

The Linguistic Construction of the Bilingual Stuttering Experience

A Dissertation

Presented to the

Graduate Faculty of the

University of Louisiana at Lafayette

In Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

Angela M. Granese

Summer 2014

UMI Number: 3687683

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI 3687683

Published by ProQuest LLC (2015). Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.

Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code



ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

© Angela M. Granese

2014

All Rights Reserved

Dedication

To my grandfathers, Robert Granese and Charles Murray, for teaching me that with hard work anything is possible.

Acknowledgments

I cannot express enough thanks to my committee chairs, Dr. Nicole Müller and Dr. John Tetnowski. Knowing that you both had faith in me and my goals was a tremendous source of motivation. Dr. Müller, your commitment to this study has been an inspiration to me. You paved the way for several of my “aha!” moments, which allowed me to emerge from those rough patches with a sense of pride. I am beyond appreciative for your guidance and patience. Dr. Tetnowski, your passion for the field of fluency is contagious. I am so grateful for the clinical expertise you contributed to this study, as well as the much-needed pep talks and words of encouragement throughout this process. My sincerest thanks to both of you.

I would also like to thank my committee members Dr. Nancye Roussel and Dr. Judith Oxley, as well as my advisor, Dr. Martin Ball, for their professional feedback and support.

Many thanks to Dr. Nathan Maxfield, Dr. Dale Williams, and the National Stuttering Association for helping me with the recruitment of participants for this study. I would not have been able to get this study off the ground if it were not for your assistance. I would also like to thank Dr. Geoff Coalson for the invaluable insight he gave in the development of the language profiles I incorporated in this study.

Special thanks to Rey, Verena, Ingrid, my mother, and Vicky for “getting your hands dirty” with translating, editing, and formatting tasks. When I asked for help, you all happily agreed without hesitation and I am indebted to each of you for it.

Finally, I would like to thank my family and friends for their unwavering love and support. There is no better feeling than emerging from 10 months of isolation and to be greeted with the warmth of my loved ones. I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my pillar of strength, Rey, for your unconditional love and selflessness. Te adoro.

Table of Contents

Dedication	iv
Acknowledgments	v
List of Tables	xii
List of Abbreviations	xiii
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Chapter 2: Literature Review and Research Questions	5
Defining Stuttering.....	5
Defining Bilingualism.....	7
Bilinguals Who Stutter.....	9
Clinical considerations regarding the bilingual PWS.....	13
Assessment of stuttering.....	13
Determining language proficiency and stuttering severity across languages.....	15
Measuring affect and cognition relative to stuttering.....	17
Systemic Functional Linguistics and the bilingual stuttering experience.....	20
Statement of the problem.....	23
Research questions.....	24
Chapter 3: Methodology	25
Research Design.....	25
Participants.....	26
Ivan, Biographical Sketch.....	27
Stuttering History.....	28
Language History.....	30
Sam, Biographical Sketch.....	30
Stuttering History.....	31
Language History.....	32
Neil, Biographical Sketch.....	33
Stuttering History.....	33
Language History.....	35
Brian, Biographical Sketch.....	36
Stuttering History.....	36
Language History.....	38
Secondary Participants.....	38
Data Collection.....	39
Ivan's formal assessment results.....	43
Sam's formal assessment results.....	48
Neil's formal assessment results.....	53
Brian's formal assessment results.....	58
Data Analysis.....	63

Identification of keywords	64
Analysis of the Interpersonal Metafunction	64
Appraisal System	65
Attitude	65
Graduation	66
Modality	68
Analysis of the Textual Metafunction	70
Analysis of the Experiential Metafunction	70
Reliability	74
Chapter 4: Ivan	76
Section 1 : Ethnographic Interview	77
Feelings relative to stuttering	77
Pride	78
Stuttering as “a feeling you can see”	81
Getting older	84
The “Rhythm” Factor	87
Beforehand knowledge	87
Impersonating accents	89
Rhythm as a technique for any stutterer	93
English as a second language	95
Learning English	95
English as a circumstance	97
Ivan’s Fluency Techniques	101
Muleti	101
Working on confidence	103
The word “tartamudo” (stutterer)	105
Insulting	105
Tartamudo vs. gago	106
Section 2 : Family Conversation	109
La palabra “tartamudez” (the word “stuttering”)	110
Mirielle : Un término grotesco (a nasty term)	110
Ivan : Ya no es ofensivo (now it isn’t offensive)	112
Theories regarding etiology	114
Mother’s temperament	114
Embarazo terrible (terrible pregnancy)	117
Mandíbula (mandible)	119
Mirielle’s description of “la familia” (the family)	121
Como broma (as a joke)	122
Father’s attitude	123
Confronting Iliana	126
Lack of resources in Ecuador	130
Terapistas (therapists)	131
El médico (the doctor)	132
Profesoras (teachers)	134
Down Syndrome Group	136

Chapter 5: Sam	139
Section 1 : Ethnographic Interview	139
Factors contributing to stuttering.....	140
Confidence.....	140
Conversational circumstances.....	145
The word “stuttering”	148
Appraisal of stuttering.....	151
Opportunity to succeed	151
Something that will go away.....	154
Up and down.....	156
Feelings during early teen years	159
Staying positive.....	159
Anxieties.....	161
Speech Therapy.....	163
Current therapy.....	163
Past therapy experiences.....	164
Spanish.....	167
Not confident with the language.....	168
Spanish as “a reset”	169
Fluency techniques in Spanish.....	170
Section 2 : Family Conversation	173
Speech Therapy.....	174
Ingrid’s Appraisal of: “la experta en fluency” (the fluency expert).....	174
Sam’s Appraisal: Very helpful.....	178
Ingrid’s Appraisal of Sam’s stuttering during therapy.....	181
Ingrid: No querías hacer esto (You didn’t want to do this).....	185
Spanish.....	187
Sam: Not as fluent in Spanish.....	187
Ingrid: Hablando (speaking) Spanglish.....	190
Ingrid: Mas fluency en inglés.....	194
 Chapter 6: Neil	 197
Section 1 : Descriptions of stuttering.....	199
Emotional Characteristics	199
Terrifying.....	199
Panic.....	199
Frustrating.....	201
Exhausted.....	203
Self-conscious.....	204
Physical Concomitants.....	206
Phone.....	206
Sensing a difficult day.....	207
Physical sensations.....	209
Silent block.....	211
Varying concomitants	212
Cyclical nature.....	214

Section 2 : The Onset of Stuttering.....	216
Noticing something in speech.....	216
The nature of silent blocks.....	218
Attributing what it could be.....	220
Reaction to first block.....	223
Section 3 : Comparing speech therapy experiences.....	224
Online therapy experience.....	224
Appraisal of techniques.....	224
Non-preferred therapy approach.....	225
3-week program experience.....	231
Appraisal of techniques.....	231
Awareness vs. Prevention.....	232
Section 4 : Confidence.....	235
The role of confidence.....	236
Entities contributing to confidence.....	238
SFU Program.....	238
Toastmasters.....	241
Support group.....	242
Section 5 : Spanish.....	243
Mapping.....	244
Role of Spanish.....	245
Chapter 7 : Brian.....	248
Section 1 : Description of stuttering.....	248
Use of Metaphorical Language.....	248
“Devil”.....	249
The “battle” metaphor.....	250
The “struggle” metaphor.....	251
Self as “fighter”.....	255
“The delivery has mastered us”.....	256
Description through comparison.....	259
Comparing to person on crutches.....	259
Comparing stuttering to cancer.....	260
Section 2 : Factors that affect fluency.....	263
Learning Spanish.....	263
Confidence.....	263
Vowels.....	264
Accustomed to being uncomfortable.....	266
Not as comfortable.....	268
Marijuana.....	269
Smoking pot.....	269
Research-worthy.....	270
Improved speech.....	272
Effort.....	273
Stuttering despite efforts.....	274
Effort as “the problem”.....	275

Section 3 : Family History.....	277
Father’s stammer.....	277
Brother.....	279
Other family members.....	284
Section 4 : Appraisal of outside entities.....	286
Support group.....	286
Not saying a word.....	286
Complaining.....	287
Emotions.....	289
Speech Therapy.....	292
No transfer.....	292
Stereotypical methods.....	294
Not nearly what I need.....	295
Chapter 8 : Discussion.....	297
Participant 1 : Ivan.....	297
Constructing the stuttering experience.....	297
The “dual pressure” of stuttering.....	297
Stuttering as a matter of “rhythm”.....	299
Perceptions of stuttering across languages.....	300
Confidence in proficiency as a catalyst for fluency.....	300
Positioning of self relative to stuttering experience.....	301
Prideful out of necessity.....	301
Ivan as a consequential participant in the behavior of stuttering.....	304
Participant 2 : Sam.....	304
Constructing the stuttering experience.....	305
The role of conversational circumstances.....	305
Perceptions of stuttering across languages.....	306
Lack of fluency in Spanish.....	306
Positioning of self relative to stuttering experience.....	308
Shift in identity: “old Sam vs. new Sam”.....	308
Participant 3 : Neil.....	310
Constructing the stuttering experience.....	310
Fear-inducing.....	310
The cognitive aspect.....	312
Cyclical.....	312
Perceptions of stuttering across languages.....	313
Spanish as a hindrance to fluency.....	313
Positioning of self relative to stuttering experience.....	314
“The Bystander”.....	314
Participant 4 : Brian.....	315
Constructing the stuttering experience.....	316
Stuttering as a negative experience.....	316
Perceptions of stuttering across languages.....	317
Vowels as a cause for disfluency in Spanish.....	317
Positioning of self relative to stuttering experience.....	318

Varying social identities	318
Similarities across cases	321
Methodological and theoretical considerations	322
Clinical implications	324
Limitations and implications for future research	327
Conclusions	330
References	331
Appendix	350
Abstract	351
Biographical Sketch	352

List of Tables

Table 1. Ivan, SSI-4 English Results	47
Table 2. Ivan, SSI-4 Spanish Results	48
Table 3. Ivan, OASES Results	48
Table 4. Sam, SSI-4 English Results	52
Table 5. Sam, SSI-4 Spanish Results	53
Table 6. Sam, OASES Results	53
Table 7. Neil, SSI-4 English Results	57
Table 8. Neil, SSI-4 Spanish Results	58
Table 9. Neil, OASES Results	58
Table 10. Brian, SSI-4 English Results	62
Table 11. Brian, SSI-4 Spanish Results	63
Table 12. Brian, OASES Results	63
Table 13. Process types, meanings, and participants	73
Table 14. Quantitative overview of Ivan’s use of the word “stutter” and its variants	77
Table 15. Overview of use of keyword “tartamudez” (and variants) and frequency of use of “problema”	109
Table 16. Quantitative overview of Sam’s use of the keyword “stutter” and its variants	139
Table 17. Quantitative overview of function and frequency of “stutter”	173
Table 18. Quantitative overview of Neil’s function and frequency of use of the keywords “stutter,” “fluency,” “cycle” and their variants in both contexts	198

List of Abbreviations

+	Positive
-	Negative
4S	Self-Stigma Stuttering Scale
Appre	Appreciation
AG	Researcher
B	Brian
Circ.	Circumstance
cog	Mental clause of cognition
des	Mental desiderative clause
dwn	Down-scale
emo	Mental emotive clause
Exp	Experiential configuration
Grad	Graduation
IH	Ivan
IR	Ingrid
int	Intensive relational clause
Judg	Judgment
L2LHQ	L2 Language History Questionnaire
LAQ	Lifestyle Appraisal Questionnaire
M	Mirielle
max	Maximal
N	Neil

NEG	Negation
neu	Neutral
NSA	National Stuttering Association
OASES	Overall Assessment of the Speaker's Experience of Stuttering
proj	Projection
PWDNS	People who do not stutter
PWR	Part-word repetition
PWS	Person who stutters/ People who stutter
QOL	Quality of life
R	Rey
S	Sam
SFL	Systemic Functional Linguistics
SLD	Stuttering like disfluency
SS%	Percentage of stuttered syllables
SSI-4	Stuttering Severity Instrument, 4 th edition
SSWR	Single syllable word repetition
TOEFL	Test of English as a Foreign Language
up	Up-scale
V	Verena

Chapter 1:

Introduction

During my time as a student clinician, I conducted a fluency diagnostic for a 20-year old bilingual male, VB. He came to the university speech, language, and hearing center because his stuttering was having a negative impact on his academics and self-esteem. He was very critical of his speech and said that he felt inferior to others because he could not “speak right.” He said his pronunciation of English words was “horrible” and believed that this was unacceptable because he was an adult and should not be speaking “like a little kid.” His stuttering was something that embarrassed him. He felt that if he didn’t stutter, he would be better able to achieve his goals in life. VB also talked a lot about the theories he had about his stuttering. He believed that his stuttering was worse in Spanish because of his fast rate of speech. He said that he had to put extra thought into speaking English since it was his second language and this, he thought, prevented him from stuttering as much. While he spent several sessions passionately talking about the negative effects of his stuttering and his theories about it, I observed very few stuttering events.

Results from the *Stuttering Severity Instrument, 4th Edition* (SSI-4) (Riley, 2009) indicated that the severity of his stuttering was mild in both languages, while the *Overall Assessment of the Speaker’s Experience of Stuttering* (OASES) (Yaruss & Quesal, 2010) revealed that his stuttering was having a moderate to severe impact on the quality of his life. VB was in disbelief when I explained the results of the SSI-4 to him. He expressed feelings of helplessness and disappointment when he realized that not only was his stuttering “not severe,” but it was nowhere near that, as far as the instrument could measure. For him, there was a disconnect between the significant OASES results and the low numerical values derived from the

SSI-4. Though he was given a treatment plan that included fluency shaping and stuttering modification and was told that he had an excellent prognosis, he said, “maybe I should be seeing a psychiatrist instead of speech therapist.” VB, who had so much confidence in his own theories about his stuttering, lacked confidence in what the field of speech pathology had to offer him. I turned to the literature to get a better understanding of how to mend the disconnect between his personal expertise as the bilingual person who stutters (PWS) and the results of formal assessments that did not reflect what he knew to be true about his experience. While there is an impressive body of knowledge about the potential relationship between bilingualism and stuttering, as well as the issues with measuring these behaviors, there was very little information about the affective and cognitive components associated with bilingual stuttering, which leaves us with an incomplete picture of their experience. Conducting VB’s diagnostic and becoming familiar with the deficiencies in the current literature sparked my interest in exploring the bilingual stuttering experience, as described by the bilingual, not only by formal assessment results.

This study describes how four bilingual PWS construct their experiences by examining the linguistic choices they make while engaged in conversations about their stuttering. Stuttering can be defined in terms of speech characteristics, physical concomitants, emotions, perceptions, and quality of life (Bloodstein & Bernstein Ratner, 2008; Tetnowski & Scaler Scott, 2009; Bennett, 2006), and therefore it manifests in a plethora of ways across individuals and languages. Similarly, being bilingual (or multilingual) is very much an experience unique to the individual in that no two bilinguals are alike in terms of acquisition, proficiency, as well as frequency and functions of language use. Considering the highly individualistic and multidimensional nature of the phenomenon being examined, qualitative methods were best suited to investigate the

bilingual stuttering experience. Specifically, a case study approach was adopted to account for the diversity of characteristics and individualized experiences described by each of the four participants in this study.

The current literature also reveals a lack of systematic investigations of how the stuttering experience is represented through the language use of bilinguals who stutter, and it has been acknowledged that other measures outside of the traditional assessments available to evaluate stuttering can and must be utilized when working with bilinguals who stutter (Van Borsel, Maes, & Foulon, 2001). This study systematically investigates the ways individuals linguistically construct their experience as bilinguals who stutter through the use of Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), a theory of language use described by Halliday and Matthiessen (2004). Specifically, the tools provided by SFL allowed for the examination of the participants' talk during a conversation about their stuttering with a family member as well as during a conversation-like ethnographic interview with the researcher. This gave insight into how they created and conveyed meaning through their word choices and grammatical structures, which also shed light on the underlying affective and cognitive aspects of their stuttering experiences. It also worked to show the efficacy of using aspects of SFL as a tool in clinical assessment.

As Bennett (2006) states, there is more to stuttering than the behavioral manifestations, that is, the actual speech signal and other observable features. As the number of multilingual clients increases, it is of utmost importance that clinicians understand the way stuttering manifests itself beyond the behavioral components that are stressed in the literature. The aim of this study is to open a window to the affective and cognitive components of stuttering in this population by examining the linguistic construction of stuttering as experienced by the bilingual. It is my hope that this study achieves a better understanding of the bilingual stuttering experience

that will guide clinicians in the development of appropriate, meaningful and effective stuttering intervention for the “whole” bilingual who stutters.

This dissertation is divided into eight chapters. Following this introductory chapter, a review of the literature on the topics of bilinguals who stutter, issues with clinical assessment, and systemic functional linguistics as relevant to this dissertation will be presented in Chapter 2. Chapter 3 will provide an overview of the qualitative approach that was adopted for this study. Descriptions of data collection methods and the analytic framework, SFL, are provided along with biographical sketches and formal assessment results of each of the four participants. Chapter 4 presents the results of the first participant, Ivan. Chapter 5 presents Sam’s results, while Chapter 6 and Chapter 7 present the results of Neil and Brian respectively. These chapters provide an in-depth analysis of the linguistic tools used by the participants to configure experiences and convey attitudes relative to their stuttering. Chapter 8 discusses the results, suggests future research and posits the theoretical and clinical implications of the findings.

Chapter 2:

Literature Review and Research Questions

This chapter reviews the literature relevant to this dissertation. The topics of stuttering and bilingualism are described separately first in order to fully demonstrate the dynamic, multi-faceted nature of each, which has implications for the way both are defined in the literature. This is followed by a discussion that links the topics together. This is followed by a review of the literature regarding the clinical aspects of bilingual stuttering, which include implications for assessment of stuttering severity, language proficiency, and impact on quality of life. Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) is discussed in terms of its theoretical underpinnings as well as the implications for clinical use of the analytic tools derived from this theory. This chapter concludes with a statement of the problem in light of the literature review and subsequent research questions.

Defining Stuttering

According to the Stuttering Foundation of America, more than 68 million people stutter, which accounts for approximately 1% of the world's population (Stuttering Foundation of America, 2013). It is estimated that over 3 million people in the United States stutter. The incidence of those who stutter at some time in their lives is 4-5%, and is indeterminately higher if early childhood episodes of brief duration are counted (Bloodstein & Bernstein Ratner, 2008). There are two distinct paradigms on how stuttering is labeled, evaluated, and treated: (1) the outward manifestation of speech that can be judged by observers or precise physical measurement tools, or (2) the opinion, inner feelings, attitudes, and reactions of the person who stutters (PWS) and how it affects their daily life in authentic settings (Tetnowski & Scaler Scott, 2009). These two descriptions speak to the dynamic and multi-faceted nature of this disorder. In

one of the more popular descriptions of this phenomenon, Sheehan (1970) made the comparison of stuttering to an iceberg. The visible portions of the iceberg are “above the surface” and are represented as the perceived components of stuttering. These include the part-word repetitions, one-syllable word repetitions, prolongations and blocks that are commonly considered to be stuttering (Ham, 1989). However, the visible parts of the iceberg (stuttering) may also include the facial contortions, body movements, or movements of the extremities that may accompany the stuttering. In Sheehan’s iceberg analogy, many components cannot be seen and actually represent a larger portion of the entire phenomenon. These may include fear, anxiety, guilt, anger and other emotions that can accompany stuttering. These “below the surface” feelings and emotions are not easily viewed. Thus, stuttering may be looked at as two distinctive parts. One part is easily observed, the other part is much less observable.

In a more common view, Bennett (2006) states that there are affective, behavioral and cognitive components of stuttering. Affective components account for the emotions experienced by the PWS and include feelings of anger, shame, and guilt, and can impact the PWS’s self-concept (Bennett, 2006). The behavioral component is comprised of both speech behaviors and physical concomitants. The following terminology described by Tetnowski and Scaler Scott (2009) is used to characterize and differentiate aspects of speech: Nonfluency refers to any breakdown in fluency, whether stuttering or not; disfluency refers to breakdowns in fluency that would not be considered stuttering; stuttering or stuttering-like disfluency (SLD) refer to breakdowns in fluency that would be defined as stuttering. Yairi & Ambrose (2005) further characterize SLD as part word repetitions, monosyllabic word repetitions, prolongations, and blocks. Stuttering and disfluency are subsets under the umbrella term nonfluency. This terminology allows for differentiation between stuttering and other nonfluencies that occur in

speech disorders (Van Borsel & Tetnowski, 2007). Physical concomitants are secondary behaviors that accompany the stuttering event. These include visible, but are not limited to, tension in the face and/or jaw; distortions of the mouth; quivering nostrils; frowning; movements of eyes, head, tongue, hands, arms, legs, feet, torso and respiratory muscles (Bloodstein & Bernstein Ratner, 2008). It should be noted that not all PWS experience physical concomitants associated with stuttering, which are also commonly known as secondary behaviors, secondaries, or associated symptoms. The cognitive component of stuttering encompasses the thoughts or cognition regarding the PWS's ability to communicate. A negative belief system may develop as a result of the PWS's communicative experiences, which affects concern about listener perceptions and one's own attitude toward communicative abilities (Bennett, 2006). Some of the data presented in this study include the participants' stuttering experiences relative to the affective, behavioral, and cognitive components inherent to stuttering and will be presented in Chapters 4-7.

Defining Bilingualism

Grosjean (1982) suggests that bilingualism is the norm worldwide. "With over 50% of the world's population being classified as bilingual, it certainly is a fact that bilingualism is present in every country, in all classes of society and all age levels" (Van Borsel, 2011, p. 247). In the United States (U.S.), an estimated 20% (approximately 59 million individuals) of the population over the age of 5 speak a language other than English at home (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010). Defining bilingualism has proven to be a difficult task across disciplines, however.

Bloomfield (1935) defines bilingualism as the native-like control of two languages, while Macnamara (1967) defines bilingualism as having minimal competence in only one of the four language modalities in a language other than the speaker's mother tongue. Between these two

opposing descriptions of bilingualism, there are many other definitions of bilingualism in the literature. ASHA (2004) defines bilingualism as a fluctuating system in children and adults whereby use of and proficiency in two languages may change depending on the opportunities to use the languages and exposure to other users of the languages. Grosjean (1989) states, however, that proficiency levels will not be comparable to those exhibited by two perfect monolinguals, due to the fact that they use their languages for different purposes and in different situations, and hence will have different needs and uses of the two languages. Roberts (2011) describes bilingualism as a continuum with bilingualism and monolingualism at two end points. Mennen (2011) defines bilingualism in terms of exposure, where simultaneous bilinguals are exposed to both languages from birth, and sequential bilinguals are exposed to one language from birth and the second language later on. Wei (2000) lists over 30 terms that have been used to describe bilingual speakers. These various ways in which bilingualism is defined speaks to the myriad of factors that need to be considered when constructing a definition.

One definition that attempts to capture all of the aspects of the bilingual speaker's language abilities is that of Hamers (1981), which states that bilinguality is the psychological state of an individual who has access to more than one linguistic code as a means of social communication; the degree of access will vary along a number of dimensions, which are psychological, cognitive, psycholinguistic, social psychological, sociological, sociolinguistic, sociocultural, and linguistic. Hamers and Blanc (2000) state that current definitions of bilingualism are weak due to: unidimensionality; failure to take different levels of analysis into consideration (individual, interpersonal, societal); and a lack of underpinning guided by general theory of language behavior. There is still much disagreement in the literature in regard to this topic. In light of these issues, this study takes a descriptive approach to bilingualism by

developing language profiles for each participant, which fleshes out multiple aspects of their experiences as bilinguals. For the purpose of this study, bilingualism will be defined as the use and variable proficiency of two languages, particularly English and Spanish.

Bilinguals Who Stutter

The literature that has been published on stuttering and bilingualism shows that the conclusions are diverse in regard to number and age of participants, language proficiency and usage, language combinations, and methodologies employed for assessing stuttering as well as methodologies used for assessing bilingualism (Van Borsel, 2011). Roberts (2011) states that the stuttering literature tends to pretend that all speakers are unilingual, except for the few who are studied by the small number of people doing research that explicitly targets “bilingual stuttering.” The primary focus of this study, the bilingual stuttering experience, will serve as a contribution to the emerging body of literature centered on this population.

Earlier studies have sought to describe the linguistic characteristics of bilingual stuttering. Jayaram (1983), Jayaram (1984), Bernstein Ratner and Benitez (1985), as well as Howell and Au-Yueng (2007), focused on the linguistic characteristics of speech. Jayaram (1983) compared the speech of 10 monolingual Kannada-speaking PWS and 10 English-Kannada bilingual PWS and discovered that the bilingual PWS stuttered more on nasal sounds while both groups had difficulty with voiceless consonants. Through the investigation of the speech of 10 adult English-Kannada bilinguals, Jayaram (1984) found that the demands of speech on the motor planning at the beginning of sentences might have a significant relationship with stuttering. Bernstein Ratner and Benitez (1985) conducted a case study of an adult bilingual (Spanish-English) PWS and found that syntactic complexity was a greater determinant of stuttering than was phonology. Howell and Au-Yeung (2007) investigated the effects of phonetic complexity on

stuttering rate in Spanish and found that phonetic factors affect stuttering rate regardless of the speaker's experience with a particular factor. While linguistic characteristics do play a role in stuttering for many bilingual PWS, it does not represent the entirety of their stuttering experience.

There is a prevailing belief that bilingualism is a risk factor for stuttering (Howell, Davis, & Williams, 2009). Tetnowski, Richels, Shenker, Sisskin, and Wolk (2012) state that this is not the case, and that speech therapists should work to honor both languages of the bilingual's household. This assertion is supported by the findings of Mansson (2000), which were that stuttering incidence rates in the multilingual population of PWS were about the same as the monolingual population of PWS. Based on this study, it can be said that bilingualism is not a risk factor, though there are still disparities in the literature about this topic. In regard to prevalence, it is believed that stuttering is more prevalent in bilinguals than in monolinguals. Many studies have sought to investigate this stance, as it has been supported by studies such as Travis, Johnson, and Shover (1937) as well as Stern (1948) that found significant differences between the number of school-age bilinguals and monolinguals who stutter. For example, Travis et al. (1937) reported that 2.80% of the bilingual school children he surveyed were identified as PWS. By comparison, 1.80% of the monolingual English-speaking children were identified as PWS. Stern (1948) reported that, of the school children studied in South Africa, prevalence of stuttering amongst children who were bilingual before the age of six was 2.16% while prevalence for the monolingual children was 1.66%. Howell, Davis, and Williams (2009) found that bilingual children had an increased risk of stuttering and a lower chance of recovery from stuttering when compared to monolingual and language exclusive peers. These findings all highlight the lack of consistency in the literature regarding the existence of a causal relationship

between bilingualism and stuttering. While Van Borsel et al. (2001) cited the neuroscience model (Nudelman, Herbrich, Hoyt, & Rosenfield, 1989) and the Demands and Capacities Model (Starkweather, 1987) as resources that could show the relationship between bilingualism and prevalence of stuttering, Van Borsel et al. (2001) similarly suggested that factors such as economic insecurity, emotional instability, environmental interference, simultaneous/consecutive acquisition, and code-switching be taken into consideration before suggesting that this relationship does in fact exist. The previously mentioned factors are consistent with observable aspects of stuttering as defined earlier, however, there is almost no knowledge of the inner feelings, emotions and other below the surface elements of stuttering in bilinguals. The current study investigates this topic by examining the participants' own theories as to whether or not a relationship between bilingualism and stuttering exists for them.

An area that is receiving more attention in the literature is the manifestation of stuttering across languages in bilinguals who stutter. Nwokah (1988) describes three theoretical manifestations of stuttering in bilinguals. The first of these is the occurrence of stuttering in one language but not the other. This is said to be unusual, but may exist if a bilingual is far more proficient in one language over another and was actually not supported by Nwokah's study on the 16 (Igbo-English) bilinguals. Dale (1977) is the only study that reports language-specific stuttering in all 4 of his Cuban-American bilingual participants, where each participant stuttered in his native language, Spanish, but not English. The second possibility is for stuttering to occur in both languages under the "same-hypothesis." These individuals show similar speaking patterns in both languages. This is the most common of the three manifestations and is supported by the literature (e.g. Van Riper, 1971). The third possibility is for stuttering to occur in both languages under the "different-hypothesis." In this case, the severity of speaking patterns will

differ in both languages. This, too, is attributed to differences in proficiency and uneven language development and is supported by studies previously cited in this section of the literature review (e.g. Jayaram, 1983; Bernstein Ratner & Benitez, 1985). Therefore, while these theories posited by Nwokah (1988) have been tested in previous works, findings have been chalked up to proficiency and language dominance. Rather than simply identifying which of these hypotheses applies to the bilinguals' manifestation of stuttering across languages, this study aims to describe the factors, as theorized by the bilingual PWS themselves that contribute to stuttering in each language.

Findings in regard to the manifestation of stuttering across languages have been inconsistent. Jankelowitz and Bortz (1996) found that the language abilities of a bilingual Afrikaans and English speaker influenced the frequency, distribution and nature of stuttering. In this case, the bilingual stuttered less in the dominant, more proficient language. However, Van Borsel, Meirlaen, Achten, Vingerhoets, and Santens (2009) found that language proficiency was not a determining factor in the manifestation of stuttering in the speech of a Dutch-English bilingual who exhibited more dysfluencies in the native language. Carias and Ingram (2006) found that stuttering increased as linguistic complexity increased in the speech of four Spanish-English bilingual children. In Lim, Lincoln, Chan, and Onslow (2008), language dominance appeared to influence the severity, but not the types of stuttering behaviors in English-Mandarin bilinguals who stutter. Rather than trying to identify a cause for the varying manifestations of stuttering across languages, this study aims to investigate the way each participant linguistically constructs these manifestations while talking about them. In order to do so, very specific tools of inquiry are needed.

Coalson, Peña, and Byrd (2013) conducted a systematic search of published studies that included multilingual participants who stutter, and reviewed the level of detail provided regarding language history, function, proficiency, stability, mode, accent, covert speech, and affective factors. Results of this review indicate that the descriptions of multilingual stuttering participants in these studies were inadequate, in that the majority of the studies only focused on proficiency, history, and function as descriptive factors. It was also found that the terminology used to refer to these factors was inconsistent across studies. Findings suggest that there is a need to develop and use descriptive, multifactorial protocols when assessing multilingual PWS. The current study works to describe the various aspects of bilingual stuttering by building case studies that incorporate descriptive information provided by language profiles based on the eight factor framework proposed by Coalson et al. (2013).

Clinical considerations regarding the bilingual PWS

Assessment of stuttering. Multicultural discussions on stuttering are based on speculation and diagnostic theory rather than dependable empirical and clinical knowledge (Finn & Cordes, 1997). Van Borsel et al. (2001) suggest that diagnosticians should test the bilingual in both languages, watch for secondary behaviors to prevent confusion with second-language learner disfluencies, monitor the client's affective status, and collect data on family history of stuttering. This is somewhat consistent with the theoretical view offered by Nwokah (1998). There is often a rift, however, between clinical practice and these empirical findings. This study works to close this gap by providing evidence of the efficacy of using descriptive tools, such as SFL, in addition to standardized measures when assessing bilingual PWS.

The literature reveals a number of issues regarding reliability and validity in the measurement of the severity of stuttering across languages as well as in assessing language

proficiency. This is heavily supported by the work of Young (1980), which reported that while there were comparably more stuttering moments found during speaking than in reading tasks, upon re-examination, this discrepancy was accounted for by the smaller frequency of word repetitions and interjections exhibited during reading tasks. Inconsistencies in clinician judgment of stuttering have also been cited as problematic in the literature (e.g. Cordes & Ingham, 1994; Curlee, 1981; Ham, 1981). This has implications for the validity of results. Cordes and Ingham (1994) cited the definition of stuttering as problematic in that it does not allow for clear differentiation between stuttering and nonfluencies that are typical in normal speech during assessment.

Determining stuttering severity is still a methodological issue, as reliance on clinical impressions and self-evaluation alone are not adequate (Van Borsel, 2011). Riley's *Stuttering Severity Instrument, version four* (SSI-4), is the de facto standard for characterizing stuttering in English (Howell & Rusbridge, 2011). Norms for English have been published, and the tool's reliability and validity have been assessed (Riley, 1994). However, Lewis (1995) investigated whether SSI-3 scores adequately reflected judges' raw counts and ratings from which the scores were derived and found that they did not based on judge agreement inconsistencies regarding frequency, duration, and physical concomitant scale scores. These findings were cited as evidence that new tools should be developed to measure stuttering in the clinical setting (Lewis, 1995). This has strong implications for the use of multiple tools when determining stuttering severity.

Though SSI-3 assessment instructions have been translated into other languages, following the standardized and prescribed procedures does not ensure valid and reliable results. Howell & Rusbridge (2011) caution that the norms for English do not apply when the SSI-3 is

translated to other languages due to the lack of statistical and standardized evaluation. However, Bakhtiar, Seifpanahi, Ansari, Ghanadzade, and Packman (2010) reported that investigation of the reliability of a Persian translation of SSI-3 yielded acceptable interjudge and intrajudge agreement levels with greater than 80% agreement in scale scores for frequency and duration as well as for the overall score. Agreement of physical concomitants was low with 62.2% intrajudge agreement and 54% interjudge agreement (Bakhtiar et al., 2010). If translated versions are not available, Schafer (2008) recommends conducting formal measurements in terms of percentage of syllables stuttered as well as words stuttered, as languages differ with respect to the amount of multisyllabic words, and may potentially yield different levels of stuttering. But as Roberts (2011) points out, counting SLDs in languages other than English can be problematic since relative frequencies of one-syllable words in some languages may lead to different frequencies of occurrence of repetitions of one-syllable words. “This is by far the largest and most controversial component of SLDs in the speech of non-stuttering children and adults, in English” (Roberts, 2011, p. 362). In light of these findings regarding formal assessment, the current study results from the SSI-4 are used for descriptive, rather than diagnostic, purposes.

Determining language proficiency and stuttering severity across languages. While formal assessment of language proficiency is necessary, the concept of language proficiency is a complex one in and of itself (Van Borsel, 2011). There are varying opinions on how proficiency should be measured. As cited in Van Borsel (2011), past studies have determined proficiency using measures of length of exposure to a language (Nwokah, 1988), mean length of utterance (Carias & Ingram, 2006), cloze procedures and questionnaires (Jankelowitz & Bortz, 1996; Schafer, 2008), the language background questionnaire of Paradis’s Bilingual Aphasia Test (Jankelowitz & Bortz, 1996), and a self-report classification tool (Lim et al., 2008).

The reliability of self-reports has been brought into question by several studies due to inconsistent findings in the literature. Nwokah (1988) reported that the bilingual participants' perceptions of stuttering severity across languages yielded results indicating that their perceptions of severity were confirmed by analysis of language abilities. However, based on the findings of Roberts (2002) participants' self-evaluation of fluency in two languages was a poor predictor of fluency levels. This finding was attributed to methodological issues in the assessment and interpretation of bilingual data. Lim and Lincoln (2011) found that participants' responses varied in self-report of and in formal assessment with respect to the language they stuttered in more before treatment, and the language they were more fluent in following treatment. Tsai, Lim, Brundage, and Bernstein Ratner (2011) found that the participant stuttered more in Spanish than in English despite his self-rating of similar frequencies of stuttering in both languages.

Tsai et al. (2011) also had implications for self-reports of proficiency, which indicated that the subjective nature of self-report ratings may either lead to over or under estimation of subjects' relative proficiency in languages. Lim and Lincoln (2011) stated that a more acceptable approach might be to first determine language dominance using self-report ratings and then use the results of the objective tests to substantiate rather than determine language dominance as described by Grosjean (1998). Roberts (2011) suggests working toward situating participants along a bilingual-unilingual continuum. For the purposes of the current study, language profiles were created using the responses participants provided on a language history questionnaire. This allowed for the description of the participants' language abilities rather than the measuring and using a "one size fits all" term to label their proficiency.

The reliability of clinician judgment and perceptions has also been cited as an issue in the literature. Finn and Cordes (1997) state that there is a lack of empirical evidence concerning whether and how well clinicians can make reliable and valid judgments about presence of stuttering in languages and dialects other than their own. Humphrey (2004) found that monolingual English speakers made stuttering judgments similar to those of bilingual English-Spanish speakers. Because this study was conducted in South Florida, it is likely that the monolingual English-speakers' performance was better than expected due to their exposure to Spanish in this location. However, Van Borsel and Pereira (2005) found that language familiarity does influence stuttering judgment. It was suggested that monolingual clinicians summon help from other clinicians who are fluent in the bilingual's second language when performing an assessment (Van Borsel et al., 2001). In consideration of these findings, the researcher sought assistance from a Spanish-English bilingual speaker during the data collection and analysis phases of this study.

Measuring affect and cognition relative to stuttering. While there is a great deal of literature that focuses on the issues involved in describing and assessing the speech characteristics and abilities of bilinguals who stutter, there has not been much work that seeks to investigate the affective and cognitive components of the stuttering experience. One study that addresses these particular components is the *Overall Assessment of the Speaker's Experience of Stuttering* (OASES) as described by Yaruss and Quesal (2006). The OASES evaluates the perspective of stuttering from that of the PWS in the format of a self-report questionnaire, in which participants respond to statements about stuttering using items on a rating scale. These statements are divided into sections including general information, reactions to stuttering, communication in daily situations, and quality of life (QOL). Results from each section are

combined and are used to calculate the overall impact of stuttering on the participant's quality of life. In terms of translated versions of the OASES, the Dutch translation of this measure (OASES-A-D) has moderate to high concurrent validity and confirmed construct validity (Koedoot, Versteegh, & Yaruss, 2011). Blumgart, Tran, Yaruss, and Craig (2012) created a set of normative data based on the Australian population and found that, in comparison to results based on American normative data, the Australian data indicated that participants who stuttered severely typically had higher negative impact scores for "General Information," "Communication in Daily Situations," and "Overall" scores. These findings indicate that when using the OASES, the cultural background of the PWS needs to be taken into consideration. The OASES is outlined in detail in the methods chapter of this dissertation.

While the OASES provides valuable information about the affective and cognitive aspects of stuttering, its format inherently limits the scope of the factors that could potentially contribute to the stuttering experience. This has implications for the use of other descriptive tools in addition to the OASES, considering the dynamic nature of these aspects and the significant role they play in the stuttering experience as a whole. For example, Craig, Blumgart, and Tran (2009) used the Lifestyle Appraisal Questionnaire (LAQ) to compare the quality of life of PWS with people who do not stutter (PWDNS). This tool has two parts: the LAQ1, which assesses multiple sources of health risks, and the LAQ2, which assesses self-efficacy and the participants' beliefs about how much control they feel they have over the stressors in their lives. In comparison to the PWDNS, the PWS reported lower levels quality of life (Craig et al., 2009). Other studies using questionnaire formats to investigate the affective components of stuttering have also provided valuable information in regard to affective component of stuttering (Manning, Dailey, & Wallace, 1984; Leith, Mahr, & Miller, 1993). While these alternative

measures allowed for the identification of QOL aspects, they were arguably limited by their questionnaire formats in that the stuttering experience goes beyond these pre-determined categories presented in questionnaires.

In addition to the emotional and cognitive aspects related to stuttering, the literature has widely cited the significance that the social aspect plays in the stuttering experience (e.g. Ingham, 2012; Plexico, Manning, & Levitt, 2009; Boyle, 2013). Ginsberg (2000) expanded on these further by providing evidence of the variety of psychological experiences relative to stuttering such as triumph, heartache, and challenge; highly personal descriptions that would otherwise be difficult to detect using a questionnaire. In an attempt to account for the internalization of negative affect, Boyle (2013) described an experimental scale, the Self-Stigma Stuttering Scale (4S) which was developed to measure the various levels of self-stigma as experienced by the PWS. While it is psychometrically sound and has adequate reliability, it focuses on only one aspect of stuttering is therefore not an exhaustive measure of the stuttering experience.

Klompas and Ross (2004) conducted individual interviews with 16 adult PWS to investigate the impact of stuttering on quality of life in relation to the domains of education, social life, employment, speech therapy, family and marital life, identity, beliefs, and emotional issues. Data was analyzed using content analysis methods, which resulted in the derivation of thematic categories from the data. Findings from this study had implications for the use of qualitative measures to identify aspects of PWS' lives that impact their stuttering and provided strong evidence for the validity of using the personal narrative in the clinical setting. A limitation of this study was the collapsing of individual experiences in order to give rise to major themes, which washes out the details of the individual's experience. This study aims to describe

stuttering components, as construed by the bilingual PWS, during social interaction. Similar to Komplas and Ross (2004), their personal experiences serve as a starting point, which gives way to a breadth of individualized data.

Systemic Functional Linguistics and the bilingual stuttering experience

Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004) is a theory of language use that was developed in an effort to create an applicable, holistic, and socially accountable approach to linguistics. The development of this theory began in the 1960s with the work of M.A.K. Halliday, who drew from functional, as well as anthropological approaches to language by building upon J.R. Firth's emphasis on the description of languages (Matthiessen, 2012). Matthiessen affirms that "SFL was designed to be a holistic theory of language in context, with comprehensive descriptions of the systems of particular languages that could support text analysis" (2012, p. 437). Language is conceptualized as a resource for creating meaning by the selections speakers make within the grammar to construct their messages. As Halliday and Matthiessen state: "Language is as it is because of the functions in which it has evolved in the human species" (2004, p. 31). Under the theory of SFL, the lexicogrammar is understood as a system of meaning, which provides information about what is meant and how it is meant (Christie, 1990).

The lexicogrammar of a language represents the semantics of that language, not as one half of a sign represents the other half, but as a whole system of systems represents another system of systems: representation as it is built into the organization of natural languages is the symbolic relation we find or posit between different strata (levels) of linguistic organization. (Matthiessen & Kasper, 1985, p. 7)

SFL views language as a semiotic system in that meaning is construed through the words and syntactic structures speakers select from a system of lexical and grammatical choices to construct a message. This system is comprised of networks of interrelated contrasts whereby what the speaker means and does not mean, is encoded in the language they select from the semantic options available (Fontaine, 2010). Thus, SFL theory is based on authentic, language use. According to Halliday and Matthiessen, social interaction is “the semantic frontier of language” in that it allows people to explore and expand their meaning potential (2004, p. 34). This approach has, thus, given rise to the systemic analysis of language use during social interaction and enables researchers to uncover the semiotic properties that underlie a message in a particular context (Fontaine, 2010).

The analytic tools based on SFL theory, therefore, provide an appropriate means for examining the language data collected for the purposes of this study. In particular, SFL allows for the examination of the experiential, interpersonal, and textual metafunctions involved in making and conveying meaning during social interaction. The experiential metafunction enables speakers to construe the world of experience into process types and participants, which is accomplished by making linguistic choices within the system of Transitivity (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004). The process types, which represent particular schemas of experience, include: material, behavioral, mental, verbal, relational, and existential processes. Examination of a speaker’s experiential configuration of a message reveals how they portray a particular experience and how they position themselves in relation to it. For example, a bilingual PWS may structure their experience in such a way that their stuttering is expressed as having an active role in its occurrence, “My stuttering worsens when I speak Spanish” or they may also describe it as a behavior that they participate in “I stutter worse when I speak Spanish.”

The interpersonal metafunction allows speakers to convey and negotiate attitudes and feelings during conversation through the linguistic choices they make within the Appraisal and mood systems. The system of Appraisal is comprised of three interacting sub-systems. The first of these sub-systems is attitude, which expresses emotion, judgment, and evaluation. The sub-system of graduation allows for the grading of phenomena in terms of intensity and quantity, while engagement construes intersubjective stance (Martin & White, 2005). Modality is derived from the network of Mood and works to convey polarity in regard to usuality, probability, potential, obligation, and inclination. Analysis of the resources speakers use from these interpersonal systems can provide information about the attitudes speakers have toward their disorder.

The textual metafunction is a domain of language in which speakers organize and construct their messages in regard to Theme (typically given information) and Rheme (typically new information). Examination of this will provide insight about which topics clients select in talking about their disorder and can serve as a means to reveal language strengths through maintenance of Theme and development of Rheme. These three metafunctions as well as their respective subsystems are explained in greater detail in the methods chapter of this dissertation.

A review of the literature finds a limited body of work in applying SFL to the analysis of discourse of PWS in general. There have not been any studies, to date, that use SFL methods to analyze the talk of bilingual PWS. There are three studies available that use SFL methods to examine monolingual-English stuttering data. Spencer, Packman, Onslow, and Ferguson (2005) described a pilot study, which was conducted with the purpose of determining which of the SFL-based analyses would provide insight about the effects stuttering has on language use. It was concluded that investigation of the interpersonal aspects (specifically modality) as well as the

foregrounding of information (as conveyed through Theme) were most useful for the purposes of the study. Spencer, Packman, Onslow, and Ferguson (2009) used SFL to examine the syntactic and semantic complexity in the language use of 10 PWS. This data was then compared to the structures used by 10 fluent speakers. Findings suggest that the participants in the group of PWS use clause structures that were less complex in comparison to the control group. The results of this study also indicate the participants in the group of PWS used modality less than their fluent peers. The third study, Packman and Kuhn (2009), is a theoretical paper that describes stuttering from a “complexity perspective” where the systems within the PWS and their environment are discussed.

Analytic tools derived from SFL can be used for descriptive purposes when investigating the discourse of PWS as well as bilingual PWS. Analysis of the three metafunctions of language with the purpose of understanding the experiences of bilingual PWS can provide valuable insight on the affective and cognitive components inherent to stuttering. The way bilingual PWS structure their experiences offers a window through which researchers can explore the internal aspect that underlies the behaviors by which their disorder is defined.

Statement of the problem

Stuttering is a disorder that can be defined in terms of speech characteristics, physical concomitants, emotions, perceptions, and quality of life (Bloodstein & Bernstein Ratner, 2008; Tetnowski & Scaler Scott, 2009; Bennett, 2006). The current literature focuses on describing bilingual stuttering in terms of bilingualism being a cause; linguistic characteristics; and manifestations across languages. There is also a great deal of literature that addresses issues regarding clinical measurements of linguistic characteristics of stuttering, severity of stuttering and bilingual language proficiency, as well as how these factors affect one another in the

bilingual stuttering population. While standardized measures and definitions of these factors will allow for generalization across studies (Roberts, 2011), they will not provide a holistic picture of the bilingual stuttering experience.

The reality of the matter is: No two bilinguals are alike, or as Haugen (1953) viewed it, the only common thing about bilinguals is that they're not monolinguals. Similarly, stuttering itself is an individual's disorder in that it manifests in a plethora of ways across individuals and languages. Therefore, the experience as construed by the bilingual PWS can provide valuable information about the intricacies of their stuttering experiences. Descriptive methods are best suited for studying a dynamic, multidimensional phenomenon such as the bilingual stuttering experience. Therefore, the use of analytic tools derived from SFL is an appropriate method for examining this experience.

Research questions

How do bilinguals who stutter linguistically construct their stuttering experience?

Sub questions

- a) What perceptions do these individuals have about stuttering in each language?
- b) How do these individuals position themselves relative to their stuttering?

Chapter 3:

Methodology

Research Design

A qualitative research design was used to investigate the bilingual stuttering experience. The use of qualitative methods allowed the researcher to systematically collect and describe the authentic, contextualized social phenomenon of spoken language while attaining the goal of interpretative adequacy (Tetnowski & Damico, 2001). This design also allowed for the context-specific analysis of the discourse observed using selected methods of analysis provided by SFL. Considering the lack of research on the topic of the bilingual stuttering experience, it was not possible to formulate testable hypotheses about the relations between variables within this population (Maxwell & Satake, 2006). Therefore, a descriptive approach in which the researcher took a learning role rather than a testing role was best suited for the exploration of this topic (Damico, Simmons-Mackie, Oelschlaeger, Elman, & Armstrong, 1999).

A case study approach was employed for this study (Yin, 2014). This tradition of inquiry entails the description of participants and analysis of their use of language on an individual basis. These sets of information are presented as individual cases where each case represents a participant. This allows the researcher to investigate the complexity of a particular case or particular cases while focusing on the detail of interaction in the contexts of interest (Stake, 1994). Therefore, it is especially suited to the analysis of the way individuals linguistically construe their personal experiences with stuttering. This study presents four cases of the bilingual stuttering experience. The four primary participants as well as the contexts in which their talk was recorded are described in the following sections.

Participants

Four primary participants were recruited from bilingual communities in order to collect data on a range of experiences. In order to participate in the study, the participants had to meet the following inclusionary criteria:

- a) Identifies self as a person who stutters.
- b) Stutters with at least moderate severity in at least one language as determined by *Stuttering Severity Instrument - Fourth Edition* (SSI-4) (Riley, 2009) measures.
- c) Identifies self as a Spanish-English bilingual who is able to read and hold a conversation in both languages.
- d) Be at least 15 years of age at time of study. If under the age of 18, the individual must have signed parental consent prior to participation in the study.
- e) Be able to travel for interview.
- f) Be willing to participate in conversation with researcher.
- g) Be willing to undergo formal stuttering assessment.
- h) Has a parent or sibling that willingly volunteers to serve as conversation partner.
- i) With informed consent, willingly volunteer to participate in the study.

The National Stuttering Association (NSA) was contacted for permission to recruit from three of their regional self-help/support group chapters in the state of Florida. The researcher attended and presented the call for participants at one self-help/support group meeting. A call for participants was sent to and presented by the leaders of the two other chapters at their respective self-help/support group meetings. All four participants were recruited from their respective NSA chapters. Each of the four primary participants who willingly volunteered to participate in the study met the above criteria. All but one participant had family members that were also willing

to participate as secondary participants. In accordance with the requirements of the Institutional Review Board at the University of Louisiana at Lafayette and the National Stuttering Association Research Committee, all participants signed consent forms to participate in the study. The one participant under the age of 18, Sam, submitted a signed parental permission form as well. All consent and parental permission forms were available in English and Spanish and were given to participants according to their respective language preferences. Additionally, consent and permission forms as well as the freedom to cease participation at any time were verbally explained to all participants before they were asked to sign the forms. A pseudonym has been assigned to each participant and identifying characteristics have been eliminated or generalized in order to ensure confidentiality. The following biographical sketches represent the participants' portrayal of their own lives. The information reported in each sketch was extracted from the participants' respective ethnographic interviews and family conversation. The language history information was reported based on the responses each participant provided on the *L2 Language History Questionnaire* (L2LHQ) (Li, Sepanski, & Zhao, 2006) (Appendix A). This questionnaire will be described further in the "Data Collection" section of this chapter.

Ivan, Biographical Sketch. The first participant, Ivan, is a 29 year-old male from Ecuador. His mother and younger brother moved to South Florida when Ivan was 12 years old. He decided to stay in Ecuador with his father and had been living there until just eight months ago when he decided to come and live with his mother. He likens this experience to being 'like a newborn' as it has allowed him to start over again. He struggles with the adjustment of having to work in the kitchen of a restaurant in the United States knowing that he has promising opportunities to work in his field of interest, film and video production, in Ecuador. However, his relationship with his mother has improved as a result of his move, and that has boosted his

overall confidence. He currently writes fiction in English and Spanish about his stuttering experiences in his online blog. He has a passion for film and has recently completed his own short film about an elderly man who stutters. Ivan indicated that his primary reason for participating in this study was his hope that a mother would be able read the final product and learn techniques to help her child who stutters.

Stuttering History. Ivan first realized that he spoke differently than others when he was 5 years-old after experiencing a block. To his knowledge, his female cousin is the only other family member who stutters. Due to a general lack of resources in Ecuador, Ivan was not able to access speech therapy until the age of 20. During this time, he was taught breathing techniques to address his stuttering. He remembers being told to stop, breathe from his stomach, and listen. He worked with this particular therapist in Guayaquil over the course of a summer. His second therapy experience occurred in Quito when he was 26 years old. Similar to his previous therapy experience, he was taught to focus on his breathing. Specifically, he was instructed to feel and use the air from his stomach instead of from his lungs. He believes that the two most important factors in his fluency are rhythm and confidence. He does not stutter when he sings, impersonates accents, or talks about subjects that he is passionate about. Ivan reported that the breathing techniques work as well, however they are not convenient enough to use in all situations. He said that he frequently uses “muletillas,” which is the diminutive form of the Spanish noun “muleta” (crutch). He uses these words, also known as filler words, or interjections in English, during blocks as they allow him to “go back and get a running start” on what he wanted to say.

Ivan reported that his stuttering is characterized by a mix of “tonica” and “clonica” also known in English as blocks, prolongations, and repetitions (Bloodstein, 1960). The “tonica” he

experiences was described as spasms or difficult tension primarily felt in his tongue. He described the “clonica” aspect of his stuttering as repetitions of words and initial syllables. The researcher also noticed the presence of prolongations in Ivan’s speech throughout the duration of the interview. Ivan remembers stuttering “all the time” when he was between the ages of 12 and 13, and believes it was because he was more aware of it then and was also experiencing more stressors in his life. Before and after this short time span, he felt that he had more control of his speech and experienced similar levels of severity. He remembers that just up until moving in with his mother 6 months ago, he experienced a great deal of fluency difficulties with her in particular. Living with her and helping her financially has helped build his confidence in their relationship and has helped him be more fluid when speaking to her. Ivan reported that if his English is better than the person he is talking to, he has a feeling of superiority and therefore, experiences fewer issues with stuttering. However, if the person’s English is better than his, he feels intimidated and stutters more. He reported experiencing this with his younger brother in particular and therefore always opts to speak to him in Spanish, the brother’s weaker language.

Ivan feels that his stuttering has interfered with some aspects of his life. For example, he talked about making it to the interview stage for a Fulbright Scholarship, but “didn’t pass” because it was an intimidating situation and he stuttered a lot. He believes “100%” that if he had not stuttered during the interview, he would have gotten the scholarship. More recently, Ivan took the TOEFL exam and feels that his scores on the speaking portion were adversely affected by his stuttering. Additionally, he stated that his biggest fear is getting old and still stuttering: “I don’t want to be an old man who stutters.” These setbacks and fears are contradicted, however, by his assertion that he has accepted his stuttering and has come to take pride in it.

Language History. On the *L2 Language History Questionnaire* (L2LHQ) (Li, Sepanski, & Zhao, 2006), Ivan identified Spanish as his native language. He also reported that he has been learning Portuguese for less than a year and learned French for less than a year at the age of 20. His began to learn his second most dominant language, English, at the age of 6 in school. He learned English up to this point mainly through a mixture of classroom instruction and interacting with people. Using a scale of 1 - “very poor” to 7 - “native-like,” he rated his English abilities as follows: reading proficiency, 6 - “very good;” writing proficiency, 6 - “very good;” speaking fluency, 5 - “good;” and listening ability, 7 - “native-like.” On a scale of 1 - “not much of an accent” to 7 - “very strong accent,” Ivan rated his accent in English with a 4. He reported that others “always” identify him as a non-native speaker based on his accent in English. Spanish was the only language he reported that his parents can fluently speak. In terms of percentages, he estimated that he uses Spanish 80% of the day and English 20% of the day in all daily activities combined. Ivan reported that he adds, multiplies, and does simple arithmetic in Spanish. He primarily expresses anger or affection in Spanish, but dreams in English and Spanish. Comparing English and Spanish, he feels he usually does better with reading, writing, speaking and understanding in Spanish in both his home and work environments. However, he stated that he would prefer to use English in situations at home, work, or at a party. He prefers using Spanish in general and does not mix words or sentences from the two languages (code-mix).

Sam, Biographical Sketch. The second participant, Sam, is a 16 year-old male of Colombian decent. He was born and raised in South Florida. He lives with his mother, father, and younger brother, though he does have some relatives who live in Colombia. At the time of the study, he was in the 11th grade and homeschooled. He runs cross country at a local high school and is able to practice his Spanish speaking skills with his peers in this setting.

Stuttering History. Sam was very young at the onset of his stuttering - too young to remember his exact age. In regard to family history with stuttering, he reported that his father currently identifies as a person who stutters. Before the age of 6, Sam attended speech therapy for his stuttering and articulation, and then moved on to another therapist around the age of 7. He recalled working on “active kinds” of techniques such as restarting after blocks and prolongations as well as loosening his jaw when he was stuck in a block to reduce tension. These techniques worked inconsistently for him. Sam’s parents eventually took him out of speech therapy because he no longer wanted to go. At the age of 15, Sam decided to start therapy again because he wanted to be able to speak fluently even in moments when he was not feeling confident. With this therapist, he is working on “the emotional side of stuttering” as well as “fluency strategies” such as lowering his tone, relaxing his articulators, and breathing from his diaphragm. He reported that he is satisfied with these fluency techniques and he uses them all the time.

Sam characterizes his stuttering as “a repetition type of stuttering” where he repeats one syllable or one word, though during data collection, signs of prolongation and blocks were present. He said he feels prolongations happening at his front teeth for some sounds and at the vocal cords for vowels. He typically feels blocks occurring at his lips. Sam reported being a lot less fluent from the ages of 7-13 years old and felt that it was correlated with his confidence. His fluency was at its “worst” when he was 14 years old, which he attributed to the pressure involved in trying to counter his parents’ bids for him to go back to therapy. He also experienced fluency issues when talking to authority figures, including his mother. Sam reported that this characteristic has since subsided, and that the fluency issues arise depending on the topic of which he is speaking. He feels that he is less fluent, in terms of stuttering, when speaking

Spanish. He finds it harder to use, in Spanish, the techniques he has learned in English. He also said that just knowing it is more difficult for him to speak fluently in Spanish “isn’t helpful.” Sam said that he always has a slight prolongation with the word “stuttering” due to the emotions behind it. He recalled code switching as a child to avoid words that he knew he would stutter on and believes that this was a sign of covert stuttering.

In the past, Sam viewed stuttering as a challenge and always thought it would go away in time. When he realized in his teen years that it was not going away, it was worrisome for him for a while. He reported that he dealt with the anxieties that “everyone who stutters talks about” such as the feeling of being “the outsider - the one who can’t communicate as well as everyone else.” Despite all these feelings, Sam was able to stay positive during this time. Currently, he feels happy that he had his stutter in the first place because it gave him the opportunity to work through it and it showed that if he puts his mind to something and works hard, he can succeed.

Language History. Sam identified English as his native language on the L2LHQ (Li, Sepanski, & Zhao, 2006). He began to learn Spanish as a second language at home at approximately the age of 1 year-old and in school at age 14 years-old. Up until the time of the study, Sam learned Spanish through a mixture of interacting with people and formal classroom instruction. He assigned the following ratings to his abilities in Spanish: reading proficiency, 2 - “poor;” writing proficiency, 2 - “poor;” speaking fluency, 4-“functional;” and listening ability, 5 -“good.” Sam rated the strength of his accent while speaking Spanish with a 3 and reported that others frequently identify him as a non-native speaker based on his “pace not accent” in Spanish. His mother is fluent in both English and Spanish while his father is fluent only in English. Sam estimated that he uses English for 90% of the day and Spanish for 10% in all daily activities combined. He reported that he does simple arithmetic only in English, but dreams and expresses

anger or affection in both English and Spanish. Sam mixes words and sentences from English and Spanish when talking to a variety of people. Using a scale of 1 - “mixing is very rare” to 5 - “mixing is very frequent,” he rated his frequency of mixing in normal conversations with family members, friends, and co-workers with a 2. He feels better using English when he is not at home for reading, writing, speaking, and understanding. He feels the same about using English for these modalities at home as well but with the exception of “understanding,” which he feels better doing in both English and Spanish. While he uses both English and Spanish at home, he prefers to use only English at work, at parties, and in general.

Neil, Biographical Sketch. Neil is a 28 year-old male originally from Syracuse, New York. He had a stroke at the age of 17, but has not had any major health issues since. While traveling abroad in Peru and Panama, he learned Spanish. Upon his return from this trip was when he realized he had persistent difficulties with speech. He moved to Central Florida in 2010 and works in the organic farming industry.

Stuttering History. Neil’s first stuttering experience occurred around the age of 19. This was approximately two years after he had a stroke. He therefore is not a typical person who stutters due the late onset of his stuttering, and also because of the possibility that his stuttering is neurological or emotional in nature (DeNil, Jokol, & Rochon, 2007; Baumgartner, 1999). He has an aunt on his mother’s side of the family who also had a late onset of stuttering in her teen years. Neil characterized this first stuttering event as a silent block where he could not produce an utterance for about 10 seconds. At the time, he did not know what stuttering was. During his time in Peru, he experienced silent blocks on a daily basis but attributed it the pressure of learning a second language. Two years later, he experienced his second major silent block while at work which he said was “terrifying.” Up until that point, he had been able to use word

substitutions to avoid having a block. He saw two doctors after this incident, who both told him that his issues with speech were caused by stress and anxiety. At that point, he began to research his symptoms online and determined that he was experiencing stuttering. Though he has not had any neurological evaluations in relation to his stuttering, he believes that there is a good chance that it was caused by the stroke.

Neil began receiving speech therapy online from a speech pathologist located in Israel because she was more able to work around his schedule and the cost of her services was significantly less. During a typical session, Neil was asked to describe picture cards which addressed “look ahead” issues and would therefore help him map out what he was planning on saying with fluency. While he experienced relief using this technique with the therapist, he was unable to transfer the skills to situations outside of the therapy setting. His second experience with speech therapy occurred when his speech hit an “all time low” six months after moving to Central Florida. He attended a three-week intensive summer program at the local university, which helped him become “completely fluent.” In this program, he learned to monitor his speech and address stuttering in the moment that it happens. He said that this allows him to be more mindful and aware of his stuttering, rather than working to prevent it, which makes stuttering easier to manage and control.

Neil said that his stuttering is primarily characterized by silent blocks where his diaphragm gets tense and he feels a stoppage of airflow. He said that the silent blocks physically manifest themselves with hard blinking, lack of eye contact, and sweating. Talking on the phone is most troublesome for him because he is unable to use gestures and pointing during stuttering events. He also said that some mornings, he wakes up “just knowing” that he is going to have a difficult day in terms of speech. He uses deep breathing techniques or reads aloud to help relieve

the mental tension and anxiety associated with these situations. Neil described his stuttering as being cyclical. He reported that his “down cycles,” where he stutters on every three to four words, can last upwards of eight weeks and are typically brought on by going long periods of time without using speech exercises. The “fluent periods” of the cycle last longer than the “down cycle.”

While Neil views stuttering as something that he will have to deal with for the rest of his life, he feels that he has reached a point where it is manageable. He said that attending support groups is refreshing and makes him feel like he is not alone. He believes that staying current with his feelings and maintaining a certain level of confidence helps him to be successful with his fluency.

Language History. Neil identified English as his native language on the L2LHQ (Li, Sepanski, & Zhao, 2006). At the age of 22, he began to learn Spanish as a second language during a 6-month trip to Peru though he reported that he was first exposed to the language at the age of 15. Neil learned Spanish by interacting with people and through formal classroom instruction. He assigned the following ratings to his abilities in Spanish: reading proficiency, 4 - “functional;” writing proficiency, 4 - “functional;” speaking fluency, 4 - “functional;” and listening ability, 4 - “functional.” He rated the strength of his accent while speaking Spanish with a 4 and reported that others “always” identify him as a non-native speaker based on his accent. His mother was fluent in both English and Spanish while his father is fluent only in English. He estimated that he uses English for 99% of the day and Spanish for 1% in all daily activities combined. Neil reported that he does simple arithmetic dreams and expresses anger or affection in English only. He feels better using English when he’s not at home for reading,

writing, speaking, and understanding. He prefers using English at home, work, at parties, and in general. Neil did not report any language mixing.

Brian, Biographical Sketch. The fourth participant, Brian, is a 63-year-old male from North Carolina who moved to South Florida three years prior to data collection. He grew up in a household where there was a lot of “implied pressure to achieve,” which he attributed to his father being a “hard charger” from the Depression Era. He feels his talents and strengths have always been in his verbal aptitude, which makes the fact that he stutters more frustrating. He reported that he has had to take blue-collar jobs that he described as not being equivalent to his intellectual abilities in order to avoid having to persuade people. Brian enjoys reading, expressing his opinion, and being around people in general. He participates in weekly language-learning groups where he teaches English but also gets to practice speaking Spanish. He described himself as a “realist” and “fighter,” who is more positive and talkative than other PWS. He said his reason for participating in the study was because he really wants something to be done and feels that there is room to grow and make more progress in treating stuttering.

Stuttering History. Brian remembers stuttering as a child. He reported that there were people who stuttered on his father’s side of the family. In regard to speech characteristics of his immediate family members, he said that his sister “mumbles” and that his father “stammered.” He described his father’s speech as being a little disjointed and hurried, which he stated was not comparable to the stuttering that he experiences. His mother told him that she did not take him to speech therapy as a child because his father believed that he would eventually outgrow stuttering. He also believes that speech therapy may have been viewed as “exorbitant” by his father during that time and may have been the reason why Brian was not taken to a speech therapist as a child. Brian went to speech therapy in his mid-twenties but reported that he only

became good at speaking to the therapist as a result. Someone told him his speech was better so he said that the therapist might have helped him “on some level” based on that comment. He remembered working on what he referred to as “waxing” techniques during that time. More recently, Brian received speech therapy in a university clinic setting for approximately three weeks. He said this helped but he is still experiencing problems. Overall, he feels that his experiences with speech therapy were “not nearly” what he needed and that his fluency has not improved.

Brian judged his stuttering as being “moderate” and described it as being sound-specific with vowel-initial words giving him the most difficulty. He reported that he has greater difficulty with fluency while speaking Spanish because the language has a large number of words that start with vowels. He also cited his lack of confidence with the language as a hindrance on his fluency. Brian said the word “aurora” was the worst because of the number of vowels it contained but has since discovered that the word “iota” is even worse because of the consecutive vowels. He reported that he “gets stuck” when he encounters problematic words and described it as saying something multiple times. During data collection, the researcher noticed that his stuttering was primarily characterized by a combination of prolongations and part word repetitions (PWR). He reported that not being comfortable and trying too hard makes his stuttering worse. While describing his stuttering in situations that require fluency, he said: “it really is like some devil or something is inside of my mind trying to...destroy me.”

The most successful he has ever been with fluency was when he was between the ages of 24 and 30, which he also said was “the best time” of his life. He attributed his “excellent” fluency during this time to not taking things so seriously as well as smoking marijuana. It was this time of his life that he felt he was most successful with his speech. He believes that studies

on the effects of marijuana on stuttering have some merit and should be pursued by universities and professionals in the field. Though Brian views his stuttering as a “debilitating problem” that has not improved with his hard work, he said that he feels it’s made him stronger and that it has taught him to have more humility with people. He has turned the discomfort he has while speaking into an advantage by taking more risks while learning Spanish. Overall, he feels blessed but thinks that his life would be better without stuttering.

Language History. Brian identified English as his native language and Spanish as his second language on the L2LHQ (Li, Sepanski, & Zhao, 2006). He reported that he first started learning Spanish at approximately age 50 by watching TV, listening to the radio, reading, helping others learn English, and interacting with people. He rated his abilities in Spanish as follows: reading proficiency, 5 - “good;” writing proficiency, 4 - “functional;” speaking fluency, 6 - “very good;” and listening ability, 5 - “good.” Brian gave the strength of his accent in Spanish a rating of 6. He reported that others “always” identify him as a non-native speaker based on his accent in Spanish. In all daily activities combined, Brian uses English for 80% of the day and Spanish for 20%. He reported that he dreams, expresses anger or affection, and does simple arithmetic in English. He feels he reads, writes and speaks better in English. His understands more in English and prefers English in situations at home, work, at a party, and in general. While he does not feel he has lost any fluency in either language, Brian reported that he “must work to retain and improve efficiency in Spanish.”

Secondary participants. Secondary participants were identified by the primary participants as a parent or sibling who would be willing to participate in the study. In order to participate, the family members had to meet the following criteria:

- a) Aware of or has experience with the primary participant’s stuttering.

- b) Willing to participate in a conversation with the primary participant about the primary participant's stuttering.
- c) Able to speak English or Spanish on a conversational level.
- d) Willingly provides informed consent to be audio recorded for the study.

Sam's mother, Neil's older sister, and Ivan's younger brother and mother served as secondary participants. Brian was unable to identify a secondary participant but was included in the study because of the insight he had to offer regarding stuttering across the life span.

Data Collection

The primary data collected for this study was audio recorded during intra-dyad conversations between the participants and their family member(s) and individual ethnographic interviews with the researcher. These methods allowed for the collection of data to be investigated for the linguistic constructions of interest. Prior to engaging in an ethnographic interview with the researcher, each participant was asked to record a conversation with their family member(s) about their stuttering. The researcher instructed the participants to use whichever language was most natural for the dyad and to cover topics of their choosing, but related to stuttering. The researcher was not present during the recording of family conversations, so as to avoid interference with natural language and topic selection. Minimum and maximum requirements were not given in regard to the length of the recordings. Therefore, the times of recordings ranged from 30 minutes to 90 minutes depending on the conversation. The participants were asked to share their recordings with the researcher prior to the ethnographic interview session. This allowed the researcher time to listen to the recording and take notes on topics addressed and information that needed clarification. This data provided

insight on the co-construction of the stuttering experience as well as the linguistic construction of the bilingual stuttering experience across languages.

Ethnographic interviews as described by Westby (1990) were conducted by the researcher with participants on an individual basis. This method allowed the researcher to obtain information from each participant about his personal experiences as a bilingual who stutters. Additionally, it provided a means for the researcher to learn about the participants and their world as well as their behaviors, values and beliefs as they are related to their stuttering (Westby, 1990). In regard to developing general topics for discussion, the researcher adopted the general interview guide approach as outlined in Turner (2010), which is intended to ensure that the same general areas of information are collected from each participant. Throughout each interview, the researcher jotted unique words and phrases used by the participants in order to revisit them for further elaboration as suggested by Emerson, Fretz, & Shaw (1995). When revisiting such information, questions were descriptive, structural, and contrastive in nature (Damico & Augustine, 1995). It is from the conversation elicited during these interviews that the linguistic construction of the bilingual stuttering experience was observed.

Formal assessments were administered to add another dimension of description to each case. To assess stuttering severity, the SSI-4 was administered in both English and Spanish. This tool, which is norm-referenced for English, measures stuttering behaviors such as frequency and duration of stuttering events, physical concomitants exhibited by the person who stutters, and naturalness of an individual's speech. The researcher followed the SSI-4 procedures indicated for individuals who are "readers." Thus, the frequency of stuttering score was derived from speech recorded during a reading task and a speaking task. Each language was tested separately. Participants read the same passage in English consisting of 379 syllables after completing the

ethnographic interview. Data for the English speaking task was extracted from the participants' respective ethnographic interviews. Varying amounts of time passed before each participant read the Spanish passage depending on how long they conversed with the researcher in between. This passage consisted of 496 syllables. After the reading task, the researcher recorded a casual conversation in Spanish between Sam and his mother, and Neil and a Spanish-speaking conversational partner. Brian and Ivan were both asked to give monologues in Spanish for their speaking tasks since Spanish-speaking conversational partners were not available.

The percentage of stuttered syllables (SS%) was computed using the frequency-counting methods described by Riley (2009). The duration score (based on the average of the three longest stuttering events) was calculated by the researcher. Physical concomitants were rated based on the researcher's observations during all of the speaking samples. Naturalness of speech was judged by the researcher after the speaking task. This nine-point scale, described by Martin, Haroldson, and Triden (1984), has a level of intra- and interexaminer reliability that is adequate for clinical use with experienced examiners averaging 82% to 93%. These procedures were followed during the administration of this assessment in both languages. Test results were interpreted by the researcher according to the age of the participant. There is a caveat associated with the use of this tool for examining Spanish data, as the analysis of results are based on the norms for English speakers. This poses validity issues with the results for the Spanish data. However, these results are being used for descriptive purposes only and will provide at least an approximation of the severity of the participants' stuttering in Spanish.

To measure overall impact of stuttering, the *Overall Assessment of the Speaker's Experience of Stuttering* (OASES) (Yaruss & Quesal, 2010) was administered in English. This questionnaire was designed to evaluate: the speaker's perception of his/her stuttering; affective,

behavioral and cognitive reactions the speakers' experiences as a result of stuttering; difficulties the speaker has when communicating in daily situations; and the negative impact of stuttering on the speaker's life. It is an appropriate tool to use for research purposes because it provides comprehensive documentation of a speaker's overall experience and allows for the exploration of relationships between various aspects of the speaker's experience of stuttering (Yaruss & Quesal, 2006). The OASES-A response form, designated for individuals ages 18 and older, was used for adult participants ages 18 and up. This form contains 100 items. The OASES-T response form, designed for individuals aged 13 to 17 years old, was used for the teenage participant. This form contained 80 items. Both forms have four sections including: "General Information," "Your Reactions to Stuttering," "Communication in Daily Situations," and "Quality of Life." The participants independently answered each item by circling a number 1-5 associated with ratings unique to each section. Each participant filled out a total of two questionnaires. They were asked to respond to the items on the first questionnaire while considering their stuttering in English and the second while considering their stuttering in Spanish. The researcher followed scoring procedures to determine results. Impact ratings were assigned according to the following impact score ranges: Mild (1.00-1.49), Mild-to-Moderate (1.50-2.24), Moderate (2.25-2.99), Moderate-to-Severe (3.00-3.74) and Severe (3.75-5.00). The user qualifications recommended for administering the OASES, which include working in conjunction with a qualified speech language pathologist, were met by the researcher.

As described in the biographical sketches, language history profiles were constructed for each participant using the L2LHQ in order to adequately describe language abilities. Information for the profile was obtained through a self-report questionnaire. According to Roberts (2011), self reports serve as an estimate, not an exact measure of level of proficiency across modalities

and therefore if a study is about relatively broad features of speech, disfluencies or stuttering, adequate description can be derived from a short set of questions. The questionnaire was supplemented by additional questions derived from *The Language Experience and Proficiency Questionnaire* (Marian, Blumenfeld, & Kaushanskaya, 2007) and the *Bilingual Dominance Scale* (Dunn & Fox Tree, 2009). The data collected from this questionnaire and the additional questions provided information about the following language profile factors outlined in Coalson et al. (2013): history, function, proficiency, stability, mode, accent, covert speech and affect. Each participant's formal assessment results are presented below.

Ivan's formal assessment results. Ivan's total score for the SSI-4 assessment of his stuttering in English was 25, which indicates that he stutters with moderate severity. His score was within the 41-60th percentile for adults. This score is comprised of the totals derived from frequency, duration and physical concomitant measures. Ivan's frequency score (12) was determined by evaluating his speech during a reading task and speaking task. His percentage of stuttered syllables for the reading task was 5.37% with 20 stuttering events out the 372 syllables read. The stuttering events during this task were primarily blocks and part word repetitions. The percentage of stuttered syllables for the speaking task was 6.34% with 29 stuttering events out of 457 spoken syllables. Ivan's stuttering during this task was characterized primarily by blocks and prolongations. Based on these percentages, Ivan was assigned a task score of 6 for each respective task therefore giving him a composite score of 12 for the stuttering frequency section. The duration of Ivan's stuttering was determined by averaging his three longest stuttering events. The average length, one full second, was assigned the scale score 6. The score for physical concomitants (7) was based on the researcher's observations during the frequency tasks. Ivan exhibited "very distracting" clicking sounds and "distracting" tongue protrusion but no

distracting movements of the head or extremities. Though not computed in the total score, Ivan's speech was rated for naturalness. His speech was given the rating of 4 on a scale of 1- "highly natural sounding" to 9- "highly unnatural sounding."

Ivan's total score for the SSI-4 assessment of his stuttering in Spanish indicated he stutters with mild severity. His total score was 20. As with the English assessment, Ivan's frequency score was determined by combining his reading and speaking task scores, which were 5 and 4 respectively. There were a total of 16 stuttering events out of the 499 read which amounted to a stuttered syllable percentage of 3.20%. His stuttering during the Spanish reading task was primarily characterized by blocks. While speaking, he experienced 17 stuttering events out of 436 spoken syllables yielding a stuttered syllable percentage of 3.89%. His duration score was 4 with stuttering events averaging at least half of a second. Ivan's physical concomitants score for Spanish was also 7 as he exhibited the same behaviors observed during English stuttering events. A speech naturalness rating of 3 was assigned by the researcher.

The results of Ivan's OASES questionnaire indicate that his stuttering in both English and Spanish has a moderate overall impact on his life with a score of 2.79 in Spanish and 2.80 in English. According to Yaruss and Quesal (2010), characteristics and experiences associated with a moderate impact rating include: views self as having difficulty speaking fluently or communicating easily in many speaking situations; exhibits negative affective and cognitive reactions to stuttering and is concerned with the reactions of others; avoids speaking situations and changes words to hide stuttering; experiences limitations in the ability to communicate in key situations; is likely to take stuttering into account when deciding whether to take part in daily activities, talking to others, and making decisions; and has some difficulty functioning and is concerned about how stuttering interferes with his goals. This overall score was derived from the

ratings of each of the four sections featured in this assessment including “General Information,” “Your Reactions to Stuttering,” “Communication in Daily Situations,” and “Quality of Life.”

Ivan’s impact ratings for “Section I: General Information” were moderate for both languages with a score of 2.65 in Spanish and 2.78 in English. In this section, he rated general characteristics and experiences associated with his stuttering. A moderate impact rating indicates that Ivan: experiences considerable variability in fluency from day to day or situation to situation; has difficulty using techniques learned in therapy and saying what he wants to say in some situations but is able to do so at other times; and is unsure about his feelings about speaking and stuttering (Yaruss & Quesal, 2010). In both languages, he assigned the rating of “somewhat negatively” when asked about how he feels about the way he sounds when he speaks, being a person who stutters, and variations in his speech fluency in different situations. For both languages, he reported feeling “somewhat positively” about self-help or support groups for people who and being “very” knowledgeable about his own stuttering.

He also received moderate impact ratings for both languages in “Section II: Your Reactions to Stuttering” with a score of 2.93 for his stuttering in Spanish and 2.60 for his stuttering in English. According to Yaruss and Quesal (2010), this rating is associated with characteristics such as: difficulty accepting stuttering and feeling that some aspects of life have been limited by stuttering; confidence in speech is negatively affected; avoidance of a variety of word and speaking situations; and using starter and filler words. He reported that he “never” feels guilt but that he “often” feels anxious about his stuttering in both Spanish and English. He “often” uses filler words or starters when speaking. For the statement “If I did not stutter, I would be better able to achieve my goals in life” he responded with “strongly agree” for both languages. He responded to “I do not speak as well as most other people” with “somewhat

agree” for his speech in both English and Spanish. He “strongly disagreed” with the statement “I cannot accept the fact that I stutter” in regard to both languages.

As with the previous sections, Ivan received moderate impact ratings for both languages in “Section III: Communication in Daily Situations” with a score of 2.60 for Spanish and a 2.90 in English. The characteristics associated with a moderate rating include: difficulty communicating in many situations at work, school, home, and in social settings although there are specific situations in which he can communicate easily; and difficulty initiating conversations and speaking to unfamiliar people (Yaruss and Quesal, 2010). He rated “talking while under time pressure” as well as “talking in front of a large group of people” as being “very difficult” in both languages. He reported that standing up for himself verbally was “not very difficult” while speaking Spanish, but was “very difficult” while speaking English. While speaking English and Spanish in work situations, he reported that it was “not very difficult” to talk to his boss and co-workers, but “somewhat difficult” to talk to clients. Similarly, when rating use of both languages in social situations respectively, he reported that participating in small talk at social was “very difficult” and ordering food in a restaurant and at a drive thru was “somewhat difficult.” In regard to home situations, he stated that it was “not very difficult” for him to use the phone in either language.

Ivan’s impact ratings for “Section IV: Quality of Life” differed across languages. There was a moderate impact rating for Spanish with a score of 2.92 and a moderate-to-severe impact rating in English with a score of 3.00. A moderate rating in this section indicates that, while speaking Spanish, Ivan experiences a negative impact on certain aspects of his life including reduced satisfaction with communication in many situations, difficulty succeeding at work or school, and some limitation in the ability to participate in events (Yaruss & Quesal, 2010). The

moderate-to-severe rating he received for English indicates that he experiences a strong negative impact on many aspects of his life, including reduced satisfaction with communication in most situations, difficulty in family relationships, significant difficulty succeeding at work or school, and significantly limited ability to participate in events (Yaruss & Quesal, 2010). He reported that his quality of life was negatively affected by stuttering “a lot” in English and “some” in Spanish. Stuttering interferes with his satisfaction with communication in general and in social situations “a lot” and with relationships with family “not at all” when speaking both languages. Stuttering interferes with his ability to function in society “a lot” while speaking Spanish and “some” while speaking English. It interferes with his ability to advance in career and educational opportunities “a lot” and interferes with confidence in self and sense of control over life “a lot” while speaking both languages.

Table 1

Ivan, SSI-4 English Results

Task	Data	Comments	Score
Frequency	5.37% (reading)	20 out of 372 syllables	6
	6.34% (speaking)	29 out of 457 syllables	6
Duration	1 full second	(average of three longest stuttering events)	6
Physical Concomitants	4 (Distracting sounds) 3 (Facial grimaces) 0 (Head movements) 0 (Movmt extremities)	Very distracting Distracting None None	7
Overall Score	Percentile: 41-60	Severity Rating: Moderate	25

Table 2

Ivan, SSI-4 Spanish Results

Task	Data	Comments	Score
Frequency	3.20% (reading)	16 out of 499 syllables	5
	3.89% (speaking)	17 out of syllables 436	4
Duration	Half-second	(average of three longest stuttering events)	4
Physical Concomitants	4 (Distracting sounds) 3 (Facial grimaces) 0 (Head movements) 0 (Movmt extremities)	Very distracting Distracting None None	7
Overall Score	Percentile: 12-23	Severity Rating: Mild	20

Table 3

Ivan, OASES Results

Form: OASES-A	English		Spanish	
Section	Score	Rating	Score	Rating
I. General Information	2.78	Moderate	2.65	Moderate
II. Your Reactions to Stuttering	2.60	Moderate	2.93	Moderate
III. Communication in Daily Situations	2.90	Moderate	2.60	Moderate
IV. Quality of Life	3.00	Moderate/Severe	2.92	Moderate
Overall	2.80	Moderate	2.79	Moderate

Sam's formal assessment results. Because Sam was 16 at the time of the assessment, his SSI-4 scores were measured by using norms developed for children between the ages of 6:0 and 16:11. His total score for the SSI-4 assessment of his stuttering in English was 27, which indicates that he stutters with moderate severity. His score was within the 61-77 percentile rank for this age group. His frequency score, 11, was comprised of a reading task score of 4 and a speaking task score of 7. His percentage of stuttered syllables for the reading task was 2.04% with 8 stuttering events out the 391 syllables read. The stuttering events he exhibited during this task were primarily blocks and part word repetitions. It should be noted that his speech was highly unnatural during the span of this task. The percentage of stuttered syllables for the speaking task was 10.29% with 42 stuttering events out of 408 spoken syllables. His stuttering

during the speech task was characterized by part word repetitions and prolongations. The average of his three longest stuttering events was one full second, which was assigned the duration score of 6. Sam's score for physical concomitants, 10, was assigned based on "very distracting" noisy breathing, "distracting" lip pressing and jaw tension, "distracting" torso movement, and no distracting movements of the head. Sam's naturalness of speech received a rating of 8 based on his reading style and pronounced breathing cycles during speaking.

Sam's total score for the SSI-4 assessment of his stuttering in Spanish indicates his stuttering is severe with a total score of 34. While reading, he exhibited a total of 49 stuttering events out of the 510 read which amounted to a stuttered syllable percentage of 9.68%. His stuttering during the Spanish reading task was primarily characterized by prolongations and blocks. During the speaking task, he experienced 44 stuttering events out of 206 spoken syllables yielding a stuttered syllable percentage of 21.35% with blocks being the predominate SLD characterizing his speech. His duration score was 8 which was assigned based on an average duration of 2 seconds in terms of the length of his stuttering events. Sam's physical concomitants score for Spanish was 11 as he exhibited noisy breathing, lip pressing, tense jaw muscles, and rigid torso movement. His speech naturalness rating was 8.

Sam answered questions and rated his stuttering experiences for both English and Spanish using the OASES-T form, which is a version of the questionnaire reserved for teenagers between the ages of 13 and 17 years old. Unlike Ivan and Brian's overall impact results, Sam's results indicate a difference impact across languages. His overall impact score in Spanish was 2.02 which yielded an impact rating of mild-to-moderate while his score in English, 1.32, yielded an impact rating of mild. The mild-to-moderate rating he was assigned for Spanish include overall characteristics and experiences such as: views self as being able to speak fluently and

communicate easily in many situations but may have some difficulty in specific situations; exhibits some negative affective and cognitive reactions to stuttering and may have concerns about the reactions of others; rarely avoids speaking situations because of stuttering; experiences some limitations in the ability to communicate in some key situations but is generally able to get his point across; may take stuttering into account when deciding whether to partake in daily activities; and is able to function but is concerned about how stuttering might interfere with his goals (Yaruss & Quesal, 2010). The mild impact rating he received for English is associated with characteristics such as: views self as “being able to speak fluently” and “communicate easily” in nearly all situations; exhibits few, if any, negative affective and cognitive reactions to stuttering and is not concerned about the reactions of others; does not avoid speaking situations or change words; and does not take stuttering into account when performing daily activities, talking to others or making decisions (Yaruss & Quesal, 2010).

Sam’s scores for “Section I: General Information” indicate that there is a mild-to-moderate impact when speaking Spanish with a score of 1.93 and a mild impact when speaking English with a score of 1.20. According to Yaruss and Quesal (2010), the mild-to-moderate rating in this section is characterized by possible fluctuations in fluency from day to day, general knowledge about stuttering and general acceptance of speaking abilities with some negative attitudes toward speaking and stuttering. The mild impact rating for his speech in English is generally associated with viewing speech as fluent or natural-sounding in all or nearly all situations, being able to use techniques used in therapy, and being accepting of his speaking abilities with few, if any, negative attitudes. Sam reported that, when speaking both languages, he “always” uses techniques or strategies he learned in speech therapy, and that he “always” says exactly what he wants to say even if he thinks there is a chance he might stutter. In regard to his

knowledge about stuttering in both languages, he reported that he knew “a lot” about stuttering in general, factors that make people stutter more often or less often, and what happens with his speech when he stutters. In terms of speaking in English, he feels “very good” about his overall speaking ability, being a teenager who stutters, and the techniques or tools he has learned in speech therapy whereas in Spanish, he reported feeling “not good or bad” about these items.

As with the previous section, Sam received a mild rating for his speech in English and a mild-to-moderate rating for his speech in Spanish for “Section II: Your Reactions to Stuttering.” His impact score for Spanish was 2.00, and is associated with sometimes experiencing emotional reactions to stuttering, negatively affected confidence in speaking abilities due to stuttering, and has difficulty accepting stuttering. Sam’s English impact score, 1.48, is characterized by few negative emotional reactions to stuttering, little or no avoidance of words or situations, feeling confident in speaking abilities, accepting stuttering, and neither being defined nor limited by stuttering (Yaruss & Quesal, 2010). When considering both languages, Sam reported that he ‘never’ feels guilty, feels physical tension in muscles, breaks eye contact, or stops talking when he thinks he’s going to stutter. He reported that he “often” avoids activities, speaking situations or certain people when he thinks he might stutter more when speaking Spanish, but “never” does this while speaking English.

There was a variation in Sam’s results for “Section III: Communication in Daily Situations.” With an impact score of 2.60 in Spanish, he was assigned an impact rating of moderate. As with previous sections, his impact rating for English was mild with an impact score of 1.45. The characteristics and experiences associated with a moderate rating for Section III are outlined in Ivan’s formal assessment description. The mild rating he received for English is associated with little or no difficulty communicating in any situation as well as being able to say

what he wants in all situations without being limited by stuttering (Yaruss & Quesal, 2010). When considering both languages, he reported that it was “somewhat hard” to talk when he was upset about something or in a hurry, and to talk on the telephone. Talking to small and large groups of people, giving presentations or talking in front of the class, and talking with people he has just met for the first time were rated as “somewhat hard” in Spanish and “not at all hard” in English. He also reported that ordering food at a drive-thru or in a restaurant is “very hard” in Spanish and “somewhat hard” in English.

“Section IV: Quality of Life” yielded results similar to sections I and II in that Sam received a mild-to-moderate impact rating for Spanish with an impact score of 1.55 and a mild impact rating for English with an impact score of 1.10. According to Yaruss and Quesal (2010), the mild-to-moderate rating in this section is characterized by the speaker experiencing some negative impact on key aspects of his life including reduced satisfaction with communication in particular situations as well as experiencing only minimal limitation in his ability to participate in events. The mild impact rating he received for speaking in English is characterized by the speaker experiencing little or no negative impact on his satisfaction with communication, relationships with others, success at school, or the ability to participate in events.

Table 4

Sam, SSI-4 English Results

Task	Data	Comments	Score
Frequency	2.04% (reading)	8 out of 391 syllables	4
	10.29% (speaking)	42 out of 408 syllables	7
Duration	1 full second	(average of three longest stuttering events)	6
Physical Concomitants	4 (Distracting sounds) 3 (Facial grimaces) 0 (Head movements) 3 (Movmt extremities)	Very distracting Distracting None Distracting	10
Overall Score	Percentile: 61-77	Severity Rating: Moderate	27

Table 5

Sam, SSI-4 Spanish Results

Task	Data	Comments	Score
Frequency	9.68% (reading)	49 out of 510 syllables	7
	21.35% (speaking)	44 out of 206 syllables	8
Duration	2 seconds	(average of three longest stuttering events)	8
Physical Concomitants	5 (Distracting sounds) 3 (Facial grimaces) 0 (Head movements) 3 (Movmt extremities)	Severe Distracting None Distracting	11
Overall Score	Percentile: 89-95	Severity Rating: Severe	34

Table 6

Sam, OASES Results

Form: OASES-T	English		Spanish	
Section	Score	Rating	Score	Rating
I. General Information	1.20	Mild	1.93	Mild/Moderate
II. Your Reactions to Stuttering	1.48	Mild	2.00	Mild/Moderate
III. Communication in Daily Situations	1.45	Mild	2.60	Moderate
IV. Quality of Life	1.10	Mild	1.55	Mild/Moderate
Overall	1.32	Mild	2.02	Mild/Moderate

Neil's formal assessment results. Neil's total score for the SSI-4 assessment in English was 30, which indicates that he stutters with moderate severity. This score places him in the 61-77 percentile for adults. He was assigned a task score of 5 for the reading task and a score of 7 for the speaking task which resulted in a total frequency score of 12. The percentage of stuttered syllables for the reading task was 3.73% with 14 stuttering events out the 375 syllables read and 8.58% during the speaking task with 28 stuttering events out of 326 spoken syllables. His stuttering during the speaking task was characterized by prolongations and PWR while he primarily experienced prolongations during the reading task. The average of his three longest stuttering events, 2 seconds, was assigned the scale score 8. His longest stuttering event lasted upwards of 3 seconds. Neil's clicking sounds were rated as "severe." The tension in his jaw

muscles were rated “not noticeable unless looking” and his head movements were rated “very distracting.” These observations amounted to a physical concomitants score of 10. His naturalness of speech rating was 8 due to his unnaturally slow pace during the reading and speaking tasks. Neil commented that while he read with little stuttering, he did not comprehend what he read because he was focusing on his fluency techniques throughout the duration of the task.

Neil’s total SSI-4 Spanish score was 28 with a moderate severity equivalent. As with his English results, his score for the reading task was 5. He exhibited a total of 23 stuttering events out of the 499 read which amounted to a stuttered syllable percentage of 4.60%. His stuttering during the Spanish reading task was characterized by equal amounts of blocks and prolongations. While speaking, he experienced 25 stuttering events out of 404 spoken syllables yielding a stuttered syllable percentage of 6.18%. This resulted in a task score of 6. His stuttering was primarily characterized by PWR while speaking Spanish. Neil’s duration score was 8, which was assigned based on 2 seconds which was the average length of his three longest stuttering events. His physical concomitants score for Spanish was 9 due to “severe” clicking sounds and “very distracting” head movements such as turning away and poor eye contact. Neil’s speech naturalness rating (9) was assigned by the researcher due to Neil’s frequent long pauses, monotone voice, and unnaturally slow pace while reading and speaking in Spanish.

The OASES revealed that Neil’s stuttering in Spanish has moderate overall impact with an overall impact score of 2.55. This differs from his impact rating in English, which was mild-to-moderate as indicated by his overall score of 2.23. His impact rating in Spanish is associated with characteristics and experiences such as: views self as having difficulty speaking fluently; likely to exhibit notable physical tension which sometimes interferes with communication and

prevents speaker from saying what he wants; takes stuttering into account when deciding whether or not to take part in daily activities (Yaruss & Quesal, 2010). Whereas his mild-to-moderate impact rating in English is indicative of: viewing self as able to speak fluently and communicate easily in many situations but has difficulty in specific situations; may exhibit physical tension during stuttering but not enough to interfere with communication; exhibits some negative affective and cognitive reactions; and rarely avoids speaking situations (Yaruss & Quesal, 2010).

Neil's impact ratings for "Section I: General Information" for each language differed. For Spanish, his score of 2.65 is indicative of a moderate impact while his score for English, 2.1 is indicative of mild-to-moderate impact. According to Yaruss and Quesal (2010), his mild-to-moderate impact rating in Spanish is characterized by: having difficulty using techniques learned in therapy; experiences considerable variability in fluency from day to day or situation to situation; and is likely to be uncertain about the factors that affect stuttering. Neil indicated that in Spanish he is "rarely" able to speak fluently and say exactly what he wants to say. He reported that he is "somewhat" knowledgeable about stuttering in general and factors that affect his stuttering in Spanish. He also stated that, in regard to speaking Spanish, he felt "very positively" about being a person who stutters, as well as about support groups for people who stutter. His impact rating of mild-to-moderate in English is indicative characteristics and experiences such as: viewing speech as fluent and natural-sounding in many situations; experiencing fluctuating fluency from day to day; and generally accepting speaking abilities with some negative attitudes towards speaking and stuttering (Yaruss & Quesal, 2010). In regard to his stuttering in English, Neil reported that he "always" uses techniques, strategies, or tools that he learned in speech therapy but that he "rarely" says exactly what he wants to say. He indicates that he is

“somewhat” knowledgeable about his stuttering in English and that he feels “somewhat positively” about his speaking ability and the way he sounds when he speaks.

Neil received an impact rating of moderate for both languages in “Section II: Your Reactions to Stuttering” with an impact score of 2.5 for Spanish and English. Characteristics of this rating include: experiences emotional reactions such as embarrassment, frustration, anxiety and perhaps shame and helplessness; confidence in his speaking abilities is negatively affected by stuttering and has difficulty accepting stuttering and feels that some aspects of his life have been limited by stuttering (Yaruss & Quesal, 2010). When considering English and Spanish, Neil reported that he “rarely” feels helpless, angry, ashamed, or lonely, but “often” feels anxious. When stuttering in both languages, he “often” exhibits eye blinks, breaks eye contact or avoids looking at listener, does not say what he wants to say, and uses filler words. In regard to the statement “I think about my stuttering nearly all the time,” Neil “somewhat disagrees” when considering Spanish and “strongly agrees” when considering English. For both Spanish and English, Neil “strongly disagrees” with the statements: “I cannot accept the fact that I stutter” and “If I did not stutter, I would be better able to achieve my goals in life.”

Neil’s impact ratings differed when considering both languages in “Section III: Communication in Daily Situations.” His impact score for Spanish was 4.10, which yields a severe rating while his impact score for English, 2.77, yields an impact rating of moderate. An impact rating of severe in this section indicates: inability to communicate effectively in nearly all situations and inability to say what he wants in nearly all situations (Yaruss & Quesal, 2010). The characteristics and experiences associated with his moderate rating in English for this section, as described by Yaruss and Quesal (2010), are outlined in detail in Ivan’s results. When considering both languages, Neil rated the following situations as “extremely difficult:” talking

while under time pressure, introducing himself, telling stories and jokes, and ordering food at a drive-thru. While he rated participating in social events as “extremely difficult” in Spanish, he rated it as “somewhat difficult” in English. He rated asking for information in Spanish as “very difficult,” but “not very difficult” in English.

“Section IV: Quality of Life” yielded a mild impact rating for Spanish with a score of 1.33 and mild-to-moderate for English with a score of 1.56. His mild rating for Spanish indicates that he: experiences little to no negative impact on his satisfaction with communication, relationships with others, success at work, or the ability to participate in events (Yaruss & Quesal, 2010). His mild-to-moderate impact rating in English is indicative of: experiencing some negative impact on a few key aspects of his life as well as minimal limitation in his ability to participate in events. When considering both languages, Neil reported that his stuttering, his reactions to stuttering and other people’s reactions to stuttering negatively impact his life “a little.” Currently, he feels his stuttering in both languages “not at all” interferes with relationships with family, friends, intimate relationships, and ability to function in society. Overall, he stated that stuttering impacts his satisfaction with communication in social situations “a little” in Spanish, but “some” in English.

Table 7

Neil, SSI-4 English Results

Task	Data	Comments	Score
Frequency	3.73% (reading)	14 out of 375	5
	8.58% (speaking)	28 out of 326	7
Duration	2 seconds	(average of three longest stuttering events)	8
Physical Concomitants	5 (Distracting sounds) 1 (Facial grimaces) 4 (Head movements) 0 (Movmt extremities)	Severe Not noticeable unless looking for it Very distracting None	10
Overall Score	Percentile: 61-77	Severity Rating: Moderate	30

Table 8

Neil, SSI-4 Spanish Results

Task	Data	Comments	Score
Frequency	4.60% (reading)	23 out of 499	5
	6.18% (speaking)	25 out of 404	6
Duration	2 seconds	(average of three longest stuttering events)	8
Physical Concomitants	5 (Distracting sounds) 0 (Facial grimaces) 4 (Head movements) 0 (Movmt extremities)	Severe None Very distracting None	9
Overall Score	Percentile: 61-77	Severity Rating: Moderate	28

Table 9

Neil, OASES Results

Form: OASES-A	English		Spanish	
Section	Score	Rating	Score	Rating
I. General Information	2.1	Mild/ Moderate	2.65	Moderate
II. Your Reactions to Stuttering	2.5	Moderate	2.5	Moderate
III. Communication in Daily Situations	2.77	Moderate	4.10	Severe
IV. Quality of Life	1.56	Mild/ Moderate	1.33	Mild
Overall	2.23	Mild/ Moderate	2.55	Moderate

Brian’s formal assessment results. Brian’s total score for the SSI-4 assessment in English was 26, which indicates that he stutters with moderate severity while speaking the language. This score places him in the 41-60 percentile rank for adults. He was assigned a task score of 5 for the reading task and a score of 7 for the speaking task which resulted in a total frequency score of 12. Brian’s percentage of stuttered syllables for the reading task was 2.85% with 23 stuttering events out the 384 syllables read and 9.35% during the speaking task with 39 stuttering events out of 417 spoken syllables. Brian’s stuttering during both tasks was primarily characterized by prolongations. The average of his three longest stuttering events, two seconds, was assigned the scale score 8. Brian exhibited “very distracting” sounds such as noisy breathing and clicking as well as jaw jerking which was “barely noticeable to casual observer” during

stuttering events. No movements of the head or extremities were observed. These observations amounted to a physical concomitants score of 6. Additionally, his naturalness of speech rating was 7 due to the frequency of revisions and phrase repetitions present in his speech.

The SSI-4 assessment of Brian's stuttering in Spanish resulted in a total score of 26, which yielded a moderate severity equivalent. As mentioned in Ivan's Spanish SSI-4 results, it is important to bear in mind that these scores are based on norms for English speakers and should be viewed as approximate measures. Brian received a score of 6 during the reading task. He exhibited a total of 33 stuttering events out of the 512 read which amounted to a stuttered syllable percentage of 6.44%. His stuttering during the Spanish reading task was primarily characterized by blocks. During the speaking task, he experienced 34 stuttering events out of 473 spoken syllables yielding a stuttered syllable percentage of 7.18%. Brian's speech was characterized by prolongations while speaking Spanish. His duration score was 8 which was assigned based on 2 seconds which was the average length of his three longest stuttering events. His physical concomitants score for Spanish was 6 with similar behaviors as reported in English. A speech naturalness rating of 9 was assigned by the researcher due to Brian's unnaturally slow speech pace during the reading and speaking tasks.

The OASES revealed that stuttering has a moderate-to-severe overall impact rating with overall impact scores of 3.09 for Spanish and 3.07 for English. This impact rating is associated with characteristics and experiences such as: being unable to speak fluently or communicate easily in most speaking situations; likely to have strong affective and cognitive reactions and is very concerned about the reactions of others; often changes words to hide stuttering; experiences significant limitations in the ability to communicate effectively in a wide variety of situations; very likely to take stuttering into account when deciding whether to take part in daily activities,

talking to others, and when making decisions; has difficulty functioning; and is very concerned about how stuttering interferes with his goals (Yaruss & Quesal, 2010).

Brian's impact rating for "Section I: General Information" was moderate-to-severe with an impact score of 3.42 for both languages. According to Yaruss and Quesal (2010), this impact rating is characterized by: perception of disfluent and unnatural-sounding speech in many situations; generally unable to maintain fluency from day to day and to use techniques learned in therapy; considerable difficulty saying what he wants to say; little knowledge about factors that affect stuttering and fluency; has difficulty accepting stuttering; and has negative attitudes toward speaking and stuttering. Brian reported "rarely" using techniques, strategies, or tools learned in speech therapy and that he can "sometimes" maintain fluency from day to day in regard to both languages. He reported being "somewhat" knowledgeable about what happens with his speech when he stutters in Spanish and "a little" knowledgeable about his speech in English. When considering his speech in both Spanish and English, Brian reported feeling "somewhat negatively" about his speaking ability, ability to communicate, the way he sounds when he speaks, and techniques for speaking fluently learned in therapy. He feels "very negatively" about his ability to use techniques learned in speech therapy while speaking English and "somewhat negatively" about using them while speaking Spanish. Brian reported that he feels "very negatively" about being a person who stutters when considering speaking in Spanish and "somewhat negatively" when considering English. In regard to being identified as a person who stutters, he reported that he feels "very negatively" in the context of Spanish and "neutral" in English. He feels "very negatively" when considering the variations in his speech fluency experienced in both languages in different situations.

Brian also received an impact rating of moderate/severe for “Section II: Your Reactions to Stuttering” with an impact score of 3.20 for Spanish and 3.30 for English. Characteristics of this rating include: likely to experience negative emotional reactions to stuttering; avoids many words and uses fillers or starter words; has little confidence in his speaking abilities and does not think he can make changes in speech; does not accept stuttering; and feels that many aspects of his life have been affected by stuttering (Yaruss & Quesal, 2010). When considering both English and Spanish, Brian reported that he “never” feels defensive but that he “always” feels frustrated. He feels anxious and embarrassed “always” when speaking English and “often” when speaking Spanish. He also reported that he feels helpless “always” when speaking Spanish and “often” when speaking English. He “always” avoids speaking English in certain situations or to certain people, but reported doing this “often” in Spanish situations. When considering both languages he “strongly agreed” with the statements “If I did not stutter, I would be better able to achieve my goals in life” and “I do not speak as well as most other people” and “strongly disagreed” with the statement “I do not want people to know that I stutter.”

Similar to Ivan’s ratings, moderate impact ratings were derived for both languages in “Section III: Communication in Daily Situations” with impact scores of 2.95 for Spanish and 2.81 for English. The characteristics and experiences associated with a moderate rating for this section, as described by Yaruss and Quesal (2010), are outlined in detail in Ivan’s results. When considering both languages, Brian reported that it is “not very difficult” talking with another person one-on-one, “somewhat difficult” continuing to speak regardless of how his listener responds to his speech, and “not at all difficult” standing up for himself verbally. Talking in front of a large group of people is “extremely difficult” in Spanish and “very difficult” in English. Talking with people he knows well is “extremely difficult” in English and “not very difficult” in

Spanish. For both languages, he reported that giving oral presentations is “very difficult;” using the telephone at work, asking for information, ordering food in a restaurant and using the telephone at home is “somewhat difficult.”

“Section IV: Quality of Life” yielded a moderate impact rating for both languages with a score of 2.73 for Spanish and 2.68 for English. The characteristics associated with this rating are outlined in Ivan’s Section IV Spanish results. For both languages, Brian reported that his stuttering: negatively affects the quality of his life “completely,” interferes with his satisfaction with his communication in social situations “completely” and ability to function in society “a lot.” He reported that his stuttering interferes “not at all” with his sense of self-worth or self-esteem, enthusiasm for life, overall health and physical well-being, overall stamina or energy level, and spiritual well-being when considering both languages.

Table 10

Brian, SSI-4 English Results

Task	Data	Comments	Score
Frequency	2.85% (reading)	23 out of 384 syllables	5
	9.35% (speaking)	39 out of 417 syllables	7
Duration	2 seconds	(average of three longest stuttering events)	8
Physical Concomitants	4 (Distracting sounds) 2 (Facial grimaces) 0 (Head movements) 0 (Movmt extremities)	Very distracting Barely noticeable to casual observer None None	6
Overall Score	Percentile: 41-60	Severity Rating: Moderate	26

Table 11

SSI-4 Spanish Results

Task	Data	Comments	Score
Frequency	6.44% (reading)	33 out of 512 syllables	6
	7.18% (speaking)	34 out of 473 syllables	6
Duration	2 seconds	(average of three longest stuttering events)	8
Physical Concomitants	4 (Distracting sounds) 2 (Facial grimaces) 0 (Head movements) 0 (Movmt extremities)	Very distracting Barely noticeable to casual observer None None	6
Overall Score	Percentile: 41-60	Severity Rating: Moderate	26

Table 12

Brian, OASES Results

Form: OASES-A	English		Spanish	
Section	Score	Rating	Score	Rating
I. General Information	3.42	Moderate/Severe	3.42	Moderate/Severe
II. Your Reactions to Stuttering	3.33	Moderate/Severe	3.20	Moderate/Severe
III. Communication in Daily Situations	2.77	Moderate	2.95	Moderate
IV. Quality of Life	2.68	Moderate	2.73	Moderate
Overall	3.07	Moderate/Severe	3.09	Moderate/Severe

Data Analysis

The audio recordings of the individual ethnographic interviews and intra-dyad conversations were transcribed by the researcher (Appendices B-H). The transcripts were then analyzed using *WordSmith Tools version 6* (Scott, 2014), which is a word processing software that allowed for the quantification of words and phrases used by the participants. The transcript format is also appropriate for Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) analysis (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004). The use of this set of analytic tools allowed for the examination of the three metafunctions of language which reveal the ways in which participants linguistically construct their experiences as bilinguals who stutter. To ensure accuracy of transcriptions, the researcher re-transcribed 5% of the data as described by Müller (2006). There was at most 2 hours and 15

minutes of conversational data associated with each participant between their conversation with their family member(s) and the ethnographic interview with the researcher. Therefore, the researcher re-transcribed 7 minutes of randomly selected portions of each participant's recordings to ensure that just over 5% of the transcripts were reviewed. Intra-rater agreement was 97% which ensures a consistency and reliability of the transcriptions. After checking for accuracy of transcriptions, the researcher omitted sections of talk that were not related to the participants' stuttering experiences (Brian talking at length about a friend from high school; Ivan's talk about recording data at a wedding, for example) and replaced identifying information such as the names of universities, locations of support groups, workplaces, and names of people with pseudonyms. The data were then divided into clause complexes, which were assigned line numbers for referencing purposes. Individual transcripts are located in the Appendix section. The following stages of analysis were used to examine each transcript:

Identification of keywords. The researcher read each transcript multiple times to become familiar with the topics discussed by each participant. Keywords of interest and their variations were highlighted which included: "stutter," "speech," "Spanish," "English," "therapy," and "fluency," as well as their Spanish equivalents. Other words of interest were examined due to their high-frequency of use by particular participants including: "fluid" by Ivan; "problema" by Ivan's mother, Mirielle; "cycle" by Neil; and "struggle" by Brian. The researcher selected these keywords in order to establish general loci for each of these aspects of the participants' stuttering experience which were of primary interest to this study.

Analysis of the Interpersonal Metafunction. In relation to the interpersonal metafunction, the researcher investigated choices made within the systems of Appraisal and modality. This allowed for the identification of "clusters" of appraisal. These clusters were

significant in that they allowed the researcher focus on the attitudes and descriptions unique to each participant's stuttering experience. Examination of these systems also uncovered the intricacies of the affective, behavioral, and cognitive components of the participants' experiences as described by Bennett (2006).

Appraisal System. Analysis of the Appraisal system allowed the researcher to examine how participants conveyed attitude and graded these components through the meanings of specific, charged words and even whole clauses when talking about their personal experiences with stuttering (Eggins & Slade, 1997). Additionally, analysis of the Appraisal system provides insight as to how attitudes are negotiated, the strength of the feelings involved, the ways which values are sourced and how listeners are aligned (Martin & Rose, 2003). This analysis was focused on two of the three interacting sub-systems of Appraisal: attitude and graduation. The third element of this triad, engagement, was taken into consideration only when participants' attitudes towards one another had a bearing on the construal of the stuttering experience. Because the focal point of this study is the participants' experiences, looking at intersubjective stance in detail would sidetrack rather than enhance the results.

Attitude. "Attitude is concerned with our feelings, including emotional reactions, judgment of behavior and evaluation of things" (Martin & White, 2005, p. 35). Examination of the linguistic choices that speakers make gives insight into the interpersonal meanings speakers convey. Attitude includes the sub-categories of appreciation, affect, and judgment. Appreciation refers to the positive and negative reactions to and evaluations of an object or process with relation to interpersonal significance, textual organization, and ideational worth (e.g., *great job, discordant speech, meaningful event*). Affect involves the expression of feelings including happiness, security, satisfaction and their negative counterparts (e.g., *happy, confident,*

exasperated). Judgment refers to the evaluation of behavior of others in regard to social sanction and esteem (e.g. *wrong, credible, weak, normal, competent*). According to Martin and White (2005), there are instances where the same attitudinal lexis can be used to judge or appreciate since the lexis may express different meanings in different contexts (e.g., he was an *average* student [judgment], it was an *average* lecture [appreciation]). Additionally, some lexis may convey both judgment and affect simultaneously by construing an emotional reaction to a behavior (e.g., I felt *embarrassed* about failing) (Martin & White, 2005). The focal point of this analysis is the attitudinal lexis selected by participants to talk about their stuttering. These linguistic selections provide information on how participants position themselves relative to their stuttering as well as the feelings associated with their stuttering.

Graduation. “Graduation attends to grading phenomena whereby feelings are amplified and categories are blurred” (Martin & White, 2005, p.35). Because attitudinal values are inherently scalable, graduation and attitude have an interactive relationship in which greater or lesser degrees of intensity and quantification of attitude can be expressed.

The two major domains of graduation are “force,” which includes intensification and quantification, and “focus,” which encompasses sharpening and softening. Intensification allows for the scaling of qualities, processes, and modalities (e.g., *somewhat* sad, *slightly* reduced, *very* often). While qualities are scaled in terms of degree, processes are graded in relation to vigor. There are three modes of intensification: isolation, infusion, and repetition. Isolation refers to scaling that is accomplished by the use of an isolated, individual item. Isolation can be grammatical or lexical in nature, where grammatical items have no referential meaning (e.g., *slightly, very*), and lexical items have the capacity to carry an attitudinal coloring or are figurative in nature when grading qualities (e.g., *ridiculously* easy, *beet* red). Lexical items can

be figurative or non-figurative when grading qualities and process. Also under isolation is maximization, where up-scaling reaches the highest possible intensity (e.g., *totally* happy, *always* go) as well as comparatives and superlatives used for localized scaling (e.g., *less* afraid, *more* happy, *greatest*). The second mode of intensification, infusion, occurs when intensity is conveyed as one aspect of the meaning of a single term which contrasts with other semantically-related terms in a sequence (e.g., *warm, hot, scalding*) (Martin & White, 2005). When used to grade processes, infusion can be figurative (e.g. *crystal* clear) or non-figurative (e.g. *very* clear). The third mode of intensification, repetition, is realized through the repetition of the same lexical item (e.g., it was *bad bad bad*) or by listing items that are semantically related (e.g., It was *irresponsible, immature, and misleading*). Metaphor can occur through isolation and infusion.

Quantification, another sub-category of force, allows for grading in regard to amount in number and mass (e.g., *a few, many, small*) and to extent in terms of time and space (e.g., *recent, near, long-lasting, sparse*). Features can be isolated and infused with figurative and non-figurative items.

The domain of focus addresses categories that are not scalable in terms of an experiential perspective. In other words, the item either belongs to a category or it does not; there are no varying degrees of membership in that category. What separates this domain from that of force is that focus involves the combination of a distinct category with an appraising item. Under this domain are sharpening and softening. Sharpening is used to up-scale an assessment and convey prototypicality (e.g., *a real* teacher, *genuine* leather). It has the effect of showing the speaker's maximum investment in a statement. Softening refers to the down-scaling of an assessment to express partial membership in a category and is comparable to that of hedging and vague

language (e.g., *kind of mad*, an apology *of sorts*). In conversation, softening is meant to lessen investment and maintain solidarity with the listener.

While the appraisal categories outlined above were originally developed for English, their application to Spanish data is in line with recent research (Oteiza & Pinto, 2008; Oteiza, 2009; Taboada & Carretero, 2012; Taboada, Carretero, & Hinnell, 2014). English and Spanish are sufficiently similar in regard to the aspects that were evaluated during this study. Both are inflecting nominative and accusative languages that use the same structural principles to signal experiential configurations, and to expand noun groups. However, the positioning of these expanding items differs in that adjectives typically follow the head noun in Spanish.

Examination of the lexis used to scale attitudinal assessments provides information on the strength of feelings held by participants in regard to their stuttering and will also offer insight into how they grade the severity and frequency of their stuttering.

Modality. The modality system, which is a dimension of the interpersonal system of Mood, refers to an area of meaning between “yes” and “no,” or positive and negative polarity (Togher, 2001). An analysis of this system was conducted in order to uncover the different ways participants qualified their statements. There are two aspects of modality to be considered: modalization and modulation. Speakers use modalization to shape their messages in varying degrees of usuality or probability. Usuality, which expresses frequency of an experience, can be construed through the speaker’s use of: modal Finites indicating usuality (e.g. The cat *will* sit there all day); mood Adjuncts or adverbs of frequency (e.g. He *always* eats at noon); and objective explicit clauses (e.g. It is *typical* for him to go to therapy). Probability is expressed in degrees of polarity which range from “high” (almost certain) to “low” (very uncertain) through the use of: modal Finites (e.g. You *must* attend class); interpersonal Adjuncts (e.g. Kelly

definitely had an influence); and explicit subjective sources (e.g. I *think* we're leaving soon). Subjective sources allow the speaker to convey that their message is based on their own perspective.

“Modulation is a way in which speakers temper the directness with which they seek to act upon each other” (Eggins & Slade, 1997, p. 102). This includes obligation, inclination, and potential. Obligation refers to the varying degrees expressed between a positive command and a negative injunction, which can be encoded through: modal Finites expressing obligation (e.g. You *must* graduate in August); *be + ed* clauses with a personal Subject (e.g. You are *allowed* to graduate in August); and impersonal *it + -ed* clauses (e.g. It is *permitted* that you graduate in August). Inclination, another sub-category of modulation, relays the speaker's willingness and desire to participate in a process and is expressed through: personal Subject + attitudinal adjective structures (e.g. I am *willing* to work hard); and impersonal structures with a nominalized mental process (e.g. It's a *commitment*) (Eggins & Slade, 1997). Potential, which Eggins and Slade (1997) refer to as “capability,” are expressions of one's ability to participate in a process. This subcategory of modulation is construed through: the modal Finite *can* (e.g. I *can* work for hours) and personal Subject + adjective of capability structures (e.g. I am *capable*).

In light of Lavid, Arus, and Zamorano-Mansilla (2010), the following considerations were made when conducting this analysis in Spanish: “tener que” + Infinitive (to have to) imposes obligation (e.g. *Tiene que salir*) (have to leave) whereas the Continuous Infinitive form flags probability (e.g. *Tiene que estar viniendo*) (it must be coming); and the imperfect tense of the verbs conveys usuality (e.g. *Yo caminaba por el parque*) (I *used to walk* in the park). Lavid et al. (2010) describe a category of “willingness,” which is identical to the English's category of “inclination.” For the sake of consistency, the researcher maintained the label “inclination.”

While this work does not cite a category for “potential,” it does mention that the verb “poder” (can, be able to) represents “a possibility to be taken into account.”

Analysis of the Textual Metafunction. The researcher took the base established by the clusters of appraisal and expanded outward to capture referential chains and progression of Themes in which the clusters were embedded. In particular, the researcher analyzed the organization of Theme and Rheme in the participants’ messages. As defined by Halliday and Matthiessen (2004), the Theme is an element which locates and orients the message within its context and is typically marked off in speech by intonation. The Theme typically represents Given information in the clause, while the Rheme represents New information. For example, in the clause *The cat is eating*, the Theme is *the cat* and the Rheme is *is eating*. The researcher commented on instances where the participants deviated from the typical Theme and Rheme structure to use one that is considered “marked.” Clauses that contain marked themes include structures in which something other than the Subject serves as Theme (e.g. *What a lady she is*) (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004). By using marked Themes, participants are able to foreground information other than the default Subject. This not only works to create contrast but also serves to highlight the significance of the information (e.g. *In 5 minutes*, I am leaving to my Pilates class). Theme-Rheme analysis gives insight into the structuring of messages, and the development of a conversation in terms of how information is managed, foregrounded, and backgrounded.

Analysis of the Experiential Metafunction. The final stage of this analysis involved the examination of the processes and participants used in the construction of experiential configurations. The experiential metafunction represents the ability of a language to express experience by construing a model of experience that consists of a process, the participants

involved in it, and the circumstances under which the process occurred (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004). The lexico-grammatical system of Transitivity divides these experiences into process types. “Each process type provides its own schema for constructing a particular domain of experience as a figure of a particular kind” (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, p.170). Analysis of the participants’ use of linguistic resources reveals how they construe stuttering in terms of entering into experiential figures, which can be categorized as material, behavioral, mental, verbal, relational, and existential processes. Halliday and Matthiessen (2004) state that the types should be addressed circularly with an understanding that the boundaries between each category should be taken as being fuzzy rather than crisp. Rather than occurring on a spectrum where material processes are on one end and mental processes are on the other, this system exhibits the fundamental aspect of interdeterminacy, where each process has traces of other processes along the borders of where they meet. This speaks to the multifaceted interpretations of experiences that can be made on a clause by clause basis. The process “laugh” for example has roots in the mental process type because it is essentially an expression of emotion. At the same it has traces in the material process type because it is a type of “doing.” Both of these traits, however, are accounted for by the behavioral process type.

Material processes are those that refer to “outer” experiences and can be considered events or actions that happen to participants or because of participants. Halliday and Matthiessen (2004) differentiate between “happening” and “doing,” where the outcome of a happening is restricted to the Actor (e.g. She fell off the ladder). “Doing” involves the unfolding a process which is directed at or impacts the Goal (e.g. She held the *cat*). The element representing the second participant is called the Scope. Unlike the Goal, the Scope is not affected by the process but serves to represent the domain of which the process takes place (e.g. They crossed *the river*).

Behavioral processes are those which represent outer manifestations of inner consciousness. These processes involve a Behavior and the participant who carries out the behavior, the Behaver (e.g. The girl laughed). This category falls between material and mental processes; thus behaviors will exhibit characteristics of both surrounding categories.

Mental processes have to do with the inner workings of the conscious participant such as perceiving, feeling, thinking, and wanting. Processes of this type involve a Senser and Phenomenon. The Senser is the person, entity, or thing endowed with consciousness that perceives the Phenomenon, which can be an action, fact, or thing (e.g. He enjoyed the movie). Mental process verbs can also be used in projections, where clauses project other clauses which have the status of ideas or of the content of consciousness (e.g. The professor thinks it's a good idea) (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004).

Verbal processes are inner workings that are brought to life by language. The act of saying is at the heart of these processes. The participant is categorized as the Sayer and their message is the Verbiage (e.g. Lauren said they had a great time). When verbal processes are receptive, there will be a second participant who receives the information, called the Receiver (e.g. She told the children not to run). Another classification is Target where the entity in which the process is directed is named (e.g. The lawyer accused Gonzalez of lying).

Relational processes have to do with classification in that the process ties together two fragments for a linear unfolding of information. These processes require two participants that are facts, things, or acts. Relational processes are specified in regard to the types of relationship they convey. Intensive relational clauses can be "attributive" in that they consist of a Carrier and an Attribute (e.g. she is intelligent) or "identifying" where they consist of a Token and a Value (e.g. Verena is the director). Possessive relational clauses construe a relationship in which one

element of the clause has ownership over another (e.g. Mary has a cat). Circumstantial relational clauses convey a relationship between the two elements is one of time, place, manner, cause, accompaniment, role, matter or angle (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004).

Existential processes are based solely on existence. Any phenomena that are recognized “to be” in a specific time or at a particular place are considered existential. The entity or event which is said to exist is labeled Existent and can exist as a person, object, institution, abstraction, action, or event. A distinctive feature of these processes in English is the word “there” as a subject in place of a participant (e.g. There are several kids on my caseload).

Table 13

Process types, meanings, and participants

PROCESS TYPE	Meaning	Participants	
		Primary	Secondary
material	‘doing’ ‘happening’	Actor, Goal	Recipient; Scope; Attribute
behavioral	‘behaving’	Behaver	Behavior
mental: perception cognition desideration emotion	‘sensing’ ‘seeing’ ‘thinking’ ‘wanting’ ‘feeling’	Senser, Phenomenon	
verbal	‘saying’	Sayer, Target	Receiver; Verbiage
relational: attribution identification	‘being’ ‘attributing’ ‘identifying’		Attributor; Beneficiary Assigner
existential	‘existing’	Existent	

Lavid et al. (2010) was used to guide the researcher’s application of this analytic tool to the Spanish data. There were a few differences to be taken into account. In regard to the material process type, every experiential participant can serve as Subject in English, but this is restricted to Goal and Actor in Spanish. This major process type includes behavioral processes as a subcategory in Lavid et al. (2010). The following differences were considered for the verbal process type: “decir” (to say) is a default verb for this process, regardless of whether or not there

is a Receiver; Receivers are typically marked by prepositional “a” (to) or through reduplication (e.g. *Le dije a Victoria que me llamara*) (Victoria likes the music); the Indicative is used for projected statements and questions unless projecting, and projected clauses have the same subject; the Infinitive is used for offers; and the Subjunctive is used for commands. When considering relational process types in Spanish, the researcher accounted for instances where “ser” (to be [static in nature]) was used to represent class and spatial events and “estar” (to be) used to construe a state of being and spatial matters. Existential processes are included as a subcategory of relational processes and are typically identified in clauses including “hay” (there is; literally “it has”), which is similar to the existential construction found in English (e.g. *Hay un perrito en la casa*) (There is a puppy in the house).

The results of these analyses are presented throughout the following chapters in an excerpt format:

E1110. IH	so	I	know	I	will	always	stutter
Exp:		Mental (cog. proj.)					Behavioral
Modality:					Usuality		
Appraisal:						Grad (max)	
	but	I	can	mask	it	a little bit	
Exp:	Circ.			Material			
Modality:			Potential				
Appraisal:						Grad (dwn)	

Reliability

Upon the conclusion of each interview, corroboration with the participants took place in order to laminate impressions and understandings held by the researcher. The purpose of this corroboration is not to confirm whether the participants’ perceptions are accurate or true reflections of a situation but rather to ensure that the research findings accurately reflect their perceptions, whatever they may be (Key, 1997). A member of the researcher’s committee, who has a background in the application of SFL methods, reviewed 5% of the researcher’s coding at

the conclusion of the data analysis phase to establish inter-coder reliability. As with all qualitative studies, the assignment of codes was subject to potential biases. Receiving input from the perspective of an outside coder helped increase the credibility of the findings (Stainback & Stainback, 1988) and minimize instances of researcher bias throughout the course of this study.

Chapter 4:

Ivan

This chapter presents the results of the analyses of Ivan's talk, which was collected during a conversation with his mother, Mirielle, and his younger brother, Rey as well as during an ethnographic interview with the researcher.

Ivan was asked to record a conversation about his stuttering with a family member. He selected his mother and younger brother as conversational partners. The recording lasted approximately 45 minutes. All three speakers chose to speak Spanish throughout their conversation although Rey intermittently used English. The general field of this interaction was centered on Mirielle's experiences with Ivan's stuttering while they were living in Ecuador. In regard to tenor, Mirielle assumes the role of "information giver" while Ivan and Rey occasionally interject to offer their perspectives on the topics she selected

The ethnographic interview was conducted after the researcher listened to the recording of the family conversation. The interview, which is approximately 1 hour and 27 minutes long, was conducted in English, though there are instances where Ivan code-mixes to demonstrate his use of a fluency technique as well as to quote things people have said to him while he was in Ecuador. The number of turns taken by both the researcher and Ivan are comparable; however, Ivan's turns typically lasted as long as five minutes whereas the researcher's turns are made to ask questions. Therefore, the tenor of this interview differed from that of the family conversation in that Ivan took the role of "information giver."

The results from each context are presented separately due to the amount of data retrieved. The results from the ethnographic interview are presented in section one followed by the results of the family conversation in section two.

SECTION 1: Ethnographic Interview

In the following section, results from Ivan’s ethnographic interview with the researcher are presented. Table 14 provides a quantitative overview of Ivan’s use of the keyword “stutter” and its variants throughout the interview.

Table 14

Quantitative overview of Ivan’s use of the word “stutter” and its variants

Keyword: Stutter		
Function	Frequency	
Behavior	72	58.82%
Circumstance	19	15.96%
Scope	8	6.72%
Grammatical metaphor	8	6.72%
Carrier	5	4.20%
Descriptor	4	3.36%
Actor	2	1.68%
Attribute	1	.84%
Total	119	

These results reveal that Ivan primarily conceptualizes stuttering as a behavioral process (58.82%) that he participates in, rather than a process in which the stuttering plays an active role such as Actor (1.68%). He spoke about his stuttering using the keywords “fluid” and “fluent” interchangeably for a total of 42 times, which both terms serves as an item of appraisal in all cases. In 11 instances (26.19%), he graduated these appraisal items by using comparatives and quantifiers.

The results from the analyses are presented by topic: feelings relative to stuttering; the “rhythm” factor; English as a second language; fluency techniques; and the word “tartamudo” (stutterer).

Feelings relative to stuttering. The following excerpts illustrate how Ivan discusses some of his feelings associated with stuttering. Though stuttering is something he does not want

for himself, he still takes pride in it. He shares the emotional implications of his stuttering being a “feeling you can see” and addresses his biggest fear about stuttering.

Pride. In this series of excerpts, Ivan speaks to the fact that while he does not want to stutter he still has pride in it. Later in the interview however, Ivan attributes his pride to being his “only option” and compares it to being gay.

Excerpt 4.1

E296. IH	I	reached	a point	in which	I	don't	want	to stutter	or not	that
Exp:		Material				NEG	Mental (des)	Behavioral		
Modality:						NEG	Inclination			
Appraisal:						NEG	Appre (+)			
E297. IH	but	stuttering	is	a part	of	my life	but	that's	it	
Exp:			Relat (int)					Relat (int)		
Appraisal:				Appreciation (neu)						
E298. IH	I'm	like	proud	of	it	you know				
Exp:	Relat (int)									
Appraisal:		Grad (dwn)	Affect (+)							
E299. IH	but	at	the	same time	but	eh-	I	don't	want	to stutter
Exp:	Circ.				Circ.			NEG	Mental (des)	Behavioral
Modality:								NEG	Inclination	
Appraisal:								NEG	Appre (+)	
E300. IH	or or	do	the	best	I	can	to	not	stutter	
Exp:		Material						NEG	Behavioral	
Modality:						Potential				
Appraisal:				Appre (+)						

In line E296, Ivan construes his lack of desire to stutter as a feeling he came to over time as indicated by his use of “reached.” Because the clause expresses both his lack of desire and of inclination to stutter, his structuring it as “a point” allows him to distance himself from the overall negative appreciation he has for the behavior of stuttering. In the following line, he chalks up his stuttering to being “a part” of his life but suggests that its significance does not go beyond that. This neutral statement, which serves as a counter to line E296, sets the stage for Ivan’s positive appraisal of himself. This positive affect that he now feels in the face of stuttering

is down-scaled however. Ivan counters this positive attribution in line E299 as indicated by the circumstantial contingency “but at the same time.” This prefaces his repetition of the negated mental desiderative structure found in line E296, where Ivan conveys his lack of desire to participate in the behavioral process of stuttering. While it is something he has learned to take pride in over the years, it still remains an undesirable part of his life. He extrapolates on this point by indicating that he actively puts forth his best efforts “to not stutter.” This avoidance of the behavior that he takes pride in creates a mismatch, which is addressed in Excerpt 4.2 taken from a later part of the interview.

Prior to this excerpt, Ivan was talking about his stuttering being a failure in his ego and that it was something he needed to make up for by excelling at sports in high school. The researcher counters his negative appraisal by paraphrasing his previous statement in Excerpt 4.1. He responds by first confirming the validity of her counter statement with “yeah” then counters it with a relational clause construction. Here, “that” (reference to being proud of stuttering) is assigned the maximally up-scaled Attribute “only option;” one that he again describes as being undesirable. He builds upon this in line E601 with a series of probable circumstances, which he presents through a verbal clause construction. By setting the researcher in the role of Sayer for the purposes of this clause, he casts her as the one who theoretically offers him the option of “being born again” and not stuttering. In his own verbal projection, he responds with double polarity, both of which are negative. This emphasizes his lack of desire to be born again as a PWS. He counters this with a statement geared toward the reality of his current situation in line E604, where “the only option I have” is now identified as “to be proud of something.” This suggests that his pride is not only superficial to a certain extent but that it is also born out of necessity since it is not something he chooses to feel in relation to his stuttering.

Excerpt 4.2

E598. AG	but	you	were	saying	earlier	that	that	was	part of
Exp:				Verbal				Relat (int)	
Appraisal:									
	who	you	are	you're	somebody	who	stutters	and	you're
Exp:			Relat (int)	Relat (int)			Behavior		
E599. IH	yeah	but	that's	my	only	option			
Exp:			Relat (int)						
Appraisal:					Grad (max)				
E600. IH	It	wasn't	something	that	I	wanted			
Exp:		NEG	Relat (int)			Mental (des)			
Modality:		NEG				Inclination			
Appraisal:		NEG				Appre (+)			
E601. IH	if	you	ask	me	if uh-	if if	I	was	born
Exp:	Circ.		Verbal			Circ.			Material
Modality:	Probability					Probability			
	again								
Exp:	Circ.								
E602. IH	and I	have	the	option	of	stuttering	or	not	
Exp:		Relat (pos)				Behavioral		NEG	
E603. IH	I	would	say	no-	I	wouldn't	stutter		
Exp:			Verbal (proj)			NEG	Behavioral		
Modality:		Probability				Usuality			
E604. IH	but	it's	the	only	option	I	have		
Exp:		Realt (int)					Relat (pos)		
Appraisal:				Grad (max)					
	you know	to be	proud	of	something				
Exp:		Relat (int)		Circ.					
Appraisal:			Affect (+)						

He then compares his pride in stuttering to the pride others express in “being gay” in

Excerpt 4.3.

Excerpt 4.3

E608. IH	you know	like	being	gay	I	don't	know	
Exp:			Relat (int)			NEG	Mental (cog)	
Appraisal:			Appreciation (neu)				Grad (dwn)	
E609. IH	ok	gay-	ok	so	I'm	proud		
Exp:				Circ.	Relat (int)			
Appraisal:						Affect (+)		
E610. IH	because	if	not	if	you	are	not	proud
Exp:	Circ.	Circ.	NEG	Circ.		Relat (int)	NEG	
Modality:		Probability		Probability				
Appraisal:							NEG	Affect (+)
	eh	what	do	you	have			
Exp.					Relat (pos)			
E611. IH	like	gay	people-	I	don't	know		
Exp:					NEG	Mental (cog)		
Appraisal:		Appreciation (neu)						

In line E608, Ivan likens his only option to that of “being gay” but down-scales the metaphor with the negated mental clause construction “I don’t know.” He then projects verbiage from the perspective of a gay speaker in line E609, where he sets the topic of the projection with “ok gay” then follows it with an intensive relational clause in which “I” (reference to the hypothetical gay speaker) is assigned the Attribute “proud.” Through this juxtaposition, Ivan expresses the need for both gays and people who stutter to turn the social stigma of their being into a positive by being “proud.” Ivan works to provide an explanation for this in line E610 through another series of circumstances. This serves to highlight the significance Ivan places on the possession of pride. For him, not having pride implies that you have nothing which he, again, compares to the plight of gay people.

Stuttering as “a feeling you can see.” The following excerpt was taken from a portion of talk in which Ivan was describing his stuttering as something that people “don’t necessarily see.” He was unsure as to whether or not he was being clear which prompted the researcher to share

her understanding. She first states in line E743 “you’re more aware of it” then “you’re conscious of it.” Ivan’s response is presented below:

Excerpt 4.4

E746. IH	extremely	aware	of it	and	conscious	of it	
Exp:	Mental (cog)			Mental (cog)			
Appraisal:	Grad (up)						
E747. IH	even	though	people	in front	of you		
Exp:	Circ.			Circ.			
E748. IH	they	don't	even	uh	feel	it	
Exp:		NEG		Mental (per)			
Appraisal:			Grad (up)				
E749. IH	or	see	it				
Exp:	Mental (per)						
E750. IH	so	it's	like	a	dual	pressure	to you
Exp:		Relat (int)					Circ.
Appraisal:						Appre (-)	

In line E746, Ivan accepts the researcher’s understanding of the mental states “aware” and “conscious,” but intensifies the researcher’s quantified “more aware” with “extremely aware.” The face-to-face aspect of his interactions is then set as a contingency to the fact that his interlocutors do not perceive his stuttering. This is significant in that stuttering is something that Ivan is “extremely aware” of, but his interlocutors are not. This circumstance of others not perceiving his stuttering is assigned the Attribute “like a dual pressure,” which indicates Ivan’s negative appreciation as well. The dual sources of this pressure are his hyper-awareness of his stuttering and the interlocutor’s unawareness of it. In the following excerpt, which is a continuation of the previous one, Ivan discusses how this lack of others’ perception was revealed during the recorded conversation with his family.

Excerpt 4.5

E752. IH	sooo so	that-	so	my	brother	told	me	
Exp:						Verbal (proj)		
	"o-oh	I	didn't	know	it	was	so	serious"
Exp:			NEG	Mental (cog. proj.)		Relat (int)		
Appraisal:	Appre (-)						Grad (up)	Appre (-)
E753. IH	heh-	my mom	told	me	that	too		
Exp:			Verbal					
E754. IH	but	inside	me	it's	really	serious		
Exp:	Circ.			Relat (int)				
Appraisal:					Grad (up)	Appre (-)		
E755. IH	but	they	don't	look	it like-			
Exp:	Circ.		NEG	Mental (cog)				
E756. IH	they	didn't	see	it	like	that-	just	me
Exp:		NEG	Mental (cog)					
Appraisal:							Grad (up)	
	because	I	suffered	everyday				
Exp:	Circ.		Material					
Modality:				Usuality				
Appraisal:			Affect (-)	Grad (max)				

In line E752, Ivan uses a verbal projection to quote, verbatim, what his brother said. He does so by constructing a negated mental projection where the projected relational clause “it was so serious” serves as the information his brother did not know. The way in which Ivan structures this also works to convey that his brother did not realize the significant impact stuttering was having on Ivan’s life. Ivan’s inclusion of “oh” at the beginning of the Verbiage serves to indicate both surprise from the brother’s perspective, but also Ivan’s negative appreciation of his brother’s not knowing. This appreciation transfers on to his mother since he identifies her as telling him that as well. Thus, while his family did not perceive anything serious from an external perspective, Ivan was still dealing with significant negative affect on the inside. This is

in line with his statement in the previous excerpt where he describes his struggles with stuttering as something that not everyone can see.

Ivan uses a negated mental clause of cognition to convey that his family did not see it from his perspective. His use of present tense leads one to believe that his mother and brother still do not view Ivan's stuttering as being significant. In the following clause, he adjusts the tense of the mental process to the past which leaves the mismatch of perspectives in the past. He includes the circumstance "just me," which works to up-scale the significance of Ivan being alone in understanding the seriousness of his own stuttering during that time frame. He then structures a circumstance of cause to account for this in which Ivan is the Behaver in the process of "suffering." This verb also works to convey the negative affect Ivan feels because of the seriousness of his stuttering, which he experienced with high-usuality as conveyed by "everyday."

In summary, Ivan's stuttering is something that he is "extremely aware" of. However, he reports that people who are standing right in front of him do not perceive it thus using a visual angle to contrast what people see with what he regularly deals with "inside."

Getting older. In Excerpt 4.6, Ivan selects a new topic, which is the "biggest fear" he has in regard to his stuttering. He introduces a new Theme, his "biggest fear," which he identifies as the persistence of his stuttering through old age. Not only does this possible future state-of-being invoke negative affect but also total rejection of the desire and inclination to be in that state. He contrasts this by using a positively polarized construction in which he depicts the process of solving his stuttering as desirable. His use of the verb "solve" indicates that Ivan views his stuttering as a problem that has an answer he must work to attain. This clashes with the circumstance "somehow," which suggests that Ivan does not know how he will go about finding

a solution. It is this recognition of not knowing how “to solve” his stuttering that ultimately feeds his fear of being characterized as a PWS stutters in his old age, which he downranks by using the behavioral process of stuttering as a postmodifying clause.

Excerpt 4.6

E1103. IH	and um	my	biggest	fear	is	that	to get	old	
Exp:					Relat (int)		Relat (int)		
Modality:									
Appraisal:			Grad (max)	Affect (-)					
	and	keep	stuttering						
Exp:			Behavioral						
Modality:		Usuality							
E1104. IH	I	don't	want	to be	like	that	uh uh		
Exp:		NEG	Mental (des)	Relat (int)					
Modality:		NEG	Inclination						
Appraisal:		NEG	Appre (+)						
E1105. IH	I	want	to solve	it	somehow	in my 20s	or	in my 30s	
Exp:		Mental (des)	Material			Circ.		Circ.	
Modality:		Inclination			Probability				
Appraisal:		Appre (+)							
E1106. IH	but	I	don't	want	to be	an	old man	who	stutters
Exp:	Circ.		NEG	Mental (des)	Relat (int)				Behavioral
Modality:			NEG	Inclination					
Appraisal:			NEG	Appre (+)					

Building on this topic, the researcher then questions Ivan’s perception of the probability of finding a solution in line E1107:

Excerpt 4.7

E1107. AG	do	you	think	it's	possible	though	to ah-
Exp:		Mental (proj)		Relat (int)			
Modality:					Probability		
E1108. IH	yes	I	have	improved	a lot		
Exp:				Material			
Modality:			Probability				
Appraisal:				Appre (+)	Grad (up)		
E1109. IH	so	I	know	I	will	always	stutter
Exp:		Mental (cog. proj.)					Behavioral
Modality:					Usuality		
Appraisal:						Grad (max)	
	but	I	can	mask	it	a little bit	
Exp:	Circ.			Material			
Modality:			Potential				
Appraisal:						Grad (dwn)	
E1110. IH	but	I	also	know	that	if	
Exp:	Circ.		Mental (cog. proj.)			Circ.	
Modality:						Probability	
Appraisal:							
	I	stutter	it's	alright			
Exp:		Behavioral	Relat (int)				
Appraisal:				Appre (+)			

Ivan responds in line E1108 with “yes” and supports his answer with a material clause in which he simultaneously conveys his positive appreciation of himself rather than his stuttering. Ivan then uses the textual Theme “so,” which flags the likelihood of his stuttering persisting as an aspect of his improvement that he acknowledges. Therefore, his wants for the future are contradicted by what he actually knows about his stuttering. By serving as the primary participant in this construction, Ivan puts the onus on himself as the Behaver who will continue to participate in the process. His use of the textual Theme “but” indicates that the upcoming information will serve to counter his previous statement. This is realized by Ivan’s assertion of his potential to participate in a process that he actively uses to counter his stuttering: hiding it.

Thus, Ivan equates his ability to “mask” his stuttering as an improvement he has made. This reveals that Ivan’s ultimate solution is to address the outward manifestation of his stuttering; the aspect interlocutors can see. His solution to the “inner” aspect of his stuttering, which he described in the previous excerpt, is solved by his acceptance of his behavior.

The “Rhythm” Factor. A recurring topic throughout the ethnographic interview was “rhythm,” in that it comes up on nine different occasions during his conversation with the researcher. Ivan asserts that stuttering is a matter of rhythm in line E96. He cites his ability to sing without stuttering “at all” as an example of this. In the following excerpts, Ivan shares his definition of the word “rhythm,” which he describes in terms of circumstances. He also expresses how he thinks it could help others who stutter.

Beforehand knowledge. In line E114, the researcher asks Ivan to describe what he means by “rhythm.” His response is presented in Excerpt 4.8.

Ivan puts universal “you” in a primary participant role for the entirety of his description. By not putting himself in this role, he is able to speak about his “rhythm” theory in more general terms rather than making statements about himself that require veracity. Ivan speaks to the predictability involved in the act of singing. He then says “no” and readjusts this statement in line E116 where he replaces the material process with the behavioral process “to say.” This correction worked to negate the act of singing as a factor aiding fluency and highlights Ivan’s point that it is the actual foreknowledge of what was to be said (or sang) that helps with fluency. He attributes this beforehand knowledge of what is to be said to “the lyric.”

In line E118, he charges this prior knowledge inherent to singing with an agentive role in the process of giving “confidence” but conveys some uncertainty as to how this works through his inclusion of “somehow.” He reiterates what he does know by repeating line E116 almost

verbatim, which highlights this information as the main point of his message. He positively appraises this clause in line E120 through a material clause construction where “that” (reference to knowing what to say) is Actor and universal “you” is Goal in the process of “help.” The verb “help” inherently carries a positive appreciation and this is up-scaled by the quantifier “a lot.”

Excerpt 4.8

E114. AG	when	you	say	rhythm	like	what	do you	mean	by that?
Exp:			Verbal					Material	
	Like	what?	If	you	could	describe	it	to me	
Exp:						Material		Circ.	
Modality:			Probability		Potential				
E115. IH	for	example	when	you	sing	you know	what		
Exp:			Circ.		Material	Mental (cog. proj.)			
	you	are	going	to do					
Exp:				Material					
Modality:			Probability						
E116. IH	no-	you	already	know	beforehand	what	are		
Exp:				Mental (cog. proj.)		Circ.			
Modality:			Usuality						
	you	going	to say	because	of	the lyric			
Exp:			Verbal	Circ.					
Modality:		Probability							
E118. IH	so	that	somehow	gives	you	confidence and	you ah-		
Exp:				Material					
Modality:			Probability						
Appraisal:						Affect (+)			
E119. IH	you	already	know	what	you	are	going	to say	
Exp:			Mental (cog)					Verbal	
Modality:		Usuality					Probability		
E120. IH	and	that	will	help	you	a lot			
Exp:				Material					
Modality:			Probability						
Appraisal:				Appre (+)		Grad (up)			

Through this description, it is made evident that Ivan is not talking about “rhythm” in the everyday sense of the word. Essentially he uses it to refer to situations in which foreknowledge is inherent and confidence-giving. This is exemplified in the continuation of this excerpt:

Excerpt 4.9

E121. IH	and	when	you	memorize	a play	and	you're	an	actor
Exp:		Circ.		Mental (cog)			Relat (int)		
E123. IH	you ah-	you	already	know	the words				
Exp:				Mental (cog)					
Modality:			Usuality						
E124. IH	and	you	are	somehow	prepared	beforehand			
Exp:			Relat (int)			Circ.			
Modality:				Probability					
E125. IH	and	when	you	sing	you	support	your	speech	on sound
Exp:		Circ.		Material		Material			Circ.

In line E121, the circumstance of “when you memorize a play” is posited as another circumstance that invokes “rhythm.” He builds upon this further with a relational clause in which universal “you” is assigned the Value of “an actor” and thus takes on another identity. Again, Ivan highlights the significance of prior knowledge of “the words” but also includes the Attribute of “prepared.” Ivan’s addition of the element of preparedness has implications for his perception that stuttering is something that can be prevented if he has a set script to scaffold his speech.

Impersonating accents. Ivan cites the behavior of impersonating accents as another “type of rhythm.” In the following excerpt, he describes his experiences using it as a technique to prevent stuttering.

Excerpt 4.10

E135. IH	when	I	make-	when	I	impersonate	accents-		
Exp:	Circ.		Behavioral	Circ.		Behavioral			
Appraisal:									
E136. IH	that's	a type of	rhythm	too					
Exp:	Relat (int)								
Appraisal:		Sharpen							
E137. IH	cuando	yo	hablo	asi	como	un	argentino	de	Cordoba
Exp:	Circ.		Behavioral						
	<i>when I speak like an Argentinean from Cordoba</i>								
E138. IH	nunca	voy	a	estar	tan	mundial-	es	increible	o sea
Exp:	NEG		Relat (int)				Relat (int)		
Modality:	NEG Usuality								
Appraisal:					Grad (up)	Appre (+)		Appre (+)	
	<i>never will I be so worldly- it's incredible I mean</i>								

In line E135, Ivan presents the behavior of impersonating accents as a circumstance. His verb choice suggests that the behavior goes beyond imitating accents; rather it involves personifying someone else. This rings similar to his description of being “an actor” in the previous excerpt. In both cases, Ivan implies that he needs to act like someone else in order to prevent stuttering. His assignment of the Attribute “a type of rhythm” in the following relational clause serves to sharpen the degree at which he feels this behavior qualifies as “rhythm.” Ivan then code-mixes with the primary purpose of demonstrating this technique. Within the verbiage, his speaking “like an Argentinean from Cordoba” is structured as a circumstance, one of which he comments about using humor by implying that it is a degree of worldliness (“tan mundial”) that he could never (“nunca”) be. He then positively appraises this circumstance with “increible” (incredible), which also conveys a certain degree of amazement (and lack of understanding) of why this works.

Excerpt 4.11

E139. IH	I	don't	know	until	when	but			
Exp:		NEG	Mental (cog)	Circ.		Circ.			
E140. IH	if	I	adapt	this	accent	to	my	lifestyle	
Exp:	Circ.		Material						
Modality:	Probability								
E141. IH	there	will	be	a point	that	I	stutter	in that	accent
Exp:			Existential				Behavioral	Circ.	
Modality:		Probability							
E142. IH	because	my	memory-	my mind	will	identify	it		
Exp:	Circ.					Material			
Modality:					Probability				
	as	my	nature	accent					
Appraisal:			Appreciation (neu)						

He first uses a negated mental clause of cognition to express that he does not know how long the technique will last and uses the textual Theme “but” to add details, which serve to counter this lack of knowledge. What he does in fact know is that the efficacy of this technique will inevitably come to an end. His structuring of this knowledge begins with him in the role of Actor; the one taking the initiative and carrying out the technique of adapting the accent. His transition into the role of Behavior is downranked by the main clause, which serves to highlight the moment in which the stuttering begins rather than Ivan’s participation in the behavior. This active participation is extinguished completely in line E142, where his mind serves as the Actor taking ultimate control over his speech. In the following continuation of his talk, Ivan compares his mind to a computer.

Excerpt 4.12

E143. IH	so	it's	like	a virus	you know	the	computer	says	
Exp:		Relat (int)						Verbal (proj)	
Appraisal:				Appre (-)					
E144. IH	"ah now	this	is	your	new	speech			
Exp:	Circ.		Relat (int)						
E145. IH	eeh or	your	new	accent					
E146. IH	now	we	aren't	infected					
Exp:	Circ.		NEG Relat (int)						
Modality:			NEG	Appre (-)					
E147. IH	and	now	you	are	going	to stutter	again"		
Exp:		Circ.				Behavioral			
Modality:					Probability				
E148. IH	but it-	you	get	to	don't	stutter	for	a long	time
Exp:	Circ.		Relat (pos)		NEG	Behavioral	Circ.		
Appraisal:								Grad (up)	

He then uses a relational clause construction to assign the Carrier “it” (reference to the use of the accent) the Attribute of “like a virus.” As the talk unfolds, it can be inferred that this attribution only holds for his initial use of the accent. Keeping the metaphor going, he uses a verbal projection to present a quote from the Sayer, “the computer.” Within the Verbiage, the computer’s identification of the new accent as “not infected” implies that the accent essentially becomes recognized as his normal way of speaking which instantiates the default characteristic of stuttering. This virus metaphor, then, suggests that Ivan views his stuttering as a factory setting of sorts. Despite this, Ivan still speaks positively about using accents as a technique in line E148.

In summary, Ivan identifies “impersonating accents” as a type of process he participates in, in an effort to prevent his stuttering. Despite these efforts, however, he speaks to the idea that

his mind is ultimately in control of how long this technique works. This personification of his mind also implies that he views himself and his mind as two separate entities.

Rhythm as a technique for any stutterer. After addressing techniques in general, Ivan talks at length about “rhythm” being a factor that can help “any stutterer.” This excerpt illustrates how he negotiates the degree at which this can be generalized in the stuttering community and how he uses his experiences with stuttering as grounds to make these statements.

Excerpt 4.13

E204. IH	the	rhythm	that'll	help	all	stutterers	talking	about	rhythms	something
Exp:				Material			Verbal	Circ.		
Modality:			Probability							
Appraisal:				Appre (+)	Grad (max)					
E205. AG	(unintelligible)									
E206. IH	no no	to	all	stutterers						
Exp:										
Appraisal:	NEG		Grad (max)							
E207. IH	because	stuttering	is	a	thing-					
Exp:			Relat (int)							
E208. IH	I'm	not	like	an	expert					
Exp:	Relat (int)									
Appraisal:		NEG			Sharpen					
E209. IH	but	I	stutter							
Exp:			Behavioral							
E210. IH	but	you	can	help	any	stutterer				
Exp:				Material						
Modality:			Potential							
Appraisal:					Grad (max)					
E211. IH	if	you	treat	their	rhythm	their confidence				
Exp:	Circ.		Material							
Modality:	Probability									
E212. IH	I'm	not	saying	they're	gonna	stop	100%	their	stutter	
Exp:		NEG	Verbal (proj)			Material				
Modality:					Probability					
Appraisal:							Grad (max)			
	but	it will-	they	will	get	better	like	me		
Exp:	Circ.				Relat (int)					
Modality:				Probability						
Appraisal:						Appre (+)				

Ivan begins a new clause with “that,” which is kataphoric in that it presumes “talking about rhythms” and anaphoric since it refers back to the pre-posed “rhythm.” Here, “the rhythm” serves as Theme of the clause. The verb “help” itself expresses Ivan’s positive appreciation of rhythm in that he appraises it as something that will benefit “all stutterers.” This maximal quantification serves to strengthen his commitment to the significance of the rhythm variable. Ivan speaks over the researcher to counter his previous statement about the quantity of people who will benefit by negating it in line E206. He abandons his explanation for this retraction in order to give a disclaimer about his knowledge of stuttering. He offers a contingency where he contrasts the negated attribute “not an expert” with his behavioral experience of stuttering, construed such that this experience does in fact entitle him to make the claim presented as a circumstantial contingency in the following clause.

In line E210, universal “you” is in the role of Actor rather than “the rhythm.” This switch in Actors marks Ivan’s role change to “expert” in the context of the interview. Now he is the expert who is indirectly giving advice to the researcher. He reverts back to using a maximal quantifier to up-scale the number of “stutterers” who can potentially be helped; rather than “all” he uses “any.” He then down-scales this assertion in line E212, where he negates the verbal projection “they’re gonna stop 100% their stutter.” This leaves some gray area in terms of how effective he truly thinks the aspects of “rhythm” and “confidence” are. He specifies a new degree of effectiveness with a counter statement and begins to do so with “it” as a primary participant in the new clause but abandons it for a relational clause in which “they” (reference to other people who stutter) is in the role of Carrier. The Attribute “better” not only represents the probable positive outcome of his suggested treatment but also works to appraise himself as accomplished by his inclusion of the circumstance “like me.”

In summary, Ivan speaks to a few ways he helped himself get better in terms of stuttering. He feels that working on his confidence was the most effective of these self-help techniques and suggests that it could be used to help “all stutterers.” During this time, he embodies the role of expert in the context of the interview which he justifies by speaking to his experience with stuttering. He then spends some time negotiating the quantity of people he believes can be helped. Once he settles for “any stutterer,” which is maximally up-scaled, he works to adjust the degree at which they can be helped. Therefore, while Ivan views himself as being highly knowledgeable about the effects these techniques have on his own stuttering, he still is uncertain about the efficacy these techniques when used by others who stutter.

English as a second language. The following excerpts illustrate the way Ivan discusses his stuttering in the context of his being an English language learner. He first talks about his “fluidity,” which he uses as an equivalent term for “fluency,” when he first came to the United States in the first excerpt. He then describes how having “better English” than his interlocutors contributes to his “fluidity.”

Learning English. After making a statement about his “fluidity” in Ecuador, Ivan tells the researcher what speaking English in the United States was like when he first arrived. He uses the textual Theme “and,” which signifies his continuation on the topic of “fluidity,” but changes the topical Theme to the circumstance of time in which he arrived in the United States. In the following relational clause, the behavioral process “to speak English fluidly” is identified as “impossible.” He therefore highlights the significance of relocating and implies it had a causal relationship with his inability to speak fluidly. He continues with the textual Theme “so” and indicates that his previous statement is a perspective to be taken into consideration in regard to his participation as Actor in the process “doing.” Here, “this thing I am doing” and “this life

decision I took” collectively serve as Carrier of the Attribute “like I’m a newborn here.” In both of the aforementioned processes, Ivan is in the role of Actor which expresses a high degree of ownership in his actions. His introduction of this Attribute with the interpersonal Theme “maybe” in line E57, conveys some uncertainty in his making this attribution in which he metaphorically refers to himself as a newborn to symbolize his new beginnings in the United States) both as a resident and as an English speaker. He repeats this clause verbatim which works to strengthen his commitment to it.

Excerpt 4.14

E52. IH	and	when	I	first	come	here			
Exp:		Circ.			Material	Circ.			
E53. IH	it	was	impossible to me		to speak	English	eh eh eh	fluidly	
Exp:		Relat (int)			Behavioral				
Appraisal:			Appre (-)					Appre (+)	
E54. IH	so	you	see	it	from	that	way		
Exp:			Mental (per)		Circ.				
E55. IH	this	thing	I'm	doing-					
Exp:				Material					
E56. IH	this this	like eeh	life	decision	I	took	is	like	
Exp:						Material	Relat (int)		
E57. IH	maybe	it's	like ah	I'm a	newborn	here	I'm a	newborn	here
Exp:		Relat (int)		Relat (int)		Circ.	Relat (int)		Circ.
Modality:	Probability								
Appraisal:	Grad (dwn)				Appre (neu)			Appre (neu)	
E58. IH	ah ah ah	at	the	same	time				
Exp:		Circ.							
E59. IH	if	you're	a	newborn	here	you	are	learning	to talk
Exp:	Circ.	Relat (int)			Circ.			Mental (cog)	Behavioral
Modality:	Probability								
Appraisal:			Appre (neu)						
E60. IH	so	it's	like-	it	helps	me	somehow		
Exp:					Material				
Modality:							Probability		
Appraisal:					Appre (+)				

He begins line E58 with a circumstance indicating he will counter his previous statement in some way. Because the appreciation “newborn” is neutral, it is not clear which position he will be countering. He then uses the circumstantial element “if” which marks the relational clause “you’re a newborn here” as a probable contingency. Unlike the construction in line E54, he places universal “you” in the role of Carrier to remove himself from the equation. Ivan creates a cause and effect clause construction, which has implications for the difficulties inherent in learning a new language. Ivan therefore highlights the contextual factors that contribute to it. His selection of the verb “helps” not only places this perception of himself in an active role, but it also conveys his positive appreciation of this idea.

Ivan thus compares himself to being a newborn which is a metaphor for his new start which has implications for all the things he must learn with language being at the forefront. By likening himself to a newborn in terms of “learning to talk,” he has lowered expectations for his speaking abilities, which has helped him.

English as a circumstance. The researcher asks Ivan to appraise his stuttering in the context of talking to other English language learners from other countries. The way in which he structures his response is presented in Excerpt 4.15.

Ivan begins his turn by signaling to the researcher that what he has to say may be offensive. He does so, however, by assigning himself, not his upcoming statement the Attribute “like a little bit harsh.” This works to comment on what he chooses to say rather than the content of the answer itself. In other words, he is aware of a nicer way to deliver his message but is choosing not to do so. Ivan negates this appreciation with “not harsh” and replaces it with a down-scaled neutral appreciation “like direct” which removes the negative connotation inherent

to the adjective “harsh.” Now, instead of being malicious, he is portraying himself as being straightforward.

Excerpt 4.15

E78. AG	when	you	talk	to	new	people	like that	from	other	countries
Exp:	Circ.		Verbal	Circ.				Circ.		
	and	they	have	different	language	bases	how	do	you	feel
Exp:			Relat (pos)							Mental (cog)
	your	stuttering	is	in	those	moments				
Exp:			Relat (int)	Circ.						
E79. IH	I'm	going to	be	like	a little bit	harsh	so so so			
Exp:			Relat (int)							
Modality:		Probability								
Appraisal:				Grad (dwn)	Grad (dwn)	Appre (-)				
E80. IH	not	harsh	like	direct						
Appraisal:	NEG	Appre (-)	Grad (dwn)	Appre (neu)						
E81. IH	if	my	English	is	better	than	his or hers			
Exp:				Relat (int)						
Modality:	Probability									
Appraisal:						Grad (up.):	Appre (+)			
E82. IH	my	speech	is	going to	be	better				
Exp:					Relat (int)					
Modality:				Probability						
Appraisal:							Appre (+)			
E83. IH	because	somehow	I	feel	superior					
Exp:	Circ.			Mental (cog)						
Modality:		Probability								
Appraisal:						Affect (+)				
E84. IH	if	somehow-	if	his or her	English	is	better	than	mine	
Exp:			Circ.			Relat (int)				
Modality:	Probability		Probability							
Appraisal:							Appre (+)			
E85. IH	you	can	feel	that	uh					
Exp:			Mental (per)							
Modality:		Potential								
E86. IH	I	can	feel	that						
Exp:			Mental (per)							
Modality:		Potential								

E87. IH	when	somebody's	language	is	better	than	yours
Exp:	Circ.				Relat (int)		
Appraisal:					Appre (+)		
E88. IH	somehow-	I	don't	want to-			
Exp:			NEG	Mental (des)			
Modality:	Probability		NEG	Inclination			
Appraisal:			NEG	Appre (+)			
E89. IH	but	somehow	I	feel	a little bit	intimidated	
Exp:				Mental (cog)			
Modality:		Probability					
Appraisal:					Grad (dwn)	Affect (-)	
E90. IH	maybe	I	don't know				
Exp:			NEG	Mental (cog)			
Appraisal:	Soften		Grad (dwn)				
E91. IH	and	I	always	stutter	more	with	that person
Exp:				Behavioral		Circ.	
Modality:			Usuality				
Appraisal:			Grad (max)		Grad (up.)		
	or	at least	at	the	beginning		
Exp:	Circ.		Circ.				
Appraisal:		Grad (dwn)					

He opens line E84 with the textual Theme “if” which is followed by the topical Theme “my English.” The entire clause complex serves to represent a causal relationship between the circumstantial contingency of Ivan’s English proficiency (in comparison to that of his interlocutors) and his speaking abilities in relation to stuttering. He ties in an explanation for this with a downranked clause complex, which he introduces with the textual Theme “because.” His reason for structuring it this way has to do with the content of the downranked clause in which he expresses feelings of superiority. His choice of the word “superior” rather than the word “confident” for example, he up-scales the positive affect he feels in these circumstances. Because he realizes this degree of expression borders on being judged negatively, he did warn the researcher about being “harsh” and also down-scaled this feeling before announcing it.

He then offers the opposite circumstance in line E84, where the interlocutor's English is appraised as being "better than" his. In the following clause conveying the effects of this, universal "you" is the primary participant in the mental perceptive process of feeling "that" (reference to circumstance). Therefore, somebody's level of English proficiency is something that can be sensed and is therefore subjective. Ivan uses the same construction in the following clause but replaces universal "you" with "I" in the role of Senser, which works to pull himself back into the forefront of the process. He then places the language of universal "you" as the Subject of comparison rather than his own language as he has done in the previous comparisons. In doing so, he is able to speak more broadly about this phenomenon and thus implies the usuality of its occurrence.

Ivan uses the topical Theme "somehow" to convey uncertainty in the upcoming assertion he is about to add to this subject. He resurfaces as a participant by filling the role of Senser, which makes the feelings he expresses specific to him. He prefaces his negative emotions with a negated mental process of desire, which indicates that he does not have control in experiencing the Phenomenon of feeling "a little bit intimidated." Ivan down-scales this affect locally by using the quantifier "a little bit" and the intensifier "maybe." His post-hoc inclusion of the negated mental process "I don't know" also serves to down-scale this statement. Ivan probably did not like having to admit his feelings of being intimidated by others, but felt the need to be candid in the context of the interview. His way of compromising between these two objectives was down-scaling his true, negative feelings as much as possible.

Continuing on this topic with the textual Theme "and," Ivan adds detail I regard to the usuality and circumstantial nature of his stuttering in that the increase of frequency is specific to

the people who he has perceived as having better English than him. He specifies even further with the down-scaled circumstance of time “or at least in the beginning.”

In summary, Ivan’s stuttering is related to his negative feelings, which are triggered by his perception of whether or not his English speaking skills are better than his interlocutor’s. This suggests that Ivan’s fluency is largely determined by his level of confidence in the dyad.

Ivan’s fluency techniques. Ivan did not have access to speech therapy as a child. His one experience with therapy in his teen years was centered on placing a pencil under his tongue to prevent stuttering, which is not an uncommon practice in Latin America according to Salas-Provance, Erickson, & Reed (2002). However, Ivan thought this method was “stupid” and did not participate in therapy for long. He has not sought therapy as an adult and therefore has developed his own techniques to address his stuttering. The following excerpts illustrate the ways in which he talks about these strategies and give further insight into his perception of stuttering.

Muleti. In line E311, Ivan introduces the Spanish term “muleti” as something that he uses to help him during stuttering moments. This word he uses has roots in the noun “muleta,” which means “crutch” in Spanish. The following excerpt presents his description of “muleti” in the context of his stuttering which also reveals some similarities with “muleta.”

Excerpt 4.16

E314. IH	it's	a	word	that	supports	you	that-		
Exp:	Relat (int)				Material				
Appraisal:					Appre (+)				
	that	push	you	to say	the	word			
Exp:		Material		Verbal					
Appraisal:		Grad (up)							
E315. IH	por	ejemplo	for	example	I'm	stuttering	and I-	and	
Exp:	Circ.		Circ.			Behavioral			
	I	know	that	on	the	next word	I'm	going	to stutter
Exp:	Mental (cog. proj.)			Circ.					Behavioral
Modality:								Probability	
E316. IH	so	I	say	the word	"este"	este			
Exp:			Verbal						

Ivan begins by providing a definition for “muleti,” which has a similar purpose of a “muleta” (crutch). He up-scales this process in the following phrase by switching it to “push,” which implies more vigor that does the process “supports.” So rather than carrying him through, the “muleti” thrusts him forward. This contrasts with the effects of stuttering, where blocks cause one to stop. Looking at this in terms of ergativity, it is revealed that the “muleti” has an agentive, or causal, role in the process. In line E315, he provides an example in which he sets the context with him actively involved in the process of stuttering. Within the following mental projection, the circumstance, “on the next word,” works to contrast the order of the word. Because it is “next” it speaks to the predictability of his stuttering. Therefore, the center of this message is on the circumstance rather than the probability of his stuttering. In using the textual Theme “so” he adds detail to the message and specifies that his personal “muleti” is the word “este” (this).

After taking some time to figure out the English translation of “muleti,” he gets back on topic and describes what happens when he uses “muleti” in stuttering moments in line E324.

Excerpt 4.17

E324. IH	and	when	I	use	that word	it	will	you know
Exp:		Circ.		Material				
Modality:							Usuality	
E325. IH	that	like	uhhh	mild	my	stutter		
Exp:				Material				
Appraisal:		Grad (dwn)		Appre (+)				
E326. IH	a word	like	"este"-					
Exp:								
Appraisal:								
E327. IH	and uh	it's	like	a car	you know			
Exp:		Relat (int)						
Appraisal:				Appre(neu)				
E328. IH	It's	like	you	get	a block	you	go	back
Exp:	Relat (int)			Material			Material	
	and	then	you	run				
Exp:				Material				

He begins line E324 with a textual Theme that refers back to the topical Theme of “muleti.” Here, the circumstance of time in which Ivan is the Actor is downranked. This works to highlight the significance of the following clause, where “it” (reference to use of “este”) is Actor where Ivan down-scales the impact of the process “mild.” Thus, his positive appreciation of using “este” is revealed in his verb selection in that it represents his belief that it is something that helps lessen his stuttering. In line E326, he suggests that there are other words besides “este” that can serve as “muleti” with the phrase “a word like este” therefore speaking to the fact that it is his personal “muleti.” He then uses a relational process to construct a metaphor in which he likens the use of “este” as “like a car.” He explains this metaphor in terms of material processes conveying movement in various degrees of vigor. The first of these, the block, implies that speech is completely stopped. His verb choice, however, places the Actor “you” in the role of Medium. Here, the block is structured as a process that comes upon “you;” whereas in the proceeding clauses, “you” is agentive in that the Actor is doing the going back and running.

Overall, this metaphor works to convey movement out of the stagnant position of a block. This resonates with his description of “muleti,” which he described as a word that pushes rather than supports. Therefore, getting out of a block requires vigor, a running start or a push, which Ivan says can be accomplished by his personal “muleti,” “este.”

Working on confidence. This following excerpt illustrates how Ivan talks about the ways he got better on his own. He also discusses how working on his confidence was the most significant of these efforts.

Excerpt 4.18

E1119. IH	in my case	I	got	better	on	my	own			
Exp:	Circ.		Relat (int)		Circ.					
Appraisal:				Appre (+)						
E1120. IH	just	with	the	internet						
Exp:		Circ.								
Appraisal:	Grad (dwn)									
E1121. IH	and	looking	for	therapy						
Exp:		Material								
E1122. IH	and	working	on	my	confidence	too	because			
Exp:		Material	Circ.				Circ.			
E1123. IH	I	got	this	idea	that	my	problem	was	physical	too
Exp:		Relat (pos)						Relat (int)		
Appraisal:							Appre (-)		Appre (neu)	
E1124. IH	and	but	most	of	it	was	confidence			
Exp:						Relat (int)				
Appraisal:			Grad (up.)				Affect (+)			
E1125. IH	it	was	confidence	that ha-	that	helped	me	a lot		
Exp:		Relat (int)				Material				
Appraisal:			Affect			Appre (+)		Grad (up.)		

He begins with the marked Theme “in my case,” which highlights the personal nature of his message. The point of contrast is that what he is about to say is applicable exclusively to his situation and not necessarily to that of others who stutter. Ivan then positively appraises himself as getting “better” on his own, which is contrary to the typical treatment of stuttering, going to speech therapy. He uses the textual Theme “and” to add details to the topic of getting better on his own. In each of these clauses, Ivan is the implied Actor, which speaks to his level of participation in the processes of “looking” and “working.” He then moves from talking about his personal self-help strategies to describing an idea he had about his stuttering through his use of a mental projection. Overall, his structuring of this complex puts his actual idea in the background, which may be because he is not sure about its validity. By referring to his stuttering as “my problem” Ivan conveys his negative appreciation of the behavior. He begins line E1244 with a

textual Theme to add information, then replaces it with “but,” which signals he is going to counter what he said in the previous clause. Here, “most of it” is identified as “confidence” and also serves to contrast the significance of confidence with the “physical” aspect of his stuttering. “Confidence” serves as a the predicated Theme in the final complex of this excerpt which works to place a great deal of significance on its role in the process of helping Ivan with his stuttering.

While Ivan started this topic of conversation by attributing his own efforts as making a difference in his stuttering, he later identifies “confidence” as the primary helping factor. This is in line with his explanation of feelings of superiority (i.e. feeling supremely confident) feeding his ability to be more fluid.

The word “tartamudo” (stutterer). Early in the ethnographic interview, Ivan brings up a topic discussed during the conversation he had with his mother and brother: the negative connotation of “tartamudo.” In the first excerpt, Ivan speaks to the “vibe” associated with the word then discusses the difference between “tartamudo” and “gago” in the second excerpt.

Insulting. Ivan discusses how the word “tartamudo” is perceived in his home country, Ecuador. He then presents his general appraisal of stuttering. Ivan begins this excerpt with the textual Theme “though,” which flags his following statement as related to the previous topic of Ecuador, but as a countering piece of information to his prior assertion that alluded to a lack of knowledge about stuttering in his country during his childhood. In this clause “they,” which is a reference to people in Ecuador during his childhood, is the topical Theme. He expresses their negative appraisal with a mental projection, which conveys Ivan’s lack of alignment with this judgment of the following Verbiage. Both verbal projections are intensive relational constructions where universal “tu” and “you” are assigned the Attributes “tartamudo” and “a stutterer” respectively. He elaborates on this further by using negatively charged adjectives to

describe the “vibe” that one senses when unspecified “people” make reference to the word “stuttering.” Again, Ivan distances himself from this appraisal by placing universal “you” in the role of Senser. He himself may not have actually felt the “mocking” or “negative” vibes of this word so he cannot speak from his own perspective in this case.

Excerpt 4.19

E15. IH	though	they	thought	it	was	kind of	insulting	to say
Exp:		Mental (cog. proj.)			Relat (int)		Verbal (proj)	
Appraisal:						Soften	Judg (-)	
	eh eh	"tu	eres tartamudo"	"you	are	a	stutterer"	
Exp:			Relat (int)		Relat (int)			
E16. IH	that	was	kind of-	you	can	feel	the	mocking
Exp:		Relat (int)			Mental (per)			
Modality:					Potential			
Appraisal:			Soften					Appre (-)
E17. IH	or the	insulting	vibe	when	people	refer to	the word	stuttering
Exp:				Circ.		Verbal		
Appraisal:		Appre (-)						
E18. IH	but	it's	fine	if	you	stutter		
Exp:		Relat (int)		Circ.		Behavioral		
Modality:				Probability				
Appraisal:			Appre (+)					
E19. IH	you	should	get	help	for	it	or	therapy
Exp:			Material		Circ.			
Modality:		Obligation						
Appraisal:		Judg (+)						

He uses a textual Theme in line E18, which structures Ivan’s perspective on the topic as one that counters the past perspective held by others in Ecuador. Rather than seeing it as something taboo to talk about, Ivan appraises the behavior of stuttering with neutral judgment but expresses obligation to seek help for it.

Tartamudo vs. gago. In line E1089, the researcher brings up Ivan’s mother’s negative reaction to the word “tartamudo” during the family conversation. She asks Ivan if there is any

other word one could use instead. The following excerpt captures Ivan’s response in which he suggests the word “gago” then appraises it with a comparison to the word, “tartamudo.”

Excerpt 4.20

E1091. IH	in	that days	to say	tartamudo			
Exp:	Circ.		Verbal (proj)				
E1092. IH	it	was	very	harsh			
Exp:		Relat (int)					
Appraisal:			Grad (up)	Appre (-)			
E1093. IH	but	nowadays	I	don't	know		
Exp:	Circ.			NEG	Mental (cog)		
E1094. IH	uh	another	word	is uh	gago		
Exp:				Relat (int)			
E1095. IH	I	think	that's	really	insulting		
Exp:	Mental (cog. proj.)		Relat (int)				
Modality:		Probability					
Appraisal:				Grad (up)	Appre (-)		
E1096. IH	it's	like	"gago-				
Exp:	Relat (int)	Verbal (proj)					
E1097. IH	oh	you're	a gago				
Exp:		Relat (int)					
Appraisal:	Appre (-)						
E1098. IH	you're	a	like-"				
Exp:	Relat (int)						
E1099. AG	what's	the	difference	between	the two?		
Exp:	Relat (int)			Circ.			
E1100. IH	they're	the	same	but	it's-	tartamudo	is uh
Exp:	Relat (int)			Circ.			Relat (int)
	like	the	pretty	way	to say	it	you know
Exp:					Verbal		
Appraisal:	Grad (dwn)		Appre (+)				

Ivan uses a marked Theme in which he sets the circumstance of time as a contrastive element meaning his upcoming statement is specific to the time frame and is no longer applicable “nowadays.” The act of saying “tartamudo” serves a pre-posed Theme, which is anaphorically picked up by “it” in the following relational clause construction. Therefore, Ivan works to draw attention to the Carrier rather than the negative Attribute, which he is not alignment with. He offers additional information on this topic as conveyed by the topical Theme “another word” where he presents “gago” as a related term that he personally deems as insulting. He conveys that this is his opinion by using a mental projection. As he did in the previous excerpt, Ivan uses a verbal projection to present Verbiage from the perspective of another speaker, where the Receiver is being labeled as “gago.” The negative undertone in this statement is marked by his inclusion of “oh,” which indicates negative appreciation of the attribution. Though Ivan up-scales his negative appraisal of “gago” to intensify the contrast he makes with “tartamudo” he identifies the terms as being “the same” when the researcher asks him to identify the difference between them. He then counters this by differentiating “tartamudo” as the less offensive of the two.

In summary, Ivan indicates that the word “tartamudo” had negative social implications at one point in Ecuador. While he is unsure of whether or not this is still the case, he conveys his lack of alignment with this sentiment and judges stuttering as a socially acceptable topic. Though he recognizes the negativity behind the word, he negatively appraised the alternative “gago” to a greater extent thereby making “tartamudo” the lesser of two evils. This speaks to the cultural implications of stuttering. In Ivan’s home country, the topic of stuttering was taboo at one point.

SECTION 2: Family Conversation

The results presented in this section were derived from the data collected during Ivan’s conversation with his mother, Mirielle, and younger brother, Rey, which they recorded in Spanish. The majority of this data was extracted from Mirielle due to the number and length of her turns in comparison to Ivan and Rey’s contributions.

Throughout the conversation, all three participants used the keywords “tartamudez” (and its variants) and “problema” interchangeably. Table 15 provides an overview of the frequency each participant used each keyword.

Table 15

Overview of use of keyword “tartamudez” (and variants) and frequency of use of “problema”

Keyword	Ivan	Mirielle	Rey
“Tartamudez”	6	9	7
Behavior	4	3	6
Attribute	-	3	-
Possession	1	1	-
Verbiage	-	1	-
Phenomenon	-	1	-
Actor	-	-	1
Carrier	1	-	-
“Problema” as reference to stuttering	11	35	4

All three participants primarily conceptualize stuttering as a behavioral process, though Mirielle uses the variants of “tartamudez” as Attributes with an equal amount of frequency. The low frequency of each participant’s use of the keyword “tartamudez” can be explained by the high frequency at which they all use the word “problema” as a reference to stuttering. This word inherently carries negative appraisal and thus serves as another layer meaning relative to the interpersonal metafunction. In some instances, Mirielle includes circumstantial information when using the word “problema,” which sheds light on some of her theories about the etiology of Ivan’s stuttering. Throughout the conversation, she refers to it as the “problema de:”

“mandíbula” (mandible); “temperament” (temperament); “lenguaje” (language); “hablar” (to speak); “congenito” (congenital); and “familiar” (family). Ivan refers to it as a “problema de:” “confianza” (confidence) and “lenguaje.”

The results of the SFL-based analyses are presented by the following conversation topics: la palabra “tartamudez,” theories regarding etiology; and description of “la familia” (the family).

La palabra “tartamudez” (the word “stuttering”). Ivan’s mother, Mirielle, opens the family conversation recording with her appraisal of the word “tartamudez” (stuttering). She gives insight as to how this word is viewed in their home country, Ecuador, and ties the social stigma of the word to the lack of identification of Ivan’s stuttering when he was younger. Later in the conversation, the topic resurfaces, and Ivan discusses how the word is judged in Ecuador “ahora” (now).

Mirielle: *Un término grotesco (a nasty term)*. The first topic of the family conversation, the word “tartamudez,” was selected by Mirielle in line F3. She introduces the topic “esa palabra” (this word), which she postmodifies with “tartamudez.” By referring to it as a “palabra” (word) she implies that she is going to speak about the word itself rather than the behavior of “tartamudez.”

Mirielle opens the conversation by using a construction that draws attention to the word “tartamudez” rather than her negative appraisal of it. She pads the appraisal, “muy fuerte” (very harsh), even further by using a mental clause construction to introduce it. This allows her to present it as her personal perspective on the effect of the word. She continues to add detail to this topic in the following clause where she changes the perspective from that of her own to one held in Ecuador, which is also negative which she maximally up-scales to make the appraisal more intense than her own.

Excerpt 4.21

F3. M	esa-	esa	palabra	tartamudez - me	suen	muy	fuerte		
Exp:					Relat (int)				
Appraisal:						Grad (up)	Appre (-)		
<i>that- that word stuttering sounds very harsh to me</i>									
F4. M	eso	en-en-en	nuestro	país	suen	bastante	grosero		
Exp:		Circ.			Mental (per)				
Appraisal:						Grad (max)	Appre (-)		
<i>that in-in-in our country sounds pretty nasty</i>									
F5. M	por	eso-	creo	que	es	uno	de	los	motivos
Exp:	Circ.		Mental (cog proj)		Relat (int)				
Modality:			Probability						
<i>for that, I think that is one of the reasons</i>									
	que	no	pudimos	detectar	a tiempo	que	es	la tartamudez	
Exp:		NEG		Material	Circ.		Relat (int)		
Modality:			Potential						
<i>we didn't figure out in time that it was the stuttering</i>									
F6. M	porque	eso	se	lo	trata	como un-			
Exp:	Circ.				Relat (int)				
Modality:			Usuality						
<i>because it is treated like a-</i>									
	como	un	término	grotesco	a	la	persona		
Exp:					Circ.				
Appraisal:				Appre (-)					
<i>like a nasty term against a person</i>									
F7. M	como	un	insulto	entonces	eso	casí	no	se	usa
Exp:							NEG		Material
Modality:						Usuality	NEG		
Appraisal:			Appre (-)			Grad (dwn)			
<i>like an insult- so that's almost never used.</i>									

Mirielle follows this with another construction which serves to highlight the fact that there are implications for “eso” (that), which again she structures as a personal belief using a mental clause construction. In terms of the clause complex structure, she downranks the inability to detect the stuttering, which is a process that she does not take full ownership of as indicated by the conjugation of “no pudimos” (we didn’t). It is not clear who “we” includes. Not only does

she diffuse blame for not detecting Ivan’s stuttering by including unspecified others in the process, but cites society’s negative appraisal of the word as a cause. As flagged by her use of the textual Theme “porque” (because) in line F6, she continues to support her assertion by speaking to the commonplace nature of “tartamudez” being treated as a taboo word; one that would serve as “un insulto” to the person which she cites as the primary reason this word was rarely used in Ecuador.

Ivan: Ya no es ofensivo (now it isn’t offensive). Later in the conversation, Ivan talks about the current status of “tartamudez” in Ecuador which differs from his mother’s previous description of the word.

Excerpt 4.22

F457. IH	ahora	el	problema	de	la tartamudez	ya	no	es	ofensivo
Exp:	Circ.					Circ.		Relat (int)	
Appraisal:			Appre (-)				NEG		Appre (-)
	<i>now the issue of the stuttering isn't offensive</i>								
F458-459. IH	ya	la	gente	ya ha	ido	poco	a	poco	en Ecuador
Exp:	Circ				Material			Circ.	
Modality:						Grad (dwn)			
	<i>the people have gone little by little in Ecuador</i>								
F460. IH	si-	"oye	tu hijo	tiene	problemas de tartamudez				
Exp:				Relat (pos)					
Appraisal:				Appre (-)					
	<i>if- "listen your son has problems stuttering</i>								
F461. IH	hay	que	llevarlo	a	terapia	de	lenguaje"		
Exp:			Material	Circ.					
Modality:	Obligation								
	<i>you have to take him to language therapy"</i>								
F462.M	allá	nadie	podía	decir	eso	era	un	insulto	
Exp:	Circ.	NEG		Verbal		Relat (int)			
Modality:		NEG	Potential						
Appraisal:		Grad (max)					Appre (-)		
	<i>over there- no one could say that- it was an insult</i>								
	una	grosería	en	Ecuador	decir	eso			
Exp:			Circ.		Verbal				
Appraisal:		Appre (-)							
	<i>it's nasty in Ecuador to say that</i>								

Ivan begins his turn of talk in line F457 with the marked Theme “ahora” (now) which works to contrast with the time frame Mirielle was referencing during her turn of talk. He identifies “el problema” (the problem) as “la tartamudez,” which serves as an interpersonal indicator of his negative appreciation of the behavior. However, he follows this by asserting that it is not offensive which counters the insulting connotation of the word that Mirielle was describing. Their appraisals contrast not only in terms of positive and negative appreciation but also in regard to the timeframes their appraisals are relevant to. Ivan’s assertion is geared toward the present social judgments of this word, while Mirielle’s is based on beliefs from over 10 years ago.

He continues to use time as a point of contrast in the following clause with “ya” (now) when describing the gradual change of perspective held by the people in Ecuador relative to the judgment of the word. He then uses a verbal projection to present Verbiage from the perspective of an un-specified Sayer to illustrate this change. The projection not only works to up-scale the change, but also highlights the casual nature in which people now bring up the topic of stuttering by starting the quote with informal “oye” (listen). Within the projection, he also weaves in the objectively construed necessity of seeking therapy for stuttering.

Mirielle counters this in line F462 and uses a marked Theme to situate the location, “alla” (over there), as a point of contrast. Building from Ivan’s verbal projection, she intensifies the negative social implications of saying such a thing by using maximally down-scaled “nadie” (no one) to quantify the number of people who would say it. She supports her counter statement with a relational clause in which she assigns Ivan’s projection the Attribute “un insulto” (an insult). She follows this with a negative appraisal of the following verbal process “decir eso” (to say this), where “eso” also refers to Ivan’s projection. Her placement of the circumstance, “en

Ecuador,” before delivering the process marks the significance of location in this clause. This is because Mirielle understands that these appraisals are unique to Ecuador and do not apply in the United States. Both of the appraisals she uses are structured to represent the general consensus “en Ecuador” in the past and are not so much a reflection of Mirielle’s personal opinion.

This exchange serves to represent the awareness both Ivan and Mirielle have of the social implications of stuttering in Ecuador. While Ivan focuses on how it has changed since his youth, Mirielle focuses on its stigma because she cites it as a reason that Ivan’s stuttering was never diagnosed. This works to take the blame off herself and project it on to society.

Theories regarding etiology. Mirielle discusses her past beliefs about the cause of Ivan’s stuttering. While her temperament and Ivan’s issues with the alignment of his mandible were identified as causes by others, the idea that her “terrible” pregnancy is one she came to on her own.

Mother’s temperament. The following excerpt illustrates how Mirielle discusses the doctors’ theory that Ivan’s stuttering was caused by her “cárcer fuerte” (strong character).

Excerpt 4.23

F25. M	y	lo	que	me	decían	es	que	son	los	nervios
Exp:					Verbal	Relat (int)		Relat (int)		
Modality:					usuality					
<i>and what they would tell me was that it was nerves</i>										
F26. M	que	de	pronto	"usted	como	tiene	carácter	fuerte	lo	tiene
Exp:	Circ.					Relat (pos)				Material
Appraisal:								Judg (-)		
<i>that as a result "you have a strong character you make him</i>										
	nervioso	al	niño	y	no	puede	hablar"			
Exp:					NEG		Behavioral			
Modality:						Potential				
Appraisal:	Judg (-)									
<i>nervous and he can't talk"</i>										
	que	ese	era	el tema	de	todo	el	mundo		
Exp:			Relat (int)							
Appraisal:							Grad (max)			
<i>and that was everyone's point</i>										

Here, “lo” is postmodified by “que me decian” (what they would tell me), which in turn serves as a projecting clause for the doctors’ explanation for Ivan’s speech problem. She uses the textual Theme “que” (that) to continue adding to her report which she presents through a verbal projection from the perspective of the doctors. By reporting their Verbiage this way, Mirielle shows her lack of alignment with their message, which is a negative appraisal of her character. Within this structure, “usted” (formal “you”), serves as non-obligatory subject pronoun. Therefore, “usted” is marked Theme, which highlights her role in the process of making Ivan nervous which is finally identified as the cause of his not being able to speak. When examining this clause for ergative configuration, Mirielle’s ‘strong character’ takes an agentive role in the process of which Ivan is the Medium. Therefore, Mirielle suggests that the doctors indirectly blamed her for Ivan’s speech problems. In her continuation of this topic, indicated by the textual Theme “que,” she says that what the doctors told her was “el tema” (point) of everybody. This implies that people other than the medical professionals brought up the negative effect she was having on Ivan. A few lines later, Mirielle describes what actions she took to adjust her “temperamento” (temperament).

Mirielle opens Excerpt 4.24 by attributing Ivan’s problem to her temperament which she identifies as something that comes with her. Because it is something that is inherent, she speaks to how she always tries (“siempre he tratado”) to modify it. The verb group “he tratado” is present perfect tense, which indicates that this is a process that originated in the past and continues into the present. This verb selection also implies her lack of success in completing the process. She uses the textual Theme “pero” (but), which indicates her addition of information that counters her statement about trying to modify her behavior.

Excerpt 4.24

F35. M	entonces	como	es	un	problema	de un-un	un	temperamento	mío
Exp:			Relat (int)			Circ.			
Appraisal:					Appre (-)				
	<i>then it's like it's a problem of my temperam</i>								
	que	viene	conmigo	yo	siempre	he	tratado	como	que
Exp:		Material	Circ.				Material		
Modality:					Usuality		Probability		
Appraisal:					Grad (max)			Grad (dwn)	
	<i>that comes with me and I've always tried to</i>								
	de	modificar	en	no	gritar	no	hablar	alto	(unintell.)
Exp:		Material		NEG	Behavioral	NEG	Behavioral		
Appraisal:					Affect (-)			Grad (up)	
	<i>to change in not to yell or raise my voice</i>								
	para	no	ponerlo	nervioso					
Exp:	Circ.	NEG	Material						
Appraisal:				Affect (-)					
	<i>so that I wouldn't make him nervous</i>								
F36. M	pero	es	algo	que-que	que	sale	que		
Exp:		Relat (int)				Material			
Modality:									
Appraisal:									
	<i>but it's something that-that that comes out that</i>								
	tu	no	lo	puedes	controlar	porque	es	tuyo	
Exp:		NEG			Material	Circ.	Relat (int)		
Modality:				Potential					
	<i>you can't control because it's yours</i>								
F37. M	entonces	yo dije	"bueno	pues	mientras	yo	me-		
Exp:		Verbal (proj)		Circ.					
	<i>and so I said "well then so long as I</i>								
	me	controle	en	manejar	mi	carácter	mi	hijo	va a mejorar"
Exp:		Material		Material					Material
Modality:								Probability	
Appraisal:									Appre (+)
	<i>I control myself in dealing with my character, my son is going to improve</i>								

Mirielle’s counter goes back to her previous assertion that essentially, “es algo” (it is something), that cannot be controlled because it is “tuyo” (yours). Here, her use of universal “you” allows her to distance herself from the description of being someone who cannot control her anger and therefore removes blame from herself. Mirielle then uses a verbal projection in line

F37 to report her self-talk, which is set in the past and serves as her passive acknowledgement of her role in making Ivan nervous as conveyed by “bueno” (well). She presents the duration of her efforts in a marked Theme construction which makes it the center of her message rather than the actual processes she planned to participate in at the time. “En manejar mi carácter” (in dealing with my character) is presented as a circumstantial matter which highlights the significant role she thought this process played in Ivan’s getting better. By using a verbal projection, Mirielle distances herself from her previous perception and understanding of the role she played in Ivan’s stuttering.

Embarazo terrible (terrible pregnancy). Mirielle also describes a past theory of hers in which she used her “embarazo terrible” to justify Ivan’s “problema de hablar” (speech problem). She introduces her theory by first describing Ivan as always crying (“llanto”) during childhood. She up-scales this even more so by including the circumstance “día y noche” (day and night). By going into detail about how much he cried, she implies that it was problematic. Since it was a problem, she came up with a justification in which “mi hijo” (my son) becomes the topical Theme. Therefore, the nervousness is something inherent to Ivan which removes Mirielle’s temperament as being a cause. She explains further that this was a result of her terrible pregnancy which again, diffuses blame from herself and puts it on the circumstances of her pregnancy which have an agentive role under the system of ergativity. She gets even more specific and indicates that there were problems within her marriage. This brings in Ivan’s father as having a role in her negative experience. She refers back to “los problemas” in line F60 with “todo eso” (all of this) then cites it as her justification of his speech problems. Her repetition of “justificaba” (justified) in line F61 conveys the interpersonal significance of this process and also

indicates that she construed these experiences of hers as an explanation for Ivan's speech issues, which she did not understand at the time.

Excerpt 4.25

F56. M	todo	era	llanto	todo	día	y	noche			
Exp:		Relat (int)								
Modality:	Usuality			Usuality						
Appraisal:	Grad (max)			Grad (max)						
	<i>Everything was tears day and night</i>									
	y	entonces	yo	como	justificaba	eso?				
Exp:					Material					
	<i>and then how could I justify that?</i>									
F58. M	mi	hijo	nació	nervioso-	tuve	un	embarazo	terrible		
Exp:			Material		Relat (pos)					
Appraisal:				Judg (-)				Appre (-)		
	<i>my son was born nervous- I had a terrible pregnancy</i>									
	por el-	por el-	por	los problemas	de pareja					
Exp:			Circ.							
	<i>for him- for him- for the problems of the couple</i>									
F60. M	osea	todo	eso	yo	lo	justificaba so-	su	problema	de hablar	
Exp:	circ					Material			Circ.	
Appraisal:		Grad (max)							Appre (-)	
	<i>all of this I justified your speech problem</i>									
F61. M	lo justificaba	con	todos	los problemas	que	yo	había	tenido		
Exp:		Material	Circ.						Relat (pos)	
Modality:								Usuality		
Appraisal:				Grad (max)		Appre (-)				
	<i>that I justified with all the problems that I had</i>									
	en	el	alrededor	no?	en	el	alrededor	de	mi	
Exp:	Circ.				Circ.			Circ.		
	<i>in the surroundings no? in my surroundings</i>									
	durante	el	embarazo	por	por parto	o	osea			
Exp:	Circ.			Circ.						
	<i>during the pregnancy for the parts of it</i>									
F63. M	pero	nunca	me	imaginé	que	realmente	era	un	problema	grande
Exp:	Circ.			Mental (cog proj)			Relat (int)			
Modality:		Usuality				Probability				
Appraisal:		Grad (max)						Appre (-)	Grad (up)	
	<i>but never did I imagine that in reality it was a huge problem</i>									

At first she describes the problems as something she was always having but decreases the probability of her having a role in these problems by naming the circumstance of location “en el alrededor” (in the surroundings) as being a factor. Her inclusion of “no?” after making this assertion works to draw a response from Ivan inviting his alignment with her rationale to which Ivan never replies. She begins to do a post-hoc downscaling by shortening the length of time with “por parto” (for the parts). Mirielle begins line F63 with the circumstantial element “pero” (but), which suggests she is going to say something that is contrary to the information she just provided. Her maximal negation of imagine makes the fact that the terrible pregnancy may have been the cause of “un problema grande” (a huge problem) extraordinary.

In summary, Mirielle works to remove herself from having a role in Ivan’s nervousness, which is similar to the objective she was working to achieve in the previous excerpt. This time, she directs attention to the external circumstances of her terrible pregnancy, which implies her belief that the factors in her surroundings caused Ivan to be born nervous.

Mandíbula (mandible). During both the family conversation and the ethnographic interview, it was revealed that when Ivan was a child he had issues with the alignment of his jaw and was required to wear a retainer-like device to correct the problem. Mirielle places a great deal of significance on “el asunto de la mandíbula” (the issue of the mandible), which early on, she believed was the cause of Ivan’s speech problems. The following excerpt shows how she structures her coming to this conclusion, the feelings associated with it, and how she construes these experiences in light of them eventually being proven false.

Excerpt 4.26

F207. M	yo	siempre	he	sido	muy preocupada	cuestión	del	médico	todos	los meses
Exp:					Mental (emo)				Circ.	
Modality:		usuality								
Appraisal:		Grad (max)			Affect (-)				Grad (up)	
<i>I had always been very worried with the issue of the doctor- every month</i>										
	el doctor	una cosa-	como	le	decía	el	asunto	de	la	mandíbula
Exp:					Verbal					
Appraisal:						Appre (-)				
<i>the doctor one thing- he said it was the issue of the mandible</i>										
F209. M	yo	creí	que	era	por	eso	que	usted	hablaba	así
Exp:		Mental (cog proj)		Relat (circ)	Circ.				Behavioral	Circ.
Modality:		Probability							Usuality	
<i>I thought that it was for that reason that you spoke that way</i>										

After discussing the topic of “ignorancia general” (general ignorance) with Ivan’s brother, Mirielle changes the topic by making herself the topical Theme with “yo” (I). Here, Mirielle explains that she was worried, which contrasts with the “cáncer fuerte” she described before. This worry is expressed with a high degree of usuality through her use of a present perfect verb construction “he sido muy preocupada” (always been very worried). When examining this for the ergative, Mirielle is in the role of Medium in that she is experiencing this emotion as a result of the “cuestión del médico” (issue of the doctor). She follows this with a circumstance of time which she up-scales in terms of quantity with “todos” (all) to indicate the length of time in which the doctor focused on “una cosa” (one thing) therefore highlighting the significance the doctor put on Ivan’s mandible. Mirielle uses a mental projection in line F209 to assert the fact that her beliefs about Ivan’s speech, which were later proven to be wrong, were based on what the doctor told her. After having a side conversation about what the brother believed was the cause in lines F211-214, Mirielle circles back to the topic of herself relative to “la mandíbula.”

Excerpt 4.27

F216. M	yo	me desesperaba	y	me preocupaba	mucho	
Exp:		Mental (emo)		Mental (emo)		
Modality:		Usuality		Usuality		
Appraisal:		Affect (-)		Affect (-)	Grad (up)	
	<i>I would always get desperate and worried very much</i>					
	por	arreglar	la	mandíbula		
Exp:	Circ.	Material				
	<i>to fix the mandible</i>					
F217. M	yo	dije	cuando	ya	termine	la mandíbula
Exp:		Verbal (proj)	Circ.		Material	
	<i>I told myself that when the mandible is fixed</i>					
	mi hijo	ya	va	a	estar	bien
Exp:					Relat (int)	
Modality:		Probability				
Appraisal:						Appre (+)
	<i>my son will be well</i>					

As seen in the previous excerpt, Mirielle places herself as the topical Theme when discussing Ivan’s mandible and drawing attention to the negative emotions she felt as a result. She uses another verbal projection to relay another false belief where the circumstance of time, “cuando ya termine la mandíbula” (when I finish the mandible) is downranked by the proceeding clause. Within the downranked clause, Mirielle is in the role of Actor which shows her sense of responsibility in fixing Ivan’s mandible. She also uses to the projection to express the high degree of probability that fixing Ivan’s mandible would make him better. By using a verbal projection, she effectively distances herself from these past beliefs since she eventually came to the realization that this was not the case. In the closing clause of this turn, “mi hijo” (my son) is Theme, indicating that this message is about him. Therefore, “bien” is an appraisal of him rather than his speech.

Mirielle’s description of “la familia” (the family). Part of Mirielle’s experience with Ivan’s stuttering involves past adversity from her family. The following collection of excerpts

illustrates how she describes her family’s take on Ivan’s stuttering, the way it made it her feel, and the actions she took to change her sister-in-law’s perspective.

Como broma (as a joke). The following excerpt illustrates how Mirielle describes her family’s perspective on Ivan’s stuttering.

Excerpt 4.28

F130. M	Pero	ahí	el-	el	asunto	se	hacia	muy-		
Exp:		circ					Material			
Modality:							Usuality			
	<i>but there the- the issue was always made very</i>									
	osea	dentro	de la	familia	el	asunto				
Exp:		Circ.								
	<i>you know inside the family- the issue</i>									
	se	lo	tomaba	como-	como	broma	como	juego	como	burla
Exp:			Relat (int)							
Modality:			Usuality							
Appraisal:						Appre (-)		Appre (-)		Appre (-)
	<i>they took it like a joke- like a game- like a joke</i>									
F131. M	y	entonces	entre	la	familia-	a mí	me	molestaba	mucho	eso-
Exp:			Circ.			Circ		Mental (emo)		
Appraisal:								Affect (-)	Grad (up)	
	<i>and so within the family- to me- it bothered me very much that-</i>									
	eso	de las	burlas	y los	(unintel.)	y	esas	cosas		
Appraisal:			Appre (-)					Grad (dwn)		
	<i>that of the jokes and the (unintelligible) and those things</i>									
F133. M	entonces	como	la gente	lo	tomaba	de	una	forma	dinámica	
Exp:	Circ.				Mental (cog)	Circ.				
Modality:					Usuality					
	<i>and then the people took it in a dynamic form</i>									
	yo	dije	"bueno	es	broma"					
Exp:		Verbal (proj)		Relat (int)						
Appraisal:					Appre (-)					
	<i>I said "well it's a joke"</i>									

“Ahí” (there), which is a reference to Ecuador, serves as the marked Theme of line F130. She continues speaking to the high degree of usuality in which the “asunto” (issue) was taken but abandons the clause to specify that her comment is specific to the family. She follows this with

an impersonal construction in which stuttering is assigned a series of negative attributes. This triadic structure serves as an effective rhetorical tool which conveys her negative judgment of her family's perception of Ivan's stuttering. Mirielle then presents a similar circumstantial matter in line F131 with "entre la familia" (within the family), but abandons this for a construction where "a mí" (to me) is marked topical Theme. By doing so, she makes the message about her while creating a contrast between herself and the rest of the family in experiencing the negative affect "molestaba" (bothered). Examining this clause for the ergative, "eso" (reference to family's perspective) is the Agent causing the process of which Mirielle is the Medium as denoted by "me." She defines "eso" further as "de las burlas" (the jokes) and "esas cosas" (those things), where unspecified "cosas" has a down-scaling effect.

Mirielle then speaks to how her perspective changed in line F133 and introduces it with the textual Theme of continuity "entonces" (then). In her realization that people judge Ivan's stuttering in a dynamic or variety of ways, she uses a verbal projection where "bueno" (well) works to convey her succumbing to the perspective of others. The result of this is exemplified in the relational clause construction where she assigns implied "el asunto" the Attribute "broma" (joke), which is contrary to what she believes. On the surface, Mirielle aligns herself with her family's perspective on Ivan's stuttering but maintains her private reservations.

Father's attitude. Another perspective Mirielle presents is that of Ivan's father, whom she divorced when she was pregnant with Ivan. This following excerpt first unfolds with Mirielle's reporting of Verbiage from a previous conversation she had with his father.

Excerpt 4.29

F537. M	"si	necesita	mas	terapia	dime	yo	no	tengo	problema
Exp:	Circ.	Mental (des)			Verbal		NEG	Relat (pos)	
Modality:	Probability								
Appraisal:			Grad (up)						
	<i>"if he needs more therapy tell me - I have no problem</i>								
	en	que	en	donde	las	haga			
Exp:	Circ.		Circ.			Material			
	<i>in what- in where we do it</i>								
F539. M	cuando	les	cobre-	pero	yo	necesito	que		
Exp:	circ			Circ.		Mental (des)			
Modality:						Obligation			
	<i>when they bill- but I need that</i>								
	el	vaya	resolviendo el problema"						
Exp:			Material						
Modality:		Usuality							
Appraisal:					Appre (-)				
	<i>go resolving the problem"</i>								
F540. M	"no	te preocupes	que	es	problema	que	el no art-		
Exp:	NEG	Mental (emo)		Relat (int)					
Appraisal:	NEG	Affect (-)			Appre (-)				
	<i>"don't worry that is a problem that he doesn't-</i>								
	es	problema	nervioso	y	no	respira	bien	no	te preocupes"
Exp:	Relat (int)				NEG	Behavioral		NEG	Mental (emo)
Appraisal:		Appre (-)			NEG		Appre (+)	NEG	Affect (-)
	<i>it's a nervous problem and he doesn't breathe well- don't worry"</i>								
542. M	osea	él	lo	tomaba	deportivamente	todo			
Exp:				Mental (cog)					
Appraisal:						Grad (max)			
	<i>he took it all in stride</i>								
F543. IH	que	es	como	se	dice	sabiduría	criolla		
Exp:		Relat (int)			Verbal				
Modality:					Usuality				
	<i>that is what they call folk knowledge</i>								
544. M	entonces	lo	tomaba	como	"ohh"	no	le	importaba"	
Exp:			Mental (cog proj)			NEG			
Appraisal:					Grad (up)				
	<i>and then he would take it like "ohh it's not important"</i>								

In line F537, Mirielle uses a verbal projection to present Verbiage where Ivan's father is the implied Receiver in a past conversation. She begins with the circumstantial element "si" (if),

which also relays the aspect of probability in the mental desiderative process in which Ivan is the primary participant. The subject of the phenomenon is “mas terapia” (more therapy), which implies that Ivan had already been receiving therapy at the time of the conversation. Mirielle’s verb choice, “dime” (tell me), expresses the authoritative tone she took with the father. By stating that she does not have a problem (“no tengo problema”), she constructs a positive image of herself, which is supported further by indicating that she had to guide the father in helping Ivan. She uses a series of circumstances to specify what is not problematic in an attempt to prove her flexibility during this time. She also asserts that she expressed to his father the high degree of obligation in the process of “resolviendo el problema” (resolving the problem). While she paints herself as an advocate for Ivan in this verbal projection, she also conveys her negative appreciation of Ivan’s stuttering by referring to it as a problem. The amount of assertiveness she portrays in her Verbiage also implies that Ivan’s father did not care as much as she did about seeking help for Ivan. She strengthens this implication by reporting Verbiage on behalf of the father.

In structuring his response, Mirielle places herself as the topical Theme and where Ivan’s father tells her not to worry. In doing so, she contrasts her concern for Ivan with the father’s lack of concern which works to put her in a positive light. The verb itself suggests that the father took notice of Mirielle’s negative affect and commanded her to stop with the negation “no.” She continues to speak from the perspective of the father with a relational clause in which “problema” is first identified as “el no art-“ (he doesn’t-), which is abandoned for a statement in which the father attributes Ivan’s stuttering to nervousness. Mirielle continues speaking on behalf of the father and adds another theory on his behalf in which the stuttering is attributed to Ivan not breathing well. She ends her report of what the father told her with the same negated

mental emotive clause construction as she used in the beginning of her report. Therefore, the information she reported on behalf of the father is structured as reasons he gave her as to why she should not worry. She follows this reported Verbiage with a clause construction in which she comments on the way the father viewed Ivan's stuttering. While the comment itself "deportivamente" (in stride) is neutral in regard to appraisal, the up-scaling of quantity "todo" (all) relays Mirielle's negative judgment of his carefree attitude by painting it as being excessive.

In line F543, Ivan interjects with a relational clause construction where he assigns his father's perspective the Attribute of "sabiduría criolla" (folk wisdom). He therefore sums up his father's theories as being related to his lack of knowledge about stuttering rather than his not taking it seriously. His statement works to neutralize the negative image Mirielle is constructing of his father which she presumably does with the intention of making herself look like the better parent. Mirielle does not align herself with Ivan's comment and responds by asserting that he did not care.

Confronting Iliana. The topic of the family resurfaces later in the conversation. This time, Ivan's interjects by trying to introduce his aunt, specifically, by making "mi tía" (my aunt) Theme. However, Mirielle continues with the general term "nadie" (nobody) and a 3rd person plural construction in line F549.

Mirielle begins her turn of talk with the marked Theme "en la familia" (in the family), which serves to put attention on the context of the family rather than on the lack of attention they gave to Ivan's stuttering. Mirielle probably expected them to care more because they were family, which is why she highlights the relationship status at the beginning of the construction. In describing their lack of interest, she adds the circumstance of manner "de verdad" (really),

which indicates that some may have taken an interest but not to the degree that Mirielle would consider sincere.

Excerpt 4.30

F545. M	entonces	en la	familia	nadie	puso	atención	tampoco	a eso
Exp:		Circ.		NEG	Material			Circ.
Appraisal:				Grad (max)				
	<i>and then in the family- nobody would pay any attention to this</i>							
F546. M	ninguno	de la	familia	que se	hubiera	preocupado		
Exp:	NEG	Circ.				Mental (emo)		
Modality:					Usuality			
Appraisal:	Grad (max)					Affect (-)		
	<i>none of the family was worried -</i>							
		interesado de	verdad					
Exp:	Mental (des)	Circ.						
	<i>was interested really</i>							
547. IH	y	mi	tía	no	decía	nada?		
Exp:				NEG	Verbal	NEG		
Appraisal:						Grad (max)		
	<i>and my aunt wouldn't say anything?</i>							
F548. M	nadie	ni	siquiera	tocaba	el	tema		
Exp:	NEG			Material				
Modality:	NEG	Usuality						
Appraisal:	Grad (max)	Grad (up)						
	<i>nobody would even touch the topic</i>							
F549. M	y	si	lo	tocaban	era	como		
Exp:		Circ.		Material	Relat (int)			
Modality:		Probability						
	<i>and if they did touch it- it was like</i>							
		era	como	en	tono	de	burla	
Exp:	Relat (int)			Circ.				
	<i>it was like in a joking tone</i>							

In line F547, Ivan interjects with a question in which “mi tía” (my aunt) is topical Theme. Mirielle responds with maximally negated “nadie” (nobody), indicating that even his aunt is included in the maximally negated amount of family members who did not care about his

stuttering. This intensifies how alone Mirielle was in her concern for Ivan but also puts the rest of the family in a negative light by comparison. She uses a textual Theme to add the probable material process “si lo tocaban” (if they touched it) in which she asserts that they did so in a joking manner. Mirielle then continues her turn of talk by addressing Ivan’s question directly in the following excerpt.

Excerpt 4.31

F550. M	por ejemplo- Iliana	y Nabor	lo	tocaban	como	burla		
Exp:	Circ.				Relat (int)			
Modality:					Usuality			
	<i>for example Iliana and Nabor would always take it like a joke</i>							
	y	eso	me	enojaba	mucho	a	mí	
Exp:				Mental (emo)		Circ.		
Appraisal:				Affect (-)	Grad (up)			
	<i>and that would upset me very much - to me</i>							
F552. M	me	enojaba	muchísimo que	en	vez	de	ayudar	
Exp:		Mental (emo)			Circ.		Material	
Appraisal:		Affect (-)	Grad (up)					
	<i>I would get so upset that instead of to help</i>							
	actuaban	de	una	forma	ofensiva			
Exp:	Material							
Appraisal:					Judg (-)			
	<i>they acted in an offensive way</i>							
F553. M	para	ellos	no	daban	cuenta	pero	a	mí
Exp:	Circ.		NEG		Material	Circ.		
Modality:				Usuality				
	<i>for them- they wouldn't realize- but for me</i>							
	sí	me	llegaba	como	ofensivo			
Exp:			Material					
Appraisal:					Appre (-)			
	<i>I took it as offensive</i>							

In line F550, Mirielle begins by providing an example to support her previous assertion. The topical Theme of her example are Ivan’s aunt and uncle, Iliana and Nabor, who she describes as taking his stuttering as a joke with high usuality. Mirielle cites this as causing her

negative affect, which she up-scales in line F552. Under the system of Appraisal, Mirielle’s negative judgment of their behavior also expresses the negative affect she felt as a result of it. She uses a marked Theme construction to signify the contrast in perspectives taken between “para ellos” (as for them) and “a mí” (for me).

Excerpt 4.32

F554. M	entonces	y a	lliana	sí	le	dije			
Exp:		Circ.				Verbal (proj)			
	<i>and then lliana if I told her</i>								
	"mira	yo	creo	que	tu	tienes	que	tomar en	
Exp:		Mental (cog proj)						Mental (cog)	
Modality:		Probability				Obligation			
	<i>"look I think that you need to take</i>								
	serio	el asunto	de	Ivan	porque	si	lo		
Exp:					Circ.				
Modality:						Probability			
Appraisal:	Appre (+)								
	<i>this seriously- Ivan's issue because if you</i>								
	estás	ayudando	ayudémoslo						
Exp:	Material		Material						
	<i>are helping him- let's help him</i>								
F556. M	pero	no	de	esa	manera-	vale"			
Exp:	Circ.	NEG							
	<i>but not in that manner- right"</i>								
	pero pero	nadie	lo	tomó	en	serio			
Exp:	Circ	NEG	Mental (cog)		Circ.				
Appraisal:		Grad (max)							
	<i>but but no one would take it seriously</i>								

In line F554, Mirielle uses a verbal projection to report the Verbiage she directed toward the Receiver, Iliana. The Verbiage is structured as a mental projection, which conveys that Mirielle is speaking her opinion and also down-scales her statement from a command to a suggestion. She adds the circumstantial manner “en serio” (seriously) to convey interpersonal

significance she assigns to Ivan's stuttering. This contrasts with the joking manner in which Iliana takes the issue. She follows this with the textual Theme "porque" (because), which indicates that her following message is related to the topical Theme in terms of cause. Iliana is assigned the role of potential Actor in the material process "estas ayudando" (you are helping) but adds herself as an additional actor in the verb "ayudemoslo" (let's help). This structure allows Mirielle to question Iliana's intentions while also implying that the workload of helping will be shared by multiple people including herself. The Verbiage projected towards Iliana continues in line F556 where Mirielle adds on another circumstance in which she negates "esa manera" (this manner) to indicate that she does not approve of it. Mirielle closes the projection with "vale?" (right?), which indicates that she wanted to elicit alignment from Iliana. She uses the circumstantial element "pero" (but), which signals that the contrary happened despite her efforts in that nobody took it seriously.

In summary, Ivan's stuttering was a topic that the family took as a joke, according to Mirielle. When Ivan asks about the behavior of his "tía" (aunt), Mirielle responds by identifying both Iliana and Nabor as using a joking tone. She then uses verbal projections to describe a time in which she confronted Iliana about this but garnered no results from her or the rest of the family. As Mirielle did in the previous excerpts, she positioned herself as the good parent advocating for Ivan in the face of a family who did not care.

Lack of resources in Ecuador. Besides having to cope with an unsupportive family, Mirielle also describes struggles caused by a lack of resources in Ecuador. Not only does she assert that there were no therapists during Ivan's childhood, but she also directs blame towards other professionals such as doctors and teachers who did not properly inform her nor offer her assistance when Ivan was exhibiting issues with his speech.

Terapistas (therapists). The following excerpts show how Mirielle discusses the topic of “terapistas” during a specific time frame in Ecuador.

Excerpt 4.33

F94. M	y-y- en	Ecuador-	pues	no	se considera-	en	la	epoca
Exp:	Circ.		Circ.	NEG		Relat (int)	Circ.	
	<i>in Ecuador- it wasn't considered in that time</i>							
	que	yo	estuve	alla-	no	se	consideraba-	
Exp:			Relat (circ)	Circ	NEG		Relat (int)	
	<i>that I was there it wasn't considered</i>							
F95. M	yo	no	había	escuchado que	había	terapia	para	eso-
Exp:		NEG		Mental (per)	Existential		Circ.	
Modality:		NEG	Usuality					
	<i>I hadn't even heard that there was therapy for that</i>							
	osea	terapistas	del	lenguaje				
Exp:	Circ.							
	<i>or even therapists for language</i>							
F97. M	terapistasde ningún	tipo	en	mi	epoca			
Exp:		NEG		Circ.				
Appraisal:		Grad (max)						
	<i>therapists of any kind in my time</i>							
F98. M	si	lo	habia-	era	muy	costosos-	muy	costoso
Exp:			Existential	Relat (int)				
Appraisal:					Grad (up)		Grad (up)	
	<i>if there was- it was very expensive - very expensive</i>							
	y	no estabamos	nosotros	en condiciones	para	hacer		
Exp:		NEG	Relat (int)		Circ.		Circ.	Material
	<i>and we were in no position for that</i>							

Here, the circumstance “en Ecuador” serves as the marked Theme of line F94, which puts it in direct contrast with their current location, the United States. She interrupts the following relational clause construction with a circumstance of time, making her information both location and time specific and therefore sets her own parameters for the validity of her upcoming statements. Since she has been out of the country for several years, she cannot speak to the

current situation in Ecuador and cannot scale it with her experiences from the past. Her use of the optional subject pronoun, “yo,” serves as a contrastive Theme, which implies that while she did not hear of any therapy options, others may have. By leaving the existence of it open, she relieves herself of any blame for not taking Ivan to get help. In line F98, however, she speaks to the possibility of the existence of therapists as a circumstance in which she assigns “terapia” (therapy) the Attribute “muy costoso” (expensive), which is contradictory to her previous statement. She covers herself not only by bringing unspecified others into the picture with her with “nosotros” (we), but by making therapy sound like it would not have been a possibility even if she knew about it because of the cost.

El médico (the doctor). Mirielle transitions from the topic of therapists in Ecuador to the lack of guidance she received from medical professionals during this time.

Excerpt 4.34

F100. M	pero	yo	mas	creo	no	había-	no-				
Exp:	Circ.			Mental (cog)	NEG	Relat					
Modality:				Probability							
Appraisal:			Grad (up)								
<i>but I didn't think there was any- no-</i>											
	yo	no	conocía	del	médico	en	ese	aspecto-	porque?		
Exp:		NEG	Mental (cog)			Circ.					
<i>I didn't know that of the doctor in this aspect- why?</i>											
F101. M	porque	quien	debía orientarnos		era	el	pediatra-	era	el	médico	
Exp:	Circ.			Material	Relat (int)				Relat (int)		
Modality:			Obligation								
<i>because the person who should have guided us was the pediatrician- it was the doctor</i>											
F103. M	y	si	el	no	lo	hizo	como	lo	íbamos	a	saber-
Exp:		Circ.		NEG			Mental (des)				Mental (cog)
Modality:		Probability							Probability		
Appraisal:						Affect (-)					
<i>and if he didn't do it how would we know?</i>											
F104. M	y	si	yo	hubiese detectado	el	problema	a	tiempo			
Exp:		Circ.			Material			Circ.			
Modality:		Probability									
Appraisal:							Appre (-)				
<i>if I would have figured out the problem in time</i>											
	quien	me	orientaba	a	donde	tenía	que	ir-	nadie		
Exp:			Material	Circ.				Material	NEG		
Modality:						Obligation					
Appraisal:									Grad (max)		
<i>who would guide me to where I needed to go?- no one</i>											

Mirielle's use of "pero" indicates that her statement is contrary to the implications of the previous topic of therapists where she essentially had a role in not taking Ivan to therapy. She up-scales the mental cognitive process "creo" (think), which works to intensify the opinion that she structures as a projection then abandons. She then indicates that she was unaware of where the doctor stood in respect to Ivan's stuttering. Her use of "porque?" (why?) at the end of this assertion sets up her next utterance to be an explanation for her lack of knowledge. She continues with the textual Theme "porque" to link this information to the rhetorical question she asked in the previous line, which up-scales the interpersonal significance of her message. Rather than presenting an explanation, she uses an interrogative structure to set up another turn in which she lists those whom she thinks were responsible for "orientarnos" (to orient us). In terms of the textual metafunction, "quien debía orientarnos" serves as the predicated Theme of the complex, putting the spotlight on "pediatra" and "médico." By including the imperfect-tensed "debía" (should) in the verb group, Mirielle conveys a high degree of obligation in the process and also implies that no one participated in the process. She answers her own question with a series of relational clauses which identify "el pediatra" (the pediatrician) and "el médico" (the doctor) as those who are obligated to participate in the process of guiding her and her family.

She continues in line F103 with a scenario of probability as indicated by "si" (if). Here, "hizo" (did) is in the preterite tense conveying that this process of the past was completed. The hypothetical circumstance is structured as a negated mental clause of desire where "el" (he), reference to the doctor, is described as intentionally withholding information from the family. Because she abandons the clause before completing it, the information she feels the doctor was withholding is never revealed. By using this construction though, Mirielle is able to present a hypothesis as to why the doctor did not offer guidance. In line F104, she turns the attention to

herself by placing “yo” in the role of Actor in the hypothetical process of detecting “el problema” (the problem), which is a reference to and negative appreciation of Ivan’s stuttering. She includes the circumstance “a tiempo” (on time) suggesting that she believes if he was diagnosed by a certain time, he could have been cured. She follows this with another interrogative structure which essentially works to build up the fact that “nadie” (nobody) told her where she needed to go to seek help.

In summary, Mirielle believes that “el pediatra” and “el médico” had obligatory roles in guiding her with Ivan’s stuttering. She suggests that even if she had detected his stuttering on time, she still would not have anyone to guide her in regard to where she should take him for help. Similar to the previous excerpt about the topic of “terapistas,” this excerpt is an example of how Mirielle works to deflect the blame from herself for not taking Ivan to therapy when he was younger.

Profesoras (teachers). Another group Mirielle identifies as not providing assistance is “las profesoras.” Ivan interjects his opinion as to why he believes this is the case.

Excerpt 4.35

F445. M	otra	cosa-	las profesoras	nunca	me dijeron		
Exp:	Circ.			NEG	Verbal (proj)		
Modality:							
Appraisal:				Grad (max)			
	<i>another thing- he teachers never told me</i>						
	ni	siquiera	que	eras	tartamudez o	que	gageabas
Exp:	NEG			Relat (int)			Behavioral
Modality:							
Appraisal:		Grad (up)					
	<i>not even that you were stuttering or mumbling</i>						
F446. IH	no	capaz-	sabían-	y	les	daba	como verguenza
Exp:	NEG		Mental (cog)			Mental (per)	
Modality:	NEG	Potential					
Appraisal:							Affect (-)
	<i>unable- they didn't know- and it made them feel embarrassed</i>						

After responding to the brother's positing of bilingualism as a cause for stuttering, Mirielle adds to the topic but zeroes in on "las profesoras." She uses a verbal projection to present the information she thinks they should have told her about Ivan. Therefore, she structures "las profesoras" as a potential source of information that did not come through.

In line F446, Ivan counters Mirielle's statement with a series of explanations, thereby removing blame from the teachers. Here, Ivan attributes their lack of communication with Mirielle first to their inability then to their lack of knowledge about stuttering. He follows this with another suggestion wherein their lack of communication is a choice they made based on the "shame" they would feel by telling Mirielle this. Mirielle and Ivan both speak in support of his assertion that the topic of stuttering is now "mas abierto" (more open) in lines F447-451. Following this, she aligns herself with Ivan's suggestions in line F446.

First, she uses sets "ahora" (now) as the marked Theme of the construction, which highlights the significance of the circumstance of time in the existence of therapists and thereby makes a point of there not being any in the past. With therapists being available now, she believes it is no longer the responsibility of the teacher to bring up stuttering to parents. She then uses a verbal projection to speak from the point of view of a teacher, which she appraises as being "delicado" (delicate). This not only aligns her with Ivan's assertion in line F446, but also counters the blame she was putting on the teachers in the previous excerpt. In line F455, Mirielle revisits her previous assertion but offers a possible cause for this with a mental clause of perception in which "las profesoras" is assigned the role of Senser in the process "sentían recelo de ofenderme" (they felt suspicion of offending me). Not only is Mirielle reiterating what Ivan suggested, but she is also conveying her understanding of the possible negative emotions that played a role in the teachers' not telling her about Ivan's stuttering.

Excerpt 4.36

F452. M	ahora	hay	terapistas	las profesoras	no	sabían	ni	que	decir
Exp:	Circ.	Existential			NEG	Mental (cog)			Verbal
<i>now there are therapists- the teachers didn't even know what to say</i>									
F453. M	entonces	se	le	hacía	delicado	decir	"señora	su hijo	esta
Exp:						Verbal (proj)			
Modality:				Usuality					
Appraisal:					Appre (+)				
<i>and then it was delicate to say "ma'am your child is</i>									
	gagueando	mucho"	esta	delicado					
Exp:	Behavioral		Realt (int)						
Appraisal:		Grad (up)		Appre (+)					
<i>mumbling a lot" - it's delicate</i>									
F454. M	"señora	su hijo	esta	tartamudeando"					
Exp:				Behavioral					
<i>"ma'am your child is stuttering"</i>									
F455. M	nunca	me	lo	dijeron	porque	sentían	recelo	de ofenderme	
Exp:	NEG			Verbal	Circ.	Mental (per)		Mental (emo)	
Appraisal:	Grad (max)							Affect (-)	
<i>never did they tell me because they felt suspicion of offending me</i>									
	porque	decir	eso	era	una	ofensa			
Exp:	Circ.	Verbal		Relat (int)					
Appraisal:						Appre (-)			
<i>because to say that is an offense</i>									

In summary, Mirielle first approaches the topic of “las profesoras” to assign blame for them not telling her about Ivan’s stuttering. After Ivan presents possible explanations for this, Mirielle expresses her understanding as to why they probably did not confront her about this topic. She therefore changes her perspective and aligns herself with Ivan’s.

Down Syndrome Group. Ivan brings up the topic of his mother bringing him to a group for “niños con síndrome de Down” (kids with Down’s Syndrome). This leads to his appraisal of professionals in general.

Excerpt 4.37

402. IH	yo	me	acuerdo	que	una	vez me	llevó	a una	terapia	
Exp:		Mental (cog proj)			Circ.		Material	Circ.		
	<i>I remember that one time you took me to a therapy</i>									
	me	acuerdo	que	no	tenía	nada	que	ver-		
Exp:		Mental (cog proj)		NEG	Relat (pos)	NEG				
Appraisal:						Grad (max)				
	<i>I remember that it didn't have anything to do</i>									
F404. IH	osea	era-	eran	niños	con	síndrome	de	Down-		
Exp:			Existencial		Circ.					
	<i>they were children with Down syndrome</i>									
	niños	especiales	como	le	dicen	ahora				
Exp:			Circ.		Verbal	Circ.				
	<i>special children, how they say nowadays</i>									
F406. IH	yo	era	el	único	ahí	este-	digamos	no	especial	
Exp:		Relat (int)			Circ.		Verbal	NEG		
Appraisal:				Grad (max)					Judg (-)	
	<i>I was the only one there- as we say "not special"</i>									
F407. IH	enonces	era	como	la	ignorancia profesional					
Exp:		Relat (int)								
Appraisal:					Judg (-)					
	<i>it was like professional ignorance</i>									

Ivan introduces this new subject with “yo” (I) serving as topical Theme. He takes attention off Mirielle’s role in taking him by first structuring his comment as a memory which is a less direct way of talking about it. In this projection, the frequency “una vez” (one time) is down-scaled relative to the process of Mirielle taking him to the Down Syndrome group. He follows this with another mental projection which he abandons before delivering the Attribute of the relational clause construction. Both this abandonment of the Attribute as well as his choice to project the clause serves to distance him from the information. This may be another example of Ivan doing work to save face.

In line F404, he continues his turn by restructuring his statement as an existential clause in which he rephrases “niños con síndrome de Down” as “niños especiales” (special kids) to be

in agreement with the circumstantial matter “como le dicen ahora” (as they say now). With himself serving as topical Theme, he speaks to the fact that he was the only one there who was not special and down-scales the inherently negative connotation of this Attribute with “digamos” to indicate that it is a term commonly used by others. He uses the textual Theme “entonces” (then) to add his opinion on the matter where he assigns blame to “la ignorancia profesional” (professional ignorance). This not only serves as his negative judgment of the professionals involved but also suggests that he does not blame Mirielle.

Later in the conversation, Ivan uses verbal projection in line F428 to relay his negative thought process, which came a result of this situation. All three family members laugh about it, however. This could be their attempt to make light of a serious situation that was essentially brought on by Mirielle. She implies that the blame should be directed toward her friend who suggested that she take Ivan to the group in the first place. She builds her case for this by projecting all the Verbiage the friend used to convince her in lines F431-434. Mirielle closes the topic by aligning herself with Ivan. She does so by identifying this situation as “la ignorancia total” (total ignorance) which is similar to his negative appraisal. However, Mirielle maximally expands her negative judgment with “total” which works to include her friend as well as herself in the group of those who are being judged as ignorant. This contrasts with Ivan’s earlier judgment which is only directed towards professionals.

In summary, Ivan talks about a time that his mother brought him to a therapy group (specifically designed for children with Down’s Syndrome), to illustrate the consequences he suffered due to the lack of resources available to his mother regarding the proper treatment for his stuttering. He structures this story, however, in such a way that allows him to save face for Mirielle, being the one that took him to the group.

Chapter 5:

Sam

This chapter presents the results of the analyses of Sam’s conversational data. Conversation samples were recorded in two contexts. The first was a conversation that he had with his mother, Ingrid. Sam participated in conversation by using English while Ingrid used Spanish. Throughout the duration of the interview, Sam takes the role of “interviewer” in that his input was primarily comprised of questions. Ingrid, therefore, was the “information provider.” This conversation lasted approximately 23 minutes. The second conversation was recorded during an ethnographic interview with the researcher which lasted about 36 minutes. Sam switched roles for this context and served as the “expert” in regard to stuttering. The results relative to both of these conversations are split into two sections below. The first section presents data and results for the ethnographic interview and the second section does so for the family conversation.

SECTION 1: Ethnographic Interview

Throughout the ethnographic interview with the researcher, Sam used the keyword “stuttering” and its variants approximately 14 times. An overview of the functions this keyword served throughout out his talk is outlined in Table 16.

Table 16

Quantitative overview of Sam’s use of the keyword “stutter” and its variants

Keyword: Stutter		
Function	Frequency	
Behavior	6	42.85%
Circumstance	3	21.42%
Scope	2	14.28%
Possession	1	7.14%
Carrier	1	7.14%
Grammatical metaphor	1	7.14%

In the few instances that Sam uses the word “stutter” or its variants, he primarily structures it as a behavioral process. This relatively low number of instances in which he uses the word “stutter” could be explained by the frequency at which he used the keyword “fluent” and its variants to talk about himself relative to his stuttering. Of the 19 times he used this keyword regarding his stuttering, 18 of the instances functioned as Attributes, which he typically assigned to himself, and one instance served as a Phenomenon. Rather than fluency being something that Sam possesses, he largely uses it as a means to describe himself and his speaking abilities.

The following excerpts were extracted from Sam’s ethnographic interview with the researcher. The subsections used for the organization of this data reflect the conversational topics that came up in this particular dyad and include: factors contributing to stuttering, feelings during teen years, speech therapy, and Spanish.

Factors contributing to stuttering. During the ethnographic interview, Sam described factors that he believed contributed to his stuttering. This collection of excerpts illustrates how Sam constructs the roles that confidence, conversational circumstances, and the word “stuttering” play in his fluency.

Confidence. During the family conversation, Sam’s mother identifies the time frame of ages 7 to 13 as being significant in regard to Sam’s fluctuating fluency. So, while in the context of the ethnographic interview, the researcher asks Sam to talk about any memories he has of his fluency in this time frame. He responds in lines E113-116 with a comment about his fluency and to state that he didn’t use techniques at that time. Sam then introduces “confidence” as a factor in his stuttering as seen in the following excerpt:

Excerpt 5.1

E117. S	um	I	just	remember	it	was	very correlated	
Exp:			Mental (cog. proj)			Relat (int)		
Appraisal:			Grad (up)				Grad (up) Appre (neu)	
	with	my	confidence					
Exp:	Circ.							
Modality:			Affect (+)					
E118. S	so	when	I	was	feeling	confident		
Exp:		Circ.		Mental (emo)				
Appraisal:						Affect (+)		
E119. S	I	wouldn't	stutter	as much				
Exp:			Behavioral					
Modality:	NEG Usuality							
Appraisal:				Grad (dwn)				
E120. S	I	would	be	fluent				
Exp:			Relat (int)					
Modality:		Usuality						
Appraisal:				Appre (+)				
E121. S	and	you know	when	I	wasn't	confident		
Exp:			Circ.	NEG Relat (int)				
Appraisal:					NEG	Affect (+)		
E122. S	then	I	would	stutter	a lot			
Exp:	Circ.			Behavioral				
Modality:			Usuality					
Appraisal:					Grad (up)			

Sam begins line E117 with a mental projection in which he up-scales the significance of what he remembers with “just.” He projects an intensive relational clause where “it” (reference to fluency) is assigned the Attribute “very correlated with my confidence.” He uses “very” to up-scale his assertion that there is relationship between his fluency and confidence. Sam supports this assertion with examples of circumstances from his own experience. In line E118, the mental process of emotion, “feeling confident” is presented as a circumstance. “Confident” conveys positive affect in terms of appraisal. The usuality of this behavioral process is negated then

down-scaled, which implies that his stuttering is usually less frequent when he is confident. He follows this with an intensive relational clause assigning himself the Attribute “fluent,” also serving as a positive appreciation of himself. He incorporates usuality into this clause as well with the auxiliary verb “would.”

Sam then offers the opposite circumstance in line E121, but this time with a relational clause construction. Here, he negates the Attribute “confident” which, in terms of polarity, indicates an absolute absence of the positive affect. It is in this circumstance that Sam states he “would stutter a lot.” This clause construction conveys a high degree of usuality of this behavioral process through his use of the auxiliary verb “would.” He also includes “a lot” to up-scale the frequency of the behavior.

Based on his experiences with confidence affecting his fluency, he came up with his own conclusions about his situation. This played a role in his decision to go back to therapy as seen in this continuation of his talk presented in Excerpt 5.2.

Here, “the eventual conclusion I came to with that” is the marked topical Theme of the entire clause represented in line E123. It is modified by the adjective “eventual,” conveying that the conclusion was a result of a series of events. The material process “came to” also works to postmodify the Theme. The process itself is downranked, suggesting that it has a lesser degree of importance than its product and is therefore integrated into the “conclusion.” This process and its elements represent the Carrier in the overarching relational complex that hinges upon “was.” The Attribute is fulfilled by the following desiderative mental clause where the process “like” expresses positive affect as well as inclination due to the inclusion of the modal Adjunct “would.” The Phenomenon of this construction is realized through an embedded mental clause construction in which the Attribute is “be confident all the time.”

Excerpt 5.2

E123. S	so	the	eventual	conclusion	I	came	to	
Exp:						Material		
Appraisal:			Appre (neu)					
	with	that	was					
Exp:	Circ.		Relat (int)					
E124. S	though	I	would	like to	be	confident	all	the time
Exp:	Circ.			Mental (des)		Mental (emo)		
Modality:				Inclination				Usuality
Appraisal:				Affect (+)		Affect (+)	Grad (max)	
E125. S	no one	can	be	confident	all	the	time	
Exp:	Circ.			Mental (emo)				
Modality:	NEG Usuality	Potential					Usuality	
Appraisal:	Grad (max)			Affect (+)	Grad (max)			
E126. S	which	is	why	I	wanted	to go		
Exp:		Relat (int)			Mental (des)	Material		
Modality:					Inclination			
Appraisal:					Appre (+)			
	back	to	speech	therapy				
Exp:		Circ.						
E127. S	so	you know	even	when	I'm	not	confident	
Exp:				Circ.	Relat (int)			
Appraisal:			Grad (up)			NEG	Affect (+)	
E128. S	I	could	still	be	fluent			
Exp:				Relat (int)				
Modality:		Potential	Usuality					
Appraisal:					Appre (+)			
E129. S	just	during	that	time	period			
Exp:		Circ.						
Appraisal:	Grad (dwn)							
E130. S	it	was	all	on the	emotional	side	that	
Exp:		Relat (circ)						
Appraisal:			Grad (max)					
	I	was	trying					
Modality:			Inclination					
	to deal	with	my	stuttering	not	with the	technical	side
Exp:	Material	Circ.						

Inclusion of “all the time” maximally up-scales the usuality at which he would like to be confident. This entire attributive construction is prefaced by the circumstantial element of contingency “though,” where his desire to be confident is a concession to the following clause in line E125 that “no one can be confident all the time.” “No one” maximally negates usuality, which makes Sam’s inability to be confident all the time a social norm. Overall, Sam assigns the greatest amount of significance to the “conclusion,” which he suggests is one that emerged gradually.

In line E126, “which” (reference to the information in line E125) functions as the topical Theme of the entire clause complex. Through a relational clause construction, this is identified as “why” or the reason he “wanted to go back to speech therapy.” In terms of the textual configuration, this attribution serves as the predicated Theme. Because his going back to therapy was something his parents wanted him to do in the first place, he puts his own rationale in the foreground to highlight the fact that it was on his own accord to go back. This is further supported by his use of the desiderative mental process “want,” which expresses Sam’s positive appreciation and inclination to go back which contrasts with the description of his feelings when his parents were trying to convince him to go. In line E127, Sam elaborates on the effects going back to therapy would have on his fluency despite his lack of confidence. He uses an up-scaled circumstantial construction to present the intensive relational clause by which he assigns himself the Attribute of “not confident.” In this typically fluency-disrupting circumstance, he “could still be fluent” because of speech therapy. Here, “could” implies potential and “still” conveys usuality.

The construction in line E129 is set in terms of time by the circumstance of “that time period.” In the following construction, “all on the emotional side” serves as the predicated

Theme of the construction, which highlights it as a significant aspect of the material process of “trying to deal.” Therefore, the Theme position and “all” reinforce each other. His use of the verb “trying” conveys Sam’s lack of achievement the following material process “to deal.” His predication of the Theme suggests that his exclusive focus on the emotional side may have been the cause of this lack of success in the circumstantial matter “with my stuttering.” Sam then includes “not with the technical side of it,” indicating that stuttering has two distinct aspects. This speaks to Sam’s awareness of the two major approaches used in fluency therapy: stuttering modification (the emotional side) and fluency shaping (the technical side).

Conversational circumstances. In Excerpt 5.3, the researcher seeks confirmation about Sam being less fluent around his mother. While he verifies that he did mention this with “mhm” in line E258, he reports a change in usuality with “not so much.” This negation of an up-scaled quantity conveys that he still has less fluency with his mother, but at a lesser frequency as of “right now.” He uses the same circumstance of time in the following line to introduce his current “issues.”

Sam uses “only” to down-scale the quantity of “issues” he currently possesses with fluency. Sam explicitly places this in the foreground, which makes his message about his lack of issues rather than the issue itself. The main clause is relational in nature in that Sam identifies and subsequently negatively appreciates the Token which is fulfilled by “what the conversation is about.” He then cites his conversation with the researcher as an example of this issue in line E261, setting the background for the following relational construction in which Sam assumes the role of Carrier of the Attribute “not as fluent.” This not only conveys his negative appreciation of himself but also sets up the following comparative construction where he is the Carrier of the elided Attribute “fluent.”

Excerpt 5.3

E257. AG	you mentioned	that	um	you	were	less	fluent		
Exp	Verbal (proj)				Relat (int)				
Appraisal						Grad (dwn)			
	around	your	mother						
Exp:	Circ								
E258. S	mhm	um	not	so much	right	now			
Exp			NEG		Circ.				
Modality			Usuality						
Appraisal				Grad (dwn)					
E259. S	right now	the only	issues	I have	with	fluency	tends	to be	
Exp:	Circ.			Relat (pos)				Relat (int)	
Modality:							Usuality		
Appraisal:		Grad (dwn)	Appre (-)						
E260. S	um	what	the conversation	is	about				
Exp:				Relat (int)					
E261. S	like	this conversation	for	example	I'm	not as	fluent	as	
Exp:	Circ.				Relat (int)				
Appraisal:						Grad (dwn)	Appre (+)		
E262. S	as	I	would	probably	be	on a	different	topic	
Exp:				Relat (circ)					
Modality:			Usuality	Probability					
Appraisal:						Appre (neu)			
E263. S	just	because	it	is	emotional	to talk	about		
Exp:				Relat (int)		Verbal			
Appraisal:	Grad (dwn)								
E264. S	so	yes							
E265. S	but yes	my	f-fluency	is	topic-based	I	guess	you	could
Exp:				Relat (int)			Mental (cog)		
Modality:							Probability		Potential
Appraisal:					Appre (neu)				
E266. S	say-	just	depends	what	I'm	talking	about		
Exp:	Verbal		Relat (circ)	Circ.		Behavioral			
Appraisal:		Grad (dwn)							

He conveys a low degree of certainty in line E262 by including the modal Adjunct “probably” in regard to the probability that this assertion would hold in the circumstantial matter

of “on another topic.” His explanation of this is flagged by the up-scaled circumstantial element “just because” which works to convey a certain degree of exclusivity in regard to the cause of his lack of fluency (line E263). The cause is configured as an intensive relational clause construction where he assigns “it” (reference to stuttering) the Attribute “emotional to talk about.” His selection of the adjective “emotional” functions to represent his negative appreciation of stuttering as a topic but also suggests the negative affect associated with it. The affect, however, is backgrounded in light of the appraisal of the topic. In line E265, he takes the attention off himself by marking “fluency” as the Theme of the construction. He uses an intensive relational clause to assign his fluency the Value of “topic-based,” which is neutral in regard to appraisal. Sam then distances himself from this assertion by adding a mental clause of cognition to express uncertainty. He reiterates the significance of the circumstantial nature of his fluency in line E266.

In this continuation of the previous excerpt, Sam goes back to the topic introduced by the researcher in line E267:

Excerpt 5.4

E267. S	umm	the	people	I'm	talking	to	um	
Exp:		Circ.			Behavioral			
E268. S	I've	gotten	past	that	now			
Exp:		Material			Circ.			
E269. S	with	the	speech	therapy	techniques	I	can	be
Exp:	Circ.							Relat (int)
Modality:							Potential	
	the	same	for	any	person	really		
Exp:			Circ.					
Modality:						Probability		
Appraisal:		Appre (+)		Grad (max)				

He reintroduces the topic of his fluency being person-specific by using a marked Theme construction in line E267, which functions to put this former aspect of his stuttering in direct

contrast with the current, topic-based nature of his stuttering. This is followed by the material process “gotten past” where Sam alludes to his participation in this change by placing himself in the role of Actor. Here, the marked Theme pre-sumes “that,” which in turn resumes “the people I’m talking to.” The marked Theme, therefore, reinforces that “the people” is what the message is about and works to put it at the forefront of the message. This assertion conveys that this circumstance no longer has an effect on his fluency and is further cemented by his inclusion of “now.” In line E269 the circumstance of accompaniment, “with the speech therapy techniques,” serves as the marked Theme of the relational clause configuration where “I” is the Carrier of the potential to be “the same.” This serves to highlight the significant role the speech therapy techniques played in helping him overcome the problems he had with conversation partners. However, the “topic-specific” aspect of his stuttering still remains as a static part of the aforementioned “emotional side” of stuttering.

The word “stuttering.” In line E444, the researcher asks Sam to describe a moment of stuttering involving the “repetitions” he referred to earlier in the conversation. In his response, he exhibits stuttering-like disfluencies in his prolongation of the word initial consonant in “stuttering” and repetition of the first syllable of the word “repetition.” This is an outward manifestation of the emotional significance he associates with the word “stuttering” in Excerpt 5.5.

Sam introduces this topic as a circumstance of matter with “for the word stuttering.” In this marked Theme construction, Sam uses the maximally up-scaled adverb, “always,” to comment on the usuality of having “a slight prolongation or repetition.” His prolongation of the “s” in “stuttering” works to prove his assertion. The length of the prolongations is down-scaled by “slight.”

Excerpt 5.5

E445. S	uh	for	the	word	stuttering			
Exp:		Circ.						
E446. S	I	always	have	a slight	prolongation or	repetition	there	
Exp:			Relat (pos)					
Modality:		Usuality						
Appraisal:		Grad (max)		Grad (dwn)				
E447. S	um	because	the	emotions	behind	the word		
Exp:		Circ.			Circ.			
E448. S	it's	difficult	to say					
Exp:	Relat (int)		Verbal					
Appraisal:		Appre (-)						
E449. S	difficult	to talk	about	um	a little			
Exp:		Behavioral						
Appraisal:	Appre (-)				Grad (dwn)			
E450. S	but um	I	know	I'll	always	get	through	it
Exp:			Mental (cog)			Material		
Modality:			Probability		Usuality			
Appraisal:					Grad (Max)			
E451. S	so	it's	not	anxiety				
Exp:		Relat (int)						
Appraisal:			NEG	Affect (-)				
E452. S	um	if	anything	it's	a	slight	annoyance	
Exp:		Circ.		Relat (int)				
Modality:		Probability						
Appraisal:			Grad (dwn)			Grad (dwn)	Appre (-)	
E453. S	just	cause	I	know	I	can		
Exp:		Circ.		Mental (cog. proj.)				
Modality:				Probability		Potential		
Appraisal:	Grad (up)							
	make	the	"s" sound	well				
Exp:	Material							
Appraisal:				Appre (+)				
E454. S	but	it's	just	the	meaning	of	the word	
Exp:		Relat (int)						
Appraisal:			Grad (dwn)					
	that	kinda	catches	me	with it			
Exp:			Material					
Modality:		Soften						

Sam presents the cause of these nominalized behaviors as a circumstantial element in line E448 “the emotions behind the word,” which also functions as the marked Theme of the construction. By using parallel marked Theme constructions, Sam underlines that the message about stuttering is all about the emotions. After sharing this, he then uses a series of intensive relational clauses where “it” (reference to the word “stuttering”) is assigned the Attributes of “difficult to say” and “difficult to talk about.” Here, “stuttering” as a word is negatively appraised as is “stuttering” as a topic, where the latter supports his previous assertion that his stuttering is “topic-based.” He then adds “a little” to the end of the clause in order to down-scale the negative force of the appraisal.

In line E450, Sam offers a circumstance of concession with a mental projection. This construction incorporates the element of probability from the modality system and works to up-scale Sam’s level of commitment to the projected information. In this projection, Sam is the Actor in the figurative material process of “get through.” His use of this metaphor implies that there is a struggle, both physical and emotional in nature, which is inherent to his saying the word “stutter.” The usuality of this process is maximally up-scaled by the combination of the auxiliary verb “will” and adverb “always.” The role of Scope is assigned to “it” (reference to aforementioned difficulties). He uses another intensive relational clause construction to assign “it” (reference to his emotional state) the negated Attribute of “anxiety.” The negation works to disqualify this negative appraisal of affect from being associated with the difficulties. In line E452 “if anything” is a circumstantial element of contingency, where “if” conveys the low degree of probability that “anything” in regard to emotion exists in this context. This construction down-scales the negative Attribute, “a slight annoyance,” assigned to “it” (reference to his emotional state) in the following relational clause. Under the system of appraisal, the

Attribute represents a down-scaled negative expression of affect. Overall, this clause works to down-scale the effect this difficulty has on Sam. He then offers an explanation for his attribution through a mental projection. The projected information is up-scaled by the high-degree of probability conveyed in the projecting structure “I know.” He follows this with an assertion about his potential to carry out the material process with “can make.” It is his underlying knowledge of being able to make this sound that clashes with his inability to do so when he is confronted with saying the word “stuttering.”

In line E454, he makes a concession as signaled by the circumstantial element “but.” Here, Sam uses a construction where the relational clause “it is just the meaning of the word” serves as the predicated Theme. His use of “just” in conjunction with the Theme construction, convey exclusivity. This clause serves as the Actor in the following down-ranked material clause Sam is the Goal of the process “catches.” Sam therefore maximally distances himself from having any responsibility in the difficulty he has with saying the word “stuttering” by foregrounding the role of “meaning of the word” and assigning himself as Goal of the process.

Appraisal of stuttering. Throughout the ethnographic interview, Sam shares his appraisal of stuttering setting up a contrast between his current views and those he held in the past. By doing so, he builds a rhetorical device that the researcher coins as “old Sam versus new Sam” where “old Sam” refers to his past self and “new Sam” refers to his current self. The following collection of excerpts illustrates how he appraises stuttering as: an opportunity to succeed, something that will go away, and a fluctuating phenomenon.

Opportunity to succeed. In the following excerpt, Sam responds to the researcher’s question about what emotions and thoughts are tied to his stuttering at this time in line E322.

Excerpt 5.6

E323. S	at this	point	in time	I'm	happy	I	had			
Exp:	Circ.			Relat (int)			Relat (pos)			
Appraisal:					Affect (+)					
E324. S	my	stutter	in	the	first	place				
Exp:			Circ							
E325. S	just	because	I	had	the opportunity	to	work	through	it	
Exp:				Relat (pos)			Material			
Appraisal:	Grad (dwn)					Appre (+)				
E326. S	and	succeed	through	it						
Exp:		Material								
Appraisal:		Appre (+)								
E327. S	and um	it	shows	that	you know	if	I	put	my mind	
Exp:			Material					Material		
Modality:						Probability				
E328-329. S	to something	and	work	hard	at-	I	can	succeed		
Exp:			Material					Material		
Modality:							Potential			
Appraisal:				Grad (up)				Appre (+)		

He opens his response with a circumstance of time “at this point in time” meaning that what he is about to say represents how he currently feels, which serves to contrast with his feelings from the past. By highlighting the aspect of time, Sam sets the stage for the rhetorical device “old Sam” and “new Sam,” where “old Sam” is embodied by his feelings toward and experiences with stuttering from the past and “new Sam” is constructed with those he currently feels and experiences. Another contrasting facet is that of his use of appraisal. As seen in this excerpt, Sam not only conveys positive affect triggered by stuttering, but also positively appraises stuttering itself by assigning it the attribute “opportunity.” He uses these positive appraisals as a platform to support his assertion he has high-potential to succeed when he puts his mind to something and works “hard.” His use of the verb “succeed” inherently represents a positive appreciation of the end point of the process.

Sam then describes the opposing view he attributes to “some people” in the following continuation of this excerpt:

Excerpt 5.7

E330. S	and	you know	some	people	would	nnn	consider	it	
Exp:							Relat (int)		
Modality:					Probability				
Appraisal:			Grad (down)						
E331. S	handicap	but	um	I	personally	don't			
Appraisal:	Judg (-)				Grad (dwn)	Judg (+)			
E332. S	but I	view	it	more as	an opportunity	to succeed		at something	
Exp:	Mental (cog. proj.)						Material		
Appraisal:				Grad (up.)		Appre (+)			
E333. S	something else	that	I	can	succeed	at			
Exp:					Material				
Modality:					Potential				
E334. S	that	somebody	else	wouldn't	have	the opportunity	to		
Exp:					Relat (pos)				
Modality:				NEG	Probability				
Appraisal:						Appre (+)			
E335. S	but	that's	me	right	now	but	in	most	of my
Exp:		Relat (int)		Circ.			Circ.		
Appraisal:								Grad (up)	
	past-	it's	been	something	that	is a	challenge	for me	
Exp:			Relat (in)			Relat (int)			
Modality:		Usuality							
Appraisal:							Appre (-)		

In line E330, Sam uses a projecting construction to posit what “some people would consider it” to be. By doing this, he sets up a straw man of sorts in order to strengthen his opposing viewpoint. The process “succeed” is reliant upon his ability to “work through” stuttering, which he tempers through his use of modality with words such as “can” and “probably.” These constructions imply that his success is not a given, but something that he considers himself capable of on the basis of experience. Regardless, stuttering is always present as an “opportunity” (or challenge).

Sam counters this in line E335 by temporally restricting his positive appraisal to “right now.” In this structure, he identifies his previous statement as being “me” in a relational clause construction. Therefore, this idea he has is a part of who he is rather than an idea or a thought. Sam continues to speak to circumstance of time involved in this feeling with up-scaled “in most of my past.” Here, “it” (reference to stuttering) serves as the predicated Theme of the clause complex which works to downrank Sam’s negative appreciation of “it” being “a challenge.” By using this construction, he centers attention on the ongoing nature of his stuttering rather than the hardship it has caused him. This negative appreciation of his stuttering in the past contrasts with the positive appraisals he currently associates with it and serves as another differing factor between the perspectives held by “old Sam” and “new Sam.”

Something that will go away. After sharing his current appraisal of stuttering and contrasting his feelings about it in the past, Sam changes the topic and builds on his early theory that his stuttering was something that would “go away.”

He begins this change of topic with a mental projection, which is maximally up-scaled in terms of usuality with “always.” Before presenting the projection, he adds a circumstantial element to specify the time at which he thought this would come to fruition “in the future.” The projection comes in the form of a material clause of probability where “it” (reference to stuttering) is in the role of Actor. Sam expresses more uncertainty in regard to how this material process would happen through his inclusion of “somehow” at the end of the clause. He then down-scales this process in the following clause with “gradually,” which conveys his expectation that his stuttering would taper away rather than stop completely. This belief was based on the information he presents in line E340 as a relational clause of possession. In this construction,

“they” (reference to “so many people”) is in the role of Possessor of “stuttering” in the circumstance of time “when they were younger.”

Excerpt 5.8

E337. S	and	I	always	thought	you know			
Exp:				M (cog proj)				
Modality:			Usuality					
Appraisal:			Grad (max)					
E338. S	in	the future	it	would	go	away	somehow	
Exp:	Circ.				Material			
Modality:				Probability			Probability	
E339. S	or	gradually	go	away	since	you know	so many	people
Exp:			Material					
Modality:								
Appraisal:		Grad (down)					Grad (up)	
E340. S	they	have	stuttering	when	they	were	younger	
Exp:		Relat (pos)		Circ.		Relat (int)		
E341. S	but	it	goes	away				
Exp:			Material					
E342. S	so	I	thought	I	would	be	like	that
Exp:			Mental (cog. proj.)			Relat (int)		
Modality:			Probability		Probability			
E343. S	once	in	my teen	years	I	realized	you know	
Exp:		Circ.				Mental (cog. proj.)		
	that	wasn't	happening					
Exp:		NEG Material						
	and	it	was	uh-	worrisome	for	a little bit-	a while
Exp:			Relat (int)					
Modality:							Usuality	
Appraisal:					Appre (-)		Grad (dwn)	Grad (up)

In line E341, he uses the circumstantial element of contingency “but” to preface the material process “it goes away” where “it” is a reference to their stuttering. His use of “so many” to up-scale the number of people at the beginning of the clause works to convey a high-degree of

usuality of this situation and therefore strengthen the validity of this information that he based his belief on. He follows this with the mental projection of an intensive relational clause construction in which he assigns himself the Attribute “like that,” where “that” is a reference to the whole preceding clause complex. Here, the mental projection construction as well as the auxiliary verb “would” work to convey the high degree of probability that was present in the past. This degree of probability no longer applies.

Sam prefaces his next statement with “once in my teen years” in line E343, which highlights his knowledge of the significance of this circumstance of time. It is widely known in the stuttering community and is documented in the literature that if stuttering does not cease by the teen years, it typically means the person will stutter through adulthood. This could explain why Sam offset this information as a circumstantial element. In the projection, “that” is a reference to the circumstance of his stuttering going away like it did for others. This circumstance, then, is the Actor in the negated material process “wasn’t happening.” He then uses a relational clause construction to assign this realization the Attribute of “worrisome.” Under the system of appraisal, this also conveys that he experienced negative affect as a result of this realization. This explication strengthens the contrast between “old Sam,” who used to worry about his stuttering not going away, and “new Sam,” who views it as “an opportunity to succeed” (line E332). Another contrast is “old Sam’s” construal of stuttering as an independent actor through the use of the process “go away,” whereas “new Sam” views stuttering as something he can “work through.”

Up and down. At the beginning of the interview, Sam discusses his first memories of stuttering which, initially, were centered around his therapy experiences. He then appraises his experiences with stuttering directly as seen in the following excerpt:

Excerpt 5.9

E19. S	yes-	so	I	do	remember	that	after	that-
Exp:				Mental (cog proj)			Circ	
E20. S	experiences		with	stuttering-	they	were	up and down	
Exp:			Circ.			Relat (int)		
Appraisal:							Appre (+)	Appre (-)
E21. S	um	there	were	periods	you know	I	thought	weeks
Exp:			Existential				Mental (cog)	
Modality:							Probability	
E22. S	and	there	were	months	at a time	where		
Exp:			Existential					
Appraisal:				Grad (up.)				
	I	wouldn't	worry	about it	at all			
Exp:			Mental (emo)	Circ.				
Modality:		NEG Usuality						
Appraisal:			Affect (-)		Grad (max)			
E23. S	and	I	felt	very	fluent	and	confident	
Exp:			Mental (per)					
Appraisal:				Grad (up)	Appre (+)		Affect (+)	

Sam sets up his appraisal with the circumstance of time “after that” where “that” refers to attending therapy when he didn’t want to. In the following clause, “experiences with stuttering” are assigned the Attributes “up and down.” Therefore, Sam simultaneously appraises his stuttering this time with negative and positive appreciation. This is significant in that it signals the fluctuating nature of his stuttering which is likely to be unsettling. He then uses a series of existential clause constructions to approximate the length of time that he “wouldn’t worry about it at all.” Here, the mental process of emotion is negated in terms of usuality and implies that he did not experience the negative affect “worry.” This lack of worry is maximally up-scaled at the end of the clause with “at all.” In line E23, Sam uses a mental clause of perception to state that he also felt “very fluent and confident.” While both operate as positive appraisals, the former is

an up-scaled appreciation and the latter is an expression of affect. Sam then contrasts these feelings with his actual experience of stuttering at “other times”:

Excerpt 5.10

E24. S	but	then	other	times	I'd	go	back	to		
Exp:						Material				
Modality:			Usuality		Usuality					
	the way	it	was	before	almost					
Exp:			Relat (int)							
Appraisal:	Appre (-)				Grad (dwn)					
E25. S	and	then	that	um	gradually	went	up			
Exp:						Material				
Appraisal:					Grad (dwn)		Appre (-)			
	in	my	young	teen years	and	it	started	to get	worse	
Exp:	Circ.							Material		
Appraisal:									Appre (-)	
E26. S	I'm	sure	you know	getting	into	being	a	teenager-		
Exp:	Relat (int)			Material		Relat (int)				
Modality:		Probability								
	having	more	responsibilities and independence			I'm	sure	that	affected	me
Exp:	Relat (pos)					Relat (int)			Material	
Modality:							Probability			
Appraisal:		Grad (up.)								
E27. S	so	then	um	I	stuttered	more	then			
Exp:					Behavioral					
Appraisal:						Grad (up.)				
	and	I	still	didn't	want	to go	back	to	speech	therapy
Exp:				NEG Mental (des)		Material		Circ.		
Modality:			Usuality	NEG Inclination						
Appraisal:				Appre (-)						

He begins line E24 with the circumstantial element of contingency “but” and structures a comparison in regard to “times” with “then other times.” In this construction, the contraction for “would” signals a high degree of usuality of the material process “go back.” This phrasal verb is indicative of Sam’s regression, which he assumes an active role by identifying himself as the Actor. In explicating the severity of his regression, he uses the severity of his stuttering “before” therapy as a point of comparison. Though there is no specific mention of what “the way... before” refers to, it can be assumed that it is negative since the time period related to positive

experiences was presented earlier in the comparison. This not only highlights the significance of his regression but also suggests that Sam views stuttering as a default state of being. He down-scales this assertion, however, with his post-hoc inclusion of “almost.”

Sam’s description of the ups and downs of his stuttering is reminiscent of his mother’s description, where she states his gradual progress as being “five steps forward and three steps back” (F200).

In line E25, Sam down-scales the worsening of severity with the adverb “gradually.” In this construction, “that” (reference to stuttering) is the Actor in the material process “went.” He uses a circumstantial construction of time to place this worsening in his “young teen years.” It was during this time frame that “it” (reference to stuttering) started to get worse. While “worse” conveys Sam’s negative appreciation it also incorporates a comparative element. The purpose of this description of his worsening, like the previous one of fluctuation, builds his opposition to going back to therapy. He states in line E27 that he “still didn’t want,” where “still” represents the persistence of his lack of desire to participate in the material process of going back to therapy. In sum, Sam had negative feelings towards therapy, even though he does not state them outright.

Feelings during early teen years. The researcher asks Sam what feelings he had when he realized in his teen years that his stuttering wasn’t going away. In the first excerpt, he speaks about his efforts to “stay absolutely positive” then talks about the negative emotions that “everyone who stutters talks about” in the following excerpt.

Staying positive. Sam begins his response to the researcher’s question by talking about his inclination to “stay positive” as seen in the following excerpt:

Excerpt 5.11

E347. S	I	was	always	very	good	with	staying	pretty	positive
Exp:		Relat (int)				Circ.	Realt (int)		
Modality:			Usuality						
Appraisal:			Grad (max)	Grad (up)	Appre (+)				
E348. S	um	even to	the point	where	I	think	I	really	could
Exp:				Circ.	Mental (cog proj)				
Modality:									Potential
Appraisal:		Grad (up)						Grad (up)	
E349. S	cover	it	up	a lot	of	the	anxieties	I	had
Exp:	Material								Relat (int)
Appraisal:				Grad (up)					
E350. S	just	because	I	was	trying	to deny	them		
Exp:		Circ.			Material	Material			
E351. S	trying	to	stay	absolutely	positive				
Exp:	Material	Relat (int)							
Appraisal:				Grad (max)	Appre (+)				
E352. S	which	is	a	good	or	bad	thing		
Exp:	Circ.	Relat (int)							
Appraisal:				Appre (+)		Appre (-)			
	depending	on	how	you	look	at it			
Exp:	Circ				Mental (cog)				

Sam uses a relational clause to assign himself the up-scaled Attribute “very good,” which also serves as a positive appreciation. The process itself is maximally up-scaled in terms of usuality with the adverb “always.” This attribution is being made in the context of the circumstantial matter “with staying pretty positive.” While “staying” operates as a relational process, it also conveys that “pretty positive” was persistent state of being for Sam. Here, the positive appraisal is down-scaled by “pretty.” He then strengthens this in line E348 by prefacing his next assertion with the circumstantial element “even to the point.” The word “even” up-scales the significance of the information to be identified as “the point,” which he relays through a mental projection. The projected clause contains the material process “really could cover up,”

where really up-scales the potential conveyed by the auxiliary verb “could.” In this construction, Sam is Actor and “it” is Goal, which is kataphoric in nature since it serves as a reference to the following structure in line E349. Here, the relational process “I had” serves to postmodify “anxieties.” By structuring the complex this way and moving the noun group after the clause boundary, Sam effectively puts extra weight on the anxieties in relation to the other elements.

He opens line E350 with a down-scaled, circumstantial element of cause “just because” then offers a reason for why he could cover it: “I was trying to deny them,” where his use of “trying” indicates his lack of success in the material process of denying his aforementioned anxieties. Line E351 reveals that maintaining “absolutely positive” affect was another process that Sam used to cover up his anxieties. His use of the maximally up-scaling adverb “absolutely” serves to make his lack of accomplish more understandable. He then neutrally appraises his past efforts in line E352 as being “a good or bad thing.” Sam includes the contingency “depending on how you look at it” and therefore speaks to the subjectivity of the appraisal.

Sam juxtaposes “being good at staying positive” and “covering up” his anxieties, thus speaking to his overall message that “being positive” is something of a face he puts on for the outside world by “covering up” his true feelings. His consist use of the material process “trying” represents his inclination and inability to do so.

Anxieties. In this continuation of the previous excerpt, Sam speaks more openly about the negative feelings he had during his early teens which also works to build upon his identity as “new Sam.”

Excerpt 5.12

E353. S	but yes I-	the	anxieties	that	everyone	who	stutters	talks	about
Exp:							Behavioral	Behavioral	
Modality:					Usuality				
Appraisal:			Affect (-)		Grad (max)				
E354. S	um	you know	feeling	of	being	the	outsider		
Exp:					Relat (int)				
Appraisal:							Appre (-)		
E355. S	the	one	who	can't	communicate as	well as	everyone	else	
Exp:					Behavioral				
Modality:				NEG Potential					
Appraisal:		Grad (max)		Judg (-)	Grad (up)		Grad (max)		
	and	yes	then	I	got	past	all that		
Exp:					Material				
Appraisal:							Grad (up)		

In line E353, Sam flags a change in topic with “but yes.” He then uses a relational clause of possession in which he was the Possessor of “the anxieties.” While this serves as Attribute in terms of the system of Transitivity, it also conveys negative affect under the appraisal system. He specifies even further by identifying them as something “that everyone who stutters talks about.” His use of the word “everyone” maximally up-scales the quantity of people thereby instantiating the system of modality to convey usuality. In other words, Sam is asserting that his feelings of anxiety are not abnormal. He then expands on his previous statement in line E354 by adding “feeling of being the outsider.” The nominalization of this construction structurally places it on the same level as “anxieties.” The Value of this clause, “the outsider,” also serves as a negative appreciation. Sam adds another Value to this construction in line E355 with “the one who can’t communicate as well as everyone else.” In this downranked clause, the potential for carrying out the behavioral process is negated. The Actor’s ability to communication is then down-scaled and negatively appreciated through the comparative structure “as well as.” Here, Sam compares “the one” (internalized role of people who stutter) to “everyone else.” Sam closes this excerpt by

asserting that he “got past all that.” Here, Sam is the Actor in the figurative material process where the Range, “all that,” refers to a metaphorical landmark. Thus, he not only speaks to his involvement in the process but also to the point that these are issues of the past, which supports the ongoing “new Sam versus old Sam” identity. Old Sam was someone who felt like he didn’t fit in socially because of his stuttering whereas new Sam has gotten past it.

Speech Therapy. The following collection of excerpts shows how Sam constructs his therapy experiences and appraises the techniques he learned during these contrasting past and present experiences.

Current therapy. The researcher asks Sam to identify the “things” he is working on with his current therapist in line E42. He responds by describing two different aspects of therapy in Excerpt 5.13. Sam first replies with “general fluency things.” This is softened by “pretty much” and down-scaled by “general,” making his statement non-specific. He works towards more specificity in the following phrase “a lot of fluency strategies.” Here, he replaces the non-specific noun “things” for “strategies.” Sam differentiates between the two major types of fluency tactics: ones that are used all the time (which he calls “strategies”) versus ones that are used only in moments of stuttering (which he calls “techniques”). He treats these as two separate therapy objectives in line E47 when he refers to them as “those two things.” He follows this with a comment about the therapist. Through his use of a circumstantial element and down-scaling, Sam conveys that she was limited in the help she could give in the circumstance of “talking about the emotional side of stuttering.” This statement also implies that Sam’s therapist addressed both the behavioral aspect of stuttering as well as the affective “side.”

Excerpt 5.13

E42. AG	what	sorts	of	things	are	you	working	on
Exp:							Material	
	in there	with	her?					
Exp:	Circ.							
E43. S	um	pretty	much	uh nnn	general	fluency	things	
Appraisal:		Soften			Appre (neu)		Grad (dwn)	
	uh uh	a lot	of um	fluency	strategies			
Appraisal:		Grad (up)						
E44. S	as	well	as	different techniques		to use	to get	out
Exp:						Material	Material	
Appraisal:				Appre (neu)				
E45-46. S	of	stuttering	when	it	does	occur		
Exp:			Circ.			Material		
Modality:					Probability			
E47. S	so	those	two	things	and	also	to	an extent
Appraisal:								Grad (dwn)
E48-49. S	as much	as	she	can	help	with	talking	
Exp:					Material	Circ.	Behavioral	
Modality:				Potential				
Appraisal:	Grad (dwn)							
	the	emotional	side	of	stuttering			
E50. S	and	how	all my	emotions	and	confidence	can	affect
Exp:								Material
Modality:							Potential	
Appraisal:			Grad (max)					
	the way	I	stutter	and	all that			
Exp:			Behavioral					
Appraisal:				Soften				

Past therapy experiences. In line E75, the researcher asks Sam to give examples of the “sort of things” he did during his childhood therapy experiences that he is doing now. Excerpt 5.14 presents Sam’s response.

Excerpt 5.14

E76. S	from	the past	it	was for	stuttering	for	the	stuttering
Exp:	Circ.			Relat (int)				Behavioral
E77. S	like	if	I	was	having	a block	or prolongation-	
Exp:					Relat (pos)			
Modality:		Probability						
E78. S	like	restart						
Exp:		Material						
Appraisal:	Grad (dwn)							
E79. S	or	um yeah	just	breath	in	again		
Exp:				Behavioral				
Modality:								
Appraisal:			Grad (dwn)					
E80. S	and	then	start	over-				
Exp:			Material					
E81. S	something	like	that					
Modality:		Probability						
E82. S	or else	if	I	was	very	stuck	in a block	
Exp:				Relat (int)			Circ.	
Modality:		Probability						
Appraisal:					Grad (up)	Appre (-)		
	just	kinda	lo-losen	my jaw				
Exp:			Material					
Appraisal:	Grad (dwn)							
E84. S	or	maybe	move	it	a little			
Exp:			Material					
Modality:		Probability						
Appraisal:					Grad (dwn)			
	to	reduce	the	tension	overall			
Exp:		Material						
Appraisal:					Grad (up)			
E85. S	and	from	what	I	remember	those	would	work
Exp:					Mental (cog)			Material
Modality:					Probability		Usuality	
Appraisal:								Appre (+)

E86. S	but	not	that	consistently				
Modality:		NEG		Usuality				
Appraisal:			Grad (dwn)					
E87. S	which	was	more	of	the	whole	theme	
Exp:		Relat (int)						
Appraisal:			Grad (up)			Grad (max)	Appre (+)	
	of	my	speech	therapy	when	I	was	younger
Exp:					Circ.		Relat (int)	

Sam repeats the researcher’s circumstantial element “from the past,” then states the purpose of the therapy techniques during that time. This is done through his use of a relational clause construction. When repeating the Attribute, he inserts the article “the,” which may have served to ease him into this word that he previously identified as being difficult for him to say. Sam then elaborates with an example that is circumstantial in nature and that conveys probability through the word “if.” Within this circumstance is a relational clause of possession in which Sam is the Possessor of “a block or prolongation.” He follows this with “like restart” indicating that this technique could potentially be used in this situation. He presents a two-step material process as another potential option in line E79 and down-scales the difficulty of using this technique with “just.” He then says “or something like that,” conveying Sam’s uncertainty in his recollection of the technique.

In line E82, he presents another circumstance with a relational clause construction where Sam is assigned the Attribute “very stuck.” He follows this with the technique he uses in this particular circumstance which is the material process of loosening his jaw. This construction is similar to the one he uses in line E77 in that he presents the stuttering behavior as a circumstance and follows it with a clause down-scaling the difficulty of the technique to be used during that time. He gives a less-technical alternative to the process found in line E82 with “maybe move it a little.” Here, the process is down-scaled in terms of the amount of movement that needs to take

place. Sam expresses the intended outcome of this process: “to reduce the tension overall.” The word “overall” conveys that the reduction of tension is not limited to the area of the jaw and therefore up-scales the range of this technique.

Sam then appraises these techniques in line E85. The circumstance “from what I remember” signals that Sam is distancing himself from the information he is about to share. He delivers his first appraisal in a material clause construction. “Those” (reference to techniques) is in the role of Actor of the process “would work.” The verb “work” not only serves as the process but also functions as a positive appreciation of the technique. This is down-scaled by Sam’s inclusion of the auxiliary verb “would” which, under the system of modality, is a statement about the degree of usuality. He counters this with “not that consistently” thereby expressing that the usuality was fluctuating. He then uses an intensive relational clause to assign this situation the Attribute “more of the whole theme of my speech therapy.” Within this Attribute, the positive appreciation “theme” is up-scaled by “more” as well as “whole,” conveying that a high degree of significance is being attributed in this construction. He uses a circumstantial clause to limit this appraisal to the techniques he learned when he was “younger.”

In sum, Sam uses vague terminology such as the modifiers “just,” “kinda,” and “something like that” to describe the techniques he learned during his past experiences with therapy. Additionally, he speaks to the inconsistency in which these techniques have worked for him. All of these aspects, unclear and tepid as they are, constitute what he identifies to be the “whole theme” of this experience when he was younger.

Spanish. Another topic discussed during the ethnographic interview was Sam’s experience with Spanish. Though he learned both English and Spanish simultaneously in his household, he identifies English as his dominant language. The following excerpts illustrate his

theories about his difficulties with Spanish and challenges he faces with the language because of his stuttering.

Not confident with the language. In the following excerpt, the researcher presents a behavioral clause construction for Sam to accept or deny in terms of usuality as conveyed by “often.” He responds by directly addressing usuality but also includes his reasoning for this which resurfaces the significance of confidence in his speaking abilities.

Excerpt 5.15

E376. AG	so	you	don't	speak	Spanish	often		
Exp:			NEG	Behavioral				
Modality:						Usuality		
E377. S	um	not	that	often	but	I do	try	sometimes
Exp:					Circ.		Material	
Modality:		NEG		Usuality			Inclination	Usuality
Appraisal:		Grad (dwn)						Grad (dwn)
E378. S	and	again	still	at	that point	where		
Exp:				Circ.				
Modality:			Usuality					
E379. S	I'm	not fluent	with it					
Exp:	Relat (int)		Circ.					
Appraisal:		Appre (-)						
E380. S	but	very	much	because	I'm	not	confident	
Exp:					Relat (int)			
Appraisal:		Grad (up)				NEG	Affect (+)	
	with	the	language	yet				
Exp:	Circ.			Circ.				

In line E377, Sam down-scales the usuality of his speaking Spanish with “not that” then counters it with a material clause construction. He justifies his infrequent efforts with a relational clause construction that is prefaced with “still at that point” making the upcoming attribution temporal in nature. In this construction Sam assigns himself, rather than his speech, the Attribute of “not fluent with it.” He elaborates on this in line E380 by revealing that, at the root of Sam’s

infrequent efforts of speaking Spanish, is his lack of confidence with the language. As mentioned in a previous excerpt, Sam feels that his confidence directly affects his fluency. This excerpt reveals that this applies not only to his fluency in English, but also his fluency in Spanish.

Spanish as “a reset.” Sam continues speaking on the topic of Spanish in the following excerpt. Here, he regards it as being “a kind of reset” and explains why he thinks this is the case.

Excerpt 5.16

E381. S	but	I	do	feel	it	is	a	kind of	you know	reset	
Exp:	Circ.										
Modality:											
Appraisal:											
E382. S	because	all	the sounds	and	the	syllables	are	totally	different		
Exp:											
Modality:											
Appraisal:											
	from	the	English	language							
Exp:	Circ.										
E383. S	even	though	if	I'm	perfectly	fluent	and comfortable	in English			
Exp:											
Modality:											
Appraisal:											
E384. S	I	change	it	to Spanish							
Exp:											
E385. S	and	I	realize	you know	"whoa	these	sounds	are			
Exp:											
Modality:											
Appraisal:											
	totally	different	to me	and	I'm	not	used to	them"			
Exp:											
Modality:											

Sam begins line E381 with “but” to mark a change in focus in regard to the topic of Spanish. He uses a mental projection to convey that the upcoming relational clause is a statement of opinion. In this construction, “it” (reference to Spanish) is assigned the Attribute “a kind of reset.” This neutral appraisal is figurative in nature. His reason for describing it as such is due to the characteristics of the language which he describes as “totally different” in comparison to

those of English. He extrapolates on this by using elements of surprise and unfamiliarity in his description of what happens when he switches to Spanish. He uses the ideal circumstance of being “perfectly fluent and comfortable in English” as a contingency which conveys that the reset has negative implications for his fluency. So, rather than his lack of fluency in Spanish being caused by his speaking abilities, he attributes it to the phonetic characteristics of the language.

Fluency techniques in Spanish. In line E395, the researcher asks Sam if he has used his techniques in Spanish to which he replies “yes.” After stating that he uses “the fluency ones” in particular, he talks about the difficulties he’s encountered along the way in Excerpt 5.17.

Sam begins line E400 with “but” to convey that the following circumstance occurs despite his use of the techniques. He uses a relational clause construction in which “the main issues” are something he possesses with “it” (reference to using techniques in Spanish). The adjective “main” conveys the significance of these “issues” which, by definition, carries Sam’s negative appreciation. He then identifies these issues in the following intensive relational clause as “the different sounds.” In line E402, he structures a contingency in which he conveys that the material process of articulating of these sounds is dependent upon several factor. His description is very technical and detailed, thus he may be explaining these factors based on what he heard in the clinical setting. This relationship of contingency is expressed through the auxiliary verb group “have to” which signals a high degree of obligation under the system of modality. His listing of these different characteristics works to up-scale the obligatory element of the process by presenting all of the things he has to do in order to articulate these sounds. He ends this listing by including the non-specific “and stuff” that he later identifies as things he is “totally not accustomed to using.”

Excerpt 5.17

E400. S	but	the	main	issues	I	have	with	it		
Exp:	Circ.					Relat (pos)	Circ.			
Appraisal:				Appre (-)						
E401. S	is	um	the	different	sounds					
Exp:	Relat (int)									
E402. S	to	articulate	them	I	have to	use	different movements			
Exp:		Material				Material				
Modality:					Obligation					
Appraisal:							Appre (neu)			
E404-406. S	different techniques		different	sounds	different	transitions	through	letters		
Appraisal:	Appre (neu)		Appre (neu)		Appre (neu)					
Appraisal:			Grad (up)							
E407. S	and	stuff	that	I'm	totally	not	accustomed	to using		
Exp:				Relat (int)				Material		
Modality:						NEG	Usuality			
Appraisal:					Grad (max)					
E408. S	so	in terms	of	the techniques	I	use	to get			
Exp:		Circ.				Material	Material			
E409. S	out	of	stuttering	when	I	am	stuttering			
Exp:		Circ.		Circ.			Behavioral			
E410. S	I	don't	really	know	how	to use	them	well	in Spanish	
Exp:				Mental (cog)		Material			Circ.	
Modality:		NEG								
Appraisal:		Grad (dwn)						Appre (+)		
E411. S	which	I	will	have to	practice	with that				
Exp:	Circ.				Material	Circ.				
Modality:				Obligation						
E412. S	but	it'll	take	a lot	of practice	just	cause			
Exp:			Material							
Modality:			Obligation							
Appraisal:				Grad (up)		Grad (dwn)				
	it	is	that	different	of a language	in	terms of	sounds	being	made
Exp:		Relat (int)				Circ.			Relat (int)	
Appraisal:			Grad (up)	Appre (neu)						

His use of a relatively static relational process in line E407 highlights the Attribute of “not accustomed” as a characteristic of habit rather than an inability. In this portion of the

excerpt, Sam's talk has become comparatively more technical than it was when he was describing techniques in vague terms. His use of what resembles "clinic speak" suggests that Sam does not have a grasp of the technicality in the context of Spanish which would account for his not being "accustomed" to using the techniques. At the same time, this speaks to idea that his techniques are language and sound-specific.

Sam then asserts that he has some knowledge of how to use the techniques but not to the degree that he could positively appraise his use in the context of Spanish. He suggests that a remedy for this is the material process of practicing, where "practice" is made obligatory by his inclusion of "have to." In this context, Sam places a great deal of significance on the necessity of practicing his use of techniques in Spanish but does not indicate that confidence plays a role which contrasts with his description of the factors that contribute to his stuttering in English. Rather, he closes the topic by up-scaling just how different he perceives the sounds of Spanish to be in comparison to those of English.

In this excerpt, Sam attributes his "issues" of using fluency techniques in Spanish to the different sounds and unfamiliar articulation requirements of the language. He also posits his lack of knowledge of using the techniques as a reason for his difficulties but states that this can be remedied by practice. However, practice is something that he feels will require a lot of effort due to the aforementioned "issues" he finds to be inherent to speaking Spanish. This speaks to the fact that in terms of learning techniques, it is not only about mastering the principle but transferring it to the other language and indicates that, for Sam, the techniques he uses are language specific.

SECTION 2: Family Conversation

Throughout the conversation, Sam assumed the role of “interviewer” and therefore selected the majority of topics that he and his mother discussed during this time. In terms of language selection, Sam chose to speak in English while his mother decided to speak in Spanish. While they primarily speak English to one another in the context of their household, it is not uncommon for Sam to respond in English to Ingrid’s Spanish.

Sam’s used of the word “stutter” and its variants approximately 12 times, while Ingrid used it approximately 24 times. Table 17 provides an overview of the functions the word “stutter” served for both participants.

Table 17

Quantitative overview of function and frequency of “stutter”

Keyword: Stutter	Sam	Ingrid
Function	Frequency	
Behavior	9	11
Circumstance	-	6
Actor	2	-
Scope	-	2
Possession	-	2
Attribute	1	2
Carrier	-	1

Similar to that of the quantitative results for the ethnographic interview, Sam configured his stuttering as a behavioral process throughout his conversation with Ingrid, who primarily used the keyword for similar purposes. Rather than using the Spanish word for stuttering, “tartamudeo,” she used the English word as well as variations including “stutter” and “stuttering.”

The excerpts in this section illustrate the principal topics of conversation relating to Sam’s stuttering as experienced by himself and by his mother, Ingrid.

Speech Therapy. A persistent topic of discussion throughout the family conversation was speech therapy. Ingrid shares her negative appraisal of the fluency expert, which is indirectly countered by Sam's positive appraisal of his overall experience participating in speech therapy. Additionally, the excerpts in this section illustrate how Ingrid appraises Sam's stuttering in the context of speech therapy. This collection also shows how Ingrid constructs Sam's not wanting to go to therapy in his young teen years.

Ingrid's Appraisal of: "la experta en fluency" (the fluency expert). In Excerpt 5.18, Ingrid changes the topic to discuss what she learned from one of Sam's speech therapists, "la experta en fluency." After this, she shares her appraisal of the therapist.

In line F99, Ingrid sets up a mental projection. She conveys a high degree of certainty with her inclusion of "sí." Rather than delivering the projection, she adds a series of circumstances to specify which therapist she taught her the upcoming information. The circumstances gradually become more detailed until she provides the final descriptor in a relational clause construction. Ingrid delivers what the therapist taught her by using a double projection and making it the complement of "creyo" (thought). The double projection allows Ingrid to distance herself from her behavior that the therapist deemed as problematic and also conveys Ingrid's skepticism in regard to the validity of the therapist's assertion. Her selection of "creyo" highlights Ingrid's perception of the therapist's observation being opinion-based and not factual in nature.

She then aligns herself with the therapist's statement by identifying it as the truth ("la verdad"). However, she specifies that what is true is that she speaks faster in Spanish than in English, as opposed to accepting that it has a role in Sam's stuttering. She then reports the therapist's recommendation using an imperfect verb tense. Her selection of tense expresses

modality as to likelihood, therefore, leaving a question of certainty as to whether or not Ingrid actually changed the way she spoke. This assigns some blame to Ingrid in that her natural way of speaking is pinpointed as something that had to be changed in order to help improve Sam's stuttering. Because this suggestion is made in regard to her speech "en español," it strengthens her negative appraisal of the therapist's knowledge of Spanish in line F104.

Excerpt 5.18

F99. IR	pero	sí	aprendí	de	uno	de	tus	speech	therapists	
Exp:		Mental (cog. proj.)		Circ.						
	<i>but I did learn from one of your speech therapists</i>									
	la	segunda	la	que	era	experta	en fluency			
Exp:					Relat (int)					
	<i>the second one the one one that was a fluency expert</i>									
F100. IR	sí	aprendí	que	ella	creyo	que				
Exp:	Mental (cog. proj.)			Mental (cog. proj.)						
	<i>I did learn that she thought</i>									
	yo	estaba	hablando	rápido	en español					
Exp:			Behavioral		Circ.					
Appraisal:				Grad (up)						
	<i>I was speaking fast in spanish</i>									
F101. IR	entonces	es	la	verdad	yo	hablo				
Exp:		Relat (int)				Behavioral				
Appraisal:				Appre (+)						
	<i>then it's the truth I speak</i>									
	mas	rápido	en español	que	en	inglés				
Appraisal:	Grad (up)									
	<i>faster in Spanish than in English</i>									
F102. IR	entonces	ella	me	dijo	que	yo	tenía	que		
Exp:				Verbal (proj)						
Modality:							Obligation			
	<i>then she told me that I had to</i>									
	hablar	mas	despacio	en español						
Exp:	Behavioral			Circ.						
Appraisal:		Grad (up)								
	<i>speak slower in spanish</i>									
F103. IR	entonces	eso	fue	lo	único	que	aprendí	de	ella	sobre el-
Exp:			Relat (int)				Material			Circ.
Appraisal:					Grad (max)					
	<i>then that was the only thing I learned from her about the</i>									

In line F103, Ingrid uses a predicated Theme construction in which she identifies “eso” (this) (reference to the therapist’s suggestion) with the Value “lo unico que aprendi” (the only thing I learned). Though this construction primarily serves to highlight the maximally down-scaled quantity of the things she learned, it also conveys an up-scaled degree of interpersonal significance. This implies that Ingrid expected to learn about stuttering from “la experta,” but instead was flagged as being a contributor to her son’s stuttering because of the way she talked. Her negative appraisal of the therapist is therefore relayed through the explication of her unmet expectations. She begins her next thought with the circumstantial element “sobre” (about) but abandons it in the following line to share her appraisal of the therapist as seen in the continuation of this excerpt:

Excerpt 5.19

F104. IR	claro	que	ella	era	americana y					
Exp:				Relat (int)						
	<i>of course she was American and</i>									
	no	sabía	nada	de	español	y	nada	de	bilingual	cosas
Exp:	NEG	Mental (cog)		Circ				Circ.		
Modality:			NEG				NEG			
Appraisal:	NEG	Judg (+)	Grad (max)				Grad (max)			
	<i>she didn't know anything about Spanish and nothing about bilingual things</i>									
F105. IR	entonces	quien	sabe	si	ella	tenía	razón	o	no	
Exp:						Relat (pos)				
Modality:				Probability						
	<i>then who knows if she had a point or not</i>									

Ingrid assigns “ella” (reference to the therapist) the Attribute “Americana” in a downranked clause construction. The projecting structure, “claro que” (of course), lacks a copula. By structuring the complex this way, she presents her appraisal as a self-evident truth. This attribution serves as grounds for her negative appraisals of the therapist which she presents in a negated mental process of cognition. This also works to convey that Sam’s mother negatively judges the therapist’s capacity to advise her about Spanish and bilingual things

(“bilingual cosas”). In line F105, Ingrid makes a concession of possibility in regard to of whether or not the therapist had a point (“ella tenía razón”), which speaks to her own uncertainty about the validity of the therapist’s input. Her consistent use of the optional subject pronoun “ella” throughout this excerpt, as well as the following excerpts, places emphasis on the therapist rather than the actual processes Ingrid describes her as being involved in.

Ingrid presents another negative appraisal of the therapist in a later excerpt but follows it with a positive appraisal of Sam:

Excerpt 5.20

F193. IR	y	ella	no sabía	mucho	pero	lo	que		
Exp:		NEG Mental (cog)			Circ.				
Appraisal:		NEG Judg (+) Grad (up)							
	<i>and she did not know a lot but what</i>								
	yo	noté	fue	que	tu	mejorabas	con	el	stuttering
Exp:		Mental (cog)	Relat (int)			Material	Circ.		
Appraisal:						Appre (+)			
	<i>I noticed was that you improved with the stuttering</i>								

Ingrid uses a negated mental clause construction as seen in the previous excerpt to express her negative judgment of the therapist’s capacity. This appraisal is not as intense as the others in that she uses negated “mucho” to scale the quantity of what the therapist did not know. In this instance, she conveys that the therapist knew something which contrasts with her previous quantification, “nada” (nothing). Sam’s mother follows this negative appraisal of the therapist with a positive one about Sam. However, the appraisal itself is downranked by Ingrid’s use of a mental projection, which expresses her appraisal of Sam’s improvement in fluency as an opinion. The identifying information is presented as a material construction in which Sam is assigned the role of Actor in the process “mejorabas” (improved). Because this verb is positive by definition, it also serves to express Ingrid’s positive appreciation of Sam relative to the circumstantial

matter “con el stuttering.” Therefore, she attributes improvement to Sam rather than his stuttering and does not make any implications about the therapist having a role in this.

Sam’s Appraisal: Very helpful. Sam and his mother speculate whether or not his focus on fluency hindered his learning Spanish. When Ingrid states that it may be a possibility, Sam responds with a positive appraisal of his involvement in therapy.

He begins his turn in Excerpt 5.21 signaling that he is going to counter what his mother said with “but,” then abandons this construction to present a contingency prior to stating his counter statement. The relational clause construction is one of probability as signaled by “if.” Within the clause, “that” (reference to topic) is identified as the probable Value “the case.” This situation is presented as a negated relational clause construction in which Sam assigns himself the Attribute “not... able.” By using this construction, Sam makes not learning Spanish the result of his lack of ability to do so rather than the result of him choosing not to learn. He then specifies in line F151 that this lack of ability was caused by the material process of focusing on being able to speak English fluently. Therefore, Sam structures learning Spanish and focusing on fluency in English as mutually exclusive processes, the latter being the one which he assigns the most interpersonal value.

Sam structures the clause complex in line F152 as a mental projection, which conveys the subjective nature of the projected message. The message itself begins with the noun group “all the speech therapy I’ve done,” which pre-poses the clause and serves as marked Theme. The noun group is referenced within this clause through Sam’s use of “it.” This functions to put the amount of speech therapy Sam has done in the foreground of the message. The appraisal, which is construed through a relational clause construction, represents Sam’s positive appreciation of the amount of therapy that he has done and not of the therapy itself.

Excerpt 5.21

F150. S	but	I	also	don't-	if	that's	the	case		
Exp:.	Circ.			NEG	Circ.	Relat (int)				
	I	also	don't	regret	not	being	able	to learn	Spanish	
Exp:			NEG		NEG	Material		Circ		
F151. S	because	I	focused	on	being	able	to speak	English	more	fluently
Exp:	Circ		Material	Circ	Material		Circ			
Modality:						Potential				
Appraisal:									Grad (up)	
F152. S	I	think	that	all	the	speech	therapy	I've	done-	
Exp:		Mental (cog proj)							Material	
Modality:		Probability								
Appraisal:				Grad (up)						
	it's	been	very	helpful						
Exp:		Relat(int)								
Modality:		Usuality								
Appraisal:			Grad (up)	Appre (+)						
	not	only	to speak	fluently	but	also	a lot	of	it	is
Exp:	Circ,		Behavioral		Circ.					Relat (int)
Modality:										
Appraisal:	NEG	Grad (up)		Appre (+)			Grad (up)			
	what-	as	people	who	cant	talk				
Exp:					NEG	Behavioral				
Modality:					NEG	Potential				
Appraisal:						Judg (-)				
F153. S	in	front	of	crowds	and	such	are	taught		
Exp:	Circ.							Material		
	how	to speak	in terms	of	projecting	your	voice	properly		
Exp:		Behavioral	Circ.		Material					
Appraisal:								Appre (+)		
F154. S	and	you know	making	it	sound	good	and professional	and	all that	
Exp:			Material							
Appraisal:						Appre (+)		Appre (+)		Soften
F155. S	and	so	all	that that	I	learned	I	am	very	happy
Exp:		Circ.				Mental (cog)		Relat (int)		
Appraisal:			Grad (max)						Grad (up)	Affect (+)
	that	I	had	the opportunity		to learn	that			
Exp:			Relat (pos)			Mental (cog)				
Appraisal:					Appre (+)					
F156. S	so	I	don't	regret	any	of	that			
Exp:			NEG	Mental (emo)						
Appraisal:			NEG	Affect (-)	Grad (up)					

As illustrated in the continuation of line F152, Sam adds circumstances in which therapy has helped him, thereby strengthening his assertion. The first of these is being able “to speak fluently.” This is an expected outcome of speech therapy so he negates “only,” making the fact that there is another benefit even more significant. The next area that Sam says speech therapy has helped is presented as an identifying relational clause, which includes a series of circumstances. When talking about what therapy entailed, he provides the detail that it is something usually “taught” to “people who can’t talk in front of crowds.” This allows Sam to draw a commonality between his stuttering and the speech problems encountered by people who do not stutter. He then delivers the other piece of the relational clause construction as a series of material processes representing techniques including “projecting your voice properly” and “making it sound good and professional.” Both of these clauses suggest that the implied Actor has a role in carrying out these processes in way that would merit a positive appreciation. His use of precise word choice to construct these clauses has implications for the characteristics and processes he uses to characterize successful speech as defined in the clinical setting.

Sam then brings his turn to a close with a positive appraisal of all the things he learned during therapy in line F155. Here, “all that I learned” is pre-posed because of its placement outside of the clause and into the foreground of Sam’s message. The structure indicates that the things he learned has a causal relationship with Sam’s being “very happy.” This up-scaled expression of affect is characteristic of “new Sam,” who now positively construes his therapy experiences. By expressing these feelings and referring to learning the techniques as an “opportunity,” Sam conveys his positive appreciation of his active role in the learning process. Similar to line F152, Sam’s actions receive the positive appraisal rather than the speech therapy itself. In line F156, he reiterates his lack of regret for “any of that,” which is a reference to all

aspects of his therapy experience. This implies that he stands behind his original assertion that his efforts were well-spent on focusing on fluency in English at the cost of not learning Spanish.

Ingrid's Appraisal of Sam's stuttering during therapy. This continuation of the previous excerpt represents Ingrid's appraisal of Sam's stuttering while he was receiving therapy from "la experta en fluency." As depicted in Excerpt 5.22, Ingrid begins her description of Sam's stuttering by first indicating the participatory role Sam has in the behavioral process "andabas" (would go). Her use of the imperfect tense suggests the high degree of usuality in which Sam would exhibit this behavior. Ingrid conveys some uncertainty in the duration of time that Sam would go "sin stuttering" (without stuttering) by offering approximations. Her vague language used in this clause contrasts with her emphatic assertion in the following construction in line F196. Here, Ingrid switches to English with the statement "out of nowhere," which not only indicates that the material process "empezaste" (started) came without warning but also expresses her bewilderment on an interpersonal level. Thus, Ingrid contrasts Sam's on-going behavior with the sudden recurrence of his stuttering which she attributes to Sam by assigning him the role of Actor.

She begins to make a statement in regard to usuality but abandons this construction and restarts with a negated material construction in line F198. In this clause, Ingrid and Sam are both participants in the process "no parábamos" (we didn't stop) even in the circumstance of Sam being fluent. The imperfect tense expressed by "seguíamos" (continued) indicates the persistence of their participation in therapy, which she highlights further through repetition. Ingrid then speaks to the fluctuation of Sam's stuttering by assigning it the Attribute "five steps forward and three steps back" in line F200. Her use of code-mixing here has the interpersonal function of up-scaling her characterization of the fluctuations.

Excerpt 5.22

F195. IR	entonces	por	ejemplo	tu	andabas	como	una	semana		
Exp:	Circ.				Behavioral	Circ				
Modality:					Usuality					
	<i>then for example you would go like a week</i>									
	o	diez	días	sin	stutter	sin	stuttering			
Exp:				Circ		Circ	Behavioral			
	<i>or 10 days without stutter without stuttering</i>									
F196. IR	y después	out	of	nowhere	tu	empezaste	otra	vez		
Exp:	circ.					Material				
Appraisal:				Grad (up)						
	<i>and later out of nowhere you started again</i>									
F197. IR	entonces	pero	seguíamos-							
Exp:		Circ	Material							
	<i>then but we continued</i>									
F198. IR	nosotros	no parábamos	la	terapia						
Exp:		NEG	Material							
Modality:			Usuality							
	<i>we didn't stop the therapy</i>									
F199. IR	cuando	estabas	fluen-	fluent	seguíamos	y	seguíamos			
Exp:	Circ	Relat (int)			Material		Material			
Appraisal:						Grad (up)				
	<i>when you were fluen- fluent we continued and continued</i>									
F200. IR	era	como	dicen	en	inglés	"five steps	forward	and three steps	back"	
Exp:	Relat (int)		Verbal	Circ						
Appraisal:							Appre (+)		Appre (-)	
	<i>it was as they say in English "five steps forward and three steps back"</i>									
F201. IR	entonces	tu	mejorabas	y	después	no	mejorabas	y	después	
Exp:	Circ		Material		Circ	NEG	Material			
Modality:			Usuality				Usuality			
Appraisal:			Appre (+)			Appre (-)	Appre (+)			
	<i>then you would improve and later you wouldn't and later</i>									
	era	kind of	a relapsing type	thing						
Exp:	Relat (int)									
Appraisal:		Soften								
	<i>it was kind of a relapsing type thing</i>									
	pero	nunca	nunca	tan	intenso	como	era	al principio		
Exp:	circ.	NEG	NEG				Relat (circ)	Circ.		
Modality:		Usuality	Usuality							
Appraisal:		Grad (up)			Appre (-)					
	<i>but never never as intense as it was at first</i>									

In line F201, she then positively appraises Sam in regard to his stuttering by assigning him the role of Actor in the material process “mejorabas” (improved), where the imperfect tense expresses its interdeterminacy. She follows this with a negation of the positive appraisal which includes the circumstantial element “después” (later). She repeats this structure again which works to up-scale her overall appraisal of the fluctuating nature of his stuttering. Ingrid then uses an intensive relational clause to assign Sam’s fluctuating stuttering the softened Attribute “kind of a relapsing type of thing.” By softening the Attribute and including the non-specific noun “thing,” she expresses some uncertainty in her statement. She continues with another appraisal of his stuttering that serves to comment on the level to which Sam would “relapse.” The Attribute “nunca nunca tan intenso como al principio” (never never as intense as at first) is comparative in nature and has implications for the severity of Sam’s stuttering “al principio” (at first). She maximally negates the usuality of his stuttering being comparable to how it was “al principio” with repetitions of “nunca,” which work to up-scale its intensifying effects even more so.

Ingrid then elaborates on the severity of Sam’s stuttering during the circumstance of “al principio.” She begins her explication by setting “al principio” as the circumstance of time in which Sam was the Behaver of “decías” (would say). Ingrid’s negative appreciation of his speech is doubly intensified both by the adverb as well as her repetition of it. In line F203, she speaks to how his stuttering got progressively worse during this time frame by negating Sam’s potential to participate in the behavioral process “decir” (to say) and up-scaling her assertion with the circumstance of manner “ni siquiera” (not even). She signals that she is going to counter this in line F204 with her insertion of the circumstantial element “pero” (but). Ingrid then assigns the role of Actor to both herself in the process “fuimos” (we went). By doing this, she includes herself as a participant in Sam’s speech fluctuations rather than placing all of the ownership on

Sam. Ingrid switches to English in line F205 where she replaces the verb “fuimos” with “fell,” which comparatively indicates a lesser degree of participant control. Again, “we” is in the role of Actor conveying her sense of solidarity with Sam in the material process of “never” falling back.

Excerpt 5.23

F202. IR	al principio tu	decías	unas	frases	de	cinco	palabras		
Exp:	Circ.		Behavioral			Circ			
Modality:			Usuality						
	<i>at first you would say some five word phrases</i>								
	de	esa	frase	eran	con	mucho	mucho	dificultad	
Exp:	Circ			Relat (circ)	Circ				
Appraisal:						Grad (up)		Appre (-)	
	<i>from that phrase they were with much much difficulty</i>								
F203. IR	entonces	tu	ni	siquiera	podías	decir	una frase	sin	stutter
Exp:			Circ			Behavioral		Circ	Behavioral
Modality:					Potential				
	<i>but you couldn't even say a phrase without stutter</i>								
F204. IR	pero	entonces	nunca	fuimos	a	eso			
Exp:	circ		NEG	Material	Circ				
Modality:			Usuality						
	<i>but then we never went to that</i>								
F205. IR	we	never	fell	back	asi	tanto			
Exp:		NEG	Material						
Modality:		Usuality							
Appraisal:						Grad (dwn)			
	<i>we never fell back so much like that</i>								

As seen in the construction in line F204, Sam’s mother maximally negates the usuality of this process occurring which indicates it has not happened since “al principio.” Her post-hoc inclusion of “así tanto” (so much like that) primarily functions to down-scale the extent of Sam’s regression portrayed in the figurative process of falling back. At the same time, it also speaks to the fact that they indeed had instances where they “fell back” which is characteristic of the fluctuating nature of Sam’s stuttering.

Ingrid: No querías hacer esto (You didn't want to do this). After appraising Sam's post-therapy stuttering, Ingrid shares her take on the stretch of time in which Sam did not want to work on the therapy exercises at home with her.

Excerpt 5.24

F213. IR	y	tu	no	querías	hacer	los	ejercicios	en la casa	conmigo
Exp:			NEG	Mental (des)	Material			Circ	Circ
Appraisal:			NEG	Appre (+)					
	<i>and you didn't want to do the exercises at home with me</i>								
F214. IR	tu	decías	que	no	querías	hacer	esto		
Exp:		Verbal (proj)		NEG	Mental (des)	Material			
Modality:		Usuality							
Appraisal:				NEG	Appre (+)				
	<i>you would say that you didn't want to do this</i>								
F215. IR	te	empujé	un poco	y	tú	me	dijiste	que	
Exp:		Material					Verbal (proj)		
Appraisal:			Grad (dwn)						
	<i>I pushed you a little and you told me that</i>								
	no	te	querías	enfocar	en	estas cosas	mas		
Exp:	NEG		Mental (des)	Material	Circ				
Appraisal:	NEG		Appre (+)				Grad(up)		
	<i>you didn't want to focus on these things anymore</i>								
F216. IR	que	te	sentías	como	si	algo	estaba	mal	contigo
Exp:			Mental (per)				Existential		
Modality:					Probability				
Appraisal:								Appre (-)	
	<i>that you felt as if something was wrong with you</i>								
F217. IR	entonces	que	te	sentías	raro				
Exp:				Mental (emo)					
Modality:				Usuality					
Appraisal:					Affect (-)				
	<i>then that you felt strange</i>								
F218. IR	entonces	yo	te	escuché	y	no	te	empujé	mas
Exp:				Mental (per)		NEG		Material	
Appraisal:									Grad (up)
	<i>then I listened and didn't push anymore</i>								

Ingrid begins this topic with a negated mental process of desire, “no querías” (didn't want), where Sam is in the role of Senser. This verb group also functions as a negated

appreciation of the material process “hacer” (to do), with “los ejercicios” (the exercises) in the role of Goal. She uses a circumstance of location to specify that this was happening “en la casa” (at home) as well as one of accompaniment “conmigo” (with me). In line F214, she projects the content of what Sam would usually tell her with verbal process “tu decías” (you would say). Here, Sam is the Sayer though his mother reports his Verbiage rather than quoting it. Her report of his Verbiage is constructed similarly to the negated mental clause in line F213. In this instance, however, the Goal of the undesired material process “hacer” is “esto,” which is a reference to “los ejercicios en la casa conmigo.”

In line F215, Ingrid assigns herself the role of Actor in the material process “te empujé” (pushed you), which indicates that her encouragement took a negative turn and became more of an act of imposing her wishes upon Sam. It is likely that Ingrid down-scaled the vigor of this process with “un poco” (a little) because of the inherently forceful connotation behind it. She follows this with another verbal projection using the negated mental process of desire seen in the previous lines. The projected information is presented as a mental clause construction construing Sam’s lack of desire to focus on these things (“enfocar en estas cosas”). She inserts the up-scaled comparative “mas,” which is negated by “no” earlier in the clause suggesting that the process of focusing on the exercises in this context was ongoing. This projection and its continuation in F216 and F217 are all double-downranked. This puts the primary focus of her message on “tú me dijiste” and secondary focus on the mental processes “no te quieras” (you did not want) and “te sentías” (you felt). She also uses subject pronouns in the main clauses of these lines, but not in the projections. By doing this, Ingrid is able to attribute her withdrawal from pushing Sam to do the exercises at home with her to the negative feelings Sam was reporting in response to therapy. Therefore, Ingrid portrays herself as a mother who was being sensitive to Sam’s emotional needs

rather than one who was being irresponsible by not insisting that Sam go to therapy. This is supported by her final statement in relation to this topic, where she states “yo te escuché” (I listened to you) in line F218 with “y no te empujé mas” (and I didn’t not push you anymore) occurring as the result of her listening to Sam. With the exception of this line, Ingrid consistently uses subject pronouns when talking about Sam, but not herself. This has the effect of putting what Sam did in the foreground, which serves as the basis for the way she responded.

In summary, Ingrid uses verbal projections to report his lack of desire to continue working on his therapy exercises. By using verbal projections, she adds a higher degree of validity to the information she is reporting as it is based on things Sam said. She also uses projections to describe his feelings during this time. Taking his negative feelings into consideration, she tells Sam “yo te escuché y no te empujé mas.” This statement works to put the decision to stop therapy on Sam rather than on herself. In doing so, she attempts to avoid being judged for not seeking help for Sam’s stuttering.

Spanish. Another topic discussed during the family conversation was Sam’s ability to speak Spanish. The following excerpts illustrate how Sam and Ingrid appraise his fluency (in terms of not stuttering) in Spanish by contrasting it with his fluency in English. Ingrid’s description of Sam’s use of Spanish and English, which she regards as “Spanglish,” is also presented.

Sam: Not as fluent in Spanish. Prior to this excerpt, Sam’s mother asks him to appraise his Spanish with consideration to the context of speaking with his grandparents as well as his aunt and uncle. He responds by down-scaling his fluency in Spanish by comparing it to his fluency in English with “not as fluently as.” Sam uses another down-scaled comparative

structure to reiterate his persisting lack of fluency then signals a new circumstance with “but” as seen in the following excerpt.

Excerpt 5.25

F68. S	so, so	still	not	quite	as	fluent	but	I	do	believe	
Exp:							Circ.			Mental (cog proj)	
Modality:		Usuality								Probability	
Appraisal:				Grad (dwn)		Appre (+)			Grad (up)		
F69. S	I'm	less	fluent	with	you	in	Spanish				
Exp:	Relat (int)				Circ.		Circ.				
Appraisal:		Grad (dwn)	Appre (+)								
F70. S	just	because-	even	though	in	English	I	can	speak	to	you
Exp:		Circ				Circ.			Behavioral	Circ.	
Appraisal:	Grad (up)										
	as	fluently	as	I	can	anyone	else	now			
Exp:								Circ.			
Modality:						Potential					
Appraisal:	Grad (up)	Appre (+)				Grad (max)					
F71. IR	ahora	si	mhm								
Exp:	Circ.										
		<i>now, yes.</i>									

In this circumstance, he uses an up-scaled mental projection to assign himself the comparative Attribute “less fluent” in an intensive relational clause construction. This down-scaled positive appreciation is made in regard to the circumstances “with you in Spanish,” which brings to light Ingrid’s role in Sam’s lack of fluency. This is particularly problematic since Ingrid is the only person Sam attempts speaking Spanish with. He places his ability to be fluent with his mother in the present with “now.” This conveys that fluency with his mother was once an issue but is not currently. In line F71, his mother marks that her agreement with his statement is contingent upon the temporal circumstance “ahora” (now), which is followed by affirmative “si” (yes). Sam circles back the topic of not being as fluent while speaking Spanish with his mother and estimates why this is the case.

Excerpt 5.26

F73. S	right	but	I	guess	because	it's	the	other	language	
Exp:		Circ.	Mental (cog proj)		Circ.	Relat (int)				
Modality:			Probability							
F74-75. S	um	I-	the	effect	of	you	being	the	authority	figure
Exp:					Circ.		Relat (int)			
	still-	still	is	there						
Exp:			Existential							
Modality:		Usuality								
F76. S	because	I	haven't	practiced	with	that	language	so		
Exp:	Circ.		NEG	Material	Circ.					

He starts his turn with “right” in line F73, which signals that he agrees with his mother’s contingent agreement. Sam marks a shift in topic with “but” then follows it with a mental projection structure. Here, “I guess” not only indicates an upcoming projection but also serves as an expression of Sam’s uncertainty in what he is about to say. The projected information is a circumstance of cause that is presented as a relational clause construction in which “it” (reference to Spanish) is assigned the Value “the other language.” With this circumstance on the table, Sam speaks to the persistence of Ingrid’s role as the authority figure through his use of “still.” In line F76, Sam states that this is “because” he has not “practiced with that language.” The material process “practiced” is negated conveying that he has not attempted to work on this issue in Spanish. His inclusion of the circumstantial matter “with that language” implies that he has in fact practiced in English. This speaks to the fact that the fluency issues with his mother was once a characteristic of his stuttering across languages but is now limited to the language of Spanish, which Sam attributes to his lack of practice working through this issue in the context of Spanish. Thus, Sam is in a double bind attributed to his lack of linguistic fluency in Spanish, but also the highly language specific fluency techniques that he has not be able to transfer to Spanish.

Ingrid: Hablando (speaking) Spanglish. In the following excerpt, Sam’s mother responds to his question about his degree of fluency in Spanish when he was “very young.” She discusses his tendency to combine words from both English and Spanish by using the term “Spanglish,” which inherently carries negative appraisal. This leads Sam to theorize about his purpose for doing this.

Excerpt 5.27

F84. IR	cuando	chiquito	cuando	tu	hablabas	español	tú	no	decías	
Exp:	Circ		Circ		Verbal			NEG	Behavioral	
Modality:					Usuality				Usuality	
	<i>when you were small when you would speak Spanish you wouldn't say</i>									
	frases	enteras	en	español						
Exp:			Circ.							
Appraisal:		Grad (up)								
	<i>whole sentences in Spanish</i>									
F85-86. IR	tu combinaste	el inglés	y	el español	juntos	como el Spanglish	como	dicen		
Exp:		Material							Verbal	
Appraisal:								Appre (-)		
	<i>you combined English and Spanish together like "Spanglish" as they say</i>									
F87. IR	entonces	eso	difícil	de um-	de	evaluar	porque	ca-		
Exp:					Circ.	Material	Circ.			
Appraisal:			Appre (-)							
	<i>then that difficult to um to evaluate because ca-</i>									
F88. IR	nunca	decías	frases	enteras	en español					
Exp:		Behavioral			Circ					
Modality:	NEG	Usuality								
Appraisal:	Grad (max)			Grad (up)						
	<i>you would never say whole phrases in Spanish</i>									
F89. IR	y de	vez	en	cuando	claro	con	inglés-			
Exp:						Circ.				
Modality:		Usuality		Obligation						
	<i>and every now and then of course with English</i>									
F90. IR	y	era	lo mismo	igual	hiciste	stuttering	hablando	Spanglish	que	
Exp:		Relat (int)				Behavioral		Circ.	Circ.	
Appraisal:				Grad (up)				Appre (-)		
	<i>and it was the same thing the same way you did stuttering speaking Spanglish as</i>									
F91. IR	cuando	era	inglés	solamente	entonces	era	igual			
Exp:		Relat (int)				Relat (int)				
Appraisal:				Grad (max)			Appre (neu)			
	<i>when it was only English so then it was the same</i>									

After gathering her thoughts in lines F82 and F83, Sam's mother responds to Sam's question by repeating the circumstances he specifically requested information about: "cuando chiquito" (when you were little) and "cuando tu hablabas español" (when you would speak Spanish). The latter circumstance conveys that she is speaking in reference to what would usually happen when he spoke Spanish. In line F85, she assigns the role of Actor to Sam in the process of speaking "Spanglish." His mother then sets parameters for this negative appreciation by adding the circumstantial matter "de evaluar." She begins to structure her reason for making this circumstantial appraisal with "porque" but abandons the structure to reiterate her statement in line F84 about the usuality of Sam's behavior. This time, however, she uses the maximally up-scaled negation, "nunca," to comment on the usuality of the behavior. She down-scales usuality he would do this "con ingles." She inserts "claro" which conveys a high-degree of obligation for bringing up English as a circumstance considering the fact that it is his dominant language.

His mother then uses an intensive relational clause to assign the comparative Attribute "lo mismo" to the implied Carrier topic "English and Spanish." She up-scales this comparison by following this Attribute with "igual" which conveys a greater amount of similarity. His mother then draws a comparison between his stuttering when "hablando Spanglish" with his use of "ingles solamente." In this circumstance, she uses a relational clause construction to assign the Attribute "igual" which is neutral in terms of appraisal. In the continuation of this excerpt, Sam uses the information provided by his mother as a basis for his theory about using "Spanglish" as a child.

Excerpt 5.28

F92. S	I	see-	so	I	am	theorizing	that			
Exp:	Mental (cog)			Mental (cog proj)						
Modality:						Probability				
F93. S	I	may	have	used	a combination	of	the	languages	to-	
Exp:				Material						
Modality:	Probability									
F94. S	in	many	cases-	find	words	that	were	easier	to say	
Exp:	Circ			Material			Relat (int)		Verbal	
Modality:	Usuality									
Appraisal:	Grad (up)							Appre (+)		
F95. S	and	I	had	two	languages	to choose	from			
Exp:			Relat (pos)			Material				
F96. S	so	that	could	be	a	form	of	covert	stuttering	
Exp:	Circ.			Relat (int)						
Modality:			Probability							
	that	I	was	doing	even	that	young			
Exp:				Material	Circ.					
Appraisal:				Grad (up)						

Sam begins his turn with a mental process of cognition to convey his understanding of his mother’s explanation. He prefaces the next clause with “so” to indicate that the following mental projection is based on this understanding, but also implying a degree of uncertainty. The projection is structured as a material process which is also expressed with a great deal of uncertainty, which is appropriate since Sam is hypothesizing about his participation in this process based on his mother’s comments and not his own memory. He begins to posit a possible purpose for this with “to” but abandons this structure to insert the circumstance “in many cases” where the up-scaling element “many” suggests usuality. Overall, this construction reveals Sam’s identification of code-mixing as a tool that he used to prevent stuttering moments in the past. This contrasts with his mother’s reference to what he did as “Spanglish,” which is typically thought of as communication process that is used by those who are not proficient in one of the two languages.

Sam picks up his abandoned structure at the end of line F92 by following the circumstance with the material process “find.” Unlike processes such as “choose” and “select,” for example, his use of “find” implies a degree of uncertainty. The Goal, “words,” is further explicated in the next relational clause construction where it is assigned the Attribute “easier to say,” which also functions as a positive appraisal. The purpose of his use of an adjective with a comparative element is revealed in the following clause, where Sam places himself in the role of Possessor of “two languages to choose from.”

Sam then posits another theory in line F96. Through his use of a relational clause construction, he assigns the Carrier “that” (reference to combining languages) the Attribute “a form of covert stuttering.” He conveys uncertainty in this attribution by using the auxiliary verb “could” in conjunction with the process “be.” Here, “covert stuttering” is presented as new information through Sam’s use of a predicated Theme construction. By definition, covert stuttering refers to a situation where a person who stutters avoids certain words or sounds to prevent stuttering and therefore, hides it. Sam adds the circumstance “that young” which is marked with a high degree of significance through his use of “even.” He also up-scales how young he was with “that.” His juxtaposition of his young age with this technical term may serve to highlight the fact that he did not know that there was an actual name for what he was doing.

In summary, Sam asks his mother to recall his fluency in Spanish. She finds it difficult to answer this question directly because it was typical for him to combine “el inglés y el español juntos” thereby producing what she referred to as “Spanglish.” She is able to comment on his fluency, when “hablando Spanglish” and “cuando era inglés solamente” at the end of her turn. However, Sam picks up the topic of combining languages for the duration of his turn. Based on the information his mother gave him, he theorizes that he combined the languages in an effort to

select words that were “easier to say.” This, he attributes as a possible “form of covert stuttering,” which he marks as significant considering how young he was at the time.

Ingrid: Mas fluency en inglés. Sam asks his mother to consider whether or not there were times in which he was “fluent in one language but not the other” in line F236. She initially responds with “pues estoy pensando” (I am thinking) to indicate that she has to jog her memory to answer Sam accurately.

Excerpt 5.29

F236. S	do	you	think	there	were	times	where	I	was	fluent	
Exp:			Mental (cog proj)		Existential				Realt (int)		
Modality:			Probability								
	in	one	language	but	not	the	other?				
Exp:	Circ.			Circ.							
F237. IR	pues	estoy	pensando								
Exp:			Mental (cog)								
			<i>so I'm thinking</i>								
F238. IR	yo	creo	que	eras	mas-	fuiste	mas	fluency			
Exp:		Mental (cog proj)		Relat (int)		Relat (int)					
Modality:		Probability									
Appraisal:					Grad (up)		Grad (up)				
			<i>I believe that you were more you were more fluency</i>								
	en	inglés	que	en	español						
Exp:	Circ.			Circ.							
		<i>in English than in Spanish</i>									
F239. IR	pero	no	sabemos	si	era	porque	no	tenías	la	practica	
Exp:	Circ.	NEG	Mental (cog)	Circ.	Relat (circ)	Circ.	NEG	Relat (pos)			
Modality:			Probability					Usuality			
			<i>but we don't know if it was because you didn't have practice</i>								

She structures her response to his question as a mental projection in line F238 where her use of the optional pronoun “yo” (I) strengthens the inherently subjective nature of the construction as does the process “creo” (think). Ingrid abandons the first clause of the projection where Sam was cast as Carrier and restarts with a relational construction in which she positively appraises Sam’s participation in “fuiste” (were). This statement is made in comparison to his

fluency “en español.” Ingrid’s abandonment of the first structure indicates her preference to avoid directly appraising Sam as an individual with the static verb “eras” by appraising the manner in which he participated in the process with “fuiste” instead.

Ingrid then counters her previous statement with “no sabemos” (we don’t know) where “we” is assigned the role of Senser which works to include another participant in the process of speculating the probable cause of his situation. She follows this with a relational clause of circumstance to attribute his lack of fluency in Spanish to “no tenías la practica” (you didn’t have the practice). In this construction, Sam is assigned himself the role of Possessor which effectively places the focus on Sam’s lack of practice as a Possession rather than as an unaccomplished process. She then places him in the role of Actor of the negated material process in F240, which contrasts with the previous line in that Ingrid is now attributing Sam’s lack of practice to him. The imperfect tense of “no practicabas” (you didn’t practice) also conveys that it was typical for Sam not to practice “mucho en español.” His mother then makes a statement in regard to her role in his practicing Spanish as seen the continuation of her turn.

In Excerpt 5.30, Ingrid recognizes the difficulty Sam has maintaining fluency with her through her use of the circumstance of accompaniment “a mí” (to me) in line F243. As mentioned in the previous section, a past characteristic of Sam’s stuttering was his inability to speak fluently to his mother due to the effects of her role as “the authority figure.” While this is no longer a characteristic of his stuttering in English, he stated earlier that it was still the case in Spanish. Therefore, the way she structures this in line F243 conveys that she is in alignment with Sam’s assertion.

Excerpt 5.30

F240. IR	tu	no practicabas	mucho	en español y				
Exp:		NEG	Material					
Modality:		NEG	Usuality					
Appraisal:		NEG		Grad (up)				
	<i>you didn't practice much in Spanish and</i>							
	yo	no	te	iba	a	empujar	para	español
Exp:						Material		
Modality:		NEG		Probability				
	<i>I wasn't going to push you for Spanish</i>							
F242. IR	si porque	noté	que	era	un	poco	mas	difícil
Exp:	Circ.	Mental (per. proj.)		Relat (int)				
Appraisal:						Grad (dwn)	Grad (up)	
	<i>it's because I noticed that it was a little more difficult</i>							
	para	ti	en español					
Exp:	Circ.		Circ.					
	<i>for you in Spanish</i>							
E243. IR	también	podría	ser	porque	me	estabas	hablando	a mí
Exp:			Relat (circ)	Circ.		Behavioral		Circ.
Modality:		Potential						
	<i>it could also be because you were speaking to me</i>							

Chapter 6:

Neil

This chapter presents the results of the analyses of Neil's talk, which was collected during a conversation with his sister and an ethnographic interview with the researcher.

Neil was asked to record a conversation about his stuttering with a family member. He selected his older sister, Verena, as a conversational partner. The recording lasted approximately 15 minutes and 38 seconds. Both Neil and Verena chose to speak English throughout their conversation. The general field of this interaction was centered on Neil's stuttering, though the details of it were chosen by the dyad on a turn by turn basis. In regard to tenor, Neil assumes the role of "information giver." His sister moved out of the family household prior to the onset of Neil's stuttering and therefore did not have much exposure to it. This is evident in the status relation of the dyad, where Neil serves as the "expert" on the topic of stuttering. Verena primarily contributes to the conversation by asking questions to clarify, confirm, rebound, and probe, which also indicates her lack of exposure to his stuttering.

The ethnographic interview was conducted after the researcher listened to the recording of Neil's conversation with his sister. The interview, which is approximately 57 minutes and 23 seconds long, was conducted in English. The tenor of this interview was similar to that of the family conversation, where Neil assumed the role of "expert" of his own stuttering. The researcher participated primarily by asking questions.

Results from both contexts are presented in the following sections due to the similarities in the topics Neil selects.

Table 18

Quantitative overview of Neil’s function and frequency of use of the keywords “stutter,” “fluency,” “cycle,” and their variants in both contexts

Function	Frequency	
“Stutter”	80	
Behavior	32	40%
Circumstance	22	27.5%
Grammatical metaphor	11	13.75%
Attribute	7	8.75%
Actor	2	2.5%
Scope	2	2.5%
Carrier	2	2.5%
Phenomenon	1	1.25%
Descriptor	1	1.25%
“Fluency”	16	
Appraisal item	5	31.25%
Circumstance	5	31.25%
Possession	4	25%
Phenomenon	1	6.25%
Carrier	1	6.25%
“Cycle”	7	
Circumstance	5	71.42%
Possession	1	14.28%
Phenomenon	1	14.28%

Results from the quantitative analysis revealed that Neil primarily uses the word “stutter” and its variants as a behavioral process (40%). His placement of this keyword in the role Actor conveys that the stuttering itself is an active participant in its own occurrence. The keyword “fluency” and its variants largely served as an appraisal item and circumstantial matter in Neil’s talk. It also surfaced as a trait that he possessed in 25% of its occurrences. By structuring it as a Phenomenon, Neil conveys that fluency is something that comes upon him rather than something he triggers himself. Neil frequently discussed the cyclical nature of his stuttering and used the keyword “cycle” primarily as a circumstance of location (71.42%). His use of the “cycle” keyword was typically paired with the appraisal item “down” signifying the part of his cycle in which he stuttered frequently.

SECTION 1: Descriptions of Stuttering

The following collection of excerpts represents Neil’s description of his stuttering. He uses the Appraisal system to express both negative appreciation and affect that is triggered by his stuttering. Neil also describes his stuttering in terms of physical concomitants. He speaks to how the “cyclical” nature of his stuttering makes his experience different from the experiences had by other people who stutter.

Emotional Characteristics.

Terrifying. Neil brings up the topic of silent blocks in his narrative with both the researcher, as well as with his sister. In this excerpt, which was extracted from his ethnographic interview, Neil describes his first silent block. While the experiential configuration of the first clause indicates that he was an Actor in the process, the following clause relaying his negative appreciation of it reveals that his participation came as a surprise.

Excerpt 6.1

E70. N	and	I	just	went	into	a silent	block
Exp:				Material	Circ.		
Appraisal:			Grad (up)				
	and	that	was	absolutely terrifying			
Exp:			Relat (int)				
Appraisal:				Grad (max)	Appre (-)		

Panic. The following excerpt illustrates the way Neil contextualizes the process of being “panicked” relative to his first silent block experience.

Excerpt 6.2

E74. N	and	I	can remember	that	block	happened	early	on		
Exp:			Mental (cog)			Material	Circ.			
Modality:			Potential							
	in	the	shift							
Exp:	Circ.									
E75. N	and	I	just	went back	into	the	office	and	just	put
Exp:				Material	Circ.					Material
Appraisal:			Grad (up)						Grad (up)	
	the	phone	ringer	on	very	low				
Exp:				Circ.						
Appraisal:					Grad (up)					
	and	I	did not	touch	the phone	for	the	rest	of the	shift
Exp:			NEG	Material		Circ.			Circ.	
E76. N	and	I	was	so	panicked	I	think	I	ended up	
Exp:			Relat (int)				Mental (cog. proj.)		Material	
Modality:							Probability			
Appraisal:				Grad (up)	Affect (-)					
	the	next day	quitting	I	just-					
Exp:			Material							
E77. N	up to	that point	I	was	having	more	blocks	where	I	would go
Exp:	Circ.				Relat (pos)			Circ.		
Modality:										Usuality
Appraisal:						Grad (up)				
	to say	the	schpeel							
Exp:	Behavioral									
	but	I	could substitute	a word	to facilitate	saying	it			
Exp:	Circ.			Behavioral		Behavioral				
Modality:			Potential							

Here, Neil builds up the emotional effect of his first silent block by first contextualizing the experience with a series of circumstantial clauses, which is indicative of the vivid and lasting memory he has of this particular experience. In the opening mental projection, he places “that block” in the role of Medium, conveying that the block manifested itself; however, no external Agents or triggers of its happening were identified. He uses graduation to up-scale the significance of the processes he partook in after the block occurred, which reveals the fact that he

abandoned his job requirements for the rest of his shift. This suggests that the feelings caused by the block were stronger than the fear of the consequences he might suffer for not doing his job.

He then uses a relational construction that not only expresses negative affect, but also implies that his state of panic was caused by another entity, which can be inferred as the silent block and was out of his control. He instantiates the Appraisal system to up-scale the degree of panic then qualifies it through his use of the process “ended up.” The downranking of “quitting” relative to “end up” foregrounds the fact that quitting happened as a result of the panic. His inclusion of the circumstance “the next day” speaks to the impulsivity behind this decision he made.

He closes the topic by explaining why this block was more significant than the others he had experienced in the past. Structurally speaking, Neil configures these other blocks as something he possesses, which stands in contrast with the block that took an active role in “happening” while he was at work. Therefore, Neil reveals that there was a shift in terms of his participation in the occurrence of blocks, where the one he is describing owned so much of the participant role that its happening took Neil by surprise in such a way that it caused negative emotions.

Frustrating. This next excerpt represents Neil’s talk about the feelings his stuttering triggered initially. While he also uses descriptors like “scary” and “stressful,” he describes it as being “frustrating” twice within the excerpt.

Excerpt 6.3

E248. N	in	the	beginning	it	was	very	frustrating		
Exp:	Circ.				Relat (int)				
Appraisal:						Grad (up)	Appre (-)		
E249. N	I	would	say	that	word's	the	best	description	more than
Exp:			Verbal		Relat (int)				
Modality:		Probability							
Appraisal:							Grad (up)		Grad (up)
	anything								
Appraisal:	Grad (max)								
E250. N	it	was	you	know	scary	at times...	stressful		
Exp:		Relat (int)							
Modality:						Usuality			
Appraisal:			Grad (dwn)		Appre (-)		Appre (-)		
E252. N	but	in	the	beginning	it	was	very	frustrating	
Exp:		Circ.				Relat (int)			
Appraisal:							Grad (up)	Appre (-)	
E253. N	and	then	once	you	identify	it			
Exp:		Circ.			Mental (cog)				
E254. N	and	you	have	struggles	in	the profesional	environment	then it	
Exp:			Relat (pos)		Circ.			Circ.	
Appraisal:				Appre (-)					
	gets	more	stressful						
Exp:	Relat (int)								
Modality:		Grad(up)	Appre (-)						

Neil starts this portion of talk with a circumstance of time, signifying that the following information he is about to give is in reference to the onset of his stuttering. With this timeframe established, he deploys a series of relational clause constructions that allows him to assign negative Attributes to his stuttering. Further examination of these Attributes under the system of Appraisal reveals that not only did he negatively appreciate his stuttering at the time of onset, but he experienced negative affect because of it. Interestingly, Neil includes “identifying it” as a factor that intensifies the stress he attributes to stuttering. This suggests that having a diagnosis

possibly made him self-conscious and therefore contributed to the increase in stress he experienced after that point.

What can be gleaned from this excerpt, overall, is that Neil structures his negative appraisals and emotions during a specific timeframe, which coincides with the onset of his stuttering.

Exhausted. The following excerpt shows how Neil uses a familiar activity, going to a restaurant, as a basis for the causal role stuttering has in his feelings of exhaustion.

Excerpt 6.4

E270. N	sometimes going	into a restaurant	ordering	a sandwich	can	really	be	an ordeal		
Exp:	Material	Circ.	Material				Relat (int)			
Modailty:	Usuality				Potential	Probability				
Appraisal:								Appre (-)		
E271. N	so	life	is	stressful	enough-	so	if	you	have to	put
Exp:			Relat (int)							Material
Modailty:						Probability		Obligation		
Appraisal:			Appre (-)	Grad (up)						
	all	that	energy	into something	so	minute				
Exp:			Circ.							
Appraisal:	Grad (up)				Grad (up)	Appre (-)				
	then	it	can	just	make	you	feel	exhausted		
Exp:	Circ.				Material		Mental (emo)			
Modailty:			Potential							
Appraisal:			Grad (dwn)					Affect (-)		
E272. N	you	not only	feel	the	mental	strain	you	feel	the	physical
Exp:			Mental (per)					Mental (per)		
Appraisal:		NEG Grad (max)				Appre (-)				
	strain									
Appraisal:	Appre (-)									

In line E270, Neil shares his negative appreciation of ordering food in a restaurant. He structures this appraisal as the Rheme of the clause, which highlights its importance as a new piece of information. His selection of this commonplace activity allows him to bring into focus the extent at which stuttering affects his life. Saying that public speaking is “an ordeal” would not be as significant because even those who do not stutter appraise this circumstance negatively

as well. Something as familiar as ordering food at a restaurant, however, is typically not troublesome for others and thus makes his negative attribution stand out. His use of the textual Theme “so” in line E271 indicates that his talk is a continuation of this topic, whereby which he expresses the negative implications for putting a significant amount of energy into “something” so insignificant. This serves as a comment about the amount of effort Neil is required to put into maintaining fluency in certain situations.

The condition of putting “energy into something so minute” is then placed in the role of Theme as referenced by “it.” Here, the conditional circumstance takes on an agentive role in causing “you” to feel exhausted. However, Neil’s use of the textual Theme “then” just prior to this conveys the fact that these feelings of exhaustion are contingent upon the amount of effort put into avoiding stuttering. He characterizes this exhaustion as an internal aspect of his stuttering experience through his use of a mental perceptive clause construction. This structure configures the strain inherent to this exhaustion as sensations he perceives both mentally and physically.

Self-conscious. The following excerpt was taken from Neil’s conversation with his sister, Verena. After mentioning that confidence helps him maintain eye contact in line F122, his sister asks him to elaborate on this statement. Here, he is responding to his sister with an explanation about why it is hard for people who stutter, in general, to maintain eye contact during a stuttering moment.

Excerpt 6.5

F125. V	it's	hard	for	you?				
Exp:	Relat (int)		Circ.					
Appraisal:		Appre (-)						
F126. N	well	if	you're	stuttering	it's	hard to	maintain	eye contact
Exp:				Behavioral	Relat (int)		Behavioral	
Modality:		Probability						
Appraisal:						Appre (-)		
F127. V	cause	why?						
F128. N	because	you	get	self-conscious				
Exp:	Circ.		Relat (int)					
Appraisal:				Affect (-)				
F129. N	and	if	you	think	of	a fluent speaker	just	
Exp:				Mental (circ)				
Modality:		Probability						
Appraisal:						Appre (+)	Grad (up)	
	a normal	speaker	they	don't	talk	like	that	
Exp:				NEG	Behavioral			
Appraisal:	Judg (+)							
F130. N	but	if	you	talk	to	a stutterer	you'll	notice
Exp:	Circ.			Behavioral				Mental (per)
Modality:		Probability					Probability	
	they	do	that	because	they	are	self-conscious	
Exp:		Material		Circ.		Relat (int)		
Appraisal:							Affect (-)	
F131. N	and	when	you	do	that	you	lose	focus
Exp:		Circ.		Material			NEG	Mental (per)
	of what-	your	idea	of what	you're	trying	to say	
Exp:				Circ.			Verbal	
Modality:						Inclination		
F132. N	so	that	exacerbates	your	stuttering	as well		
Exp:			Material			Circ.		
Appraisal:			Appre (-)					

Verena reveals a lack of understanding in regard to the significance of Neil's being able to maintain eye contact. This is made apparent by the interrogative intonation she uses to deliver the clause "it's hard for you?" Neil responds by using universal "you," thus making the issue one that is global rather than one that is specific to him. Before qualifying her attribution, he uses a circumstantial contingency to specify what makes maintaining eye contact "hard." She asks him to elaborate further in line F127 with "cause why?" Neil then reveals that the underlying reason is "You get self conscious." Again, universal "you" is the primary participant, which reiterates the message that this is something that happens to people other than him.

Neil shifts to a teaching role as seen in lines F129 and F130, where he supports his assertion by comparing a "fluent speaker" to a "stutterer." He first says "fluent speaker" then adjusts his reference to something his sister might understand better: "just a normal speaker." This also suggests that he feels justified in equating "normal" with "fluent" and indicates that he considers difficulty in maintaining eye contact as a characteristic of PWS. In line F130, Neil's placement of "they" in the roles of Actor and Behavior is a means to position himself as an outsider in relation to his own condition. This reinforces his role as "teacher" in the dyad. Neil then goes on to construe the components of the vicious cycle that "exacerbates" stuttering. Throughout this description, Neil never references himself directly as an active Agent, which expresses his lack of control over the cycle.

Physical Concomitants.

Phone. A recurring topic throughout both of Neil's narratives is the closing of his eyes during stuttering moments. In this excerpt, Neil provides the specific circumstances in which this physical aspect of his stuttering occurs.

The first of these circumstances is being “on the telephone” and going “into a block.” The structure of this conjunction gives some insight into Neil’s role in his blocks. Here, “I” operates as Medium in that the combination of the process and circumstance “go into a block” implies that a block is something that Neil is passively a part of. In other words, he is involved only as the being in which this happening occurs. He prefaces his next clause with a circumstance of contingency “if it’s a business-related call.” He follows this with a relational clause of possession, where he is the Possessor of “a tendency” to really close his eyes hard. His inclusion of “hard” works to up-scale the vigor of this behavior and also adds an affective element to this description, conveying that he feels some tension and distress in these moments. If he were to exclude “hard,” the closing of his eyes could have been interpreted as a relaxation technique, for example.

Excerpt 6.6

E291. N	when	I'm	on the telephone		and	I	go	into a block
Exp:	Circ.		Circ.				Material	Circ.
	or	if	it's	a business-related		call		
Exp:			Relat (int)					
Modality:		Probability						
	I	have	a	tendency	to	really	close	
Exp:		Relat (pos)					Material	
Modality:				Usuality				
Appraisal:						Grad (up)		
	my eyes	hard	like that					
Appraisal:		Appre (-)						

Sensing a difficult day. Neil can physically sense when he is going to have a “difficult day” in regard to his speech. The following excerpt illustrates the ways he describes these sensations and provides the circumstances in which they occur.

Excerpt 6.7

E428. N	there's	a	mental	pressure	or	tension	that	you	feel
Exp:	Existential								Mental (per)
Appraisal:				Appre (-)		Appre(-)			
	where-	when	you	wake up	you	feel	this	mental	pressure
Exp:		Circ.		Behavioral		Mental (per)			
Appraisal:									Appre (-)
E430. N	and	you	know	"I'm	going to	have	a difficult	day with	speech"
Exp:		Mental (cog. proj.)				Relat (pos)			
Modality:					Probability				
Appraisal:							Appre (-)		
	very	subtle							
Appraisal:	Grad (up)								
E432. N	and	it	doesn't	really	happen	I	can't say	it	always
Exp:			NEG		Material		NEG Verbal		
Modality:				Probability			NEG		Usuality
	happens	when	you know	I	had	a stressful day or two			
Exp:	Material	Circ.			Relat (pos)				
Appraisal:						Appre (-)			
E433. N	it	just	seems	to happen	so um	yeah			
Exp:			Relat (int)						
Modality:			Probability						
Appraisal:		Grad (dwn)							

Neil opens this description with an existential clause conveying the existence of “mental pressure,” which he rephrases with the physical term “tension.” Universal “you” is assigned the role of Senser in the mental perceptive process of feeling the tension, allowing Neil to talk about this Phenomenon in a global sense. By situating this sensation at the time of when he wakes, Neil conveys that his stuttering is something he becomes aware of before he has even spoken or partaken in any activities for the day. His use of a mental projection serves as a means to express his belief that these sensations foreshadow a high-degree of probability in the occurrence of his stuttering. He then refers to this sensation as “very subtle,” which suggests that this tension he

feels in the morning is not something that is easily detected. Therefore, it may have been something Neil did not sense when he first started stuttering due to his lack of experience with it.

Neil then speaks to the unpredictability of the occurrence of this sensation. He forms a tight referential chain whereby he uses “it” to maintain the sensation’s role as Theme. Its happening, then, is what is of importance as conveyed by its placement in the Rheme of the clause. In terms of experiential configuration, the sensation is placed in the role of Actor. He posits his having “a stressful day or two” as an example of a concrete cause and effect relationship; however, it is one he is unable to relate to his situation. Therefore, Neil does not assign agency to any outside entities nor himself. Because Neil has been unable to identify a cause, he views occurrence of these sensations as random happenings.

Physical sensations. Excerpt 6.8 illustrates how Neil describes to the researcher the physical sensations that accompany his stuttering. Here, Neil sets juxtaposition between himself as an Actor with “I’m managing” and then his body taking over. He then characterizes his stuttering moments in terms of biological processes and anatomical structures, some of which he does not have control over. For instance, “my diaphragm” and “my eyes” are assigned the role of Actor, which flags them as participants in the physiological response he has during stuttering moments.

When discussing his diaphragm, Neil’s use of the word “tight” not only conveys his negative appreciation of the action, but also suggests that he experiences tension in the affective sense. In line E438, Neil intensifies his previous statement about breathing in line E436. Rather than the breathing being “all off,” it has completely stopped in this case. Whereas, “your breathing” served as Medium, Neil is now the Behaver who actively participates in the process “stop breathing.”

Excerpt 6.8

E434. N	physically	I	feel	that	when	I'm	in a	moment
Exp:			Mental (per)			Relat (circ)	Circ.	
	where	I'm	managing my speech	very	poorly			
Exp:	Circ.		Behavioral					
Appraisal:					Grad (up)	Appre (-)		
	it's	you know	very	easy	to feel	it		
Exp:	Relat (int)				Mental (per)			
Appraisal:			Grad (up)	Appre (+)				
E436. N	your	breathing	will be	all	off			
Exp:			Relat (int)					
Modality:			Usuality					
Appraisal:				Grad (up)	Appre(-)			
E437. N	your diaphragm-	my diaphragm	gets	really	tight			
Exp:				Relat (int)				
Modality:					Grad(up)			
Appraisal:						Appre (-)		
E438. N	I	stop breathing						
Exp:		NEG Behavioral						
E439. N	my eyes	will close						
Exp:		Material						
Modality:		Usuality						
E440. N	you know-	I'll	start	to sweat	um			
Exp:				Behavioral				
Modality:		Usuality						
Appraisal:	Grad (dwn)			Affect (-)				

He places the anatomical structure, “my eyes,” in the foreground of the material process of closing, which expresses his lack of control in the process. He brings himself back into the picture by marking himself as a participant in the process of sweating. Since sweating is a visceral reaction that can occur in moments of emotional distress, it serves as another instance in which Neil has no control over his body’s reaction to stuttering. Neil’s positing this as an example also serves to express the negative affect underlying this process.

Silent block. This excerpt was taken from a portion of Neil’s conversation with his sister during his description of the early manifestation of his stuttering, which he now recognizes as “silent bocks.” He constructs the physical aspects of his silent blocks in the following lines.

Excerpt 6.9

F25. N	but	before	I completely		had	a block	where	
Exp:	Circ.	Circ.			Relat (pos)		Circ.	
Modality:								
Appraisal:				Grad (max)				
	I	couldn't	say	one	word-			
Exp:		NEG	Behavioral					
Modality:		NEG Potential						
Appraisal:				Grad (up)				
F26. N	I	would	start	to have	instances	where	there	were
Exp:				Relat (pos)		Circ.		Existential
Modality:		Usuality						
	words	I	couldn't	say	for	whatever	reason	
Exp:			NEG	Verbal	Circ.			
Modality:			NEG Potential					
F27. N	I	would	have	what's	called	"a	silent	block"
Exp:			Relat (pos)	Relat (int)	Verbal			
Modality:		Usuality						
	when	you	just	can't	get	any words	out	
Exp:	Circ.			NEG	Material			
Modality:				NEG Potential				
Appraisal:			Grad (up)	NEG		Grad (max)		
F28. N	just	your diaphragm		gets	really	tense		
Exp:				Relat (int)				
Appraisal:	Grad (up)				Grad (up)	Appre (-)		
F29. N	your	airflow	stops					
Exp:			Material					
F30. N	so	I	was	definitely	suffering	from	that	problem
Exp:					Material	Circ.		
Modality:				Probability				
Appraisal:				Grad (max)				Appre (-)
F31. N	that's	really	how	my	stuttering	manifested	itself	early on
Exp:	Relat (int)					Material		Circ.
Modality:		Usuality						

Neil initially configures “a block” as something he possesses. As seen in other excerpts from this conversation, Neil takes a teaching role by prefacing this with a relational construction. Here, Neil uses a passive verbal projection, which instantiates an objective stance. While this configuration is unmarked in terms of information, it is marked for voice, which signals to his sister that he is using a technical term. He adds circumstantial information about time as conveyed by the textual Theme “when.” By including the adverb “just,” he up-scales the significance of his inability to participate in the task of speaking, which expresses his perception of speaking as a task that should be simple. As seen in his previous constructions, he places entities and processes in the foreground rather than himself in lines F28 and F29, where the anatomical structure “your diaphragm” and the biological process “your airflow” are both in the role of Actor. He then uses these descriptions as a basis for his “suffering” in line F30, where he is back, front and center, as Behavior of a process that is essentially out of his control. This is very similar wording to the previous excerpt, indicating that he has established a narrative about experiencing silent blocks. In the following circumstantial clause of matter, he negatively appreciates the physical aspects of silent blocks by referring to them as “that problem.” In his continuing talk relative to this topic, “stuttering” is once again in the role of Actor. However, he includes a circumstance of time to limit these descriptions to a timeframe in the past, which is most likely around the onset of his stuttering.

Varying concomitants. At the end of their conversation, Neil tells his sister, Verena, how the manifestations of stuttering vary from person to person. He does so by describing the possible physical concomitants in the following excerpt:

Excerpt 6.10

F178. N	so	it	just	manifests	itself	differently	
Exp:				Material			
Appraisal:			Grad (up)				
F179. N	some	people	clench	their fists			
Exp:			Material				
Appraisal:	Grad (dwn)						
F180. N	their	arm	will	flap			
Exp:				Material			
Modality:			Usuality				
F181. N	I	mean	there's	crazy	variations of	stuttering	
Exp:			Existential			Circ.	
Appraisal:				Appre (-)			
F182. N	nobody	stutters	the	same	way		
Exp:	NEG	Behavioral					
Appraisal:	Grad (max)						

Neil marks “it” (reference to stuttering) as the topical Theme of his talk, which is centered on explicating the different ways it participates in the process of “manifesting itself.” He uses “some,” in line F179, to down-scale the number of people who “clench their fists.” Here, people are in the role of Actor and thus actively participating in the process. In the following line, “their arm” is the primary participant in the process “will flap.” With cases of neurological disorder aside, the flapping of an arm requires action from a person. Neil’s placement of “their arm” in the role of Actor implies that the arms of some PWS flap on their own accord. Neil uses an existential clause to support this statement by affirming the existence of “crazy variations of stuttering,” where the word “crazy” as an item of appraisal works to up-scale the various ways in which stuttering manifests itself. It is also indicative of Neil’s lack of knowledge (and bewilderment) of this. He closes the conversation with line F182 stating that “nobody stutters the

same way.” Using a negated, maximally graduated quantification of people, “Nobody,” Neil drives home the point that the characteristics of stuttering vary from person to person.

Cyclical Nature. Throughout his conversation with the researcher, Neil describes his speech as “cyclical” in that he experiences periods of fluency and disfluency for weeks at a time. The following excerpts illustrate how Neil elaborates on the characteristics of his cyclical speech, discusses the role of implementing fluency strategies, and uses the cycle as a point of contrast, when comparing his stuttering to the stuttering of others.

Excerpt 6.11

E9. N	I	think	I	mentioned	to	you	earlier	
Exp:	Mental (cog. proj.)			Verbal	Circ.		Circ.	
Modality:	Probability							
	that	my	speech	is	very	cyclical		
Exp:				Relat (int)				
Appraisal:					Grad (up)			
E10. N	so	there	will be	periods	like	now	where	I -
Exp:			Existential		Circ.		Circ.	
Modality:			Usuality					
	I	consider	this	to be	a very	fluent	period	for me
Exp:	Mental (cog)			Relat. (Int)				Circ.
Modality:	Probability							
Appraisal:					Grad (up)	Appre (+)		
E11. N	whereas	others	I	will be stuttering		eh-	every	three or
Exp:	Circ.			Behavioral				
Modality:				Usuality				
Appraisal:							Grad (up)	
	four	words	my	speech	is	very	labored	
Exp:					Relat (Int)			
Appraisal:						Grad (up)	Appre (-)	
E12. N	and it's-	it's	an	onus	it's	not	very	noticeable
Exp:		Relat (Int)			Relat (Int)			
Appraisal:				Appre (-)		NEG	Grad (up)	
	that	I	stutter					
Exp:			Behavioral					

Neil construes the cyclical nature of his stuttering into periods, where he cites his current level of fluency as an indicator of his being in a “fluent period.” His use of the verb “consider” in the relational clause construction speaks to the subjective element of this statement. This depiction of the fluent period differs from the following description of the disfluent period, where he has now placed himself in the active role of Behaver. He talks about this period in terms of usuality and frequency of the behavior of stuttering and assigns his speech the up-scaled Attribute “very labored.” Not only does this Attribute represent his negative appreciation of his speech, but it also sheds light on the amount of effort he puts into his speech during this time. Neil assigns the internal nature of his stuttering the negative Attribute, “onus.” Therefore, the fact that his struggling is not obvious to others is presented as a problem.

Excerpt 6.12 demonstrates how Neil structures the cyclical nature of his stuttering as a point of contrast, when comparing himself to other PWS. He begins by structuring a mental projection indicating that he is speaking from his personal perspective. The element of probability instantiated by this construction highlights the subjective nature of his message. The projected information is prefaced with the circumstantial contingency, “in my case,” which signals that the statement he is about to make is relevant only to his situation and therefore setting up a contrast with others who stutter. The primary feature conveying contrast, however, is that of modality. The frequency of others’ stuttering is described with maximum usuality “always,” whereas the frequency of his stuttering is the opposite, “cyclical.” He explicates this point further in line E277 by contrasting the variations in his own stuttering behavior by down-scaling frequency in one instance with “hardly” and up-scaling intensity in the other with “really.” He negatively appraises the cyclical nature of his stuttering with the cliché “an

emotional rollercoaster,” which has implications for the change in affect he experiences relative to the cycle.

Excerpt 6.12

E274. N	well	I	think	in	my	case	it's	a little	different	because
Exp:		Mental (cog. proj.)					Relat (int)			Circ.
Modality:		Probability								
Appraisal:								Grad (dwn)		
	it	is	cyclical							
Exp:		Relat (int)								
E275. N	whereas	with	other	stutterers	they're	always-	they	always	stutter	a lot
Exp:	Circ.	Circ.							Behavioral	
Modality:						Usuality		Usuality		
Appraisal:										Grad (up)
E276. N	they	always	stutter	a	small	amount				
Exp:			Behavioral							
Modality:		Usuality								
Appraisal:					Grad (dwn)					
E277. N	whereas	me	you	know	I'm	kind of	either	hardly	stuttering	or
Exp:	Circ.								Behavioral	
Appraisal:						Soften		Grad (dwn)		
	really	stuttering								
Exp:		Behavioral								
Appraisal:	Grad (up)									
E278. N	uh	and	it's-	that	can	be	a bit	of an emotional rollercoaster		
Exp:						Relat (int)				
Modality:					Potential					
Appraisal:							Grad (dwn)		Appre (-)	

SECTION 2: The Onset of Stuttering

A hallmark of Neil’s stuttering experience is his not knowing what it was in the early stages of its onset at the age of 19. In both conversations, Neil’s “not knowing” is a frequently recurring topic. The following excerpts show how this topic unfolds throughout his conversation with Verena, as well as with the researcher.

Noticing something in speech. When talking to his sister, Neil refers back to a time when he was working at a hotel in Syracuse. This reference is significant in that Neil

experienced his first “silent block” while working at this hotel. After setting up this reference through a series of circumstantial clauses in line F17, he uses a relational clause of circumstance to equate this setting with “when I knew.” This circumstance also functions to project the existential clause “obviously there was something wrong with my speech.” He conveys a high-degree of certainty in his statement by using the adverb “obviously.” The word “wrong” is a vague appraisal item, which invokes uncertainty as to exactly what was wrong.

Excerpt 6.13

F17. N	it's	like	when	I	was	working
Exp:	Relat (circ)		Circ.			Material
	at	that	hotel	back	in	Syracuse
Exp:	Circ.				Circ.	
F18. N	that's	when	I	knew	obviously	there
Exp:	Relat (circ)	Circ.		Mental (cog)		
Modality:					Probability	
	was	something	wrong	with	my	speech
Exp:	Existential			Circ.		
Appraisal:			Appre (-)			

As illustrated in Excerpt 6.14, Neil uses a similar construction when explaining this moment to the researcher.

Excerpt 6.14

E52. N	the	first time	I	noticed	something strange	in my	speech
Exp:				Mental (cog)			
Appraisal:					Appre (-)		
	I	didn't	know	it	was	stuttering	
Exp:		NEG	Mental (cog. proj.)		Relat (Int)		

In both instances, Neil uses negatively-charged items of appraisal, which are indicative of the unfamiliarity of what he was experiencing with his speech.

Neil brings up the topic again but attributes his difficulty to not being able to talk. In line E81, he uses “just” to down-scale the mental projection of what he “knew” which was “I couldn’t talk.” Here, Neil places himself in the role of Behaver. He instantiates the system of modality with the negated auxiliary verb “couldn’t.” By using this structure, Neil is able to assert a lack of potential to carry out the behavior on his part. He then uses an intensive relational clause in line E82, where he assigns “that” (reference to “I couldn’t talk) the Attribute of “my understanding.”

He uses identical constructions when talking to his sister about the same topic. Except with her, he includes the circumstance “on phones.”

Excerpt 6.15

F48. N	I	didn't	know	it	was	stuttering	at	that point
Exp:		NEG	Mental (cog)		Relat (int)		Circ.	
F49. N	I	just	knew	I	couldn't	speak	on phones	
Exp:			Mental (cog. proj.)		NEG	Behavioral	Circ.	
Modality:					NEG Potential			
Appraisal:		Grad (dwn)						
F50. N	that	was	my	understanding				
Exp:		Relat (int)						

This construes his knowledge as a recollection of concrete experiences and real-life consequences. It highlights the fact that all he was lacking at that point was a label for what he was experiencing.

The nature of silent blocks. In line E83, the researcher asks Neil if he held any theories about his speech before identifying it as stuttering. He responds by describing the characteristics of his speech during his time in Peru. His consistent use of the auxiliary verb “would” throughout this description instantiates the system of modality and thereby suggests the usuality in which these processes took place.

Excerpt 6.16

E88. N	there	were	a lot of	instances	down	there	where	I'd go	to
Exp:		Existential			Circ.				
Modality:								Usuality	
Appraisal:			Grad (up)						
	introduce	myself for example		I'd	just go	into a	silent	block	
Exp:	Material				Material	Circ.			
Modality:				Usuality					
Appraisal:					Grad (dwn)				
E89. N	I	wouldn't	be	able	to say	my name			
Exp:		NEG	Relat (int)		Verbal				
Modality:		NEG Usuality							
E90. N	I didn't-	I	didn't	yet	know	what	a silent	block	was
Exp:			NEG	Circ.	Mental (cog)				Relat (Int)
E91. N	I	didn't	know	about	stuttering	at that	point	but	
Exp:		NEG	Mental (cog)			Circ.		Circ.	
	I	can	remember	the	silent	blocks	were	very	frequent
Exp:			Mental (cog)				Relat (int)		
Modality:		Potential							Usuality
Appraisal:								Grad (up)	
E92. N	they	were	happening		on a	daily	basis		
Exp:			Material		Circ.				
Modality:						Usuality			
E93. N	again	I didn't	know	what	it	was	I	just	knew
Modality:		NEG	Mental (cog)			Relat (int)			Mental (cog)
Appraisal:								Grad (dwn)	
	there	were	certain	words	or sounds	that	I	couldn't	say
Exp:		Existential						NEG	Verbal
Modality:								NEG	Potential
Appraisal:			Grad (up)						

In line E88, Neil uses an experiential configuration, which is metaphorical in nature in that his participation in the process “go” construes the state of a silent block as a place he can enter into. This suggests that the blocks were pre-existing. In line E92, however, “they” (reference to the silent blocks) are assigned the role of Actor, which suggests that the blocks were the primary participants in their own “happening” in some instances. This has implications

for the potential randomness and uncontrollability of their occurrence. As seen in previous excerpts, Neil speaks to not knowing “what it is,” which indicates that he was looking for the Agent behind these experiences he was having. He then contrasts his lack of knowledge of “it” with the experiential knowledge that he does have, thereby suggesting that he could not make sense of the blocks at a more abstract level.

Attributing what it could be. Illustrated in Excerpt 6.17 is the way Neil talks about the steps he took in trying to figure out what was causing his speech problems. Here, he uses the time he quit his job at the hotel as a point of reference for when he began to accumulate experience with “the problem” and started to look into the topic of stuttering. In line E120, he places himself in the role of Possessor of “a few years under my belt of noticing the problem,” which intensifies the amount of experience he had with stuttering at that point. His use of the verb “noticing” implies that, while he acknowledged, it he did not take any action. Neil’s use of the word “problem” as a reference to his speech issue exposes his negative appraisal of them as well. His use of the verb “trying” in line E121 indicates he wanted “to attribute” what it could be, but was unsuccessful in doing so. Neil uses his experience with a doctor as evidence of his overall lack of success.

He begins retelling this experience with a verbal projection of what his general practitioner told him. This information is projected as a relational clause where “it” (reference to the possible cause) is assigned the Attribute “stress” as well as “anxiety.” Therefore, the doctor posited a possible cause, negative affect, but did not offer a diagnosis. Neil then uses a mental projection to down-scale the statement “I went to two doctors” in line E123. This down-scaling shows Neil’s low degree of commitment to this statement, which means he may not have actually seen two doctors. He states that he went to them “before” making a “self-diagnosis,”

which he presents as a reflexive construction. This conveys maximal agency on Neil's part and suggests that he partook in this process without the assistance of anyone else. By making a comment about his previous encounters with the doctor, Neil makes this act of "self-diagnosis" more acceptable in that even the socially-valued "second opinion" did not provide him with any answers.

In line E124, Neil prefaces his assertion with a circumstantial clause of frequency, where he uses "every time" to convey maximal usuality of the following scenario. He uses a relational clause of possession to indicate that during these visits to the doctor, he "would have fluency." Here, "would" operates to convey a high degree of usuality. Neil reiterates this in the following clause. This time, however, he describes fluency as something he would "experience" thereby placing himself in the role of Medium. Thus, his untimely fluent speech at the doctor's office was out of his control. Because Neil was experiencing fluency during these times, he states that the doctor could not hear nor gauge his speech problems.

In line E127, Neil uses a verbal projection to present the doctor's conclusions about his condition. His use of a relational clause construction conveys the doctor's belief that stress plays a role in the occurrence of Neil's speech problems. Neil reveals his lack of acceptance of the doctor's conclusions by using the non-specific words "this" and "that" when reiterating his orders. He then cites the lack of efficacy in the doctor's recommendations as the cause of his feelings of frustration in line E128. It was at this point that Neil says he started reading online and doing some research on stuttering. He presents his findings in the form of a mental projection where "silent blocks" is assigned the Attribute of "a form of stuttering."

After a long road of dealing with his unknown speech problem, Neil turned to the internet and diagnosed himself with stuttering after a few unsuccessful experiences with doctors.

Excerpt 6.17

E119. N	and	when	I	quit	the hotel	that's	when	I	
Exp:		Circ.		Material			Circ.		
	started	to look	into	stuttering					
Exp:	Material	Material	Circ.						
E120. N	I had-	up to	that point	of	quitting-	I	had	a few	
Exp:		Circ.		Circ.			Relat (pos)		
	years	under	my belt	of	noticing	the problem	speaking		
Exp:		Circ.		Circ.					
Appraisal:							Appre (-)		
E121. N	so I	was	just	trying to	attribute	what	it	could	be
Exp:				Material	Material				Relat (int)
Modality:								Potential	
Appraisal:			Grad (up)						
E122. N	I had	gone to	the	doctor-	my	general practitioner	and		
Exp:		Material							
	he	said	that	you	know-	it's	stress-	anxiety-	
Exp:		Verbal (proj)				Relat (int)			
Appraisal:							Affect (-)	Affect (-)	
	and	it	just	so	happened	I	think	I	went to
Exp:							Mental (cog. proj)		Material
	two	doctors	before	I	self-diagnosed	myself			
Exp:			Circ.		Material				
E124. N	so	happened	every	time	I	went	I	would	have
Exp:						Material			Relat (pos)
Modality:			Usuality						
Appraisal:			Grad (max)						
	fluency-	I	would	be experiencing	fluency				
Exp:				Mental (per)					
E125. N	so he	couldn't	really	hear it-	he	couldn't	gauge	it	
Exp:				Mental (per)			Material		
Modality:		NEG Potential				NEG Potential			
E127. N	so	he'd	say	"you're	stressed	do this	do that"		
Exp:			Verbal(proj)	Relat (int)		Material	Material		
Modality:		Usuality							
Appraisal:					Appre (-)				

E128. N	and	I	was	so	frustrated	because	I	didn't	feel	like
Exp:			Relat (int)			Circ.		NEG	Relat (int)	
Appraisal:				Grad (up)						
	that	worked								
E129. N	so	eventually	I	started	reading	online	just	doing	some	research
Exp:		Circ.		Material	Material	Circ.		Material		
Appraisal:									Grad (dwn)	
	on	stuttering								
Exp:	Circ.									
E130. N	I	discovered	silent	blocks	is	a	form	of	stuttering	
Exp:		Material			Relat (int)			Circ.		

Reaction to first block. In the following excerpt, Neil is telling his sister about his reaction to his first block, which happened while he was working at the front desk of a hotel.

Excerpt 6.18

F40. N	so when	that	happened	I	just	remembered	picking up	the phone		
Exp:	Circ.		Material			Mental (cog. proj.)	Material			
Appraisal:					Grad (dwn)					
	and	just	I couldn't	couldn't	even say	"uhh"	or	any sound	whatsoever	
Exp:				NEG	Verbal					
Modality:				NEG Potential						
Appraisal:		Grad (up)			Grad (dwn)			Grad (up)	Grad (max)	
F41. N	and	just	remember	hanging up	and	just	sitting			
Exp:			Mental (cog. proj.)	Material			Material			
Appraisal:		Grad (dwn)				Grad (up)				
	in the	back	office	for	like	6 hours				
Exp:	Circ.			Circ.						
F42. N	just	sweating	bullets	because	you know	I	couldn't	talk	and	
Exp:		Behavioral					NEG	Behavioral		
Modality:							NEG Potential			
Appraisal:	Grad (up)	Affect(-)								
	I	didn't	know	why						
Exp:		NEG	Mental (cog)							
F43. N	it	was	a	pretty	frightening	moment				
Exp:		Relat (int)								
Appraisal:				Grad (up)	Appre (-)					

When setting up the scenario in which the block occurred, Neil uses “just” to up-scale the significance of what he remembers in two clauses. He also uses it to up-scale the significance of the material and behavioral processes he participated in as a result of the block.

In line F42, he uses the metaphor “sweating bullets” to intensify the negative affect he was experiencing in that moment. The block also had a causal effect on his sudden inability to talk. His inability to identify the problem is included as another factor contributing to this “moment,” which he negatively appraises. By choosing “frightening” as an appraising item, Neil speaks to the negative affect he experienced due to his inability to identify what was happening to him in these moments.

SECTION 3: Comparing speech therapy experiences

Neil received speech therapy from two different sources for his stuttering. His first experience was with an Israel-based speech therapist he found online. Therapy sessions were conducted online via Skype. Neil’s second experience was with a 3-week summer program designed specifically for people who stutter. This program was offered by a Florida university referred to as “SFU,” in Neil’s area. Therapy was provided on campus by the university’s communicative disorders department. In the following excerpts, Neil describes and appraises the techniques he learned in both therapy settings.

Online therapy experience.

Appraisal of techniques. The following excerpt was taken from Neil’s description of the therapy techniques used by his online speech therapist. During the description, however, Neil interjects with a comment about the lack of efficacy of the technique.

Excerpt 6.19

E136. N	I	experienced	relief	with	my	speech	while	in	the	session
Exp:		Material		Circ.			Circ.			
Appraisal:			Affect (+)							
	with	her								
Exp:	Circ.									
E137. N	when	while	I	was	out	of	it-	it	was	still
Exp:	Circ.			Relat (circ)		Circ.			Relat (int)	
Modality:										Usuality
	a	struggle	for	me						
Exp:			Circ.							
Appraisal:		Appre (-)								

He starts his assertion by assigning himself the role of Medium in the process of experiencing relief in line E136. This relief is was limited, however, in that he only experienced it “while in the session with her.” He elaborates on this by prefacing his next assertion with an opposing circumstance “when while I was out of it.” He presents the outcome with an intensive relational clause where “it” (reference to speech) is assigned the Attribute of “still a struggle for me.” Here, “struggle” implies that he was making an effort with his speech but did not find success. The structure of the researcher’s question in line E138 sets Neil up to respond with a possible cause for the skills not transferring beyond the therapy setting. He answers with a relational clause of possession in which he uses negated “really” to down-scale how much understanding he possessed of the course material. He softens this statement with the post-hoc addition of “I guess.”

Non-preferred therapy approach. While appraising the approach used by his online speech therapist, Neil compares it with the approach used during the 3-week university program. In doing so, he expresses that prefers the university’s approach and gives some reasons as to why in the following excerpt.

Excerpt 6.20

E141. N	you know	her approach	was	completely different	from	
Exp:			Relat (int)			Circ.
Appraisal:				Grad (max)		
	the approach	I	learned	at	SFU	
Exp:			Mental(cog)	Circ.		
E142. N	I	favor	the	approach	I	learned at SFU
Exp:		Mental (emo)			Mental (cog)	
Appraisal:		Affect (+)				
	because	it	teaches	you	awareness and mindfulness	
Exp:	Circ		Material			

He begins the comparison in line E141 with an intensive relational clause. In this construction, “her approach” is being assigned the maximally up-scaled Attribute “completely different.” Here, the adjective “different” also works as a comparative element between the Carrier of the clause and the circumstance “from the approach I learned at SFU.” The process “learned” implies that he retained the information he was given during this time, which contrasts with the online therapy techniques, which are “gray” to him now. After asserting that the approaches were unlike, he uses a mental cause of emotion to convey that he favors the approach he learned at SFU. His selection of the verb “favor” has implications for appraisal in that it also serves to express positive affect toward the SFU approach. Neil adds a circumstantial clause of cause to explain why he feels this way. He presents the cause as a material process where “it” (reference to the approach) is the Actor partaking in the teaching. Universal “you” is assigned the role of Beneficiary, who is impacted by the process but does not actively participate in it. The Goal of the process is the content of the teaching, “awareness and mindful,” which are both concepts related to cognition. This contrasts with Neil’s previous description of the online

therapist’s approach, which he defined in terms of techniques. He follows this with another point of comparison as demonstrated in the following excerpt:

Excerpt 6.21

E143. N	and	instead of	trying to	do away	with	your	stuttering	
Exp:			Material	Material	Circ.			
	to correct	it	quote	unquote				
Exp:	Material							
E144. N	it	you know	to manage	it	whereas	her	technique	
Exp:			Material		Circ.			
E145. N	well	I	guess	it	had	some	similarities	
Exp:			Mental (cog. proj.)		Relat (pos)			
Appraisal:						Grad (dwn)		

Here, the contrasting information is presented as two material processes; both of which position stuttering as a flaw. The first process, “do away with,” carries with it the implication that stuttering is something that should be extinguished. The second material process, “to correct” signifies that stuttering is something that needs to be fixed. Neil counters these negative implications by adding “quote unquote” to the end of the clause. In doing so, he distances himself from the statement by insinuating that he is repeating somebody else’s words. Neil then completes the comparison in line E144, by giving the opposing behavioral process associated with SFU’s approach: “to manage it.” Unlike the processes in line E143, “manage” does not inherently place a negative value on stuttering. Rather than having to fix or do away with stuttering, the process of managing it keeps stuttering in the picture and also assigns some control to the person partaking in the process. Neil begins to structure another comparison but abandons it before completion. While he thinks, he holds his place in the conversation with “uhhh.” He then counters his previous assertion in line E141 about the approaches being completely different with “well I guess it had some similarities” in line E145. He uses “I guess”

to indicate detachment from his attributing the online approach with “some similarities.” He also down-scales the amount of similarities with the quantifier “some.” Though he countered his original claim of the approaches being different, he does not fully stand behind his new assertion that they were similar. He does not offer any examples of these similarities, as it would strengthen the new assertion.

While Neil initially identifies his lack of understanding as the cause of the skills not transferring over, he later describes the techniques as ones he would not use in a typical speaking setting as seen in the following excerpt:

Excerpt 6.22

E146. N	I	think	she	was	really	trying	to get	the	speaker
Exp:	Mental (cog. proj)					Material	Material		
Appraisal:					Grad (up)				
	to	totally	let go	of	control				
Exp:			Material	Circ.					
Appraisal:		Grad (max)							
E147. N	that	was	her	mission	statement	I	think		
Exp:		Relat (int)					Mental (cog)		
E148. N	in order	to get	there	there	was	a lot	of just	teaching	devices
Exp:	Circ.	Material			Existential		Circ.		
Appraisal:						Grad (up)			
	and	learning techniques		that	were	very regimented		and	things
Exp:					Relat (int)				
Appraisal:						Grad (up)			
	that	didn't	seem	natural	to me				
Exp:		NEG	Relat (int)		Circ.				
E149. N	they	were	a lot	of techniques		that	I	wouldn't	apply
Exp:		Existential		Circ.				NEG	Material
Modality:								Usuality	
Appraisal:			Grad (up)						
	in	a	typical	speaking	setting				
Exp:	Circ.								

Neil starts to build a case for the therapist’s approach being problematic, which counters his previous assertion that his lack of understanding was to blame for the lack of transfer. His

first statement in this excerpt is presented as a mental projection with “I think.” This conveys a degree of uncertainty about the information he is about to share in line E146. In the projection, he uses a construction in which the therapist is Actor who, he implies by his use of “trying,” is not successful in getting him to “let go.” While “to get” is downranked by “trying,” it serves to downrank the process “let go.” Taken as a whole, Neil structures his statement in such a way that allowed him to double downrank the process of which he is involved, thereby placing the participation of “the speaker” in the background. By referring to “the speaker” rather than to himself, Neil distances himself from the process altogether, which allows him to evaluate her approach under the guise of an objective outsider. In regard to the therapist’s intentions, Neil uses “totally” to maximally up-scale the degree of letting go of control he thought she was working towards. He strengthens this assertion in line E147 by assigning “that” (reference to the whole therapy experience) the Attribute of “her mission statement.” He adds “I think” at the end of the line in an effort to down-scale the power of this relational clause.

Neil then offers as an explanation as to why this approach did not work for him by first commenting on the number of components involved. In line E148, he prefaces with a circumstance of contingency “in order to get there.” He follows this with an existential process, which serves to downplay any participant’s involvement and to downrank the implied process of using “teaching devices and learning techniques.” Neil’s hiding of these processes underneath the existential clause suggests that he is working around the fact that he did not use the devices and techniques he learned during this time. He negatively appraises these necessary components for getting “there” as “very regimented.” He adds another component: “things that didn’t seem natural to me.” This relational clause is down-scaled by his use of the verb “seem,” which implies some uncertainty in his attribution and marks it further as an opinion with the

circumstance “to me.” These appraisals serve as a basis for line E149, where he uses a negated material clause of high usuality to describe his lack of use of the techniques. His inclusion of the circumstantial location “typical speaking setting” parallels with his appraisal of the techniques as being “regimented” and “not... natural.”

In line E150, the researcher asks Neil for examples of what the therapist had him do during sessions. After providing some examples in lines E151 and E152, he comments on the fact that he has not “looked at the course material in a couple years.” While this statement serves as an explanation for his inability to recall specific examples, it also attests to the fact that he has completely abandoned the techniques that he was taught. He follows this with an intensive relational clause where “it” (reference to course material) is assigned the Attribute “pretty gray.” Taken as a whole, this attribution serves to comment on the sharpness of his memory, which is made explicit through his inclusion of the circumstances “to me at this point.” Neil then makes an assertion about something he does remember with a mental projection in line E155. The projection begins with a circumstance of contingency “had I not seen the material at that moment,” thus indicating the material was only beneficial in a particular moment of time. He then couples a maximally negated auxiliary verb of usuality with the process to form the construction “would’ve never used.” Here, “I” (reference to Neil) is in an agentive role, meaning he was an active participant in the process of not using the techniques. This brings to light the fact that his use of the techniques is a matter of choice. He specifies the circumstance in which he chooses not to use them: “in a typical speaking situation.” This circumstance is the same one he claimed the techniques were not transferring over to after the therapy sessions.

While Neil has revealed that he played a part in the lack of transfer of the therapy skills,

he also builds a case for not using the techniques through his consistent negative appraisals of the therapist’s approach.

3-week program experience.

Appraisal of techniques. The following excerpt shows how Neil appraises the techniques he learned through SFU’s therapy approach.

Excerpt 6.23

E188. N	yeah	I	really	identified	with	it				
Exp:				Mental (per)						
Appraisal:			Grad (up)							
E189. N	the techniques	were	all	easy	to understand					
Exp:			Relat (int)							
Appraisal:			Grad (max)	Appre (+)						
E190. N	I	thought	all in all	they	were	easy	to learn			
Exp:		Mental (cog. proj.)			Relat (int)					
Appraisal:			Grad (up)			Appre (+)				
E191. N	I	liked	the idea	that	it's	not	about	trying	not to	stutter
Exp:		Mental (emo)			Relat (circ)	NEG	Circ.		NEG	Behavioral
Modality:								Inclination		
Appraisal:		Affect (+)								
E192. N	it's	just	about	accepting	your	stuttering	which	is		
Exp:	Relat (circ)			Mental (cog)		Behavioral		Relat (int)		
Appraisal:		Grad (dwn)		Affect (+)						
	such	an easier	approach							
Appraisal:	Grad (up)	Appre (+)								

After explaining how he came upon the SFU program, the researcher makes a statement for Neil to accept or reject in line E187. He up-scales his acceptance by replacing her verb, “liked,” with “identified.” While both are mental processes, “liked” carries an appraisal of positive affect. “Identified,” on the other hand, functions as an appraisal of appreciation, which conveys a high degree of personal significance to Neil. He uses “really” to intensify this significance. Therefore, Neil chose a more nuanced verb to accept the researcher’s statement. He then goes on to appraise the techniques with an intensive relational clause, where “techniques”

are assigned the maximally up-scaled, positive Attribute “all easy to understand.” In line E190, he projects a relational clause assigning the techniques the Attribute “easy to learn.” He then makes a comment about the approach with a mental clause of emotion stating that he “liked the idea.” He uses a relational clause of circumstance, which indicates that “the idea” is “not about trying not to stutter.” So, what he specifically liked about the approach was the fact that he did not have to work to prevent his stuttering. In line E192, he structures another relational clause where “it” (reference to the approach) is assigned the Attribute “just about accepting your stuttering.” Here, “just” up-scales the significance of the program’s exclusive focus on acceptance. Neil appraises this in the following clause as being “such an easier approach.” Here, “such” up-scales the positive appraisal “easier,” which is a reason why he likes the SFU approach. It can be assumed that the approach is appraised as easier since it is centered on accepting stuttering and essentially letting go of the struggle involved with preventing stuttering. The only other approach he talks about is that of his online therapist, therefore it can be assumed that it is her approach which he is comparing the SFU approach to. In line E200, he uses a mental projection to positively appreciate his ability to use the techniques.

Awareness vs. Prevention. Excerpt 6.24 illustrates the way Neil explains the differences between awareness-based and prevention-based approaches to stuttering. In line F76, he refers to the SFU program as “that program” uses a relational clause of circumstance to present specifics about the program’s approach. The first of these circumstances is up-scaled with “all,” which flags the phrasal verb “being aware” as the main objective of the approach. He uses “just” to up-scale the significance of this mental process of cognition. He incorporates a circumstance of matter, which identifies the stuttering as the behavioral process to be aware of and follows this with a circumstance of time “while it’s happening.” In this last circumstance, “it” (reference to

stuttering) is an Actor involved in the process of “happening” albeit with low energy as expressed by the verb itself.

Excerpt 6.24

F76. N	that	program	was	all	about	just	being	aware	
Exp:			Relat (circ)					Mental (cog)	
Appraisal:				Grad (up)		Grad (dwn)			
	of	your	stutter	while	it's	happening			
Exp:			Behavioral	Circ.		Material			
F77. N	as	opposed	to preventing	it	which	I			
Exp:				Material					
	much	prefer	being	aware					
Exp:		Mental (emo)		Mental (cog)					
Appraisal:	Grad (up)	Affect (+)							
F78. N	it's	just	easier	to manage	when	just	the	moment	of
Exp:	Relat (int)			Behavioral	Circ.				
Appraisal:		Grad (dwn)	Appre (+)			Grad (dwn)			
	stuttering	comes	which	it	always	does			
Exp:		Material				Material			
Modality:					Usuality				
Appraisal:					Grad (max)				
F80. N	when	you're	aware	it	gives	you	more	control	so
Exp:	Circ.	Relat (int)			Material				
Appraisal:							Grad (up)		
	you	don't	have	to feel	such	a sense	of panic		
Exp:				Mental (per)					
Modality:		NEG	Obligation						
Appraisal:					Grad (up)		Affect (-)		
F81. N	whereas	if	you're	trying	to con-	prevent	it	completely	
Exp:		Circ.				Behavioral			
Modality:		Probability		Inclination					
Appraisal:								Grad (max)	
	which	is	impossible	when	it	happens	you're	just-	
Exp:		Relat (int)		Circ.		Material	Relat (int)		
Appraisal:			Appre (-)						

Neil then brings in the comparative element in line F77 with “as opposed to.” Here, the contrast is made between “being aware” and “preventing” the stuttering. “Being aware” implies that one needs to be involved in mental processes of cognition when dealing with stuttering, whereas “preventing” is a material process that is taken up in order to stop the stuttering from happening. He uses a mental clause of emotion to express that he prefers the approach that focuses on “being aware.” He uses “much” to up-scale the positive affect inherent to the verb “prefer.” In line F78, he expresses the reason for this in an intensive relational clause assigning “it” (reference to awareness-based approach) the Attribute of “just easier to manage.” The following circumstance of time has embedded within it the process of “comes” of which “moment of stuttering” is the Medium. This role assignment is consistent with Neil’s ongoing portrayal of stuttering as something that comes, by implication, to him. This stands in opposition to another plausible construction where he could have said “when I stutter.” He follows this with a clause that serves to maximally up-scale the usuality of “it” occurring.

Neil continues to talk about the favorable aspects of the awareness-based approach to stuttering in line F80. He sets up the relational clause as a circumstantial contingency. This contingency is then assigned Actor in the process of giving the Beneficiary, universal “you,” the Goal “more control.” Neil uses “more” to up-scale the amount of control “you” have during stuttering moments when you are aware. He uses a circumstantial clause to convey a cause and effect relationship between having “more control” and feeling “such a sense of panic.” In this clause, he negates obligation from the process “to feel,” which indicates that the sense of panic is inherent to not having control in the situation. While “such” operates to intensify the negative affect of “panic,” the negated verb construction creates an overall meaning that the panic is still present, but to a lesser degree when you have control. Neil introduces another point of

comparison in line F81 with “whereas.” The content of the comparison is circumstantial in nature as indicated by the word “if.” Here, universal “you” is in the role of Behavior, who has an inclination to accomplish the behavioral process of preventing the stuttering. He uses the maximally up-scaled adverb, “completely,” to identify the degree of prevention. He negatively appraises this process as “impossible” and begins a new experiential configuration expressing the circumstance of time. Again, “it” (reference to stuttering) is in the role of Medium, which underlines Neil’s belief that stuttering is a phenomenon that happens on its own and is therefore not controllable or really preventable. He sets up a relational clause construction with universal “you” serving as the primary participant. His sister interjects with an interrogative construction in line F82, but does not complete her turn due to Neil’s continuing talk. In line F83, universal “you” is designated as the Medium of the figurative process of being “thrown through a loop,” where the Agent is the occurrence of stuttering.

In this excerpt, Neil explains to his sister why he prefers the awareness-based approach used by the SFU program over the prevention-based approach. The primary contrast is between the processes of “being aware” and “preventing” the stuttering, which is a point of his that is illustrated in Excerpt 6.23. By comparing these two processes in both conversational contexts, it can be said that this is another instance of an established way of talking about his experience.

SECTION 4: Confidence.

Throughout both conversations, “confidence” emerges as a recurring topic in Neil’s talk. In the following collection of excerpts, Neil elaborates on the role of confidence and discusses how entities such as Toastmaster’s, the stuttering support group, and the SFU program contributed to his level of confidence.

The role of confidence. During his conversation with the researcher, Neil identified “confidence” as a significant factor in his fluency and overall quality of life. While addressing the efficacy of his techniques and strategies in the midst of a “down cycle,” he asserts in line E41 “I think so much of it has to with confidence” in regard to his ability to implement his strategies. Confidence is also cited in line E280 as an emotion that he stays “current” with in order to cope with stuttering.

In line E302, the researcher asks Neil if he would like to share anything else or if he has any advice for other people who stutter. He responds by attesting to the role confidence has in regard to quality of life then uses contrasting contingencies to illustrate his point as seen in the following excerpt:

Excerpt 6.25

E303. N	well	I	think	a big	part	of it	is	just	your confidence	
Exp:			Mental (cog)				Relat (int)			
Modality:			Probability							
Appraisal:				Grad (up)				Grad (dwn)		
E304. N	if	you	can have	confidence	where	it's	ok	to stutter		
Exp:	Circ.		Relat (pos)		Circ.	Relat (int)		Behavioral		
Modality:	Probability			Potential						
Appraisal:				Affect (+)			Appre (+)			
	then	I	don't	think	your quality of life	is	affected			
Exp:			NEG Mental (cog. proj.)				Material			
Modality:			Probability							
E305. N	if	you're	always	trying	to hide	it-	if	you're	trying	to fix
Exp:	Circ.				Material					Material
Modality:	Probability		Usuality	Inclination			Probability		Inclination	
Appraisal:			Grad (max)							
	it-	if	you're	trying	to make	it	go away			
Exp:					Material					
Modality:		Probability		Inclination						
Appraisal:										
	then	I	think	you're	really	going to	struggle			
Exp:		Mental (cog. proj.)					Material			
Modality:		Probability				Probability				
Appraisal:				Grad (up)			Appre (-)			

He begins his response with a mental clause of cognition implying that his upcoming clause of attribution is based on his opinion. He attributes “a big part of it,” where “it” references stuttering, to “your confidence.” Here, “big” works to up-scale the significance of the Attributive role he is assigning to confidence. Neil then constructs the following clause making the relational process of possessing “confidence” a circumstantial contingency. According to Neil, when this contingency is met quality of life is not affected. He conveys this belief through a negated mental projection structure. By doing so, he expresses some uncertainty in his assertion that quality of life is (not) affected. Because Neil is speaking from his personal experience, he cannot generalize this contingency to everybody’s situation but he still tries to invoke a notion of general truth or validity by using “you.”

In line E305, he offers an opposing contingency as a point of comparison, where universal “you” is placed in the role of Actor who is inclined “to hide” their stuttering. This is followed by two other contingency constructions with the processes “to fix” and “to make (it) go away.” He therefore uses a triadic structure, which is rhetorically effective. Of even more significance is his selection of processes in that each link of this chain intensifies the intended effect on the Goal (his stuttering). For example, “hide” does not directly affect its nature since the stuttering is still there but not obvious. “Fix” does alter the nature of the stuttering to an improved state, but “make it go away” involves extinguishing it.

By setting up a comparison based on circumstantial contingencies, Neil is able to up-scale the significance of “confidence” in regard to quality of life. He links confidence with acceptance of the behavior of stuttering and contrasts this with material processes of prevention and correction. Therefore, the inclination to partake in the latter processes implies a lack of confidence and will lead to struggles which negatively affect quality of life.

Entities contributing to confidence. Neil credits three entities with giving him confidence and thus helping him with his fluency. When speaking to the researcher, Neil identifies his local Toastmaster’s chapter and his stuttering support group as confidence-inducing entities. When talking to his sister, he specifically names the SFU program as the primary source of his newfound confidence.

SFU Program. During the conversation with his sister, Neil identifies the 3-week program at SFU as a major contributor to his level of confidence. In the following excerpt, he describes how much confidence he had after participating in the course and how it affected his fluency.

Excerpt 6.26

F118. N	but	at	that	course-	at	the end	of	those	3 weeks
Exp:		Circ.			Circ.		Circ.		
F119. N	I was-	I	had	a confidence level	that	I	hadn't	had	
Exp:	Relat (int)		Relat (pos)				NEG	Relat (circ)	
	in	a few	years	since	before	I started	stuttering		
Exp:	Circ.				Circ.		Behavioral		
F120. N	you know	when	I	still	considered	myself			
Exp:		Circ.			Relat (int)				
Modality:				Usuality					
	just	a	regular	fluent	speaker				
Appraisal:	Grad (dwn)		Appre (+)						
F121. N	but wh-	the confidence	certainly	helped	me	to speak	more	fluently-	
Exp:				Material		Behavioral			
Modality:			Probability						
Appraisal:		Affect (+)		Appre (+)			Grad (up)	Appre (+)	
F122. N	helps	you	to do	things	like	maintain	eye	contact	
Exp:			Material			Behavioral			
Appraisal:	Appre (+)								
	which	is	a big	deal					
Exp:		Relat (int)							
Appraisal:			Grad (up)	Appre (+)					

Neil begins by putting the circumstance of time in the position of topical Theme thereby making it a marked choice for Theme. This flags his completion of the course “at the end of those three weeks” as a significant factor in the upcoming piece of information. He follows this with an intensive relational clause construction, which he abandons for a relational process of possession. Here, Neil is the Possessor of “a confidence level.” This is explicated further with an embedded relational clause of possession that also up-scales the significance his level of confidence in that he has not had it “in a few years.” Up-scaling the statement even more, he uses a circumstance of time to compare the newfound confidence level to that of which he had before he “started stuttering.” While this series of clauses serves to intensify the level of confidence Neil felt after participating in the program, they also have implications for the negative effects stuttering had on his confidence. His statement “since before I started stuttering” conveys the fact that Neil was confident up until that point and experienced a lack of confidence for “a few years.” He identifies that point of time as circumstance in which he “still considered” himself “just a regular fluent speaker” in line F120. Not only does he associate this circumstance of time with having a high level of confidence, but also with the positive appreciation of his speaking abilities. However, examination of modality reveals that his use of the verb “considered” speaks to his wavering certainty about this attribution. Neil’s use of the adjective “regular” to describe his former self has implications for people who stutter being “not regular.”

He then assigns the role of Actor to “the confidence” in the material process of helping him “to speak more fluently.” This construction not only conveys Neil’s positive appreciation of confidence, but also reveals a cause-and-effect relationship between his fluency and level of confidence. His use of the adverb “certainly” expresses a maximally high degree of commitment to this statement. In line F122, he asserts that confidence also plays an obligatory role in helping

universal “you” to participate in the behavioral process of maintaining eye contact which Neil thinks is “a big deal.”

After answering his sister’s questions about maintaining eye contact, he re-introduces the topic about the course’s impact on his confidence level in line F133 of the following excerpt:

Excerpt 6.27

F133. N	but	the	course	gave	me	a lot	of confidence
Exp:				Material			
Appraisal:						Grad (up)	Affect (+)
F134. N	it	desensitized	us	which	was	tremendous	
Exp:		Material			Relat (int)		
Appraisal:						Appre (+)	
F135. N	it	definitely	contributed to	my	confidence level		
Exp:			Material				
Modality:		Probability					
Appraisal:		Grad (up)					

Here, Neil assigns “the course” (reference to SFU 3-week program) the role of Actor, which highlights the role it plays in the process of giving “a lot of confidence.” “The course” is also in the role of Theme and Subject in three main clauses, therefore making his message about the course and what it did. Rather than portraying himself as taking an active role in the therapy process, he puts himself at the receiving end as Beneficiary. Therefore, he appraises the course very positively, while downplaying his own role. The amount of confidence he receives is up-scaled by the quantifier “a lot.” On the receiving end of this process is “me” (reference to Neil), which is assigned the role of Beneficiary. A similar construction is utilized in line F134 where “the course” is the Actor in the process of desensitizing. This time, however, “us” (possible reference to others in program) is in the role of Goal, which identifies Neil as a member of the group. Neil positively appreciates this process with the adjective “tremendous,” which also speaks to the personal significance it held for Neil. He closes the topic in line F135 by using the

adverb of maximal probability, “definitely,” to convey his level of commitment to the idea that the course played an active role in raising his confidence level.

Toastmasters. While talking to the researcher, Neil identifies Toastmasters as an entity that contributed to his confidence. As seen in the previous SFU program excerpt, Neil consistently assigns this entity the role of Agent and himself secondary roles as Goal and Beneficiary. He begins the following excerpt by introducing the topic of Toastmasters.

Excerpt 6.28

E281. N	I	mean	I	did	a Toastmasters	chapter	last year		
Exp:				Material			Circ.		
	which	is	a	public	speaking	chapter			
Exp:		Relat (int)							
E282. N	and	that	helped	me	tremendously				
Exp:			Material						
Appraisal:			Appre (+)		Grad (up)				
E283. N	gave	me	a lot	of	confidence				
Exp:	Material								
Appraisal:			Grad (up)		Affect (+)				
E284. N	it	gave	me confidence	to go	out	in	public		
Exp:		Material		Material		Circ.			
Appraisal:				Affect (+)					
	and	try	some	of the	techniques				
Exp:		Material							
Appraisal:			Grad (dwn)						
E285. N	and	just	feel	that	I	was	more	in control	of my speech
Exp:			Mental (per)			Relat (int)			
Appraisal:		Grad (dwn)					Grad (up)		

His introduction of Toastmasters as a new topic includes a circumstance of time “last year” which conveys when the process of doing took place. Additionally, he uses an intensive relational clause to offer a definition of what Toastmasters is. In line E284, “that” (reference to Toastmasters) is Actor in the process of “helped.” This verb also conveys Neil’s positive appraisal of the entity. He uses “tremendously” to up-scale the degree to which he was “helped,”

also expressing the great deal of significance Neil attributes to Toastmasters. In line E284, he gives examples of processes he was able to participate in due to the confidence, which serve to support his claim that Toastmasters helped him. He uses a mental clause of perception to project his feeling of being “more in control” of his speech in line E285. While the quantifier “more” up-scales the amount of control he felt, it also conveys that he still did not have complete control of his speech. The rhetorical device then, is one of increasing specialization.

Support group. Neil also identifies his stuttering support group as an entity that contributed to his level of confidence. In the following excerpt, Neil shares his positive appraisals of the group and talks about the positive influence it has had on his life.

Excerpt 6.29

E367. N	it's	always	refreshing	to go	to	a meeting				
Exp:	Relat (int)			Material	Circ.					
Modality:		Usuality								
Appraisal:		Grad (max)	Appre (+)							
E368. N	I	always	enjoy	it						
Exp:			Mental (emo)							
Modality:		Usuality								
Appraisal:		Grad (max)	Affect (+)							
E369. N	and	I	do	go	regularly					
Exp:				Material						
Modality:			Probability		Usuality					
E370. N	and	I	attribute	that	support group	to helping	my confidence	a lot		
Exp:			Mental (cog)			Material				
Appraisal:						Appre (+)		Affect (+)	Grad (up)	
E371. N	helping	me	to realize	that	you're	not	out there	experiencing		
Exp:			Mental (cog. proj.)		Relat (int)	NEG		Mental (per)		
Appraisal:	Appre (+)									
	all this	alone								
Appraisal:	Grad (max)									

Neil describes the process of being given confidence as one that is based on positive affect. By placing, “helps get me confidence” in Rheme position, he indicates that this

information is new and relevant. By downranking “get” underneath “helps,” Neil creates a configuration that foregrounds the process of helping.

In line E371, he uses a similar construction in which “me” (reference to Neil) is Goal in the process of “helping (me) to realize.” Neil presents the content of what he was helped to realize with a mental projection. The projected information is an intensive relational clause with universal “you” as the Carrier of the Attribute “not out there experiencing all this alone,” where “this” is presumably a reference to all the aspects that come with stuttering. Therefore, Neil not only gained confidence from attending the meetings but also a sense of community. He closes the topic by down-scaling the purpose of the support group with “just” most likely because he realizes that the fact that the group “offers support” is obvious.

Overall, Neil has had a positive experience in the support group setting. Not only does he attribute it to helping with his confidence but it also helps him feel a sense of community as a person who stutters.

SECTION 5: Spanish

Early in his conversation with the researcher, Neil brings up learning Spanish as a possible contributing factor to the severity of his stuttering. He shares the thoughts he had on his way home from Peru in the following excerpt:

Excerpt 6.30

E98. N	and	I	can	remember	thinking	on	the plane	"I'm	glad	
Exp:				Mental (cog)	Mental (cog. proj)			Relat (int)		
Modality:			Potential		Probability					
Appraisal:									Affect (+)	
	I'm	out of	those	countries	now	I	don't	have to	speak	Spanish
Exp:	Relat (circ)	Circ.			Circ.		NEG		Behavioral	
Modality:							NEG	Obligation		
	now	I	won't	have	those	speech	problems"			
Exp:			NEG	Relat (pos)						
Modality:			Probability							
Appraisal:							Appre (-)			

Here, he uses two mental projections to present his first thoughts about the cause of his stuttering. He structures the projection in such a way that it implies a causal relationship between the obligation of speaking Spanish, which inherently contains a degree of negative affect, and his speech problems. By presenting this as a projection, he is able to distance himself from this former assumption, which is later proven to be wrong.

Mapping. Neil begins his turn about the role Spanish played in his early speech problems with a description of the problematic behavior he calls “mapping.”

Excerpt 6.31

E338. N	well	actually	when	I	returned	from	my trip	in	Peru
Exp:			Circ.		Material				
Modality:		Probability							
	and	was	stuttering	in	the	United States			
Exp:		Behavioral		Circ.					
	my	big	problem	was	looking	ahead	to	words	
Exp:				Relat (int)	Material				
Appraisal:		Grad (up)	Appre (-)						
E339. N	trying	to select	words	I	was	saying	prior	to saying	them
Exp:	Material	Material				Verbal		Behavioral	
Modality:									
E340. N	so	I	was	mapping	everything	I	would say	out	
Exp:				Behavioral			Behavioral		
Modality:							Usuality		
Appraisal:					Grad (max)				
	in	my mind	prior	to saying	it				
Exp:	Circ.			Behavioral					
E341. N	and everybody-		even	fluent	speakers	know	if	you	think
Exp:						Mental (cog)			Mental (cog)
Modality:							Probability		
Appraisal:		Grad (max)	Grad (up)	Appre (+)					
	about something		too much	you're	going to	have	a	stuttering	moment
Exp:						Relat (pos)			
Modality:					Probability				
Appraisal:			Grad (up)						
E342. N	everybody		does	that					
Exp:			Behavioral						
Appraisal:		Grad (up)							

This excerpt starts with a series of circumstances placing the upcoming references about his stuttering in the time frame after he returned to Peru and was living in the United States. His word choice in the series of processes, which he appraises as problematic, indicates his participation in planning and repairing his speech before he produces it. “Trying,” however, implies that these processes did not always work in preventing his stuttering. Neil then refers to this behavior as “mapping” in line E340. In the process of “mapping,” Neil assumes an agentive role. The intensity and usuality of this process is up-scaled with “everything I would say” as the Goal. He specifies that this occurred in his “mind” which speaks to the cognitive aspect of this process.

In line E341, he structures a circumstantial contingency that “everybody- even fluent speakers” are aware of. His inclusion of “fluent speakers” in this statement works to generalize the contingency to all speakers- not just people who stutter. The contingency is presented as a mental clause of cognition where the process of thinking “about something too much” is structured as the possible cause of having “a stuttering moment.” He strengthens this contingency in line E342 by placing maximally up-scaled “everybody” in the role of Behavior. Generalizing this contingency to all speakers serves to strengthen his “mapping” theory.

Role of Spanish. Neil then ties his mapping theory to Spanish in Excerpt 6.32, which is a continuation of the talk presented in the previous excerpt. At this point in the narrative, Neil takes his talk of “mapping” in a different direction by addressing how he thinks Spanish “contributed” to it while in Peru. In line E344, he uses a circumstantial clause of causation to present a series of material processes as a possible explanation. The first of these is “trying,” which he included while describing the process of “mapping” in the previous excerpt this time, however, he pairs it with the material process “to translate.” This recurrence of the process

“trying” indicates that, overall, Neil’s planning what he was going to say before saying it did not garner him any success in regards to speech. He uses the word “everything,” which maximally up-scales the number of things he was translating and the frequency at which he was involved in the behavior.

Excerpt 6.32

E343. N	so	there w-	I	think	Spanish	contributed to	that		
Exp:				Mental (cog)		Material			
Modality:				Probability					
E344. N	because	I	was	trying	to	translate	everything from		
Exp:	Circ.			Material		Material			
Modality:							Usuality		
Appraisal:							Grad (max)		
	English	to Spanish							
E345. N	and	then	I	found	when	I	came	back	
Exp:				Mental (cog)	Circ.			Material	
	somewhere	where	it	was	just	English	speaking		
Exp:		Circ.			Relat (int)				
Modality:						Grad (dwn)			
	I	was	still	trying	to translate				
Exp:				Material	Material				
Modality:			Usuality						
E346. N	but	in	this	case	English	to	English		
Modality:	Circ.								
E347. N	so	it	took	me	probably	two years	before		
Exp:			Material						
Modality:					Probability				
	I	could	stop	doing	that				
Exp:			Material	Material					
Modality:		Potential							
348	which	was	a	big	reason	for	my	speech	problems
Exp:		Relat (int)				Circ.			
Appraisal:				Grad (up)					Appre (-)

In line E345, he uses a mental projection to present what he “found” while in a different circumstance of location, which he identifies as “somewhere” that was “just English-speaking.” He adds the circumstance of contingency, “English to English,” to show that the process that was required of him to speak another language was something he was doing unnecessarily in his own language.

Neil places himself in the role of Actor in line E347, where he expresses that it required a certain capacity for him to “stop doing that.” He then uses an intensive relational clause to assign the aforementioned material process the Attribute “a big reason for my speech problems.” His use of the adjective “big” conveys the significant role his behavior played in the circumstantial matter of his “speech problems.”

Chapter 7:

Brian

Brian's ethnographic interview with the researcher lasted approximately one hour and 43 minutes. The majority of his responses were narrative-like in that they typically lasted between one and a half to two and a half minutes. His longest turn lasted for over three and a half minutes. The researcher's turns were primarily used to ask questions in order to confirm, clarify, probe, and rebound, which is expected for the role of interviewer. Throughout the recording, Brian's speech was marked by stuttering-like disfluencies (SLDs) such as prolongations and PWRs, as well as linguistic nonfluencies in which he would repeat phrases and entire words to restart his turn. He did not record a conversation with a family member because his parents are deceased and he did not think his younger siblings knew enough about his stuttering. The results from the ethnographic interview are presented in four sections, each of which represents a topic of discussion including: description of stuttering, factors that affect fluency, family history, and appraisal of outside entities.

SECTION 1: Description of stuttering

Throughout the interview, Brian uses the word "stutter" and variations of it such as "stuttering," "stutters," and "stutterer" a total of 16 times. He uses it for the purpose of conveying a behavioral process in 9 instances; referring to other people who stutter as "stutterers" in 4 instances; and specifying a circumstantial matter in 3 instances. In place of the word "stutter," he uses other linguistic tools such as figures of speech, referential chains, and comparatives to describe his stuttering to the researcher.

Use of Metaphorical Language. The following excerpts illustrate how Brian uses figures of speech, which enable him to describe his stuttering without actually using the word

“stutter” or its variants. Not only do these devices allow him to refer to his behavior, but they also convey Brian’s appraisal of certain aspects of his stuttering experience.

“Devil.” The first figure of speech that Brian uses is in reference to the “devil.” He uses an intensive relational clause to assign “it” (a reference to his stuttering) with the figurative Attribute “like some devil or something inside of my mind.” In this instance, Brian down-scales the force of the negative appreciation carried by “devil” with “some.” He does further work to down-scale the power of this negative appreciation by including post-hoc “or something.” This down-scaling functions to create a distinction between the evil force he perceives and the presence of the biblical entity “The Devil,” with the latter carrying a maximal level of evil. Brian uses a circumstance of location to specify that this evil force is present inside of his mind, which reveals the mental element involved in stuttering instead of highlighting the physical or behavioral aspects. In the next clause, Brian places “that” (a reference to “some devil”) in the role of Actor in the material process of “trying to destroy me.” This role assignment not only conveys that “some devil” is taking an active participant in the process of trying to destroy Brian, but that it is also acting under an inclination or desire to do so as expressed through Brian’s use of “trying.” Rather than being active participant in stuttering, Brian positions himself as the Goal.

Excerpt 7.1

E44. B	it	really	is	like some	devil	or something	inside of	my mind
Exp:			Relat (int)				Circ.	
Modality:		Probability				Probability		
Appraisal:					Appre (-)			
	that	is	trying to	destroy	me or	something		
Exp:				Material				
Modality:			Inclination			Probability		
Appraisal:				Appre (-)				

The “battle” metaphor. Brian incorporates the behavioral process of “battling” early on in his talk. He places “the people” and “they” in the role of Behaver, which allows for an initial distancing of himself from a behavior, which he judges negatively. The negated positive judgment in line E135, “not supposed to,” also serves as a statement of obligation under the system of modality. Here, Brian selects universal “you” as the Behaver. He then follows this judgment call with a positive one, where he uses his current state as an example of how universal “you” “should be.”

Excerpt 7.2

E133. B	you	see	the	people	are	always	battling		
Exp:							Material		
Modality:						Usuality			
Appraisal:						Grad (Max)	Appre (-)		
E134. B	they	are	battling	hemselve	or	some	you know	other	thing
Exp:			Material						
Appraisal:			Appre (-)						
E135. B	but	you're	not	supposed	to battle	all	the	time	
Exp:					Material				
Modality:				Obligation			Usuality		
Appraisal:			NEG	Judg (+)	Appre (-)	Grad (up)			
	you are	supposed	to be	like	this				
Exp:			Relat (int)						
Modality:		Obligation							
Appraisal:		Judg (+)							

Later in his talk, the battle metaphor resurfaces. This time, Brian uses an intensive relational clause to assign the Attribute of “just a horrible waste of time,” an up-scaled negative appreciation, to the battle which he repeats, verbatim, before moving on to his next assertion in line E636. He uses the system of modality to explicate his potential to “do a lot more” and begins to offer a causal circumstance for why he is not doing as much as he can with “but.” However, he abandons this structure and begins a new relational clause that again prepares the researcher for his revelation of something of which he assigns the Value “main thing” that prevents him

from doing more. But again, he interrupts the delivery of the Token in order to up-scale the delayed information with “forget about the waste of time.” Brian thus retracts his previous appraisal of the battle in light of a more important factor that he finally delivers in line E639: “enjoy the little things.” As seen in the previous excerpt, Brian presents this information as an obligation with positive judgment by deeming it as something you are “supposed to” do.

Excerpt 7.3

E633. B	It	is	just	a	horrible	waste	of time	
Exp:		Relat (int)						
Appraisal:					Grad (up)	Appre (-)		
E634-635. B	a	horrible	waste of	time-	the	battle		
Appraisal:		Grad (up)	Appre (-)					
E636. B	I	could	do	a lot-	a lot	more		
Exp:			Material					
Modality:		Potential						
Appraisal:					Grad (up)			
E637. B	but	uh	the	main	thing	is-		
Exp:						Relat (int)		
Appraisal:				Appre (neu)				
E638. B	forget	about	the	waste of	time			
Exp:	Mental (cog)							
Appraisal:				Appre (-)				
E639. B	is just-	is-	what	is-	it	really	is	just
Exp:							Relat (int)	
Appraisal:						Probability		
	not-	supposed to enjoy-	you're	supposed to enjoy	little	things		
Exp:		Mental (emo)		Mental (emo)				
Modality:		Obligation		Obligation				
Appraisal:		Judg (+)	Affect (+)	Judg (+)	Affect (+)	Grad (dwn)		

The “struggle” metaphor. Excerpt 7.4 presents Brian’s introduction of “the struggle” metaphor. Throughout the conversation, he uses the word “struggle” and its variants a total of 6

times. At the request of the researcher, he explains some of the processes that occur in conjunction with the struggle.

Brian first introduces the term “struggle” in line E302. Inherently, this term carries a negative meaning. He activates the system of modality to convey that it is something that is “constant” or ongoing. He uses an intensive relational process to assign the Attribute of “just an incredible waste of time” to “it,” which refers back to the marked Theme, “this constant struggle.” This Attribute also represents Brian’s up-scaled negative appreciation of the struggle. By repeating this Rheme in lines E633 and E638, as seen in the previous excerpt, he strengthens his commitment to this negative appraisal. Brian opens his response to the researcher’s question with a relational clause of circumstance with the circumstance being a reference to the conversation he was having with a fellow Spanish table member earlier in the day. In the circumstantial process of “talking,” Brian positions himself as the Behavior. However, when describing the actual behavioral process involved in the struggle in line E304, he selects universal “you” to fill the role of Behavior, rather than assigning it exclusively to himself. This creates some distance between him and the behavior of mapping out “what you’re saying.” Here, “her” is exophoric in that it refers to a lady from Brian’s Spanish group, whom he met with prior to the interview.

Brian prefaces his next comment with an up-scaled remark about the usuality of the behavior in line E305 with “a lot of times” and intensifies it further with by adding a circumstance of time “even when we’re talking today.” These two elements convey that the behavior is something that is occurring at all times. Brian then talks about the mental processes of cognition that underlie the behavior of “mapping out” in line E307, which include “planning a lot of sentences” and “thinking about what I am going to be able to construct that sentence.” His

use of the reasonably technical, metalinguistic term “sentence” highlights the intentionality behind the conscious processes of “planning” and “construct(ing).” He utilizes the system of modality to express that his ability “to construct that sentence” is a matter of probability, which is why talking requires constant forethought.

In order to put himself in a position to make a judgment about the “mapping out” behavior, Brian assigns the role of Token to universal “you” in line E309. He starts by setting up a relational clause, which consists of the positive judgment and statement of obligation “supposed to be-,” but abandons the construction without assigning the Value to a Token. Brian begins his new thought by identifying what one should not be doing “instead of thinking about yourself-“ then readjusts this assertion with “I mean battling or planning.” The behavioral process of “battling” carries a negative sentiment with it, which could be why Brian readjusted his assertion once again with the neutral mental process of “planning.”

Brian closes the topic without ever assigning the abandoned Value of positive judgment and obligation in line E309. Because “mapping out” is something he does on a regular basis, he may not quite know what one is “supposed to be” doing instead of that, though he is clear that it is not planning. By instantiating the system of modality to convey obligation in this clause, Brian construes his struggle and planning in contrast to the accepted norms. He wraps up the topic with what he does know in line E311 “I mean that is a lot of wasted effort.” This intensive relational clause assigns the Attribute of up-scaled negative appreciation to “that,” which represents the “planning” involved in the behavior of “mapping out.”

Excerpt 7.4

E302. B	and	this	constant	struggle	it	is	just an	incredible	waste of	time
Exp:						Relat (int)				
Modality:			Usuality							
Appraisal:				Appre (-)				Grad (up)	Appre (-)	
E303. AG	What	is the	struggle?	I	mean	if	you	can	give	
Exp:		Relat (int)							Material	
Modality:						Probability		Potential		
	me	some	insight	on	what	goes on	in	your	head	
Exp:						Material	Circ.			
Modality:						Usuality				
Appraisal:		Grad (dwn)								
E304. B	the	struggle	is	that	when	I	am	talking	to her	earlier
Exp:			Relat (int)		Circ.			Behavioral		
Modality:										
Appraisal:										
	today-	you	do	map	out	what	you're	saying		
Exp:				Material				Verbal		
Modality:			Probability							
E305. B	I	mean	a lot	of times	that um-					
Exp:										
Modality:			Usuality							
Appraisal:			Grad (up)							
E306. B	even	when	we're	talking	today	you and I				
Exp:		Circ.		Behavioral						
E307. B	I	am	planning	a lot	of	sentences	or	thinking	about	what
Exp:			Material					Mental (cog)		
Modality:										
Appraisal:				Grad (up)						
E308. B	I	am going	to be	able to	construct	that	sentence			
Exp:			Relat (int)		Material					
Modality:		Probability		Potential						
E309. B	and	again	you're	supposed	to be	instead	of	thinking	about	yourself
Exp:					Relat (int)			Mental (cog)		
Modality:				Obligation						
Appraisal:				Judg (+)						
E310. B	I	mean	battling	or	planning					
Exp:			Material		Material					
Appraisal:			Appre (-)							
E311. B	I	mean	that	is	a lot	of	wasted	effort		
Exp:				Relat (int)						
Appraisal:					Grad (up)		Appre (-)			

In summary, Brian explains that the “constant struggle” he refers to, consists of a combination of behaviors such as “mapping out” and “battling” as well as mental processes such as “planning” and thinking.” He negatively appreciates them as being “an incredible waste of time.” At the same time, Brian realizes that his participation in these processes is necessary due to the lack of consistency in his ability to construct sentences. Thus, his answer to stuttering is to be as non-spontaneous as he can, even though he does not like it and knows that it is not the accepted norm of talking.

Self as “fighter.” Later in the interview, Brian portrays himself as a “fighter” in the following excerpt:

Excerpt 7.5

E803. B	but	um ah	I'm	pretty	much	a	survivor	fighter	or	
Exp:			Relat (int)							
Appraisal:				Grad (down)			Appre (+)	Grad (up)	Appre (+)	
E804. B	and	you know	nobody	is	say	the master				
Exp:				Relat (int)						
Appraisal:			Grad (max)							
	of	their	own	fate	all	the way				
Appraisal:					Grad (dwn)					
E805. B	I	mean	God	is	there-	that	is	what	I	believe
Exp:				Existential			Relat (int)			Mental (cog)
E806. B	however	I	am-	I	will	keep	swinging	as long as		
Exp:							Material			
Modality:					Usuality					
Appraisal:							Grad (up)	Grad (up)		
	I	can	still	swing	but ah	anyway				
Exp:				Material						
Modality:		Potential								

Here, Brian begins the next portion of talk with an intensive relational clause in which he assigns himself the down-scaled Attribute of “pretty much a survivor.” He then up-scales this assignment to a more active Attribute: “fighter.” Line E804 works as a down-scaled concession to the previous attribution in line E803 in which he recognizes that nobody is “say the master of

their own fate.” In this relational clause construction, the impact of the Attribute is lessened by Brian’s use of the word “say,” which functions as a quasi-circumstantial element. While the maximally up-scaled circumstance of extent “all the way” is negated by “nobody,” the structure itself indicates that Brian believes that one can be the master of their own fate to some unspecified extent. He follows this with a profession of his belief in the existence of God but does not explicitly assign the Attribute of “master of fate” from line E804 to this entity since he does not recognize it as having an active role. Despite the fact that Brian believes God exists, he still feels he has a role in the matter and states that he “will keep swinging as long as (he) can still swing” in line E806, which is a formulaic structure. In this construction, Brian assigns himself the role of Actor, who is carrying out the metaphorical material process of “swinging.” This takes the “fighter” metaphor a step further by alluding to a metaphorical fist-fight or violent confrontation, though it is an ineffectual one.

While Brian speaks to his potential to continue being a “fighter” in the face of his stuttering, his necessity to “keep” doing so indicates that he has been unsuccessful in winning the “battle” thus far.

“The delivery has mastered us.” In Excerpt 7.6, Brian attests to the power he feels “the struggle” has over people who stutter. He re-opens the “struggle” metaphor in line E872 by using an intensive relational clause to assign the Value of “problem” to “that it shows when you know-we’re struggling.” In regard to the textual metafunction, this construction also serves as a thematic equative allowing the Value to stand as Rheme and therefore, important information. The Value also functions as a representation of Brian’s negative appreciation of the aforementioned visual aspect of the struggle.

Excerpt 7.6

E872. B	but	ah	the	problem	with this	is	that	
Exp:						Relat (int)		
Modality:								
Appraisal:				Appre (-)				
	it	shows	when	you know	we're	struggling		
Exp:		Material	Circ.			Behavioral		
Appraisal:						Judg (-)		
E873. B	I'll	bet	you	that	you	know	I watch-	
Exp:		Material						
Modality:	Probability							
	I	watch	Barack	Obama	I	watch	Bill	Clinton
Exp:		Mental (per)				Mental (per)		
E874. B	and	those	people	are	just	really	good	at the way
Exp:				Relat (int)				
Appraisal:						Grad (up)	Appre (+)	
	the	way	they	communicate				
Exp:				Verbal				
B875. B	They	probably	have-	they	probably do	have	conflicts	inside
Exp:			Relat (pos)			Relat (pos)		
Modality:		Probability			Probability			
Appraisal:							Appre (-)	
	their	mind	also	when	they're	speaking		
Exp:				Circ.		Verbal		
E876. B	however	they	have	mastered	the	delivery		
Exp:				Behavior				
Modality:			Probability					
Appraisal:				Judg (+)				
E877. B	the	delivery	has	mastered	us			
Exp:				Behavioral				
Modality:			Probability					
E878. B	I	mean	I	don't	even	want	to say	mastered
Exp:							Verbal (proj)	
Modality:					Inclination			
Appraisal:					Appre (-)			
E879. B	The	delivery	has	conquered	us			
Exp:				Material				
Modality:			Probability					
Appraisal:				Grad (up)				

E880. B	It	has	conquered	us	and	that's	a	pretty
Exp:			Material			Relat (int)		
Modality:		Probability						
Appraisal:								Grad (up)
	good	way	of	putting	it	I	think	
Exp:				Verbal			Mental (cog)	
Modality:							Probability	
Appraisal:	Appre (+)							

He then goes on to positively appraise the communication skills of Barack Obama and Bill Clinton, whom he refers to as “those people” at the beginning of the clause. This sets up a distinction between two groups: “those people” who are “just really good” at communicating; and those who are not with Brian being a member of the latter. After structuring this distinction, he draws a comparison in line E875 by putting forward the probability that they (reference to ‘those people’) “probably do have conflicts in their mind also,” which makes them similar to people who stutter, in that respect. As seen in previous excerpts, the mind serves as a circumstantial location rather than an active participant in the “conflicts.” Under the system of modality, Brian’s use of the modal Adjunct “probably” conveys his uncertainty about the validity of his statement, therefore weakening its impact. Brian uses this probable similarity to introduce the difference between the two groups of communicators in line E876: “However, they have mastered the delivery. The delivery has mastered us.” Here, Brian uses “us,” which works to put the focus on PWS rather than on himself. He makes use of agency to set up this stark contrast, where “they” serve as Agent signifying that they play an active role in the process of mastering the delivery. “The delivery,” however, takes the role of Agent in the following contrastive construction, which places it in a position of control over the process of mastering. While Brian closes the excerpt by up-scaling the process of “mastered” with the replacement process “conquered” in lines E879 and E880, he still preserves the contrasting agentive role assignments

from the previous construction. His repetition of this process also has an up-scaling effect on its overall impact.

By constructing two groups that contrast in terms of communicative skill, Brian was able to use agency to reveal the lack of control he ultimately feels when faced with the metaphorical struggle/battle involved in talking. His consistent use of the present perfect allows him to construe his “talking” as something that has happened in the past, but has relevance extending into the present. This contrasts with the way he talks about his struggle, which he structures through his use of verb tense, as an ongoing process.

Description through comparison.

Comparing to person on crutches. Brian sets the stage for comparison in line E265 with his statement: “I would see somebody that comes in here that is on crutches or something- somebody that’s really got a problem.” His use of the modal Adjunct “really” suggests that Brian views “being on crutches” as a true “problem.” Under the system of Appraisal, this Adjunct serves to sharpen his assessment. Though he digresses from this topic in lines E267-269, he comes back to it in the following excerpt:

Excerpt 7.7

E270. B	because	despite	the fact	that	person	is on	crutches		
Exp:						Relat (int)			
E271. B	this	is	a really	debilitating	problem				
Exp:		Rela (int)							
Modality:			Probability						
Appraisal:				Appre (-)					
E272. B	because	it	completely	changes	the way	you	live	your	life
Exp:				Material			Material		
Modality:									
Appraisal:			Grad (max)						
	and but	you see	that's	not	obvious	to	a lot	of people	
Exp:			Relat (int)						
Modality:				NEG	Probability				
Appraisal:							Grad (up)		

He picks up the topic again in line E270 with a counter to his assertion, where he uses a relational clause of circumstance “is on crutches.” This structure places the focus on the visible aspect of the person’s condition rather than their injury, which downplays the seriousness of the person’s condition. He then contrasts this by using an intensive relational clause to assign the Attribute “a really debilitating problem” to his stuttering. His selection of the word “debilitating” to appraise stuttering is interesting in that the person who is “on crutches” has a debilitating condition as well. Brian up-scales this appraisal with “really” in order to create a difference in severity between the two debilitating conditions, thus introducing the comparative element. He then builds his case for this assertion of stuttering being “really debilitating” in line E272. Here, he maximally up-scales the process “changes,” which strengthens the control that is inherent to the agentive role he has assigned to “it” (reference to stuttering). This serves as another contrast between the two conditions: stuttering is an active participant with exclusive control in the process, while “on crutches” is just a circumstance. Brian attempts to elicit alignment from the researcher with “you see” before deploying his next comparison, where he states that the active role stuttering plays “is not obvious to a lot of people.” This stands in stark contrast to being “on crutches,” where there exists an obvious external aspect to the debilitating nature of the condition.

By comparing these debilitating conditions, Brian portrays stuttering as being the more severe of the two because of its internal aspect and makes this point by taking a visual angle in his word choices and his overall structuring of this comparison.

Comparing stuttering to cancer. In the following excerpt, Brian up-scales his previous comparison in Excerpt 7.8, being “on crutches,” and selects a more serious condition for the

current comparison, cancer. Brian also re-instates his figurative talk of the “devil” to strengthen the severity of stuttering when comparing it to the seriousness of cancer.

Excerpt 7.8

E400. B	but it	is	a	horrible	horrible	thing	
Exp:		Relat (int)					
Appraisal:				Grad (up)	Appre (-)		
E401. B	and	like	I	say-	other	people	who
Exp:				Verbal			
Modality:							
	got	cancer	or	something			
Exp:	Relat (pos)						
Modality:			Probability				
E402. B	I	mean	they	really	have	a	much
Exp:					Relat (int)		
Modality:			Probability				
Appraisal:						Grad (up.)	
	more	serious	thing	in	a	certain	way
Exp:				Circ.			
Appraisal:	Grad (up)	Appre (-)					
E403. B	but	at	the	same	time	this	is
Exp:		Circ.					Relat (int)
	a	diabolical-	I	keep	saying	that	word
Exp:					Verbal		
Modality:				Usuality			
Appraisal:		Appre (-)					
E404. B	but	it	is	made by	el Diablo		
Exp:			Relat (int)				
Appraisal:					Appre (-)		
E405. B	that	is	the Devil				
		Relat (int)					
E406. B	it	could	never	be	devised		
Exp:			NEG		Material		
Modality:		Potential	NEG Usuality				
Appraisal:			Grad (max)				
E407. B	I mean	that	is a	good way	of	putting	it
Exp:			Relat (int)			Verbal	
Appraisal:				Appre (+)			

Throughout this excerpt, Brian maintains a tight referential chain by keeping “it” (reference to stuttering) in Subject/Theme position of the clause complexes. He begins by using an intensive relational clause to appraise “it” as “a horrible, horrible thing” in line E400. His repetition of the word “horrible” operates as an up-scaling of his negative appreciation. Brian then introduces a new topic, “people who got cancer,” with a relational clause of possession where “cancer” is the item possessed by “people.” Brian down-scales his introduction of this serious topic by adding post-hoc “or something.” He uses another relational clause of possession to deploy his up-scaled appraisal that “they really have a much more serious thing,” where “they” refers to “people who got cancer.” The first up-scaling device is the modal Adjunct “really,” which works to convey factuality and therefore sharpens the appraisal. Brian also uses the quantifier “much” to heighten the comparative element “more,” which conveys his appraisal of cancer being a more serious condition than stuttering. However, Brian softens this assertion by concluding the clause with a circumstance of matter: “in a certain way.” By softening this potentially life-threatening illness he makes its contrast with stuttering, which he attributes as “diabolical,” even stronger. He up-scales his negative appreciation of stuttering in line E404 by assigning it the Attribute “made by el Diablo.” In line E405, he references “el Diablo” with “that” and relays its English translation: “the Devil. Diabolical.” His use of passive verb constructions such as “is made” and “could never be devised” serve to maintain “it” as the Theme of his talk.

In sum, Brian introduces the topic of cancer and uses it to structure a comparison with stuttering. The selection of cancer serves as an up-scaling of the subjects Brian uses for comparative purposes in that the previous subject of comparison, being “on crutches,” does not have the life-threatening element inherent to cancer. Before making the comparison, Brian

recognizes that cancer is indeed a “much more serious thing,” but counters it by assigning a series of up-scaled references to the “devil” to stuttering. In doing this, Brian was also able to express an overall negative appreciation of stuttering: that it is a more severe condition than cancer, which is a potentially terminal illness. Investigation of the thematic progression of this sequence reveals that he makes this point by contrasting “stuttering” with “people with cancer” as opposed to cancer itself.

SECTION 2: Factors that affect fluency

Brian identifies specific circumstances that have affected his fluency throughout his life. The following excerpts show how he shares his theories about the effects learning Spanish, smoking marijuana, and “making an effort” have had on his life.

Learning Spanish.

Confidence. Brian begins his turn with an intensive relational clause to signal to the researcher that his following statement is “just” his opinion. This preface down-scales the strength of his assertion “I do stutter more in Spanish” in which he expresses a maximal degree of certainty by his inclusion of modal “do” in this behavioral clause. He up-scales the frequency of this behavior by using the comparative quantifier “more.” This creates a contrast between the circumstantial matter “in Spanish” and English. He then uses a mental projection to theorize the cause of this difference. He structures the projection as a relational clause, where “the reason” is realized by another relational clause “you are not gonna be as confident in the second language.” Here, Brian places universal “you” in the role of Carrier of the down-scaled Attribute “not as confident.” This scaling also sets up a comparative element, which Brian specifies with the circumstantial matter “in the second language.” He strengthens this assertion in line E4 by using the maximally quantified Carrier “no one” and up-scaling the relational process by combining it

with words conveying maximal usuality “will ever be.” The Attribute “as confident” signals a comparative element, which Brian clarifies through the inclusion of circumstantial matter. The use of universals such as “you” and “no one” serve to make Brian part of the category of language learners and marks his lack of confidence in the second language as a general group characteristic.

Excerpt 7.9

E1. B	this is	just my-	this	is	just my	opinion	is	that	
Exp:	Relat (int)			Relat (int)			Relat (int)		
Appraisal:		Grad (dwn)			Grad (dwn)				
	I	do stutter	more	in Spanish					
Exp:		Material		Circ.					
Modality:		Probability							
Appraisal:			Grad (up)						
E2. B	but ah	I	think	the	reason	is- is	that	because	obviously
Exp:		Mental (cog. proj.)				Relat (int)			
Modality:									Probability
E3-4. B	you	are not	gonna	be	as	confident	in the	second	language
Exp:		NEG		Relat (int)			Circ.		
Modality:		NEG	Probability						
Appraisal:		NEG			Grad (dwn)	Affect (+)			

Vowels. In the following excerpt, Brian discusses his theory that the high volume of vowel-initial words in the Spanish language plays a role in his difficulty with fluency while speaking the language. Brian’s structuring of this theory is identical to the structure he used in the previous excerpt in that the relational clause that identifies “the reason” is presented as a mental projection. Because his theories are based on his personal experiences Brian uses projections, which underline the fact that he figured them out on his own.

Excerpt 7.10

E5. B	I	thought	at first	that	the	reason	was	
Exp:	Mental (cog)						Relat (int)	
Modality:	Probability							
E6-7. B	that	in Spanish	there	seemed	to be	more	words	
Exp:		Circ.		Relat (int)	Existential			
Modality:				Probability				
Appraisal:						Grad (up)		
E8. B	that	start	with	certain	vowels	and this	seems	to
Exp:	Circ.		Circ.				Relat (int)	
Modality:							Probability	
E9. B	and	I	do	have	more	problems	with	words
Exp:				Relat (pos)				
Modality:			Probability					
Appraisal:					Grad (up)			
	that	start	with	vowels				
Exp:	Circ.		Circ.					
E10. B	and so	I	think	I	told	you		
Exp:		Mental (cog. proj.)			Verbal			
E11. B	it's	62 pages	in	my	Spanish	side	of	
Exp:	Relat (int)		Circ.				Circ.	
	my	bilingual	dictionary	of	the	"a" letters		
Exp:				Circ.				
E12. B	62 pages	in	Spanish	and	in English	it's	39	
Exp:		Circ.			Circ.	Relat (int)		
	or	something	or	other				
Modality:	Probability							
Appraisal:	Grad (dwn)							
E13. B	so	I	thought	that	was	significant		
Exp:		Mental (cog. proj.)			Relat (int)			
Modality:		Probability						
Appraisal:						Appre (+)		

Brian down-scales the content of his projection by using the modality “seemed” in conjunction with the existential process “to be,” which denotes uncertainty in his assertion that there are “more words that start with certain vowels” in Spanish. This is something he cannot say for sure. However, he is able to express a high degree of certainty in the relational clause of possession, where he positions himself as Possessor of “more problems with words that start with vowels.” He then supports his previous statement about the amount of words starting with vowels in Spanish by using a bilingual dictionary to compare the number of pages that contain vowel-initial words in each language. Because there are more pages in Spanish than in English, he attributes this as being “significant.”

This excerpt shows that Brian actively searches for evidence to support the theories he has formed based on his personal experience with stuttering. He has identified difficulty with vowels as a characteristic of his stuttering in English. He used this knowledge as the foundation for his theory as to why his stuttering was worse in Spanish, which he has proven to be heavy in vowel-initial words. By structuring this characteristic of the language as the focus of his talk, Brian effectively places his abilities as a speaker in the background thereby suggesting that the onus is on the language.

Accustomed to being uncomfortable. In Excerpt 7.11, Brian describes how he has turned his experience with stuttering into an advantage when learning Spanish. He begins with a verbal projection that is aimed towards his Spanish-learning peers. Brian assigns himself the role of Actor in the material process, which is situated through his use of a spatial metaphor for entering interactions where he needs to speak Spanish. He elaborates on the significance of his being Actor by assigning himself the Attribute of “uncomfortable” with the circumstantial matter “everything I say.”

Excerpt 7.11

E899. B	I	said	"listen	for me	to go	out there"	I	mean	
Exp:	Verbal (proj)				Material				
	I	am	uncomfortable	everything	I	say	and in	both	languages
Exp:		Relat (int)				Verbal	Circ.		
Modality:				Usuality					
Appraisal:			Affect (-)	Grad (up)					
E900. B	so	for that	reason	I'm	going to	turn	this		
Exp:		Circ.				Material			
Modality:					Probability				
	into	an	advantage	and	see	that's	the	truth	
Exp:	Circ.					Relat (int)			
Appraisal:			Appre (+)					Appre (+)	
E901. B	I	can	go	to	these	groups	now	and	you
Exp:			Material				Circ.		
Modality:		Potential							
E902-903. B	cannot	learn	a foreign	language	unless	you	go out	and	practice it
Exp:	NEG Mental (cog)						Material		Material
Modality:	NEG Potential				Probability				
E904. B	I	do	this	all	the	time			
Exp:		Material							
Modality:					Usuality				
E905. B	I	am	no	worse	in	say	my	stuttering	except
Exp:		Relat (int)			Circ.				Circ.
Appraisal:			NEG	Appre (-)					
E906. B	that	you will-	this	thing	is	a	function	of	comfort
Exp:					Relat (int)				
Appraisal:						Appre (neu)	Affect (+)		
E907. B	but	see	I	am accustomed	to being	uncomfortable			
Exp:	Circ.			Relat (int)		Relat (int)			
Modality:					Usuality				
Appraisal:					Affect (+)		Affect (-)		
E908. B	and so	I'm	not	sure	that	that's	a	positive	thing
Exp:		Relat (int)				Relat (int)			
Modality:			NEG	Probability					
Appraisal:								Appre (+)	

By using a maximal quantifier in line E899 to up-scale the base, “thing,” Brian conveys the fact that the behavior of talking, in both languages, is something that regularly causes him to feel this way. He adds a material clause revealing his intentions to turn “this” (reference to stuttering) into an advantage. In doing so, he has been able to go out and practice Spanish “all the time,” which Brian identifies as a key element to learning a foreign language in line E903. With “practicing Spanish” as the source of contrast, Brian assigns himself the comparative Attribute of “no worse” in an intensive relational clause construction where “stuttering” is a circumstantial matter completing the contrast. Because a similarity is revealed through making this contrast, Brian adds the exception through an intensive relational clause, where “thing” (reference to learning Spanish) is assigned the Attribute of “function of comfort,” which has worked in his favor since he is “accustomed to being uncomfortable.”

Brian uses a series of intensive relational clauses to assign himself the Attribute of “uncomfortable” in regard to the circumstantial matter of speaking. Because this is something he is used to, as expressed through the static nature of the relational processes, he has been able to excel in learning Spanish because the necessary element of practicing does not make him anymore uncomfortable than he already is.

Not as comfortable. Brian uses an intensive relational clause to assign himself, not his stuttering, the Attribute “a little worse” in regard to speaking Spanish. He presents the cause of this in an intensive relational construction where he assigns himself the Attribute of “not as comfortable.” His use of “as” not only works to down-scale the positive affect of comfort but also to convey a contrast in the levels of comfort he feels when speaking each language. In line E458, he identifies this assertion as his “theory” and his “feedback” with an intensive relational

clause construction. This works to lower the level of commitment he has to the veracity of this assertion as it is based on his personal experiences, not objective fact.

Excerpt 7.12

E457. B	but	overall	I	am	a little	worse	in it		
Exp:	Circ.			Relat (int)			Circ.		
Appraisal:					Grad (dwn)	Appre (-)			
	because	I	am	obviously	not	as	comfortable		
Exp:			Relat (int)						
Modality:				Probability					
Appraisal:					NEG	Grad (dwn)	Affect (+)		
E458. B	and	this	is	my	theory	you	know	my	feedback
Exp:			Relat (int)						

Marijuana.

Smoking pot. Brian introduces the topic of marijuana, which frequently resurfaces throughout this conversation. He uses words such as “marijuana,” “pot,” “drugs” (as a reference to marijuana), and “THC” a total of 9 times. While he believes the drug helped him with fluency, he works to avoid the social stigma that comes with recreational drug use. This is evidenced by his use of a circumstantial clause of location to open the topic in line E72, “when I was young.” This places the behavioral clause “I smoked pot and stuff” into the distant past. He down-scales this taboo behavior with “and stuff.” Before diving into the details of smoking pot, he forestalls criticism by assigning the behavior the Attribute of “not something I am proud of.” In the following clause, he up-scales the quantity of Behavers, which acts to position the behavior as a social norm. Brian uses the circumstance of location, “that period,” in lines E74 and E75 to preface the positive appreciations he assigns to himself through the relational clause construction. This implies a link between his behavior during that time and his success with fluency, which he up-scales with the superlative “most.” He uses a negated mental projection, which conveys uncertainty in the relationship between marijuana and his success.

Excerpt 7.13

E72. B	that	when	I	was	young	or I	might	have		
Exp:		Circ.		Relat (int)						
Modality:							Probability			
	told	you	that	I	smoked	pot	and	stuff		
Exp:	Verbal				Material					
Appraisal:								Grad (dwn)		
E73. B	and	that's	not something		I'm	proud	of			
Exp:		Relat (int)			Relat (int)					
Appraisal:			NEG			Affect (+)				
	but	a lot	of	people	did	it				
Exp:	Circ.		Circ.		Material					
Modality:					Usuality					
Appraisal:		Grad (up)								
E74. B	and	for	that	period	of	time				
Exp:		Circ.			Circ.					
	that	was	by far	the	most	successful				
Exp:		Relat (int)								
Appraisal:			Grad (up)		Grad (max)	Appre (+)				
E75. B	or	the	period	that	I	was	the	most	fluent	
Exp:						Relat (int)				
Appraisal:								Grad (max)	Appre (+)	
E76. B	I	don't	know	if	it	was	the	marijuana		
Exp:		Mental (neg. cog.)				Relat (int)				
Modality:				Probability						
E77. B	or	there	was	something about		that	that	really	did	make
Exp:			Existential							Material
Modality:								Probability		
	me	not	as	concerned	about	things	that	are	not important	
Exp:		NEG		Mental (emo)				Relat (int)		
Appraisal:		NEG	Grad (dwn)	Affect (-)					NEG	Appre (+)

While Brian tries to avoid portraying himself as someone who advocates recreational use of drugs, he is uncertain about whether or not his use of marijuana during young adulthood contributed to his success with fluency during that given time.

Research-worthy. After digressing from the topic for some time, Brian re-introduces marijuana into his talk by expressing interest in seeing research done on its effects on stuttering.

Excerpt 7.14

E120. B	somebody	needs	to do	that				
Exp:			Material					
Modality:		Obligation						
Appraisal:		Judg (+)						
E121. B	and	again	from	my	experience	I	do not	know
Exp:			Circ.				NEG	Mental (cog)
	like I	say	if	during	that	period	of	my life
Exp:		Verbal (proj)		Circ.			Circ.	
Modality:			Probability					
E122. B	I	just	did	not	care	about	things	
Exp:				NEG	Mental (emo)	Circ.		
Modality:			Probability					
Appraisal:		Grad (up)		NEG	Affect (-)			
E123. B	or	you know	whether	that	actually	affected	it	positively
Exp:			Circ.			Material		
Modality:					Probability			
Appraisal:								Appre (+)
E124. B	but	if	there	is	a possibility	for	something that-	
Exp:	Circ.			Existential		Circ.		
Modality:		Probability						
E125. B	if-	some	university	needs to	carry out	a study	about	that
Exp:					Material		Circ.	
Modality:				Obligation				
Appraisal:				Judg (+)				
E126. B	because	that	possibly-	that	is	the	only thing	
Exp:	Circ.				Relat (int)			
Modality:			Probability					
Appraisal:							Grad (max)	
	I	can	tell	you	in my life	that	I felt	uninhibited
Exp:			Verbal		Circ.		Mental (emo)	
Modality:		Potential						
Appraisal:								Affect (+)

He appraises research on the topic as something that “needs” to be done. The modal item “needs” carries a moderate level of obligation and functions as a positive judgment in the Appraisal system. This speaks to the high level of significance Brian assigns to the matter. In line

E121, he offers a disclaimer to convey his low degree of certainty about the possible contributing factors he considers in lines E122 and E123. The first factor is his emotional status of not caring about things during that time, which he expresses as a negated mental clause of emotion. The other possibility, presented in line E123, refers back to his original inclination of marijuana having a positive effect. In this construction, marijuana is placed in an agentive role with referential “that” while fluency is in the role of Medium with referential “it.” Brian has removed the behavior of smoking from the equation which assigns the possible positive effects to the actual drug rather than the stigmatized behavior of using it.

Brian then circles back to the “need” for research to be done. This time, however, he assigns the obligation of carrying out a study to “some university,” whereas in line E120 he assigned it to an unspecified “somebody.” In line E126, he reveals the significance of smoking marijuana through a relational clause construction, where he assigns it the up-scaled Attribute of “the only thing in my life” that has made him feel “uninhibited.”

Improved speech. Brian brings up the topic of marijuana again through the use of the same “distancing then positively appraising” structure he has used in the previous excerpts. Here, he asks the researcher if “this” is “shunned” in her discipline. In line E278, he clarifies that “this” in the previous line was a reference to the “possibility of THC.” By using the technical name of a chemical found in marijuana, THC, Brian highlights the possible research implication he discussed in Excerpt 7.14. As seen in the previous excerpts, Brian discloses his intentions before positively appraising the significant impact marijuana has had on his speech. He up-scales the significance of its impact by assigning it the maximally quantified Value of “only thing.” Brian strengthens this assertion in line E281 by maximizing the negated quantification of other factors that he can attribute to his improved speech, including speech therapy.

Excerpt 7.15

E277. B	is	this	shunned	in	your	discipline	talking	
Exp:	Relat (int)			Circ.			Verbal	
Appraisal:			Judg (-)					
E278. B	the	possibility	of say	ah	THC	or	I mean	
Exp:			Circ.					
E279. B	I	am not	trying	to promote	that	or	anything	
Exp:		NEG	Material	Material				
Modality:			Inclination					
Appraisal:							Grad (dwn)	
E280. B	but that	is	the	only thing	I	can	tell	you that
Exp:	Circ.	Relat (int)					Verbal	
Modality:						Potential		
Appraisal:				Grad (max)				
E281. B	I mean	I	can	give	you	nothing	else	that
Exp:				Material				
Modality:			Potential			NEG		
Appraisal:						Grad (max)		
E282. B	I	will ever	say	improved	my speech	speech	therapy	anything
Exp:			Verbal	Material				
Modality:		Probability						
Appraisal:		Grad (up)						Grad (max)
E283. B	but um	I	think	that	is	worthy		
Exp:			Mental (cog. proj.)		Relat (int)			
Modality:			Probability					
Appraisal:						Appre (+)		
	of	some type	of	research				
Exp:				Material				

Effort . The following excerpts illustrate how Brian talks about the role effort plays in his fluency. He first introduces effort as an intentional process that he took an active role in the past to improve his stuttering. He then identifies the process of making an effort as being a contributing factor to his stuttering in the second excerpt. This reveals that, over time, the role of effort in Brian’s stuttering changed.

Stuttering despite efforts. Brian describes stuttering as the only thing in his life that, despite his efforts, he has not improved or had success in.

Excerpt 7.16

E807. B	this	is	the	only thing	in	my life	that
Exp:		Relat (int)			Circ.		
Modality:							
Appraisal:				Grad (up)			
	I	have	worked	with	that		
Exp:			Material				
Modality:		Usuality					
E808. B	that	I	have	worked	hard	at	
Exp:				Material			
Modality:			Usuality				
Appraisal:					Appre (+)		
E809. B	that	I	have	not	improved		
Exp:				NEG	Material		
Modality:			Probability				
Appraisal:				NEG	Appre (+)		

Brian uses a thematic equative, which effectively reduces “this” (reference to the topic of stuttering) to its result: a lack of success. The intensive relational process he uses to construe the experiential configuration is static in nature. He places the Attribute “that I have not improved” in the final Rheme position, which strengthens the effect of his assertion. The Attribute is a maximally up-scaled by his use of “only” which conveys a high level of significance. Additionally, he up-scales the behavioral process of “worked” by including the word “hard” to indicate that there was a high level of effort involved. Brian completes this statement with the circumstantial clause “that I have not improved.” In both circumstances, work and not improving, Brian assigns himself roles that denote his active participation. He digresses from this topic in lines E809-813, but re-introduces it line E814 with the preface “but I want to say again,” which serves to project the information.

Excerpt 7.17

E814. B	but	I	want	to say	again-	everything	else	I	have
Exp:				Verbal					
Modality:			Inclination						Usuality
Appraisal:			Appre (+)			Grad (max)			
	put forth	any effort	at	I	have had	some	success	in	
Exp:	Material				Relat (pos)				
Modality:					Usuality				
Appraisal:		Grad (up)				Grad (dwn)			
E815. B	not	had	a	bit	with	that			
Exp:	NEG	Relat (pos)			Circ.				
Appraisal:				Grad (up)					

His use of the verb “want” conveys a high degree of modal inclination, which signals the interpersonal significance in what he is about to say- even though it may be old information as flagged by “again.” Brian does in fact relay the same information from the beginning of the excerpt but makes use of the graduation system in several instances. For example, in line E814 he uses the maximally up-scaled words in the phrases “everything else” and “any effort” to build a case for his capacity to achieve success. Though he up-scales his abilities to a maximal extent, he down-scales the amount of success he has had with “some.” In comparison to usually having the down-scaled quantity of “some” success, Brian up-scales the lack of success he has had with stuttering by negating the already down-scaled quantity of “a bit.”

Brian usually finds some success in anything he puts effort towards. Stuttering is the “only” exception to this effort=success configuration. Despite the “hard” work he’s put into improving his stuttering, he has not been able to have any success.

Effort as “the problem.” Brian uses an intensive relational clause to assign “effort” the Attribute of “the problem” in line E834. His repetition of “effort” intensifies his commitment to this attribution, though he reveals a lack of certainty through his use of the modal item “probably.” The researcher asks for clarification of this statement with the mental cognitive

process “feel.” This verb also activates modal probability which gives Brian the option to respond with an opinion rather than a concrete fact that he must stand behind. Because this restriction is removed, Brian responds with a high-level of certainty, which he up-scales through repetition. This is followed by a string of linguistic nonfluencies in which Brian tries to formulate his next clause. He produces a circumstance of time that universal “you” partakes in the process of seeing the negatively appreciated “contorted faces,” which supports his use of the adjective “obviously”- underlining the fact that this is a phenomenon that can be seen. This represents a contradiction in regard to the choices he makes within the system of modality, where “probably” and “certainly” are matters of conviction and “obviously” is one of observation. He then assigns “those people” (reference to people who stutter) the role of Behaver in the process of “struggling,” which also expresses Brian’s negative judgment.

Excerpt 7.18

E834. B	effort-	effort-	effort	is	probably	the	problem	
Exp:				Material				
Modality:					Probability			
Appraisal:							Appre (-)	
E835. AG	you	feel	like	making	an effort	makes	it	worse?
Exp:		Mental (cog)		Material		Material		
Appraisal:								Appre (-)
E836. B	yeah	oh	certainly	certainly				
Modality:			Probability					
E837. B	I	mean	obviously	when	you	see	the-	
Exp:				Circ.		Mental (per)		
Modality:			Probability					
	when	you	see	these	contorted	faces		
Exp:	Circ.		Mental (per)					
E838. B	those	people	are	struggling				
Exp:				Behavioral				
Appraisal:				Judg (-)				

SECTION 3: Family History

The greatest concentration of the word “stuttering” and its variants is located in the portion of talk where Brian discusses his family history with stuttering. The following excerpts show how Brian differentiates between his father’s stammering and his stuttering; uses his late brother’s problematic lifestyle as a catalyst to express his negative appreciation of stuttering; and uses other family member’s lack of stuttering as a measure of perfection.

Father’s stammer. Excerpt 7.19 exemplifies the contrast Brian makes between being a “real stutterer” and his father who would “just stammer.” Here, Brian makes a clear distinction between his stuttering and his father’s “stammering.” He uses a relational process in line E502 “not like me,” which is followed by a post-hoc statement, “however he stammered.” This expresses that though he does not view his father’s behavior as being comparable to his stuttering, they both had issues with speech nonetheless. When the researcher asked Brian to explain the difference between his father’s stammering and his own behaviors, he responds in line E504 by downscaling his father’s stammer with “just,” which lessens the severity of his father’s behavior.

He continues to lessen the severity of his father’s stammer by down-scaling his negative appraisal of the composition of his father’s language, which says is “a little disjointed” in line E505. Brian also views the stammering as something that his father participated in as he reported that his father would “hurry part of it” thus putting his father in the role of Actor. This contrasts with Brian’s description of his stuttering in Excerpt 7.10, where he is less in control of the stuttering as it is affected by language selection. Brian also defines his father’s stammering by line E507 “would not appear comfortable.” Here, “appear” indicates that Brian is speaking from his personal perspective.

Excerpt 7.19

E499. B	but	a couple	of	stutterers	on	my dad's	side		
Exp:	Circ.		Circ.		Circ.				
Appraisal:		Grad (dwn)							
AG	really?	on	your	dad's	side?				
Exp:		Circ.							
B	on	my	dad's	side					
Exp:	Circ.								
E500. AG	who?								
E501. B	well	he	stammered						
Exp:	Circ.		Behavioral						
E502. B	he	was	not	like	me	however	he	stammered	
Exp:		Relat (int)	NEG			Circ.		Behavioral	
E503. AG	how	was	it	different?	can	you	explain	like	what
Exp:		Relat (int)					Material		
Modality:					Potential				
	the	stammering	was	versus	what	you	do?		
Exp:			Relat (int)				Material		
E504. B	oh	well	he	would	just	stammer			
Exp:						Behavioral			
Modality:				Usuality					
Appraisal:					Grad (dwn)				
E505. B	it's	like	you	can	tell	that	language		
Exp:	Relat (int)				Mental (per)				
Modality:				Potential					
Appraisal:									
	is	a little	disjointed						
Exp:	Relat (int)								
Appraisal:		Grad (dwn)	Appre (-)						
E506. B	he	would	like	hurry	a part	of	it		
Exp:				Material		Circ.			
Modality:		Usuality							
Appraisal:					Grad (dwn)				

E507. B	he	would	not	appear	comfortable if	you	
Exp:			NEG	Relat (int)		Circ.	
Modality:		Usuality	NEG				
Appraisal:			NEG		Affect (+)		
	were	talking	to him				
Exp:		Behavioral	Circ.				
E508. B	I mean	like	you	could	tell	that	he was
Exp:					Mental (per)		Relat (int)
Modality:				Potential			
	a little bit	nervous	and	was	like	that	
Exp:				Relat (int)			
Appraisal:	Grad (dwn)	Affect (-)					
E509. B	but	he	was	not	a	real	stutterer
Exp:	Circ.		Relat (int)	NEG			
Appraisal:						Sharpen	

He then describes his father as “a little bit nervous” in line E508. This description is problematic for Brian’s overall goal of differentiating stuttering and stammering in that “comfort” is a topic that Brian frequently brings up throughout his talk as a major factor in whether or not he stutters. Because of this similarity, Brian has to do work to maintain his stance that his father’s stammering is different from his stuttering and closes the topic by stating that his father was “not a real stutterer” in line E509. In this structure, he does not use “stutter” as a process. Instead, he uses a grammatical metaphor (“stutterer”) paired with negative polarity to absolutely assert that his father did not belong to the same category as Brian himself.

Brother. Brian talks about his second brother who was “the most important person” that he ever knew, but who “always had problems.” Brian builds an increasingly dysfunctional image of his late brother’s life which he later uses to up-scale his negative appreciation of stuttering. The following excerpt illustrates how Brian sets the stage by contrasting his brother’s extraordinary intelligence with his reckless behavior.

Excerpt 7.20

E512. B	and	my	second	brother	he	passed	away	very very	young	from-
Exp:						Material				Circ.
Appraisal:								Grad (up)		
E513. B	everything	was	wrong	in	his	life				
Exp:		Relat (int)			Circ.					
Appraisal:	Grad (max)		Appre (-)							
E514. B	he	was	accepted	to Princeton	his	junior	year-	early	acceptance	
Exp:			Material		Circ.					
Appraisal:								Grad (up)		
E515. B	we	thought	he	would	be	a real	prodigy	or so-	and	you know
Exp:		Mental (proj)			Relat (int)					
Modality:				Probability						
Appraisal:						Sharpen	Appre (+)			
E516. B	and	but	he	always	had	problems				
Exp:		Circ.			Relat (pos)					
Modality:				Usuality						
Appraisal:				Grad (max)		Appre (-)				
E517. B	he	did	not	stutter	but no	he	really	did	not	stutter
Exp:			NEG	Behavioral	Circ				NEG	Behavioral
Appraisal:							Grad (up)			
E518. B	but	at the	same time	I	think	there	is	a link	between-	just-
Exp:	Circ.	Circ.			Mental (cog. proj)		Existential			
E519. B	he	did	have	a lot	of	sociological	problems			
Exp:			Relat (pos)		Circ.					
Appraisal:				Grad (up)			Appre (-)			
E520. B	women	drugs	alcohol							
E521. B	he	passed	away	at the	age	of	49			
Exp:		Material		Circ.		Circ.				
	and	he	passed	away	of	AIDS				
Exp:			Material		Circ.					
E522. B	and	that	was	just	one	of	a myriad	of things		
Exp:			Relat (int)			Circ.				
Appraisal:				Grad (up)			Grad (up)			
E523. B	he	had	4	DUIs						
Exp:		Relat (pos)								
E524. B	he	never	opened	a	book					
Exp:		NEG	Material							
Modality:		NEG Usuality								
Appraisal:		Grad (max)								

Brian begins this sequence with “my second brother” serving as marked Theme, thus setting up the topic for the whole exchange which he maintains by structuring a tight referential chain. He starts with a comment about his brother’s death with an up-scaled appreciation through repetition then alludes to external factor being the cause through his use of “from.” However, Brian abandons the clause instead of divulging in the cause of his death. His foreshadowing continues in line E513 with a maximally up-scaled negative appreciation of his life “Everything was wrong in his life.” Here, the brother has not been assigned role of Agent which is evidence that Brian views the aspects of his brother’s life as being “wrong” inherently and not as a result of his brother’s actions.

After this preface, Brian sets up the element of tragedy in his brother’s life by first talking about the bright future he was expected to have. In line E514, Brian states that “He was accepted to Princeton his junior year,” which signals that his brother was not only intelligent, but he was extraordinary in that he was accepted to an Ivy league school before graduating from high school. Brian reiterates this point by saying “early acceptance.” With his brother serving as Goal of this process, it highlights the fact that the only positive thing mentioned was something that happened to the brother rather than something he did. Brian uses a mental projection to present his family’s expectations for his brother in line E515. Here, Brian uses modality to convey probability in the mental projection “we thought” as well as in his use of the auxiliary verb “would” with “be,” which both serve to foreshadow the upcoming negation of this expectation. He follows this with a relational clause conveying that problems were something that his brother “always” possessed. This maximal up-scaling of usuality is an indication that Brian may now realize that his brother’s problems were present even before the family thought up these expectations therefore rendering them unrealistic despite his extraordinary accomplishment.

While Brian is on the topic of problems, he inserts the comment “He did not stutter. But he really did not stutter.” Now the brother is in the role of Behaver, which stands in contrast with his comparably less active roles in the previous lines. Because Brian refers to stuttering as a problem throughout his talk, it was necessary for him to make clear that despite all these problems inherent to his brother’s life, stuttering was not one of them. He up-scales this assertion in the second clause with “really,” which acts to draw a distinct line between his brother, who does not stutter, and his most recent topic, his father, whose speech has traces of stuttering (lines E499-509). Brian begins to formulate a mental projection about “a link” in line E518, but abandons the clause before explaining what the link is. He re-initiates the previous topic of his brother’s problems with a relational clause in line E519, where his brother is the Possessor of “a lot of sociological problems.” This is reminiscent of lines E513 and E516, where his brother was not assigned an agentive role in the occurrence of the problems. This lack of agency is made even more apparent in line E520, where Brian identifies his brother’s problems by listing nouns “women, alcohol, drugs” instead of behavioral processes. By not identifying his brother’s behaviors, he does not assign his brother responsibility for any of his problems and makes it clear that even though others might, he does not judge his brother.

Brian blocks judgment again with line E521 by circling back to the topic of his brother’s death which he had been building up over the previous nine lines. He reopens the topic by first specifying that “He passed away at the age of 49,” which Brian previously appreciated as being “very, very young.” Announcing this tragic detail allowed Brian to delay and soften the identification of the cause of his brother’s death: AIDS. There is a stigma associated with the illness, so it is not a preferred topic. Also, sharing this information opens the floor back up for judgment of his brother’s behaviors which Brian may have been avoiding through delaying the

topic. He closes the topic in the following line with a relational clause of possession “He had four DUIs” which is also something that is subject to negative judgment but is more preferred than the topic of AIDS.

Brian ties in an up-scaled appreciation about his brother’s intelligence in line E524: “He never opened a book.” Here, “never” expresses a maximally up-scaled comment on usuality, which adds to Brian’s earlier portrayal of his brother’s intelligence being extraordinary. This line stands in contrast with the few details that Brian gave about his lifestyle.

This excerpt shows how Brian uses the description of his brother’s problematic life as catalyst to express how he feels about stuttering.

Excerpt 7.21

E532. B	he	meant	the	world	to me						
Exp:		Relat (int)			Circ.						
Appraisal:				Grad (up)							
Appraisal:				Appre (+)							
E533. B	same	time-	prostitutes	alcohol	drugs						
Exp:	Circ.										
E534. B	he	did	not	function	but	he	was	not	a stutterer		
Exp:			NEG	Material	Circ.		Relat (int)	NEG			
Appraisal:			Judg (-)								
	so	I	give	him	that						
Exp:			Material								
Appraisal:					Appre (+)						
E535. AG	he	was	not?								
Exp:		Relat (int)	NEG								
E536. B	he	was	not	so	I	give	him	that			
Exp:		Relat (int)	NEG			Material					
Appraisal:								Appre (+)			
Appraisal:						Grad (up)					

The listing of problems in line E533 is almost identical to that of line E520 presented above, except this time, Brian swapped out “women” for “prostitutes,” which alludes to his involvement in illegal activities. In line E534, Brian summates the description of his brother’s

lifestyle by saying simply “He did not function.” This is a neutral statement about the usuality of his behavior in lieu of positing a negative appreciation like “He was dysfunctional” or a negative judgment about his capacity or potential with “He could not function.” This statement is then juxtaposed with a concessional clause of intensive relation, where “not a stutterer” is the Attribute carried by his brother. As seen in Excerpt 7.19, Brian uses the grammatical metaphor “stutterer.” So, while his brother is the Behaver of “not function,” he does not belong to the category of “stutterers.” The figurative expression that follows, “so I give him that,” expresses Brian’s positive appraisal of the Attribute “not a stutterer.” When the researcher asks for clarification, Brian stands by his original statement and repeats it almost verbatim in line E536 “He was not so I give him that,” which serves to up-scale his commitment to the statement.

In the above excerpts, Brian spends a great deal of time talking about his brother, who “meant the world” to him. He viewed his brother as someone who was extraordinary in terms of intelligence and the family as a whole had high expectations for his future. Brian counters these past beliefs by saying “Everything was wrong with his life” and revealing details about his brother’s life, which included “prostitutes, drugs, alcohol” and “four DUIs.” His brother passed away at the age of 49 with AIDS. He concludes his talk about his brother by saying “He was not functional, but he was not a stutterer so I give him that.” With this string of clauses, Brian makes a positive comment about his brother but at the same time expresses an overarching negative appreciation of stuttering. In light of all the aforementioned details of his brother’s life, Brian views the fact that he did not stutter as a redeeming quality.

Other family members. Brian also gives a brief description of his other two siblings after talking about his brother and his “dysfunctional” sister. Through this description, the

connection between their perfection and not stuttering is made by the researcher then is confirmed by Brian.

Excerpt 7.22

E544. B	but	the	other	two	members	of	my family	are	completely	normal
Exp:	Circ.					Circ.		Relat (int)		
Appraisal:									Grad (max)	Judg (+)
E545. B	they	are	almost	like	what	is it-	"father	knows	best"	
Exp:		Relat (int)				Relat (int)				
Appraisal:			Grad (dwn)					Appre(+)		
	or	something								
Appraisal:	Soften									
E546. B	I mean,	perfect	family							
Appraisal:		Appre (+)								
E547. AG	they	don't	stutter?							
Exp:		NEG	Behavioral							
E548. B	they	don't	stutter-	their	lives	are	just-	perfect	families	
Exp:		NEG	Behavioral			Relat (int)				
Appraisal:								Appre (+)		

Brian uses an intensive relational clause in line E544 to assign his “other two family members” the Attribute of “completely normal.” This Attribute is also a maximally up-scaled positive appreciation. The use of “completely” serves to make a distinction between these two family members and the family members, who he spoke about previously, who have some normal qualities but were dysfunctional to certain extent. He uses another intensive relational clause to assign them the Attribute of “almost like- what is it- like ah ‘father knows best’ or something” in line E545. “Almost” and “or something” down-scales his positive appreciation, but also have the effect of conveying a lack of certainty in terms of modality. In the following line, he conveys his positive appreciation of the family by describing them as “perfect.” He responds to the researcher’s question by echoing the content of her question and tacking on additional information through the use of another intensive relational clause, where the positive

appreciation “perfect families” is assigned as an Attribute to the two family members’ respective families.

SECTION 4: Appraisal of outside entities

Support Group. Brian attends monthly stuttering self-help/ support group meetings led by Dr. Maxwell at a local university in Florida. He uses words such as “group” and “sessions” I reference to the self-help/ support group a total of 13 times throughout the conversation. The behaviors of the people who attend the meetings serve as a frequently recurring topic throughout Brian’s talk. By comparing their collective behaviors and attitudes to his own, he constructs an image of himself as being personable, realistic and positive in light of his stuttering. He contrasts this with the overall negative affect his peers bring to the meetings with their complaining and self-victimization.

Not saying a word. In Excerpt 7.23, Brian talks about his peers’ lack of participation during support group meetings. He uses this description of their behavior to structure a comparison where he portrays himself as a talkative, people person.

Brian begins the excerpt by building his credibility on the topic of support group happenings by up-scaling the number of meetings he has attended, as well as by using the present-tense verb “go” to express the usuality of his attendance. He uses an existential clause to specify the number of people that are typically at these meetings. Despite the fact that there are between 6-7 potential speakers, Brian uses a behavioral construction “and not a person will be saying a word” to convey that this is typical of his support group peers. Brian then brings in the comparative element by describing himself as “talkative person,” which he up-scales with the adverb “really” to express the high level of commitment to this statement. He uses “really” for the same purposes in the following mental emotive clause “I really love people.” He uses a maximal modal “always” in circumstantial relational clause “I am always with someone.”

Excerpt 7.23

E90. B	I	mean	I	go	to a lot	of	his	sessions	in there
Exp:				Material					Circ.
Modality:				Usuality					
Appraisal:					Grad (up)				
E91. B	and	sometimes	there	will be	6 or 7	people	in there		
Exp:				Existential			Circ.		
Modality:		Usuality							
E92. B	and	not	a	person	will	be	saying	a	word
Exp:							Behavioral		
Modality:					Usuality				
Appraisal:			Grad (up)					Grad (up)	
E93. B	and so	I	really	am	a talkative	person			
Exp:				Relat (int)					
Modality:			Probability						
Appraisal:					Appre (+)				
E94. B	I mean	I	really	love	people				
Exp:				Mental (des)					
Modality:			Probability						
Appraisal:				Affect (+)					
E95. B	and	I	am	always	with	somebody			
Exp:			Relat (Circ)		Circ.				
Modality:				Usuality					
Appraisal:				Grad (up)					

Essentially Brian portrays himself as a people person who enjoys socializing. This not only contrasts with his support group peers, who usually do not say a word during the meetings, but also with his “constant struggle” metaphor.

Complaining. Brian identifies “complaining” as another behavior that differentiates him from his support group peers.

Excerpt 7.24

E173. B	and	see	I	go	into	a lot	of	Dr. W's	groups	
Exp:				Material			Circ.			
Modality:				Usuality						
Appraisal:						Grad (up)				
E174. B	over there	and the	people	when	we're	sitting	around	the table		
Exp:				Circ.		Material				
E175. B	complain	about	people	or you know	whatever	types	of	situations	they	
Exp:	Verbal									
Appraisal:	Judg (-)									
	encounter	with	people	shunning	them	or-				
Exp:	Material			Material						
E176. B	but	I	never do	that	because	when	I			
Exp:			Material			Circ.				
Modality:			Usuality							
Appraisal:			Grad (max)							
	had	that job	at	that	bank					
Exp:	Relat (pos)									
E177. B	I	said	"well	why	should	they	put	me	on the	loan desk"
Exp:		Verbal (proj)					Material			
Modality:					Obligation					
Appraisal:										
	for example	because	I'm	not going	to do	that	very	well		
Exp:				NEG	Material					
Modality:				NEG	Probability					
Appraisal:				NEG			Grad (up)	Appre (+)		

Brian prefaces this new topic with an almost verbatim repetition of the credibility-building statement used in line E90 of the previous excerpt. He begins with “the people” (a reference to support group peers), but delays process selection by interjecting a circumstantial clause “when we’re sitting around the table.” The delayed process, “complain,” is behavioral in terms of process type but also functions as a negative judgment under Appraisal. Brian first states that his peers complain “about people,” then elaborates it with “whatever types of situations they encounter with people shunning them.” In the latter construction, “people” (those who the peers complain about) are placed in an active role where they participate in the

conscious behavior of “shunning,” whereas in the former construction “people” served as circumstantial matter.

Brian then deploys his comparison in line E176 by stating that he “never” does “that” (reference to complaining). In using the maximally up-scaled negation of usuality “never,” Brian not only achieves contrast but also creates distance between him and his peers, whom he negatively judges for their complaining. He distances himself even further in line E177 with a verbal projection of his thoughts about his past banking job. By utilizing this construction, Brian indirectly challenges his peers’ beliefs that others have an obligation to treat them nicely by projecting the question “Well, why should they put me on the loan desk?” He then follows this projection with a negative appreciation of his possible performance in such a position: “because I’m not going to do that very well.” Brian’s negative appraisal of himself aligns him with the bank’s lack of obligation which works to distance him further from his peers.

Emotions. Brian uses negative judgments when discussing his support group peers’ emotions to create contrasts and distance himself. There are two instances where Brian does not instantiate a comparative element when talking about their emotions. Rather, he made statements in regard to the quantity of the people in the group who exhibited a particular emotion. For example, in line E772 he states that “a lot of people there are angry too.” Here, he uses an intensive relational clause to assign the Attribute of “angry” to “people.” The quantification of people with “a lot” not only up-scales the number of people whom he perceives to be “angry” but also creates the sense that this emotion may be normal for the group as a whole. Brian also judges some of his peers as being “sullen” or “morose.” The following excerpt illustrates how he uses an intensive relational clause to assign the Attribute of “kind of sullen or kind of- morose” to “some people in some of the groups.” The quantity of Carriers is down-scaled by “some” and

is down-scaled further through the addition by the circumstance “in some of the groups.” This down-scaling has the overall effect of structuring the Attribute as one that is not usually seen in the support group setting. Brian softens “sullen” as well as “morose” with “kind of.” This softening conveys a lack of commitment to the emotions he is attributing to a small amount of peers in his group, thus making this a weaker judgment.

Excerpt 7.25

E99. B	but	I've	seen some people	in some	of the	groups	over	there
Exp:		Mental (per)					Circ.	
Modality:		Usuality						
Appraisal:				Grad (dwn)	Grad (dwn)			
	that	are	kind of	sullen	or kind of	what	is	the word morose
Exp:		Relat (int)				Relat (int)		
Appraisal:			Soften	Appre (-)	Soften			Appre (-)

Brian speaks more affirmatively in the following excerpt where he compares his feelings of confidence to the group’s “very low self-esteem.”

Excerpt 7.26

E232. B	but but	however	the	majority	of	people	in	there
Exp:							Circ.	
Appraisal:				Grad (up.)				
	have	very low	elf esteem	I	think			
Exp:	Relat (pos)				Mental (cog)			
Modality:					Probability			
Appraisal:		Grad (up)	Judg (-)					
E233. B	and but	see	I	really	feel	good	about	myself
Exp:				Mental (per)				
Modality:				Probability				
Appraisal:						Affect (+)		
E234. B	I	think	that	I'm	better	than	most	people
Exp:		Mental (cog)		Relat (int)				
Modality:		Probability						
Appraisal:					Grad (up)/ Appre (+)		Grad (up)	

In line E232, Brian uses a possessive relational clause to assign the Attribute “very low self-esteem” to “the majority of people” in his support group. The Carrier, “people,” is up-scaled in terms of quantity with “majority.” He uses the circumstantial clause of location “in there” to specify that he is referring to his peers in the support group. The Attribute also represents Brian’s negative judgment of peers, which he up-scales with “very.” After delivering this attribution, he says “I think,” which indicates he is positing an opinion and therefore has a softening effect on his previous assertion. Brian begins line E233 with a counter element then attempts to draw attention to the counter itself by prefacing it with “see.” He deploys a comparative element in line E233 with a modal mental clause of emotion “I really feel good about myself.” “Really” instantiates a high degree of certainty in the process of feeling good and intensifies the statement. Brian also ties in the circumstantial matter “about myself,” which makes the information he has given about himself suitable for contrast with his peers’ self-esteem. In line E234, Brian begins his statement with a mental projection which, under the system of modality, indicates he is delivering an opinion and therefore softens the upcoming information. The content of this projection is structured as an intensive relational clause, where Brian assigns himself the Attribute “better than most people.” This Attribute is comparative in nature and functions to up-scale the positive appreciation inherent to the superlative “better.” Another point of contrast is seen in the way Brian structures this comparison in that the feeling of “low self-esteem” experienced by others is construed as a noun, whereas he is Senser of “feel(ing) good.”

Brian uses the topic of “self-esteem” as a catalyst for comparing himself with his support group peers who he negatively judges as having “very low self-esteem.” In contrast, Brian says that not only does he “feel good” about himself, but intensifies that assertion by saying he thinks

he is “better than most people.” This differentiation of self-esteem functions similarly to Brian’s previous talk where he appraises himself positively and his peers negatively.

This series of excerpts provides examples of how Brian talks about his support group peers. He primarily does so by comparing himself to them, where he casts negative judgments of their behaviors and emotions, but assigns positive Attributes to himself. Brian’s negative judgments highlight an underlying schema of how he expects others to present themselves in the public forum of the support group. Because his peers do not act in a way that is in line with his schema of socially acceptable behavior, he works to distance himself from them by making stark comparisons. In reality, his peers’ behavior is appropriate for the support group setting. The purpose of this forum is to give people who stutter the opportunity to disclose feelings in a safe setting to peers who can offer support.

Speech Therapy. Another entity Brian comments on is the field of speech therapy. Brian reported that when he was a child, his mother wanted to take him to a speech therapist for his stuttering but his father decided against the idea because he believed Brian would “outgrow” his stuttering (line E564). Brian also believes that the financial commitment of speech therapy deterred his father as “he didn’t want to do anything that was... exorbitant” (line E574). As an adult, Brian has attempted speech therapy twice but was not satisfied with the results. The following collection of excerpts illustrates how Brian walks a tight rope in expressing his negative experiences with and views about the field of speech therapy while trying to avoid offending the researcher, who is a member of the field.

No transfer. As illustrated in Excerpt 7.27, Brian uses a material clause to convey that he has “taken” speech therapy in the past, but is currently not doing so.

Excerpt 7.27

E145. B	I	mean	I	have	taken	speech	therapy		
Exp:					Material				
Modality:				Usuality					
E146. B	and	the	only	thing	I got	out	of	that	was
Exp:					Material		Circ.		Relat (int)
Appraisal:			Grad (max)						
	I	became	very	good	at	speaking	to the	speech	therapist
Exp:		Relat (int)			Circ.				
Appraisal:			Grad (up)	Appre (+)					
E147. B	when	I	walked	out	the	door	and	encountered	
Exp:	Circ.		Material					Material	
	unexpected situations I			became	the	same	in-	however	I do
Exp:				Relat (int)					
E148. B	because	I	do	have	periods	of	increased	or	you know
Exp:				Relat (pos)					
Modality:			Probability						
Appraisal:							Grad (up)		
	decreased	fluency	so	you	know				
Appraisal:	Grad (dwn)								

In line E146, he uses a relational clause construction that he frontloads with maximal intensified “only thing” to up-scale the significance of the Value “I got out of that.” Brian assigns this to the Token, which he presents as an intensive relational clause “I became very good at speaking to the speech therapist.” In this construction, Brian positions himself as Carrier of the desirable Attribute “very good at talking” that is qualified by the circumstance “to the therapist.” Addition of this circumstance conveys that this positively appreciated skill was limited to a certain context therefore rendering it useless. This point is evidenced further by his downranking of the process “speaking,” which serves as a complement of a preposition in a circumstantial Adjunct. In terms of the textual metafunction, this line represents a thematic equative structure that situates the Token of the relational clause as the important part of the message. He elaborates this point further in line E147 with another circumstantial clause of

location which speaks to the role that location played in the effectiveness of the skill. In the controlled therapy setting, he was “very good at talking to the therapist” but “became the same” as before when he encountered “unexpected situations” in the uncontrolled environment just “out the door” of the therapy facility. In sum, the skills he learned in therapy only worked in a particular setting and which indicates a lack of transfer, which is a well-known issue in the field of speech therapy.

Stereotypical methods. Brian does a lot of work to pad his negative evaluations of the field of speech therapy, which could potentially offend the researcher. He begins this sequence with a disclosure of his intentions. By negating the modal Adjunct of inclination “mean,” he softens the verbal process of saying “something bad” as result of the circumstantial cause “just because it has not helped me.” Within this circumstance, Brian places “it” (reference to “your discipline”) in an agentive role and himself in the role of Beneficiary of the negated process “helped.” He offers consolation in line E290 using the system of modality to convey certainty that “some people have been helped with the stereotypical methods of treatment.” He weakens this statement by down-scaling the number of people with “some” and appraising the methods as “stereotypical.” Therefore, Brian down-scales the negative impact of his assertion that he has not benefited from speech therapy with a preface and a post-hoc bid of confidence in successful therapy for others.

Excerpt 7.28

E288. B	and	see	I	do	not	mean	to	say
Exp:					NEG	Material		Verbal
	something bad		about	your	discipline			
Exp:			Circ.					
Appraisal:		Appre (-)						
E289. B	just	because	it	has not	helped	me		
Exp:		Circ.		NEG	Material			
Modality:				NEG	Usuality			
Appraisal:				NEG	Appre (+)			
E290. B	I	am	sure	that	some	people	have	been
Exp:		Relat(int)						
Modality:			Probability				Usuality	
Appraisal:					Grad (dwn)			
	helped	with	the	stereotypical	methods	of	treatment	
Exp:	Material	Circ.						
Appraisal:				Appre (neu)				
E291. B	but	see	I	am	so	frustrated	about	this
Exp:				Relat (int)			Circ.	
Appraisal:					Grad (up)	Affect (-)		

Not nearly what I need. As seen in the previous excerpt, Brian down-scales his negative appreciation of speech therapy by prefacing it with a disclosure of his intentions in line E676. He negates the modal inclination “mean” to remove intentionality from the processes of imputing and saying “anything about” the researcher’s discipline. He adds a circumstantial clause to clarify that he is not implying that therapists “don’t do anything,” which represents a negated, maximally up-scaled process. Brian then delivers his appraisal in an intensive relational clause construction, which assigns the Carrier “it” (a reference to “your discipline”) with the negated Attribute “not nearly what I need.” This negation duplicates the down-scaling accomplished by “nearly,” which serves to strengthen Brian’s negative appreciation of speech therapy.

Excerpt 7.29

E676. B	I	don't	mean	to impute	or	say	anything	about	your
Exp:				Material		Verbal		Circ.	
E677. B	discipline	because	you	all	don't	do	anything		
Exp:					NEG	Material			
E678. B	but	it-	perhaps	um-	but	at	the	same	time
Exp:					Circ.				
Modality:			Probability						
Appraisal:									
	it	was	not	nearly	what	I	need		
Exp:		Relat (int)					Mental (des)		
Appraisal:			NEG	Grad (dwn)			Appre (+)		

Chapter 8:

Discussion

This chapter presents a discussion of the results in relation to the research questions: 1) How do bilinguals who stutter linguistically construct their stuttering experience; 2) What perceptions do these individuals have about stuttering in each language; and 3) How do these individuals position themselves relative to their stuttering? The chapter addresses the linguistic tools participants used to talk about their personal experiences by making choices within the systems of Appraisal, Transitivity, modality, and Theme/Rheme. The findings are discussed in light of the current literature on bilingual stuttering and stuttering in general. The chapter concludes with suggested methodological, theoretical, and clinical implications of this investigation.

Participant 1: Ivan

In the following section, aspects of Ivan's construction of his stuttering experience are discussed including the "dual pressure" inherent to the internal aspect of his stuttering and the role of, what Ivan refers to as, "rhythm." His construction of the role confidence plays in inducing fluency in English is also presented. Ivan's linguistic construction of the identities of "prideful" as well as "consequential participant in stuttering" are discussed as ways he positions himself relative to his stuttering experience.

Constructing the stuttering experience.

The "dual pressure" of stuttering. It is widely discussed in the literature that stuttering is comprised of multiple components, which are affective, behavioral, and cognitive in nature (Bennett, 2006; Yairi, 2007; Bloodstein & Bernstein Ratner, 2008; Craig, Blumgart, & Tran, 2009; Tetnowski & Scaler Scott, 2009). In the context of conversation, however, the behavioral

aspect of stuttering is the most evident component and is the only true manifestation of stuttering that is visible. The affective and cognitive components cannot be accessed unless the PWS chooses to share these internalized aspects. Without the presence of visible signs of stuttering, interlocutors are unaware or left guessing in terms of what the PWS is experiencing internally as a result of their stuttering.

Ivan, who has experienced this, describes the experience as a “dual pressure.” He uses the Appraisal system to intensify his level of awareness of his stuttering and contrasts it with the absence of awareness of his face to face interlocutors. The internal aspect of his stuttering is represented through his consistent use of mental clause constructions. While he describes this at first by talking about interlocutors in general, he intensifies the significance of this issue by bringing up the fact that his mother and brother were not aware of how “serious” the situation was “inside.” By structuring this location as a circumstance, he conveys a contrast between the internal and external components of stuttering. Though he is critical of his family’s lack of awareness, his presentation of his brother’s Verbiage supports the idea that this internal aspect of stuttering is not accessible unless the PWS voluntarily opens up about it.

In Ivan’s case, the absence of physical concomitants associated with his stuttering has a negative effect on his overall experience as a bilingual PWS. His appraisal of this experience is in opposition not only with therapy approaches that aim to extinguish these behaviors, but also with the literature that cites overt stuttering (or visible signs of stuttering) as a cause of negative emotions (Kraaimaat, Vanryckeghem, & Van Dam-Baggen, 2002; Messenger, Onslow, Packman, & Menzies, 2004; Blomgren, Roy, Callister, & Merrill, 2005; Craig et al., 2009). Physical concomitants are typically regarded as a negative aspect in the literature (Ruscello, Lass, & Brown, 1988; Lass & Ruscello, 1989; Ruscello, Lass, Schmitt, & Pannbacker, 1994).

However, through the analysis of how Ivan experientially configures his experience with stuttering, it was found that physical concomitants play a significant role in giving face to face interlocutors a window to the internal aspect of stuttering.

Stuttering as a matter of “rhythm.” Wingate (2002) regards stuttering theory as a distracting topic in that the literature is preoccupied with finding the cause of stuttering. However, there is a lot to be learned from the individual’s theories about their own stuttering, which essentially stem from their experiences with the disorder (Kathard, 2001; Klompas & Ross, 2004). Ivan theorizes that the management of stuttering is based on “rhythm” and has constructed a set of fluency-inducing techniques that directly stem from this belief he holds. Thus, his theory plays a significant role in the way he conceptualizes his stuttering experience.

Ivan’s definition of “rhythm” in regard to his stuttering is not the same as the traditional definition, namely, a regular pattern of sound. Rather, he defines rhythm in terms of having advance knowledge of the content he needs to produce, which also contrasts with the Wingate (1970) description of stuttering as “a disturbance of rhythm.” Ivan’s use of mental clauses of cognition highlights the cognitive aspect of “rhythm” involved in the processes of singing, speaking, and acting (Excerpt 4.8). In doing so, he reveals that it is not the behaviors of singing or acting that help to prevent stuttering, but the cognitive process of memorization. It is heavily cited in the literature that singing does have a fluency-inducing effect on PWS (Healy, Mallard, & Adams, 1976; Colcord & Adams, 1979; Bloodstein, 1995; Stager, Jeffries, & Braun, 2004; Wan, Ruber, Hohmann, & Schlaug, 2010). However, Ivan’s linguistic choices within the experiential metafunction actually reveal that it is the rehearsal or memorization aspect of singing, rather than the singing itself, that helps him. In the literature, this rehearsal or monitoring aspect is discussed by Levelt (1983), while the work of Postma and Kolk (1993)

relate it to the Covert Repair Hypothesis. He conveys a strong degree of commitment to his “rhythm” theory by using the Appraisal system to maximally quantify the number of PWS who can be helped by addressing this aspect of stuttering and uses positive appraisal of his personal experience as evidence for the efficacy of this idea.

During his description of “rhythm,” Ivan down-scales the level of his academic knowledge about stuttering then counters it with the statement “but I stutter,” which speaks to the role of his lived experience with stuttering in his construction of this theory.

Perceptions of stuttering across languages.

Confidence in proficiency as a catalyst for fluency. Ivan began acquiring his second language, English, while he was living in Ecuador. He starts the topic about the change in “fluidity” he experienced with the language by highlighting the circumstance of time in which he arrived to the United States. This construction therefore marks his change in location as a factor affecting his stuttering. While he negatively appraises his speaking abilities in light of this circumstance, he also attributes it as being a helping factor in his speech. Like “a newborn,” he is “learning to talk,” which implies a certain degree of forgiveness given by society and himself for having issues with being “fluid” in English. The “newborn” metaphor expresses his positive appraisal of this move to the United States as an opportunity to start over, not only in terms of the direction of his life, but also for his identity as a person who stutters. At the same time, it indicates a degree of helplessness.

Throughout his 6 months in the U.S., Ivan came to the realization that his ability to speak English “fluidly” varies from person to person because it is dependent upon his level of proficiency in comparison to his interlocutors. He makes use of the system of modality to structure a series of hypothetical situations that serve to show the relationship between

proficiency and “fluidity,” which is based on his participation in mental perceptive processes in the midst of conversations (Excerpt 4.15). When he perceives his English to be better than that of his interlocutors’, he has feelings of “superiority” and he attributes these to inducing success with stuttering. While the literature sums this up as a matter of proficiency having an influence on fluency (Jankelowitz & Bortz, 1996; Van Borsel et al., 2009, Carias & Ingram, 2006; Lim et al., 2008), examination of Ivan’s linguistic construction of this experience reveals that this is actually a matter of confidence in his level of proficiency. It is this confidence, then, that supports his “fluidity” in English. Because his level of proficiency differs when comparing it to each individual interlocutor he converses with, his confidence fluctuates from conversation to conversation. This is supported by his assertion that his stuttering worsens when he feels “intimidated” by his interlocutors’ higher level of proficiency.

Through Ivan’s use of the mental perceptive constructions to describe his stuttering in his second language, evidence that fluency is determined by confidence in proficiency rather than proficiency itself was revealed. This is supported by Perkins, Kent, and Curlee (1991), who state that stuttering, in this regard, is a type of signal-system dyssynchrony that occurs when paralinguistic processes are delayed due to self-expressive uncertainty. Ivan’s construal of this experience is also reflected in the Demands and Capacities Model as described by Starkweather and Gottwald (1990) in that his emotional response to an interlocutor’s higher level of proficiency is a demand that exceeds his capacity to speak fluently.

Positioning of self relative to stuttering experience.

Prideful out of necessity. Ivan described himself as being proud of his stuttering. Through further examination of his talk, it was revealed that this positive affect is superficial and is more of a face he puts on rather than the way he truly feels. The first clue in his talk was his

use of the Appraisal system to down-scale his commitment to this feeling, which contrasts with the absolute negative polarization of his desire to stutter (Excerpt 4.1). He also uses the Appraisal system to strengthen the intensity of which he prevents himself from stuttering. This is reminiscent of a personal narrative by Hicks (1997), who spent the majority of his teen years trying to “solve” and “cure” his stuttering. So, while he expresses strong feelings about not stuttering, his feelings of pride are weak by comparison. These choices within the Appraisal system indicate inconsistency between the image he is trying to project and the way he actually feels.

When the researcher questions his pride, Ivan equates it as his “only option” through his use of a relational clause configuration indicating it is a feeling or persona that he must take on out of necessity. He elaborates on this by drawing a similarity between stuttering and gay people, which brings to the surface the stigma associated with his stuttering. This comparison of the stuttering community with the gay community is widely cited in the literature in terms of acceptance of disability in the face of social stigma (Douglass, 2012). Pride is used as a means to distance oneself from the “victim” mentality (Samuels, 2003) and thus serves as a way for these stigmatized groups to combat negative social judgment or “stigma.”

Ivan is no stranger to stigma as gleaned from the information gathered from his conversation with his mother and brother. Ivan, indeed, suffered from stereotypes and discrimination from a very young age due to the stigma associated with the word “tartamudez” in Ecuador (Excerpt 4.21). This negative judgment ran so deep during this time that even the act of a teacher or doctor bringing it up was viewed as offensive. This finding is in line with the literature, which states that disabilities are viewed differently across cultures and therefore has implications for diagnosis and treatment (Marshall, 2000; Salas-Provance, Erickson, & Reed,

2002; Ezrati-Vinacour & Weinstein, 2011). In addition to his extended family taking his stuttering as a joke (“como una burla”), Ivan was also teased in the public setting of school. Boyle (2013a) states that negative reactions from others become internalized by the PWS, which leads to the prevalence of self-stigma amongst this population. This may lead to the development of the unobservable features of stuttering (anxiety, guilt, shame, etc.) that are so widely cited in the literature. Although many researchers refer to these unobservable features, they are still very difficult to document with previously used methods.

Ivan’s presentation of himself as being proud is countered further in his introduction of the Theme of “my biggest fear” during the ethnographic interview with the researcher, which he identifies as stuttering through old age (Excerpt 4.6). He builds on this Theme with a series of negated desiderative clause constructions, thereby expressing his rejection of being characterized as a person who stutters for the rest of his life. Though, he acknowledges the permanence of his stuttering through his use of modality (Excerpt 4.7). This realization, which is at the root of his fears, is consistent with the findings of Boyle (2013b) in which PWS who attended support group meetings were likely to believe they would stutter for the rest of their lives.

As Goffman (1955) states, when a person is stigmatized they must negotiate their identity with the world, and Ivan does just that. While on the surface, he positions himself as being proud of his stuttering, analysis of the experiential configurations he uses and attitudes he conveys provided insight on his true negative feelings of fear and his rejection of the stigma associated with his stuttering that he has internalized over time. His fear is warranted, as Gabel (2006) found that stuttering severity does indeed have an effect on listeners’ attitudes toward the PWS. This finding supports the results of Ivan’s OASES assessment, which indicate that stuttering has a moderate effect on the quality of his life when considering both English and Spanish.

Ivan as a consequential participant in the behavior of stuttering. Locus of control is widely discussed in the literature in regard to the role it plays in the management of stuttering severity (Smith, 1990; De Nil, 1995; Ginsberg, 2000; Riley, Riley, & Maguire, 2004; Lee, Manning, & Herder, 2011). Ivan asserts that he has the ability to mask his stuttering and induce fluency through “impersonating accents” (Excerpt 4.10). The use of accents to reduce stuttering is quite prevalent. Mowrer (1987) describes a case in which a young male’s imitation of a Japanese accent eliminated his stuttering because of the confidence it gave him. Despite Ivan’s use of accents, he still speaks to the fact that he essentially does not have absolute control in the occurrence of his stuttering. He expresses this by assigning his mind an agentive role in rejecting his preventative efforts.

Ivan intensifies the amount of control his mind has in his stuttering, and ultimately over him, by constructing a metaphor through a series of verbal projections made on behalf of his mind (Excerpt 4.12). In this configuration, his “mind” tells him that he is going to stutter, which highlights the point that Ivan is an involuntary participant in the behavioral process of stuttering. The metaphor also brings to the surface Ivan’s belief that stuttering is a default setting that he will always revert to despite his efforts. Therefore, stuttering is viewed as something that is innate to him and the way he communicates.

Participant 2: Sam

The role conversational circumstances play in Sam’s construction of his stuttering experience is discussed in the following section as well as the lack of fluency he experiences while speaking Spanish. His shift in identity from “old Sam” to “new Sam” is discussed as a rhetorical device construing his position relative to his stuttering.

Constructing the stuttering experience.

The role of conversational circumstances. Stuttering is an individual's disorder not only in the way it manifests itself across PWS, but also in its etiology. Starkweather's *Demands and Capacities Model* (2002) addresses the relation of genetics in stuttering as they are related to the physiology and behaviors of stuttering, as well as the environmental contexts in which stuttering occurs. Sam's description of his stuttering is highly focused on the environmental factors affecting his fluency, which he structures as circumstances of time and matter. The first of these, the role of the authority figure, was discussed during his conversation with his mother, Ingrid. The role of the authority figure is a heavily cited topic in the literature (Sheehan, Hadley, & Gould, 1967; Oberlander, Schneier, Franklin & Liebowitz, 1994; Starkweather, 2002; Harrison, 2004; Bernstein Ratner & Tetnowski, 2006). When talking about the issues he has with fluency in Spanish, he introduces the role Ingrid plays with a circumstantial construction (Excerpt 5.26) marking it as a contrasting detail, conveying that his stuttering was specific to her. He uses similar circumstantial constructions to add supporting information to indicate that this was a factor that was more serious in the past and that it has since tapered off when speaking English. He states that this issue still persists when he speaks Spanish by using an existential clause construction, where the actual existence of the problem is downranked. Sam never directly assigns blame or a causal role to Ingrid. When he places information regarding this topic in a thematic role, he does so by highlighting the "effect" of her being the authority figure (Excerpt 5.27). During his conversation with the researcher, he puts "the people" in a marked Theme position, which highlights the person-specific nature of his stuttering but avoids making a direct reference to Ingrid. By indirectly addressing this topic through circumstantial clauses and putting entities other than Ingrid in thematic roles, Sam is able to talk about a topic relevant to his

stuttering experience while saving face for his mother, who has a role in the occurrence of his stuttering.

Sam redirects the researcher to an aspect that is presently more relevant to his stuttering: the topic of conversation (Excerpt 5.3). This assertion is in alignment with the literature in that, as Sam describes, the emotional weight of particular topics affect his fluency (Bloodstein, 1950; Au-Yeung & Howell, 1998; Starkweather, 2002). In structuring his description of this factor, he uses relational clause constructions, which directly identify the topic of conversation as being problematic and that contrast with the way he talks about the role Ingrid plays in his stuttering. Sam specifically cites “stuttering” as being problematic on the level of conversational topics, as well as on the word level. He brings the emotional significance of “stuttering” (as a topic and a word) to the surface through his use of circumstantial constructions, which allow him to highlight the causal role the emotions play in his problems articulating the word (Excerpt 5.5) and discussing it as a topic.

The circumstantial nature of Sam’s stuttering supports the literature in that his fluency is highly affected by extrinsic factors (e.g. Bloodstein, 1950; Freeman, 1999; Starkweather, 2002). Through his use of circumstantial constructions, he is able to talk about the intricacies of his stuttering while placing sensitive and potentially face-threatening details in less prominent roles in his clause complexes.

Perceptions of Stuttering Across Languages.

Lack of fluency in Spanish. A topic contributing to the growth of the bilingual stuttering literature is the manifestation of stuttering across languages. As a whole, however, this body of knowledge is inconclusive, which is indicative of the dynamic, multidimensional nature in which this phenomenon presents itself amongst individual bilingual PWS (Nwokah, 1988; Jankelowitz

& Bortz; 1996; Carias & Ingram, 2006; Lim et al., 2008; Van Borsel et al., 2009). A great deal of Sam's conversation with his mother was geared toward appraising his fluency (in regard to stuttering) in his dominant language, English, and his emerging language, Spanish. Therefore, the constructions of their statements were comparative and entailed frequent use of graduation under the system of Appraisal. These appreciations were directed towards Sam in that he was in the role of Carrier in the relational clause constructions that were used to assign him varying degrees of fluency as an Attribute. Thus, it was not the behavior of stuttering that was being appraised, but Sam's manner of involvement as a participant in the process.

Sam and Ingrid were aligned in their appraisal of Sam's being more fluent in English than Spanish, supporting the findings of Jankelowitz & Bortz (1996) in which bilingual PWS stuttered less in their more proficient language. Their judgment of Sam's fluency is supported by the SSI-4 results, which indicate that his stuttering in Spanish was severe, while his stuttering in English was assigned the severity rating of "moderate." In speculating the reason for this, it was revealed that Sam only speaks Spanish to his mother. This is problematic because, as explained earlier, Sam's stuttering is specific to her as an "authority figure" (Excerpt 5.31). While this has implications for determining whether or not Sam's fluency is truly worse in Spanish, it also highlights Sam's point that the techniques he learned to counter this issue in English did not transfer over to Spanish.

During his conversation with the researcher, he points to the characteristics of the Spanish language such as the sounds, transitions, and syllable structures as the reason why his techniques do not work (Excerpt 5.16). Though this idea is supported by the literature, Sam's use of "clinic speak" suggests that he does not truly understand how the techniques work in both languages (Jayaram, 1983; Bernstein Ratner & Benitez, 1985; Howell & Au-Yeung, 2007).

Therefore, his construction of this aspect of his experience is limited to neutral appreciations in which he repeatedly appraises these characteristics as being “different” in comparison to those of English. He also makes use of the system of modality by positioning usuality as a contrasting factor in his experience of using the techniques with these “different” Spanish characteristics.

Sam is therefore in a double bind of sorts when it comes to attaining fluency in his non-dominant language, Spanish. While the literature sums it up as a matter of language proficiency, we learn from Sam that it goes beyond that. Not only does he struggle with linguistic fluency in Spanish, but also transferring fluency-inducing therapy techniques, which he describes as being highly specific for English.

Positioning of self relative to stuttering experience.

Shift in identity: “old Sam vs. new Sam.” Though Sam is still in his teens, he describes his stuttering in terms of his past and present self. His use of the Appraisal system, in reference to particular periods of time in his life, reveals a difference in attitude. This emerges as two separate identities that the researcher represents using the rhetorical devices “old Sam” and “new Sam.”

“Old Sam” is an identity Sam describes in regard to his early teen years, which he typically marks with a circumstance of time to indicate it is an identity of the past. This time of his life is characterized by negative affect such as feelings of anxiety, social alienation, and an overall negative self-perception. According to the literature, these feelings are not uncommon for PWS (Van Riper, 1937; Craig, 1990; Miller & Watson, 1992; MacKinnon, Hall, & MacIntyre, 2007; Erickson & Block, 2013; Blumgart & Craig, 2014). He uses graduation to up-scale and intensify the severity of his stuttering, therefore building the degree of which he did not want to go to therapy. Through his conversation with his mother, it was revealed that the negative affect

he was expressing during this time such as feeling “raro” (strange) and “como si algo estaba mal” (as if something was wrong), prevented Ingrid from pushing him to continue with therapy (Excerpt 5.24). Sam cites the realization that his stuttering was not going away as a source of these negative feelings. In his construction of this belief, the stuttering itself is placed in the role of Actor. Through further examination of the ergative, no Agent is identified, which is indicative of the lack of participation and even control “old Sam” actually possessed in the process of his stuttering going away (Excerpt 5.8). This construction of Sam’s past experience with stuttering reveals that “old Sam” was in a challenging place in terms of severity and the emotions he was dealing with at the time.

Sam has since experienced a shift in identity as related to his stuttering and represents it through his construction of his current self or “new Sam.” His description of this position contrasts with the “old Sam” identity on multiple levels; a contrast, which is maintained through the use of circumstantial elements of time. In describing the “now,” Sam uses the Appraisal system to express his positive appreciation of stuttering, which he now regards as an “opportunity to succeed” (Excerpt 5.7) instead of a “challenge.” Rather than passively hoping his stuttering will go away, now “new Sam” takes an active role and works through stuttering moments. “New Sam” negatively appraises the feelings he felt in the past and distances himself from them by regarding them as stereotypical for a PWS (Excerpt 5.12). Sam’s current perspective on stuttering is also revealed during his conversation with his mother, in which his positive appraisals of therapy counter his mother’s criticism of the speech therapist. This is indicative of a change in position on both sides in that his mother used to be the one advocating for therapy while “old Sam” refused to go. All of these aspects are used to bolster the identity of “new Sam,” who is relentlessly positive in the face of stuttering.

Through his use of circumstances of time to organize his positive and negative appraisals of stuttering, Sam reveals that he underwent an identity shift in the midst of his teen years. Sam's description of this change in position relative to his stuttering supports Blood, Blood, Tellis, and Gabel (2003), which found that younger adolescents perceive stuttering as a more negative and stigmatizing condition than older adolescents. His shift into his current identity, "new Sam," is not only characterized by positive affect and confidence, but also the positive perspective he has on therapy now. Sam's change in attitude towards therapy is supported by the literature (e.g. Dilollo, Neimeyer, & Manning, 2002; Plexico, Manning, & Dilollo, 2005; Plexico, Manning, & Dilollo, 2010; Lee, Manning, & Herder, 2011).

Participant 3: Neil

While Neil's experience is unique, due to the late onset of his stuttering, the surface characteristics of his stuttering are much like other PWS in that he has PWR, blocks, and exhibits the physical concomitant of blinking hard. The construction of his overall stuttering experience revolves around the span of time that his stuttering began. Therefore, the feelings, thoughts, and identities discussed in the following sections are relevant primarily to the past, due to the significance of the onset. Constructions based on the fear-inducing component, as well as the cognitive and cyclical aspects of his stuttering experience, are discussed. His description of Spanish as a hindrance to fluency is addressed. The way in which he positions himself as a "bystander" relative to his stuttering is also illustrated.

Constructing the stuttering experience.

Fear-inducing. Neil's stuttering experience is primarily comprised of retellings of events, feelings, and beliefs from the past. Because he has been stuttering for a little less than 10

years, he does not have a lifetime's worth of experiences to draw from, which could be the reason why his talk is limited to the time of onset.

Neil's stuttering experience is characterized by negative emotions, which he expresses primarily through his use of intensive relational configurations to assign the Attributes "very frustrating," "scary," and "stressful" to his stuttering. Under the system of Appraisal, these Attributes serve dual purposes. The first purpose is to express his negative appreciation of his stuttering, whereas the second is to convey the negative affect he experienced as a result of his stuttering. He presents "in the beginning" as a circumstantial element, making these appraisals relevant only for that particular period of time, which has implications for the way he felt about his stuttering at the time of the interview. Neil assigns agency to his stuttering by describing it as an entity that can cause feelings of exhaustion and panic.

The majority of these appraisals are based on the underlying emotion of fear. This is not surprising considering the fact that Neil did not know that he was experiencing the onset of stuttering at that time. Neil's feelings are in line with those expressed by the participants of Roth, Aronson, and Davis (1989), a work presenting case studies of people who entered the hospital for medical evaluation at the time of onset. 10 of the 12 patients in this study had psychological disturbances at the time of their onset, while the other two had psychological histories that were deemed as being causally related to the onset. On a side note, Neil's stuttering onset occurred two years after he had a stroke, which has implications for the psychogenic nature of his stuttering. Besides this study, the rest of the literature is focused on describing the fears of PWS associated with social situations (Craig, 1990; Mahr & Torosian, 1999; Craig, Hancock, Tran, Craig, & Peters, 2002). Results from Neil's OASES indicate that his negative emotions

associated with stuttering may still have a mild-to-moderate and moderate impact on his quality of life, when considering his stuttering in English and Spanish respectively.

The cognitive aspect. Neil reveals the cognitive aspect of his stuttering experience through his use of mental perceptive clause constructions. By using these experiential configurations, he structures stuttering as something that can be sensed. Neil first describes the Phenomenon as “mental strain” and “physical strain” (Excerpt 6.4) then as “mental pressure and tension” that can be sensed in the morning (Excerpt 6.7). Interlaced in these phenomena are Neil’s negative appreciations of them. This is indicative of the predictable nature of his stuttering and stands in contrast with the previous description of his stuttering as something that causes fear.

Cyclical. Neil asserts that his stuttering is “cyclical” in that he has periods in which he is “very fluent” followed by “down cycles” in which he stutters “a lot.” This cyclical aspect of his stuttering is primarily structured through his use of graduation under the system of Appraisal, where he contrasts the quantity of stuttering moments with up-scaled levels of fluency to make his point. He views the cyclical nature of his stuttering as something that sets him apart from other people that stutter, in that he judges other PWS as either “stuttering a lot” or stuttering “a small amount.” Primarily, the contrast is made through his use of the system of modality in that he perceives these behaviors of other PWS to occur with high usuality, as marked by his use of “always.” The frequency in which his stuttering moments occur, on the other hand, vary from “period” to “period.” This is not an uncommon trait across PWS, however.

Neil’s stuttering experience includes affective and cognitive aspects, which are constructed through his use of Appraisal and mental perceptive clause configurations. He uses

resources from the system of modality to contrast the fluctuating frequency of his stuttering with the usual steadiness of frequency other PWS.

Perceptions of stuttering across languages.

Spanish as a hindrance to fluency. Rather than talking about which language he feels he stutters more in, Neil discusses language learning as a factor contributing to his stuttering. Specifically, he asserts that learning Spanish played a role in the increase of the severity of his stuttering in English. Though there is a large body of literature that seeks to uncover the relationship between bilingualism and stuttering, findings have been inconclusive (Travis, Johnson, & Shover, 1937; Stern, 1948; Karinol, 1992; Van Borsel, Maes, & Foulon, 2001; Howell, Davis & Williams, 2009). Neil provides more insight on this topic though by describing the internal process of “mapping” that he feels is at the root of the problem. Neil’s use of resources within the experiential metafunction indicates that “mapping” is a series of material processes he participates in, which include: “looking ahead to words” and “trying to select words before saying them.” Therefore, it is a matter of planning. He speaks to the internal nature of this process by specifying that it occurs in his mind. In structuring his mind as a circumstantial location, Neil maintains his role as the sole participant in the process of “mapping.” These findings are consistent with Levelt (1983) and Postma & Kolk (1993).

While he was in Peru learning Spanish, he typically had to translate English to Spanish before speaking. However, he reports that when he returned to the United States his participation in the material process of “translating” persisted, which therefore led to his frequent attempts to translate “English to English” (Excerpt 6.32). Through his use of Appraisal, Neil not only negatively appreciates this process, but also up-scales the significant role it played in his “speech problems.” Neil’s mapping theory is supported by Starkweather’s *Demands and Capacities*

Model (2002) in that the “mapping” served as a demand that had implications for his capacity to maintain fluency. Au-Yeung and Howell (1998) also found that planning was disruptive to the speech of PWS.

Neil’s description of “mapping,” however, differs from that described in the *Covert Repair Hypothesis* (Postma & Kolk, 1993) in that his mapping was a consequence of his becoming used to translating while living in a foreign country. The *Covert Repair Hypothesis*, on the other hand, is a reference to the mapping process in which PWS try to prevent stuttering by repairing their speech before speaking. At the core of this difference is the intention held by the individual participating in the mapping. Neil was mapping, or translating, out of habit, which he thinks caused his stuttering, while others engage in mapping to prevent their stuttering.

Thus, through examination of the linguistic resources Neil uses to talk about his stuttering across languages, it was revealed that “mapping,” an artifact from translating English to Spanish for an extended period of time, was a contributing factor to his stuttering in English.

Positioning of self relative to stuttering experience. As mentioned at the beginning of the section, Neil’s late onset of stuttering has implications for the way he constructs not only his stuttering experience but his position relative to it. The identity that is most developed in his talk is one relative to the timeframe in which his stuttering began. Therefore, the position outlined below should be construed as one that represents his past experience with stuttering.

“The Bystander.” In Neil’s construction of the onset of his stuttering, he simultaneously speaks to the passive role he had during stuttering moments. The researcher therefore refers to this identity using the rhetorical device “the bystander” due to the frequency in which he assigns aspects of his stuttering the role of Actor.

In terms of experiential configuration, Neil assigns a participant role to stuttering and silent blocks. He places “my stuttering” in the role of Actor in the process of “manifesting itself.” A similar position is taken in respect to the occurrence of “silent blocks,” which he places in the role of Actor in the process of “happening.” These role assignments indicate that Neil views stuttering as a phenomenon over which he has no control.

Neil’s position as a “bystander” in relation to his stuttering is also constructed through the recurring structure in which he makes statements about his inability to participate in speech-related activities. He then follows it with a statement about his lack of knowledge about stuttering. By coupling his inability to “speak” and “get words out” with “I didn’t know it was stuttering,” he implies that he now identifies stuttering as the cause for these difficulties.

By assigning his stuttering an active role in processes such as “manifesting” and “happening,” Neil constructs an image of himself in which he was a “bystander” in the occurrence of his stuttering. Though he had a late onset, the way he characterizes his stuttering is not uncommon for PWS in general, in that it relates back to locus of control (e.g. De Nil, 1995; Riley, Riley, & Maguire, 2004; Lee, Manning, & Herder, 2011).

Participant 4: Brian

In the following section, Brian’s construction of stuttering as a negative experience is discussed. The role vowel-initial words play in his stuttering in Spanish is discussed in relation to his perception of stuttering across languages. Brian’s linguistic construction of varying identities when comparing himself to stuttering support group peers and his non-stuttering family members are presented as positions he takes relative to his stuttering.

Constructing the stuttering experience.

Stuttering as a negative experience. Throughout the duration of his one hour and 43 minute conversation with the researcher, Brian uses the word “stuttering” and its variants only 15 times. His continued talk about it was reliant on referential chains or other terms that conveyed his negative appraisal of stuttering such as “problem,” “dilemma,” “struggle,” and “affliction.” This characteristic of his ongoing talk not only suggests the existence of self-stigma as described by Boyle (2013a), but may also be indicative of the word “stuttering” being problematic in and of itself (Bloodstein, 1950; Au-Yeung & Howell, 1998; Starkweather, 2002).

Brian structures his overall stuttering experience primarily through his use of figurative language and the Appraisal system that he accomplishes throughout his talk by maintaining the “battle” and “struggle” metaphors. When talking about these processes, which he conveys as being inherent to stuttering, he places universal “you” and unspecified “people” in the role of Actor. By doing so, he removes himself as a participant allowing him to negatively appraise the actions of others from an outsider’s perspective (Excerpts 7.2 and 7.4). His negative evaluation is also accomplished by his contrastive use of the system of modality in which he conveys a high degree of obligation to adhering to social norms, which are in opposition with the processes of battling and struggling. Through these constructions, Brian not only expresses the difficulty involved in countering stuttering, but he also reveals his agreement with the stigmas associated with stuttering. In terms of Boyle’s Multidimensional Model of Stigma (2013a), Brian is at a level of self-stigma referred to as “stereotype agreement,” where he agrees with public stereotypes and applies them to people of his own stigmatized group. In a roundabout way, then, Brian is negatively appraising himself since he speaks to his involvement in these processes by

referring to himself as a “fighter.” (This point is discussed further in the “Position relative to stuttering” section below.)

Brian makes use of comparative constructions to juxtapose stuttering with other ailments, which have the effect of intensifying his negative appraisal of it. The first of these comparisons is to that of a person on crutches. In doing so, he puts the internal (and invisible) aspect of stuttering in contrast with external (and thus easily identified) characteristic of having a broken leg. Therefore, stuttering is comparatively worse because others cannot sense the “debilitating” nature of stuttering (Excerpt 7.7). His perspective on the effects of physical concomitants in stuttering resonates with Ivan’s sentiments about the lack of visibility being a “dual pressure.” While this comparison was used to contrast visibility, he compares stuttering to people with cancer. By doing so, he intensifies the severity of stuttering as a disorder, which is significant due to the life-threatening aspect inherent to cancer.

Brian primarily structures his stuttering experience as being negative. This is expressed through his use of negatively-charged referential terms, the Appraisal system, and comparative structures. His on-going reference to the “struggle” and “battle” inherent to stuttering has implications for the negative impact the internal aspects (affective and cognitive) have on his quality of life.

Perceptions of stuttering across languages.

Vowels as a cause for disfluency in Spanish. Kelly (1955) states that people create hypotheses about their environments and are constantly engaged in the active process of proving them. Brian holds the theory that his stuttering is worse in Spanish due to the number of words in the language that have a vowel in word-initial position. This sound-specific hypothesis comes

from his experience with English in which he identified “aurora” and “iota” as being particularly problematic because of the number of vowels in these words.

In terms of experiential configuration, Brian primarily uses mental projections to construct this hypothesis. This not only works to convey that this hypothesis based on his personal experience, but also that it is one that he came up with on his own. He then uses quantitative information to back up his theory, which he alters using the system of Appraisal. He asserts that he has counted “62 pages” worth of Spanish words that start with “a” in Spanish, in his Spanish-English dictionary. He then down-scales the significance of the “39 pages” he counted in the English section of his dictionary (Excerpt 7.10). His use of non-specific language after identifying the page count in English signals that the important part of his message is the number of vowel initial words in Spanish because it supports his theory. This is also realized in the thematic progression, in that the number of words is the recurring Theme of his message.

Therefore, Brian attributes the fact that he stutters more in Spanish to the characteristics of the language, specifically the number of vowel-initial words in the Spanish lexicon. This theory of his has been heavily researched in terms of finding a link between severity of stuttering and linguistic characteristics of the language, including phonological and phonetic complexity (Jayaram, 1983; Bernstein Ratner & Benitez, 1985; Howell, Au-Yeung, Yaruss, & Eldridge, 2006; Howell & Au-Yeung, 2007).

Positioning of self relative to stuttering experience.

Varying social identities. Throughout his conversation with the researcher, Brian positions himself in a variety of ways relative to his stuttering. He primarily accomplishes this through his use of comparative structures in which he casts himself in a positive light in

comparison to his stuttering self-help/support group peers, but constructs negative judgment of himself when comparing himself to his non-stuttering siblings.

An overarching identity Brian works to construct of himself is that of “the positive one” in the context of the stuttering self-help/ support group. He accomplishes this by using a comparative formula in which he first describes the behaviors of his peers then follows them with descriptions of his own behaviors that stand in complete opposition with those of the group. Besides selecting verbs that inherently carry his negative judgment of his peers, he also instantiates the system of modality, specifically usuality, as a point of contrast. For example, he states that his peers “complain” during support group meetings. This verb choice works to convey his negative appraisal of this behavior, whereas the verb “talk” could have been used neutrally instead. Brian sets himself in opposition with his peers’ complaining by using modality to assert that he “never” does “that” (Excerpt 7.24). Brian paints an image of his peers being victims through his description of their emotional characteristics. He portrays his peers as being “sullen,” “morose,” and with “very low self-esteem,” while he feels “good” about himself. This positive self esteem he attests to supports his identity as “a fighter,” which is related to the ongoing “battle” metaphor he uses to describe his stuttering.

Thus, Brian sets up a contrast between him and his peers not only to distance himself from them, but also to construct a positive and socially acceptable image himself. This resonates with Plexico et al. (2009), which describes emotion-based avoidant coping responses. As discussed by Boyle (2013b), many PWS judge themselves more positively than they judge their peers who stutter. His negative judgment of his peers also has implications for the “stereotype agreement,” which was addressed in the section about his construction of the stuttering experience. The purpose of the self-help/ support group is to provide a safe haven for PWS to

disclose feelings and discuss personal experiences with others who can offer support and empathy. Therefore, Brian's criticism of his peers suggests a lack of alignment between his expectations and the objectives of the self-help/ support group. This supports personal construct psychology, as described by Dilollo et al. (2002), in that Brian is viewing his peers and the structure of the self-help/ support group from a particular "template," which rejects stuttering. Interestingly, when the researcher attended a support group meeting a few months following this ethnographic interview, one of the support group members told Brian that he needed to stop being "so negative."

Brian takes on the identity of "the one who is dysfunctional" by comparing himself to his siblings, all of whom do not stutter. In this case, he uses the Appraisal system to construct positive images of his family members and works to cast himself as the PWS in a negative light by comparison. For instance, he appraises his siblings as being "perfect" and "completely normal" in light of the fact that they do not stutter. This assignment of the Attribute "normal" has implications for his "dysfunction" as a PWS. The most revealing description, however, is the juxtaposition of his brother's behaviors and stuttering in Excerpts 7.20 and 7.21. Over a series of clauses, Brian constructs a questionable image of his brother by naming some of the reckless and illegal activities he partook in, which Brian suggests had a hand in his untimely AIDS-related death. Despite all of these stigmatized life choices his brother made, Brian structured the fact that his brother did not stutter as a redeeming quality. While he negated his brother's ability to "function," he alludes to the fact that his stuttering makes he him even more dysfunctional by comparison.

Through his use of the Appraisal system, Brian structures two social identities of himself relative to his stuttering. Even though he works to convey a positive image of himself in

comparison to his stuttering group peers, traces of his overall feelings of stigma related to stuttering are salient. They are intensified even more so when he compares himself to his non-stuttering siblings. These negative judgments of himself and others who stutter are reflected in his OASES results, which indicate that stuttering has a moderate-to-severe impact on his quality of life, when considering his stuttering in English and Spanish.

Similarities across cases

In all four cases, confidence was described as having a role in the bilingual stuttering experience, which is a finding that is heavily supported by literature (e.g. Plexico et al., 2005; Lee & Manning, 2010; Boyle, 2013b, Plexico et al., 2013). By examining the way each participant describes confidence, it was revealed that it can be gained from particular entities such as Toastmasters and self-help/ support groups, as reported by Neil, and therapy, as reported by Sam. Confidence also plays a role in the maintenance of fluency while speaking a second language. For example, Ivan gains confidence when his English proficiency is better than that of his interlocutors, which also helps him to be more fluent when he speaks. Brian cites his lack of confidence in his second language, Spanish, as one of the reasons why he stutters more frequently when speaking it.

Another commonality found across three participants was the negative appraisal of the internal aspect of stuttering. For example, Ivan refers to it as a “dual pressure,” while Neil appraises it as “an onus.” Brian, on the other hand, structures the problematic nature of this aspect through his comparison of stuttering to a person on crutches, where he highlights the visibility of being on crutches.

Methodological and theoretical considerations

Methodological and theoretical issues arose throughout the course of this study. In terms of data collection, eliciting naturalistic data from the participants was difficult due to the inherent role of the researcher as an authority figure in the context of the ethnographic interview. This could be the cause for the down-scaling of their beliefs about the etiology of their stuttering and their negative appraisals of speech therapy. The primary objective of using the context of the family conversation as a data source was to give participants and their family members the freedom to select topics related to their stuttering in the language of their choice. With the lack of monitoring, this led to some participants taking the floor for the entirety of the recording, Mirielle and Neil in particular, while their interlocutors did not get much time to co-construct and provide input on the topics.

When this study was planned, a focus group was to be held with all four primary participants of this study, which would have provided a third context where the construction of the bilingual stuttering experience could have been observed. Due to time constraints, as well as difficulty in getting all four participants to agree on a day and time to meet, this portion of the study was not carried out.

The researcher decided to use SFL as an analytical framework to tap into the internal component of bilingual stuttering. This systematic and theoretically grounded method provided insight as to how participants made linguistic choices across the three metafunctions of language to construe their experiences. This theory assumes that language is a semiotic system in that speakers create meaning through the linguistic choices they make across a variety of contexts. In choosing this framework for analytic purposes, this study was limited by the pre-determined labels used to identify the linguistic resources the participants used while constructing their

experiences. There were some cases in which multiple labels could have been used to describe a choice. For example, in the clause, “It was terrifying,” the appraisal item “terrifying” could be construed as a negative appreciation of “it” or as negative affect. These labels are not exhaustive and are subject to the interpretations of the researcher, which has implications for the consistency across contexts (Martin & White, 2005).

As discussed in the literature review chapter of this dissertation, Spencer et al. (2005) uses SFL to look at the use of modality and Theme in English in two cases of PWS, while Spencer et al. (2009) used SFL to examine the syntactic and semantic complexity in the language use of 10 PWS. The current study is the only one that examines Spanish in the context of conversation in relation to the bilingual stuttering experience. Therefore, applying this set of analytic tools, which is based on English, was difficult as there was not a solid base of literature available as a resource. The researcher relied heavily on the work of Lavid, Arus, and Mansilla (2010) to gain insight into the differences in the Spanish grammar that needed to be taken into consideration during analysis of the Spanish data. In cases where the researcher encountered difficulties understanding the Spanish recordings, native speakers and, in some cases, the participants were consulted. For example, Ivan was asked to explain the difference between the words “tartamudo” and “gago,” which are both used to refer to a PWS. Through lamination though, it was revealed that “gago” is used to convey that there is a cognitive disability in addition to the stuttering. This term, Ivan says, is “worse” than “tartamudo.”

The findings of this study indicate that each bilingual’s experience with stuttering was highly individualized in terms of the actual processes and attitudes they used to construct their experiences. It was also found that stuttering manifested itself differently across languages and participants. In all four cases, the individual had a theory about this, which they constructed

based on their personal experiences with stuttering. The attitudes and experiential configurations used by the participants revealed multiple identities and positions they adopted relative to their stuttering.

Clinical implications

Several findings of this study have implications for the clinical setting. The most salient of these is the critical role cultural background plays in the bilingual's experience, which supports the findings of Salas-Provance, Erickson, & Reed (2002). Because of the stigma associated with stuttering in some cultures, bilingual PWSs' and their parents' involvement in therapy may be limited. As revealed in Ivan's case, the taboo surrounding the word "tartamudez" hindered his mother, Mirielle, in seeking therapy for her son's speech problems. Feeding this lack of intervention were her theories about the etiology of Ivan's stuttering. Because she held the belief that her "caracter fuerte" (strong character) was to blame, she thought being nicer and screaming less would help Ivan get better. Her beliefs about etiology were deeply rooted in culture, which is a finding supported by the literature (Tellis & Tellis, 2003; Salas-Provance, Erickson, & Reed, 2002). Therefore, there are implications for the responsibility therapists have in mediating misunderstandings and empowering clients through education and providing access to resources. At the same time, therapists need to be knowledgeable of and sensitive to culture-based beliefs and judgments related to stuttering.

This study also revealed a lack of transfer of therapy techniques across languages, which was expressed through the participants' beliefs that the phonological and phonetic characteristics of the Spanish language were to blame. This, in part, could be due to the lack of knowledge monolingual therapists have about the linguistic characteristics of the unfamiliar language. Tellis, Bressler, and Emerick (2008) speak to the general uneasiness expressed by clinicians,

when it comes to the assessment and treatment of multilingual clientele. The implications then are twofold. Not only is there a need to educate clients about strategies and how to apply them in their second language, but also that clinicians need to know enough about the language in order to achieve validity and efficacy in their evaluation and treatment techniques. Therefore, clinicians need to educate themselves about the language in regard to features such as phonology, phonetics, and prosody and also need to seek assistance from native speakers when in doubt.

This study served as evidence for the efficacy of using SFL techniques in the clinical setting. Standardized measures such as the SSI-4 and the OASES provide valuable information about the severity of the behavioral and affective aspects of stuttering respectively. However, their use is limited when considering multilingual clientele due to the fact that they are normed for English. While descriptive approaches such as *The UL-Lafayette Stuttering Profile* (Tetnowski, 2010) can and should be used for diagnostic purposes, there still are no standardized means for determining severity of stuttering in multilingual clients. In these cases then, clinicians should rely, not only on their clinical judgment, but also on the expertise offered by the bilingual PWS. SFL can be used to uncover the experiences that underlie the theories they hold about their stuttering, which will give way to patterns and contexts of its manifestation (e.g. “mapping”; vowel-initial words). This information can buttress clinical impressions and boost the validity of diagnoses.

SFL can also be used to gain insight on the deep-seated, cognitive aspects that are brought to life by the client’s use of language, which has implications for treatment. According to Bruner (1986), language has the capacity to create and stipulate realities of its own: constitutiveness. It is this constitutiveness that gives an externality and an apparent ontological

status to the concepts that words embody (Bruner, 1986). Eventually the culturally shaped cognitive and linguistic processes that guide the self-telling of life narratives achieve the power to structure perceptual experience, to organize memory, to segment and purpose-build the very “events” of a life (Bruner, 2006). Therefore, this study has implications for the use of narrative in the treatment of bilingual PWS as described by Lee et al. (2011) and Dilollo et al. (2002). Lee et al. (2011) used content analysis of freely spoken or written narratives of PWS as a means to determine agency (locus of control) relative to stuttering as well as perceived causality. By using Origin and Pawn values, which are likened to externality and internality of the experience, the authors were able to identify indicators of the speaker’s locus of causality and ability to develop an agentive lifestyle in the face of their stuttering. Dilollo et al. (2002) used personal construct psychology to account for the shift in roles PWS cope with post-treatment, which is attributed to relapse. It is proposed that a narrative approach is used during treatment in order to deconstruct stuttering-dominated personal narratives and then reconstruct alternative narratives in which the PWS structures himself as a fluent speaker. SFL can provide a means for identifying specific linguistic choices used by the bilingual PWS that should be deconstructed (e.g. experiential configurations conveying lack of agency; negative appraisal items) and can provide options, supported by SFL theory, for reconstruction. For example, instead of structuring their stuttering experiences as something that happens to them (e.g. “My stuttering manifests itself when I speak Spanish”) with “my stuttering” in an active role, the narrative can be molded into one that conveys control over the behavior (e.g. “I stutter when I speak Spanish”) with “I” in the role of primary participant.

Limitations and implications for future research

Because of the relatively small sample of participants in this study, the highly individualized results are not meant to be generalized to the population of bilinguals who stutter. The aim of this study was to describe the intricacies of each participant's experience as a bilingual who stutters through detailed examination of their language use in the context of conversation. The only variable controlled for in the context of the family conversation was the requirement that the conversation should be geared toward the topic of stuttering. Actual conversational topics used to achieve this requirement varied from recording to recording because of the variations in the family member's knowledge and experience with the bilingual PWS's stuttering. The interpersonal roles the participants and their family members took on during these conversations varied as well. For example, Ivan's conversation with his mother, Mirielle, and his brother, Rey, was centered on his Mirielle's experience with Ivan's stuttering. Little input was given by Ivan during the recording. Sam took the role of "interviewer" during the conversation with his mother, Ingrid, and therefore selected all of the topics of discussion. Neil took the role of "expert" during his conversation with his sister, Verena, since she had no experience with his stuttering as a result of his late onset. Very little data was collected from his sister because of this. The language in which these conversations took place was selected by the participant and their family member(s) at the time of the recording. Because of this, no conversational Spanish data was collected from Neil's recording. Sam chose to speak English while his mother, Ingrid, spoke Spanish during their conversation. The lack of controlled variables served to elicit naturalistic data, which needs to be taken into consideration when examining the results.

This study was limited due to the emotional and personal nature of the stuttering experience. Many of the potential candidates the researcher was referred to in the recruitment stage of this study refused to participate due to the requirement of recording a conversation with their family member. Brian, being one of these people, insisted that his younger siblings did not know enough about his stuttering to make meaningful contributions to the study. He also cited that the fact they lived out of state was problematic in terms of recording a conversation. Both of his parents are deceased. Despite his inability (and refusal) to record a family conversation, Brian was included in the study due to the insight he had to offer based on his age. This broadened the study and gave some perspective in the variation of bilingual stuttering experiences across the life span.

While SSI-4 results were used only for descriptive purposes, there were limitations inherent to this standardized measure that need to be discussed. All four participants used fluency-inducing techniques while completing the reading portion, which decreased the amount of syllables stuttered by a significant amount during the task. The time it took for the participants to read the passages, as well as the comments they made after reading, serve as evidence that they indeed were not reading in a natural manner in order to prevent stuttering. When these low scores were combined with those of the speaking task, severity rates were lower than expected. Therefore, the overall severity ratings for each participant were skewed by the results of the reading tasks in both languages. Another factor to be taken into consideration is the fact that the SSI-4 is norm-referenced for English. This has implications for the validity of the stuttering severity ratings assigned to the participants' stuttering in Spanish.

Future research based on the bilingual stuttering experience should investigate how bilingual PWS construct their experiences when interacting with other bilingual PWS, which can

be accomplished by conducting a focus group. “The focus group setting will facilitate access to the participants’ own meanings by enhancing disclosure, by highlighting participants’ own language and concepts, by enabling participants to follow their own agendas, by facilitating production of elaborated accounts, and by enabling the researcher to observe the co-construction of meaning in action” (Wilkinson, 1998, p. 341). This information can provide valuable insight about the ways bilingual PWS position themselves relative to their peers and thus serve as a base for exploring the efficacy of social group approaches as a means to provide therapy.

To gain more insight on the cultural implications of stuttering, future research should focus on the stuttering experiences of Hispanics, in particular. Much work has been done cross-culturally relative to stuttering including: American Indian’s attitudes towards stuttering (Stewart, 1960; Zimmerman, Liljebald, Frank, & Cleeland, 1983; St. Louis, Przepiorka, Bese-Guldborg, Williams, Blachnio, Guendouzi, Reicherl, & Ware, 2014); attitudes held by Turkish families (Ozdemir, St. Louis, & Topbas, 2011a) and public attitudes in Turkey (Ozdemir, St. Louis, & Topbas, 2011b); attitudes towards stuttering in China (Ip, St. Louis, Myers, & Xue, 2012); and Arab teachers’ attitudes towards stuttering (Abdalla & St. Louis, 2012). The work of Salas-Provance et al. (2002) is one of the few studies that explores stuttering beliefs from the Hispanic perspective. So, research regarding stuttering attitudes held by Hispanic-Americans (a rapidly growing population in the United States) is lacking. Ivan’s results scratched the surface in terms of what can be learned about the culture-specific beliefs held about the etiology of stuttering. Issues such as social stigma and lack of resources amongst this population should be examined further, as they have implications for access to therapy in this growing population.

Conclusions

This dissertation used analytic tools based on SFL, a theory of language use. Examination of the linguistic choices participants' made to construe processes, attitudes, and highlight topics of significance demonstrated the individualized nature of the bilingual stuttering experience. Bilingual PWS have theories about their stuttering based on their personal experiences with the disorder, which has implications for the way they conceptualize their stuttering. This study addressed the following research questions: 1) How do bilinguals who stutter linguistically construct their stuttering experience; 2) what perceptions do these individuals have about stuttering in each language; and 3) how do these individuals position themselves relative to their stuttering? Through answering these questions, insight was gained from the perspective of the individual bilingual PWS and gave rise to clinical implications for the use of SFL when taking a narrative approach to fluency treatment. This study also shed light on the culture implications inherent to the bilingual stuttering experience with the most salient issue being stigma. These findings are intended to build upon the current knowledge about the bilingual stuttering experience and serve as an example of the efficacy of using SFL in for both research and clinical purposes.

References

- Abdalla, F.A. & St. Louis, K.O. (2012). Arab school teachers' knowledge, beliefs and reactions regarding stuttering. *Journal of Fluency Disorders*, 37(1), 54-69.
- American Speech-Language-Hearing Association. (2004). *Knowledge and Skills Needed by Speech-Language Pathologists and Audiologists to Provide Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services* [Knowledge and Skills]. Available from www.asha.org/policy.
- Au-Yeung, J., & Howell, P. (1998). Lexical and syntactic context and stuttering. *Clinical Linguistics and Phonetics*, 12, 67-78.
- Bakhtiar, M., Seifpanahi, S., Ansari, H., Ghanadzade, M., & Packman, A. (2010). Investigation of the reliability of the SSI-3 for preschool Persian-speaking children who stutter. *Journal of Fluency Disorders*, 35(2), 87-91.
- Baumgartner, (1999). Acquired Psychogenic Stuttering. In R.F. Curlee, *Stuttering and related disorders of fluency*, 2nd ed., NY: Thieme Medical Publishers, Inc.
- Bennett, E.M. (2006). The ABCs of stuttering (pp. 22-55). In *Stuttering: An Integrated Approach to Its Nature and Treatment*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- Bernstein Ratner, N. & Benitez, M.(1985). Linguistic analysis of a bilingual stutterer. *Journal of Fluency Disorders*, 10(3), 211-219.
- Bernstein Ratner, N., & Tetnowski, J. (2006). Stuttering treatment in the new millennium: Changes in the traditional parameters of clinical focus. In N. Bernstein Ratner & J. Tetnowski (Eds.), *Current issues in stuttering research and practice*, (pp. 1-16). Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

- Blood, G.W., Blood, I.M., Tellis, G.M. & Gabel, R.M. (2003). A preliminary study of self-esteem, stigma, and disclosure in adolescents who stutter. *Journal of Fluency Disorders*, 28(2), 143-159.
- Bloodstein, O. (1950). A rating scale study of conditions under which stuttering is reduced or absent. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders*, 15, 29-36.
- Bloodstein, O. (1960). The development of stuttering: I. Changes in nine basic features. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders*, 25, 219-237.
- Bloodstein, O. (1995). *A handbook on stuttering*. (5th ed.) New York: Learning, Inc. Thomson.
- Bloodstein, O. & Bernstein Ratner, N. (2008). *A handbook on stuttering*, 6th ed. Clifton Park, NY: Delmar.
- Bloomfield, L. (1935). *Language*. London: Allen & Unwin.
- Blumgart, E., Tran, Y., Yaruss, J.S. & Craig, A. (2012). Australian normative data for the Overall Assessment of the Speaker's Experience of Stuttering. *Journal of Fluency Disorders*, 37(2), 83-90.
- Blumgart, E., Tran, Y., & Craig, A. (2014). Social support and its association with negative affect in adults who stutter. *Journal of Fluency Disorders*, 40, 83-92.
(doi: 10.1016/j.jfludis.2014.02.002).
- Blomgren, M., Roy, N., Callister, T., & Merrill, R.M. (2005). Intensive Stuttering Modification Therapy: A Multidimensional Assessment of Treatment Outcomes. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 48, 509-523.
- Boyle, M. (2013a). Assessment of Stigma Associated With Stuttering: Development and Evaluation of the Self-Stigma of Stuttering Scale (4S). *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 56, 1517-1529.

- Boyle, M. (2013b). Psychological characteristics and perceptions of stuttering of adults who stutter with and without support group experience. *Journal of Fluency Disorders*, 38(4), 368-381.
- Bruner, J.S. (1986). *Actual minds, Possible worlds*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bruner, J.S. (2006). Life as narrative. In J.S. Bruner, *In search of pedagogy. Volume II. The selected works of Jerome S. Bruner*. (pp.129-140). New York: Routledge.
- Carias, S. & Ingram, D. (2006). Language and disfluency: Four case studies on Spanish-English bilingual children. *Journal of Multilingual Communication Disorders*, 4(2), 149-157.
- Christie, F. (1990). *The contributions of systemic linguistics to Mother Tongue Education as developed in Australia*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED327065).
- Coalson, G. A., Peña, E. D., & Byrd, C. T. (2013). Description of multilingual participants who stutter. *Journal of Fluency Disorders*, 38(2), 141-156.
(doi: 10.1016/j.jfludis.2013.02.008).
- Colcord, R.D. & Adams, M.R. (1979). Voicing Duration and Vocal SPL Changes Associated with Stuttering Reduction During Singing. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 22, 468-479.
- Cordes, A.K. & Ingham, R.J. (1994). The Reliability of Observational Data II. Issues in the Identification and Measurement of Stuttering Events. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 37, 279-294.
- Craig, A. (1990). An Investigation into the Relationship Between Anxiety and Stuttering. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders*, 55, 290-294. (doi:10.1044/jshd.5502.290).
- Craig, A., Blumgart, E., & Tran, Y. (2009). The impact of stuttering on the quality of life in adults who stutter. *Journal of Fluency Disorders*, 34, 61-71.

- Craig, A., Hancock, K., Tran, K., Craig, M., & Peters, K. (2002). Epidemiology of Stuttering in the Community Across the Entire Life Span. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research, 45*, 1097-1105. doi:10.1044/1092-4388(2002/088).
- Curlee, R.F. (1981). Observer agreement on disfluency and stuttering. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research, 24*, 595-600. doi:10.1044/jshr.2404.595.
- Dale, P. (1977). Factors related to dysfluent speech in bilingual Cuban-American adolescents. *Journal of Fluency Disorders, 2*, 311-314.
- Damico, J.S. & Augustine, L.E. (1995). Social considerations in the labeling of students as attention deficit hyperactivity disorder. *Seminars in Speech and Language, 16*, 259-274.
- Damico, J. S., Simmons-Mackie, N., Oelschlaeger, M., Elman, R., & Armstrong, E. (1999). Qualitative methods in aphasia research: Basic issues. *Aphasiology, 13*(9-11), 651-665.
- De Nil, L.F. (1995). Interview with Dr. C. Woodruff Starkweather fifth president-elect of the International Fluency Association. *Journal of Fluency Disorders, 20*(3), 303-313.
- De Nil, L.F., Jokol, R. & Rochon, E. (2007). Etiology, symptomatology, and treatment of neurogenic stuttering. In E.G. Conture and R.F. Curlee (Eds.), *Stuttering and related disorders of fluency* (pp. 326-343). New York: Thieme Medical Publishers, Inc.
- Dilollo, A., Neimeyer, R.A., & Manning, W.H., (2002). A personal construct psychology view of relapse: indications for a narrative therapy component to stuttering treatment. *Journal of Fluency Disorders, 27*, 19-42.
- Douglass, J. (2012). Covert Stuttering: Coming out of the stuttering closet. Retrieved on 5/29/14 from: <http://www.mnsu.edu/comdis/isad16/papers/douglass16.html>.

- Dunn, A. L., & Fox Tree, J. E. (2009). A quick, gradient Bilingual Dominance Scale. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition, 12*, 273-289.
- Eggins, S. & Slade, D. (1997). *Analyzing casual conversation*. Washington: Cassell.
- Emerson, R.M., Fretz, R.I., & Shaw, L.L. (1995). In the field: Participating, observing, and jotting notes. In *Writing ethnographic fieldnotes*. (pp. 17-39). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Erickson, S. & Block, S. (2013). The social and communication impact of stuttering on adolescents and their families. *Journal of Fluency Disorders, 38*(4), 311-324.
- Ezrati-Vinacour, R. & Weinstein, N. (2011). A dialogue among various cultures and its manifestation in stuttering therapy. *Journal of Fluency Disorders, 36*, 174-185.
- Finn, P. & Cordes, A.K. (1997). Multicultural identification and treatment of stuttering: A continuing need for research. *Journal of Fluency Disorders, 22*(3), 219-236.
- Fontaine, L. (2010). *Language as social semiotic in Halliday's systemic functional linguistics*. Retrieved on 7/1/14 from: <http://semioticon.com/semiotix/2012/03/language-as-social-semiotic-in-hallidays-systemic-functional-linguistics/>.
- Freeman, F. (1999). Going out on a limb: Hypotheses regarding the nature and treatment of stuttering. Retrieved on 6/3/14 from: <http://www.mnsu.edu/comdis/isad2/papers/freeman.html>.
- Gabel, R.M. (2006). Effects of stuttering severity and therapy involvement on attitudes towards people who stutter. *Journal of Fluency Disorders, 31*, 216-227.
- Ginsberg, A.P. (2000). Shame, Self-Consciousness, and Locus of Control in People Who Stutter. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology: Research and Theory on Human Development, 161*(4), 389-399.

- Goffman, E. (1955). On face-work: an analysis of ritual elements in social interaction. *Journal for the Study of Interpersonal Processes*, 18, 213-231.
- Grosjean, F. (1982). *Life with two languages: An introduction to bilingualism*. Harvard University Press.
- Grosjean, F. (1989). Neurolinguists, beware! The bilingual is not two monolinguals in one person. *Brain and Language*, 36(1), 3-15.
- Grosjean, F. (1998). *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*. Cambridge University Press.
- Halliday, M.A.K., & Matthiessen, C.M.I. (2004). *An introduction to functional grammar*. New York: Hodder Arnold.
- Ham, R.E. (1989). What are we measuring? *Journal of Fluency Disorders*, 14, 231-243.
- Hamers, J.F. (1981). Psychological approaches to the development of bilinguality. In H. Baetens Beardsmore (Ed.), *Elements of bilingual theory*, 28-47. Brussels, Belgium: Vrije Universiteit te Brussel.
- Hamers, J. F. & Blanc, M.H.A. (2000). Definitions and guiding principles. In *Bilinguality and bilingualism*, 2nd ed. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Harrison, J.C. (2004). Developing a new paradigm for stuttering. The National Stuttering Association. Retrieved on 7/19/2014 from:
<http://www.mnsu.edu/comdis/kuster/Infostuttering/Harrison/hexagonarticle.html>
- Haugen, E. (1953). *The Norwegian language in America: A study in bilingual behavior*. University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia.
- Healy, E.C. Mallard, A.R. & Adams, M.R. (1976). Factors contributing to the reduction of stuttering during singing. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 19, 475-480. (doi:10.1044/jshr.1903.475).

- Hicks, R. (1997). Another path toward recovery. Retrieved on 5/30/14 from:
<http://www.mnsu.edu/comdis/kuster/casestudy/path/hickspath.html>.
- Howell, P., Au-Yeung, J., Yaruss, J. S., & Eldridge, K. (2006). Phonetic difficulty and stuttering in English. *Clinical Linguistics and Phonetics*, 20(9), 703-716.
- Howell, P. & Au-Yeung, J. (2007). Phonetic complexity and stuttering in Spanish. *Clinical Linguistics and Phonetics*, 21(2), 111–127. (doi:10.1080/02699200600709511).
- Howell, P., Davis, S., & Williams, R. (2009). The effects of bilingualism on stuttering during late childhood. *Archives of Disease in Childhood*, 94, 42-46.
(doi: 10.1136/adc.2007.1344144).
- Howell, P., & Rusbridge, S. (2011). Speech and language characteristics of developmental stuttering in English speakers. In P. Howell & J. Van Borsel (Eds.), *Multilingual aspects of fluency disorders*, (pp. 93-138). USA: Multilingual Matters.
- Humphrey, B.D. (2004). Judgments of disfluency in a familiar vs. an unfamiliar language. In A. Packman, A. Meltzer and H.F.M. Peters (Eds.), *Theory, research, and therapy in fluency disorders. Proceedings of the 4th world congress on fluency disorders, Montreal, Canada* (pp. 423-427). Nijmegen: Nijmegen University Press.
- Ingham, R. J. (2012). Comments on recent developments in stuttering treatment maintenance research using the Camperdown Program. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 55, 306-309.
- Ip, M.L., St. Louis, K.O., Myers, F. L., & Xue, S.A. (2012). Stuttering attitudes in Hong Kong and adjacent Mainland China. *International Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*, 14(6), 543-556.

- Jankelowitz, D.L. & Bortz, M.A. (1996). The interaction of bilingualism and stuttering in an adult. *Journal of Communication Disorders, 29*(3), 223-234.
- Jayaram, M. (1983). Phonetic influences on stuttering in monolingual and bilingual stutterers. *Journal of Communication Disorders, 16*(4), 287-297.
- Jayaram, M. (1984). Distribution of stuttering in sentences: Relationship to sentence length and clause position. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research, 27*, 338-341.
- Karinol, R. (1992). Stuttering out of bilingualism *First Language, 12*, 255-283.
(doi:10.1177/014272379201203604).
- Kathard, H. (2001). Sharing stories: Life history in stuttering research. *International Journal of Language and Communication Disorders, 36*(1), 52-57.
- Kelly, G.A. (1955). *The psychology of personal constructs*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Key, J.P. (1997). Research design in occupational education: Qualitative research. Retrieved on 4/22/11 from:
<http://www.okstate.edu/ag/agedcm4h/academic/aged5980a/5980/newpage21.htm>.
- Klompas, M. & Ross, E. (2004). Life experiences of people who stutter, and the perceived impact of stuttering on quality of life: Personal accounts of South African individuals. *Journal of Fluency Disorders, 29*(4), 255-273.
- Koedoot, C., Versteegh, M. & Yaruss, J.S. (2011). Psychometric evaluation of the Dutch translation of the Overall Assessment of the Speaker's Experience of Stuttering for adults (OASES-A-D). *Journal of Fluency Disorders, 36*(3), 222-230.
- Kraaimaat, F.W., Vanryckeghem, M. & Van Dam-Baggen, R. (2002). Stuttering and social anxiety. *Journal of Fluency Disorders, 27*, 319-331.

- Lass, N.J., & Ruscello, D.M. (1989). Speech-language pathologists' perceptions of child and adult female and male stutterers. *Journal of Fluency Disorders, 14*(2), 127-134.
- Lavid, J., Arús, J., & Zamorano, J. R. (2010) *Systemic Functional Grammar of Spanish. A Contrastive Study with English*. London: Continuum.
- Lee, K., Manning, W.H., & Herder, C. (2011). Documenting changes in adult speakers' locus of causality during stuttering treatment using Origin and Pawn scaling. *Journal of Fluency Disorders, 36*, 231-254.
- Leith, W.R., Mahr, G.C., & Miller, L.D. (1993). The assessment of speech-related attitudes and beliefs of people who stutter. *ASHA Monographs, 29*, 1-32.
- Levelt, W.J.M., (1983). Monitoring and self-repair in speech. *Cognition, 14*, 41-104.
- Lewis, K. E. (1994). Reporting observer agreement on stuttering event judgments: A survey and evaluation of current practice. *Journal of Fluency Disorders, 19* (4), 269-284.
- Lewis, K.E. (1995). Do SSI-3 scores adequately reflect observations of stuttering behaviors? *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology, 4*, 46-59.
- Li, P., Sepanski, S., & Zhao, Xiaowhei. (2006). Language history questionnaire: A Web-based interface for bilingual research. *Behavior Research Methods, 38*(2), 202-210.
- Lim, V.P.C., & Lincoln, M. (2011). Stuttering in English-Mandarin bilinguals in Singapore. In P. Howell & J. Van Borsel (Eds.), *Multilingual aspects of fluency disorders*, pp.271-307. USA: Multilingual Matters.
- Lim, V.P.C., Lincoln, M., Chan, Y.H., & Onslow, M. (2008). Stuttering in English–Mandarin bilingual speakers: The influence of language dominance on stuttering severity. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research, 51*, 1522-1537.

- Macnamara, J. (1967). The bilingual's linguistic performance- A psychological overview. *Journal of Social Issues, 23*(2), 58-77.
- MacKinnon, S.P., Hall, S. & MacIntyre, P.D. (2007). Origins of stuttering stereotype: Stereotype formation through anchoring-adjustment. *Journal of Fluency Disorders, 32*, 297-309.
- Mahr & Torosian, (1999). Anxiety and Social Phobia in Stuttering. *Journal of Fluency Disorders, 24*(2), 119-126.
- Manning, W.H., Dailey, D., & Wallace, S. (1984). Attitude and personality characteristics of older stutterers. *Journal of Fluency Disorders, 9*(3), 207-215.
- Mansson, H. (2000). Childhood stuttering: Incidence and development. *Journal of Fluency Disorders. 25*(1), 47-57.
- Marian, V., Blumenfeld, H. K., & Kaushanskaya, M. (2007). The Language Experience and Proficiency Questionnaire (LEAP-Q): Assessing language profiles in bilinguals and multilinguals. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research, 50*, 940–967.
- Marshall, J. (2000). Critical Reflections on the Cultural Influences in Identification and Habilitation of Children with Speech and Language Difficulties. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education, 47*(4).
- Martin, J.R. & Rose, D. (2003). *Working with discourse: Meaning beyond the clause*. London & New York: Continuum.
- Martin, J.R. & White, P.R.R. (2005). *The Language of Evaluation*. New York: Palgrave.
- Martin, R. R., Haroldson, S. K., & Triden, K. A. (1984). Stuttering and speech naturalness. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders, 49*, 53–58.

- Matthiessen, C. (2012). Systemic functional linguistics as applicable linguistics: Social accountability and critical approaches. *DELTA: Documentação de Estudos em Lingüística Teórica e Aplicada*, 28(Especial), 435-471.
- Matthiessen, C. & Kasper, R. (1985). *Representational issues in systemic functional grammar and systemic grammar and functional unification grammar*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED289165).
- Maxwell, D.L. & Satake, E. (2006). *Research and statistical methods in communication sciences and disorders*. Canada: Thomson Delmar Learning.
- Mennen, I. (2011). Speech production in simultaneous and sequential bilinguals. In P. Howell & J. Van Borsel (Eds.), *Multilingual aspects of fluency disorders*, (pp. 24-42). USA: Multilingual Matters.
- Messenger, M., Onslow, M., Packman, A., & Menzies, R. (2004). Social anxiety in stuttering: measuring negative social expectancies. *Journal of Fluency Disorders*, 29(3), 201-212.
- Miller, S. & Watson, B.C. (1992). The relationship between communication attitude, anxiety, and depression in stutterers and non-stutterers. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research*, 35(4), 789-798.
- Mowrer, D. (1987). Reported use of a Japanese accent to promote fluency. *Journal of Fluency Disorders*, 12, 19-39.
- Müller, N. (2006). *Multilayered Transcription*. San Diego: Plural Publishing.
- Nudelman, H. B., Herbrich, K. E., Hoyt, B. D., & Rosenfield, D. (1989). A neuroscience model of stuttering. *Journal of Fluency Disorders*, 14, 399-427.
- Nwokah, E. (1988). The imbalance of stuttering behavior in bilingual speakers. *Journal of Fluency Disorders*, 13 (5), 357-373.

- Oberlander, E.L., Schneier, Franklin, F.R., & Liebowitz, M.R. (1994). Physical Disability and Social Phobia. *Journal of clinical psychopharmacology*, 14(2).
- Oteiza, T. & Pinto, D. (2008). Agency, responsibility and silence in the construction of contemporary history in Chile and Spain. *Discourse and Society*, 19(3), 333-358.
- Oteiza, T. (2009). Evaluative patterns in the official discourse of human rights in Chile: giving value to the past and building historical memories in society. *DELTA: Documentação de Estudos em Lingüística Teórica e Aplicada*, 25. Retrieved on 6/3/14 from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S0102-44502009000300004>.
- Ozdemir, R.S., St. Louis, K.O., & Topbas, S. (2011a). Stuttering attitudes among Turkish family generations and neighbors from representative samples. *Journal of Fluency Disorders*, 36 (4), 318-333.
- Ozdemir, R.S., St. Louis, K.O., & Topbas, S. (2011b). Public attitudes toward stuttering in Turkey: Probability versus convenience sampling. *Journal of Fluency Disorders*, 36 (4), 262-267.
- Packman, A. & Kuhn, L. (2009). Looking at stuttering through the lens of complexity. *International Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*, 11(1), 77-82. (doi:10.1080/17549500802630039).
- Perkins, W., Kent, R., & Curlee, R. (1991). A theory of neuropsycholinguistic function in stuttering. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research*, 34, 734-752.
- Plexico, L.W., Manning, W.H., & Dilollo, A. (2005). A phenomenological understanding of successful stuttering management. *Journal of Fluency Disorders*, 30, 1-22.

- Plexico, L.W., Manning, W.H., & Dilollo, A. (2010). Client perceptions of effective and ineffective therapeutic alliances during treatment for stuttering. *Journal of Fluency Disorders, 35*, 333-354.
- Plexico, L.W., Manning, W.H., & Levitt, H. (2009). Coping responses by adults who stutter: Part II. Approaching the problem and achieving agency. *Journal of Fluency Disorders 34*(2), 108-126.
- Plexico, L.W., Plumb, A.M., & Beacham, J. (2013). Teacher knowledge and perceptions of stuttering and bullying in school-age children. *SIG 4 Perspectives on Fluency and Fluency Disorders, 23*, 39-53. (doi:10.1044/ffd23.2.39).
- Postma, A. & Kolk, H. (1993). The Covert Repair Hypothesis: Prearticulatory repair processes in normal and stuttered disfluencies. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research, 36*, 472-487.
- Riley, G.D. (1994). *Stuttering severity instrument for children and adults*. Austin, TX: PRO-ED.
- Riley, G.D. (2009). *Stuttering severity instrument – fourth edition*. Austin, TX: PRO-ED.
- Riley, J., Riley, G., & Maguire, G. (2004). Subjective Screening of Stuttering severity, locus of control and avoidance: research edition. *Journal of Fluency Disorders, 29*(1), 51–62.
- Roberts, P.M. (2002). Disfluency patterns in four bilingual adults who stutter. *Journal of Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology, 26*(1), 5-19.
- Roberts, P.M. (2011). Methodological matters. In P. Howell & J. Van Borsel (Eds.), *Multilingual aspects of fluency disorders*, (pp.353-369). USA: Multilingual Matters.
- Roth, C.R., Aronson, A.E., & Davis, L.J. (1989). Clinical studies in psychogenic stuttering of adult onset. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders, 54*, 634-646.

- Ruscello, D., Lass, N., Schmitt, J., & Pannbacker, M. (1994). Special educator's perceptions of stutterers. *Journal of Fluency Disorders, 19*, 125-132.
- Ruscello, D.M., Lass, N.J., & Brown, J. (1988). College students' perceptions of stutterers. *NSSLHA Journal*.
- Salas-Provance, M.B., Erickson, J.G. & Reed, J. (2002). Disabilities as viewed by four generations of one Hispanic family. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology, 11*(2), 151-162. (doi:10.1044/1058-0360(2002/015)).
- Samuels, E.J. (2003). My body, my closet: Invisible disability and the limits of coming-out discourse. *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies, 9*(1-2), 233-255.
- Schafer, M. (2008). Stuttering characteristics of German-English bilingual speakers. Retrieved on 6/3/14 from: <http://hdl.handle.net/10092/1508>.
- Scott, M. (2014). *WordSmith Tools version 6*, Liverpool: Lexical Analysis Software.
- Sheehan, J.G. (1970). *Stuttering; research and therapy*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Sheehan, J., Hadley, R., & Gould, E. (1967). Impact of authority on stuttering. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 72*(3), 290-293.
- Smith, A. (1990). Toward a comprehensive theory of stuttering: A commentary. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders, 55*, 398-401.
- Spencer, E., Packman, A., Onslow, M., & Ferguson, A. (2005). A preliminary investigation of the impact of stuttering on language use. *Clinical Linguistics and Phonetics, 19*(3), 191-201.
- Spencer, E., Packman, A., Onslow, M., & Ferguson, A. (2009). The effect of stuttering on communication: A preliminary investigation. *Clinical Linguistics and Phonetics, 23*(7), 473-488.

- St. Louis, K.O., Przepiorka, A.M., Beste-Guldborg, A., Williams, M.J., Blachnio, A., Guendouzi, J., Reicherl, I.K., & Ware, M.B. (2014). Stuttering attitudes of students: Professional, intracultural, and international comparisons. *Journal of Fluency Disorders*, 39, 34-50.
- Stager, S.V., Jeffries, K.J., & Braun, A.R. (2004). Common features of fluency-evoking conditions studied in stuttering subjects and controls: an H215O PET study. *Journal of Fluency Disorders*, 28(4), 319-336.
- Stainback, S. B. & Stainback, W. C. (1988). *Understanding & conducting qualitative research/ Susan Stainback, William Stainback* Council for Exceptional Children ; Kendall/Hunt Pub. Co., Reston, VA: Dubuque, Iowa.
- Stake, R. E. (1994). 'Case Studies', in N. K. Denzin and Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.) *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, pp. 236–47. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Starkweather, C.W. (1987). *Fluency and stuttering*. Englewood-Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Starkweather, C.W., & Gottwald, S.R. (1990). The demands and capacities model II: Clinical applications. *Journal of Fluency Disorders*, 15, 142-157.
- Starkweather, C.W. (2002). The epigenesis of stuttering. *Journal of Fluency Disorders*, 27(4), 269-288.
- Stern, E. (1948). A preliminary study of bilingualism and stuttering in four Johannesburg schools. *Journal of Logopaedics*, 1, 15-25.
- Stewart, J.L. (1960). The problem of stuttering in certain North American Indian societies. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders*.
- Stuttering Foundation of America. (2013). Stuttering facts and information, *How many people stutter?* Retrieved on 5/ 27/13 from: <http://www.stutteringhelp.org/faq>.

- Taboada, M., & Carretero, M. (2012). Contrastive analyses of evaluation in text: Key issues in the design of an annotation system for Attitude applicable to consumer reviews in English and Spanish. *Linguistics and the Human Sciences*, 6(1-3), 275-295.
- Taboada, M., Carretero, M., & Hinnell, J. (2014). Loving and hating the movies in English, German, and Spanish. *Languages in Contrast*, 14(1), 127-161.
- Tellis, G.M., Bressler, L., & Emerick, K. (2008). An exploration of clinicians views about assessment and treatment of stuttering. *SIG 4 Perspectives on Fluency and Fluency Disorders*, 18, 16-23. (doi:10.1044/ffd18.1.16).
- Tellis, G. M. & Tellis, C. (2003). Multicultural issues in school settings. *Seminars in Speech and Language*, 24(1), 21-26.
- Tetnowski, J.A. (2010). *The UL-Lafayette Stuttering Profile*.
- Tetnowski, J.A., Richels, C., Shenker, R., Sisskin, V., & Wolk, L. (2012). When the diagnosis is dual. *The ASHA Leader*, February 14, 2012 Features.
- Tetnowski, J.A. & Damico, J.S. (2001). A demonstration of the advantages of qualitative methodologies in stuttering research. *Journal of Fluency Disorders*, 26(1), 17-42.
- Tetnowski, J.A., & Scaler Scott, K. (2009). Fluency and fluency disorders. In M.J. Ball, J.S. Damico, & N.M. Muller (Eds.). *The Handbook of Language and Speech Disorders*, (pp.431-454). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Togher, L. (2001). Discourse sampling in the 21st century. *Journal of Communication Disorders*, 34(1-2), 131-150.
- Travis, L. E., Johnson, W., & Shover, J. (1937). The relation of bilingualism to stuttering. *Journal of Speech Disorders*, 2, 185-189.

- Tsai, P., Lim, V.P.C., Brundage, S.B., & Bernstein Ratner, N. (2011). Linguistic analysis of stuttering in bilinguals: Methodological challenges and solutions. In P. Howell & J. Van Borsel (Eds.), *Multilingual aspects of fluency disorders*, (pp. 308-331). USA: Multilingual Matters.
- Turner, D.W. (2010). Qualitative interview design: A practical guide for novice investigators. *The Qualitative Report*, 15(3), 754-760.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2010). Place of birth by language spoken at home and ability to speak English in the United States. Retrieved on 5/ 28/13 from:
http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/productview.xhtml?pid=ACS10_1YR_B06007&prodType=table
- Van Borsel, J. (2011). Review of the research on the relationship between bilingualism and stuttering. In P. Howell & J. Van Borsel (Eds.), *Multilingual aspects of Fluency Disorders*, (pp. 247-270). USA: Multilingual Matters.
- Van Borsel, J. & Tetnowski, J.A. (2007). Stuttering in genetic syndromes. *Journal of Fluency Disorders*, 32(4), 279-296.
- Van Borsel, J. and Pereira, M.M. (2005). Assessment of stuttering in a familiar versus an unfamiliar language. *Journal of Fluency Disorders*, 30(2), 109-124.
- Van Borsel, J. & Tetnowski, J.A. (2007). Fluency disorders in genetic syndromes. *Journal of Fluency Disorders*, 32(4), 279-296.
- Van Borsel, J., Meirlaen, A., Achten, R., Vingerhoets, G., & Santens, P. (2009). Acquired stuttering with differential manifestation in different languages: A case study. *Journal of Neurolinguistics*, 22(2), 187-195.

- Van Borsel, J., Maes, E., & Foulon, S. (2001). Stuttering and bilingualism: A review. *Journal of Fluency Disorders*, 26(2001), 179-205.
- Van Riper, C. (1937). The effects of penalty upon frequency of stuttering spasms. *The Pedagogical Seminary and Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 50(1), 193-195.
- Van Riper, C. (1971). *The Nature of Stuttering*, Prentice-Hall: Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- Wan, C.Y., Ruber, T., Hohmann, A., & Schlaug, G. (2010). The therapeutic effects of singing in neurological disorders. *Music Perception*, 27(4), 287-295.
(doi: 10.1525/mp.2010.27.4.287).
- Wei, L. (2000). Dimensions of bilingualism. In L. Wei (Ed.), *The bilingualism reader*, pp. 2-21. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Westby, C.E. (1990). Ethnographic Interviewing: Asking the right questions to the right people in the right ways. *Communication Disorders Quarterly*, 13(1), 101-111.
- Wilkinson, S. (1998). Focus groups in health research: Exploring the meanings of health and illness. *Journal of Health Psychology*, 3, 329-348.
- Wingate, M.E. (1970). Effect on stuttering of changes in audition. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research*, 13, 861-873.
- Wingate, M.E. (2002). *Foundations of stuttering*. San Diego: CA: Academic Press.
- Yairi, E. (2007). Subtyping stuttering I: A review. *Journal of Fluency Disorders*, 32(3), 165-196.
- Yairi, E. & Ambrose, N.G. (2005). *Early childhood stuttering: For clinicians by clinicians*. Austin, TX: Pro-Ed.

- Yaruss, J.S. & Quesal, R. (2006). Overall assessment of the speaker's experience of stuttering (OASES): Documenting multiple outcomes in stuttering treatment. *Journal of Fluency Disorders, 31*, 90-115.
- Yaruss, J.S. & Quesal, R. (2010). *Overall Assessment of the Speaker's Experience of Stuttering*. NCS Pearson, Inc.
- Yin, R.K. (2014). *Case study research: Design and methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Young, M.A. (1980). Comparison of stuttering frequencies during reading and speaking. *Journal of Speech & Hearing Research, 23*(1), 216-217.
- Zimmerman, G., Liljebald, S., Frank, A., & Cleeland, C. (1983). The Indians have many terms for it: Stuttering among the Bannock-Shoshoni. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research, 26*, 315-318. (doi:10.1044/jshr.2602.315).

Appendix

Appendices A-H are located on the supplemental disc included with this dissertation

Granese, Angela M. Bachelor of Arts, University of South Florida, Fall 2006; Master of Arts, Florida International University, Summer 2010; Doctor of Philosophy, University of Louisiana at Lafayette, Summer 2014

Major: Applied Language and Speech Sciences

Title of Dissertation: The Linguistic Construction of the Bilingual Stuttering Experience

Dissertation Directors: Dr. Nicole Müller and Dr. John Tetnowski

Pages in Dissertation: 366; Words in Abstract: 208

ABSTRACT

Stuttering is a disorder that can be defined in terms of speech characteristics, physical concomitants, emotions, perceptions, and quality of life (Bloodstein & Bernstein Ratner, 2008; Tetnowski & Scaler Scott, 2009; Bennett, 2006). The current literature focuses on describing bilingual stuttering in terms of bilingualism being a cause; linguistic characteristics; and manifestations of stuttering across languages. While standardized measures and definitions of these factors will allow for generalization across studies (Roberts, 2011), they will not provide a holistic picture of the bilingual stuttering experience. This study uses analytic tools grounded in the theory of Systemic Functional Linguistics (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004) to investigate how four bilingual PWS construct their stuttering experiences. Specifically, this study examines the linguistic choices participants made while engaged in conversations about their stuttering. Considering the highly individualistic and multidimensional nature of the phenomenon being examined a case study approach was adopted to account for the diversity of characteristics and individualized experiences described by each of the four participants in this study. It is through the analysis of their talk that this study provides insight on the affective and cognitive aspects of the bilingual stuttering experience, which have clinical implications for the development of appropriate, meaningful and effective fluency intervention for the “whole” bilingual who stutters.

Biographical Sketch

Angela Marie Granese was born on October 15, 1983 in Miami, Florida. She earned a Bachelor of Arts in Mass Communication from University of South Florida in 2006 and a Master of Arts in Linguistics from Florida International University in 2010. She began her doctoral studies in Applied Language and Speech Sciences at University of Louisiana at Lafayette in 2010. She was the 2012-2013 recipient of the Sertoma-Allen Comeaux Memorial Scholarship and received an Academic Achievement Award at the UL Lafayette 2012 Honors Convocation for maintaining a 4.0 GPA. While pursuing her Ph.D., Angela also worked towards earning her CCC-SLP.