

The Linguistic Construction of Identity by Bilinguals Who Stutter 2 3

Angela M. Medina 4

Florida International University 5

Nicole Muller 6

University College Cork 7

John A. Tetnowski 8

University of Louisiana-Lafayette 9

Abstract 10

This study's aim was to investigate the self-perceptions of bilingual people who stutter as uncovered by their word choices during social interaction. Specifically, the perceptions they have about themselves relative to their stuttering are examined using qualitative methods. Three bilingual males who stutter were recruited from stuttering support groups. Semi-structured interviews were conducted to elicit participants' perspectives on their stuttering experiences. Tools derived from Systemic Functional Linguistic (SFL) theory were used to analyse interview transcripts revealing how participants use linguistic resources to appraise, organise and convey their identities relative to their stuttering. SFL-based analyses revealed individual topics in each participant's talk including: being prideful about stuttering out of necessity, shifting identity based on views about stuttering, and adopting various identities depending on social context. Analysis of word selections and clause structures revealed that all three participants project a positive identity relative to their stuttering, though they still struggle with negative feelings. 11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Affiliation 26

Florida International University, USA 27
Email (corresponding author): MedinaAM@fiu.edu 28

1 KEYWORDS: SYSTEMIC FUNCTIONAL LINGUISTICS, STUTTERING, BILINGUALISM,
2 QUALITATIVE METHODS

3 Introduction

4 From a social constructivist standpoint, 'identity' can be defined as one's con-
5 text-dependent answer to the question 'Who am I?' that one conveys during
6 social interaction (Sarbin, 1997). It is formed through one's experience with
7 and interpretations of one's environment and it is influenced significantly by
8 reinforcements, evaluations by others, and the attributes one assigns their own
9 behaviour (Shavelson & Bolus, 1982). People have multiple selves, including
10 the 'embodied self', the 'autobiographical self' and the 'social self' (Harré,
11 2004). Harré (2004) describes the embodied self as a continuous, self-identi-
12 cal reflection of a person's view of themselves and how they act in the world,
13 whereas the autobiographical self serves as the hero or heroine in stories,
14 which differs greatly from story to story. The social self is an ever-changing
15 version of the self that one presents in social interaction. Of particular inter-
16 est to communication disorders is the interplay between the different selves,
17 particularly the social self and autobiographical self. The social self is not just
18 one that a person chooses to show interlocutors, but also one that interlocu-
19 tors allow a person to project. When people come to understand who they are,
20 they do so with consideration for what society considers to be 'good' or 'bad'
21 and 'normal' or 'abnormal' (Kathard, 2006). This can put the social self at odds
22 with the autobiographical self. This struggle between the selves gives rise to
23 stigma and has implications for people with communication disorders.

24 There is much work regarding identity in acquired communication dis-
25 orders such as: aphasia (e.g. Brumfitt, 1993; Hinckley, 2006; Horton, 2007;
26 Shadden, 2005; Shadden & Agan, 2004; Simmons-Mackie & Elman, 2015;
27 Simmons-Mackie & Damico, 2008); dementia (e.g. Caddell & Clare, 2010;
28 Cohn-Mansfield, Golander & Arnheim, 2000; Hughes, Louw & Sabat, 2005);
29 dysarthria (e.g. Dickson et al., 2008); and traumatic brain injury (e.g. Bryson-
30 Campbell et al., 2013; Carroll & Coetzer, 2011; Douglas, 2012; Keegan, Togher,
31 Murdock, & Hendry 2017; Levack, Kayes & Fadyl, 2010; Overton & Worth, 2014).
32 Because acquired communication disorders typically occur later in life, clients
33 experience a shift in identity as they move from being a competent commu-
34 nicator to a less competent communicator. For instance, Musser, Wilkinson,
35 Gilbert and Bokhour (2015) described how participants with aphasia second-
36 ary to stroke were forced to renegotiate their occupational identities, familial
37 roles and social identities over time due to the change in their communica-
38 tive abilities. This speaks to the point that identity, being a social construct, is
39 built through language use in social interaction. Therefore, it is not surprising

that a major change in communication abilities will impact one's perception of the self. Developmental communication disorders, which occur early in life, are subject to spontaneous recovery, recovery through clinical intervention, or can persist throughout the child's life and, therefore, do not yield the same changes in identity seen in clients who acquire communication disorders. However, developmental communication disorders that persist, such as stuttering, have been shown to have an impact on the way clients construct their identities (Daniels & Gabel, 2004; Danzak & Silliman, 2005; McIlroy & Storbeck, 2011). Living with these disorders can involve struggle for acceptance in terms of Harré's (2004) autobiographical self and social self: for example, a child perceiving herself as different and wanting to fit in, or others perceiving a child as 'not normal' and, hence, inferior in some way.

Identity in stuttering

Stuttering is a highly individualistic disorder in that its hallmark behaviours and traits (i.e. repetitions, prolongations, blocks, physical concomitants, feelings, attitudes) vary from person to person and context to context across the lifespan. Speech-language pathologists have tools to determine whether or not stuttering is evident and, if it is, the level of severity. There are also assessments available to determine the impact stuttering has on one's life. Means for systematically investigating identity of people who stutter (PWS) are not available, but necessary given that accessing and examining identity construction can facilitate understanding of a client's unique experience with stuttering (Daniels & Gabel, 2004; Kathard, Norman & Pillay, 2010). By investigating clients' meaning-driven descriptions of themselves, clinicians will be better equipped to provide more meaningful therapy to PWS (Guendouzi & Williams, 2010). Additionally, identity studies give clinicians a means to explore the social, cultural and contextual variables of stuttering as focusing only on behavioural aspects without consideration for the social implications of stuttering serving as a barrier to clients who stutter and experience relapse (Hagstrom & Daniels, 2004).

Identity construction of PWS has been investigated qualitatively with methodologies such as grounded theory (e.g. Kathard, 2001, 2006) and the functional individual system framework based on sociocultural theory (e.g. Hagstrom & Daniels, 2004) as well as with methods like cross-case analysis (e.g. Kathard, 2006), thematic analysis (e.g. Daniels, Hagstrom & Gabel, 2006; Kathard et al., 2010; Klompas & Ross, 2004), conversation analysis (e.g. Guendouzi & Williams, 2010) and representational narrative analysis (e.g. Kathard, 2006; Kathard et al., 2010). Findings from these studies have revealed, respectively, that: identity in stuttering involves an interplay between communication and culture; identities of PWS can be multiple and contradictory in that

1 negative and positive identities coexist; and identity can be used as a tool to
2 successfully live with stuttering.

3 None of the published work on identity construction has paid close atten-
4 tion to specific wordings and language use employed by PWS. Since language
5 is the prime instrument to accomplish social action (Halliday & Matthiesen,
6 2004) and to project one's own identity as well as communicate one's construal
7 of others' identities, it should be investigated to expand our understanding of
8 identity in stuttering. Therefore, the current study uses tools grounded in lin-
9 guistic theory to explore the perceptions of PWS through their word choices.

10 *Identity in bilingual stuttering*

11 Bilingualism, the ability to comprehend and communicate in two languages, is
12 an important factor to consider given its relationship with stuttering in terms
13 of how stuttering manifests across languages (e.g. Nwokah, 1988) as well as
14 the role it plays in identity construction. Kanno (2000) states that, because
15 bilinguals have the ability to switch languages, they have a greater potential to
16 exhibit variation in social roles and emotional attitudes than do monolinguals.
17 Further, choosing to speak a particular language with an interlocutor affords
18 bilinguals another avenue for self-expression and provides a means to affiliate
19 with interlocutors (Kanno, 2000). This sentiment is echoed by Mills (2001),
20 who describes language as coming with a particular set of cultural features and
21 experiences which can, in turn, have an impact on self-definition and identity.
22 Therefore, bilingualism is another dimension that needs to be explored in the
23 construal of identity of PWS.

24 Much of the linguistics-based work in bilingual stuttering has focused
25 on characterising the linguistic contexts in which stuttering behaviours
26 occur including: phonological and syntactic structures (Bernstein, Ratner &
27 Benitez, 1985); word classes (Ardila, Ramos & Barrocas, 2011; Gkatlitsiou,
28 Byrd, Bedore & Taliancich-Klinger, 2017); phonetic complexity (Howell &
29 Au-Yueng, 2007); speech sound types (Jayaram, 1983); and sentence length
30 (Jayaram, 1984). While findings from this line of research has furthered our
31 understanding of the relationship stuttering has with the linguistic aspects of
32 language in a behavioural sense, the attitudinal aspects of bilingual stuttering
33 have not been adequately explored. Furthermore, tools grounded in linguis-
34 tic theory have not been used to investigate identity construction of bilinguals
35 who stutter.

36 *SFL-based tools for the investigation of identity*

37 Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) is a theory of language use developed
38 to create an applicable, holistic and socially accountable approach to linguis-
39 tics (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2013). This theory was developed by M. A. K.

Halliday in the 1960s, whose work incorporated the functional and anthropological approaches to language which stemmed from J. R. Firth's emphasis on the description of languages (Matthiessen, 2012). According to Matthiessen, '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 conceptualised as a resource for creating meaning by the selections that speakers make, within the constraints of the grammar, to construct their messages.

Under SFL, language is viewed as a semiotic system in that meaning is made and conveyed through the words and syntactic structures speakers select from a system of lexical and grammatical choices. This system is comprised of networks of interrelated contrasts whereby what the speaker means and does not mean is conveyed 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 (2004), social interaction is 'the semantic frontier of language' in that it allows people to explore and expand their meaning potential. This approach has given rise to the systemic analysis of language use in social interaction and allows for examination of the semiotic properties that underlie a message in a particular context (Fontaine, 2010). Therefore, SFL offers a means for systematically investigating the ways individuals linguistically construct their experience and is appropriate for examining narrative data. In particular, SFL allows for the analysis of the linguistic resources (i.e. particular words) speakers use to create and convey meaning during social interaction.

Currently, there is no work describing how bilingual PWS use linguistic resources to construct their identities. This is problematic given that about half of the world's population is bilingual (Grosjean, 2012) and that 70 million people stutter worldwide (Stuttering Foundation, 2019), which has implications for the number of bilingual PWS. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to describe how bilingual PWS perceive themselves relative to their stuttering. The following research question guided the analysis:

What are the self-perceptions of bilingual PWS as uncovered by their word choices?

Methods

Research design

A qualitative case study research design (Tetnowski & Damico, 2001) was used to investigate the experiences of bilingual PWS (Granese, 2014). This

1 design also allowed for the context-specific examination of discourse using
 2 selected methods of analysis provided by SFL. As a result, a holistic view of
 3 the intricacies involved in the individuals' linguistic construction of identity
 4 can be explored. The methods and data presented in the current work is part
 5 of a larger study conducted by the first author, which investigated the linguis-
 6 tic resources used by four Spanish–English bilinguals who stutter to describe
 7 their experiences with stuttering throughout their lives in general (Granese,
 8 2014). Identity was investigated via a sub-question and, therefore, was not the
 9 primary focus of the original study.

10 **Procedure**

11 The study was approved by the IRB at the University of Louisiana at Lafayette
 12 and the National Stuttering Association Research Committee. The participants
 13 were recruited from a stuttering support group in South Florida. Inclusion
 14 criteria were: self-identified as a PWS; self-identified as a Spanish–English-
 15 speaking bilingual able to read and hold a conversation in both languages; at
 16 least 15 years of age at time of study. Those who reported adult onset of stutter-
 17 ing were excluded from the current study. Participant names are pseudonyms.

18 *Development of participant profiles*

19 After obtaining informed consent, biographical information was collected
 20 (Granese, 2014). The SSI-4 (Stuttering Severity Instrument; Riley, 2009) pro-
 21 cedures were followed to qualitatively describe stuttering severity in both lan-
 22 guages. The percentage of stuttered syllables across languages and tasks was
 23 computed using the frequency-counting methods (Riley, 2009).

24 The Overall Assessment of the Speaker's Experience of Stuttering (OASES)
 25 (Yaruss & Quesal, 2010) was administered twice using the English-language
 26 response forms to determine the impact of stuttering on each participant's
 27 quality of life. Each participant was asked to respond to the items on the first
 28 questionnaire considering their stuttering in English and the second consid-
 29 ering their stuttering in Spanish. Ratings from the OASES range from mild
 30 to severe. Form A, for adults, was completed by the two participants over
 31 the age of 18, while Form T, for teenagers, was completed by the 16-year-old
 32 participant.

33 Language history information about each participant was collected using
 34 the *L2 Language History Questionnaire* (L2LHQ) (Li, Sepanski & Zhao, 2006)
 35 to describe participants' language use and abilities – history, function, profi-
 36 ciency, stability, mode, accent, covert speech, and affect (Coalson, Peña & Byrd,
 37 2013). Information was obtained through an English-language self-report
 38 questionnaire. The questionnaire was supplemented by additional questions
 39 derived from *The Language Experience and Proficiency Questionnaire* (Marian,

Blumenfeld & Kaushanskaya, 2007) and the *Bilingual Dominance Scale* (Dunn & Fox Tree, 2009). 1
2

Recording of semi-structured interviews 3

Individual semi-structured interviews conducted by the first author were 4
audio-recorded (Granese, 2014). While broad interview topics were intro- 5
duced by the researcher in all three interviews (i.e. stuttering behaviours in 6
each language, therapy history, fluency techniques, family reactions), the 7
semi-structured interview gave the participants the freedom to discuss any 8
material that they felt was pertinent to the conversation. This in turn allowed 9
participants to choose their own wordings and examples, which was the data 10
of particular interest to this study. Participants' personal experiences, values 11
and beliefs as a bilingual PWS were discussed. To expand and clarify partic- 12
ipants' turns of talk, the researcher used probing questions as suggested in 13
Damico and Augustine (1995). Given that these probing questions were based 14
on the participants' talk in vivo, they were not predetermined prior to each 15
interview and, therefore, varied from participant to participant. Interviews 16
ranged from 36 minutes to one hour and 43 minutes. The audio recordings of 17
the individual semi-structured interviews were transcribed by the researcher. 18
To ensure accuracy of transcriptions, the researcher listened to 5% of the 19
audio data again and made corrections when necessary (Müller, 2006). The 20
first author conducted the initial analysis and coding of the data. A member of 21
the research team with expertise in SFL-based analyses reviewed all of the first 22
author's coding at the conclusion of the data analysis phase. Disagreements 23
in analysis were resolved through both researchers re-examining the data in 24
question and coming to a consensus on the final coding. 25

Participants 26

Ivan 27

Ivan, 29, moved to the United States from South America eight months prior 28
to the study. He first realised that he spoke differently than others after experi- 29
encing a block when he was five years old. To his knowledge, only one other 30
family member stutters. Ivan reported that his stuttering is characterised by 31
a mix of spasms or difficult tension primarily felt in his tongue and repeti- 32
tions of words and initial syllables. He attended speech therapy briefly as an 33
adult. According to his responses on the *L2LHQ*, Spanish is Ivan's native lan- 34
guage and he began learning English at age six in school through a mixture of 35
classroom instruction and interacting with people. He reported that he uses 36
English 20% of the day and Spanish 80%. Ivan described his English (reading, 37
writing, speaking and listening) as 'very good'. 38

1 *Sam*

2 Sam, 16, is of Colombian descent and was very young at the onset of his stut-
 3 tering. He reported that his father identified as a PWS. He reported that he
 4 finds it harder to use fluency techniques he has learned in English when speak-
 5 ing Spanish. Sam said that he always has a slight prolongation with the word
 6 'stuttering' due to the emotions behind it. Sam attended speech therapy since
 7 childhood with a two-year gap in his early teen years. He identified English
 8 as his native language on the *L2LHQ*. He began to learn Spanish as a second
 9 language at home at approximately the age of one and in school at age 14.
 10 He learned Spanish through interaction and formal classroom instruction. He
 11 reported that he uses English 90% and Spanish 10% of the day. Sam rated his
 12 Spanish reading and writing proficiency as 'poor', speaking fluency as 'func-
 13 tional', and listening ability as 'good'.

14 *Brian*

15 Brian, 63, remembers stuttering as a child. He reported that there were PWS
 16 on his father's side of the family; specifically, he said that his sister 'mum-
 17 bles' and his father 'stammered'. Brian judged his stuttering as being 'moderate'
 18 and described it as being sound-specific with vowel-initial words giving him
 19 the most difficulty. He went to speech therapy for a few months later in life
 20 and stopped because he felt the techniques only worked in the therapy room.
 21 Brian reported that speaking Spanish is more difficult for him than English
 22 because many Spanish words start with vowels. On the *L2LHQ*, Brian iden-
 23 tified English as his native language. He began learning Spanish at approxi-
 24 mately age 50 by watching TV, listening to the radio, reading, helping others
 25 learn English, and interacting with people. He uses English 80% and Spanish
 26 20% of the day. He rated his abilities in Spanish as follows: reading proficiency
 27 and listening ability 'good'; writing proficiency 'functional'; and speaking flu-
 28 ency 'very good'.

29 *Data analysis*

30 Three stages of analysis were used to examine each transcript, including iden-
 31 tification of keywords, analysis of interpersonal meaning, and analysis of
 32 experiential meaning (Granese, 2014) (see Appendix).

33 *Identification of keywords*

34 The transcripts were read multiple times to establish familiarity with the con-
 35 tent. Keywords of interest and their variations were highlighted including:
 36 'stuttering', 'speech', 'Spanish', 'English', 'therapy' and 'fluency'. Other words were
 37 examined due to their high frequency of use as synonyms for the keywords of

interest by particular participants, including ‘fluid’ by Ivan and ‘struggle’ by Brian. Sam did not have any unique high-frequency words outside of the keywords of interest. These keywords were selected to uncover general grammatical loci (i.e. whole chunks of talk) that provided information about the aspects of the stuttering experience the research team was interested in investigating. The boundaries of the chunks of talk were determined by the beginnings and ends of participants’ talk relative to their identities rather than the end of a turn of talk (e.g. Brassel et al., 2016; Keegan et al., 2017). For the purpose of the current study, only the chunks of talk about identity were analysed.

Analysis of interpersonal meaning

Participants’ attitudes, feelings, and beliefs about themselves relative to their stuttering was examined by analysing word choices they made within the systems of APPRAISAL and MODALITY.* Analysis of the APPRAISAL system reveals the ways participants expressed their feelings and attitudes about their stuttering experiences through the words they chose while talking about their stuttering (Eggin & Slade, 1997). The primary mechanisms of the APPRAISAL system are ATTITUDE and GRADUATION. ATTITUDE includes the domains of appreciation, affect and judgement (Martin & Rose, 2003). Appreciation refers to speakers’ positive and negative evaluations of people and happenings (*good* therapist). Affect reflects emotions (She’s *upset*) while judgement encompasses the speaker’s evaluation of others’ behaviours, for instance in relation to an accepted moral standard or set of values (It was *wrong* for you to say that). GRADUATION is a measure of the quantification (*few* repetitions), intensification (*completely* fluent), and downscaling/hedging (*kind of* short) of attitudes.

The MODALITY system is a means for speakers to make meaning between the polar areas of ‘yes’ and ‘no’ (Togher, 2001). Within the system or MODALITY, the aspect of MODALISATION can be used by speakers to express degrees of probability and frequency (He *always* goes on Tuesdays). MODULATION, another aspect of MODALITY, allows for the tempering of directness during social interaction including obligation (You *must* go to therapy), inclination (She’s *willing* to wait) and potential (I *can* be fluent) (Eggin & Slade, 1997).

Analysis of experiential meaning

The experiential function represents the ability of a language to express experience by constructing a model of experience that consists of a process

* Following SFL typography conventions, names of systems and their subsequent aspects or mechanisms are presented in all caps.

1 (typically expressed by a verb), the persons/objects/things involved in it, and
 2 the circumstances under which the process occurred (Halliday & Matthiessen,
 3 2004). These experiences are classified as particular process types in the lex-
 4 icogrammatical system of TRANSITIVITY. 'Each process type provides its
 5 own schema for construing a particular domain of experience as a figure of
 6 a particular kind' (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, p. 170). *Behavioural pro-*
 7 *cesses* represent outer manifestations of inner consciousness as well as physi-
 8 ological behaviours (He *blocks* on vowels). *Verbal processes* are reports of what
 9 has been said (My teacher *said* 'read slower'). *Material processes* are events
 10 or actions classified as types of 'doing' (I *ran* at the gym) or 'happening' (The
 11 monitor *beeped*). *Mental processes* encompass the inner workings of conscious-
 12 ness such as perceiving, feeling, thinking and wanting (I *want* to get better).
 13 *Relational processes* tie together two pieces of information to represent types
 14 of being, having and symbolising (I *am* a person who stutters). *Existential pro-*
 15 *cesses* are based solely on existence (There are no morning appointments). By
 16 examining these process types, information about the way the participants
 17 construe their lived reality as people who stutter are revealed.

18 Results and discussion

19 Table 1 presents the percentage of syllables stuttered during reading and
 20 speaking tasks in each language.

21 **Table 1.** Percentage of stuttered syllables by language and task

	Spanish		English	
	Reading	Speaking	Reading	Speaking
22 Ivan	3.20%	3.89%	5.37%	6.34%
23 Sam	9.68%	21.35%	2.04%	10.29%
24 Brian	4.60%	6.18%	3.73%	8.58%

25
 26
 27 Table 2 presents the overall impact stuttering has on participants' lives
 28 when considering their stuttering in each language.

29 **Table 2.** OASES overall impact of stuttering scores by language

	OASES Form	Spanish	English
30 Ivan	A	Moderate	Moderate
31 Sam	T	Mild/moderate	Mild
32 Brian	A	Moderate	Mild/moderate

33
 34 The following are extracts from each participant's interview which demon-
 35 strate the linguistic construction of the participants' perception of themselves
 36 relative to their stuttering (Granese, 2014) as they answer the question: 'Who

am I as it relates to my stuttering?'. Other identities emerged in each participant's interview but were not included in the current study because they were not related to stuttering (i.e. Brian identifying as a son who did not meet his father's expectations or Ivan identifying as an immigrant).

Ivan

Excerpt 1

I reached a point where I don't want to stutter – or not that – but stuttering is a part of my life but that's it. I'm like proud of it you know– but at the same time but –eh– I don't want to stutter – or – or I do the best I can to not stutter.

Ivan construes his lack of desire to stutter as a feeling he came to over time as indicated by his use of 'reached', which also functions as a metaphor for the endpoint of a journey. Because the clause expresses both his lack of desire and inclination to stutter, his structuring it as 'a point' allows him to distance himself from the overall negative appreciation he has for the behaviour of stuttering. Ivan uses a relational process configuration to construe stuttering not as something he does rather it is something that is static as 'a part' of his life. The positive affect ('proud') that he now feels in the face of stuttering is down-scaled by 'like'. Ivan then counters this statement indicated by the circumstantial contingency 'but at the same time'. This prefaces his repetition of the negated mental desiderative structure where Ivan conveys his lack of desire to participate in the behavioural process of stuttering: 'I don't want to stutter'. While it is something he has learned to take pride in over the years, it still remains an undesirable part of his life. He expands on this point by indicating that he actively puts forth his best efforts 'to not stutter'. This avoidance of the behaviour that he says he takes 'pride' in creates a mismatch, which is addressed in the following excerpt:

Excerpt 2

Yeah but that's my only option – it wasn't something I wanted. If you ask me if uh– if – if I was born and I have an option of stuttering or not, I would say no – I wouldn't stutter. But it's the only option I have – you know– to be proud of something.

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 countered his negative appraisal by paraphrasing his previous statement in Excerpt 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)

1 is assigned the maximally upscaled Attribute ‘only option’ – one that he again
 2 describes as being undesirable. He builds on this with a hypothetical sce-
 3 nario, which he presents through a verbal clause construction. By setting the
 4 researcher in the role of Sayer for the purposes of this clause, he casts her
 5 as the one who theoretically offers him the option of ‘being born again’ and
 6 not stuttering. In his own verbal projection, he responds with double polar-
 7 ity, both of which are negative. This emphasises his lack of desire to be born
 8 again as a PWS. He counters this with a statement geared toward the reali-
 9 ty of his current situation, where ‘the only option I have’ is now identified as
 10 ‘to be proud of something’. This suggests that his pride in stuttering is some-
 11 thing that he has accepted as an inalienable possession. It is born out of neces-
 12 sity since it is not something he chooses to feel in relation to his stuttering. He
 13 then compares his pride in stuttering to the pride others express in ‘being gay’.

14 *Excerpt 3*

15 . . . you know, like being gay – I don’t know. Ok gay – ok so I’m proud – because
 16 if not, if you are not proud, eh what do you have – like gay people – I don’t
 17 know.

18 Ivan likens his only option of being proud of his stuttering to that of gay pride
 19 but downscale the metaphor with the negated mental clause construction ‘I
 20 don’t know’. He then projects verbiage from the perspective of a speaker who
 21 is gay, where he sets the topic of the projection with ‘ok gay’ then follows it
 22 with an intensive relational clause in which ‘I’ (reference to the hypotheti-
 23 cal speaker who is gay) is assigned the attribute ‘proud’. Through this juxta-
 24 position, Ivan expresses the need for people who are gay and PWS to turn
 25 the social stigma of their being into a positive by being ‘proud’. This serves to
 26 highlight the significance Ivan places on the possession of pride. For him, not
 27 having pride implies that you have nothing which he, again, compares to the
 28 situation of people who are gay.

29 Through linguistic analysis of Ivan’s talk, it was revealed that his positive
 30 affect of being ‘proud’ is an attitude born out of necessity. The pride he conveys
 31 is an act of defiance against the stigma he faced in Ecuador and the teasing he
 32 endured in school. The first clue in his talk was his use of the APPRAISAL
 33 system to downscale his commitment to this feeling, which contrasts with the
 34 absolute negative polarisation of his desire to stutter in Excerpt 1. He also
 35 uses the APPRAISAL system to strengthen the intensity of which he prevents
 36 himself from stuttering. While he expresses strong feelings about not stut-
 37 tering, his feelings of pride are weak by comparison. These choices within the
 38 APPRAISAL system indicate inconsistency between the image he is trying to
 39 project and the way he actually feels. Analysis of the experiential meanings

he conveys and the attitudes he conveys provided insight on his true negative 1
 feelings of fear and his rejection of the stigma associated with his stuttering 2
 that he has internalised over time. This finding supports the results of Ivan's 3
 OASES assessment, which indicate that stuttering has a moderate effect on the 4
 quality of his life when considering both English and Spanish. 5

Sam 6

Excerpt 4 7

At this point in time, I'm really happy I had my stutter in the first place – just 8
 because I had the opportunity to work through it and succeed through it – and 9
 um – it shows that, you know – if I put my mind to something and work hard at 10
 it – I can succeed. 11

He opens his response with a circumstance of time: 'at this point in time'. This 12
 structure places the proceeding talk in the present, which contrasts with his 13
 feelings from the past. By highlighting the aspect of time, Sam sets the stage 14
 for the rhetorical device 'old Sam' and 'new Sam', where 'old Sam' is embodied 15
 by his feelings toward and experiences with stuttering from the past and 'new 16
 Sam' is constructed with those he currently feels and experiences. Another 17
 contrasting facet is his use of appraisal. As seen in this excerpt, Sam not only 18
 conveys positive affect of having had a stutter and being able to work through 19
 it, but also positively appraises stuttering itself by assigning it the attribute 20
 'opportunity'. He uses these positive appraisals as a platform to support his 21
 assertion he has high potential ('can') to succeed when he puts his mind to 22
 something and works 'hard'. His use of the verb 'succeed' inherently represents 23
 a positive appreciation of the end-point and, more importantly, underlines his 24
 own personal effort in the process. 25

Excerpt 5 26

... and – you know – some people would consider it a handicap – but 27
 um I personally don't – but I view it more as an opportunity to succeed at 28
 something– something else that I can succeed at that somebody else wouldn't 29
 have the opportunity to – but that's me right now – but in most of my past – it's 30
 been something that is a challenge for me. 31

Sam uses a discourse marker to posit what 'some people would consider it 32
 [stuttering]' to be. By doing this, he sets up a straw man of sorts in order 33
 to strengthen his opposing viewpoint. The process 'succeed' is reliant on his 34
 personal ability to 'work through' stuttering, which is indicated through his 35
 use of modality with 'can'. These constructions imply that his success is not 36
 a given, but something that he considers himself capable of on the basis of 37

1 experience. Though stuttering is inherently challenging, Sam has turned it
2 into an ‘opportunity’.

3 Sam then counters this by temporally restricting his positive appraisal to
4 ‘right now’, which sets up a juxtaposition between the present and the past,
5 which he also restricts with ‘in most of [my past]’. He then describes ‘it’ (his
6 stuttering) in the past with the downranked clause ‘something that is a chal-
7 lenge for me’. His choice of using ‘a challenge’, instead of the verb ‘challenged’
8 or adjective ‘challenging’, for example, hedges the direct, negative impact stut-
9 tering had on him. Another aspect to consider is Sam’s use of present tense
10 ‘is’, which indicates that, despite his positive view, stuttering is still something
11 he struggles with. This negative appreciation of his stuttering in the past con-
12 trasts with the positive appraisals he currently associates with it and serves as
13 another differing factor between the perspectives held by ‘old Sam’ and ‘new
14 Sam’.

15 *Excerpt 6*

16 . . . and I always thought – you know – in the future it would go away somehow
17 or gradually go away since – you know – so many people they have stuttering
18 when they were younger but it goes away – so I thought I would be like that.
19 Once in my teen years I realised – you know – that wasn’t happening and it was
20 uh – worrisome for a little bit – a while.

21 Sam begins this change of topic with a mental projection, which is maximally
22 upscaled in terms of usuality with ‘always’. Before presenting the projection,
23 he adds a circumstantial element to specify the time at which he thought this
24 would come to fruition ‘in the future’. The projection comes in the form of a
25 material clause of probability where ‘it’ (reference to stuttering) is in the role of
26 Actor. Sam expresses more uncertainty in regard to how this material process
27 would happen through his inclusion of ‘somehow’ at the end of the clause. He
28 then downscales this process in the following clause with ‘gradually’, convey-
29 ing his expectation that his stuttering would taper off rather than stop com-
30 pletely. This belief was based on the information presented in the following
31 relational clause of possession in which ‘they’ (reference to ‘so many people’)
32 is in the role of Possessor of ‘stuttering’ in the circumstance of time ‘when they
33 were younger’. His use of ‘so many’ to upscale the number of people at the
34 beginning of the clause works to convey a high degree of commonality of this
35 situation and therefore strengthens the validity of this information on which
36 he based his belief. He follows this with the mental projection of an intensive
37 relational clause construction in which he assigns himself the Attribute ‘like
38 that’, where ‘that’ is a reference to the whole preceding clause complex. Here,
39 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. 1 2

Sam prefaces his next statement with ‘once in my teen years’, which highlights his knowledge of the significance of this circumstance of time. It is widely known in the stuttering community 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’ refers to his stuttering going away, as it does for many children when they grow older. This circumstance is couched in the negated material process ‘wasn’t happening’. He then uses a relational clause construction to assign this realisation the Attribute of ‘worrisome’. Under the system of APPRAISAL, this conveys that he experienced negative affect as a result of this realisation. This 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’ as depicted in Excerpt 5. 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’. 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18

Through shifting process types and his use of circumstances of time to organise 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 aligns with Blood, Blood, Tellis and Gabel (2003), which found that younger adolescents perceive stuttering as a more negative and stigmatising condition than older adolescents. His shift into his current identity, ‘new Sam’, is characterised by positive affect and confidence. 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26

Brian 27

Excerpt 7 28

... but uh ah I’m pretty much a survivor – fighter or ... and you know nobody is – say – the master of their own fate all the way – I mean God is there – that is what I believe – however, I am – I will keep swinging as long as I can still swing but ah anyway. 29 30 31 32

Here, Brian begins the next portion of talk with an intensive relational clause in which he assigns himself the downscaled (‘pretty much’) Attribute of ‘a survivor’. He then upscales this assignment to a more active Attribute: ‘fighter’. He then constructs a downscaled concession to ‘fighter’ in which he recognises that nobody is ‘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 33 34 35 36 37 38 39

1 upscaled circumstance of extent ‘all the way’ is negated by ‘nobody’, the struc-
 2 ture itself indicates that Brian believes that one can be the master of their own
 3 fate to some unspecified extent. He follows this with a profession of his belief
 4 in the existence of God, but does not explicitly assign the Attribute of ‘master
 5 of fate’ to this entity since he does not construe it as having an active role.
 6 Despite the fact that Brian believes God exists, he still feels he has a role in the
 7 matter and uses the boxing metaphor that he ‘will keep swinging as long as
 8 [he] can still swing’, which is a formulaic structure. In this construction, Brian
 9 assigns himself the role of Actor, who is carrying out the metaphorical materi-
 10 al process of ‘swinging’. This takes the ‘fighter’ metaphor a step further by
 11 alluding to a metaphorical fist-fight or violent confrontation, though it is an
 12 ineffectual one.

13 Brian speaks to his potential to continue being a ‘fighter’ in the face of his
 14 stuttering by expressing maximal probability (‘will’) in his determination to
 15 ‘keep’ doing so. However, this need to continue fighting indicates that he has
 16 been unsuccessful in winning the ‘battle’ thus far.

17 *Excerpt 8*

18 Brian: . . . he meant the world to me– same time – prostitutes, alcohol,
 19 drugs. He did not function but he was not a stutterer so I give him
 20 that.

21 Researcher: He was not?

22 Brian: He was not so I give him that.

23 In this excerpt, Brian uses the description of his brother’s problematic life
 24 as a catalyst to express how he feels about stuttering. Brian summarises the
 25 description of his brother’s lifestyle by saying simply, ‘He did not function’.
 26 In terms of appraisal, this is a neutral statement about the usuality his broth-
 27 er’s behaviour in lieu of positing a negative appreciation like ‘He was dysfunc-
 28 tional’ or a negative judgement about his capacity or potential with ‘He could
 29 not function’. This statement is then juxtaposed with a concessional clause of
 30 intensive relation, where ‘not a stutterer’ is the Attribute carried by his brother.
 31 Brian uses the grammatical metaphor ‘stutterer’. So, while his brother is the
 32 Behaver of ‘not function’, he does not belong to the category of ‘stutterers’. The
 33 figurative expression that follows, ‘so I give him that’, expresses Brian’s positive
 34 appraisal of the Attribute ‘not a stutterer’. When the researcher asks for clar-
 35 ification, Brian stands by his original statement and repeats it almost verbatim
 36 with ‘He was not so I give him that’, which serves to upscale his commitment
 37 to the statement. With this string of clauses, Brian makes a positive com-
 38 ment about his brother but at the same time expresses an overarching negative
 39 appreciation of stuttering. Taking into account the details of his brother’s life,

Brian views the fact that he did not stutter as a redeeming quality, which sheds light on how he constructs his identity as a PWS. 1 2

Brian constructs another identity by comparing himself to his stuttering support group peers. He accomplishes this by creating contrasts and distancing himself by using negative judgements when discussing his peers' emotions (see Excerpts 9 and 10). He states that 'a lot of people there are angry too', which is an implicit comparison to himself who is not angry. Here, he uses an intensive relational clause to assign the Attribute of 'angry' to 'people'. The quantification of people with 'a lot' not only upscales 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'. Excerpt 9 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 downscaled by 'some' and is downscaled further through the addition by the circumstance 'in some of the groups'. This downscaling 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 judgement. 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20

Excerpt 9 21

... but I've seen some people in some of the groups over there that are kind of sullen or kind of- what is the word- morose. 22 23

In the following excerpt, Brian compares his feelings of confidence to the group's 'very low self-esteem'. 24 25

Excerpt 10 26

but - but however - the majority of people in there have very low self-esteem I think - and but see I really feel good about myself - I think that I'm better than most people. 27 28 29

Here, Brian uses a possessive relational clause to assign the Attribute 'very low self-esteem' to 'the majority of people' in his support group. 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 judgement of peers, which he upscales 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 the next clause with a counter-element then draws attention to the counter itself by prefacing 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37

1 it with 'see'. He deploys a comparative element in the mental clause of emotion
 2 'I really feel good about myself'. 'Really' instantiates a high degree of certainty
 3 in the process of feeling good and intensifies the statement. Brian also ties in
 4 the circumstantial matter 'about myself', which makes the information he has
 5 given about himself suitable for contrast with his peers' self-esteem. In the
 6 next clause, Brian begins his statement with a mental projection which, under
 7 the system of modality, indicates he is delivering an opinion and therefore soft-
 8 ens the upcoming information. The content of this projection is structured as
 9 an intensive relational clause, where Brian assigns himself the Attribute 'better
 10 than most people'. This Attribute is comparative in nature and functions to
 11 upscale the positive appreciation inherent to the superlative 'better'. Another
 12 point of contrast is seen in the way Brian structures this comparison in that
 13 the feeling of 'low self-esteem' experienced by others is construed as a noun,
 14 whereas he is Senser of 'feel[ing] good'.

15 Brian uses the topic of 'self-esteem' as a catalyst for comparing himself with
 16 his support group peers who he negatively judges as having 'very low self-
 17 esteem'. In contrast, Brian says that not only does he 'feel good' about himself
 18 but intensifies that assertion by saying he thinks he is 'better than most people'.
 19 This differentiation of self-esteem functions similarly to Brian's previous talk
 20 where he appraises himself positively and his peers negatively. Brian's negative
 21 judgements highlight an underlying schema of how he expects others to pre-
 22 sent themselves in the public forum of the support group. Because his peers
 23 do not act in a way that is in line with his schema of socially acceptable behav-
 24 iour, he works to distance himself from them by making stark comparisons. In
 25 reality, his peers' behaviour is appropriate for the support group setting. The
 26 purpose of this forum is to give people who stutter the opportunity to disclose
 27 feelings in a safe setting to peers who can offer support.

28 Through his use of the APPRAISAL system, Brian structures two social
 29 identities of himself relative to his stuttering. Even though he works to convey
 30 a positive image of himself in comparison to his stuttering group peers, his
 31 overall feelings of stigma related to stuttering are salient. They are intensified
 32 even more so when he compares himself to his non-stuttering sibling. These
 33 negative judgements of himself and others who stutter are reflected in his
 34 OASES results, which indicate that stuttering has a moderate-to-severe impact
 35 on his quality of life, when considering his stuttering in English and Spanish.

36 Conclusions

37 The goal of this study was to describe how bilingual PWS use linguistic
 38 resources to construct their identity relative to their stuttering. By using

analytic tools grounded in SFL theory, it was revealed how the participants 1
 construed and projected their identities through their linguistic choices. Ivan 2
 conveyed that he is someone who is prideful out of necessity by downscal- 3
 ing the degree of pride he has in being a PWS, but upscaling of the degree to 4
 which he tries to hide his stuttering. Sam used circumstances of time and dif- 5
 ferences in agency through his use of different processes to organise his neg- 6
 ative appraisals in the past and his positive appraisals in the present. It is in 7
 these past and present constructions that Sam couched the shift in his iden- 8
 tity from someone who was negative and full of worry in the past to some- 9
 one who is optimistic and grateful presently. Brian used resources in the 10
 APPRAISAL system and comparative clause structures to construct multiple 11
 identities across social contexts including the contexts of his family life and his 12
 local support group. Therefore, tools grounded in SFL theory offer a means to 13
 investigate expression of meaning relative to the stuttering experience includ- 14
 ing construction of identity. This differs greatly from other linguistic analy- 15
 ses that have been conducted up to this point, which have served to analyse 16
 the phonological and syntactic characteristics of speech behaviours associated 17
 with stuttering. 18

Implications 19

The findings of Matthiessen (2013) demonstrated the utility of SFL in the 20
 investigation of the social workings involved in the healthcare setting by 21
 uncovering how patients and medical professionals linguistically constructed 22
 their social roles in a hospital. In the same vein, the results of the current study 23
 have implications for using SFL-based tools in the exploration of interactions 24
 and linguistic construction of roles in the speech therapy clinic. SFL can also 25
 be used to gain insight on the attitudinal aspects of stuttering (Bennett, 2006) 26
 such as self-concept and views of self as a communicator that are brought 27
 to life by the PWS's use of language. While asking 'who are you?' is a simple 28
 means for getting a PWS to express their identity (Daniels & Gabel, 2004), 29
 SFL-based tools offer a systematic means for investigating the details of PWS's 30
 responses to that question. The linguistic choices made within PWS's narra- 31
 tives are expressions of their inner worlds. SFL-based analytic tools can be used 32
 by clinical researchers to explore how PWS position themselves vis-à-vis their 33
 stuttering. By looking at the systems of APPRAISAL and TRANSITIVITY, 34
 clinical researchers can learn how PWS and stuttering interact in the world, 35
 and how this affects the PWS's mental and emotional life. Investigating the use 36
 of agency can provide insight on the degree of control a PWS feels he/she has 37
 over his/her stuttering. Such investigations on the roles and meanings ther- 38
 apists and clients convey through language use during therapy sessions can 39
 inform speech therapy intervention in the future (Matthiessen, 2013). 40

1 As described by Shenker (2013), treating stuttering exclusively in one of
 2 the bilingual client's languages is usually the only available option for mono-
 3 lingual clinicians. Though learning fluency skills in one language is likely to
 4 induce spontaneous improvement in the untreated language (Shenker, 2013),
 5 the same cannot be said for the emotional and attitudinal components of stut-
 6 tering since they are grounded in each of the client's languages. This is of con-
 7 cern given that bilinguals experience particular events in each language and,
 8 as a result, form language-specific memories, perceptions, identities and nar-
 9 ratives. Thus, while the clinician may be linguistically limited from treating a
 10 bilingual PWS in both of their languages, they can still explore the client's lan-
 11 guage-based experiences and perceptions which will serve as a more holistic
 12 approach to stuttering therapy for bilingual clientele. Findings from the cur-
 13 rent study have shown how SFL-based tools can be used to facilitate explora-
 14 tion of the multiple identities and perceptions held by bilingual PWS.

15 Funding


16 This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the
 17 public, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

18 References

- 19 Ardila, A., Ramos, E., & Barrocas, R. (2011). Patterns of stuttering in a Spanish/English
 20 bilingual: A case report. *Clinical Linguistics & Phonetics*, 25(1), 23–36.
- 21 Bennett, E. M. (2006). The ABCs of stuttering. In B. Guitar (Ed.), *Stuttering: An Integrated*
 22 *Approach to Its Nature and Treatment* (pp. 22–55). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- 23 Blood, G. W., Blood, I. M., Tellis, G. M., & Gabel, R. M. (2003). A preliminary study of self-
 24 esteem, stigma, and disclosure in adolescents who stutter. *Journal of Fluency Disorders*,
 25 28(2), 143–59.
- 26 Brassel, S., Kenny, B., Power, E., Elbourn, E., McDonald, S., Tate, R., MacWhinney, B.,
 27 Turkstra, L., Holland, A., & Togher, L. (2016). Conversational topics discussed by indi-
 28 viduals with severe traumatic brain injury and their communication partners during
 29 sub-acute recovery. *Brain Injury*, 30(11), 1329–42.
- 30 Brumfitt, S. (1993). Losing your sense of self: What aphasia can do. *Aphasiology*, 7(6),
 31 569–75.
- 32 Bryson-Campbell, M., Shaw, L., O'Brien, J., Holmes, J., & Magalhaes, L. (2013). A scoping
 33 review on occupational and self identity after a brain injury. *Work*, 44(1), 57–67.
- 34 Caddell, L. S., & Clare, L. (2010). The impact of dementia on self and identity: A systematic
 35 review. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 30(1), 113–26.
- 36 Carroll, E., & Coetzer, R. (2011). Identity, grief and self-awareness after traumatic brain
 37 injury. *Neuropsychological Rehabilitation*, 21(3), 289–305.



- Coalson, G. A., Peña, E. D., & Byrd, C. T. (2013). Description of multilingual participants who stutter. *Journal of Fluency Disorders*, 38(2), 141–56. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jfludis.2013.02.008>
- Cohen-Mansfield, J., Golander, H., & Arnheim, G. (2000). Self-identity in older persons suffering from dementia: Preliminary results. *Social Science & Medicine*, 51(3), 381–94.
- 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, 259–74.
- Daniels, D. E., & Gabel, R. M. (2004). The impact of stuttering on identity construction. *Topics in Language Disorders*, 24(3), 200–15.
- Daniels, D. E., Hagstrom, F., & Gabel, R. M. (2006). A qualitative study of how African American men who stutter attribute meaning to identity and life choices. *Journal of Fluency Disorders*, 31(3), 200–15.
- Danzak, R. L., & Silliman, E. R. (2005). Does my identity speak English? A pragmatic approach to the social world of an English language learner with language impairment. *Seminars in Speech and Language*, 26(3), 189–200.
- Dickson, S., Barbour, R. S., Brady, M., Clark, A. M., & Paton, G. (2008). Patients' experiences of disruptions associated with post-stroke dysarthria. *International Journal of Language & Communication Disorders*, 43(2), 135–53.
- Douglas, J. M. (2013). Conceptualizing self and maintaining social connection following severe traumatic brain injury. *Brain Injury*, 27(1), 60–74.
- Dunn, A. L., & Fox Tree, J. E. (2009). A quick, gradient Bilingual Dominance Scale. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 12, 273–89.
- Eggs, S., & Slade, D. (1997). *Analyzing casual conversation*. Washington, DC: Cassell.
- Ervin, S. (1964). Language and TAT content in bilinguals. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 68, 500.
- Fontaine, L. (2013). *Language as social semiotic in Halliday's systemic functional linguistics*. Retrieved 1 July 2014, from <http://semioticon.com/semiotix/2012/03/language-as-social-semiotic-in-hallidays-systemic-functional-linguistics>
- Gkalitsiou, Z., Byrd, C. T., Bedore, L. M., & Taliancich-Klinger, C. L. (2017). Stuttering on function words in bilingual children who stutter: A preliminary study. *Clinical Linguistics & Phonetics*, 31(10), 791–805.
- Granese, A. M. (2014). *The linguistic construction of the bilingual stuttering experience* (Order No. 3687683). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses A&I; ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global; Social Science Premium Collection. (1669973326). Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.fiu.edu/login?url=https://search.proquest.com/docview/1669973326?accountid=10901>
- Grosjean, F. (2012). *Bilingual: Life and reality* (repr. ed.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard.
- Guendouzi, J., & Williams, M. J. (2010). Positioning identity in clinical interviews with people who stutter. *Communication & Medicine*, 20, 119–29.
- Hagstrom, F., & Daniels, D. E. (2004). Social identity and the stuttering experience. *Contemporary Issues in Communication Sciences and Disorders*, 31, 215–24.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. I. (2004). *An introduction to functional grammar*. New York: Hodder Arnold.

- 1 Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. (2013). *Halliday's introduction to functional gram-*
 2 *mar*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- 3 Harré, R. (2004). Positioning theory. *Self Care, Dependent Care & Nursing: The Official Jour-*
 4 *nal of the International Orem Society*, 16(1), 28–32.
- 5 Hinkley, J. J. (2006). Finding messages in bottles: Living successfully with stroke and apha-
- 6 *sia. Topics in Stroke Rehabilitation*, 13(1), 25–36.
- 7 Horton, S. (2007). Topic generation in aphasia language therapy sessions: Issues of identity.
 8 *Aphasiology*, 21(3–4), 283–98.
- 9 Howell, P., & Au-Yeung, J. (2007). Phonetic complexity and stuttering in Spanish. *Clinical*
 10 *Linguistics & Phonetics*, 21(2), 111–27.
- 11 Hughes, J., Louw, S., & Sabat, S. R. (2005). **Dementia: Mind, meaning, and the person.**
- 12 Jayaram, M. (1983). Phonetic influences on stuttering in monolingual and bilingual st
 13 *ters. Journal of Communication Disorders*, 16(4), 287–97. 
- 14 Jayaram, M. (1984). Distribution of stuttering in sentences: Relationship to sentence length
 15 and clause position. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 27(3), 338–41.
- 16 Kanno, Y. (2000). Bilingualism and identity: The stories of Japanese returnees. *International*
 17 *Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 3(1), 1–18.
- 18 Kathard, H. (2001). Sharing stories: Life history narratives in stuttering research. *Interna-*
 19 *tional Journal of Language & Communication Disorders*, 36(sup1), 52–7.
- 20 Kathard, H. (2006). On becoming someone: Self-identity as able. *Advances in Speech Lan-*
 21 *guage Pathology*, 8(2), 79–91.
- 22 Kathard, H., Norman, V., & Pillay, M. (2010). Configurations of self-identity formations of
 23 adults who stutter. *South African Journal of Communication Disorders*, 57(1), 51.
- 24 Keegan, L. C., Togher, L., Murdock, M., & Hendry, E. (2017). Expression of masculine iden-
- 25 *tity in individuals with a traumatic brain injury. Brain Injury*, 31(12), 1632–41.
- 26 Klompas, M., & Ross, E. (2004). Life experiences of people who stutter, and the perceived
 27 impact of stuttering on quality of life: Personal accounts of South African individuals.
 28 *Journal of Fluency Disorders*, 29(4), 275–305.
- 29 Levack, W. M., Kayes, N. M., & Fadyl, J. K. (2010). Experience of recovery and outcome
 30 following traumatic brain injury: A metasynthesis of qualitative research. *Disability and*
 31 *Rehabilitation*, 32(12), 986–99.
- 32 Li, P., Sepanski, S., & Zhao, X. (2006). Language history questionnaire: A Web-based inter-
- 33 *face for bilingual research. Behavior Research Methods*, 38(2), 202–10.
- 34 Marian, V., Blumenfeld, H. K., & Kaushanskaya, M. (2007). The Language Experience and
 35 Proficiency Questionnaire (LEAP-Q): Assessing language profiles in bilinguals and mul-
- 36 *tilinguals. Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 50, 940–67.
- 37 Martin, J. R. & Rose, D. (2003). *Working with discourse: Meaning beyond the clause*. London/
 38 *New York: Continuum.*
- 39 Matthiessen, C. (2012). Systemic functional linguistics as applicable linguistics: Social
 40 accountability and critical approaches. *D.E.L.T.A.*, 28(Especial), 435–71.
- 41 Matthiessen, C. M. (2013). Applying systemic functional linguistics in healthcare contexts.
 42 *Text & Talk*, 33(4–5), 437–66.

- McIlroy, G., & Storbeck, C. (2011). Development of deaf identity: An ethnographic study. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*, 16(4), 494–511. 1
2
- Mills, J. (2001). Being bilingual: Perspectives of third generation Asian children on language, culture and identity. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 4(6), 383–402. 3
4
5
- Müller, N. (2006). *Multilayered transcription*. San Diego: Plural Publishing. 6
- Musser, B., Wilkinson, J., Gilbert, T., & Bokhour, B. G. (2015). Changes in identity after aphasic stroke: Implications for primary care. *International Journal of Family Medicine*, 2015. 7
8
9
- Nwokah, E. E. (1988). The imbalance of stuttering behavior in bilingual speakers. *Journal of Fluency Disorders*, 13(5), 357–73. 10
11
- Ownsworth, T. (2014). *Self-identity after brain injury*. Abingdon, UK: Psychology Press. 12
- Riley, G. D. (2009). *Stuttering severity instrument*. 4th ed. Austin, TX: PRO-ED. 13
- Sarbin, T. R. (1997). The poetics of identity. *Theory & Psychology*, 7(1), 67–82. 14
- Shadden, B. (2005). Aphasia as identity theft: Theory and practice. *Aphasiology*, 19(3–5), 211–23. 15
16
- Shadden, B. B., & Agan, J. P. (2004). Renegotiation of identity: The social context of aphasia support groups. *Topics in Language Disorders*, 24(3), 174–86. 17
18
- Shavelson, R. J., & Bolus, R. (1982). Self concept: The interplay of theory and methods. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 74(1), 3. 19
20
- Shenker, R. C. (2013). Bilingual myth-busters series. When young children who stutter are also bilingual: Some thoughts about assessment and treatment. *Perspectives on Communication Disorders and Sciences in Culturally and Linguistically Diverse (CLD) Populations*, 20(1), 15–23. 21
22
23
24
- Simmons-Mackie, N., & Damico, J. S. (2008). Exposed and embedded corrections in aphasia therapy: Issues of voice and identity. *International Journal of Language & Communication Disorders*, 43(sup1), 5–17. 25
26
27
- Simmons-Mackie, N., & Elman, R. J. (2015). Negotiation of identity in group therapy for aphasia: The Aphasia Café. *International Journal of Language & Communication Disorders*, 1–12. 28
29
30
- Stuttering Foundation (2019). Frequently asked questions. Retrieved 22 July 2019 from <http://www.stutteringhelp.org/faq> 31
32
- 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. 33
34
- Togher, L. (2001). Discourse sampling in the 21st century. *Journal of Communication Disorders*, 34(1–2), 131–50. 35
36
- Yaruss, J. S. & Quesal, R. (2010). *Overall Assessment of the Speaker's Experience of Stuttering*. London: NCS Pearson, Inc. 37
38

Excerpt 2

line 598 (researcher)	but you were saying earlier that was part of who you are you're somebody who stutters and you're –
line 599	yeah but that's my only option
Exp:	Relat (int)
Appraisal:	Grad (max)
line 600	It wasn't something that I wanted
Exp:	NEG Relat (int) Mental (des)
Modality:	NEG Inclination
Appraisal:	NEG Appre (+)
line 601	if you ask me if uh – if if I was born again
Exp:	Circ Verbal Circ Material Circ
Modality:	Probability
line 602	and I have the option of stuttering or not
Exp:	Relat (pos) Behavioural NEG
line 603	I would say no- I wouldn't stutter
Exp:	Verbal (proj) Behavioural
Modality:	Probability NEG Usuality
line 604	but it's the only option I have you know to be proud of something
Exp:	Realt (int) Relat (pos) Relat (int) Circ
Appraisal:	Grad (max) Affect (+)

Excerpt 3

line 608	you know	like	being	gay	I	don't	know	
<i>Exp:</i>			Relat (int)			NEG	Mental (cog)	
<i>Appraisal:</i>			Appreciation (neu)				Grad (down)	
line 609	ok	gay-	ok	so	I'm	proud		
<i>Exp:</i>				Circ	Relat (int)			
<i>Appraisal:</i>						Affect (+)		
line 610	because	if	not	if	you	are	not	proud
<i>Exp:</i>	Circ	Circ	NEG	Circ		Relat (int)	NEG	
<i>Modality:</i>		Probability		Probability				
<i>Appraisal:</i>							NEG	Affect (+)
	eh	what	do	you	have			
<i>Exp:</i>					Relat (pos)			
line 611	like	gay	people-	I	don't	know		
<i>Exp:</i>				NEG		Mental (cog)		
<i>Appraisal:</i>		Appreciation (neu)						

Sam

Excerpt 4

line 323	at this point in time I'm happy I had	Relat (int)	Relat (pos)
<i>Exp:</i>	Circ		
<i>Appraisal:</i>		Affect (+)	
line 324	my stutter in the first place		
<i>Exp:</i>	Circ		
line 325	just because I had the opportunity to work through it	Relat (pos)	Material
<i>Exp:</i>	Grad (down)	Appre (+)	
<i>Appraisal:</i>			
line 326	and succeed through it		
<i>Exp:</i>	Material		
<i>Appraisal:</i>	Appre (+)		
line 327	and um it shows that you know if I put my mind to something		Material
<i>Exp:</i>	Material		
<i>Modality:</i>		Probability	
line 328	and work hard at it		
<i>Exp:</i>	Material		
<i>Appraisal:</i>	Grad (up)		
line 329	I can succeed	Material	
<i>Exp:</i>	Potential		
<i>Modality</i>			
<i>Appraisal:</i>	Appre (+)		

Excerpt 5

line 330	and	you know	some	people	would	nnn	consider	it	
<i>Exp:</i>									Relat (int)
<i>Modality:</i>					Probability				
<i>Appraisal:</i>			Grad (down)						
line 331	a handicap	but	um	I	personally	don't			
<i>Appraisal:</i>	Judg (-)				Grad (down)	Judg (+)			
line 332	but I	view	it	more as	an opportunity	to succeed	at something		
<i>Exp:</i>		Mental (cog proj)							Material
<i>Appraisal:</i>				Grad (up)		Appre (+)			
line 333	something else	that	I	can	succeed	at			
<i>Exp:</i>									Material
<i>Modality:</i>				Potential					
line 334	that	somebody	else	wouldn't	have	the opportunity	to		
<i>Exp:</i>					Relat (pos)				
<i>Modality:</i>				NEG Probability					
<i>Appraisal:</i>						Appre (+)			
line 335	but	that's	me	right	now	but	in	most	of my past
<i>Exp:</i>		Relat (int)		Circ					Circ
<i>Appraisal:</i>									Grad (up)
line 336	it's	been	something that	is	a challenge	for	me		
<i>Exp:</i>		Relat (in)							
<i>Modality:</i>		Usuality							
<i>Appraisal:</i>						Appre (-)			

Excerpt 6

line 337	and I always thought you know	
Exp:		M (cog proj)
Modality:	Usuality	
Appraisal:	Grad (max)	
line 338	in the future it would go away somehow	
Exp:	Circ	Material
Modality:	Probability	Probability
line 339	or gradually go since you know so many people	
Exp:	Material	
Appraisal:	Grad (down)	Grad (up)
line 340	they have stuttering when they were younger	
Exp:	Relat (pos)	Relat (int)
line 341	but it goes away	
Exp:	Material	
line 342	so I thought I would be like that	
Exp:	Mental (cog proj)	Relat (int)
Modality:	Probability	Probability
line 343	once in my teen years I realized you know that wasn't happening	
Exp:	Circ	Mental (cog proj) NEG Material
line 344	and it was uh worrisome for a little bit a while	
Exp:	Relat (int)	
Modality:		Usuality
Appraisal:	Appre (-)	Grad (down) Grad (up)

Brian

Excerpt 7

line 803	but	uh ah	I'm	pretty	much	a	survivor	fighter	or	
<i>Exp:</i>			Relat (int)							
<i>Appraisal:</i>			Grad (down)				Appre (+)	Grad (up)	Appre (+)	
line 804	and	you know	nobody	is	say	the master				
<i>Exp:</i>			Grad (max)	Relat (int)						
<i>Appraisal:</i>										
	of	their	own	fate	all	the way				
<i>Appraisal:</i>							Grad (down)			
line 805	I	mean	God	is	there	that	is	what	I	believe
<i>Exp:</i>				Existential			Relat (int)			Mental (cog)
line 806	however	I	am-	I	will	keep	swinging	as long as		
<i>Exp:</i>							Material			
<i>Modality:</i>					Probability					
<i>Appraisal:</i>							Grad (up)	Grad (up)		
	I	can	still	swing	but ah	anyway				
<i>Exp:</i>				Material						
<i>Modality:</i>		Potential								

Excerpt 8

line 532	he	meant	the	world	to me
<i>Exp:</i>		Relat (int)		Circ	
<i>Appraisal:</i>			Grad (up)		
<i>Appraisal:</i>			Appre (+)		
line 533	same	time	prostitutes, alcohol, drugs		
<i>Exp:</i>	Circ				
line 534	he	did	not	function	but he was not a stutterer
<i>Exp:</i>			NEG	Material	Relat (int) NEG
<i>Appraisal:</i>			Judg (-)		
	so	I	give	him	that
<i>Exp:</i>			Material		
<i>Appraisal:</i>				Appre (+)	
line 535 (researcher)	he	was	not?		
line 536	he	was	not	so	I give him that
<i>Exp:</i>		Relat (int)	NEG		Material
<i>Appraisal:</i>					Appre (+)

Excerpt 9

line 99	but	I've	seen some people	in some	of the	groups	over	there
Exp:			Mental (per)					Circ
Modality:		Usuality						
Appraisal:			Grad (down)	Grad (down)				
line 100	that	are	kind of	sullen	or kind of –	what	is	the word
Exp:			Relat (int)				Relat (int)	
Appraisal:			Soften	Appre (-)	Soften			Appre (-)

Excerpt 10

line 232	but but	however	the	majority	of	people	in	there
Exp:								Circ
Appraisal:				Grad (up)				
	have	very	low	self-esteem	I	think		
Exp:	Relat (pos)					Mental (cog)		
Modality:						Probability		
Appraisal:		Grad (up)	Judg (-)					
line 233	and but	see	I	really	feel	good	about	myself
Exp:								
Modality:						Mental (per)		
Appraisal:					Probability			
						Affect (+)		
line 234	I	think	that	I'm	better	than	most	people
Exp:								
Modality:						Mental (cog)		
Appraisal:						Probability		
						Relat (int)		
							Grad (up)/Appre (+)	Grad (up)