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SPONSORS
Dear colleagues,

We're delighted to welcome you to Newcastle University for the second Discourse-Pragmatic Variation & Change-conference.

DiPVaC2 provides a platform for the presentation of cutting-edge research into variation and change in the use of items and constructions often referred to as discourse markers or pragmatic particles whose primary functions are interpersonal and textual (e.g. well, like, you know, comme, alors, doch, zwar, diciamo, dakedo). It also provides a forum for the formation of new international and multidisciplinary research networks exploring the theoretical and social importance of quantitative research into discourse-pragmatic variation and change. The conference will bring together participants from across the world to achieve multiple aims:

- to discuss methodological, empirical and theoretical advancements in the analysis of variation and change in the use of discourse-pragmatic features;
- to examine the social implications and applications of research into the use of these features;
- to promote the field of discourse variation analysis within and beyond linguistics.

We hope that you enjoy your stay in Newcastle, and wish you a fruitful and productive conference.

Our warmest wishes,

(on behalf of the DiPVaC organizing committee)
PRACTICAL INFORMATION

CASH MACHINE: A cash machine can be found near the main pedestrian access to the Newcastle University campus (Campus Coffee building), i.e., as you approach the campus from Haymarket Station/Northumberland Street before you reach the steps.

INTERNET ACCESS: When you registered, you will have been given a name badge. On the back of your name badge, you will find a sticker with a password. Please use this password to log into the wireless network in the Research Beehive. In case you lose your name badge, please speak to one of the conference assistants who will be able to remind you of your password.

Instructions: Locate the wireless network newcastle-uni-guest on your wireless device; open your web browser; then enter your password. If you have problems, please ask one of our conference assistants for help.

IMPORTANT PHONE NUMBERS: You can always ask at the Beehive reception to call a taxi or emergency vehicle for you. Alternatively, you may wish to call the numbers listed below:
- Taxis: 0191 262 6666, 0191 262 7121, 0191 262 5610
- Emergencies: 999
- Beehive Reception: 0191 222 3401

GETTING AROUND NEWCASTLE: Newcastle is pretty compact; your hotel is likely to be within walking distance from Newcastle University campus and the conference dinner venue as well as the main shopping and restaurant areas in the city. Alternatively, Newcastle has a very reliable Metro system and frequent bus services. For all local public transport enquiries, call 0871 200 22 33, or visit the following website:

GETTING TO BLACKFRIARS, THE CONFERENCE DINNER VENUE: Blackfriars Restaurant (Friars Street, NE1 4XN) is located in the heart of the city centre, within easy walking distance from Newcastle University campus and most city centre hotels.
If you go to the restaurant from Newcastle University campus, exit the campus via the main pedestrian access to campus (Campus Coffee corner), turn right and follow Percy Street all the way till you reach The Gate, Newcastle’s premier leisure and entertainment centre. Walk past The Gate, take the first right into Low Friar Street and the second right into Monk Street, and a few yards past (yes, sorry) the Newcastle Wine School. Estimated walking time: 15-20 minutes.
If you go to the restaurant from Central Station, exit Central station and turn left into Neville Street. Cross the road and turn right into Clayton Street West. Then take the 3rd left into Fenkle Street and the 2nd right into Friar Street. Follow Friar Street round the bend until you reach the restaurant. Estimated walking time: 5-10 minutes.

THINGS TO DO ON NEWCASTLE UNIVERSITY CAMPUS

COFFEE, SNACKS: There is a cafeteria called Courtyard located on the ground floor of the Old Library Building, basically right below the Research Beehive. It serves the basic ingredients for a stressful day: all things coffee and sugar but also cooked breakfast, hot lunch and sandwiches. Note that the Courtyard closes mid-afternoon.

DRINKS: Your best choice to get a drink on campus is Northern Stage which is on your left immediately after the arches as you walk back from the Research Beehive to the main
pedestrian access to the campus. It also serves cold and hot food throughout the day. If you just go a few yards further, down the steps, turning right at Campus Coffee, you’ll find a more traditional (atmospheric?) British pub called Crows Nest on your right.

**MUSEUMS/PARK**: If you want to escape linguistics for a little while, you may want to visit the Hatton Gallery or the Hancock Museum. Or you may want to go for a stroll in Leazes Park (about 5 minutes from campus). Our conference assistants will provide directions on request.

**SUPERMARKET/PHARMACY**: There is a big Marks & Spencer supermarket located just a few yards from Haymarket Station. Also, at the top end of Northumberland (i.e. the end closest to Newcastle University), there is a Boots pharmacy.

---

**RESTAURANTS IN NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE**

If you are looking for a nice place to eat, the best thing to do is to check out this website: http://www.newcastlegateshead.com/food-and-drink. Alternatively, here’s a selection of some of our favourites.

**Traditional British pub food at its best**

Broad Chare restaurant, 25 Broad Chare, Newcastle upon Tyne NE1 3DQ (Tel: 0191 211 2144), [http://www.thebroadchare.co.uk/](http://www.thebroadchare.co.uk/)

**Italian/Sardinian food (low budget)**

Pani’s Café, 61-65 High Bridge, Newcastle Upon Tyne NE1 6BX (Tel: 0191 2324366), [http://www.paniscafe.co.uk/](http://www.paniscafe.co.uk/)

Strada, Intu Eldon Square, Blackett Street, Newcastle NE1 7JG (Tel: 0191 261 6070), [http://www.strada.co.uk/italian-restaurant/newcastle](http://www.strada.co.uk/italian-restaurant/newcastle)

**Thai food**

The Old Siam restaurant, 1-3 Side, Newcastle upon Tyne NE1 3JE (Tel: 0191 261 5590), [http://theoldsiam.co.uk/newcastle.html](http://theoldsiam.co.uk/newcastle.html)

**Deli-style (closed in the evenings)**

Olive & Bean, 17-19 Clayton St, Newcastle upon Tyne NE1 5PN (Tel: 0191 233 0990), [http://www.oliveandbean.co.uk/](http://www.oliveandbean.co.uk/)

**For the gourmets (with a very decent income)**

Café 21, Pandon, Newcastle upon Tyne NE1 2HH (Tel: 0191 222 0755), [http://www.cafetwentvone.co.uk/](http://www.cafetwentvone.co.uk/)

Jesmond Dene House, Jesmond Dene Road, Newcastle Upon Tyne NE2 2EY (Tel: 0191 212 3000), [http://www.jesmonddenehouse.co.uk/](http://www.jesmonddenehouse.co.uk/)

---

**A FEW TRIED-AND-TESTED PUBS & COCKTAIL BARS**

Broad Chare, 25 Broad Chare, Newcastle upon Tyne NE1 3DQ (Tel: 0191 211 2144), [http://www.thebroadchare.co.uk/](http://www.thebroadchare.co.uk/)

Crown Possada, 31 Side, Newcastle upon Tyne NE1 3JE (Tel: 0191 232 1269), [http://www.crownposadanewcastle.co.uk/](http://www.crownposadanewcastle.co.uk/)

Popolo, 82-84 Pilgrim Street, Newcastle upon Tyne NE1 6SG (Tel: 0191 232 8923), [http://www.popolo.co.uk](http://www.popolo.co.uk)
Variation in discourse marker use: Position matters!

Liesbeth Degand, University of Louvain
liesbeth.degand@uclouvain.be

Discourse markers have been described as typically occurring in utterance-initial position, also described as left-peripheral position. But more recently, discourse markers occurring at utterance-final, or right-peripheral position have attracted quite some researchers' attention too (for an overview, Degand forthc.). In this context, I would like to raise the question whether we find differentiated paradigms in these two key positions, or whether the semantic and pragmatic distribution of a given discourse marker remains stable whatever its position in the utterance. Beeching and Detges (forthc.) propose that the left periphery is the locus of subjective meanings, and that the right periphery favours intersubjective meanings. This hypothesis has been empirically tested for specific discourse markers, but was only partially confirmed (e.g. Degand forthc., Traugott 2012).

In this presentation, I will focus on the peripheral distribution of all DMs extracted from the LOCAS-F corpus, a multi-genre corpus of spoken French segmented into “basic discourse units” and annotated with syntactic and prosodic functions (Degand et al. forthc.) in order to further explore the peripheral paradigm hypothesis.

References
Degand, L. (forthc.). 'So very fast very fast then' Discourse markers at left and right periphery in spoken French. In Beeching, Kate and Ulrich Detges, eds. Forthcoming. The Role of the Left and Right Periphery in Semantic Change. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
The acquisition of variation and change in the quotative system: A preadolescent perspective
Stephen Levey, University of Ottawa
slevey@uottawa.ca

Interest in how children acquire and use sociolinguistic variables has been galvanized by increasing recognition that children are not merely passive acquirers of community speech varieties, but active participants in local linguistic norms (Roberts 2002, 2005). In learning these norms, children acquire stable patterns of variation, as well as those engaged in innovation, raising important questions about the role of children in the ‘logistic incrementation’ of language change (Labov 2007). To the extent that these questions have been addressed in the sociolinguistic literature, previous research has predominantly concentrated on children’s acquisition of phonological variation (Labov 1989, Roberts 1997), resulting in a dearth of information about their acquisition of other variable features.

In this talk, I shift the focus away from phonological variation to patterns of discourse-pragmatic variation and change. Exemplifying with a study of the quotative system, widely recognized to be the locus of rapid language change (Ferrara and Bell 1995; Tagliamonte and D’Arcy 2007), I adopt a developmental perspective to track the acquisition of quotatives by Canadian children in the four to twelve-year-old age range. Systematic comparisons with adult quotative usage, supplemented by apparent- and real-time perspectives on the Canadian quotative system, enable children’s role in sustaining discourse-pragmatic variation and change to be empirically characterized using an accountable quantitative methodology. Among the key findings of the investigation are the lability of sex effects associated with variant choice in preadolescence, as well as evidence of young children’s participation in advanced trajectories of change. Taken together, the results indicate that fine-grained examination of children’s usage can yield fresh insights into their contribution to advancing discourse-pragmatic change.

References
Obsolescence and innovation in discourse-pragmatic change:  
The view from Canada  
Sali A. Tagliamonte, University of Toronto  
sali.tagliamonte@utoronto.ca

Research on discourse-pragmatic features has typically focused on their textual and interpersonal functions (e.g. Aijmer, 2002; Jucker & Ziv, 1996; Schiffrin, 1987); however, considerable research has established that they also carry social meaning such as speaker age, sex, social class and education (e.g. Denis & Tagliamonte, to appear; Dubois, 1992; Pichler, 2009; Pichler & Levey, 2011). My research on socially stratified corpora of spoken Canadian dialects is beginning to map the nature of these combinatorial factors. I began by focusing on right periphery items and constructions (Tagliamonte, 2006), including phenomena such as general extenders (Tagliamonte & Denis, 2010) and utterance final particles (Denis & Tagliamonte, to appear). These analyses have revealed dramatic patterns of obsolescence and innovation across the 20th and into the 21st century. Further, a contrast between major varieties of English as well as urban vs. rural dialects has emerged exposing variegated developmental patterns and therefore new insights into mechanisms of discourse pragmatic change (Tagliamonte, to appear; Tagliamonte & Denis, 2010).

In this presentation, I extend this research program to consider forms on the left periphery, including well, (1), so, (2), like (3) and others, e.g. oh, ah, I mean, anyway etc.

(1) **Well**, some of the girls, their home was in North Bay. (KL, F, 89)
(2) **So**, we lost our stripes, we lost a mickey. (NB, M, 89)
(3) **Like**, you don’t find this stuff in Canada. (SP, F, 16)
(4) **Oh** it was alright. I was cabin-girl. (TS, F, 93)
(5) **Ah**, he didn’t take that lightly. (KL, M, 20)

Preliminary analyses suggest that this area of the language is also undergoing substantial reorganization. For example, well and oh tend to be an older person’s usage, while like, increases among youth, particularly women. In contrast, the most frequent form, so, seems to operate outside social evaluation and is used across the age span, at least in some locales.

The fact that both change and stability is evident in the data as well as varying social, interactional and other influences suggests that discourse-pragmatic variation offers multiplex insights into interaction, grammar and community. I will explore these tantalizing issues in my presentation.

References


Exploring novel impact pathways in variationist research:
Discourse-pragmatic variation in healthcare settings
Ashley Hesson, Michigan State University & Heike Pichler, Newcastle University
bartell6@msu.edu; heike.pichler@ncl.ac.uk

In this workshop, we address the societal relevance of discourse variation research, with a specific focus on healthcare settings. While medical interactions have been thoroughly explored from a qualitative perspective, quantitative variationist research in healthcare talk is relatively rare; even though such research has the potential to identify clinically significant, generalisable patterns in language use with implications for providers as well as patients. We demonstrate the value of applying variationist methods to physician-patient consultations by highlighting a context in which the interpretation of discourse-pragmatic features has diagnostic and therapeutic consequences. Our objective is to show that the cross-disciplinary study of institutionally framed talk can provide novel opportunities for researchers interested in discourse variation while generating meaningful insights for practitioners.

To this end, we present a systematic variationist analysis of the use of I DON’T KNOW in the Verilogue corpus, a large US-wide database of physician-patient interactions. Our analysis of I DON’T KNOW in child counselling sessions reveals that correct interpretation of the construction’s interactional meaning crucially depends on its phonetic and prosodic realization, its optional modification through interpolation, and its varying distribution in question-answer adjacency pair sequences. We contrast phonetically non-reduced tokens that carry primary stress on know, are modified with even or really, and are followed by an explanation for the declaration of insufficient knowledge with phonetically reduced and non-modified tokens that constitute the sole element of a turn. The later uses do not generally signal a lack of knowledge. Instead, these reduced/non-modified tokens tend to signal children’s attempts to decline or curtail a topic, thus signalling their resistance to answering unwelcome questions and discussing problematic topics. Counsellors’ awareness of and sensitivity to the differential use of I DON’T KNOW and other such stance indicators may impact their ability to develop rapport with patients and offer effective therapeutic interventions.

The presentation of our analysis is intended to initiate a discussion about novel impact pathways in variationist research. Whether it is in healthcare or other service-oriented fields, targeted analyses rooted in sociolinguistic theory have the potential to expand the audience for discourse variation research.
Variation in the use of general extenders in London adolescent speech
Gisle Andersen, NHH Norwegian School of Economics
gisle.andersen@nhh.no

This paper gives a comparative corpus-linguistic account of the use of general extenders (GEs) such as “you’re told how to dress and shit like that” in two corpora of London adolescent speech, the Bergen Corpus of London Teenage Language (Stenstrøm et al. 2002), recorded in 1993, and the Linguistic Innovators Corpus (Cheshire et al. 2008), recorded in 2005. GEs perform important discourse-pragmatic functions in conversation, such as indicating vague reference or approximation (Channel 1994; Erman 2001), expressing shared knowledge and intersubjectivity (O’Keeffe 2004) or contributing to politeness (Overstreet 1999; Erman 2001). To some degree, sociolinguistic patterns of use have been explored (Cheshire 2007; Levey 2007; Tagliamonte & Denis 2010; Palacios 2011).

GEs are a flexible, extendible and dynamic class in which new forms emerge and where substantial formal variability can be observed. The similarities in the age, geographical distribution and ethnicity of the speakers in the two corpora justifies a comparison with a view to detecting ongoing change in real time, as argued by earlier comparative studies using the same corpora in (Torgersen et al. 2011; Pichler & Torgersen 2012; Andersen 2012a, 2012b). A preliminary comparison shows that there are significant differences between the two corpora in terms of GE usage. For instance, there seems to be an increased preference for forms containing that (and that, and all that, and stuff like that), and the GE and all appears to be on the increase. In this study I will chart the inventory and frequency of general extenders in the two corpora, and the aim is both to identify notable patterns suggesting innovative use and possible ongoing changes in the system of general extenders.
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Discourse markers in university classroom discourse: 
discourse functions and disciplinary variation
Federica Barbieri, Swansea University
f.barbieri@swansea.ac.uk

While discourse markers (DMs) have been studied primarily in conversational contexts, there is a large body of research on DMs in classroom discourse. Motivated by the challenges faced by second language learners during lecture comprehension, these studies have typically focused on the textual functions of DMs and their role in signaling discourse structure and facilitating lecture comprehension (Chaudron & Richards, 1986; Flowerdew & Tauroza, 1995; Olsen & Hackin, 1990). Alternatively, recent large-scale corpus-based studies have investigated DMs in a wide range of academic speech events (e.g., office hours, tutorials, labs, defenses, lectures) (Poos & Simpson, 2002) or looked at the co-occurrence of DMs with other features as part of dimensions associated with particular communicative functions (Csomay, 2005). Consequently, little is known about the distribution of DMs across different discourse or textual functions and the relationship between different discourse functions and important situational factors.

Adopting corpus-based methods, the present study tackles this research gap by investigating a large set of DMs (well, just, okay, alright, oh, yeah, like, you know, I mean, I guess, kind of/sort of, so) in a large corpus (1.3 million words) of American university classroom discourse, comprising class sessions (N = 150) from five US universities, representing three major disciplinary domains: Humanities, Social Sciences, Natural Sciences. DMs were coded for discourse functions (discourse marker/filler, confirmation check, response token, minimal response) using an especially designed tagger. Reliability was measured with precision and recall.

Analyses reveal few statistically significant differences in the use of DMs across disciplinary domains. Overall, however, DMs are more frequent in the Humanities and Social Sciences. The findings also reveal the complex relationship between discourse function, disciplinary domain, and other key situational factors, such as interactivity or discourse mode (e.g., monologic discourse, interactive discourse). For example, confirmation check okay is particularly common in the Natural Sciences.
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Quotative innovation in Paris and London: j’`suis là “ah bon?”

Jenny Cheshire, QMUL, Penelope Gardner-Chloros, Birkbeck College London & Maria Secova, QMUL/Brickbeck College London

j.l.cheshire@qmul.ac.uk, p.gardner-chloros@bbk.ac.uk, m.secova@bbk.ac.uk

This paper examines parallels in the quotative use in two corpora of informal speech collected in Paris and London as part of the ‘Multicultural London English - Multicultural Paris French’ project. The French data exhibits some innovative tendencies similar to those found in other languages and varieties (for English, see Tagliamonte & D’Arcy 2007, Buchstaller & D’Arcy, 2009, Cheshire et al. 2011, Fox 2012; for Québec French, cf. Levey et al. 2013), but also some differences likely to be specific to European French. This article discusses the pragmatic functions that the emerging forms fulfil in various contexts, and examines the driving forces behind their development. The results of a multivariate analysis are discussed to shed light on possible grammaticalisation and change in the French quotative system.
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Discourse-pragmatic or semantic variation? Theoretical and methodological issues discussed in the light of a quantitative study of epistemic adverbials in Danish

Tanya Karoli Christensen, University of Copenhagen
tkaroli@hum.ku.dk

The principle of semantic equivalence embraced in variationist studies (Labov 1991 [1972] 188) poses theoretical and methodological problems for the sociolinguist who wants to study variation involving different lexical items (as found in many studies of discourse-pragmatic variation), since different forms are generally assumed to carry different meanings. Most of these problems still stand in spite of several years of discussions (ranging at least from Sankoff 1973, Lavandera 1978, Dines 1980, Romaine 1984). The most widespread solutions center around the functional or pragmatic (dis)similarities between variants (see, e.g., Pichler 2010, Terkourafi 2011), and this may resolve the methodological problem of comparability in two ways: 1) the same lexical item may vary across different pragmatic functions (formal equivalence), 2) several lexical items may share functional-pragmatic conditions of use (functional equivalence).

A question typically left unanswered, though, is the difference in meaning underlying either of these approaches (even the same lexical item typically has polysemous senses co-occurring with different linguistic and extra-linguistic factors, see, e.g. D’Arcy 2005). For this, and for other reasons, I find it indispensable to consider how semantic variation proper may enter the field of variationist studies in a methodologically and theoretically sound way (see also Hasan 2009).

On the basis of a quantitative study of epistemic adverbials in spoken Danish, I suggest a theory-neutral way of operationalising epistemicity as a semantic variable with the variants ‘uncertain’ (e.g. måske ‘maybe’, vist ‘apparently’) and ‘certain knowledge’ (e.g. bestemt ‘absolutely’, klart ‘clearly’). Mixed-effects modelling of my data show a highly significant interaction of informants’ age and time of recording, involving a shift in adolescents use of adverbials meaning ‘uncertain knowledge’ from the 80s to the 2000s (cf. Figure 1). My data thus support the notion that semantic variation can be socially significant.

Figure 1. Epistemic adverbials. Age:time-interaction

References


The intensifier system, as in (1), is a notorious site of ‘fevered invention’ (Bolinger 1972:18) and constant renewal (Brinton & Arnovik 2006). This renders it ideal for delving into the mechanisms that operate on variation and change, and variationist analyses of intensification are plentiful. With but one exception (Barnfield & Buchstaller 2010), this work is based in synchrony, yet recycling is a putatively longitudinal constant. The dearth of diachronic evidence thus creates a significant lacuna in our understanding of grammaticalization pathways and consequences of change within the system.

(1) a. They wore very pretty bonnets. (m, b.1877)
   b. That sounds really sexist, doesn’t it? (f, b.1954)

The Origins of New Zealand English Corpus (ONZE; Gordon et al. 2007) provides a rare opportunity to trace intensification over 150 years of speech (1851-1996), effectively doubling the perspective availed by synchronic snapshots. This paper therefore provides a critical extension to research on intensification, providing a longitudinal view of competition and development within the system. Are frenetic shifts typical of intensification, or are stability and developmental stasis the norm, only intermittently punctuated by bursts of change? What is the longitudinal impact of grammaticalization on the sector as a whole? Is the variable grammar mutable or do lexical shifts operate separately from the architecture of intensification?

Accountable variationist analysis of over 13,000 tokens reveals gradual, parallel patterns of ebb and flow. The longitudinal trajectory is one of general expansion (cf. Barnfield & Buchstaller 2010), but the contemporary situation consists of rapid and large-scale reorganization of forms, precisely as seen in previous research. Some reorganization is quantitative, but some is qualitative, involving changes in the configuration of the constraints on variation. The diachronic evidence provided by ONZE thus suggests that stability and of static development can persevere for quite some time, yet the inherent form/function asymmetry that characterizes the domain also supports periods of ‘fevered’ change.
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Recent variationist investigations of general extenders (GEs), have presented compelling counter-evidence to the idea that these pragmatic markers develop through grammaticalization. Tagliamonte and Denis (2010) (T&D) and Pichler and Levey (2011) (P&L) find a lack of evidence for ongoing grammaticalization in the GE system of two geographically-disparate speech communities through apparent-time. However, among incoming variants, they observe possible vestiges of grammaticalization that may have become arrested before the period covered by the apparent-time data (cf. Hopper and Traugott 1993:95). P&L (2011:464) plead for “a real-time component to increase the time-depth of data analysed” before making any firm conclusions.

In an effort to unravel the development of GEs, this paper examines an “appropriate real-time benchmark” (P&L 2011:462). The data come from the Corpus of Earlier Spoken Ontario English (CESOE), a collection of oral histories recorded between 1975–1984 with elderly residents in three Canadian speech communities. Speakers in this corpus were born between 1879–1920. Thus, this paper is able to expand the time depth of T&D’s investigation of GEs in Canadian English by several generations.

Following the methodology of T&D for maximum comparability, preliminary results show that the CESOE covers the period of time when GEs with stuff and thing generics, as in (1), entered Canadian English.

(1) I did Christmas platforms and all that kind of thing ... for one Christmas, I was tired of Santa-Claus pictures and all that stuff so I did one...

Tracking these forms from their inception suggests that although they may have phonetically reduced after entering the variable system, there is no evidence for any decategorialization or semantic-pragmatic expansion of these forms in real-time. Thus, consistent with T&D’s conclusion, the development of GEs is perhaps better understood as a process of lexical replacement, rather than grammaticalization.

References
‘I sound Irish when I use like!’
Acquisition of discourse-pragmatic markers by non-native speakers of Irish English
Chloe Diskin, University College Dublin
chloe.diskin@ucdconnect.ie

This paper takes a sociolinguistic approach to Second Language Acquisition (SLA) and examines the acquisition of discourse-pragmatic markers (DPMs) by recently-arrived migrants in the city of Dublin. It focuses on L1 speakers of Polish, Mandarin and Cantonese who came to Ireland during the Celtic Tiger or economic boom years and who are acquiring and using Irish English within naturalistic settings.

It has previously been shown in Canada that the fluency with which a non-native speaker (NNS) uses DPMs in the L2 is an indication of their level of integration into the speech community (Sankoff et al. 1997). It is predicted that similar phenomena may be occurring in Ireland.

DPMs in Irish English have to date received only limited attention within the literature and they have been understudied in general among NNS (Müller 2005). However, there has been discussion on the DPMs like, you know and I mean behaving idiosyncratically within Irish English, particularly in terms of like in clause-final position and the high frequency of you know (Kallen 2005, 2006). It has also been speculated that like as a DPM may have originated within Irish English (Amador-Moreno & McCafferty 2013). These DPMs therefore provide a fruitful context for the study of SLA and Irish English.

This paper presents results from a quantitative analysis of 50 sociolinguistic interviews conducted with both migrants and native speakers (NS) in 2012. It presents figures on the frequency, position and function of approximately 3,000 tokens of like, you know and I mean, as well as collocations such as like you know, you know like, you know what I mean etc. Using statistical tests, it will compare the patterns of use by the NS as compared to the NNS. It will show the effect of ethnicity, gender, L2 proficiency and length of residence on SLA. The results will be discussed in light of issues of migration, integration and language and identity.

References
Amador-Moreno C and McCafferty K. ‘Sure he has been talking about coming for the last year or two’: the Corpus of Irish English Correspondence and the use of discourse markers. Corpus Linguistics. Lancaster, UK. 22-26 July 2013.
This study focuses on a group of pragmatic markers that codify intentional vagueness which are derived from the Italian verb dire “to say” (e.g. dico “say.PRES.1SG”, diciamo “say-PRES.1PL”, direi “say-COND.1SG”, per così dire “as it were”). Within such repertoire of forms, it seems that the domain of use of diciamo has recently increased (Ghezzi 2013).

Speakers typically employ these expressions as meta-discourse comments to refer to their formulation work, to imply a less than literal resemblance between the uttered unit and a potential, more appropriate, alternative (Andersen 2001, Mihatsch 2010).

Their pragmatic functions have been studied for Italian (Hölker 2005, Bazzanella 1995) and range from approximation of lexemes (1) and categorizations (2), to pragmatic hedging of speech acts (3).

(1) Ognuno di noi è, diciamo, un albero.
   “Each of us is, let’s say, a tree”
(2) Diciamo quindi venti, quasi quasi vent’anni, insomma.
   “So let’s say twenty almost almost twenty years in short”
(3) La cravatta del Milan campione d'Italia mi darebbe un certo disturbo, diciamo.
   “The tie of Milan champion of Italy would give me a sort of annoyance, let’s say”

The position of markers, in the left or right periphery of speech acts, and their scope, are relevant in determining their functions. The analysis of their structural contexts of use sheds light on the preferences of speakers for one variable, e.g. diciamo vs other forms, but also on peculiar function-forms configurations that characterize groups of speakers. Moving from the analysis of an age-stratified corpus of listeners’ phone-ins to a talk radio, gathered in 1976 and in 2010, this study investigates (1) how formal and functional properties of markers (scope, position, function) interact, (2) how function-forms configurations are exploited by age-cohorts to reach their interactional ends, (3) how and if speakers’ preferences for specific forms have changed across time (from 1976 to 2010).

References


Hölker, Klaus (2005). “Diciamo come mitigatore”. In Hölker, Klaus e Maass, Christiane (a c. di), *Aspetti dell’italiano parlato*. Münster: LIT.

Managing intersubjective understanding in conversational interaction: Explicated inferences with *so* and *then*  
*Alexander Haselow, University of Rostock*  
alexander.haselow@uni-rostock.de

This paper discusses the results of a study on two major routine practices used by speakers of English for the negotiation of intersubjective understanding in real-time spoken interaction, namely the explication of inferences drawn from a prior speaker’s turn with initial *so* and final *then*, as illustrated in (1).

(1)  
a. A: but you say you began to feel better before you produced a plan (..)  
B: uhm to a certain extent yes  
A: OK  
so you’re saying the plan was irrelevant (.)  
B: well it helps to get some things down I find (..)  

b. B: my grandmother was really uhm helpful  
A: who was  
you told her all about it *then*  
B: yeah I did

The examples illustrate that the marking of an utterance as inference-based can vary in the sense that speakers can choose between initial marking with *so*, thus projecting the inferential character of an upcoming utterance, or final marking with *then*, which provides a retrospective cue to the interpretation of an utterance as representing an inference. However, the choice between one or the other strategy is far from random since the two markers differ in function: *so* is used for intersubjective inferences and thus for the explication of meanings that are regarded as intended by a prior speaker, but left unexpressed by him/her, final *then* marks subjective inferences, thus accompanying information that has not been necessarily communicated by the prior speaker, but is a subjective consequence drawn by the second speaker (see also Deppermann & Helmer 2013 for German). Thus, the two markers are used for different purposes in sequences of understanding checks.

The findings presented in this paper are based on the analysis of all occurrences of *so* and *then* as markers of inferential relations in transcripts of spontaneous dialogic interaction provided by the British component of the *International Corpus of English* (ICE-GB), following the principles of conversation analysis. The results of the study will be related to the different structural positions in which inferential *so* and *then* occur and be discussed with respect to the *asymmetry hypothesis*, which assumes an asymmetric view in terms of the type of information (e.g. subjective vs. intersubjective meanings) expressed in a clause or unit of talk (e.g. Degand & Fagard 2011; Traugott 2012; Detges & Waltereit forthc.). It will be shown that, in the case of marking inferences, the turn-initial slot is employed for marking intersubjectivity, indexing the speaker’s relation to the addressee’s viewpoint, whereas the final slot seems to host elements indicating subjectivity, marking a message as being based on the speaker’s subjective understanding of new information.
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Discourse marker “like” (DML) is known for its highly stigmatized social status (D’Arcy 2007). Previous work suggests that DML speech is judged as more friendly and less intelligent than controls (Dailey-O’Cain 2000). Though informative, such studies cannot speak to the magnitude/stability of DML’s effects nor potential interactions between said effects and individual processing styles. The current study measures online social valuations of DML, contributing an unprecedented level of detail to our understanding of discourse-pragmatic perception.

We conducted a matched-guise task wherein one instance of DML was digitally manipulated across guises. Participants (N=16) in two randomly-assigned groups heard 10 audio stimuli with varied selections of control v. DML clips, continuously rating the speaker on two social scales: “intelligence” and “friendliness”. These scales were arranged orthogonally on an electronic tablet, allowing for simultaneous rating. Participants also completed the Broader Autism Phenotype Questionnaire (BAPQ, Hurley et al 2007) as a measure of social interaction preferences/ cognitive flexibility.

Participants generally evaluated the speaker as friendly, increasing their ratings linearly with time ($R^2=0.31$). Surprisingly, DML did not improve friendliness scores (Fig1), regardless of participants’ social aptitude (i.e, BAPQ score). Individuals with high pragmatic language skills (a BAPQ sub-scale) actually downgraded friendliness ratings immediately post-DML, albeit transiently (Fig2).

Our results suggest that DML has a greater, more long-lasting effect on perceptions of intelligence than friendliness. Intelligence ratings increased sigmoidally over time for both conditions, but the DML condition’s slope decreased notably following DML, maintaining a significantly lower score than the control condition (Fig3). This statistically significant drop in intelligence ratings was especially pronounced for participants with high social aptitude (Fig4) and high pragmatic language skills, where these measures were demonstrably independent ($R^2=0.171$). Despite its small scale, this experiment demonstrates real-time differences in DML perception across social dimensions.
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Development of discourse-pragmatic markers in Modern Japanese:
A corpus-based study of daro(o) and desho(o)
Yuko Higashiizumi, Tokyo Gakugei University
nqd46130@nifty.com

Japanese has a rich variety of utterance-initial discourse-pragmatic markers consisting of the copula da (or its variant forms de and na) and a connecting particle such as dakara ‘because/so’, dakedo ‘although/but’, demo ‘but’, dewa ‘then’, nanode ‘because/so’, and nanoni ‘although/but’, etc. The interplay between their positional change in discourse and (inter)subjectification has attracted much attention in recent historical-pragmatic studies in Japanese (Onodera and Suzuki (eds) 2007; Onodera forthcoming and elsewhere). This study will investigate another type of discourse-pragmatic expression involving the copula, namely, daro(o)/desho(o), the plain and polite forms of the clause-final conjectural/modal auxiliary (Iwasaki 2013; McGloin 2002) as in (1) and (2). They appear in clause-initial or utterance-initial position as in (3), and stand alone as in (4) (Higashiizumi and Onodera 2013; Sugiura 2013), serving to express the speaker’s agreement to the preceding utterance.

(1) nande, bacckuappu ga dete kuru n daroo
why backup NOM pop up come NML daroo
‘why is the backup (file) popping out, I wonder’ [Hituzi D258]

(2) de kyoo wa kaji yaru n daro ↑
then today TOP housekeeping do NML daro
‘then, today (you are) doing housekeeping, aren’t you/right?’ [Hituzi D819]

(3) K: kanari kitsui ne. S: desho, nanka bakabakashii
pretty tough FP desho Kind.of stupid
‘pretty tough’ ‘Right? It’s kind of stupid’ [adapted from McGloin 2002: 143]

(4) Son: umai! Mother: desho
yummy desho
yummy!’ ‘right?/innit?’ [television advertising]

Developing from Higashiizumi and Onodera (2013), who compared the data from present-day conversation transcripts as in (1)–(4) and those from conversation segments in novels in the Taiyo Corpus (1895–1925) in order to observe the diachronic variation and change of daro(o)/desho(o) in conversation, this study will analyse the data from the Balanced Corpus of Contemporary Written Japanese (BCCWJ) (2001–2005) to compare the diachronic and synchronic variation and change in written Japanese.
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“It wasnae me but!” – Functions and emergence of Scottish right-peripheral *but*  
Carolin Hofmockel, University of Augsburg  
Carolin.hofmockel@phi.uni-augsburg.de

More recently, the right-periphery (RP) has started to attract significant attention in pragmatics (Beeching & Detges, in prep., Van der Wouden & Foolen 2011). A right-peripheral element typical among Scottish speakers, which has only received little scholarly attention despite being well-attested in dictionaries on Scottish English, is tone-group final particle *but* in spoken conversation.

Adopting an integrative approach that combines qualitative and quantitative methods, this paper aims to fulfil two major goals: firstly, the analysis of the discourse functions *but* fulfils in the RP; secondly, the deduction of a hypothesis that accounts for the move of the typically left-peripherally used particle to an utterance-final position.

A corpus analysis has revealed that *but* used in right-peripheral position exhibits the twofold pragmatic functions characteristic of a pragmatic marker (Brinton 1996): on the textual level, it marks contrasts, topic changes, turn changes, pops and repair, while on the interpersonal level, it is used as an indicator of intimacy, politeness and emphasis. Occurring only in highly informal conversation among speakers influenced by the Glaswegian dialect, Final *but* may also function as an indexical (Silverstein 2003) of the sociocultural background of a speaker. The distribution of *but* in the data at hand, featuring a frequent employment of *but* as both a turn-opening and turn-continuing device in the Scottish variety, furthermore suggests an underlying grammaticalization of the pragmatic marker (Hopper & Traugott 2003) which is promoted by frequency, metonymic inferencing and analogy, and follows the cline left-peripheral *but* \( \rightarrow \) turn-continuing *but* \( \rightarrow \) Final *but*.

The study thus indicates that in its shift from left to right periphery, *but* acquires a greater functional variability by adopting additional sociolinguistic functions, and hints at the importance of the right periphery in the sociolinguistic context.
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The emergence of new quotative markers in several languages has led to an increasing number of studies on the grammaticalization and diffusion of quotatives in monolingual (Cameron, 1998; Tagliamonte & D’Arcy, 2007) and bilingual communities (Levey et. al., 2013; Sánchez-Muñoz, 2007). The present investigation is a qualitative and quantitative analysis of the use of quotatives in the Spanish of Southern Arizona, based on a corpus of twenty-four sociolinguistic interviews of young male and female Spanish-English bilinguals. The quotatives in the present corpus were classified according to four strategies for directly quoting speech: 1) verbs of direct report, 2) discourse markers, 3) bare-noun phrases, and 4) freestanding quotations with no frame.

The most common strategies in the present corpus were verbs of direct report, discourse markers, and bare-noun phrases. Variation in the use of these strategies was analyzed according to content of the quote, grammatical person, and sex. The most commonly used verb of direct report ‘decir’ primarily introduced reported speech whereas the discourse marker ‘como’ mainly introduced internal speech and was used with the first person. Bare-noun phrases also were used mostly with the first person. Lastly, female bilinguals used quotatives more than male bilinguals.

These results reflect the findings of Cameron (1998) in the Spanish of Puerto Rico who concludes that verbs of direct report are the most frequent strategy for directly quoting speech, ‘decir’ is the most common verb of direct report, bare-noun phrases are used predominantly with the first person, and young women use quotatives more than young men. The present study contributes to our knowledge of Spanish in the United States and variation in quotative systems by expanding on Cameron’s (1998) study to explore the quotative system of the Spanish of the U.S. Southwest, and adding an analysis of quotative discourse markers and internal and reported speech.
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The grammaticalization and pragmatic functions of comment clauses have been studied widely (e.g., Brinton 2008, Kaltenböck 2008, Stenström 1995). According to Biber et al (1999: 982), comment clauses show considerable differences across varieties (American vs. British English) and registers (conversation vs. fiction). For instance, *I guess* seems to be nonexistent in British English conversation and *I suppose* is less frequent in American English conversation than *I think*, but *I suppose* and *I think* are equally frequent in fiction prose. Research in variational pragmatics has also shown differences in the use of discourse markers within varieties of British English. Kallen (2005) observes more indirect language use in Irish English than in British English and Pichler discusses the localization of *I don’t know* and *I don’t think* in a Northern English dialect (2009). Differences between Irish and British (or “English”) English also pertain to small talk (Schneider 2010), to responses to thanks (Schneider 2005) and to offers and requests (Barron 2005 and 2008 respectively).

This paper investigates the variation of the use of the comment clauses *I think*, *I guess* and *I suppose* in postcolonial varieties of English and in British English. Therefore, it draws on data from the following components of the *International Corpus of English* (ICE; see http://icecorpora.net/ice/index.htm): Ireland, East Africa, Singapore, New Zealand, Jamaica and Great Britain. In addition to varietal differentiation, it takes into account differences according to register, gender and age of speakers, relying largely on quantitative analyses using R to reveal clusters and correlations in the data. Nevertheless, since the use of comment clauses is highly sensitive to context, the qualitative analysis of selected passages is also essential for a detailed examination.
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Discourse markers in the speech of learners of French L2 in Northwestern Ontario

Isabelle Lemee, Lakehead University
ilemee@lakeheadu.ca

The use of discourse markers (DMs) is common in everyday native speech. If an L2 speaker wants to sound more like a native speaker, one way is to adopt the “conventional expressions” used by native speakers. A number of studies have examined DM use by native speakers, but relatively few studies have explored the use of DMs by L2 speakers. This paper investigates the use of DMs ‘comme’, ‘pis’, ‘donc’, which are used in oral French but not used uniformly by all French speakers, L1 or L2 speakers. This new corpus was recently collected among speakers of French L2 from the Northwestern region of Ontario in Canada, where French is a minority language. The data consists of language background questionnaire and semi-formal Labovian interviews. This helped determine the frequency of the DMs use in the L2 speakers’ speech as well as the range of discursive and non-discursive functions fulfilled by their use.

The paper provides answers to the following questions: 1) to what extent the learners’ limited extra-curricular exposure to French limit the discursive/non-discursive functions fulfilled by their use of “comme, pis and donc”; 2) to what extent does the presence or absence of an English equivalent expression influence the speakers’ discursive rates of use of the DMs under study; 3) do L2 speakers mirror L1 speakers in their use of the DMs; 4) what are the independent variables influencing their use of the DMs, such as the students’ social characteristics – social standing, sex? Preliminary analyses suggest different frequency use of the various DMs under study by all participants.
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Pragmatic markers in final position: *So* and *then* in Irish English and British English

*Kathrin Luckmann de Lopez, University of Duisburg-Essen*

kathrin.luckmann@gmail.com

The initial position is generally accepted to be the unmarked position for linking adverbials (cf. Biber et al. 1999: 891) and discourse markers (cf. Schiffrin 1987: 328; Brinton 1996: 33). The markers *then* and *so* are among the four most common linking adverbials in British English (BrE) and American English (AmE) in conversation (cf. Biber et al. 1999: 887). But while *then*, *anyway* and *though* are actually used most in final position, Biber et al. claim that *so* “cannot occur in any other position than initial” (1999: 891). If we look at other varieties than AmE and BrE, we find that this is simply not the case. *So* in Irish English (IrE) can occur in final position, used other than with ‘hanging implications’ (cf. Thompson and Suzuki 2011: 672).

With a corpus-based approach to pragmatic variation using ICE-GB, ICE-IRE, LCIE and DECTE, I will show that

- final *so* with backward scope appears to be variety-exclusive to IrE
- final *so* in IrE fulfils different functions than initial *so*
- there is functional overlap between final *so* in IrE and final *then* in BrE and IrE which is mirrored in the distribution of *then* in IrE as compared to BrE

In view of the fact that the same marker can fulfil different functions depending on its syntactic position (cf. also Clancy and Vaughan 2012), we may speculate that certain functions are linked to the position of the marker. While the initial position is mostly connected to textual functions (cf. Aijmer 2013: 28), final markers appear to be used more and more "to regulate the relation between participants and to structure talk" (Haselow 2011: 3604).
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Results of a grammatical acceptability test (Peterson and Vaattovaara, under review) looking at the use of the English borrowing pliis ‘please’ in Finnish indicate that its use is socially, grammatically, and pragmatically distinct from the native Finnish politeness marker kiitos. With this study, the goal is to investigate the validity of these findings vis-a-vis naturally-occurring corpus data. Data containing the target forms pliis and kiitos is obtained from two sources: (1) comments from an online forum created by the Helsinki Transit Authority in 2012, and (2) FinnishWac, a web-based corpus. The previous is an “opportunistic” (McEnery & Hardie 2012: 11) corpus, containing approximately 5,500 anonymous written request and complaint utterances, of which approximately one fifth employs either pliis or kiitos. The latter is an automatically created web corpus containing texts from a variety of sites (see Kilgarriff et al. 2010 for details). Collocation analysis is used to explore the distribution of pliis and kiitos, focusing in particular on a) clausal position b) lexicogrammatical patterning c) association with positive/negative politeness forms and d) other linguistic information (e.g. complaints in the first corpus often indicate the mode of transportation employed, thereby revealing geographic and demographic information). Although analysis is still underway, the results thus far indicate that pliis, as hypothesized, is the more “urban” term, and that it collocates with other forms that are indexical of urban Helsinki life. Further, the data demonstrate that pliis and kiitos differ not only in terms of clausal position, but also with preference to semantic formulae and pragmatic function.

This study supports a growing body of work demonstrating how the widespread use of English in a foreign language setting such as Finland relates not only to the lexicon, but to the pragmatic system, in particular highlighting the importance of discourse particles as contact features.
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Recent studies of negative-polarity question tags (NEG-TAGS) in British English have focused on the variant *innit*, illustrated in (1)-(2); they have examined the form’s derivation from *isn’t it*, its spread across social and geographical space, and its gradual levelling across the inflectional paradigm (Andersen 2001; Cheshire et al. 2005; Pichler 2013). This paper combines the empirical methods and theoretical insights of variationist sociolinguistics, grammaticalization studies and conversation analysis to: explore apparent-time changes in the discourse functionality and syntactic mobility of *innit* and other NEG-TAG variants (e.g. *isn’t it, don’t we*); and advance hypotheses about the factors motivating these developments.

(1) Romford market’s good, *innit*?
(2) We pay them, *innit*. To rob people, *innit*.

The investigation is based on the 1.4-million-word Linguistic Innovators corpus (LIC) collected in 2005-2006 in inner- and outer-city London (Kerswill et al. 2007). Qualitative and quantitative analyses of the canon of NEG-TAGS in the data (N=3,150) reveal the following key findings: apparent-time changes in the functional distribution and functional diversity of right-periphery (RP) NEG-TAGS; and the sudden emergence of phonetically reduced NEG-TAG variants, in particular *innit*, at the left periphery (LP), illustrated in (3)-(4). At the RP, NEG-TAGS are no longer used first and foremost to seek corroboration; (non-Anglo) London adolescents use them primarily to signal attitudinal stance and to structure discourse. At the LP, NEG-TAG constructions are used either to seek interlocutors’ attention and corroboration of immediately following propositions, or to guide interlocutors’ retrieval of immediately preceding discourse-new referents. I will provide empirical evidence to argue that it is recent semantic-pragmatic, morpho-phonological and syntactic-semantic changes affecting RP NEG-TAGS that motivate the sudden occurrence and innovative uses of NEG-TAGS at the LP.

(3) *Innit*, he leaves us sometimes, Joanne.
(4) People around, *innit*, just say who’s won.

The findings demonstrate that the functionality and syntactic distribution of long-established discourse-pragmatic variables is not stable in situations of intense language contact. They also show that the semantic-pragmatic changes affecting discourse-pragmatic variables do not by definition follow a single, rigid sequence of meaning changes, as suggested by Traugott (2003), nor can their sudden emergence in new syntactic positions necessarily be associated with either intersubjectification or subjectification, as suggested by Beeching & Detges (fc.).
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In her recent work on pragmatic markers, Aijmer (2013) asserts that in order to thoroughly understand pragmatic markers, it is necessary for researchers to include regional, cultural, and social factors in their analysis of pragmatics in order to see if the frequency or function varies in different settings. Tottie (2011) also highlights the need to analyze pragmatic markers in a range of contexts, stating that *uh* and *um* “are sociolinguistic markers that differentiate between registers of English along gender, age and socio-economic class”. She maintains that while there is clear socio-economic differentiation there may be other factors involved as well, such as the length and complexity of the turn. The present study aims to determine whether there is a correlation between the use of the planners *uh* and *um* and the complexity of service encounters in restaurants of three socio-economic states. The data used in this study are from the Los Angeles Restaurant Corpus (LARC), a corpus created specifically for research in the new field of variational pragmatics. The compilation of LARC follows a Labovian methodology in that it contains transcriptions of conversations from three different price ranges of restaurants in Los Angeles, thus providing empirical, comparable, and contrastable speech. The results demonstrate a decrease in occurrences of *uh* from the upper socio-economic setting to the lower, whereas *um* is most frequent in the middle group. In addition, this study illustrates a correlation between the length of utterances and the three socio-economic contexts.
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Monophthongisation of ‘like’ in two British capitals: effects of function, context and frequency

Erik Schleef & Danielle Turton, University of Manchester
erik.schleef@manchester.ac.uk, danielle.turton@manchester.ac.uk

Previous research on ‘like’ focuses on its various discourse functions (e.g. Underhill 1988; Buchstaller 2004; D’Arcy 2006; Cheshire et al. 2011), rather than its conversational phonetics. Drager’s (2009) work on ‘like’ at a high school in New Zealand is a notable exception. Investigating a number of different pragmatic functions, she found that quotative ‘like’ tends to be less diphthongal than ‘like’ used in other functions.

This study aims to find out (a) whether monophthongisation of ‘like’ also occurs among adolescents in London and Edinburgh and, if so, (b) how it is sociolinguistically constrained. Comparing the speech in these two places is particularly interesting as vernacular realizations of the PRICE vowel are subject to different trends among adolescents in these locations. Data were collected from 20 teenagers in London and Edinburgh each. In a first step, ‘like’-realisations in a corpus of conversational recordings were coded for frequency, speaker age and sex, as well as the discourse function of ‘like’ (as quotative, discourse marker, discourse particle, approximative adverb, etc.). The ‘like’ tokens were then subjected to an acoustic analysis, noting vowel formants in nucleus and offglide, duration, pitch values, speech rate, Euclidean distance between F1 and F2, preceding and following context and formulaic status. A series of mixed-effects regressions were conducted in R in order to determine which of these factor groups contribute significantly to the variability in ‘like’ realisations.

This study provides acoustic evidence for a reduction in diphthongization in both places and for qualitative differences in the less diphthongal vowel realization in Edinburgh and London. Our results show that ‘like’ does indeed occasionally sound clearly monophthongal and that discourse function best explains this variation. Reduced diphthongisation, however, is not only constrained by discourse function but also depends on the formulaic status of the phrase in which ‘like’ occurs.
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In previous research, it has been shown that modal particles (or 'downtoning particles') in spoken German tend to co-occur with particular gesture patterns. These gestures can have a downtoning function just like the particles (headshakes, so-called intersubjective deictics, the so-called purse hand etc.), but it is also possible to find correlations in the use with non-downtoning gestures which can highlight the verbal particle or cooperate in the process of toning the utterance down (so-called conduit metaphor gestures, referential deictics, etc.) (Schoonjans forthc.).

However, not all particles are equally likely to be combined with such gestures. Furthermore, some particles tend to co-occur more often with downtoning gestures, while others show a stronger correlation with the non-downtoning ones. The aim of this talk is to get a better view of these inter-particle differences. On the basis of a video-corpus analysis focusing on seven German particles (denn, doch, eben, eigentlich, einfach, halt, and ja), differences in gesture frequency will be discussed and the question will be raised which factors may explain these differences. Factors to be mentioned include the generality/specificity of the particle's meaning, the degree of grammaticalization of the particle, and the precise function of the particle (mainly downtoning or mainly connecting). Also, the role of more general setting- and context-related factors determining whether a gesture is realized or not will be referred to.
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Anyway co-dhiù:
The use of discourse markers in bilingual Scottish Gaelic-English speech
*Cassie Smith-Christmas, University of the Highlands & Islands*
cassie.smithchristmas@uhi.ac.uk

This paper seeks to contribute to an understanding of discourse markers in bilingual speech. Situated in a corpus of ten hours of natural speech in three generations of a bilingual Scottish Gaelic-English family living on the Isles of Skye and Harris, the paper looks specifically at the code choice used in discourse markers of the first generation speakers, who can be considered the most 'balanced' in terms of their bilingualism within the three generation paradigm. The paper considers use of semantically-equivalent discourse markers (e.g. 'anyway/co dhiù; 'you know/fios agad') and compares the language contexts in which speakers use these semantically-equivalent discourse markers. The paper also considers the six emergent patterns in terms of language of the discourse marker and the language of the utterance preceding and following the use of the discourse marker (e.g. Utterance\textsubscript{English} Discourse Marker\textsubscript{English} Utterance\textsubscript{Gaelic}), focusing specifically on cases in which the language of the discourse marker differs from the language used in both the preceding and following utterances (e.g. Utterance\textsubscript{English} Discourse Marker\textsubscript{Gaelic} Utterance\textsubscript{English} or Utterance\textsubscript{Gaelic} Discourse Marker\textsubscript{English} Utterance\textsubscript{Gaelic}). The paper posits that this occurrence allows speakers to make their discourse markers doubly salient (cf. Gardner-Chloros, Charles, and Cheshire, 2000) and that congruent manipulation of code choice and discourse marker is one of the many ways that first generation speakers 'do being bilingual' (cf. Auer, 1984). The paper concludes by discussing the implications of these Scottish Gaelic-English bilinguals’ use of discourse markers within the wider scope of language contact theories.
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In this paper the discourse markers WELL, NOW, and OH will be looked upon as overt language manifestations of underlying communicative strategies, whose essential goal is to keep the communicative line open, avoid face-threatening acts and contribute to ‘a happy situation of communication’. In this respect discourse markers will be approached as communicatively regulative units of language (Leech, 1989), principle controlled rather than rule-governed in nature, whose meaning is dynamically shaped in the interplay of various contextual factors.

Using corpus data from The British National Corpus, and The Czech National Corpus, the author compares the status, forms, functions and distribution of the selected DMs in the respective socio-cultural settings of English and Czech communities with typologically remote languages.

A data-based quantitative and qualitative analysis is hoped to support our hypothesis about a formulaic nature of this relatively close group of discourse markers, with a ‘ritualistic’ way of expectations about their occurrence and co-occurrence in interaction, and their collocability with other communicatively regulative units (mitigators, hedges, and other psycho-ostensive formulas), subsumed in recent studies under the umbrella term of discourse signposts (Válková, 2012). In the application sections, discourse markers will be first projected onto a vertical (pragmatic) axis of alternation (i.e. how well/now/oh/ can alternate in their distributional domains of initial, medial, or final positions in discourse); second, onto a vertical (syntagmatic) axis of co-occurrence, to find out what prototypical chains of various types of discourse signposts emerge from corpus data and how such chains of the source language (English) can be compensated for in the target language (Czech).
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This paper addresses an apparent controversy regarding the distribution of general extenders (GEs) across registers. For our purposes, ‘register’ means talk with familiar interlocutors or with unfamiliar interlocutors. GEs are typically clause- or utterance-final phrases that extend a set of previously mentioned referents, e.g. *nuts and beans and stuff*. They have been reported to be (i) more frequent among familiars (Overstreet & Yule 1997); (ii) more frequent among (near-)unfamiliars (Terraschke 2007), and (iii) not significantly more frequent with either familiars or unfamiliars (Stubbe & Holmes 1995, Cheshire 2007).

We argue that these inconsistent results derive from the focus on GE *overall rate*. Since GEs are multifunctional in discourse, the *proportion* of GEs serving e.g. interpersonal or referential functions may be more predictably different across registers. However the task of identifying GE functions is challenging.

Our study employs a replicable new method of identifying GEs that have a clear referential function. We compare the proportional use of referential GEs in two registers: face-to-face conversation among familiar peers (Wagner 2008), and conversation between strangers on the telephone (Cieri et al 2004, 2005). Speakers in both samples were females from Pennsylvania aged 16-24, recorded 2003-2006.

No significant difference in rate of extending GE use was observed between the talk among familiars (95/605, 15.7%) and talk among strangers (59/337, 17.5%, p=0.53, 2-proportion t-test). Overall rate of use of GEs was higher in the speech between unfamiliar interlocutors (42.04 per 10,000 words) than between familiar interlocutors (25.42 per 10,000 words). Given that speakers seem to be using GEs in proportionately similar ways across our samples, we suggest that the register variation observed in previous studies may have been an artifact of comparing raw frequencies.
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Covariation in discourse-pragmatic features
Cathleen Waters, University of Leicester & Sali Tagliamonte, University of Toronto
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Covariation, the consistency of individuals across multiple sociolinguistic variables, has been the subject of a number of studies in the past fifteen years (Guy 2010; Labov 2001; Maclagan, Gordon and Lewis 1999; Nevalainen, Raumolin-Brunberg and Mannila 2011; Oushiro and Guy 2013; Stuart-Smith and Timmins 2010; Tagliamonte and Waters 2011). However, this work has yielded conflicting results. In some cases, correlation has been observed between some pairs of prestige/innovative forms but not between other related features in the community; other studies have found limited correlation in individuals’ use of prestige/innovative forms more generally. Furthermore, covariation with discourse-pragmatic features has been almost entirely absent from these studies.

In this paper, we bridge the lacuna by quantitatively examining 48 individuals’ use of two innovative discourse-pragmatic features, quotative be like and general extender and stuff, and the correlations in use of these innovations both with each other and with other innovations in Toronto English (namely, intensifiers, deontic modality and stative possession). Considering the frequency and probability of each innovation by individual, we calculated a series of Pearson correlation coefficients across all pairs of variables, focusing particularly on the behaviour of those who are leaders of these changes. Our results show that the correlations in general are extremely limited.

In particular, we contrast the quantitative patterns of covariation for be like and and stuff. For example, speakers in this study who are more likely to use be like are also using more intensifier so (r = 0.80, p < 0.05, df = 5), whereas higher use of and stuff does not correlate with other innovations. We argue, therefore, that the patterns of covariation with discourse-pragmatic features are similar to those previously observed for phonological and morphosyntactic variation. The use of one innovative form does not necessarily predict the use of other innovative forms.
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Politeness Counts: You Know and I Think in British Academic Discussions
Qun Zheng, The University of Chinese Academy of Sciences
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I think and you know seem to be two ends of a continuum: I think is speaker-oriented while you know is listener-oriented; I think is adored by assertive upper-class speakers whereas the you know is associated with working-class speech; though I think in interviews seems to occur almost twice as much as in conversations, you know does not demonstrate a significant disparity between two genres (Huspek 1989; Stubbe & Holmes 1995; Simon-Vandenbergen 2000; Fuller 2003). Studies have shown their variation across gender, age and formality, yet few of them have explored to what extent the two pragmatic expressions contribute to the flow of communication. On the one hand, they are interpersonal, heteroglossic, and expressive (Schiffrin 1987; Aijmer 2002); on the other, they may sound as exasperating, self-centered or distracting (Stubbe & Holmes 1995). It is known to all that speakers have to use them in appropriate ways, but how to define the "appropriateness" in particular social settings? It is not the matter of "more or less"(frequency), or "here and there"(position); what matters is the communicative purpose, or the politeness strategy. The present study investigates I think and you know in two corpora -- the BASE interviews and the British role-play dyads, in an attempt to find out how the two expressions convey positive and negative politeness in a given social context. In comparison to the BNC conversations (I think: 22; you know: 39 per 10,000 words), both I think and you know were used more frequently in the British academic interviews (I think: 50; you know: 45 per 10,000 words) and role-play dyads (I think: 46; you know: 43 per 10,000 words). All speakers in interviews and role-play dyads are of equal status and discussing the same topic, and their situated roles enable their display of positive politeness (respecting one's desire to be accepted or valued, certainty and involvement) and negative politeness (keeping others free from impositions, mitigation and approximation) alternately (Brown & Levinson 1987; Beeching 2003; Davies et al. 2011). When used interpersonally (excluding the fillers and quoting use), both you know and I think demonstrate more positive politeness (I think: 74% in interviews and 70% in role-play; you know: 66% in interviews and 50% in role-play) than negative politeness. Moreover, both of them collocate with intensifiers (e.g.: very, absolutely, really) or evaluative expressions (e.g.: important, different) more often than with tentative expressions (e.g.: sort of, well, probably). Therefore, the appropriate use of I think and you know in argumentation might be enhancing mainly the positive face (making the speech valued and desired) while toning down comments in due course by negative politeness strategies. Thus it may not be the interplay of I think and you know that contributes to the mutual understanding and active involvement; instead, it is the reciprocity of positive and negative politeness strategies that builds up a firm but friendly argument. The findings indicate a further exploration of pragmatic expressions in politeness framework and suggest more discussions on appropriateness of pragmatic expressions in variational pragmatic terms.
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