

Appendix A: Transcription Conventions for the L2CD (Adapted from Jefferson 2004; Simpson et al. 2002)

T	Teacher
S1, S2, etc.,	Identified student
SU	Unidentified student
Ss	Several or all students at once
-	Interruption; abruptly cutoff sound
,	Brief mid-utterance pause of less than one second
.	Final falling intonation contour with 1-2 second pause
?	Rising intonation, not necessarily a question
(P: 02)	Measured silence of greater than 2 seconds
x	Unintelligible or incomprehensible speech; each token refers to one word
<LAUGH>	Laughter
()	Uncertain transcription
{ }	Verbal description of events in the classroom
(())	Nonverbal actions
<i>Italics</i>	Non-English words/phrases
//	Phonetic transcription; pronunciation affects comprehension
ICE	Capitals indicate names, acronyms, and letters

Appendix B: Hedges and Boosters Investigated (Adapted from Hyland 2005, pp. 221–223)

Hedges

Content-oriented: Accuracy-oriented

about, almost, apparent, apparently, approximately, around, bit, broadly, certain amount, certain extent, certain level, could, couldn't, could not, doubt, doubtful, essentially, estimate, estimated, fairly, frequently, generally, guess, in general, in most cases, in most instances, just, kind of/ kinda, largely, likely, little, mainly, may, maybe, might, mostly, often, on the whole, perhaps, plausible, plausibly, possible, possibly, presumable, presumably, pretty probable, probably, quite, rather X, relatively, roughly, slightly, sometimes, somewhat, sort of/sorta, tend to, tended to, typical, typically uncertain, uncertainty, unclear, unclearly, unlikely, usually

Content-oriented: Speaker-oriented

argue, argued, appear, appeared, assume, assumed, claim, claimed, indicate, indicated, postulate, postulated, seem, seemed, suggest, suggested, suppose, supposed, suspect, suspected

Audience-oriented

believe, believed, feel, felt, from my perspective, from our perspective, from this perspective, in my opinion, in our opinion, in my view, in our view, in this view, ought, should, think, thought, to my knowledge, would, wouldn't, would not

Boosters

Emphatics

actually, beyond doubt, certain, clear, definite, demonstrate, demonstrated, doubtless, establish, established, evident, find, found, in fact, incontestable, incontrovertible, indeed, indisputable, know, known, must (possibility), no doubt, obvious, of course, prove, proved, realize, realized, really, show, showed, shown, sure, truly, true, undeniable, without doubt, without a doubt

Amplifiers

a lot/lots, absolutely, always, certainly, clearly, completely, conclusively, decidedly, definitely, evidently, incontestably, incontrovertibly, indisputably, never, obviously, so, surely, too, totally, undeniably, undisputedly, undoubtedly, very

References

- Aijmer, K. (2011). Well I'm not sure I think...the use of well by non-native speakers. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 16(2), 231–254.
- Allen, P., Fröhlich, M., & Spada, N. (1984). The communicative orientation of language teaching: An observation scheme. In J. Handscombe, R. A. Orem, & B. P. Taylor (Eds.), *On TESOL '83: The question of control* (pp. 231–252). Washington, DC: TESOL.
- Allwright, R. L. (1984). The importance of interaction in classroom language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 5, 156.
- Anthony, L. (2014). *AntConc (Version 3.4.3)* [Computer software]. Tokyo: Waseda University. Accessed 9 July. <http://www.laurenceanthony.net/>
- Baker, P. (2010). *Sociolinguistics and corpus linguistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Bamford, J. (2004). Gestural and symbolic uses of the deictic *here* in academic lectures. In K. Aijmer & A. Stenström (Eds.), *Discourse patterns in spoken and written corpora* (pp. 113–138). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Barbieri, F. (2008). Patterns of age-based linguistic variation in American English. *Journal of SocioLinguistics*, 21(1), 58–88.
- Barlow, M. (2012). *MonoConc Pro 2.2 (MP2.2)* [Software]. Available from <http://www.monoconc.com/>
- Basturkmen, H. (2009). *Developing courses for English for specific purposes*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Benson, P., & Lor, W. (1999). Conceptions of language and language learning. *System*, 27, 459–472.
- Biber, D. (1988). *Variation across speech and writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Biber, D. (1993). Representativeness in corpus design. *Literary and Linguistic Computing*, 8(4), 243–257.
- Biber, D. (2006a). Stance in spoken and written university registers. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 5(2), 97–116. doi:10.1016/j.jeap.2006.05.001.
- Biber, D. (2006b). *University language: A corpus-based study of spoken and written registers*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Biber, D. (2009). A corpus-driven approach to formulaic language in English: Multi-word patterns in speech and writing. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 14(3), 275–311. doi:10.1075/ijcl.14.3.08bib.
- Biber, D., Conrad, S., & Reppen, R. (1998). *Corpus linguistics: Investigating language structure and use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S., & Finegan, E. (1999). *Longman grammar of spoken and written English*. London: Longman.
- Biber, D., Conrad, S., & Cortes, V. (2004a). *If you look at...: Lexical bundles in university teaching and textbooks*. *Applied Linguistics*, 25, 371–405.
- Biber, D., Conrad, S., Reppen, R., Byrd, P., Helt, M., Clark, V., Cortes, V., Csomay, E., & Urzua, A. (2004b). *Representing language use in the university: Analysis of the TOEFL 2000 spoken and written academic language corpus* (ETS TOEFL monograph series, MS-25). Princeton: Educational Testing Service.
- Biber, D., Reppen, R., & Friginal, E. (2010). Research in corpus linguistics. In R. B. Kaplan (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of applied linguistics* (2nd ed., pp. 548–570). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bown, J., & White, C. (2010). Affect in a self-regulatory framework for language learning. *System*, 38, 432–443.
- Brand, C., & Götz, S. (2011). Fluency versus accuracy in advanced spoken learner language: A multi-method approach. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 16(2), 255–275.
- British Academic Spoken English and BASE Plus Collections. (2017). *The British Academic Spoken English*. Available from <http://www2.warwick.ac.uk/fac/soc/al/research/collections/base/>
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Burns, R., & Burns, R. (2008). *Business research methods and statistics using SPSS*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Byusse, L. (2012). So as a multifunctional discourse marker in native and learner speech. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 44(13), 1764–1782.

- Cairns, B. (1991). Spatial deixis: The use of spatial co-ordinates in spoken language. *Lund University, Department of Linguistics, Working Papers*, 38, 19–28.
- Canagarajah, S. (2017, March 22). *'The smartest person in the room is the room': Emplacement as language competence*. Paper presented at the AAAL 2017 Conference, Portland.
- Carson, J. G., & Nelson, G. L. (1996). Chinese students' perceptions of ESL peer response group interaction. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 5(1), 1–19.
- Casanave, C. P. (2006). *Controversies in second language writing: Dilemmas and decisions in research and instruction*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Cheng, S. W. (2012). "That's it for today": Academic lecture closings and the impact of class size. *English for Specific Purposes*, 31, 234–248.
- Cheng, W., Greaves, C., & Warren, M. (2006). From n-gram to skipgram to concgram. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 11(4), 411–433.
- Cheng, W., Greaves, C., & Warren, M. (2008). *A corpus-driven study of discourse intonation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Connor, U., & Asenavage, K. (1994). Peer response groups in ESL writing classes: How much impact on revision? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 3(3), 257–276.
- Conrad, S. (2002). Corpus linguistic approaches for discourse analysis. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 22, 75–95.
- Cortes, V. (2004). Lexical bundles in published and student disciplinary writing: Examples from history and biology. *English for Specific Purposes*, 23, 397–423.
- Coxhead, A. (2000). A new academic word list. *TESOL Quarterly*, 34, 213–238.
- Coxhead, A. (2011). The academic word list 10 years on: Research and teaching implications. *TESOL Quarterly*, 45(2), 355–361.
- Crashborn, O. (2008). Open access to sign language corpora. In O. Crashborn, T. Hanke, E. Efthimiou, I. Zwitterlood, & E. Thoutenhoofd (Eds.). *Construction and exploitation of sign language corpora* (Third workshop on the representation and processing of sign language, pp. 33–38). Paris: European Language Resources Association (ELRA).
- Crawford Camiciottoli, B. (2005). Adjusting a business lecture for an international audience: A case study. *English for Specific Purposes*, 24, 183–199.
- Csomay, E. (2007). A corpus-based look at linguistic variation in classroom interaction: Teacher talk versus student talk in American university classes. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 6, 336–355.
- Cullen, R. (2002). Supportive teacher talk: The importance of the F-move. *ELT Journal*, 56, 117–127.

- De Cock, S. (2004). Preferred sequences of words in NS and NNS speech. *Belgian Journal of English Language and Literatures*, 2, 225–246.
- De Guerrero, M., & Villamil, O. S. (2000). Activating the ZPD: Mutual scaffolding in L2 peer revision. *The Modern Language Journal*, 84(1), 51–68.
- De Haan, P. (1989). *Postmodifying clauses in the English noun phrase: A corpus-based study*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Donato, R. (1994). Collective scaffolding in second language research. In J. P. Lantolf & G. Appel (Eds.), *Vygotskian approaches to second language research* (pp. 33–56). Norwood: Ablex Publication Corporation.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Ushioda, E. (2011). *Teaching and researching motivation*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.
- Duriau, V., Reger, R., & Pfarrer, M. (2007). A content analysis of the content analysis literature in organization studies: Research themes, data sources, and methodological refinements. *Organizational Research Methods*, 10(5), 5–34.
- Ellis, R., & Barkhuizen, G. (2005). *Analysing learner language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Entwistle, N., & McCune, V. (2004). The conceptual bases of study strategy inventories. *Educational Psychology Review*, 16(4), 325–345.
- Fanselow, J. (1977). Beyond Rashomon – Conceptualizing and describing the teaching act. *TESOL Quarterly*, 11, 17–39.
- Ferris, D. R. (2003). *Response to student writing: Implications for second language students*. New York: Routledge.
- Firth, J. (1957). *Papers in linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Flower, L. (1990). Introduction: Studying cognition in context. In L. Flower, V. Stein, J. Ackerman, M. J. Kantz, K. McCormick, & W. C. Peck (Eds.), *Reading-to-write: Exploring a cognitive and social process* (pp. 3–32). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Fortanet, I. (2004). The use of ‘we’ in university lectures: Reference and function. *English for Specific Purposes*, 23, 45–66.
- Francis, D., Rivera, M., Lesaux, N., Kieffer, M., & Rivera, H. (2006). *Practical guidelines for the education of English language learners: Research-based recommendations for instruction and academic interventions*. Portsmouth: RMC Research Corporation, Center on Instruction.
- Friginal, E. (2009). *The language of outsourced call centers: A corpus-based study of cross-cultural interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Friginal, E. (2013). 25 years of Biber’s multi-dimensional analysis: Introduction to the special issue. *Corpora*, 8(2), 137–152.
- Friginal, E. (2015). Concordancers. In J. Bennet (Ed.), *The Sage encyclopedia of intercultural communication* (pp. 109–111). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

- Friginal, E., & Hardy, J. A. (2014). *Corpus-based sociolinguistics: A guide for students*. New York: Routledge.
- Friginal, E., & Polat, B. (2015). Linguistic dimensions of learner speech in English interviews. *Corpus Linguistics Research*, 1, 53–82.
- Friginal, E., Li, M., & Weigle, S. (2014). Revisiting multiple profiles of learner compositions: A comparison of highly rated NS and NNS essays. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 23, 1–14.
- Friginal, E., Pickering, L., & Bruce, C. (2016). Narrative and informational dimensions of AAC discourse in the workplace. In L. Pickering, E. Friginal, & S. Staples (Eds.), *Talking at work: Corpus-based explorations of workplace discourse* (pp. 27–54). London: Palgrave-Macmillan.
- Gabrys-Barker, D., & Belska, J. (Eds.). (2013). *The affective dimension in second language acquisition*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Gan, Z. (2010). Interaction in group oral assessment: A case study of higher- and lower-scoring students. *Language Testing*, 27(4), 585–602.
- Gass, S. (1997). *Input, interaction, and the second language learner*. Mahwah: Erlbaum.
- Gass, S. M., & Mackey, A. (2000). *Stimulated recall methodology in second language research*. New York: Routledge.
- Gass, S., Mackey, A., & Ross-Feldman, L. (2005). Task-based interactions in classroom and laboratory settings. *Language Learning*, 55, 575–611.
- Gilquin, G. (2008). Hesitation markers among EFL learners: Pragmatic deficiency or difference? In J. Romero-Trillo (Ed.), *Pragmatics and corpus linguistics: A mutualistic entente* (pp. 119–149). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Gilquin, G., De Cock, S., & Granger, S. (Eds.). (2010). *The Louvain international database of spoken English interlanguage, handbook and CD-ROM*. Louvain-la-Neuve: Presses Universitaires de Louvain.
- Goo, J. (2012). Corrective feedback and working memory capacity in interaction-driven L2 learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 34, 445–474.
- Granger, S. (1983). *The BE + past participle construction in spoken English (with special emphasis on the passive)*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Granger, S., Gilquin, G., & Meunier, F. (2015). *The Cambridge handbook of learner corpus research*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Grant, L., & Ginther, A. (2000). Using computer-tagged linguistic features to describe L2 writing differences. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 9(2), 123–145.
- Greenbaum, S. (Ed.). (1996). *Comparing English worldwide: The international corpus of English*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

- Grieve, J., Biber, D., Friginal, E., & Nekrasova, T. (2010). Variation among blogs: A multi-dimensional analysis. In A. Mehler, S. Sharoff, & M. Santini (Eds.), *Genres on the web: Corpus studies and computational models* (pp. 45–71). New York: Springer.
- Gu, T. (2014). A corpus-based study on the performance of the suggestion speech act by Chinese EFL learners. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 4(1), 103.
- Hammadou, J., & Bernhardt, E. (1987). On being and becoming a foreign language teacher. *Theory into Practice*, 26, 301–306.
- Handford, M. (2010). *The language of business meetings*. Tokyo: Cambridge University Press.
- Hardy, J., & Friginal, E. (2012). Filipino and American online communication and linguistic variation. *World Englishes*, 31(2), 143–161.
- Hinkel, E. (2002). *Second language writers' text: Linguistic and rhetorical features*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Holmes, J. (2006). Sharing a laugh: Pragmatic aspects of humor and gender in the workplace. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 38, 26–50.
- Hong, H., & Cao, F. (2014). Interactional metadiscourse in young EFL learner writing: A corpus-based study. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 19, 201–224.
- Horwitz, E. (2010). Foreign and second language anxiety. *Language Teaching*, 43, 154–167.
- Hyland, K. (1996). Writing without conviction? Hedging in science research articles. *Applied Linguistics*, 17, 433–454.
- Hyland, K. (2004). Disciplinary interactions: Metadiscourse in L2 postgraduate writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13, 133–151.
- Hyland, K. (2005). *Metadiscourse: Exploring interaction in writing*. London: Continuum.
- Hyland, F. (2008). Scaffolding during the writing process: The role of informal peer interaction in writing workshops. In D. D. Belcher & A. Hirvela (Eds.), *The oral-literate connection: Perspectives on L2 speaking, writing, and other media interactions* (pp. 168–190). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Hyland, K. (2009). *Academic discourse*. London: Continuum.
- Hyland, K., & Milton, J. (1997). Qualification and certainty in L1 and L2 students' writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 6, 183–205.
- Jacobs, G. M., Curtis, A., Braine, G., & Huang, S. Y. (1998). Feedback on student writing: Taking the middle path. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 7(3), 307–317.

- Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In G. H. Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation* (pp. 13–31). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Johansson, S., & Hoffland, K. (1989). *Frequency analysis of English vocabulary and grammar* (Vols. 1–2). Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Johnston, T., & Schembri, A. (2006). Issues on the creation of a digital archive of a signed language. In L. Barwick & N. Thieburger (Eds.), *Sustainable data from digital fieldwork* (pp. 7–16). Sydney: University of Sydney Press.
- Kamio, A. (2001). English generic *we*, *you*, and *they*: An analysis in terms of territory of information. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 33, 1111–1124.
- Kaneko, T. (2007). Why so many article errors? Use of articles by Japanese learners of English. *Gakuen*, 798, 1–16.
- Kaneko, T. (2008). Use of English prepositions by Japanese university students. *Gakuen*, 810, 1–12.
- Kecskés, I. (2007). Formulaic language in English Lingua Franca. In I. Kecskés & L. R. Horn (Eds.), *Explorations in pragmatics: Linguistic, cognitive and intercultural aspects* (Vol. 1), (pp. 191–218). Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Kennedy, G. (2003). Amplifier collocations in British National Corpus: Implications for English language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 37, 467–487.
- Kim, Y. (2008). The contribution of collaborative and individual tasks to the acquisition of L2 vocabulary. *The Modern Language Journal*, 92(1), 114–130.
- Kim, Y., & McDonough, K. (2008). The effect of interlocutor proficiency on the collaborative dialogue between Korean as a second language learners. *Language Teaching Research*, 12(2), 211–234.
- Kim, Y., & McDonough, K. (2011). Using pretask modelling to encourage collaborative learning opportunities. *Language Teaching Research*, 15(2), 183–199.
- Knight, D., Evans, D., Carter, R., & Adolphs, S. (2009). HeadTalk, HandTalk and the corpus: Towards a framework for multi-modal, multi-media corpus development. *Corpora*, 4(1), 1–32.
- Koester, A. (2010). *Workplace discourse*. London: Continuum.
- Kučera, H., & Francis, W. N. F. (1967). *Computational analysis of present-day American English*. Providence: Brown University Press.
- Lancia, F. (Ed.). (2004). *Strumenti per l'analisi dei testi* [Tools for textual analysis]. Rome: Franco Angeli.
- Lancia, F. (2016). *T-Lab online user manual*. http://tlab.it/en/allegati/help_en_online/fare.htm

- Larsen-Freeman, D., & Long, M. (2014). *An introduction to second language acquisition research*. New York: Routledge.
- Lee, Y.-A. (2007). Third turn position in teacher talk: Contingency and the work of teaching. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 39, 180–206.
- Lee, J. J. (2009). Size matters: An exploratory comparison of small- and large-class university lecture introductions. *English for Specific Purposes*, 29, 42–57.
- Lee, J. J. (2010). The uniqueness of EFL teachers: Perceptions of Japanese learners. *TESOL Journal*, 1, 23–48.
- Lee, J. J. (2011). *A genre analysis of second language classroom discourse: Exploring the rhetorical, linguistic, and contextual dimensions of language lessons*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Georgia State University, Atlanta.
- Lee, J. J. (2016). “There’s intentionality behind it...”: A genre analysis of EAP classroom lessons. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 23, 99–112.
- Lee, J. J., & Casal, J. E. (2014). Metadiscourse in results and discussion chapters: A cross-linguistic analysis of English and Spanish thesis writers in engineering. *System*, 46, 39–54.
- Lee, J. J., & Deakin, L. (2016). Interactions in L1 and L2 undergraduate student writing: Interactional metadiscourse in successful and less-successful argumentative essays. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 33, 21–34.
- Lee, J. J., & Subtirelu, N. (2015). Metadiscourse in the classroom: A comparative analysis of EAP lessons and university lectures. *English for Specific Purposes*, 37, 52–63.
- Leeser, M. J. (2004). Learner proficiency and focus on form during collaborative dialogue. *Language Teaching Research*, 8(1), 55–81.
- Leki, I. (1990). Potential problems with peer responding in ESL writing classes. *CATESOL Journal*, 3, 5–17.
- Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Li, T., & Wharton, S. (2012). Metadiscourse repertoire of L1 Mandarin undergraduates writing in English: A cross-contextual, cross-disciplinary study. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 11, 345–356.
- Lin, C. Y. (2012). Modifiers in BASE and MICASE: A matter of academic cultures or lecturing styles? *English for Specific Purposes*, 31, 117–126.
- Lindemann, S., & Mauranen, A. (2001). “It’s just real messy”: The occurrence and function of *just* in a corpus of academic speech. *English for Specific Purposes*, 20, 459–475.
- Liu, J. (2002). *Peer response in second language writing classrooms* (Michigan series on Teaching Multilingual Writers). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

- Liu, J. & Sadler (2003). *Peer response in second language writing classrooms* (Michigan series on Teaching Multilingual Writers). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Lockhart, C., & Ng, P. (1995). Analyzing talk in ESL peer response groups: Stances, functions, and content. *Language Learning*, 45(4), 605–651.
- Long, M. H. (1983). Native speaker/non-native speaker conversation and the negotiation of meaning. *Applied Linguistics*, 4, 126–141.
- Long, M. H. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. C. Ritchie & T. K. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of language acquisition (Vol. 2): Second language acquisition* (pp. 413–468). New York: Academic Press.
- Lundstrom, K., & Baker, W. (2009). To give is better than to receive: The benefits of peer review to the reviewer's own writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 18(1), 30–43.
- MacArthur, F., Alejo, R., Piquer-Piriz, A., Amador-Moreno, C., Littlemore, J., Ädel, A., Krennmayr, T., & Vaughn, E. (2014). *EuroCoAT. The European corpus of academic talk*. <http://www.eurocoat.es>
- Mackey, A. (1999). Input, interaction, and second language development. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 21, 557–587.
- Mangelsdorf, K., & Schlumberger, A. (1992). ESL student response stances in a peer-review task. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 1(3), 235–254.
- Marra, M. (2012). English in the workplace. In B. Paltridge & S. Starfield (Eds.), *The handbook of English for specific purposes* (pp. 67–99). Chichester: Wiley.
- Marton, F., & Booth, S. (1997). *Learning and awareness*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum and Associates.
- Mauranen, A. (2001). Reflexive academic talk: Observations from MICASE. In J. M. Swales & R. C. Simpson (Eds.), *Corpus linguistics in North America: Selections from the 1999 symposium* (pp. 165–178). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Mauranen, A. (2003). The corpus of English as lingua franca in academic settings. *TESOL Quarterly*, 37(3), 513–527.
- McCarthy, M., & Handford, M. (2004). Invisible to us: A preliminary corpus-based study of spoken business English. In U. Connor & T. A. Upton (Eds.), *Discourse in the professions: Perspectives from corpus linguistics* (pp. 167–201). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- McEnery, T., & Hardie, A. (2012). *Corpus linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McEnery, T., Xiao, R., & Tono, Y. (2006). *Corpus-based language studies: An advanced resource book*. New York: Routledge.

- Mendonca, C. O., & Johnson, K. E. (1994). Peer review negotiations: Revision activities in ESL writing instruction. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28, 745–769.
- Min, H. T. (2005). Training students to become successful peer reviewers. *System*, 33(2), 293–308.
- Min, H. T. (2008). Reviewer stances and writer perceptions in EFL peer review training. *English for Specific Purposes*, 27(3), 285–305.
- Morell, T. (2004). Interactive lecture discourse for university EFL students. *English for Specific Purposes*, 23, 325–338.
- Moskowitz, G. (1971). Interaction analysis – A new modern language for supervisors. *Foreign Language Annals*, 5, 211–221.
- Mukherjee, J. (2009). The grammar of conversation in advanced spoken learner English: Learner corpus data and language-pedagogical implications. In K. Aijmer (Ed.), *Corpora and language teaching* (pp. 203–230). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Mur-Dueñas, P. (2011). An intercultural analysis of metadiscourse features in research articles written in Spanish and English. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43, 3068–3079.
- Nation, P. (2001). *Learning vocabulary in another language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nelson, G. (1993). Reading and writing: Integrating cognitive and social dimensions. In J. Carson & I. Leki (Eds.), *Reading in the composition classroom: Second language perspectives* (pp. 315–330). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Nelson, G. (1996). The design of the corpus. In S. Greenbaum (Ed.), *Comparing English worldwide: The international corpus of English* (pp. 27–35). Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Nelson, G. L., & Murphy, J. M. (1992). Peer response groups: Do L2 writers use peer comments in revising their drafts? *TESOL Quarterly*, 27(1), 135–141.
- Nelson, G. L., & Murphy, J. M. (1993). An L2 writing group: Task and social dimensions. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 1(3), 171–193.
- O’Boyle, A. (2010). *The dialogic construction of knowledge in university classroom talk: A corpus study of spoken academic discourse*. PhD thesis, Queen’s University Belfast.
- O’Boyle, A. (2014). “You” and “I” in university seminars and spoken learner discourse. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 16, 40–56.
- O’Keeffe, A., Clancy, B., & Adolphs, A. (2011). *Introducing pragmatics in use*. London: Routledge.
- Ohta, A. S. (2000). *Second language acquisition processes in the classroom setting: Learning Japanese*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Ortega, L. (2012). Epilogue: Exploring L2 writing–SLA interfaces. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 21(4), 404–441.

- Patton, M. Q. (2005). *Qualitative research*. New York: Wiley.
- Paulus, T. M. (1999). The effect of peer and teacher feedback on student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8(3), 265–289.
- Pennebaker, J., Booth, R., & Francis, M. (2007a). *Linguistic inquiry and word count: LIWC* [Computer software]. Austin: LIWC.net.
- Pennebaker, J., Chung, C., Ireland, M., Gonzales, A., & Booth, R. (2007b). *The development and psychometric properties of LIWC2007 [LIWC manual]*. Austin: LIWC.net.
- Pica, T., Holliday, L., Lewis, N., & Morgenthaler, L. (1989). Comprehensible output as an outcome of linguistic demands on the learner. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 11, 63–90.
- Pickering, L., & Bruce, C. (2009). *AAC and non-AAC workplace corpus (ANAWC)*. Atlanta: Georgia State University.
- Plonsky, L., & Gass, S. (2011). Quantitative research methods, study quality, and outcomes: The case of interaction research. *Language Learning*, 61, 325–366.
- Polat, B. (2012). Experiencing language: Phenomenography and second language acquisition. *Language Awareness*, 22(2), 111–125.
- Polat, B. (2013a). *The L2 experience interview corpus*. Atlanta: Georgia State University.
- Polat, B. (2013b). L2 experience interviews: What can they tell us about individual differences? *System*, 41, 70–83.
- Poos, D., & Simpson, R. (2002). Cross-disciplinary comparisons of hedging: Some findings from the Michigan corpus of academic spoken English. In R. Reppen, S. Fitzmaurice, & D. Biber (Eds.), *Using corpora to explore linguistic variation* (pp. 3–23). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Rabiee, M. (2010). Facilitating learning together in Iranian context: Three collaborative oral feedback models in EFL writing classes. *Sino-US English Teaching*, 7(3), 9–22.
- Rayson, P. (2003). *WMatrix: A statistical method and software tool for linguistic analysis through corpus comparison*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Lancaster University, Lancaster.
- Rayson, P. (2008). From key words to key semantic domains. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 13(4), 519–549. doi:10.1075/ijcl.13.4.06ray.
- Rayson, P. (n.d). Log-likelihood calculator [Computer Software]. UK: Lancaster University. <http://ucrel.lancs.ac.uk/llwizard.html>. Accessed 9 July.
- Riazi, A. (2016). Innovative mixed-methods research: Moving beyond design technicalities to epistemological and methodological realizations. *Applied Linguistics*, 37(1), 33–49.
- Roberson, A. (2015). *The second language peer response (L2PR) corpus*. Atlanta: Georgia State University.

- Rollinson, P. (2004). Experiences and perceptions in an ESL academic writing peer response group. *Estudios Ingleses de la Universidad Complutense*, 12, 79–108.
- Römer, U. (2010). Establishing the phraseological profile of a text type: The construction of meaning in academic book reviews. *English Text Construction*, 3(1), 95–119. doi:10.1075/etc.3.1.06rom.
- Römer, U., & Wulff, S. (2010). Applying corpus methods to written academic texts: Explorations of MICUSP. *Journal of Writing Research*, 2(2), 99–127.
- Rounds, P. L. (1987a). Characterizing successful classroom discourse for NNS teaching assistant training. *TESOL Quarterly*, 21, 643–671.
- Rounds, P. L. (1987b). Multifunctional personal pronoun use in education setting. *English for Specific Purposes*, 6, 13–29.
- Saito, K., & Akiyama, Y. (2017). Video-based interaction, negotiation for comprehensibility, and second language speech learning: A longitudinal study. *Language Learning*, 67(1), 43–74.
- Scott, M. (1997). PC analysis of key words – And key key words. *System*, 25(2), 233–245.
- Scott, M. (2012). *WordSmith Tools (Version 6)* [Software]. Available from <http://lexically.net/wordsmith/>
- Seedhouse, P. (2004). *The interactional architecture of the language classroom: A conversation analysis perspective*. Malden: Blackwell.
- Seidlhofer, B. (2007). Common property: English as a lingua franca in Europe. In J. Cummins & C. Davison (Eds.), *International handbook of English language teaching* (pp. 137–153). New York: Springer.
- Seidlhofer, B. (2012). Anglophone-centric attitudes and the globalization of English. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 1(2), 393–407. doi:10.1515/jelf-2012-0026.
- Sheen, Y. (2007). The effects of corrective feedback, language aptitude and learner attitudes on the acquisition of English articles. In A. Mackey (Ed.), *Conversational interaction in second language acquisition: A collection of empirical studies* (pp. 301–322). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Shirato, J., & Stapleton, P. (2007). Comparing English vocabulary in a spoken learner corpus with a native speaker corpus: Pedagogical implications arising from an empirical study in Japan. *Language Teaching Research*, 11(4), 393–412.
- Sidnell, J., & Enfield, N. J. (2016). Deixis and the interactional foundations of reference. In Y. Huang (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of pragmatics* (pp. 217–239). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Simpson, R., Briggs, S., Ovens, J., & Swales, J. (2002). *The Michigan corpus of academic spoken English*. Ann Arbor: The Regents of the University of Michigan.
- Simpson-Vlach, R. (2013). Corpus analysis of spoken English for academic purposes. In C. Chapelle (Ed.), *The encyclopedia of applied linguistics* (pp. 452–461). Malden: Wiley Blackwell.
- Simpson-Vlach, R., & Leicher, S. (2006). *The MICASE handbook*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Sinclair, J. (2005). Corpus and text – Basic principles. In M. Wynne (Ed.), *Developing linguistic corpora: A guide to good practice* (pp. 1–16). Oxford: Oxbow Books. Retrieved from <http://www.ahds.ac.uk/creating/guides/linguistic-corpora/chapter1.htm>
- Sinclair, J. M., & Coulthard, R. M. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse: The English used by teachers and pupils*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Spada, N., & Fröhlich, M. (1995). *COLT observation scheme*. Sydney: The National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research, Macquarie University.
- Staples, S. (2015). *The discourse of nurse-patient interactions: Contrasting the communicative styles of U.S. and international nurses*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Staples, S. (2016). Identifying linguistic features of medical interactions: A register analysis. In L. Pickering, E. Friginal, & S. Staples (Eds.), *Talking at work: Corpus-based explorations of workplace discourse* (pp. 179–208). London: Palgrave-Macmillan.
- Staples, S., Laflair, G., & Egbert, J. (2017). Comparing language use in oral proficiency interviews to target domains: Conversational, academic, and professional discourse. *The Modern Language Journal*, 101(1), 1–20.
- Storch, N. (1999). Are two heads better than one? Pair work and grammatical accuracy. *System*, 27(3), 363–374.
- Storch, N. (2002). Patterns of interaction in ESL pair work. *Language Learning*, 52(1), 119–158.
- Storch, N. (2007). Investigating the merits of pair work on a text-editing task in ESL classes. *Language Teaching Research*, 11(2), 143–159.
- Stubbe, M., Lane, C., Hilder, J., Vine, E., Vine, B., Marra, M., Homes, J., & Weatherall, A. (2003). Multiple discourse analyses of a workplace interaction. *Discourse Studies*, 5(3), 351–388.
- Swain, M. (1993). The output hypothesis: Just speaking and writing aren't enough. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 50(1), 158–164.
- Swain, M. (2000). The output hypothesis and beyond: Mediating acquisition through collaborative dialogue. In J. P. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning* (pp. 97–114). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (1998). Interaction and second language learning: Two adolescent French immersion students working together. *Modern Language Journal*, 82(3), 320.
- Swain, M., Brooks, L., & Tocalli-Beller, A. (2002). Peer-peer dialogue as a means of second language learning. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 22, 171–185.
- Swales, J. M. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Swales, J. M., & Burke, A. (2003). “It’s really fascinating work”: Differences in evaluative adjectives across academic registers. In P. Leistyna & C. F. Meyer (Eds.), *Corpus analysis: Language structure and language use* (pp. 1–18). Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Swales, J. M., & Malczewski, B. (1999). Discourse management and new episode flags in MICASE. In R. C. Simpson & J. M. Swales (Eds.), *Corpus linguistics in North America: Selections from the 1999 symposium* (pp. 145–164). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Tagliamonte, S. A. (2006). *Analyzing sociolinguistic variation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tan, L. L., Wigglesworth, G., & Storch, N. (2010). Pair interactions and mode of communication: Comparing face-to-face and computer mediate communication. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, 33(3), 27.
- Tang, G. M. (1999). Peer response in ESL writing. *TESL Canada Journal*, 16(2), 20–38.
- Tang, G. M., & Tithcott, J. (1999). Peer response in ESL writing. *TESL Canada Journal*, 16(2), 20–38.
- Tausczik, Y., & Pennebaker, J. (2010). The psychological meaning of words: LIWC and computerized text analysis methods. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 29(1), 24–54.
- Tsui, A. B. M. (1985). Analyzing input and interaction in second language classrooms. *RELC Journal*, 16, 8–32.
- Tsui, A., & Ng, M. (2000). Do secondary L2 writers benefit from peer comments? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 9(2), 147–170.
- van Lier, L. (1996). *Interaction in the language curriculum: Awareness, autonomy and authenticity*. New York: Longman.
- Villamil, O. S., & De Guerrero, M. C. (1998). Assessing the impact of peer revision on L2 writing. *Applied Linguistics*, 19(4), 491–514.
- Vine, B. (2009). Directives at work: Exploring the contextual complexity of workplace directives. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 41(7), 1395–1405. doi:10.1016/j.pragma.2009.03.001.

- Vine, B. (2016). Pragmatic markers at work in New Zealand. In L. Pickering, E. Friginal, & S. Staples (Eds.), *Talking at work: Corpus-based explorations of workplace discourse* (pp. 1–26). London: Palgrave-Macmillan.
- Vine, B. (forthcoming). Just, actually at work in New Zealand. In E. Friginal (Ed.), *Studies in corpus-based sociolinguistics*. New York: Routledge.
- VOICE. (2013). *The Vienna-Oxford International Corpus of English (Version 2.0 Online)*. <http://voice.univie.ac.at> (date of last access).
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Walsh, S. (2002). Construction of obstruction: Teacher talk and learner involvement in the EFL classroom. *Language Teaching Research*, 6, 3–23.
- Warren, M. (2004). //So what have YOU been WORKing on REcently//: Compiling a specialized corpus of spoken business English. In U. Connor & T. A. Upton (Eds.), *Discourse in the professions: Perspectives from corpus linguistics* (pp. 115–140). Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Watanabe, Y. (2008). Peer–peer interaction between L2 learners of different proficiency levels: Their interactions and reflections. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 64(4), 605–635.
- Watanabe, Y., & Swain, M. (2007). Effects of proficiency differences and patterns of pair interaction on second language learning: Collaborative dialogue between adult ESL learners. *Language Teaching Research*, 11(2), 121–142.
- Webb, N. M. (1989). Peer interaction and learning in small groups. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 13(1), 21–39.
- Weinberger, S. H. (2013). *The speech accent archive*. George Mason University. Retrieved from <http://accent.gmu.edu>
- Weisser, M. (2016). *Practical corpus linguistics: An introduction to corpus-based language analysis*. Malden: Wiley Blackwell.
- Williams, J. (2012). The potential role (s) of writing in second language development. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 21(4), 321–331.
- Yang, S. (2014). *Investigating discourse markers in Chinese college EFL teacher talk: A multi-layered analytical approach*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne.
- Yeo, J.-Y., & Ting, S.-H. (2014). Personal pronouns for student engagement in arts and science lecture introductions. *English for Specific Purposes*, 34, 26–37.
- Zhao, H. (2010). Investigating learners' use and understanding of peer and teacher feedback on writing: A comparative study in a Chinese English writing classroom. *Assessing Writing*, 15(1), 3–17.

- Zheng, C. (2012). Understanding the learning process of peer feedback activity: An ethnographic study of exploratory practice. *Language Teaching Research*, 16(1), 109–126.
- Zhu, W., & Mitchell, D. A. (2012). Participation in peer response as activity: An examination of peer response stances from an activity theory perspective. *TESOL Quarterly*, 46(2), 362–386.
- Ziegler, N. (2015). Synchronous computer-mediated communication and interaction: A meta-analysis. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 38, 553–586.

Index

A

- AAC and Non-AAC User Workplace Corpus (ANAWC), 18, 19
- affect, 22, 44, 69, 84, 139, 145, 155, 158, 183, 184, 189–91, 194, 202, 203, 213, 274
- American and British Office Talk (ABOT) corpus, 19
- AntConc*, 20, 21, 24–7, 29, 81, 101, 112, 118, 120, 154, 169

B

- BASE corpus, 41, 79
- Biber Tagger, 21–3, 54
- boosters, 77–83, 89–93, 260, 263, 264, 280
- Brown corpus, 16

C

- call center interaction corpus, 19
- Cambridge and Nottingham Business English Corpus (CANBEC), 19
- classroom discourse, 24, 67–75, 77–93, 95–113, 115–28, 260, 264
- cluster analysis, 131, 136, 138, 139, 141–51, 167–84, 194, 196, 267, 268
- Coh-Metrix, 21, 22
- collaborative dialogue, 200–5, 210, 211, 218, 268
- collaborative pattern of interaction, 226
- collecting corpora, 17–20
- collocation, 22, 25–7, 29, 46, 91, 275
- complexity and sophistication, 30, 31

- concordances, 22, 24–6, 35, 120,
 248, 249, 255, 258, 275
 The Constituent Likelihood
 Automatic Word-tagging
 System (CLAWS), 21–3
 conversational interaction, 5, 6,
 109
 corpus, definition, 11, 12
 corpus linguistics, brief history, 15,
 16
 corpus linguistics introduction,
 definition, 4, 10–14
 corpus tools, 4, 11, 20–2, 29, 30
- D**
- demonstratives, 32, 33, 115–20,
 122–5, 265
 dominant/dominant pattern of
 interaction, 201, 205, 220,
 222–4, 226–8, 233, 234, 243,
 245, 248
 dominant/passive pattern of
 interaction, 201, 205, 220,
 222–4, 228–30, 235, 237,
 238, 240–2, 245, 248
- E**
- English as a Lingua Franca (ELF),
 42, 43, 246, 247
 English as a Lingua Franca in
 Academic Contexts (ELFA),
 35, 43, 44
 English for Academic Purposes
 (EAP), 4, 7–9, 24, 40, 67–75,
 77–93, 95–113, 115–28,
 263–6
 English for Specific Purposes (ESP),
 7, 18, 24
 equality, 201, 205, 220, 224, 227,
 234, 235, 238, 240, 248
 European Corpus of Academic Talk
 (EUROCAT), 48–50, 271
 expert/novice pattern of interaction,
 201, 205, 220, 222–4, 230–3,
 235, 237, 238, 240, 243, 252
- F**
- feedback on writing, 199, 206, 213,
 219
 frequency, 5, 10, 16, 20, 21, 23–5,
 27, 30, 31, 93, 104, 107, 109,
 110, 112, 120, 125, 136, 139,
 143, 155, 156, 159, 160, 162,
 168, 169, 173, 176, 181, 182,
 204, 205, 249–51, 264, 269,
 270, 274, 275
- G**
- general corpus, 13
- H**
- health care corpora, 20
 hedges, 24, 77–93, 263, 264, 279
 Hong Kong Corpus of Spoken
 English (HKCSE), 19–20, 272
- I**
- interaction-acquisition connection, 5
 International Corpus of English
 (ICE), 42–3, 50–4

K

- keyness, 27
- keyword analysis, 27–8
- Key Word in Context (KWIC), 21, 24–5, 32

L

- language proficiency, 31, 204
- Language-related episodes (LREs), 200, 201, 203–5, 210
- learner comprehension, 5, 6
- Learner Corpus Association (LCA), 54, 55
- learner interaction, 5, 6, 179, 199
- lexical bundles, 25, 29, 30, 40, 79, 117
- L2 Experience Interview Corpus, 131–51, 153, 167, 193, 266, 268
- linguistic co-occurrence, 31–2, 40
- The Linguistic Inquiry and Word Count (LIWC), 21, 22, 32, 137, 139, 153, 155, 162, 165, 167–9, 193, 194, 196, 267, 268
- LOB corpus, 13, 16
- locative adverbs, 116, 120, 125–8, 265
- log-likelihood, 82, 86, 92, 101, 102, 105, 108, 120, 121, 123, 125
- Louvain International Database of Spoken English Interlanguage (LINDSEI) Corpus, 32, 35, 44, 45, 275

M

- metacognition, 189, 190
- Michigan Corpus of Academic Spoken English (MICASE), 8, 9, 14, 24, 35–8, 40, 42, 78, 79, 96, 97, 117, 125, 247, 275
- Michigan English Language Assessment Battery (MELAB), 9
- modals of necessity/obligation, 249, 250, 258, 260
- modals of possibility/permission/ability, 249, 250, 252, 260, 261
- modals of prediction/volition, 40, 249, 250, 256, 260, 298
- modal verbs, 23, 28, 40, 218, 219, 245–60, 270
- multi-dimensional analysis (MDA), 31–2, 46, 139
- multi-modal annotation of learner talk, 270–2
- multi-word units (MWU), 19, 25, 29–30
- mutuality, 201, 220, 227, 238, 240, 241, 248

N

- n-grams, 25, 29, 30
- non-collaborative pattern of interaction, 218, 219

O

- output hypothesis, 199, 200

P

pair dynamics, 201, 206, 211
 patterns of interaction, 200–2, 204,
 205, 210, 218–43
 peer response, 4, 9, 10, 14, 199–243,
 245–60, 263, 268–70, 274
 personal pronouns, 28, 32, 70, 75,
 93, 95–113, 120, 121, 247,
 264–6, 269
 p-frames, 29, 30
 phonetically-transcribed corpora,
 272–3
 principal component analysis, 153

R

revisions, 206, 211–16, 218, 219,
 221, 222, 230, 232–5, 238,
 239, 241–3, 245, 246,
 255–60, 269

S

Second language acquisition (SLA),
 4, 5, 7, 9, 17, 35, 55, 193,
 199–206, 210, 218, 263, 268,
 269
 second language classroom discourse
 (L2CD) corpus, 71–5, 80, 82,
 120
 Second Language Peer Response
 (L2PR) corpus, 199–243, 245,
 247–53, 255–60, 269
 second language (L2) writing, 78,
 199, 206, 207, 210–13, 216,
 218, 246, 268–70
 semantic component analysis, 153
 Sketch Engine, 22

spatial deixis, 75, 113, 115–28, 265
 specialized corpus, 14, 18, 48
 specific, revision-oriented comment,
 233, 235, 236
 spoken english learner language,
 3–33
 stance, 9, 20, 24, 28, 40, 41, 70,
 77–9, 82, 83, 85, 89, 91, 98,
 112, 119, 205–7, 216–20,
 236, 245–60, 263, 264, 269,
 270
 Stanford parser/tagger, 23
 stimulated recall interview, 218, 219,
 221, 225–30, 232, 237–40,
 248, 269, 270
 student attitudes, 213, 215, 216

T

teaching applications, 37, 275
 T2K-SWAL corpus, 8, 14, 25,
 38–40, 42, 250, 275
 T-Lab, 136, 139, 141, 143, 149,
 268
 TOEFL scores, 140, 167, 184–6,
 189, 190, 192, 268
 training for peer response, 269, 270

V

*Vienna-Oxford International
 Corpus of English (VOICE)*,
 35, 42–3
 vocabulary usage, 24, 30–1

W

Wmatrix, 23