existence.

According to Louise McNally (2011), an existential sentence is, "*a specialized or non-canonical construction which expresses a proposition about the existence or the presence of someone or something*." In English, the existential structure is derived from copular locative sentence constructions (as in (3) below). Copular sentences link the subject of the sentence to its complement directly by using a restricted inventory of verbs (copular verbs: be, seem, appear). In English, a pivot noun phrase acts as the logical predicate of the sentences shown in (1) and (2) below.

1. There is a cat.

2. There is a cat sleeping in the hallway.
3. The cat is in the hallway.

To form English existentials the expletive pronoun ‘there’ is first inserted as the subject. The NP pivots (or it is postposed) to become the predicate and it determines subject-verb agreement. If there is a coda VP, it acts as either an adjunct or modifier (as in (2)), but its use is optional (McNally, 2011). Sentence (1) shows a bare existential, using the verb ‘to be’, although the use of the verb ‘to exist’ is also possible in English. Sentence (2) has the addition of a coda, ‘sleeping in the hallway,’ made up of a progressive participle and a locative expression. Finally, sentence (3) shows the canonical locative construction. Although it also uses the verb ‘to be’, it lacks the expletive pronoun and follows canonical word order (SVO).

Korean, on the other hand, utilizes a double nominative construction (DNC) to form existentials. In the case of the Korean DNC, the verb is an unaccusative (one that only takes an object as a complement and has no subject) (Kim, 1995). Korean existentials seem to derive from locative constructions, like English, but a different type of verb is used. Example (4) is interpreted as a locative existential while (5) is just a locative expression (Kim, 1995; DEC=declarative). The first nominative in (4), *miguk-ey/i,* is a locative expression and allows the second NP, jijin-*i,* to act as the pivot.

4. 미국에 지진이 났다
   miguk-ey/i *jijin-i* *na-ss-ta*
   America-LOC/NOM earthquake-NOM occur-PAST-DEC
   ‘An earthquake occurred in America

5. 미국에 톰이 산다
   miguk-ey/i *Tom-i* *san-ta*
   America-LOC/NOM Tom-NOM live-DEC
   ‘Tom lives in America’

With the cross-linguistic difference stated above and the relevance of input in SLA in mind, we performed a preliminary examination of the data provided by Van Engen et al. (2010). This initial set of variables included seven different variables for the type of noun phrase (NP) that was operating as the pivot noun (including different coda types) and five different variables regarding the type of sentence in which the TC was used. While there is potential for future research analyzing both NPs and sentence types, we decided to focus on the three most striking variable categories that arose in the sentence type analysis. Those variables are as follows: interrogative utterances, topicalized adverbials, and lack of concordance/agreement between the main verb and the pivot noun.

In a dyad task like the one that is the target of this paper, spot-the-difference, it is anticipated that the participants will feel the need to ask each other questions in order to locate items in space and to confirm matching features of the different pictures being described. Without doing so, they may struggle with finding the differences between their two pictures in the allotted time (20 minutes). The reason this sentence type should be interesting for our particular study has to do with *who* the one asking the questions is. Is it the native speakers or the non-native speakers? In the process of L2 acquisition, question formation is usually a challenging construction that is subjected to developmental sequences and is a likely candidate for avoidance in the performance of SLLs (Ortega, 2009). Additionally, in the situation of a conversational task like ours, it is very possible to have an unevenness with how much each speaker is talking. Especially in the NS/SLL conversations, you may expect the NS to try to take the lead in the conversation. However, Van Engen et al. (2010) tested the Wildcat corpus and found that speech was relatively balanced in terms of the number of turns each speaker was talking. In fact, the NS/NS pairings were the least balanced. That being said, Van Engen et al.

(2010) focused on how balanced the speaking was overall, not necessarily focusing on questions. Since interrogatives are more difficult to form than declarative statements, since they require altering the usual word order, it may still be possible that the L2 learners avoid forming them.

Topicalization is specific to the native language of the non-native participants and the way that different languages structure information within an utterance (Lee, 2011). Korean uses a topic-comment structure (Gundel, 1988). Topic-comment consists of a topic (often a noun), which will be at the beginning of the sentence, and is then followed by a comment about that noun (Gundel, 1988). While it is a productive/frequent structure in many languages, it is not as common in English and is often equated to the English passive voice in translation (Gundel, 1988). The purpose of this type of information packaging is to highlight the roles of known and unknown information in the utterance. Typically, the topic is something that the listener has already heard about or has some knowledge about, making it old information. Then the comment that follows introduces new (unknown) knowledge about that topic to the listener (Gundel, 1988). While that is the purpose of the topic-comment structure in most languages, English does not use this structure. So instead, a grammatical item is considered to be topicalized when it moves to the beginning of a structure. When using the English 'there' existential construction, a similar pattern of information structuring is obtained with adverbials that should canonically follow the pivot noun. Therefore, the most common way for topicalization to occur in this construction is through a prepositional phrase preceding the TC. An example of this can be seen in (6). In this example 'in the bowl' is topicalized from the more typical position (shown in (7)) and is assumed to be known by the listener. The TC that follows thus provides new information about what is inside the bowl. Since this structure is predominant in Korean, we predict that it should appear more often with non-native speakers than in the production of the native

interlocutors. This is because we anticipate the L2 learners will have to deal with cross-linguistic influence, which is when features of one's native language impact their acquisition of another language. Since the L2 learners all are native speakers of Korean, which uses the topic-comment structure, they may unintentionally topicalize their sentences in English as well.

6. In the bowl there are fruits.
7. There are fruits in the bowl.

The third variable of interest was that of non-concord sentences. Non-concord is short for non-concordance (or non-agreement), which indicates that there is a mismatch of grammatical features within the sentence or structure. In the case of this research, we are interested in cases where the TC's non-concordance entails the plurality of the pivot noun not agreeing with the conjugation of the verb 'to be'. This can be seen in (8) where the pivot noun, '10 cats', is plural while the verb 'is' is singular and in its contracted form 'there's', thus exemplifying an instance of non-concordance. There are two reasons why this variable is interesting for this study. The first has to do with the fact that Korean speakers often struggle with subject-verb agreement (Lee, 2001). This is because Korean verbs do not change based on plurality, instead only being affected by tense, formality, and politeness (Lee, 2001). Therefore, we may see more tokens of non-concords used by non-native speakers while performing the diapix task.

8. There's 10 cats.
9. There are cat.*

Similar to topicalization, we believe that cross-linguistic influence will be the cause. Another question that makes this a variable of interest has to do with the native speakers. While non-concordance is targeted by prescriptivists as ungrammatical in the American educational system, it is a productive construction among native speakers when using the TC (Krejci &

Hilton, 2017). Instances of non-concord typically arise when the verb, 'to be', is in the singular (such as 'there is' or even more commonly when contracted, as in 'there's') and the pivot noun is plural. Looking at (8) and (9), there is a difference in grammaticality according to native speakers of English. Sentence (8), which uses the singular 'there's', is seen as correct while (9), using the plural 'there are', is considered to be incorrect despite the fact that they are both technically non-concord sentences. This is because 'there's' is the predominant form used by native speakers in TC (Krejci & Hilton, 2017). This is especially true for younger people like the ones who participated in our corpus of choice (Krejci & Hilton, 2017). As a result, it is common to see native speakers also creating non-concord sentences in the data. Native speakers still recognize that their language is non-standard and may try to adjust their use of non-concords when engaging in FDS to make sure the verb-noun agreement is aligned. We expect that the NS will try to avoid these non-concord TCs when communicating with an L2 interlocutor but will show a larger number of non-concords when talking to a native interlocutor.

b. Research Questions

1. What is the behavior of the interlocutors with regard to the productivity of the TC in this particular task?

   We believe that the existential 'there' construction will be more productive among the L2 learners despite there not being an equivalent construction in Korean. This is because it is a construction that L2 learners are taught early on, and it is usually taught by resorting to tasks that are similar to the spot-the-difference analyzed in this thesis.

2. Given the cross-linguistic differences in the description of existence in these two languages, what will the frequency of topicalized adverbials be by group?

    We anticipate that this structure will be the most productive among SLL/SLL, NS/SLL will be the second most productive, and NS/NS will be the least productive. This is primarily due to the effects of cross-linguistic influence impacting the SLL's usage of the construction.

3. With the crosslinguistic differences in verb conjugation/plurality between these two languages and the effects of FDS, what will the frequency of non-concord TCs be by group?

    In the case of non-concord constructions, we anticipate that they will be the most productive in the NS/NS dyads, SLL/SLL will be the second most productive, and NS/SLL will be the least productive. The reason for this is that native speakers make use of non-concord (particularly between singular verb and plural pivot NP) very productively in conversation so they are likely to outnumber the L2 learners who may be unintentionally producing the construction. We also anticipate that the NSs will decrease their use of non-agreement when paired with an L2 learner in the NS/SLL dyad, therefore making it the least productive dyad.

4. Based on the information from Van Engen et al.'s (2010) description of the corpus data, what will the frequency of interrogative TCs be by dyad group?

    We predict that the native speakers will be more productive in their usage of interrogatives, specifically in the NS/SLL dyads, since L2 learners may feel less

comfortable with guiding the task/conversation when paired with a NS or may avoid this construction given the fact that they are aware of the challenge this structure presents to their interlanguage (psychotypology or transferability (Kellerman, 1995).

3. MATERIALS AND METHODS

a. Corpus Description

The data for this research was sourced from the Wildcat Corpus of Native- and Foreign Accented English. This corpus was created by the Speech Communication Research Group at Northwestern University (Van Engen et al., 2010). Its original purpose was to be used for phonetic analysis and, as a result, it is divided into two sections: a scripted task and an unscripted task. Since the goal of our current work is to investigate the use of the TC in naturalistic speech, we will be focusing on the unscripted part of the corpus.

The unscripted section of the Wildcat corpus was made up of thirty-eight recordings of speakers participating in a Diapix task in English. This style of task is, essentially, a spot-the-difference game in which the speakers must work in pairs to find the differences with each participant being given one of two versions of the same picture (See Figures 1 and 2). For this specific corpus, the pairs were sat back-to-back and then had to describe the differences to each other; there were ten differences to be found in a maximum of 20 minutes (Van Engen et al., 2010).

Figure 1.

Version 1 of the Photo Provided to Participants

Note. Image sourced from Van Engen et al. (2010).

Figure 2.

Version 2 of the Photo Provided to Participants

Note. Image sourced from Van Engen et al. (2010).

There were four distinct types of pairings that the speakers were assigned, although each of them would only complete the task once to minimize any possible practice effects. There are NS/NS pairings that feature two native speakers, NS/SLL parings that feature a native speaker and a non-native speaker, SLL/SLL pairing which feature two non-native speakers with the same L1, and SLL1/SLL2 pairings which are between two non-native speakers with different L1s. A reference table that describes the pairings (Table A1) can be found at the end of this paper in Appendix A. We will only focus on three of the four different pairing types (NS/NS, NS/SLL, and SLL/SLL). All of the second language learners (SLLs) in this study were native speakers of Korean.

b. Procedure

As stated previously, the Wildcat Corpus of Native- and Foreign Accented English was used as the primary source of data for this thesis. A sub corpus was created for this investigation and included a total of sixteen transcribed recordings: eight of those were NS/NS dyads, four were NS/SLL dyads, and four were SLL/SLL dyads. Within each dyad type, half of the total conversational pairings were between two male-identifying participants while the other half of the pairings were between two female-identifying participants. Using the transcripts that were provided for each recording, the text documents were each individually uploaded into the corpus software AntConc (Anthony, 2018). After searching for hits of the word ‘there’, a list of tokens from each pairing was downloaded and quantified. Each token was then manually checked over to verify that it was in fact a TC. Any non-existential uses of ‘there’ were discarded as well as any tokens where the verb or the pivot noun was not provided. With the tokens verified, they

were then manually classified as instances of interrogatives, non-concord utterances, and/or topicalizations. If needed, the tokens were compared to their original recordings for clarification. The NS/SLL dyad tokens were also manually codified to determine which speaker was responsible for each token, verifying this with the audio recordings. Doing so allowed us to identify provenance from a native speaker or from a non-native speaker in those specific dyads. Once all of the tokens were processed in the manner described above, raw frequencies were tallied, and the resulting data cells were subjected to chi-square tests to determine the statistical significance of the resulting differences.

4. RESULTS

a. Raw Data

In the sub corpus described in the methods section, a total of 287 tokens of the existential 'there' construction were found. 104 came from the NS/NS conversations, 91 came from the NS/SLL conversations, and 92 came from the SLL/SLL interactions. Thus, all three groupings were roughly equivalent in raw frequency (Table A2). In the NS/SLL conversations, tokens can be split an additional way depending on who the speaker was. Of the 91 NS/SLL tokens, 55 of them were spoken by a native speaker while only 36 were spoken by the L2 learners. All of the tokens and their classification can be seen in Table A3 in Appendix A.

Looking further into the variables of interest (non-concord, topicalization, and interrogatives), we can see how often they occurred in the different dyads (see Table 1). Starting with the non-concordance tokens (64 instances), among the NS/NS pairings, 21 of their tokens were classified as non-concords. This is relatively similar to the results of the SLL/SLL pairings which saw 28 non-concord tokens. There is a notable drop in non-concords, however, when the

NS/SLL conversations were analyzed, with only 15 tokens. This can be further analyzed by looking into how those tokens are split among native speakers and L2 learners. Only 4 tokens were spoken by native speakers in the NS/SLL conversations, leading the L2 learners to be the primary producers of non-concord constructions in those pairings with 11 tokens.

Moving on to the next variable, topicalization, a vastly different pattern arises in the data. Unlike the non-concord tokens, topicalization occurred the least in the NS/NS pairings, with only 16 instances. This number increases in the NS/SLL pairs, which had a total of 28 tokens, 19 that were spoken by native speakers and 9 that were spoken by L2 learners. This difference stays relatively constant in the SLL/SLL conversations, as they had a total of 25 uses of topicalization in their conversations. Overall, the total number of instances of topicalization across the three pairing types was only slightly larger than that of the non-concord tokens, with a total of 69 instances.

Interrogatives were the least frequent in raw counts amounting to 56 tokens overall (Table 1). This structure also has the most consistent distribution of all the tokens. With roughly the same number of tokens being used in both the NS/NS dyads (17 tokens) and the SLL/SLL dyads (16 tokens). Interrogatives also show up in the NS/SLL dyads but only when looking at the tokens produced by native speakers (with 16 interrogative tokens). Among the interrogative data, the number that stands out the most is that of the production of the L2 learners in the NS/SLL pairings. Here the L2 learners see a noticeable drop in the use of interrogatives, with only 7 tokens found.

Table 1.

Results of the Categorization of English Existential 'there' Construction Tokens

Dyad Type	L1 or L2 Learner	Non-Concord Tokens	Topicalization Tokens	Interrogative Tokens	Total TC Tokens
NS / NS	L1	21	16	17	104
NS / SLL	L1	4	19	16	55
	L2	11	9	7	36
SLL / SLL	L2	28	25	16	92
Total		64	69	56	287

b. Statistical Tests

A number of chi-square tests were run to see if there was any statistically significant difference in the data collected for this thesis. All chi-square tests were set for significance at $p < .05$. The first test was run to check the significance of the differences between all three dyads (see Table 2) regarding the three constructions that are the target of this investigation. This initial test proved to not be significant with a $p = .1521$. Three additional tests were done on the overall data, this time only pairing two dyad types at a time. This can be seen in Tables 3-5. These again were not significant at $p < .05$. Although, the test between NS/SLL and SLL/SLL dyads approached significance with a $p = .0709$.

Table 2

Chi-Square Test for all Three Dyads

Dyad Type	Non-Concord Tokens	Topicalization Tokens	Interrogative Tokens
NS / NS	21	16	17
NS / SLL	15	28	23
SLL / SLL	28	25	16

Note. X^2 (4, N = 189) = 6.7, p = .1521.

Table 3

Chi-Square Test for NS/SLL vs SLL/SLL Dyads

Dyad Type	Non-Concord Tokens	Topicalization Tokens	Interrogative Tokens
NS / SLL	15	28	23
SLL / SLL	28	25	16

Note. X^2 (2, N = 135) = 5.3, p = .0709.

Table 4

Chi-Square Test for all NS/NS vs NS/SLL Dyads

Dyad Type	Non-Concord Tokens	Topicalization Tokens	Interrogative Tokens
NS / NS	21	16	17
NS / SLL	15	28	23

Note. X^2 (2, N = 120) = 4.0, p = .1345.

Table 5

Chi-Square Test for all NS/NS vs SLL/SLL Dyads

Dyad Type	Non-Concord Tokens	Topicalization Tokens	Interrogative Tokens
NS / NS	21	16	17
SLL / SLL	28	25	16

Note. X^2 (2, N = 123) = 1.2, p = .5503.

With the first round of chi-square testing complete, and all of the data being deemed not significant, we decided to run additional tests comparing the individual speaker role's counts in each dyad by their native language. The focus of these comparisons was the NS/SLL dyads since they involve the type of targeted speech we are interested in, FDS. Since each of the tokens was assigned to either speaker #1 or speaker #2 in the original corpus, all speaker #1 tokens from the NS/NS dyads were tallied, the same was done with all of the Speaker #2 tokens. This was repeated for the SLL/SLL dyad. This reanalysis of the data was necessary in order to be able to compare the quantified speech forms coming from speakers 1 and 2 in the NS/NS and SLL/SLL dyads to the NS and the SLL roles in the critical dyads involving NS/SLL. The resulting figures are shown in Table 6 below.

Table 6

Individual Speaker Categorization of English Existential 'there' Construction Tokens

Dyad Type	Speaker Number	Non-Concord Tokens	Topicalization Tokens	Interrogative Tokens
NS / NS	Speaker #1	13	7	5
	Speaker #2	8	9	12
NS / SLL	NS	4	19	16
	SLL	11	9	7
SLL / SLL	Speaker #1	16	12	6
	Speaker #2	12	13	10

The results of Table 6 were then used to run 4 additional chi-square tests. The first two tests (in Tables 7 and 8) compared the linguistic behavior of the L2 learners in the SLL/SLL dyad and the L2 learner in the NS/SLL dyad. Just like before, these tests also came back as not significant at $p < .05$.

Table 7

Chi-Square Test for the SLL in the NS/SLL Dyad vs Speaker #1 in SLL/SLL Dyad

Dyad Type	Speaker	Non-Concord Tokens	Topicalization Tokens	Interrogative Tokens
NS / SLL	SLL	11	9	7
SLL / SLL	Speaker #1	16	12	6

Note. X^2 (2, N = 61) = 0.6, p = .7274.

Table 8

Chi-Square Test for the SLL in the NS/SLL Dyad vs Speaker #2 in SLL/SLL Dyad

Dyad Type	Speaker	Non-Concord Tokens	Topicalization Tokens	Interrogative Tokens
NS / SLL	SLL	11	9	7
SLL / SLL	Speaker #2	12	13	10

Note. X^2 (2, N = 62) = 0.3, p = .8727.

Nonetheless, two final chi-square tests were run, this time comparing the native speaker roles in the NS/SLL dyad to the native speakers in the NS/NS dyad. Both of these can be seen in Tables 9 and 10. These are the only tables that returned different results. The data in Table 10 (which featured NS #2 from the NS/NS dyad) resulted in a non-significant difference between speakers. The data from Table 9, on the other hand, resulted in a significant difference in linguistic behavior between NS #1 and the NS in the NS/SLL dyad when submitted to a chi-square test. The test between speaker #1 from the NS/NS dyad and the NS in the NS/SLL dyad is the only one that came back as statistically significant with a p = .0011.

Table 9

Chi-Square Test for the NS in the NS/SLL Dyad vs Speaker #1 in NS/NS Dyad

Dyad Type	Speaker	Non-Concord Tokens	Topicalization Tokens	Interrogative Tokens
NS / SLL	NS	4	19	16
NS / NS	Speaker #1	13	7	5

Note. X^2 (2, N = 64) = 13.6, p = .0011.

Table 10

Chi-Square Test for the NS in the NS/SLL Dyad vs Speaker #2 in NS/NS Dyad

Dyad Type	Speaker	Non-Concord Tokens	Topicalization Tokens	Interrogative Tokens
NS / SLL	NS	4	19	16
NS / NS	Speaker #2	8	9	12

Note. X^2 (2, N = 68) = 4.1, p = .1291.

5. DISCUSSION

The discussion of the results presented in the previous section will be guided by the research questions posed in Section 2b.

1. What is the behavior of the interlocutors with regard to the productivity of the TC in this particular task?

   We initially predicted that there would be a noticeable difference in the overall raw frequency of TCs, specifically that there would be more produced by the L2 learners. This, however, proved to not be the case. In fact, it was remarkable how close the raw frequencies of each dyad were to each other, all within 15 tokens of each other (Table 1). These raw TC frequencies were relatively balanced among the dyads and did not support our initial hypothesis.

2. Given the cross-linguistic differences in the description of existence in these two languages, what will the frequency of topicalized adverbials be by group?

We anticipated that L2 learners would be the most productive in terms of topicalization, with SLL/SLL being the most productive dyad, NS/SLL being the second most, and NS/NS being the least. The reason for this is that the L2 learners may have to deal with crosslinguistic influence from their native language of Korean. While the data does not strictly support our hypothesis, there could be some merit to this prediction as the NS/NS dyad did in fact produce the least topicalized TCs, with only 16 tokens. We would like to remind the reader that the NS/NS dyads were only eight conversations and thus there is a possibility that increasing this type of interaction in the dataset would have resulted in a trend towards significance. Contrary to what we predicted, though, the SLL/SLL dyad was only the second most productive at 25 tokens (Table 1). In the end, the NS/SLL dyad provided the most tokens of this topicalized construction with a total of 28 tokens (all data discussed thus far can be found in Table 1). What is relevant about this comparison though, is that 19 out of those 28 tokens came from the native speakers. When you compare the individual speaker roles (in Tables 9 and 10), it is evident that individually the native speakers only produce 7 and 9 tokens, respectively, when engaging with other native speakers. This is at least 10 tokens less than when the interlocutor is an L2 learner. Additionally, this is very different from the comparisons between the L2 learner in the NS/SLL dyad and the individual SLL/SLL speakers, who showed no substantial changes in their use of topicalized TCs with native and non-native interlocutors. This means that there is something about a lower proficiency interlocutor that prompts native speakers to increase their use of topicalized TCs. We believe that this

may have to do with information structure. By prefacing the TC with a known prepositional phrase, the speaker can guide the listener more easily around the picture. For example, in tokens (175-181) (in Table A3) the NS guides the L2 learner around the drawing, with each topicalized preposition referencing the pivot noun of the utterance before it. While this does not support our initial hypothesis, it does highlight an interesting potential feature of FDS that could be further researched in the future. This is especially true given the statistical significance of the data between NS #1 in the NS/NS dyad and the NS in the NS/SLL dyad.

3. With the crosslinguistic differences in verb conjugation/plurality between these two languages and the effects of FDS, what will the frequency of non-concord TCs be by group?

Our original hypothesis stated that the non-concord TC would be most productive in the NS/NS dyads as a result of it being a prevalent production among NSs (Krejci & Hilton, 2017). SLL/SLL would be the second most productive (due to errors from cross-linguistic influence) and NS/SLL would be the least because of the effects of FDS on the NS. And, again, we found partial support for this prediction. The SLL/SLL dyad ended up producing the largest number of non-concords (28 tokens, see Table 1) which was different than we anticipated. However, this structure did still end up being highly productive among the NS/NS dyads who presented 21 tokens, being the second most productive dyad (Table 1). We also assumed there would be a decrease in non-concord TC use by native speakers as a result of FDS in the NS/SLL dyads as NSs try to be more prescriptively accurate for the sake of their L2 learning interlocutor. This idea was

supported by the data. While the SLLs did remain consistent in their usage across dyads, the group responsible for a significant drop in usage was the NSs. As seen in Table 9, when the interlocutor changes, there is a 9 token drop in the use of the non-concord TC by NSs. This change is significant with a 95% threshold of certainty. While the other NS in the NS/NS pairing did not have a statistically significant decrease in usage, it still decreased by half which follows a similar trend (Table 10). If this were to be tested again, with a larger data set, we are confident that there would be strong evidence pointing toward the avoidance of the non-concord TC when native speakers are engaging in FDS.

4. Based on the information from Van Engen et al.'s (2010) description of the corpus data, what will the frequency of interrogative TCs be by dyad group?

Looking back to our fourth, and final, research question, we hypothesized that there would be a decrease in the use of the interrogative TC by L2 learners when in the NS/SLL dyad because they would try to avoid forming interrogatives compared to declaratives due to their perceived typological distance and the leading role that most NSs in these dyads took. We also expected that the NS/NS would be the most productive in their use of this form while the SLL/SLL would be the least. While the data did not support this hypothesis as the SLL/SLL dyad and the NS/NS dyad produced roughly the same number of tokens, 16-17 (Table 1) we claim that this is a result contrary to our previous predictions since it means that the L2 learners are not engaging in avoidance. Instead, the NS/SLL dyad showed the most productive use with 23 tokens (Table 1) in a clear show of negotiation of meaning in task-based interaction (Gass et al., 2005). But even then, this is not a substantial increase from the other dyads. When the SLL data is

examined on the individual speaker role (see Tables 7 and 8) the resulting differences between tokens are slim. The NS individual data, on the other hand, does present an interesting trend. While only NS #1 (Table 9) is statistically significant, when compared to the NS in the NS/SLL dyad, both NS #1 and NS #2 (Table 10) showed a decrease in the use of the interrogative structure. In the case of NS #2, the increase in usage does not reach statistical significance. While our original hypothesis was not supported, the emerging trend in the data is still remarkably interesting. Instead of SLLs avoiding the interrogative TC, we find that the NSs are actually increasing their use of the interrogative TC when engaging in FDS.

6. CONCLUSION

While our initial predictions for this data set were not strongly supported, the data and findings of this investigation still provide different avenues for future FDS research. All three of the variables we chose to look at (non-concord, topicalized, and interrogative TCs) showed changes in their use by native speakers depending on the language proficiency of the interlocutor. While engaging in NDS, the NSs tend to increase non-concords, decrease topicalization, and decrease interrogatives. On the other hand, while engaging in FDS, the NSs in this research seemed to decrease non-concords, increase topicalization, and increase their use of interrogative TCs. While we did process all of the NS and Korean L2 learner data available in the Wildcat corpus, there are a number of additional dyads involving Chinese-speaking SLLs that could also be investigated in future studies. Including additional data from the Wildcat corpus, or picking a larger corpus, would hopefully improve the predictive validity and the generalizability of the present findings in the attempt to better characterize FDS. Another step

that could be taken in future research is to look into the 'have' construction (i.e. 'I have a cat in my picture'). The 'have' construction (HC) was just as prevalent, if not more, in the data as the TC was. We were unable to draw any conclusions on why a speaker may choose the HC over the TC for this task, but there is potential to be found in that as well. While many of the statistical comparisons set in this study did not prove to be significant, we nonetheless believe that this thesis could be used as a steppingstone for further research about TCs and FDS. We are certain that a larger study, with a more extensive corpus and TC tokens, looking into the same variables as this one would be able to further characterize FDS and provide more robust and statistically significant results involving NS and SLL interaction in task-related dialogue.

Resources

Anthony, L. (2019). AntConc (Version 3.5.8) [Computer Software]. Tokyo, Japan: Waseda University. Available from https://www.laurenceanthony.net/software

Atkinson, M., Smith, K., & Kirby, S. (2018). Adult learning and language simplification. *Cognitive Science*, *42*(8), 2818–2854. https://doi.org/10.1111/cogs.12686

Berdicevskis, A. (2020). Foreigner-directed speech is simpler than native-directed: Evidence from Social Media. *Proceedings of the Fourth Workshop on Natural Language Processing and Computational Social Science*, *1*. https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2020.nlpcss-1.18

Gass, S., Mackey, A., & Ross-Feldman, L. (2005). Task-based interactions in classroom and laboratory settings. Language learning, 55(4), 575-611.

Gundel, J. K. (1988). Universals of topic-comment structure. In M. Hammond (Ed.), *Studies in Syntactic Typology* (pp. 209-242). John Benjamins B. V..

Keating, G. D. (2018). *Second Language Acquisition: The Basics*. New York, NY: Routledge

Kellerman, E. (1995). Crosslinguistic influence: Transfer to nowhere?. Annual review of applied linguistics, 15, 125-150.

Kim, Y. K. (1995). Double nominative constructions in Korean. *UCL WPL*, *7*, 297-321.

Krashen, S. (1981). Second language acquisition. Second Language Learning, 3(7), 19-39.

Krejci, B., & Hilton, K. (2017). There's three variants: Agreement variation in existential there constructions. Language Variation and Change, 29(2), 187-204. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954394517000096

Lee, H. (2011). Information Structure and the Use of the English Existential Construction in Korean Learner English. The Journal of English Language and Literature, 57(6), 1017-

1041.

Lee, J. (2001). Korean speakers. In M. Swan & B. Smith (Authors), Learner English: A Teacher's Guide to Interference and Other Problems (Cambridge Handbooks for Language Teachers, pp. 325-342). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511667121.023

Long, M. H. (2016). In defense of tasks and TBLT: Nonissues and real issues. Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 36, 5-33.

McNally, L. (2011). Existential Sentences. In 1125823825 849319283 K. V. Heusinger, 1125823826 849319283 C. Maienborn, & 1125823827 849319283 P. Portner (Authors), *Semantics* (pp. 1829-1848). Berlin, Germany: De Gruyter Mouton.

Ortega, L. (2009). *Understanding second language acquisition*. London: Hodder Education.

Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. IRAL - International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 10(1-4). https://doi.org/10.1515/iral.1972.10.1-4.209

Tal, S., Grossman, E., Rohde, H., & Arnon, I. (2021). Speakers use more redundant referents with language learners: Evidence for communicatively-efficient referential choice. https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/cw2be

Uther, M., Knoll, M. A., & Burnham, D. (2007). Do you speak E-ng-l-i-sh? A comparison of foreigner- and infant-directed speech. *Speech Communication*, *49*(1), 2–7. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.specom.2006.10.003

VanPatten, B. (2015). Foundations of processing instruction. *IRAL, International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 53*(2), 91-109.

Van Engen, K. J., Baese-Berk, M., Baker, R. E., Choi, A., Kim, M., & Bradlow, A. R. (2010). The Wildcat Corpus of native-and foreign-accented English: Communicative efficiency

across conversational dyads with varying language alignment profiles. *Language and Speech, 53*(4), 510–540. https://doi.org/10.1177/0023830910372495

Appendix A

Additional Useful Tables

Table A1.

Description of Dyad Types

Pairing Type	Abbreviation	Description
Native Speaker + Native Speaker	NS/NS	Diapix task pairing where both people are native (English) speakers.
Native Speaker + Non-Native Second Language Learner	NS/SLL	Diapix task pairing where one is a native (English) speaker and the other is a second language learner (of English).
Non-Native Second Language Learner + Non-Native Second Language Learner (shared L1)	SLL/SLL	Diapix task pairing where both speakers are second language learners (of English) and share the same first language (i.e. Korean).
Non-Native Second Language Learner + Non-Native Second Language Learner (different L1)	SLL1/SLL2	Diapix task pairing where both speakers are second language learners (of English) but have different first languages (i.e. one person is a Korean speaker while the other person is a Chinese speaker)

Note. The information in this table is adapted from Van Engen et al. (2010).

Table A2.

Raw Data Collected for the Existential 'there' Construction in the Wildcat Corpus

Dyad Type	NS/NS	NS/SLL	SLL/SLL	All
Raw TC Tokens	104	91	92	287

Table A3.

All Tokens of the Existential 'there' Construction

Instance Information			Sentence Type			Token Data	
Type	Dyad	Speaker	Interrogative	Topicalized	Non-Concord	Full Token	Token Number
N-N	EN03 / EN05	1NS			1	it's uh purple **there's** [a purple and a lighter purple with yellow marquee lights or something]	1.
		1NS				**there** are [seven]	2.
		2NS	1			okay mine too **is there** [a martini glass on the right side of your sign]	3.
		1NS				yes **there's [**a green olive]	4.
		1NS				yes **there's** [a brown border around it as well]	5.
		2NS		1		right below like on the street in front of that building **there's** [a dark green bench with four lighter green legs]	6.
		1NS		1		yes and my picture **there's** [a boy standing just to his lower right]	7.
		2NS				it's a beehive and **there are** [four little bees flying around]	8.
	EN06 / EN07	2NS		1		it says **there's** [a little drawing of dog in water it says sheep dogs]	9.
		1NS		1	1	yeah sure okay here on the left side the very left okay **there's** [three stores in the whole picture] alright the leftmost store is called boss's booze	10.
		1NS		1		yeah okay and then other than that there's- **there's** [no text on the building] it only says boss's booze no advertising at all	11.

Instance Information			Sentence Type			Token Data	
Type	Dyad	Speaker	Interrogative	Topicalized	Non-Concord	Full Token	Token Number
		1NS				it's uh magenta and purple **there's** [a purple stripe and the majority of it's magenta]	12.
		2NS	1			**is there** [anyone like a person in the door of the saloon or]	13.
		1NS				um **there is** [nobody coming out of boss's booze it's totally desolate]	14.
		2NS			1	ah **there's** [two boxes laying behind him though do you have that there]	15.
		1NS		1		um the top of the store **there's** [a little gray cat with a pink feed bowl and the background is- sorta green]	16.
	EN08 / EN09	1NS				and **there's** [no name] it just looks like uh it has a margarita glass	17.
		1NS		1		and then that same building **there are** [doors]	18.
		1NS				yeah **there are** [seven lights]	19.
		1NS				uh **there are** [two loaves of bread french loaves of bread there are five apples a loaf of l- or a head	20.
		1NS				**there are** [five apples a loaf of l- or a head of lettuce uh it's all in a bowl]	21.
		1NS			1	um the bowl seems to be yellow **there's** also [a pitcher and a glass of water]	22.
		1NS				yeah **there's** [an awning over the shop] it's red and white	23.
		1NS				okay then **there are** [two signs uh down below one says lamb chop special]	24.

Instance Information			Sentence Type			Token Data	
Type	Dyad	Speaker	Interrogative	Topicalized	Non-Concord	Full Token	Token Number
		1NS				okay uh **there's [**a window beneath that uh looks like a slice of cheese and some other indescribable thing that's o]	25.
		2NS				then uh **there's [**a guy coming out the front door wearing a green apron brown pants brown shoes looks kind of angry]	26.
		2NS				and **there's** [a small boy wearing a visor holding a box kind of looking dejected]	27.
		1NS				**there are** [two boxes actually sitting on the ground close to the building]	28.
		1NS				uh **there's** [a sign on the front that says sheep dogs and]	29.
		1NS				okay uh **there's** [a tree on the r- far right side]	30.
		1NS				uh **there's** [a beehive hanging]	31.
		1NS				then **there's [**women close uh to the front of the picture]	32.
		1NS				yeah **there's** also [a green bench in front of Boss's booze]	33.
	EN13 / EN14	1NS		1		in the middle **there's** [a marquee that says boss's booze]	34.
		1NS				and then **there's** [a l- kind of split saloon style swinging door and a gray background like blobs of gray above and]	35.
		1NS				**there's** [white interspersed kind of in the vague spots] I mean it's kind of been colored in by hand	36.
		2NS				**there's** like [a tan]	37.

Instance Information			Sentence Type			Token Data	
Type	Dyad	Speaker	Interrogative	Topicalized	Non-Concord	Full Token	Token Number
		1NS				**there's** [a brown split door] that's it it's just a rectangular door	38.
		1NS				well **there's** just like [the tan slab]	39.
		2NS	1	1		underneath that **is there** [a red and white like]	40.
		2NS		1		under that **there are** [two signs one says lamb chop special]	41.
		2NS		1		underneath that **there's** [a pink door open]	42.
		1NS	1			yeah is your **is there** [a guy standing in the doorway]	43.
		2NS			1	and **there's** [two there's a cheese and a pot in the window]	44.
		2NS				and **there's** [a cheese and a pot in the window]	45.
		1NS				and then **there's** [a picture of a brown dog in a blut- blue background]	46.
		1NS				and **there are** [one two three four bubbles around the dog as if it was submerged]	47.
		1NS				**there's** like [gray black squiggly lines denoting]	48.
		1NS			1	um they said **there was** [ten total]	49.
		1NS			1	**there's** [one two three four five six seven eight nine] so we're missing one	50.
		2NS		1		um underneath that **there's** [a bee um]	51.
		2NS				**there's** like [a um a bee's nest]	52.

Instance Information			Sentence Type			Token Data	
Type	Dyad	Speaker	Interrogative	Topicalized	Non-Concord	Full Token	Token Number
		1NS			1	yeah i think that's it if **there's** [ten]	53.
		2NS		1		furthest left **there's** [a green bench]	54.
		1NS				**there's** [something missing from]	55.
		2NS	1			**is there** [anything on the ground in your picture]	56.
		1NS			1	**there's** [a small straight line to her left and a small squiggly line to her right]	57.
		1NS				**there's** [a medium sized line below the boy and another medium sized line below and slightly to the left of]	58.
		1NS			1	the bird's nest er- bee's nest **there's** [one two three four five six seven sorry one two three four five six seven eight nine ten yeah]	59.
	ENF02 / ENF06	2NS				then **there's** [a sheep]	60.
		2NS				**there's [**a loaf of bread cherries and lettuce looks like];	61.
		1NS		1		okay below it **there's [**a red and white striped awning mmhm]	62.
		2NS		1		in front of that **there's** [a boy with a visor]	63.
		2NS				you don't have the bench but **there's** [nothing around that corner]	64.
		1NS				**there's** [nothing there at all]	65.

Instance Information			Sentence Type			Token Data	
Type	Dyad	Speaker	Interrogative	Topicalized	Non-Concord	Full Token	Token Number
		1NS				and **there's** [nothing in front of the like Boss's booze]	66.
		1NS			1	**there's** like [two levels of green]	67.
	ENF10 / ENF11	1NS				let's see um **there's** [green sign that says groceries]	68.
		1NS			1	**there's** [two loaves of french bread five apples and]	69.
		1NS	1			**are there** [seven yellow circles on the top of the sign]	70.
		1NS	1			okay back to the pet store **is there** [a sign on the window that says sheep dogs]	71.
		1NS				and **there's** [a picture of a dog]	72.
		1NS			1	let's see okay the grocery store **there's** [two windows in mine and one says lamb chop special with an exclamation point]	73.
		2NS			1	and then **there's** like [two boxes underneath the window one of them's open and they're like stacked]	74.
		1NS			1	like **there's** like [four brown branches]	75.
		1NS				then **there's [**a woman in kinda below the pet shop]	76.
		1NS				then **there's [**a bench in front of the liquor store]	77.
	ENF13 / ENF14	1NS	1			yes but **is there** like [kinda fuchsia in between]	78.
		2NS	1	1		then I guess below the house **is there** like [a green bench]	79.

Instance Information			Sentence Type			Token Data	
Type	Dyad	Speaker	Interrogative	Topicalized	Non-Concord	Full Token	Token Number
		2NS			1	yeah **there's [**two in the back and two in the front]	80.
		2NS				so then **there's** like [a bowl with lettuce I wanna say apples and bread]	81.
		2NS				and then **there's [**the red and white]	82.
		1NS				okay and then **there's [**cheese and some kinda circular thing in the window] okay I have two signs	83.
		2NS				and then **there's [**a door]	84.
		1NS				so **there're [**two columns and six total paw prints]	85.
		2NS			1	and **there's [**a bunch of like circles like a hive all- all around it]	86.
		2NS			1	then **there's [**four bees underneath it]	87.
		2NS				yeah **there's [**a package]	88.
	ENF17 / ENF18	1NS				no **there's [**no name]	89.
		2NS	1			**is there [**a martini]	90.
		2NS	1			okay um **is there** [a grocery store next door]	91.
		2NS	1			what **is there** like [a tea cup]	92.
		2NS	1			okay **is there** [a pork chop special]	93.
		2NS	1			okay **is there** [an exclamation mark]	94.

Instance Information			Sentence Type			Token Data	
Type	Dyad	Speaker	Interrogative	Topicalized	Non-Concord	Full Token	Token Number
		2NS				okay uh ch- and **there's** [a picture of cheese]	95.
		2NS				**there's** [a kitty with a bowl]	96.
		2NS				and **there's** [a sheep dog picture]	97.
		2NS	1			and **are there** [puppy prints on the door]	98.
		2NS			1	uh **there's** [three on the left side and they're small] they're	99.
		2NS			1	so **there's [**three on the left side and then three on the right side but they're kind of stagger]	100.
		1NS			1	yeah **there's [**four of them]	101.
		2NS	1			okay um **are there** [any fleck leaves in the trees]	102.
		2NS				mmhm and **there's [**nothing in it] do you have two cheeses	103.
		1NS	1			**are there** [supposed to be ten]	104.
N-NN	EN02 / KO12	NS		1		and brown up into the lower part of the branches **there is** [a beehive hanging from the tree]	105.
		NS		1		um on the ground there is a woman walking	106.
		NS		1		on the left side of the picture in the midground there is a green bench with four green legs	107.

Instance Information			Sentence Type			Token Data	
Type	Dyad	Speaker	Interrogative	Topicalized	Non-Concord	Full Token	Token Number
		NS				I don't think there's anything else in my picture	108.
		NS				there's nothing else remarkable that I see	109.
		NS				there's a grocer	110.
		NS				there's a little boy	111.
		SLL		1		okay and mine has a cat and in front of it there's a kind of a plate for a	112.
		NS		1		yes that's a much more normal sort of so so down below the main sign there's a smaller sign that says sheep dogs	113.
		SLL				uh there are six of them three uh so um two two on top two in the middle two at the bottom	114.
		NS				yeah if there are only ten we've exceeded expectations	115.
	EN04 / KO10	SLL				mm in my picture uh basically the s- drawing color is red one there is no blue	116.
		SLL			1	yeah and there is some yellow circle	117.
		SLL				no there is no sign	118.
		NS		1		and around the yellow walls there a- there is a brown I I- I don't know what yeah there's brown like wood around the	119.
		NS				there's brown like wood around the yellow walls SLL: right that's correct NS: okay so do you want so	120.

Instance Information			Sentence Type			Token Data	
Type	Dyad	Speaker	Interrogative	Topicalized	Non-Concord	Full Token	Token Number
		SLL				I think yeah there is no difference I think	121.
		SLL				how about shoes there is more darker or	122.
		NS		1		and on the apron there's a patch that is l- not quite as dark green as the rest of the apron	123.
		NS			1	okay and there's gray patches behind him in the doorway	124.
		SLL	1		1	mmhm how about the bottom is there any picture	125.
		NS				yeah there's a picture with a yellow background and what seems to be cheese	126.
		SLL				in my case I um the boy haves not light blue there's purple	127.
		SLL	1		1	then how is there um some sign of the sh- um shop	128.
		SLL	1		1	is there any picture in the sign	129.
		NS				yes and there is also a b- one brown basket	130.
		NS		1		and in the basket there's a green l- what looks like a vegetable maybe a cabbage	131.
		SLL	1			how about the bottom is there any um some su- sunshade or	132.
		SLL	1		1	mhm and there um there's any um sign	133.
		SLL		1		n- no in uh in my drawing there's no um no drawing	134.

Instance Information			Sentence Type			Token Data	
Type	Dyad	Speaker	Interrogative	Topicalized	Non-Concord	Full Token	Token Number
		NS	1			okay and is there anyone or anything in front of that building in your picture	135.
		SLL	1	1	1	I have a question in the tree there i- there is any um bee's house	136.
		SLL			1	no I got a bee house bee's house and there's some bee	137.
		SLL				no there's no just blue um clear sky	138.
		SLL				there's no cloud	139.
		SLL				there's no sun	140.
		NS				I don't- uh there's no bench in my picture	141.
	ENF03 / KOF09	NS				um there's a sign that says Boss's Booze	142.
		SLL				there is no sign uh for bar	143.
		SLL			1	I mean there is only small glasses martini glasses	144.
		NS			1	there's no words	145.
		NS				there's a teapot I think	146.
		NS				and there's a cat	147.
		NS				and um there's a cat with a dish	148.
		SLL				okay um there's a sign on the wall of the pet shop is says mmhm	149.

Instance Information			Sentence Type			Token Data	
Type	Dyad	Speaker	Interrogative	Topicalized	Non-Concord	Full Token	Token Number
		NS			1	and there's paw prints on the door	150.
		NS		1		on the door of the pet shop there are little paw prints	151.
		NS		1		on the grocery store the sign there're two signs	152.
		NS				um there's a little boy in front of the grocery store with a box	153.
		SLL				mhm and there's a man	154.
		NS				yep and there're two boxes in front of the grocery store just sitting on the ground	155.
		NS				there's a woman walking by the pet shop	156.
		NS				yep um there's a tree on the right side of my picture	157.
		SLL			1	um there's bees and bee's house	158.
		NS				on the bar there's nothing really there's two windows	159.
		NS			1	there's two windows and a door	160.
		SLL		1		uhhuh and in front of the bars uh there's green chair	161.
		SLL				and there's a window um in the uh window all right r- at the grocery and we can see a	162.
		NS	1			um is there anything on the box that the little boy is holding	163.

Instance Information			Sentence Type			Token Data	
Type	Dyad	Speaker	Interrogative	Topicalized	Non-Concord	Full Token	Token Number
		NS	1			is there's a little boy holding a box in his hands	164.
	ENF04 / KOF16	NS		1		okay um on the right of my picture there's a tree with big leafy top	165.
		NS				and there's a beehive hanging from the tree do you have a beehive	166.
		NS		1		alright above the woman um there is a yellow door on Pete's Pet Shop	167.
		SLL		1		mm uh in the d- uh on the door there is uh uh footstep of pet	168.
		NS				you said there's a path	169.
		SLL		1		and on the board there is a cat do you have	170.
		NS				um there's a store that says groceries on top	171.
		NS				okay and there's um I think it's a pitcher with a cup underneath the word groceries	172.
		SLL			1	mm uh I have board uh there is a mm some bread	173.
		NS	1	1		sure um in between the basket and the kettle is there a cup that's the same color as the kettle	174.
		NS	1	1		uhhuh underneath the sign is there a red and white awning	175.
		NS	1	1		great um underneath the awning is there a sign that says lamb chop special	176.

Instance Information			Sentence Type			Token Data	
Type	Dyad	Speaker	Interrogative	Topicalized	Non-Concord	Full Token	Token Number
		NS	1	1		great to the right of the sign that says pork chop special is there a sign that says beef soup one dollar ninety-five uh with three exclamation points	177.
		NS	1	1		um underneath those two signs is there a window with cheese in it	178.
		NS	1	1		okay um underneath the window are there two boxes	179.
		NS	1			okay um is there a boy standing to the left of the boxes	180.
		NS		1		and on the other side of the boy there is a man coming out of the door to the grocery store	181.
		NS	1			is there a martini glass	182.
		NS	1			okay neither do mine are there two red okay	183.
		NS	1			okay is there a red window to the left of the door and a red window to the right of the door	184.
		NS				you said there are two windows on each side of the door	185.
		NS	1			okay are they are there four panes in each window	186.
		SLL			1	mm two window there is uh four portion I think do you understand	187.
		NS	1			no I'm sorry I didn't understand the second word. There are four what	188.
		SLL				one window uh one window inside four portion I mean there is there are four glass glasses	189.

Instance Information			Sentence Type			Token Data	
Type	Dyad	Speaker	Interrogative	Topicalized	Non-Concord	Full Token	Token Number
		NS	1	1		okay in front of the store on the street is there a green bench	190.
		SLL	1	1		so under the tree there is there under the tree something hang on	191.
		SLL				and there is a a cat	192.
		SLL				there is- there is a picture of some food in the basket do you have	193.
		SLL		1		mm I- mm uh can you can you if you uh when you look when you look at the cat there is uh some bowl do you have	194.
		SLL		1		yes next to cat there is a pink bowl I think	195.
	KO04 / KO06	2SLL		1		in the pets s- pet shop wall there is a poster right	196.
		2SLL			1	no there are no insect	197.
		1SLL				yeah+yes there is a house of bees and the four bees uh flying around the tree	198.
		2SLL	1		1	and there are any honey cube or something	199.
		2SLL	1		1	are there any mark on the door	200.
		2SLL		1	1	in my picture there are six mark and the looks like how I can say that	201.
		2SLL				there are no I can't imagine this mark	202.

Instance Information			Sentence Type			Token Data	
Type	Dyad	Speaker	Interrogative	Topicalized	Non-Concord	Full Token	Token Number
		1SLL				you mean th- there are six animals who ha-	203.
		2SLL			1	anyway yeah the- there are six mark on the door on	204.
		2SLL	1		1	are there any light	205.
		1SLL				a- there are some	206.
		1SLL		1		and ther- the top of the store there is a just name board of the store and it tells groceries	207.
		1SLL			1	and there are some food and uh the wat- water bo- bottle for waters and yeah that's it that's all	208.
		1SLL			1	are there are six yellow circle on the top of the store	209.
		1SLL	1		1	and are there any picture	210.
		1SLL			1	an- and there are s a glass cup cup or glass we	211.
		1SLL				there are apples insi-	212.
		1SLL		1		yeah inside of the cup there a- there is apple one apple	213.
		1SLL			1	yeah an- and there are purple line	214.
		2SLL				there is th- the color of the windows	215.
		2SLL	1		1	are there any table or	216.

Instance Information			Sentence Type			Token Data	
Type	Dyad	Speaker	Interrogative	Topicalized	Non-Concord	Full Token	Token Number
		1SLL				and there are some pockets in middle	217.
		1SLL				there a- there is a pocket	218.
		1SLL			1	and there is two	219.
		1SLL				mm there are two	220.
		1SLL		1		my picture there is lamb chop special L A M B	221.
		1SLL				yes I n just there is one one cheese	222.
		1SLL				yeah but but there is uh there are differences	223.
		2SLL				yeah there are two things	224.
		1SLL			1	mean there are two cheese okay	225.
		1SLL				yeah there's only one triangular form it has	226.
	KO16 / KO17	2SLL				start um there is a woman and what kind of what color shoes	227.
		2SLL				uh there well there is a chair in the left side like bench	228.
		1SLL				no there is no bench	229.
		2SLL				yeah pet shop and there's only one dog	230.
		2SLL		1		okay and you know right above that dog there's a sign um sheep dogs	231.

Instance Information			Sentence Type			Token Data	
Type	Dyad	Speaker	Interrogative	Topicalized	Non-Concord	Full Token	Token Number
		2SLL				and uh um the sign of uh pet shop there is a lamb or sheep sheep on the grass	232.
		2SLL		1		on top of the shop there's um uh words that Pete Pete's Pet Shop	233.
		2SLL			1	Um there is no words in um the leftmost uh shop	234.
		2SLL				there's no sign no words on the on top of the shop so that is also	235.
		2SLL	1		1	and is there any um tree on the r-	236.
		2SLL	1			and is there a bee nest	237.
		2SLL	1			and how many people are there on the picture	238.
		2SLL		1		right beside the boy there are two boxes on top	239.
		2SLL				there is one uh thing looks like cheese	240.
		2SLL	1			and i- i- is there any other thing on the	241.
		1SLL				there is a water kettle	242.
		1SLL		1		inside there is a cherry or something	243.
		2SLL	1			ah how many were there	244.
		1SLL				foot there is a like um ah that:called? footstep the like six footstep	245.
		2SLL				uh there is no footstep	246.

Instance Information			Sentence Type			Token Data	
Type	Dyad	Speaker	Interrogative	Topicalized	Non-Concord	Full Token	Token Number
		1SLL			1	yeah there is six footstep they are	247.
		2SLL				okay and there's um there is a like a weird window	248.
		2SLL				and um didn't you say uh there is a sheep	249.
		2SLL			1	and there's no uh letters on the on the wine shop or like some kind of bar	250.
		1SLL				yeah but uh yeah my mine there is a bowl in front of my cat so	251.
	KOF05 / KOF06	1SLL		1		and inside there are like some cherries	252.
		1SLL			1	no there are uh pork chop special	253.
		1SLL		1	1	right side there are cheese soup one point ninety five	254.
		1SLL			1	ah no I mean um like you'r- the ther- you have lamb chop special and then there are one more uh paper	255.
		2SLL		1		and under the cheese there are two boxes	256.
		1SLL			1	there are one uh little boy	257.
		2SLL		1	1	yeah um and next to the grocery store there is a pet shop Pete's pet shop	258.
		2SLL				of lamb of a there's there's a lamb	259.
		1SLL		1		no i- on the wall there is sheep dogs	260.
		1SLL		1		on the roof yes there is pet shop le- uh letter the letter of	261.

Instance Information			Sentence Type			Token Data	
Type	Dyad	Speaker	Interrogative	Topicalized	Non-Concord	Full Token	Token Number
		1SLL				and there are pictures cat and the cat	262.
		1SLL			1	and there are a dish or something like that	263.
		1SLL		1		in on the grocery roof board there are bread and apple or something like this picture yeah	264.
		2SLL		1	1	the yellow store so on the roof of the yellow store as you said that there's some letters there which is saying Pete's pet shop	265.
		2SLL		1		and next to the letters there is a big picture but my picture has a lamb but your picture has	266.
		2SLL		1		okay and under the roof there is a kind of advertising about	267.
		2SLL		1		yeah and on the right side of the picture there's a tree	268.
		2SLL				I don't know how to express that but there's a house for ho- honey bees	269.
		2SLL				there is a house of bees uh	270.
		2SLL				and there are some bees around that I have four	271.
		1SLL		1		yeah the door of this pet shop there-	272.
		1SLL				yes and yellow and there are um footprints six foot prints	273.
		2SLL		1		and on the left side of the picture there's a green bench	274.
		1SLL				there is a letter like Boss's boo- Boss's booze	275.

Instance Information			Sentence Type			Token Data	
Type	Dyad	Speaker	Interrogative	Topicalized	Non-Concord	Full Token	Token Number
		1SLL			1	there are s- um some letter	276.
		1SLL			1	and there is a- in the middle there are some brown color	277.
		1SLL			1	and there are uh a dog	278.
		1SLL				is yeah there is a dog brown dog	279.
	KOF10 / KOF13	2SLL		1		um roof ah no pet shop mm <LS> on the top um there is cat	280.
		1SLL	1			how many cats are there	281.
		1SLL	1			and is there any print on the her skirt	282.
		1SLL	1			is there a teapot	283.
		1SLL				there are little two rectangular	284.
		1SLL	1	1		inside of the glass is there um I think it's a olive	285.
		2SLL	1			yeah and is there any any <LG> other one on the name board you how about you Boss's Booze not Boss's Booze	286.
		1SLL	1	1		mm and in the both side is there any mark or print	287.

Note. The data in this table was sourced from The Wildcat Corpus of Native- and Foreign-Accented English created by Northwestern University (Van Engen et al., 2010).