JIUSHI AS A PRAGMATIC MARKER:

EVIDENCE FROM THE *HEART-TO-HEART*

RADIO PROGRAM

WANG HONGLEI

(BA., JILIN; MA., JILIN)

A THESIS SUBMITTED

FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERAUTRE

NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF SINGAPORE

2007

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, I am very grateful to Dr. Peter K. W. Tan, my supervisor, for his patient and friendly mentorship, without which my thesis would not have been completed.

Secondly, I would like to extend my thanks to several faculty members of Department of English Language and Literature, who have taught me and provided advice on my study. They are: Zhiming Bao, Lionel H. A. Wee, Vincent B. Y. Ooi, Michelle M. Lazar, Jock Onn Wong and Alastair J. Butler.

In addition, I wish to express my gratitude to several faculty members in Department of Chinese Studies, including Hui Wang, Jie Xu and Yuzhi Shi.

Finally, I would like to thank my parents, who have encouraged me to come to study at the National University of Singapore and will continue to support my future academic career.

Table of Contents

SUMMARY

In this thesis, taking the perspective of interactional linguistics, I present an empirical reinterpretation of the functions of *jiushi*, since traditional grammar which identifies it as merely an adverb carrying several meanings fails to capture its sensitivity to the local sequential positioning in the specific setting of interactive natural conversation. In order to remedy the weaknesses in the previous descriptions, I adopt an integral approach by taking into consideration such factors as its sequential statuses in relation to the intonation unit and the conversational turn, the characteristics of the *Heart-to-Heart* radio setting where the conversations examined take place, the collocational patterns in which *jiushi* co-occurs with other linguistic items and the grammatical features of *jiushi*, etc. Therefore, my study here contains several features that make it divergent from the traditional structuralist intuition-based approach in that theoretically, my study draws on the recent interactional linguistics and conversation analysis, and methodologically, my study is based on a corpus of natural conversations. My discovery is that basically, *jiushi* is part of the linguistic resources available to the participants in talk-in-interaction, who utilize *jiushi* to accomplish a variety of social actions in the interactive conversational environment. The major findings concerning the specific interactional work performed by *jiushi* are recapitulated as follows.

In the entire data, *jiushi* displays three statuses in relation to the intonation unit within the more macro conversational structure: as an independent intonation unit, as

an initiator of an intonation unit or elsewhere within an intonation unit. As a free standing intonation unit, it can either occupy an entire conversational turn, marking confirmation or positive evaluation on the part of the speaker, or form part of a conversational turn produced by the same speaker, thus indicating the speaker's hesitation or reformulation of the previous utterance. When *jiushi* initiates an intonation unit, it indicates two operations performed by the speaker: reinforcement of the illocutionary force of the ensuing utterance or reformulation of the preceding utterance. When *jiushi* occupies any other position within an intonation unit, it is syntactically integrated with the other constituents in the intonation unit, therefore, it still functions as an adverb, thus corresponding with the descriptions in the traditional grammar.

I also propose a unified schematic representation of *jiushi*'s functions, in which its functions such as confirmation, positive evaluation, hesitation, reformulation and reinforcement are subsumed under the rubric of the pragmatic markers. At the end of the thesis, two related issues that arise from the analysis of *jiushi* are also discussed, namely, the grammaticalization of *jiushi* and the metalinguistic nature of the reformulation function of *jiushi*. The study reported in this thesis demonstrates that interactional linguistics is more suitable to capture the dynamic use of functionally versatile lexical items in natural conversations.

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

The study reported in this thesis falls within the broad framework of the functionalist tradition in linguistics, which takes the position that language should be interpreted in terms of an adaptive system to meet the exigency of interpersonal communication (Thompson, 1992). Countering the orthodox Bloomfield-Chomsky structuralist tradition (to use Tao's (1996) term) which excludes actual language use from the purview of linguistic inquiry, this tradition makes out a strong case for the importance of studying the way that linguistic structures and/or items work in natural conversations.

Specifically, this thesis adopts a functional and interactional approach to reinterpreting the function of *jiushi*, thus departing from traditional Chinese grammar, which focuses only on the syntactical and semantic properties of *jiushi* as an adverb[1]. Based on natural conversations recorded from a radio phone-in program, I try to establish that *jiushi*, as used in the institutional context of the radio phone-in program, is a pragmatic marker which both the caller and the presenter of the program employ as part of their repertoire of linguistic resources to accomplish certain actions in an interactive way. Theoretically, my research is inspired by the recent interactional linguistic research on the interrelationship between interaction and grammar, and

---

[1] I have developed this thesis from my previous thesis (Honglei Wang, 2005) submitted to Jilin University, which only presents a general summary of the functions of *jiushi* as pragmatic markers.

methodologically, my research draws on the research procedures of conversation analysis by detailing the specific functions of *jiushi* with reference to its sequential positions within the gradual unfolding of natural conversations.

There are several reasons for my focusing on this topic.

1. Previous explanations for the meanings of *jiushi* have been found to be problematic, both theoretically and methodologically. Specifically, on the one hand, the traditional linguistic approach addresses only the syntactical and semantic behaviors of *jiushi*, so many aspects of the pragmatic information (such as the situational variable, the interpersonal relationship and the sequential position within the utterance and so on) that are crucial to language understanding are neglected. On the other hand, the examples underpinning these explanations are fabricated and de-contextualized, so the natural conversational environment in which people use *jiushi* frequently is also ignored.

2. The last two decades have witnessed a spate of interactional research in syntactical structures and lexical items (including pragmatic markers) used in verbal interaction. Relying on the method of conversation analysis, scholars examine the way that coparticipants in talk-in-interaction coordinate meanings and perform actions by employing various linguistic resources.

3. Recently, conversation analysis has been applied to the study of conversational interaction in specific institutional settings. Among all those linguistic phenomena associated with institutional settings, lexical choice remains under-explored.

By examining the sequential position of *jiushi* in relation to the intonation unit and the conversational turn, this study tries to broaden our understanding of its functions as pragmatic markers used in the specific context of institutional interaction (in this study, it is the radio phone-in program). I hope that my study will make a modest contribution to the current linguistic research in the three ways as mentioned above.

The thesis will be organized into seven chapters, as outlined below.

After Chapter 1, which outlines the general theoretical background and the research question to be investigated, Chapter 2 presents a detailed review of previous treatments of *jiushi*, which will be problematized subsequently with reference to some tokens of *jiushi* in my data. Then, based on these problematic cases, I will identify two defects, both theoretical and methodological, that exist in these previous studies. The last section of Chapter 2 gives a comprehensive survey of the recent studies in English, Chinese and other languages that embrace the interactional approach.

Chapter 3, which is divided into four sections, explains the several theoretical themes that run through the subsequent analysis of *jiushi*. The first section discusses the recent interactional linguistic approach to the study of language use in conversational interaction. The second section considers the recent studies in institutional talk, followed by the third section that introduces those findings about the specific characteristics of the radio phone-in program. The fourth section concentrates on Fraser's framework of pragmatic markers which will be employed in the classification of the functions of *jiushi* in Chapter 5. The overall aim of this chapter is

to justify the theoretical significance of what I do in my thesis: to investigate the pragmatic marker function of *jiushi* in the institutional interaction of the radio phone-in program.

Chapter 4 introduces the research methodology employed in my data analysis. Specific details are devoted both to the several distinguishing features of conversation analysis (CA) and to the intonation unit (IU) in Mandarin conversation which will bear on the interpretation of *jiushi* in subsequent chapters.

Chapter 5 constitutes the main body of this study by reinterpreting the functions of *jiushi* in terms of the actions that the participants in talk-in-interaction intend to perform in the interactive conversational environment. By referring to the locations of *jiushi* relative to the conversational unfolding, I come to the following findings concerning its positions and functions. In the entire data, *jiushi* displays three primary statuses in relation to the intonation unit: as an independent intonation unit, as an initiator of an intonation unit or elsewhere within an intonation unit. As a free standing intonation unit, it can either occupy an entire conversational turn, marking confirmation or positive evaluation on the part of the speaker, or form part of a conversational turn produced by the same speaker, thus indicating the speaker's hesitation or reformulation of the previous utterance. When *jiushi* initiates an intonation unit, it marks two actions performed by the speaker: reinforcement of the illocutionary force of the ensuing utterance and reformulation of the previous utterance. When *jiushi* occupies any other position within the intonation unit, it still functions as an adverb, thus corresponding

with the descriptions in traditional grammar. At the end of this chapter, by drawing a distinction between the structural and pragmatic functions of lexical items, I present a unified schematic representation of the various functions of *jiushi* as identified above.

Chapter 6 makes further clarification on two questions that arise from my treatment of *jiushi* in the previous chapters. The first is about the grammaticalization of *jiushi*. The second is about the metalinguistic nature of the reformulation function of *jiushi*.

Chapter 7 concludes this study by recapitulating the major findings and conclusions.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

In this chapter, I will present a review of the previous descriptions of *jiushi* within the traditional Chinese grammar, which I will evaluate by referring to some tokens of *jiushi* in my data that cannot be accounted for adequately by these descriptions. Moreover, I claim that this inadequacy is due to two major limits inherent in the traditional studies in Chinese, which should be remedied in the light of recent interactional and functional research on Chinese and other languages.

2.1. The descriptions of *jiushi* in traditional grammar

Morphologically, *jiushi* consists of the adverb *jiu* (corresponding roughly to "then" in English) and the copula *shi* (meaning "be" in English). According to Biq (2001), "*Jiu* is a backward-linking connective positioned before the predicate in the main clause indicating the temporal and/or causal relationship between the situation denoted in the antecedent clause and the situation denoted in the main clause" (ibid.:55). Collectively, *jiushi* has several meanings, which are described in great detail in some Chinese dictionaries, among which *A Dictionary of Eight Hundred Words of Modern Chinese* (Lü, 1999) is the most representative one. In this dictionary, three functional categories of *jiushi* are established (Lü, 1999:319-321):

1.an adverb having the following subcategories:

a. when used independently, indicating the speaker's confirmation:

(1) *jiushi*,   *jiushi*,   ni   shuo   de   hen   dui.
   JIUSHI JIUSHI   you   say   P[2]   very   right

   Yes, yes, what you say is very right.

b. when followed by a verb or an adjective, indicating the speaker's emphasis on what is denoted by the verb or the adjective:

(2) buguan   zenme   shuo, ta   *jiushi*   bu   tongyi.
   no matter   how   say   he   **JIUSHI**   not   agree

   No matter how we persuade him, he just does not agree.

(3) tade   shenti   *jiushi*   hao.
   his   body   **JIUSHI**   strong

   His body is very strong.

c. when followed by a noun or a clause, delimiting the extension denoted by the noun or the subject of the clause:

(4) wo   jia   *jiushi*   zhe   liang jian   wuzi.
   my family **JIUSHI**   these   two   cl   room

   There are only these two rooms in my family.

(5) bieren dou   bu zheyang,   *jiushi*   ni   sha.
   others all   not this way   **JIUSHI**   you stupid

   None of the others is stupid. Only you are stupid.

2. a conjunction used together with *ye* (another semantically empty adverb), corresponding to "even if" or "even though" in English:

---

[2] Throughout my thesis, by adopting a simplified approach, I use the letter P to represent a miscellaneous group of particles with no conceptual meaning, which include *de* and *le*, *inter alia*.

(6) ni ***jiushi*** shuo cuo le, na *ye* mei you shenme guanxi.
you **JIUSHI** say wrong P that *ye* not have what relation

Even if what you say is wrong, it does not matter.

3. an item used at the end of a sentence and followed by *ye*, indicating the mood of the speaker:

(7) ni fangxin, wo renzhen qu zuo ***jiushi*** *le*.
you not worry I carefully go do **JIUSHI** P

Do not worry. I will do it carefully.

Other dictionaries (e.g. *A Dictionary of Modern Chinese* edited by the Institute of Linguistics of Chinese Academy of Social Sciences (1996) and Liangfu Guo (2000)) show no significant difference in the descriptions of the functions of *jiushi*.

A note should be added concerning the transcription conventions adopted in this study. In the following analysis of *jiushi* which is based on the spoken corpus, the transcripts include three lines: the original Chinese utterances, followed by the word-to-word gloss and the idiomatic English translation for what is said in the whole conversational turn. The pinyin Romanization system is employed when I transcribe the original data, with the detailed information of the transcription conventions listed in the Appendix. Since this study focuses mainly on *jiushi*, I leave it untranslated and printed in block capitals and in bold type in the line of word-to-word gloss, but in the third line of translation, I will use a box to highlight the English equivalent for *jiushi* in the places where it occurs. Some other comparable particles or short phrases are also treated in the same way, and these include *jiushishuo*, a phrase etymologically related

to *jiushi*, which contains *jiushi* and *shuo* (a verb meaning "to say"), because this short

phrase will also be analyzed in conjunction with *jiushi*. Since there are only two

participants in each conversation, the caller who participates in the program and the

female presenter[3], A stands for the former and B the latter in the transcribed data.

2.2. Two limits in traditional descriptions

Given the above descriptions, I have examined the tokens of *jiushi* in my data

consisting of naturally occurring conversations, only to find out that a considerable

number of tokens do not fit in with these descriptions.

The following token of *jiushi*, taken from Conversation 17, is a typical

counterexample found in the data.

```
15 B: wo   gangcai  de  yisi    shi=
        I    just now  P   meaning  be

16    ni   bu   yinggai zheyang zuo.
      you  not  should  thus    do

17    en  jiushi {15}  ni meiyou biyao xianzai jiu   zuo de zheme   jue.
      mm  JIUSHI  you not  need  now   just  do P so   extreme
```

Just now, I said that you should not have done in this way. Mm. What I am
emphasizing is that you do not have to do so.

In this example, the presenter is commenting on what the caller has done after a

quarrel with his wife. Before the above comment made by the presenter, the caller tells

her that he has hurled some insults at his wife due to some misunderstanding between

them. The presenter feels that the caller should not have dealt with this matter in such

an abrupt manner. The problematic case in the above excerpt is the token of *jiushi*

---

[3] For the detailed introduction to the radio program from which the data come, please refer to Section 3.3.

({15}) which introduces a clause. According to Lü (1999), it is supposed to delimit the extension of the subject of the clause, in this case, the pronoun "you". This explanation, however, is hardly reasonable, because, taking into account the specific context in which this conversation happens, we can see that there is no need for the presenter to do so since she is fully aware of whom she is talking about. Rather, it seems that the presenter is using this token of *jiushi* to emphasize her disagreement with the way that the caller treats his wife.

The following extracted conversation contains another token of *jiushi* that challenges the descriptions in Lü (1999).

21 B: nin   hao+
    you   good

22   you shenme shiqing xiang shuo   chulai ma。
    have what   thing   want   say   out   P

    How do you do? Do you have anything to talk about?

23 A: zhe jian shi   wo xiang   le hen jiu   dou mei   gen   bieren   shuo
    this cl thing   I   think   P very long   still not   with others   say

24   *jiushi* {56}
    JIUSHI

25   *jiushi* {57}
    JIUSHI

25   wo xiang gen   nin jiang yixia
    I   think with   you say   once

    I have thought about this matter for a very long time. But I have never mentioned it to others. ⊟⊟[4] I think that I want to talk about it to you.

---

[4] As illustrated in the following paragraph and Section 5.1.2.1, both the two tokens of *jiushi* in this example function as markers of hesitation. And since there is no corresponding word in English, I use a dash to indicate this function.

It seems that the two tokens of *jiushi* ({56} and {57}) are used independently, thus indicating the speakers' confirmation as prescribed in Lü (1999). However, the function of confirmation entails that there is something that needs to be confirmed prior to *jiushi*, but what needs to be confirmed is absent from this example, since the caller mentions nothing about what she will talk about before the two tokens of *jiushi*. A more detailed examination of the contextual information available in the recording indicates that the caller uses two tokens of *jiushi* to fill the pause in the middle of his conversational flow in order to search for what she will talk about next.

The tokens of *jiushi* listed in the above two examples are among the numerous ones that defy those descriptions provided in Lü (1999). Here I identify two possible flaws, both theoretical and methodological, which are responsible for the inapplicability of these descriptions to *jiushi* in my data, and which exist generically in the traditional Chinese linguistic studies that are represented by, for example, Lü (1999), Zhu (1982, 1985).

1. The theoretical approach to generalizing about the functions of *jiushi*

employed in these dictionaries still remains at the syntactical and semantic levels and "the sentence is the largest language unit that is important for grammatical analysis" (Chao, 1968:57). Indeed, it is the usual practice in the traditional Chinese linguistic research to focus only on the static syntactical and semantic properties of words or constructions ever since the publication of *Ma Shi Wen Tong* (by Ma Jianzhong in 1898) (Miracle, 1991). No doubt, this approach does work in some cases, however, in order to

capture the exact behavior of such functionally versatile words as *jiushi*, we have to incorporate the basic findings in recent interactional linguistics that the function or meaning of lexical items emerges from the specific position located in the talk-in-interaction and that their meaning or function is a joint production of all the conversation participants involved. In fact, the rough idea of this insight was advised as early as in 1958, when Wittgenstein proposed the notion of "language game" in order to alert people to the vivid social life in which language is used. Extending Wittgenstein, Levinson (1992:66) emphasizes the dynamic study of conversations by saying that

> Understanding a language, and by implication having a grasp of the
>
> meaning of utterances, involves knowing the nature of the activity in which
>
> the utterances play a role. This, of course, is part of a well-known doctrine
>
> of "language-games", which in the later writings had "come to mean the
>
> study of any form of use of language against a background context of a
>
> form of life" (Kenny, 1973:166).

In a similar vein, when examining the phenomena of low transitivity and high transitivity in conversations, Thompson and Hopper (2001) also point out the right direction for the interactional research of the language phenomenon: "the linguistic resources should be studied in relation to what speakers intend to do with their talk" (ibid.:54). Another piece of advice is offered by Hayashi (2003:7) in which it is observed: "language is always situated in actual context of use and its deployment

constitutes social action."

2. Methodologically, most of the examples that support the traditional descriptions of *jiushi* are based on the intuitive data, for example, conversations designed in literary works or sentences invented by the researchers themselves. This drawback still remains in some recent studies in functionally flexible linguistic items (perhaps due to the unavailability of spoken data), for example, Lei and Hu (2006), Zongjiang Li (2006), Shao and Zhu (2005), etc. One prejudicial consequence of this practice is that the analyzing of the lexical item is divorced from the natural conversational environment where the discourse practice contributes to the dynamic nature of lexical meaning (Tao, 2003), and another consequence is that what speakers intend to do (as summarized in the intuition-based grammar) differs from what they actually do (Ochs, 1979). Moreover, this intuition-based and decontextualized approach runs counter to the studies accumulated in the several past decades, which tend to emphasize the primary importance of natural conversations both in human society and in the linguistic research. Apart from Bakhtin (1986), Mey (2007) and Swales (1990), Levinson (1983: 284) claims that "face-to-face interaction is not only the context for language acquisition, but the only significant kind of language use in many of the world's communities, and indeed until relatively recently in all of them". Linell (1982) also suggests that we should overcome the written language bias in the linguistic research. Schegloff (1996a) further argues that the primordial natural environment of language use that shapes linguistic structures is talk-in-interaction, that is, originally ordinary

conversation.

The above two weaknesses exhibited in the traditional Chinese linguistics have been articulated succinctly in Miracle (1991:2): "The sentence continued to constitute the largest unit of analysis and fabricated examples remained the basis for linguistic proof." It is time to remedy these two flaws in the traditional approach to Chinese linguistics, given the upsurge in the interactional research in linguistic phenomena in natural conversations in recent years. In the following sections, I will present a selective survey of these studies that embrace the interactional approach and rely on the corpus of natural conversations.

2.3. Recent interactional studies in English, Chinese and other languages

Inspired by the emerging research paradigm that focuses on the intertwining of linguistic structure and social interaction, scholars world-wide have reexamined empirically the language as used in natural conversations. The target languages involved in these studies include English, Chinese and many other languages.

To date, Couper-Kuhlen and Selting (2001) and Hakulinen and Selting (2005) contain the most recent studies based on the European languages. Among all these studies, I just cite only those which are most relevant to my current research, i.e. those focusing on the lexical items in the interactive environment, for example, Couper-Kuhlen (1996) on *because* in English, Günthner (2005) on *wo*-constructions in German, Hakulinen (1998, 2001) on Finnish particles *nyt* and *kylla* respectively and Schulze-Wenck (2005) on first verbs in English, etc.

The scenario of the research in Chinese, however, is somewhat different. Wu (2004) describes the situation in the Chinese linguistic research in this way: the influence of interactional linguistics and conversation analysis on Chinese linguistics has begun to emerge and there have been relatively fewer studies that adhere strictly to the conversation analysis approach, but some studies do investigate linguistic structures and items by focusing on their functions in spoken data. The earlier examples include Shuanfan Huang (1999) and Tao (1999) on demonstratives, Ing Li (1999) and Luke (1990) on final particles, Wenda Li (2000) on numeral-classifiers, Jiansheng Guo (1999) on right-dislocations and so on. Some more recent examples that embrace the interactional and conversation analytical approaches include: Biq (2004a, 2004b), Fang (2000), Yu-Fang Wang (2006), Wang et al. (2003), Wang and Tsai (2005) and Wu (2004, 2005).

Most relevant to our purpose here are some studies on markers in specific institutional interactive processes, for example, *dui bu dui* (meaning literally "right not right" in English) in the Chinese classroom discourse (Chen and He, 2001) in which it is used by teachers as a pragmatic marker; *bien* in the Spanish teacher-student interaction (De Fina, 1997) in which *bien* can perform several functions associated with the institutional structure of the classroom; *well* in television commentaries on sports events (Greasley,1994); *okay* and *mmhmm* in academic advising sessions (Guthrie,1997); *can* and *you know* in the setting of academic counseling (He and Lindsey, 1998; He and Tsoneva, 1998); *and* in medical interviews (Heritage and

Sorjonen,1994), just to name a few. Collectively, these studies have offered an insightful perspective to investigate grammatical forms by examining the moment-by-moment interactive negotiation in the institutional activities in which the speakers are engaged (Chen and He, 2001;De Fina,1997; Verschueren, 1995).

Building on the previous studies of *jiushi* and the recent interactional research in linguistic items in various languages, this thesis intends to improve the previous explanations for *jiushi* proposed in Chinese dictionaries, by analyzing its functions in terms of the interactive accomplishments jointly achieved in the institutional setting of the *Heart-to-Heart* radio phone-in program.

CHAPTER THREE

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

In this chapter, I will elaborate on several theoretical themes, which form the major analytical framework to be employed in the whole thesis, and which include: interactional linguistics, the characteristics of broadcast talk and Fraser's classification of pragmatic markers. In addition, immediately after outlining the distinctive features of institutional talk and broadcast talk, I will introduce the context of the *Heart-to-Heart* radio program that my recorded data come from, with the aim of highlighting some aspects of the institutionality of this program, which impacts on the function of pragmatic markers.

3.1 Interactional linguistics

The primary theoretical foundation of my present research is interactional linguistics, which takes the position that the complexities of language cannot be understood without reference to the fact that language is adapted to and shaped by interactional functions (Aijmer and Stenström, 2004). Due to the space limit here, what I can do is only to give a brief introduction, since several influential works published previously (Couper-Kuhlen and Selting, 1996; Hakulinen and Selting, 2005; Ochs, et al. 1996; Selting and Couper-Kuhlen, 2001) have described this theory in great detail.

According to Couper-Kuhlen and Selting (2001) and Schegloff et al. (1996), interactional linguistics lies at the point where three genres of theoretical inquiry

converge. They are:

1. Linguistic anthropology, with its central tenet being that both grammatical categories and lexicon reflect the fundamental, unconscious cultural patterns of thinking and acting in a community (Schegloff et al., 1996). And in fact, much of this tenet has been mentioned by several earlier works, for example, Gumperz (1982), Hanks (1990) and Moerman (1988), etc., which study speech exchange systems and discourse strategies across cultures. Currently, although the specific research focus within the camp of linguistic anthropology varies to some degree, all the studies along this line of inquiry

    articulate how in the course of historically situated social interactions, participants formulate and co-ordinate their utterances, gestures, and other actions to co-construct understandings, misunderstandings, stances, activities, and/or modes of learning, knowing, and controlling the world (Schegloff et al., 1996:7).

2. The functional perspective on grammar, which seeks to find out the "motivated relations between linguistic form and discourse function" (Couper-Kuhlen and Selting, 2001:2). In this approach, grammatical constructions are seen as shaped by the communicative tasks that are performed by the speaker in the real context. The generally held maxim in this area is what Du Bois (1985:363) summarizes as "grammars code best what speakers do most". In this respect, this approach to grammar finds itself in opposition to the generative one to grammar, which considers it as a set

of *a priori* rules that dictate how the valid sentences of a language can be generated. Schegloff, et al. (1996) also notices that recently, the research focus of functional grammar has been shifted to the naturally occurring conversation, and this shift also prompts linguists to examine the interrelationship between grammar and interaction.

3. Conversation analysis which studies conversational interaction as the locus of social order in a purely empirical and micro-analytical manner. Moreover, conversation analysis offers a set of rigorous procedures through which language and interaction can be analyzed. Some more details of conversation analysis will be given in Chapter 4.

Apart from the above three theoretical sources, Couper-Kuhlen and Selting (2001) also adds as another conducive factor the consensus among the linguistic circles that spoken language should be the objective of linguistic inquiry.

Despite its heterogeneous theoretical origins, interactional linguistics builds on some basic assumptions that distinguish it from other linguistic theories:

1. As opposed to the Chomskyan paradigm that separates language knowledge from language use, interactional linguistics considers the former as the situated social action, therefore, the context, which includes not only the situational variable and interpersonal relations but also the immediately sequential linguistic environment where a particular linguistic structure or item is embedded, is accorded a primary status. Just as Heritage (1984: 242) claims, language use is "doubly contextual", which has two correlated implications: on the one hand, language is "context-shaped" in that the specific mode of language use is shaped by the context and on the other hand, language

is "context-renewing" in that language is capable of providing new contexts for the subsequent unfolding of verbal interaction. In other words, interactional linguistics adopts a dynamic approach to context, in which context is "treated as both the project and product of the participants' own actions and therefore as inherently locally produced and transformable at any moment" (Drew and Heritage, 1992: 19).

2. Diverging from the traditional belief that meaning is the product of a single speaker's intentions and action plans (Hakulinen and Selting, 2005), interactional linguistics treats meaning as a joint accomplishment (Goodwin, 1981) that emerges from the interaction among all the participants in the interaction (Tao, 2003), therefore, meaning is the result of the multi-lateral negotiation in the interaction. Through this lens, the view towards the language *per se* is also changed radically, as Lerner (1991) observes that the various components of linguistics, including syntax, prosody and semantics, is a kind of knowledge, which is shared in the speech community, and which can be "distributed" (ibid.:141) among speakers in the collaborative production.

3. In the same way that language cannot be described adequately without interaction, interactional linguistics also holds to the idea that interactional activities must be accomplished with the help of linguistic generalizations (Couper-Kuhlen and Selting, 2001). The most obvious fact attesting to this claim is that participants in the conversation switch turns that are composed of turn-constructional units, which may be a word, a phrase or a clause (Sacks et al., 1974). Other analytical units and sequential activities present in natural conversations also prove to be bound up with linguistic

knowledge, as Couper-Kuhlen and Selting (2001:6) observes: "conversationalists depend on their knowledge of possible syntactical templates in order to recognize repairing segments as departures therefrom". Therefore, the linguistically oriented study of verbal interaction aims to

reveal recurrent formal patterns on which the sense-making of

conversation depends and on which participants rely in their conduct of

interaction (ibid.:6).

Taken together, these basic assumptions address two fundamental questions that interactional linguistics seeks to answer (Couper-Kuhlen and Selting, 2001: 3):

1. What linguistic resources are used to articulate particular conversational structures and fulfill interactional functions?

2. What interactional function or conversational structure is furthered by particular linguistic forms and ways of using them?

The answers to these two questions also parallel the three arguments proffered by Schegloff et al. (1996) to substantiate the overarching principle that grammar and social interaction organize each other.

1. Grammar organizes social interaction;

2. Social interaction organizes grammar;

3. Grammar is a mode of social interaction.

To sum up, taking the position that language and social interaction are mutually interpenetrated by and bear on each other, interactional linguistics advocates a fresh

view towards language use and meaning making, as Schegloff et al. (1996: 40) claims: "the meaning of any single grammatical construction is interactionally contingent, built over interactional time in accordance with interactional actualities".

3.2. Radio phone-in as the institutional interaction

Since my present investigation in *jiushi* is based on the setting of the radio phone-in program, it is necessary to know some distinctive characteristics of this genre of media program, which will be sketched out below in view of the recent studies on institutional language. One reason for considering this factor is that previous studies in the linguistic marker in specified settings make a point of taking into consideration the ethnographic knowledge of the institutional context where the meaning of language emerges (He and Lindsey, 1998; He and Tsoneva, 1998).

In the introduction to *Talk at Work: Interaction in Institutional Settings*, the first paper collection devoted to the study in institutional language, Drew and Heritage (1992) point out that two converging theoretical tendencies contribute to this newly emerged research orientation: one is the "development of sociolinguistic approaches to language that address the contextual sensitivity of language use" and the other is "the emergence of analytical frameworks that recognize the nature of language as action and which handle the dynamic features of social action and interaction" (ibid. :6). Moreover, they outline several aspects where institutional talk is supposed to be distinguished from ordinary talk.

1. Institutional interaction is goal-based or task-oriented. This means that

it involves an orientation by at least one of the participants to some core goal, task or identity (or set of them) conventionally associated with the institution in question. In short, institutional talk is normally informed by goal orientations of a relatively restricted conventional form (ibid.:22).

Besides, the fact that the institutional interaction is goal-oriented entails that one of the participants in the interaction is a representative of an institution or an organization (Heritage and Greatbatch, 1991).

2. The possible contributions that the participants in institutional talk are eligible to make are constrained conventionally by the structural features of the institutional setting (Drew and Heritage, 1992), and the specific characteristics of the structural features determine the specific genres of institutional talk. Moreover, according to the degree of the institutionality of the specific setting, institutional talk can be classified into two categories, formal and informal (Heritage and Greatbatch, 1991), with the latter allowing of much more variation in terms of how the participants utilize options to make the talk proceed sequentially. The radio phone-in program, from which my data come, just falls within this category (Hutchby, 1991). The distinction between the formal and informal settings, however, should not be taken as a rigid one, rather, it should be considered as a spectrum ranging from the most formal and institutionalized settings to the least ones (Sacks, et al., 1974).

3. The frames[5] which participants employ to interpret the institutional talk are

---

[5] Minsky (1977: 355) defines frame as a "datastructure for representing a stereotyped situation like being in a certain kind of living room or going to a child's birthday party. Attached to each frame are several kinds of information."

particular to specific institutional settings (Drew and Heritage, 1992:24).

4. There are several dimensions where the institutional interaction can be realized, including lexical choice, turn design, sequence organization and so on.

Based on these above observations made on the institutional talk, Hutchby (2006: 18) identifies several distinctive features that characterize broadcast talk, under which radio talk is also subsumed:

1. The activity of talking is key to each of the main genres of the broadcast media output.

2. Broadcast talk adopts elements of everyday conversation as part of its overarching communicative ethos by incorporating a large portion of unscripted talk, that is, participants have to be creative in designing what is to be said in the actual course of talk.

3. Broadcast talk is nevertheless different from ordinary conversation by virtue of being an institutional form of discourse that exists at the interface between public and private domains of life. The reason is that although the broadcast talk is produced in the institutional site of studio, where only professional broadcasters and lay participants are engaged in the conversational interaction, the talk produced by them will be consumed by a large audience in a variety of domestic contexts.

4. Meanwhile, broadcast talk is directed at an "overhearing" audience separated from the talk's site of production by space and also, frequently, by time, so the audience, who may be absent from the studio that is the site of broadcast production, is

the ultimate consumer of the broadcast talk.

Given the features articulated above that contribute to the institutional interaction, it seems that broadcast talk lies somewhere between the most formal institutional talk and the ordinary conversation. Moreover, regarding broadcast talk, Hutchby (2006) raises a very interesting paradox: although talk is central to media broadcasting, "it is surprising, therefore, that only comparatively recently has media talk begun to be studied as a phenomenon in its own right" (ibid.:4).

3.3. Data source: The *Heart–to-Heart* program

The corpus of spoken data used in this research contains tape-recorded conversations from the live program of *Heart–to-Heart*[6], presented by the Radio Station of Health and Entertainment from 21:00 to 23:00 every night except on Tuesday nights. This station is owned by the Broadcasting Company of Changchun, located in Changchun, the leading city of Jilin Province in the northeastern part of China.

The institutional and organizational structure of this program is as follows. In the studio, there is a female presenter and two telephone numbers that anyone, both inside and outside Changchun, can dial to talk with her. Anyone who wants to participate in this program must register at the office of the program at least two days before the live broadcasting of the program, offering some information about himself or herself, for example, age, profession and the rough topic that he or she will talk about (but the

---

[6] The original title of this program is Xin Hai Man Bu in Chinese, which means literally "walk in the sea of the heart". Taking into consideration the characteristics of the program, I use the idiomatic English phrase "Heart-to-Heart" as my translation of the Chinese title.

details of what is to be talked about will not be known until the participant actually talks by telephone in the program). Then during the broadcast, the participant can call in to chat with the presenter by telephone, so disregarding the potential audience that listen to this program, the conversation is made only between two partners: one is the caller and the other is the presenter. A second participant begins to call in to talk with her until the previous one ends the talk. Each caller is officially assigned a maximum fifteen-minute duration for his or her own talk, but the actual length of each recorded conversation in the corpus varies a great deal, with the longest one lasting about 25 minutes and 14 seconds and the shortest one lasting only about 4 minutes. One characteristic of this program is that it is broadcast at night, when most people stay at home after the whole busy day, with a strong desire to give vent to their dissatisfactions about some matters related to their work or life (I did a rough count of the topics covered in the recorded conversations and discovered that in all these conversations, the callers describe and comment on something unhappy or even very negative). Moreover, what is talked about in this program by the caller is often something that he or she is reluctant to confide to other people in the daytime. The responsibility of the presenter in this setting is to act as confidant by listening attentively to and commenting on what the caller says and even by offering some advice to ease the stress of the caller. In terms of the function that it serves, this program creates a special genre of space where people can articulate their concerns and dissatisfactions.

In view of the characteristics of institutional interaction outlined by Drew and

Heritage (1992) and of broadcast talk by Hutchby (2006), the *Heart–to-Heart* program represents a mixture both of the institutional talk and of ordinary conversations for the following reasons:

1. It is institutional in the sense that both the presenter, who represents the broadcast institution, and the caller are oriented to the overarching goal of their verbal interaction: on the part of the caller, it is to express opinions and on the part of the presenter, it is to offer comments and advice.

2. It is also like an ordinary conversation in that there is nearly no restriction on each conversational partner's options to contribute to the unfolding conversation.

3. The conversation between the caller and the presenter, although originally conducted between them only, is being overheard by a large absent audience or an audience of overhearers (Heritage, 1985).

To end this section, three further points concerning the corpus collection should be made below:

1. The total length of the recording is ten hours and the number of the recorded conversations amounts to forty-five.

2. The language spoken by both the presenter and the callers is Mandarin, since most of the callers are the natives of Jilin Province, where Mandarin is widely spoken (Chappell, 2001; Sun, 2006).

3. Another reason that I focus exclusively on the *Heart-to-Heart* context in which *jiushi* occurs is that numerous studies in markers (Biber, 2006; Freed and Greenwood,

1996; Helt, 1997) suggest that due to the context-sensitivity of these marker, we should reduce the extent of the contextual variable as much as we can so that the correlation between the function of markers and the single contextual variable can be established precisely.

3.4. Fraser's definition of pragmatic markers

The aim of this section is to clarify some terminological confusion due to the recent proliferation of names employed to refer to a set of semantically empty lexical items, such as *you know*, *oh*, *well*, *but*, etc. These names include: discourse markers, discourse particles, particles, pragmatic markers, and so on (Jucker and Ziv, 1998). Despite so many different names, there are several features that are considered as shared by nearly all the linguistic items of this category (Brinton, 1996; Fraser, 1999; Schiffrin, 1987; Schourup, 1999):

1. These items constitute a heterogeneous set of forms that resist neat classification within the traditional grammatical framework;

2. They are used more frequently in spoken discourse than in writing discourse;

3. They are thought to contribute nothing to the truth-conditional content expressed in an utterance;

4. They are regarded as syntactically optional in the sense that the removal of them does not alter the grammaticality of the host sentence to which they are attached;

5. They are functionally versatile and the specific function performed by them depends crucially on the context in which they are used.

In my present study, however, I will adopt Frasers' terminology of pragmatic markers, since my claim is that *jiushi* functions as a pragmatic marker, serving to indicate specific actions that the speaker intends to perform. Related to the purpose of my study, Fraser's framework has three advantages. One is that this framework contains a more complete list of the various lexical items so that what other scholars consider as discourse markers are also subsumed under the label of pragmatic markers. The second is that the name of pragmatic markers has another implication: they can be used in service of more functions than the textual and connective ones that are long held to be performed by discourse markers. Similar practice is also advocated by Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen (2006:2) on the grounds that pragmatic markers are "also signals in the communication situation guiding the addressee's interpretation". The third is that I can identify the functions of *jiushi* in my data in a negative way: as long as *jiushi* does not "contribute to the propositional, truth-conditional content, then we consider it a pragmatic marker" (ibid.:2)".

Below is a detailed introduction of Fraser's description of pragmatic markers, which is based on the assumption that sentence meaning can be analyzed into two separate types of information: content meaning and pragmatic information (Fraser, 1990, 1996).

On the one hand, each sentence encodes a content meaning: a more or less explicit representation of some state of affairs of the world which the speaker wishes to bring to the addressee's attention. Often referred to as the propositional content, the content

meaning is the same in the following three sentences: "John goes to the school", "Does John go to the School?" and "I suggest that John go to the school".

On the other hand, each sentence also encodes pragmatic information, which signals "the speaker's potential communicative intentions" (Fraser, 1996:168), which are encoded in the linguistic forms referred to as *pragmatic markers* by Fraser. These pragmatic markers indicate different types of message, either explicitly or implicitly, which the speaker intends to convey in uttering the sentence.

Pragmatic markers are further divided into the following four subcategories.

Basic markers specify the illocutionary force of the content meaning. They may be structural (for example, the syntactic structure of the sentence itself can be used to express the interrogative mood of the speaker), lexical (for example, the word "order" in "My order is that you must come out now." is used to signal that the speaker wants his utterance to be understood as an order.) or hybrid in that a specific structure together with lexical words can be used to indicate the illocutionary force of the utterance. For example, in "To be more direct, what do you want to do?", the inserted syntactical structure is used together with the phrase "to be more direct" to signal the interrogative mood[7] of the speaker.

Commentary markers constitute comments on the content message itself. For example, in "Frankly, we are lost", the word "frankly" signals that the speaker views the following message unacceptable in some sense to the hearer.

---

[7] The term of "interrogative mood" is used in Fraser (1990) although here this term means the illocutionary force of questioning.

Parallel markers signal the message additional to the basic message. The examples in point include the word "damn" in "Damn, the weather is very hot!" and the word "waiter" in "Waiter, please bring me another fork".

Discourse markers signal how the basic message relates to the foregoing discourse. For example, "after all" in "He is brave; after all, he is an Englishman." links the two messages: "he is brave" and "he is an Englishman". And in this way, "after all" realizes a discourse operation which means that it is because he is an Englishman that he is brave.

Fraser (1996:169) presents a brief comparison of the various categories of pragmatic markers in this way: "a basic marker signals the force **of** the basic message, a commentary marker signals a message which comments **on** the basic message, a parallel marker signals a message **in addition to** the basic message, and a discourse marker signals the **relationship** of the basic message to the foregoing discourse" (boldface original).

In Chapter 5, I will demonstrate that when *jiushi* occupies different positions within the conversational structure, it carries different pragmatic information and thus belongs to different subcategories of pragmatic markers.

At the end of this chapter, I should make it clear that in the process of detailing the functions of *jiushi*, I will highlight some of its functions by comparing it with some pragmatic markers in other languages (most often from English) and other dialects of China (for example, Cantonese). This practice is argued for by Aijmer and

Simon-Vandenbergen (2006) on the grounds that the cross-linguistic study of pragmatic markers is fruitful in two ways: on the one hand, it can "show to what extent similar discourse functions are found in the languages of the world" (ibid.:1); and on the other hand, it can "result in a more precise circumscription of the range of meanings that pragmatic markers can have and may show where there are specific meanings which are lexicalized (or grammaticalized) in the form of pragmatic markers" (ibid.: 2).

CHAPTER FOUR

METHODOLOGY

This chapter is about the methodology used in my study, which involves two parts: conversation analysis and the intonation unit in Mandarin conversation.

4.1 Conversation Analysis (CA)

Methodologically, my study is founded on conversation analysis (CA) in order to reinterpret the functions of *jiushi* in my data. It should be acknowledged that CA overlaps significantly with interactional linguistics, since the latter is the result of the expansion of the former into other academic fields (Nielsen and Wagner, 2007). However, there are still some distinctive features which characterize CA.

CA originated in the 1960s in the cooperative work of Harvey Sacks, Emmanuel Schegloff and Gail Jefferson, which resulted in the seminal work in this field (Sacks et al., 1974). The central tenet of CA is the view that conversation, as the primordial site of social interaction, is structurally organized (Wu, 2004), or in other words, that systematic patterns can be identified in the ways that people talk interactively. According to Hutchby (2006), CA poses a double challenge both to the dominant idea in linguistics that considers language as an abstract descriptive device and the mainstream view in sociology that language is a transparent tool that offers a window to people's mental world. As opposed to the leading linguistic and sociological theories at that time, CA establishes several distinctive principles concerning what language is

and how language should be studied.

1. Most decisively, CA proposes an activity-oriented perspective on meaning and social interaction. The term "activity-oriented" refers to the fact that language use in context is a kind of social activity accomplished interactively. Schegloff et al. emphasizes the importance of focusing on activity in the CA oriented research in this way:

Once we register that language figures in the actual, practical activities of the lives of people and societies, and that how the language is configured is more than incidentally related to its involvement in those activities, it is readily apparent that, at the very least, attention must be paid to what the relationship is between activity, action and the orderly deployment of language called grammar (1996:21).

In a similar vein, Drew and Holt also make the similar observation concerning the study in the activity implied in language use:

the components of a turn's construction, at whatever level of linguistic production, are connected with the activity which the turn is being designed to perform in the unfolding interactional sequence of which it is a part, and to the further development of which it contributes. That is the most proximate context in which a turn is produced, and in which it is recognizably coherent, is its SEQUENTIAL context (1998: 497, emphasis original).

Elsewhere, Schegloff makes the following remarks, reminding us of the research focus on activity and action in the conversational interaction:

This logic—an interactional or socio-logic, if you will—is at work throughout talk-in-interaction[8]. To get at it, a focus on information will not suffice. It is the action import of utterances and not just what they are about or what they impart---the action import or nonaction import----that regularly drives the interactional construction of extended spates of talk, or discourses (1995:202).

This emphasis on the activity associated with situated language use provides a conceptual leverage for my following analysis of *jiushi*, since my primary attention is accorded to what speakers are doing by employing it in various sequential positions in the conversational interaction. And it is also this aspect that differentiates my present study from the previous descriptions of *jiushi* which aim only to attach a general semantic label to each of its meanings. Previously, Hayashi (2003), in the study in joint utterance constructions, also embraces the idea of seeing language use as performing situated activities interactively. In the similar vein, in her study in the Japanese particle *ne*, Tanaka (2000) also contends that speakers do exploit this particle to perform the various specific activities for the sake of turn-management.

2. The second principle lies in CA's focus on the sequential nature of interactional talk, which is essential to its unique analytical approach to talk. Since the mutual

---

[8] The term "talk-in-interaction" was coined by Schegloff (1987) to emphasize the interactive nature of ordinary conversations, which is what conversation analysis should be concerned with.

understanding among the participants in the interactive talk is unfolding as the utterances are produced in the sequential order, it is natural that they display their understanding of what the prior turn is intended to mean in the following turn produced by themselves (Wu, 2004). In other words, participants regularly demonstrate their understanding of others' talk by saying a particular item at a particular time (Koshik, 2005). Therefore, conversation analysts employ what they call "next turn proof procedure" (Hutchby, 2006:22) to examine how the joint orientation among the participants is achieved. By "next turn proof procedure", they mean that whether the prior turn is understood by the participant or not can be demonstrated in the next turn produced by this participant. This "then-relevant" (Wu, 2004:35) sense is consequential for another characteristic analytical method employed in CA as summarized in Hakulinen and Selting (2005:1): "this precludes the application of pre-conceived categories for automatic searches of the data-base and generalized ascriptions of functions and meanings to these categories". Adopting this approach means, on the one hand, that the *a priori* categorization of the linguistic data is avoided and, on the other hand, that all the observable behaviors of participants, whether verbal or non-verbal, should be integrated into the interpretation of the potential actions that participants intend to employ.

3. The third principle is related to CA's comparative analysis, which means that the procedures generalized in ordinary conversational interaction are treated as the norm, against which other institutional forms of conversational interaction are compared, so

that we can identify the patterned variation and restrictions on activities and structural features of the institutional talk (Heritage, 1984). This method has its roots in the basic realization of CA that "ordinary conversation is the predominant medium of interaction in the social world" and that "it is also the primary form of interaction to which, with whatever simplifications, the child is initially exposed and through which socialization proceeds" (Drew and Heritage, 1992:19).This method also has direct bearing on my future treatment of *jiushi* in Chapter 5, where the functions and distributions of *jiushi* as found out in the institutional context of the radio phone-in program will be compared with those identified by Biq (2001), which is based on a corpus of ordinary conversations. This comparison will lend partial support to the fact that the functions of lexical items are also subject to the institutionality of the talk in which these items are used.

The above-mentioned are the three essential principles that characterize the conversation analysis approach to talk. Put in simple terms, CA, firmly grounded in the data of natural conversations, is "designed to study how members of a society create social order and meaning in their (mundane) interactions in real time" (Nielsen and Wagner, 2007: 441). Since its inception, CA has proved to be effective and flexible for investigating the various aspects of talk-in-interaction and made tremendous contribution to the various academic disciplines (ibid.). However, as noted in Wu (2004), there has been relatively less research in Chinese that adheres to the CA method strictly in recent years. It is hoped that my present research will make a modest

contribution to this growing body of the CA-informed studies in Chinese.

4.2. Intonation units in Mandarin conversation

Since previous studies point to the fact that lexical items are sensitive to the turn position and sequential context for their meaning instantiation (Mazeland and Huiskes, 2001; Mori, 2006; Tanaka, 2000), I will identify the different functions of *jiushi* in relation to its sequential positions within the course of conversation, particularly the intonation unit. Although some other lines of research have proposed other concepts that capture the interactional units in conversation, for example, "exchange" by Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) and "turn-constructional unit" (TCU) by Sacks et al. (1974), I will adopt the intonation unit as the basic analytical unit in my treatment of *jiushi*, since Tao's (1996) comprehensive study in the intonation unit in Mandarin will provide useful insights when I segment my spoken data into intonation units.

Before proceeding to the task of analyzing *jiushi*, however, it will be helpful to provide some background information about what the intonation unit is like in the Mandarin conversation.

Generally speaking, in the studies in the information flow, the intonation unit is considered as the basic analytical unit. According to Chafe (1987: 22), the intonation unit is "a sequence of words combined under a single, coherent intonation contour, usually preceded by a pause". But the judgment of the intonation unit has to be based on a set of prosodic cues, chiefly pitch reset, pause and other disjunctive features (Du Bios et al., 1993). Tao (1996) suggests several criteria of discerning the intonation unit

boundaries in Mandarin conversations:

1. The most important criterion is that of a unified intonation contour, in other words, there must be a string of words that can be considered as falling under a single intonation contour;

2. There is often a pause between intonation units;

3. The last syllable of an intonation unit tends to be lengthened;

4. A non-turn initial new unit may start with a sequence of fast-tempo unstressed syllables;

5. Intonation boundaries typically coincide with resetting of baseline pitch levels.

Furthermore, Tao (1996) points out that in terms of the grammatical status, an intonation unit in the Mandarin conversation can range from a vacuous vocal noise, a phrase, a clause or even a clause embedding another subordinate clause.

4.3. Analytical procedures

As to the analytical procedures followed in my study, the first step is to have all the recorded conversations transcribed and segmented into intonation units, with each of them prefaced with an Arabic numeral to indicate its linear sequence. Subsequently, all tokens of *jiushi* are differentiated with respect to their positions in relation to the intonation unit and the prosodic factors are the major yardsticks for identifying their different sequential locations. Throughout the data, I have identified three placements of *jiushi* relative to the intonation unit: as an independent intonation unit, as initiating an intonation unit and as part of an intonation unit which becomes integrated

syntactically with the other constituents within the same intonation unit. Moreover, among all those tokens of *jiushi* that stand as independent intonation units, I draw a further distinction between two statuses of *jiushi*: either as a free-standing conversational turn or within a conversational turn. Closer examination of these two kinds of *jiushi* reveal that they imply different actions that the speaker intends to perform, therefore, I enunciate their functions in greater detail in two separate sections in Chapter 5.

My approach to the analysis of *jiushi* is a rather integral one, since I also consider some other factors that are relevant to the situated use of *jiushi*. The most important among these factors are the institutional characteristics of the *Heart–to-Heart* discourse. In addition, the intonation units that both precede and follow those containing *jiushi* are also examined, except when those tokens of *jiushi* contained in long personal narratives are analyzed because the functions of *jiushi* in this case have little to do with either the preceding or the following intonation unit. Background music that is inserted by the radio station staff somewhere within the conversation to season the atmosphere of the conversation is also preserved in the transcription and then taken account of.

Because this program is broadcast through radio, video-recording is impossible, thus making a lot of other paralinguistic features, such as body-movements, gestures and so on missing from the transcription.

A caveat should be added that in spite of some variables that I identify in my corpus, such as the slight difference between Mandarin Chinese and the Changchun

dialect spoken by the participants and the social information about them, including sex, age and educational background (all the recorded participants are either college students or company employees), the result of my close examination of the data indicates that they have no significant influence on the functions that *jiushi* realizes.

Another caveat to be pointed up here is that the instantiation of *jiushi* as a pragmatic marker is no isolated achievement in that it often co-occurs with some other linguistics markers, contextualization cues and back-channel cues. And as demonstrated in the prior work (He and Lindsey, 1998; He and Tsoneva, 1998), it is the co-presence of these linguistic items in certain discourse environments that are conducive to the functioning of a marker. Therefore, in Chapter 5, besides focusing on the analysis of *jiushi*, I will also tackle some cases where *jiushi* co-occurs with some contextualization cues and back-channel cues, which are introduced briefly in the following.

The term "contextualization cue" is introduced by Gumperz (1982, 1992, 2003, 2006) to designate those linguistic and non-linguistic signs that guide the contextualization of meaning, i.e., the situated understanding that the participants in the conversational interaction have of the socio-cultural aspects of meaning. By contextualization, he means the process by which meaning negotiation between conversational partners is clarified in a specific context. This process builds on the "conventionalized co-occurrence expectations between content and surface style" (Gumperz, 2003: 140). Contextualization cues are just those linguistic items that

indicate this process. As to what are included under this rubric, Gumperz continues:

roughly speaking, a contextualization cue is any feature of linguistic form that

contributes to the signaling of contextual presuppositions. Such cues may have

a number of such linguistic realizations depending on the historically given

linguistic repertoire of the participants. The code, dialect and style switching

processes, some of the prosodic phenomena we have discussed as well as

choice among lexical and syntactic options, formulaic expressions,

conversational openings, closings and sequencing strategies can all have

similar contextualizing functions (ibid.: 140).

Parallel to the notion of contextualization cues is that of backchannel cues, which

are defined as short responses, verbal or nonverbal, used by a listener as an affirmation

of his/her position as a listener, e.g., *sure, I see, mm,* etc. (Brown, 2006).

A common property shared by contextualization cues and back-channel cues is that

their interpretation is never divorced from the context or the mutual understanding

between the participants (ibid.).

It is, however, out of the scope of this thesis to discuss in detail the distinction

between contextualization cues and back-channel cues, which, tentatively, are assumed

to be blurred in some cases. For example, in Auer's (1992) list of contextualization

cues, backchannels are also included.

CHAPTER FIVE

JIUSHI REINTERPRETED: POSITIONS AND FUNCTIONS

The necessary preliminaries as illustrated in the previous chapters pave the way for this chapter, the main body of this thesis, in which I will try to detail the function of *jiushi*, notwithstanding the previous descriptions in traditional grammar. All the tokens of *jiushi* in my data are subjected to reanalysis in terms of its sequential locations in relation to the intonation unit (IU) and the conversational turn.

As is shown in the following table, a total of 1039 tokens of *jiushi* have been found in the data, with its distributions in terms of its sequential positions relative to the intonation unit shown in the table below:

Sequential positions	Numbers	Relative frequencies
As an independent IU	565	54.4%
Initiating an IU	349	33.6%
Elsewhere within an IU	125	12.0%
Total tokens of *jiushi*	1039	100%

Table 1: Total numbers of *jiushi* and its distributions

A quantitative and qualitative study of all these tokens suggests that when *jiushi* appears in different positions, it functions as a pragmatic marker to communicate different kinds of pragmatic information in verbal interaction:

When *jiushi* appears as an independent IU, it has two possible statuses in relation to the conversational turn: one is a free-standing conversational turn, and the other is an independent IU within the same conversational turn. In the former case, it marks two

actions performed by the speaker: either as a basic marker to indicate the speaker's confirmation or as a commentary marker to indicate positive evaluation. In the latter case, it functions either as a parallel marker to indicate hesitation on the part of the speakers or as a discourse marker to reformulate any aspect of the previous utterance.

When *jiushi* initiates an IU, it has two functions: it can function as a basic marker to reinforce the illocutionary force of the following utterance; or it can function as a discourse marker indicating reformulation, similar to those tokens of *jiushi* that are free-standing IUs within a conversational turn.

In the data, I have also discovered a considerable number of tokens of *jiushi* that constitute part of an IU, thus structurally integrated with the other constituents of the same IU. In this case, *jiushi* is still an adverb that modifies the following constituent, which is often a verb, an adjective or an adverb. As far as this case is concerned, its function as a modifier is consistent with the descriptions in traditional grammar.

At the end of this chapter, I draw a schematic frame to accommodate all the above functions of *jiushi*, which are reclassified into two categories: the structural one in that it is used as an adverb and the pragmatic one in that it carries pragmatic information concerning what action the speaker intends to perform.

Furthermore, in contrast to Biq (2001) who has found many tokens of *jiushi* attached to the end of an intonation unit, no such usage of *jiushi* is found in my data. It might be relevant to note that this might be due to the much difference between the Mandarin spoken in Northern China and that spoken in Taiwan in terms of the specific

usage of some lexical items (Wang et al., 2003).

The following section will present a picture of what actions *jiushi* is intended to perform in the conversational data.

5.1. *Jiushi* as an independent intonation unit

As indicated in Table 1 at the beginning of this chapter, the dominant pattern of *jiushi*'s usage in my data is as independent intonation units, and among altogether 565 such tokens of *jiushi*, 174 tokens occupy the entire conversational turn and 391 tokens are part of a conversational turn.

It should be noted, however, that what I mean by "independent" use of *jiushi* is drastically different from what is referred to by the "independent" use in Lü (1999). In my current conversation analysis approach, *jiushi* is used independently in the sense that in the unfolding of the interactive conversation, it stands sequentially as an independent intonation unit which represents a minimum contribution to the ongoing conversation by the speaker. In contrast, what Lü (1999) means by *jiushi* being "used independently" is the fact that it is detached syntactically from the host sentence that ensues. This discrepancy in the meaning of the "independent" use of *jiushi* reflects a fresh line of inquiry that I will pursue in the subsequent analysis which begins with those tokens that occupy the entire conversational turn.

5.1.1. *Jiushi* as an independent conversational turn

In terms of the functions performed by those 174 tokens of *jiushi* which constitute independent conversational turns, I make a further distinction between those indicating

confirmation on the part of the speaker (91 tokens) and those displaying the speaker's positive evaluation concerning what has been stated in the previous utterance (83 tokens). In this connection, it is appropriate to elaborate on the difference between confirmation and evaluation since previous studies have subsumed the two under the single term *stance* or *affect*, for example, Thompson and Hunston (2006) and Wu (2004). It is proposed that the difference between confirmation and positive evaluation are associated with the different states of the speaker, the former related to the epistemological state of the speaker and the latter to the emotional state of the speaker. While the expected task of confirmation is to check whether a statement is true or not, the counterpart of positive evaluation is to make a comment that something is good or bad. Therefore, the following analysis in this section will differentiate between confirmation and positive evaluation of *jiushi*, as illustrated below.

5.1.1.1. *Jiushi* as a marker of confirmation

Previously, numerous studies have proved that in the natural conversational interaction, people, either the speaker or the recipient, have to confirm what he or she has been said in order to arrive at an expected mutual understanding of each other, on which the subsequent conversation can proceed smoothly. To the best of my knowledge, Schegloff (1996b) is the first to deal with the action of confirmation within the framework of conversation analysis and he focuses on how one participant does the action of confirmation by repeating what the other participant has said, so that both what the latter means literally and alludes to are confirmed. As Schegloff (ibid.) puts it,

the participant confirms "something that had been conveyed inexplicitly", so that "both the allusion *and that it had been* an allusion" can be clarified (pp. 210, italics original).

Wu (2004) represents a more recent study in how a Mandarin-speaking participant deploys the final particle *ou* to perform this action in conversations. In this study, on one hand, she proposes tentatively that confirmation "pertains mainly to the knowledge status of coparticipants towards what is at issue" (pp. 53), which means that the coparticipants wish to clarify their epistemic status concerning the knowledge that they have acquired from what the other coparticipants have said or implicated. On the other hand, she also observes that in many languages including Mandarin, there are a variety of linguistic resources to perform the action of confirmation.

In this section, I will demonstrate that *jiushi*, when occupying the entire conversational turn, can function in this way.

In the following excerpt taken from Conversation 15, the caller discusses with the presenter about the recent job market for graduate students. Most of the time, the student complains about the dim future in the job market since the number of available job positions is much fewer than the number of recent graduates.

Excerpt 1

14 A: queshi +shi
        really   be

15   cong qu nian zao jiu bu hao le.
      from   last year early still not good   P

16   wo de naxie   pengyou zhaodao de gongzuo dou bu   tai   hao=
      I   P those   friend   find   P job   all   not   very   good

Really, the situation in the job market became worse since last year. The jobs that my friends have found are not very good.

17 B: wo zai xinwen li ye kandao le。
　　　I　in　news　in P　see　　P

18　　nanfang de gongzuo shichang hen　duo xuesheng　zai　zhao.
　　　southern P　job　　　market　very many student　　be　look for

19　　rengran hui you baifenzhishi　de ren　zhao　bu　dao 〈S〉
　　　still　will have ten percent　P people find　not　　P

I have also read the relevant news, which says that many students are still looking for jobs in the job markets in Southern China and that still ten percent of the recent graduates will not find any job.

20 A: *jiushi* {18}
　　　JIUSHI

You are right[9].

21 B: na　ni　xianzai you shenme juti　　de　dasuan ma。
　　　then you　now　have what concrete　P　　plan　P

Then do you have any concrete plan so far?

In line 20, the student utters a token of *jiushi* after the presenter says in line 19 something to the effect that the newspaper has released the statistical evidence that about ten percent of all those graduates will not find any job. After this token of *jiushi*, which stands as an independent conversational turn, the presenter takes the floor, inquiring whether the student has any definite plan to deal with such a situation, which makes the subsequent conversation shift into another topic. Given the conversational turns that both precede and follow this token of *jiushi*, it is evident that *jiushi* in this

---

[9] Since *jiushi* is a polyfunctional lexical item, it is hard to find a single umbrella word in English to cover all the functions to be identified in this thesis. Therefore, each of its functions displayed in my corpus is designated by a specific English word or phrase.

context has the direct bearing on the turn that precedes it in that by using *jiushi*, the student is orienting to what the presenter mentions in the preceding turn. What the student is implementing with the help of *jiushi* at this point is just to confirm that about ten percent of students will not be able to find a suitable job, as indicated in line 19 produced by the presenter. What the term "confirm" means here is that the speaker employs *jiushi* to indicate that he also thinks that what is said before is true, or corresponds to the actual world, although whether he believes it or not is still at issue.

After analyzing this example, I have to digress slightly by mentioning that in Chapter 2, the meaning of confirmation carried by *jiushi* is also mentioned by Lü (1999), which describes *jiushi* as indicating the speaker's confirmation when it is used independently. I should add that I define the term confirmation in a rather different way from Lü (1999). Whereas the latter considers confirmation roughly as synonymous with agreement, I define confirmation as the alignment of the speaker with the truth value of what is said.

Furthermore, since what *jiushi* is confirming is oriented towards what is said in the previous conversational turn, this function is accomplished in an interactive manner, rather different from the supposed manner of the "one-way linguistic mapping" (Wu, 2004: 3) pervading the description in Lü (1999).

Below is another example in which *jiushi* acts as a device to express the speaker's confirmation on the truth value of the knowledge presented by the other participant.

In Excerpt 1, *jiushi* is used to confirm what has been said literally in the preceding

utterance, but meanwhile, *jiushi* can also be orchestrated to confirm what has been

alluded to in the previous conversational turn. The practice of using *jiushi* to confirm

the allusion is somewhat different from what has been described in Schegloff (1996b),

in which the participant repeats part of the previous utterance, whether produced by the

speaker or by the recipient. In my database, when confirming the conversational

implicature in the previous conversational turn, the speaker utters only a single token of

jiushi to confirm that the implicature is a true proposition.

The Excerpt 2 from Conversation 32, in which a native of Changchun talks with the

presenter about the difference between Changchun and some bigger cities in Southern

China.

Excerpt 2

12 A: en wo faxian   le henduo +bu yiyang de difang
      mm I   find out P   many   not same   P place

    Mm, I have found out many differences.

13 B: birushuo。
       for example.

    Would you cite any example?

14 A: nanfang   de ren   de jingsheng zhuangtai gen changchun +hen   bu yiyang.
       southern   P people   P   mind   state   with Changchun very   not same

15   bi   zanmen zheli yao geng   jingye=
       compare   we   here will   more   committed

    There is much difference in the state of mind between the people in Southern
    China and those in Changchun. The people there are more committed to the work
    that they are doing.

16 B: ni**:** de yisi   shi zanmen de shiye   xin   buru   tamen ma。
     you P meaning be   we   P enterprise spirit   not   they P

Do you mean that our spirit of enterprise is not as strong as theirs?

17 A: *jiushi* {14}
    JIUSHI

You are right.

18 B: danshi wo juede**:** jingshen zhuangtai de chabie   mei   you zheme da**.**
     but   I feel   mind   state   P difference not have so big

But I do not think that the difference in the state of mind will be so much between the two areas.

In this example, the caller and the presenter are engaged in a discussion concerning what the caller thinks that contributes to the rather backwardness of Changchun compared with some bigger cities in Southern China. After the caller mentions in lines 14 and 15 that the sense of commitment to the job is much stronger among the people in Southern China than among those in Changchun, the presenter presents in line 16 her own understanding of what the caller has implied, by checking on her understanding of the caller's implicature. What the presenter is checking on here is the caller's implicature, not anything else, because previously, the caller has not mentioned explicitly the difference in the spirit of enterprise between Changchun and Southern China, but rather this is implied given the preceding utterances and the overall topic of this discussion. The presenter's raising questions regarding her understanding of the caller is also a frequently employed practice in the context of radio call-in program, because by bringing to light something implied in what has been

said, the presenter can "construct" a controversy (Drew, 2003:300; Hutchby, 1996). Regardless of the specific reason that the presenter attempts to create a controversy in this context, the caller utters a token of *jiushi* {14} to confirm that the implicature that the presenter has suggested is consistent with what he implies.

The above two conversation extracts, together with other similar cases not listed here, demonstrate *jiushi* as a device that conversation participants enlist to implement the action of confirmation. In other words, in order to monitor the due progression of the unfolding conversation, the participants have to give confirmation on both literal and implied meanings of the previous utterances and one resource that they can rely on is the particle *jiushi*.

With respect to the confirmation function, many studies have also proved that there are many other particle-like words or phrases both in Chinese and in English that the speaker may deploy to confirm what has been said in the proximately prior utterance. In Mandarin, apart from the utterance final particle *ou* (Wu, 2004) that denotes no semantic meaning, Chen and He (2001) suggests that in classroom discourse, the teacher often suffixes *dui bu dui* (meaning "right-not-right" in English), a tag question in Mandarin, to the end of a turn constructional unit, so that a brief confirmation of what he or she has said is provided. Another particle in Mandarin that people in conversations often deploy to assert the literal truth of a statement is *dui* (meaning "right" in English). Chui (2002), in her study in the role of ritualization in the development of the discourse particle function of *dui*, concludes that in conversational

interaction, people often use *dui* to commit to the truth value of what has been said either by others or by themselves. Yu-Fang Wang (1998) also considers *dui* as an "agreement marker" which indexes the speaker's assent. Other dialects in Chinese also contain some particles that can indicate confirmation on the part of the speaker, for example, *lo* in Cantonese (Luke, 1990) that, when following a description or a summary, also indicates that the current speaker is confirming that the state of affairs as provided by the previous speaker is compatible with the reality. When it comes to English, the most functionally similar marker is *yeah* in English, as Jucker and Smith (1998:181) notes: "Another major role of *yeah* is to present confirmation in sequences in which the interactants engage in meta-informational negotiation." They observe that usually, after the hearer utters "really" to invite confirmation or clarification from the speaker, the speaker often utters *yeah* to confirm the information that he or she has released. Thus far, it can be concluded tentatively that in order to meet the requirement that people engaged in the daily conversation have to frequently confirm whether the knowledge that he or she has received from the other partner is true or not, each language has provided a variety of resources that people may employ to perform this function. *Jiushi*, is just an example in point, as demonstrated in the above-mentioned two extracts.

In order to capture *jiushi*'s capacity of marking confirmation within Fraser's (1990, 1996) delineation of pragmatic markers, I claim that in the case of *jiushi* indicating confirmation on the part of the speaker, it is a basic marker, which is defined by Fraser

as signaling the specific force of the direct message of the sentence. As a marker of confirmation, *jiushi* indicates the speaker's validation of the truth value of the propositional content stated in the previous conversational turn, therefore, it shares with the basic marker two essential properties: being oriented towards the direct message and indicating a basic force of the following utterance.

5.1.1.2. *Jiushi* as a marker of positive evaluation

When it occupies an entire conversational turn, *jiushi* exhibits another function: to mark the positive evaluation that the speaker makes on what the other participant has said. As introduced at the beginning of the section 5.1.1, rather different from the notion of confirmation, which is related to the epistemological status of the speaker, the notion of positive evaluation is heavily laden with the speaker's emotion, subjective judgment and so on. Put in another way, by using *jiushi* as a marker of evaluation, what the speaker intends to gear towards is the idiosyncratic way that he or she conceives of the matter being discussed, therefore this evaluation function of *jiushi* is qualitatively different from the function of confirmation of the rather objective truth value illustrated in the foregoing section. In my present corpus, it is the usual case that at a particular slot of the conversational structure, by uttering a token of *jiushi*, the speaker evinces his or her emotional response to what has been said by the other participant.

An interesting phenomenon concurrent with the realization of *jiushi* as signals of positive evaluation is that among all these tokens (83 tokens) that are positive evaluators, more than half of them (57 tokens) are employed by the presenter to show

her sympathy towards the caller who often gives vent to the troubles that the latter has encountered before. Only (26 tokens) tokens are employed by the caller to express his or her positive evaluation of what the presenter says. This relative majority of those tokens of *jiushi* uttered by the presenter can be accounted for in terms of the several institutional features of the *Heart-to-Heart* radio program, one of which is that the goal-orientedness of the conversation dictates the respective obligation of the presenter and the caller: on the part of the presenter, the task is to show involvement in the caller's personal story. Therefore, it is natural that during the caller's telling of his or her own experience, the presenter may indicate her attentiveness to the caller's feeling, and one means of doing this is to use *jiushi* to give her positive evaluation of what the caller says.

The following excerpt is taken from Conversation 2, in which the caller phones in to talk about his disappointment with his son's performance in college.

Excerpt 3

66 A: (0.2) wo gen   ta shuo le   + hao   ji   hui   le.
          I   with he say   P   very   many time   P

67   buyao zai   chuqu da   youxi le.
      not   again   out   play   game P

68   ta   *jiushi* {31}bu   ting=
      he **JIUSHI**[10]   not listen

69   (0.4) hai ⟨S⟩
        Oh.

---

[10] This token of *jiushi* is in bold type because it will be analyzed in Section 5.3 as an adverb within an intonation unit, so is the 17th token of *jiushi* in Excerpt 7.

70   ni   shuo wo neng bu shengqi ma。
      you say   I can   not angry   P

    Many times, I have warned him not to play games, but he just turned a deaf ear
    to my criticism. How do you think I can refrain from being angry with this?

71 B: *jiushi* {32}.
    JIUSHI

    All right.

72 A: haiyou   ta   ma   hai xiangzhe ta ⟨S⟩
      besides   he mother still side with   he

    Besides, his mother sides with him on this matter.

73 B: en=
      mm

74   ni   de xinqing wo hen   lijie=.
      you P feeling   I very understand

75   qishi   zhe jian shiqing ni ye buyao +tai renzhen.
      in fact this cl   thing   ni P   not   too serious

    Mm. I really understand you current feeling. But in fact, you do
    not need to be too anxious with this matter.

    In the above excerpt, the caller, who has great expectations of his son, is very angry

at his son's bad performance in the college, so in this program, he talks with the

presenter about his concern, also giving vent to his anger with his wife, who fails to

recognize the seriousness of this problem. Well before this excerpt, he has told about

several episodes where he has given a serious lesson to his son and where he has

quarreled with his wife over his son's academic performance. In line 70, by asking a

rhetorical question ("How do you think I can refrain from being angry with this?"), he

expresses his current predicament: on the one hand, he is very dissatisfied with his son and on the other hand, he is at a loss as to what to do to solve this problem. To the caller's problem, the presenter responds by uttering a token of *jiushi* {32} in order to indicate her understanding of and sympathy for the caller, and in line 74, she states more explicitly that she understands the current situation in which he is bogged down. Obviously, the token of *jiushi* {32} presents a positive comment on all the efforts that the caller has paid in order to make his son quit playing truant and some other bad habits. After consideration of all the relevant factors, my conclusion is that the token of *jiushi* {32} indicates the presenter' sympathy with the caller regarding the matter, thus giving rise to the meaning of positive evaluation of what the caller has said.

Below is an example that shows more obviously the function of *jiushi* as an indicator of positive evaluation on the part of the speaker.

This excerpt is taken from Conversation 23, in which the caller talks with the presenter about the quarrel with her boyfriend.

Excerpt 4

65 B: ni　ye buyao shengqi　le ma。
　　　you　P　not　angry　P　P

　　Please do not be angry.

66 A: ni shuo zenme neng bu rang wo shengqi　ne=
　　　you say　how　can not let　I　angry　P

67　shangci　ta jingran shuo wo hen chou
　　　last time he even　say　I　very ugly

　　How can I refrain from being angry? Last time, he said that I am very ugly!

68 B: zhende ma。
    really

Really?

69 A: naci   wo zhen shi   hen   si   ta le=
    that time I   really be   hate   death he P

That time, I began to hate him to death.

70 B: *jiushi* {12}**.**
   JIUSHI

All right.

71 A: ta xianzai you   +yao   lai zhao wo**.**
    he   now again   want come contact I

Now he wants to contact me again.

In this excerpt, the caller, a girl in a college, complains about her boyfriend's awkward manner of behaving and talking, which gets her irritated. In line 67, in order to exemplify this fact, the girl cites a case where her boyfriend says that she is very ugly and this example does surprise the presenter, as she seeks confirmation from the girl by asking "really?". The girl confirms this explicitly by saying that her hatred of him was intensified considerably by his words. And interestingly, her repulsion towards him is supported by the presenter who utters a token of *jiushi* {12} to show her attitude towards this matter: the girl's hatred is well justified since her boyfriend violates the generally accepted taboo against describing any girl as ugly. Parallel to the token of *jiushi* ({32}) in Excerpt 3, the token of *jiushi* in this excerpt also represents the presenter' positive evaluation of what the girl feels.

Although the above two excerpts contain *jiushi* uttered by the presenter, there do

exist some cases in which the caller also utters *jiushi* to present his or her positive

evaluation of what is said by the presenter. In the next excerpt, the caller, a student in a

secondary school, voices his deep repugnance towards his teacher.

Excerpt 5

33 A: houlai wo juede ta haoxiang jiu dui wo you   le + chengjian.
     later   I   feel he   seem   P to   I have   P   prejudice

34   ta dui wo de taidu   jiu tebie bu   hao=
     he to   I   P attitude P   very not   good

    Later, I felt that he seemed to have formed a prejudice against me and he
    began to be less friendly to me than before.

35 B: leisi   de jingli   wo ye you guo.
    similar   P experience   I P   have P

36   bie   tai zaiyi   ni shuo ne。
     not   too care   you say   P

 I also have had a similar experience. There is no need to be overly concerned
 about this, don't you think so?

37 A: *jiushi* {19}
   JIUSHI

   All right .

38 B: zuo hao ziji de shiqing jiu xing   le.
    do well self P   thing   P   good P

  It is enough to get your own things done properly.

39 A: wo jue   de ye shi.
    I   feel   P P be

    I think so, too.

In the earlier part of the conversation, the student introduces one incident that takes place between his teacher and him, an incident that gives rise to the prejudice held currently by his teacher against him and it is due to this prejudice that this student feels very uneasy. In line 36, the presenter suggests that he should not be overly concerned about this matter, which is followed by a question "don't you think so?". To this question, the student responds very firmly with a token of *jiushi* {19}, which should be understood as an indicator of the student's positive evaluation concerning what should be done in order to deal with this annoyance. This positive evaluation is echoed once more in line 39, in which, by producing the utterance "I think so, too", the student accepts the advice raised by the presenter that he should concentrate on his own studies.

It is common to the above three examples that by uttering a token of *jiushi*, the speaker, whether the caller or the presenter, invests *jiushi* with his or her own emotional empathy with the other participant and expresses his or her positive evaluation of what the other participant has said.

Referring again to Fraser's definition of commentary markers, which indicate comments on some aspect of the basic message stated in the previous utterance, I claim that when used as a signal of positive evaluation on the part of the speaker, *jiushi* is a commentary marker. More specifically, *jiushi* is supposed to belong to the subcategory of assessment markers within commentary markers.

Here, it might be appropriate to make reference to other functionally similar

particles in Mandarin that can reveal the speakers' evaluation. Among them, one functionally versatile particle is *hao* (meaning "good" in English), with one function as a signal of positive evaluation on the part of the speaker (Shao and Zhu, 2005). Other particles or phrases that exhibit neutral or even negative evaluation include *hai hao* (meaning "still good" in English) (Biq, 2004a), *meiyou* (meaning "not to have" in English) and *bushi* (meaning "not to be" in English) (Yu-Fang Wang, 2006) and so on. These numerous studies on the evaluative functions of particles or phrases attest to the fact that evaluation, as a ubiquitous discourse practice in the human interactive communication, can be realized through many linguistic means in Mandarin.

To sum up, in this section, I have examined the cases where *jiushi* occupies an entire conversational turn, and the analysis produces the result that basically, *jiushi* is used by the speaker to perform two functions: one is to indicate that the speaker confirms the truth value both of the literal meaning and of the implied meaning; the other is to indicate the positive evaluation on the part of the speaker concerning what others think of or say in the previous conversational turn.

It should be noted here that among all those tokens of *jiushi* that stand as independent conversational turns, there do exist some tokens that, apart from the functions of indicating confirmation or positive evaluation, seem to mark simultaneously a local topical transition within the larger sequential conversational organization. For example, in line 19 of Excerpt 1, the presenter offers a piece of information that ten percent of the graduates will not find a job, which is confirmed by

the caller with a token of *jiushi* in line 20, and after this, the presenter asks in line 21 a question ("do you have any definite plan?"), which makes the ongoing conversation shift to another topical area, where the student begins to talk about his tentative plan for the future. In Excerpt 4, after the caller expresses her hatred of her boyfriend in line 69, which is evaluated positively by the presenter with a token of *jiushi* in line 70, the caller begins to mention another fact that recently, her boyfriend has begun to contact her again. These two examples show that there do exist some cases where *jiushi* at a particular sequential slot in the conversation can perform more than one job simultaneously: either confirmation plus topical transition or evaluation plus topical transition. For the presence of this problem with a pragmatic marker, both Heritage (1984) and Tanaka (2000) share the opinion that given the potentially infinite variety and richness of human interaction, no claim can be made for an exhaustive explication of every possible usage of a linguistic expression. Earlier studies on other linguistic items also draw attention to this problem: Biq (2001) finds that in a particular context, some polysemous words may imply more than one meaning; Chen and He (2001) note that the distinction between two functions of *dui bu dui*, confirmation requesting and confirmation providing, is not very clear-cut in some cases; De Fina (1997) also notes that *bien* as an evaluation marker does not completely lose its transitional character.

5.1.2. *Jiushi* within a conversational turn

In this section, I turn the attention to those 391 tokens of *jiushi*, each of which, as an independent intonation unit, is embedded within a conversational turn produced by

the same speaker. A detailed analysis uncovers that the participants in the conversation employ *jiushi* to perform two basic actions: to mark hesitation (214 tokens) and to reformulate any aspect of the prior utterance (177 tokens).

5.1.2.1. *Jiushi* as a marker of hesitation

For a long time, joint research in language from psychology and linguistics has documented that due to limitations in memory and attention or to psychological constraints (Swerts, 1998), the spontaneous speech is fraught with a variety of imperfect uses of language, such as hesitations, flaws in syntactical constructions, articulation errors and so on (Carroll, 2004; Slobin,1971). Among these phenomena, hesitation has attracted extensive investigations from different angles, among which, those made from the perspectives of discourse analysis and pragmatics try to reveal the communicative implications carried by hesitations[11]. Goldman-Eisler (1968), the seminal work on hesitations in natural speech, observes that words after hesitations have a low transitional probability, thus predicting a high informational value. Brennan and Williams (1995) remark that hesitations may indicate the speaker's feeling-of-another's-knowing in dialogues. Stenström (1994) notices the turn-holding function of hesitations and Swerts (1998) considers filled pauses as markers of discourse structure and so on. In contrast to so much work devoted to hesitations in many other languages, the counterpart research in Chinese, particularly in the linguistic items in Chinese associated with hesitations, is relatively little. The following analysis

---

[11] In some other works (Carroll, 2004; Field, 2004), the word "pause" is used more frequently than "hesitation". But in this thesis, I use the word "hesitation" instead.

of those tokens of *jiushi* which stand as independent intonation units within the same conversational turn will illustrate that it can function as a pragmatic marker to signal the speaker's hesitation. The following example is just a case in point.

The excerpt below is taken from Conversation 19, in which an undergraduate tells about his quarrel with one of his roommates.

Excerpt 6

18 A: na   shi xiaojie=
      thus   shi miss

19   wo   jide   ni cengjing
      you remember you once

20   *jiushi*{24}
      JIUSHI[12]

21   (0.3) yizhi   zhuchi   zhe   ge   jiemu   ba。
          always   host   this   cl   program   P

      Miss Shi, you have always☐been the presenter on this program, haven't you?

22 B: <M *en*。
          so

      So?

23 A: wo   xie   le   ji   shou   ger.
       I   write P   several cl   song P

24   wo   ganjue turan   xiang chang chulai
       I   feel suddenly want sing   out

25   keyi   ma。
      may   P

---

[12] For the function of marking hesitation, there is no corresponding word in English, therefore I do not provide any English translation. But I indicate this function by using a dash in the third line of translation.

I have written several songs. I want to sing a song. May I sing a song?

26 B: keyi ya。M〉
    may   P

Of course.

27 A: ni   ganjue   yixia**.**
    you   feel   a bit

28   *en*。
    mm

29   *jiushi*{25}
    JIUSHI

30   *jiushi* {26}
    JIUSHI

31   wo   xie   de zenmeyang**.**
    I   write   P   how

And you may listen to it and feel (mm)☐ ☐whether it is good or not.

The analysis focuses on these three tokens of *jiushi*: {24}, {25} and {26}, which stand as lone intonation units sequentially in the overall turn organization. This excerpt happens at the end of Conversation 19, where, this student, after talking about his anger over the quarrel with his roommate, makes a request to sing a song by telephone. As is explained by him later, all his roommates have fallen asleep when he begins to talk with the presenter. And besides, because he has been talking with the presenter for about a quarter before he demands to sing a song, he is not sure how the presenter will react to his request. In such circumstances, the tokens of *jiushi* he uses are indicative of his mental processes underlying speech generation (Swerts, 1998), i.e. how to express

his request in a more acceptable way. This mental process of searching for the appropriate wording is more conspicuous in lines 29 and 30, where two tokens of *jiushi* are clustered together by the student to gain more time for his search.

In this excerpt, *jiushi*'s function of marking hesitation is compatible with Fraser's (1996) definition of parallel markers, which signal an entire message in addition to the basic message, because as a marker of hesitation, *jiushi* is definitely not an integral part of the message conveyed either in the preceding utterance or in the following utterance.

A point that should be made here is that *jiushi*'s function of marking hesitation is also mentioned by Biq (2001:61), who considers it as a mere pause filler, or a "dummy" floor holder, which is illustrated in the following example provided by her (PRT in the following represents final particles in her transcription conventions):

(14)
B: .. Danshi,
        but
B: Zhongguo ne,
        China   PRT
B: .. fan   guolai ne   *jiushi*,
        reverse over PRT JIUSHI
B: .. hen zhongshi zhege wenrenhua,
        INT emphasize this M literati painting
B: .. But,
B: .. China,
B: .. on the contrary **jiushi**,
B: .. regards literati paintings as important.

In this example, instead of contributing any substantial semantic meaning to its preceding proposition, *jiushi* serves the communicative function of indicating the speaker's intention of continuing with his or her turn. In her corpus of conversational speech, Biq finds that the frequency of *jiushi* as a floor holder is as high as 39%. In my

corpus, the total occurrence of this function also occupies a large proportion of the total tokens of *jiushi* (20.6%). This similarity between the two corpora is not surprising given the fact that the conversations that take place in the *Heart-to-Heart* program are very close to ordinary conversations (albeit with some institutional features). And on the other hand, this similarity also points to the fact that *jiushi* has undergone an enormous semantic bleaching from an adverb to a marker of hesitation.

As mentioned in Section 4.3, in company with *jiushi*, there are some contextualization cues or back-channel cues whose co-presence contributes to its functioning as pragmatic markers. Biq (2001) makes the similar remark that contiguity of a discourse marker with other linguistic items is the driving force behind its development into its marker use. A detailed observation of the data reveals that when *jiushi* functions as a marker of hesitation, some other items cluster around it, whether before or after it. In line 28 of Excerpt 6 above, the caller utters a token of *en*, after which, he utters two tokens of *jiushi* successively to display his hesitation.

Excerpt 7 contains another token of *jiushi*, which, as a marker of hesitation, collocates with *en*. This excerpt is taken from Conversation 2, in which a company employee complains about the problem arising from the communication with his customers.

Excerpt 7
13 A: wo   houlai   you   qu   le   yici=
    I   afterwards   again go   P   once

14   wo qu de difang ***jiushi*** {17}shangci wo he   ta chaojia de difang
    I   go P place **JIUSHI**   last time   I with he quarrel P   place

That afternoon, I went again to just the place where we had the quarrel.

15 B: **en.**
    mm

    Mm.

16 A: na   tian xiawu wo juede ting= (0.3)
      that day afternoon I feel   very

17   *jiushi*{18}(0. 2)
     JIUSHI

18   ting   buhaoyisi**.**
   very embarrassed

  That afternoon, I felt very— very embarrassed.

19 B: na   houlai   ni   meiyou   zai   jieshi   yixia ma。
     then afterwards you   not   again   explain once   P

   Then afterwards, you did not explain it anymore, did you?

20 A: ou meiyou**.**
     oh not

21   danshi na   yihou
      but   that afterwards

22   **en**
    mm

23   *jiushi*{19}
    JIUSHI

24   wo   jiu   zai   ye mei yudao guo   zhe yang de kehu**.**
     I   particle again   P not   meet   P   this   kind P customer

  Oh, not. But since then on, mm—I have not met such a kind of customer.

Among altogether three tokens of *jiushi* in this excerpt, my analysis focuses on the

last two tokens ({18} and {19}), as the token {17} is merely a constituent modifier, which will be dealt with in Section 5.3 of this chapter.

Well before this excerpt, the employee tells about how a misunderstanding between a customer and him arises from an incident where he mistakenly sells a repaired refrigerator to this customer. Then the irritated customer complains about his mistake to the senior manager of the supermarket, who criticizes the employee harshly and requires him to make an apology to the customer. This is a bitter experience to this employee, indeed, so in narrating this story, he feels somewhat reluctant to express himself, which is cued by the hesitation that he shows when he tries to search for what is to be said subsequently. In line 16, he produces an incomplete utterance with the last syllable prolonged. And the adjective following the adverb "*ting*" (very) should have been produced but remains unvoiced until in line 18, in which he says that he feels very embarrassed when facing the customer. Between lines 16 and 18, in order to prevent the presenter from interrupting his speech, he utters a token of *jiushi* ({18}) which indicates his state of searching for appropriate words to describe exactly his feeling at that time. In the last conversational turn (including lines from 20 to 24) contributed by the caller, he wants to express a single idea that since then on, he has never met such a kind of customer. But in the process of expressing this idea, he stops two times, in lines 22 and 23 successively with "*en*" and "*jiushi*"({19}), so the thrust of his idea is not spelled out until line 24 is produced. Therefore, it is obvious that in the above example, during the unfolding of the caller's speech, when he wants to stop

to look for the next word to be uttered, he uses *jiushi* to fill this gap, thus preventing himself from being interrupted by the presenter.

So far, it is necessary to elaborate on the function of *en*, which occurs several times (in lines 22 and 28 of Excerpt 6 and in lines 15 and 22 of Excerpt 7). In my present study, I claim that *en* is a contextualization cue in that at certain slots in the conversation, *en* is orchestrated by the speaker to "sustain certain types of particular orientation to the talk that is being created" (De Fina, 1997: 340). And it is also on the same ground that she remarks that the Spanish marker *bien* also exhibits the property of a contextualization cue when it functions as a transitional marker that segments the interactional classroom discourse (De Fina, 1997). In my current database, by uttering a token of "*en*", either the presenter or the speaker is trying to indicate that he or she is engaged in the situated meaning negotiation in which *jiushi* is recognized as a marker of hesitation.

A closer examination of the tokens of *jiushi* as hesitation markers shows that sometimes it collocates with other contextualization cues, such as *ranhou* (which means roughly "then" in English) etc., and that there are also some cases where two or three tokens of *jiushi* are linked together by the speaker to prolong the length of hesitation in order to gain more time to search for appropriate words. This linking of more than one token of *jiushi* can be observed in Excerpt 6, in which two tokens ({25} and {26}) are clustered together. The following table illustrates several patterns in which *jiushi* is used together with other contextualization cues.

Total tokens of *jiushi* as hesitation markers	214	100%
Tokens of *jiushi* preceded by *ranhou*	15	0.07%
Tokens of *jiushi* preceded or followed by *en*	53	24.8%
Cases of two tokens of *jiushi* linked together	57	26.6%
Tokens of *jiushi* used alone	89	41.6%

Table 2: Collocation patterns of *jiushi* as markers of hesitation

5.1.2.2. *Jiushi* as a marker of reformulation

According to del Saz and Fraser (2003), the notion of reformulation in linguistics originated within text linguistics, and was further developed and reinterpreted as a discourse relation between two discourse segments by subsequent researchers. Among many definitions of reformulation proposed so far, two are most widely accepted. One is proposed by del Saz, in which

a reformulation occurs when what is said, meant or implied by discourse segment, S1, is reinterpreted by the speaker in the following segment, S2, with the specific type of reformulation signaled by a marker of such an operation (2003:3).

A more elaborate definition is given by Cuenca (2003) in which it is proposed that reformulation is a discourse operation by which the speaker re-elaborates an idea for several considerations, for example, in order to extend the information previously given or to be more specific on what has been said or to "facilitate the hearer's understanding

of the original" (Blakemore, 1993:107). Moreover, Cuenca (2003: 1071) also suggests that "reformulation is based on an equivalence operation such that two utterances are shown as different ways to express a single idea", but this equivalence is more than simply a semantic or propositional one, rather, in the process of reformulation, a certain extent of "variation is suggested" (Gülich and Kotschi, 1995: 42), and this variation means several discourse values that fall within the domain of pragmatics: explanation, specification, generalization or implication, etc. (Cuenca, 2003).

Apart from the discourse relationship established by reformulation over two discourse segments, the scopes of reformulation, i.e. what aspects of the previous discourse segment are to be reformulated, are also circumscribed by some scholars. For example, del Saz and Fraser (2003) assume that a reformulation can range from a paraphrase of a constituent, to a recasting of the intended meaning by the speaker, to the revision of an implication of the prior message, to a correction or to a request for information. Fetzer (2003) also notes that many aspects of the previous utterance can be reformulated, including the informational content, the illocutionary force of a communicative act, the discursive and pragmatic presuppositions of appropriateness, sincerity or truth and even the speaker-intended meaning.

Moreover, building on these theoretical generalizations, many studies have investigated empirically the way that certain linguistic items in different languages that indicate reformulation are employed and distributed, for example, Blakemore (1993), Brinton (2003) and Schiffrin (1987) on the phrase *I mean* in English; Cuenca (2003) on

the comparison of reformulation markers as used in the academic writing in English, Spanish and Catala; Rossari (1994) on the comparative study in reformulation markers between French and Italian, and so on.

Given so much research in the reformulation by the western scholars, it is a pity that very little has been done on Chinese and the following analysis will exemplify the function of *jiushi* as a marker of reformulation, which, although standing as a separate intonation unit, operates on both the preceding and the following intonation units. Because what is said in the intonation unit following *jiushi* reformulates some specific aspect of what has been said in the intonation unit preceding *jiushi*, I claim that *jiushi* realizes the function of reformulation. In Fraser (1996)'s classification of pragmatic markers, those words or phrases that signal reformulation are subsumed as elaborative markers under the rubric of discourse markers. Since the function of reformulation implies the "relationship of the basic message to the foregoing discourse" and provides "instructions to the addressee on how the utterance to which the discourse marker is attached is to be interpreted" (ibid.:186), *jiushi* should be classified as a discourse marker.

The following excerpt provides an example in which *jiushi* reformulates what has been stated explicitly in the previous intonation unit.

Excerpt 8 is taken from Conversation 23, in which an undergraduate tells about the agony that she has experienced after her parents got divorced.

Excerpt 8

46 B: na   houlai   ne。
        then   afterwards P

     Then what happened afterwards?

47 A: houlai wo mei xiangdao hui fasheng zhe zhong shi.
       then   I   not expect   ever happen this kind thing

48   ting duo   ci   ganjue hen wunai.
      very many time   feel very at a loss

49   *jiushi* {28}.
       JIUSHI

50   xinli   tebie   kunhuo   ye hen nanshou.
      mentally totally perplexed P   very in agony

     Then I never expected such a thing to happen. Many times, I have been at a
     loss as what to do. That is to say, I felt totally perplexed. I have experienced
     much agony.

51 B: na *ni shi shuo.*
         so you be mean

52   *jiushi*{29}.
      JIUSHI

53   youxie bu   tai   yuanyi jieshou zhe yang   yi   zhong shishi.
      a little not too   want accept   this kind one   kind   fact

54   shima。
      Is it true?

     So you mean, that is to say, that you are not prepared to accept such a thing,
     don't you?

Either of the two tokens of *jiushi* ({28}and {29}) stands as an independent

intonation unit within the same conversational turn and in terms of the function

performed in its own sequential position respectively, each establishes a discourse relation of reformulation between two discourse units, in this case, what is said in two intonation units both before and after each token of *jiushi*. This extracted piece of conversation takes place when the participant calls in to describe how she feels after her parents get divorced during her second undergraduate year. According to her account before his excerpt, this sudden event is just like a bolt out of the blue and her normal college life, which would have been very happy and exciting, is shot through by sadness. As is shown in the recording, in the middle of her narrative, with her voice trembling, she manages to choke back her tears in order to continue to talk. Since the *Heart-to-Heart* program offers an opportunity for her to express her feeling that she would be reluctant to reveal to others, she tries to deploy some words or phrases to describe her feeling in such a way that the presenter can understand her as precisely as possible. After she says that she gets at loss as what to do when faced with her parents' divorce in line 48, she utters a token of *jiushi* ({28}), after which she adds in line 50 that she feels very perplexed and much agony in the heart. A close examination of the relation between lines 48 and 50 uncovers the fact that by uttering line 50, the caller seems to imply that "I felt totally perplexed. I have experienced much agony" can present a more precise description of what she feels at that time than "many times, I have been at a loss as what to do" can do, therefore, line 50 represents a specification on what is said in line 48, which is marked by *jiushi* ({28}).

The second token of *jiushi* ({29}) appears in line 52, in which after listening to the

caller's description of her own feeling in line 50, the presenter wants to check on whether her understanding is right or not, so she says in line 53 that the caller may not be ready to accept such a reality, which is prefaced by *jiushi* in line 52. In terms of the reformulation function that *jiushi* serves, it links line 50 and line 53, with the latter representing a revised version of the former.

In fact, the reformulation function of *jiushi* ({29}) is already anticipated when the presenter utters "*ni shi shuo*" ("you mean") line 51, which is also a reformulation marker in this context. This is not the only case where a phrase such as "*ni shi shuo*" in Excerpt 8 functions as a reformulation marker. In the same way that there are many words or phrases in English that are capable of formulating the prior discourse unit, for example, *in other words*, *that is to say*, *in a word*, etc., there are also many words or phrases in Mandarin that have the capacity to establish reformulation between two discourse units. As far as my database is concerned, these phrases include: "*wo de yisi shi*" ("what I mean is"), "*wo shi shuo*" ("I mean"), "*jiushishuo*" ("that is"), "*zenme shuo ne*" ("how to say") and so on. Sometimes, these words or phrases are used alone, but sometimes, they cluster together with *jiushi*, thus facilitating the interpretation of *jiushi* as a reformulation marker, as demonstrated in Excerpt 9 which is taken from Conversation 10 in which an undergraduate tells about one incident that happens between his teacher and him.

Excerpt 9

14 B: 〈L　ni　you　gen　ta　jiang le ma。L〉
　　　 you again with he　talk　P　P

76

Have you talked with him again?

15 A: <M wo qu gou ta   de bangongshi**.**
      I   go P he P   office

16   nage laoshi dui   wo daoshi   ting   hao**.**
    that teacher to   I anyway   very   kind

17   danshi wo zong ganjue youxie   bu   duijin
    but   I always   feel somewhat not at ease

   I went to his office and he was very kind to me. But I still felt uneasy.

18 B: shi bu shi hai xiang zhe na jian shi
    be not be still think P   that cl incident

   Did you still think about that incident?

19 A: *zenme shuo ne*
    how to say   P

20   *jiushi* {13}(0.3)
     JIUSHI

21   na   jian shi   wo queshi zong   ye wang bu   liao
    that   cl incident I   really always P forget not   P

22   juede   xinli   zong   youdianr   kuijiu   gan   he zibei   gan**.**
    feel mentally always somewhat P   guilt feeling and humble feeling

23   jiu xiang   yiqian zuo le   shenme   huai   shi   shi   de**.** M〉
    just seem before   do P   certain   bad   thing seem   P

   How to say? That is to say, I can not forget that incident. I felt a sense of guilt
   and humility. And it seems that I have done something wrong before.

24 B: 〈L〉 na= ni de ganqing hen fuza。
       then you P feeling very complex

25   *wo shi shuo*
    I be say

26 *jiushi* {14}
    JIUSHI

27 ni zhidao ziji   cuo   le**.**
    you know yourself mistake P

28 haishi youxie   jianchi nage   cuor**.**
    still somewhat insist   that mistakeP

Now your feeling is very complex. I mean, and that is to say, that you have realized your mistake, but you still insist on your previous mistake.

In this conversation, the student describes what he has thought about his teacher after an unhappy incident has happened between them, so the basic mood of his conversation is a rather somber one. This is why a piece of music with a somewhat depressing mood is added by the studio staff to modify the atmosphere of the conversation and this music helps to indicate that the participant feels a little sorrow about his past misconduct. In this excerpt, two tokens of *jiushi* ({13} and {14}), function as reformulation markers, together with two other phrases, *zenme shuo ne* and *wo shi shuo*.

It should be underscored that in the case of *jiushi* ({13}), which establishes a reformulation relation between line 18 and line 21, it is the presupposition of the former line that is reformulated in the latter. In line 18, the presenter asks whether the uneasiness of the caller when he faces with the teacher is due to the fact that he is still brooding over his mistake and the presenter's question presupposes the fact that his previous mistake weighs heavily in his mind. After uttering *zenme shuo ne* and *jiushi* in lines 19 and 20 respectively, the caller does admit explicitly in line 21 the

presupposition of line 18 that the incident is really unforgettable. The reformulation

process in this example is in line with the observation in del Saz and Fraser (2003:7)

that "a presupposition of a segment may also be reformulated in the same way,

rendering an implicit proposition explicit". To illustrate it, they list the following two

examples with the reformulation markers printed in boldface:

The King of France is dead. **In other words**, there was a King of France.

John has stopped beating his wife. **That is to say**, he had been beating her.

Another example of reformulation marker is the token of *jiushi* ({14}). Prefaced by

the phrase *wo shi shuo* in line 25, this token of *jiushi* introduces lines 27 and 28 by

spelling out what the presenter implies by uttering line 24 ("your feeling is very

complex"). In lines 27 and 28, she explains in detail her understanding of the caller's

feeling: on the one hand, he is aware of his previous mistake and on the other hand, he

is reluctant to accept it. What is reformulated by this token of *jiushi* is the implication

of the previous intonation unit, therefore this example is compatible with del Saz and

Fraser (2003:7) that the "implication of the previous discourse unit can also be

reformulated", as illustrated in their following two examples:

He bought alcohol to the party. **Still worse**, he gave it to minors.

Come at noon. **Better still**, come at 1 right after the lunch break.

Before ending this section, it should be pointed out that in my corpus, I have

identified another phrase *jiushishuo*, which is morphologically close to *jiushi* in that the

former contains *jiushi* and *shuo* (a verb that means "say"). So its literal meaning can be

translated as "that is" (Biq, 2001). There are altogether 204 tokens of *jiushishuo*, which, as independent intonation units, also mark the discourse relation that the upcoming intonation unit reformulates certain aspect of the previous intonation unit. This function of *jiushishuo* is similar to that of further elaboration identified in Biq (2001).

Excerpt 10, taken from Conversation 40, contains such a token of *jiushishuo* as a marker of reformulation.

20 B: youshihou   mei   you   biyao   zaiyi   zhexie shi**.**
      sometimes   not   have   have to   care about these thing

21   bing bu shi suoyou zhexie shi dou zhide   ni qu xiang。
      still not be   all   these thing all   worth you go think

22   en+shi bu shi。
      mm be not be

    You do not have to care about all these things because not all of
    them are worth considering. Mm, is that right?

23 A: ye bu quan   shi zheyang**.**
      P not always be thus

24   *jiushi*{12}(0.3)
      JIUSHI

25   wo jingchang ye   zheyang quan   ziji=
       I   often   P   thus persuade myself

26   danshi xinli   zong   fang bu xia**.**
      but in the heart always put not down

27   ***jiushishuo***
      JIUSHISHUO

28   (0.1) bijing zhexie   shi ting fanren
          still   these thing very annoying

29   yinwei gen tongshi   zhijian chubuhao   queshi=
      because with colleague between not get along well indeed

30   pingshi gongzuo jingchang dajiaodao。
     usually   work   often   keep in contact

31   ting   bieniu<S>。
      very uncomfortable

But it is not always the case. That is to say, often I persuade myself in this way, but in my heart of hearts, I can not forget these things, that is, because these things are very annoying. The reason is that I cannot get along with my colleagues. But I meet my colleagues very often at work and I feel very uncomfortable.

32B: danshi ni zheyang zong xiang ye   bu xing a。
      but   you   thus always think P   not work P

33   ni keyi shi yi   shi zhe   ge banfa.
       you can try once try this cl method

34   *jiushishuo*
       JIUSHISHUO

35   yi xiangqi zhexie shi de shihou jiu qu zuo xie   bie de shi
       once think   these thing P time just go do some other P thing

36   wo xiang zheyang ni shi bu shi neng hao xie。
      I   think   thus   you be not be can good somewhat

But it does no good to you if you always think about these things. You may try a method, that is, whenever you think about these things, you can do some other things so that you can forget them and you may feel better.

In this conversation, the caller, a teacher who has just begun to work in a college, tells about his troubles that arise from his communication with his colleagues. The drift of his conversation is that he finds it difficult to cope with some implicit aspects involved in the communication with his colleagues.

Two tokens of *jiushishuo* in lines 27 and 34 appear in this excerpt and one is used

by the caller and other by the presenter. Since both of them form independent intonation units, in order to interpret precisely their specific functions as realized in this context, we should go beyond focusing on the isolated token of *jiushishuo* by considering the semantic and pragmatic relations between the two utterances connected by *jiushishuo*. At the beginning of this excerpt, commenting on what the caller has complained about, the presenter suggests that he should not worry much about some trivial matters, but this suggestion is challenged by him in the following conversational turn, in which he describes how serious it is if he cannot get well along with others and how uneasy he feels if he meets any of his colleagues who are at odds with him. Sequentially, the token of *jiushishuo* in line 27 connects two intonation units in lines 26 and 28. After he expresses in line 26 the idea that he tries to forget these matters but in vain, he employs *jiushishuo* to introduce line 28, in which he further elaborates on the previous utterance by adding that these matters are very annoying, indeed. A comparison of line 26 with line 28 reveals certain pragmatic shift which is bound up with the speaker's intention of conveying such a message that line 28 transmits a more accurate reflection of what he thinks about the troublesome problem with his colleagues. Based on the several discourse values that are covered by reformulation (Cuenca, 2003), elaboration on the previous content also falls within the scope of reformulation, and in this case, *jiushishuo* reformulates the propositional content of the previous intonation unit.

Another token of *jiushishuo* used by the presenter in line 34 also functions as a

marker of reformulation, which introduces the details of the solution that she suggests in the hope of relieving the caller of this mental burden. In line 32, by saying that it does no good being immersed in these trivial things, the presenter shows deep concern with the fact that the caller cannot cease to think about the problem that he faces, and she further indicates in line 33 that she wants to suggest a method for distracting his attention from them. After uttering a token of *jiushishuo* in line 34, she explains in great detail what this method is in lines 35 and 36. So the token of *jiushishuo* in line 34 signals a specification on the previous discourse segment, and also has a reformulation function.

The above analysis reveals that when *jiushi* stands as an independent intonation unit that marks reformulation, it exhibits several collocational patterns, either used alone or together with other words or phrases that perform the same function.

5.2. *Jiushi* initiating an intonation unit

In the data, there are altogether 349 tokens of *jiushi* which initiate intonation units. Prosodically, a unified intonation group ranges over *jiushi* and what follows it, and structurally, each of these tokens of *jiushi* is followed by a noun phrase, a verb phrase or a clause, so, each of them, according to Lü (1999), is supposed either to indicate the speaker's emphasis on what is denoted by the verb or the adjective or to delimit the extension denoted by the noun or the subject of the clause. A close analysis supported by the examples in the data, however, will show that the function of *jiushi* runs counter to the descriptions in Lü (1999). And the analysis conducted within the framework of

interactional linguistics will produce a fresh result that *jiushi* functions either as a marker of reinforcement or as a marker of reformulation.

5.2.1. *Jiushi* as a marker of reinforcement

Recent studies within pragmatics have drawn attention to an interesting phenomenon that the illocutionary force of the utterance varies in degree and among the various means of modulating the illocutionary force, most studied are those associated with attenuation, downgrading or mitigation (Caffi, 1999; Fraser, 1980; Holmes, 1984). It is Holmes (1984) who first observed that mitigation should be best considered in relation to the more general communicative strategies for modifying the illocutionary force of speech acts, and that complementary to mitigation is the boosting, reinforcement or strengthening of the illocutionary force. Furthermore, Sbisà (2001) suggests that the linguistic means of modifying the illocutionary force should also be accommodated into a revised speech act theory, so that modification can be correlated to the fine tuning of the interpersonal relationship between the interlocutors engaged in the verbal interaction. To this end, she recasts the standard conception of speech act proposed by Searle (1969) as one in which the uptake of a particular illocutionary force is not solely dependent upon the unilateral intention of the speaker alone, rather, the uptake is a sequel to the

aspects of the interpersonal relationship that are settled on the basis of the intersubjective agreement, which in turn is affected by the conventional effects of the speech acts (Sbisà, 2001:1797).

In other words, the illocutionary force of a speech act will vary relative to a profusion of factors associated with the multi-layered and multi-dimensional language use in the real context (Caffi, 1999); therefore, Holmes (1984:363) reminds us that the same linguistic forms "may function in some contexts as attenuating devices, in others as boosting devices" and that the identification of the boosting or attenuating of the illocutionary force should be based on the large corpus of natural conversations.

As to the linguistic devices that are deployed to modify the illocutionary force, Holmes (1984) exemplifies prosodic, syntactical, lexical and discoursal devices that are frequently used in English. Among these devices, there are some lexical items adjoined to the main sentence (for example, *I believe*, *certainly*, or *absolutely*, etc.) or phrases that indicate the illocutionary force of the following utterance (e.g. *I tell you*, *I warn you*, *furthermore*, etc.). Both functionally and morphologically, these devices are similar to *jiushi* which will be demonstrated in the following analysis as marking reinforcement of the illocutionary force when it initiates an intonation unit,

Excerpt 11 is extracted from Conversation 31, in which a company employee tells about her disappointment that she has never met a suitable man to marry though she has gone to many blind dates.

16 A: yaoxiang zhao ge heshi   de   ting nan   bu shi   ma。
　　　 want   find   cl suitable P   very hard   not be   P

　　　 It is very difficult to find a suitable man, isn't it?

17 B: [ni shuo shenme jiaozuo   heshi   de renxuan ne。]
      you say   what count as   suitable   P   man   P

      What kind of people do you think can count as suitable men?

18 A: [youqi   shi   chulai   gongzuo yihou.]
     especially   be   come out   work   afterwards

      It is even harder especially after I came to work in a company.

19 B: en。
       mm

20   ni renwei shenme cai   jiao   heshi   de renxuan ne。
      you think   what just count as   suitable P   man   P

      Mm? What kind of people do you think can count as suitable men?

21 A: en:
       mm

22   *jiushi*{18}ta dei you   ting qiang de   shiyexin.
      JIUSHI   he must have very strong P   enterprise

23   *jiushi* {19} lingwai   ta dei   you   yiding de gongzuo nengli.
      JIUSHI   additionally he must   have   certain P   work   ability

24 *jiushi*{20} ta   hai   dei   jiji   yidianr.
      JIUSHI   he additionally must   active   a little P

   Mm. In particular, he must be of great enterprise. In particular, he must also have
   certain work ability. And in particular, he must live an active life, too.

   This excerpt takes place during the middle of the conversation, in which when

asked by the presenter about the criteria for a suitable husband, the employee lists three

criteria, each of which is introduced by one clause, and each clause is prefaced by a

token of *jiushi*. Considered within the taxonomy of speech acts proposed by Searle

(1975), the speech act that she performs when listing the three criteria is that of

commissives[13], i.e. those speech acts that "commit the speaker to some future course of action" (Yan Huang, 2006: 661). In this case, by employing such speech acts, the caller indicates that she will accept a man who can meet these requirements as her husband. More interestingly, each commissive is preceded by a token of *jiushi*. The reason that she uses these three tokens of *jiushi* can be understood more easily given the fact that before this excerpt, the presenter's doubts as to whether the employee sets too high demands for her future husband are denied definitely by the latter. Hence, in lines 22, 23 and 24, besides answering the question posed by the presenter as to what her future husband is expected to be, she is also strengthening the illocutionary force of the commissive by conveying the additional information that she is determined that she will never accept anyone who fails to meet these requirements.

Moreover, in addition to the illocutionary force of the speech act of commissive each token of *jiushi* in this excerpt is reinforcing, we can also uncover what aspects of the speech act is being reinforced by *jiushi* when taking into account the felicity conditions of the speech act proposed by Searle (1969). In Searle's view, when one tries to perform an illocutionary act, one must meet some preconditions under which a certain illocutionary force can be created and these preconditions are some conventional rules that are constitutive of that type of speech act to be performed (Yan Huang, 2006). These preconditions are referred to as the felicity conditions of a speech act. Taking the speech act of promising as an example, these conditions include: (Yan

---

[13] Arguably, others may also think that the caller performs an assertive speech act. But by stating what her future husband will be like, the caller is more than making a statement about any actual situation, rather, she is also committing herself to an act of finding a husband that meets these requirements.

Huang, 2006; Searle, 1969):

1.propositional content: future act A of S;

2.preparatory: (a) H would prefer S's doing A to his not doing A, and S so believes;

(b) it is not obvious to both S and H that S will do A in a normal course of events;

3.sincerity: S intends to do A;

4.essential: the utterance of e counts as an undertaking to do A[14].

To be more specific, when the speaker promises the hearer something, the propositional content of this speech act is to say something that will happen in the future. The preparatory condition is that the hearer would prefer the speaker's doing the promised action rather than not doing it, which the speaker is aware of. Besides, both the hearer and the speaker are aware that the promised thing will not happen in the normal course of action. The sincerity condition is concerned with the fact that the speaker intends seriously to perform the promise. And the last one is that the speaker does have the intention of having the utterance place him or her under a certain obligation.

Given the four felicity conditions of the speech act, we can get a better understanding of which specific condition is being reinforced by *jiushi*. In the above excerpt where *jiushi* reinforces the illocutionary force of commissives, it is obvious that what all the three tokens of *jiushi* reinforce are the propositional contents of the three criteria listed by the caller since each token of *jiushi* introduces one clause that contains

---

[14] S stands for the speaker, H for the hearer, A for the action and e for the linguistic expression.

a proposition.

According to Fraser (1996), basic markers specify the illocutionary force of the content meaning. Here I will get this definition extended a little by proposing that basic markers are also able to specify the strength of the illocutionary force of the content meaning. Therefore, the function of *jiushi* as a marker of reinforcement can be considered as a kind of basic marker.

Below is another example in which *jiushi* reinforces the speaker's commitment to the illocutionary force (more specifically, the sincerity condition) of the following utterance.

Excerpt 12, the same as Excerpt 2, is also taken from Conversation 32, in which a native of Changchun talks with the presenter about the difference between Changchun and some bigger cities in Southern China.

29 B: ni juede changchun   he qita   difang   bi zenmeyang。
    you think Changchun with other   place compare how

30   hai   you mei you shenme   bie de bu yiyang de。
    still have not have   what   other P not same   P

    What do you think of Changchun, if it is compared with other places? Is there any other difference?

31 A: en zenme shuo ne。
    mm how say   P

32   wo ganjue shouxian zher   de
    I   feel   first   this P   P

33   ruan huanjing   jiu gen nanfang   cha   tai   yuan le**.**
    soft environment P with southern inferior too   far   P

Mm, how to say? I think that the soft environment here is much inferior to that in Southern China.

34 B: ni zenme neng zheme shuo ne zhen de ma。
　　　you　how can　thus　say　P true　P　P

How can you say that? Is it true?

35 A: wo zheme shuo mei you bie　de　yisi.
　　　I thus　say　not have other P implication

36　bu shi shuo xiang　guyi　　biandi zheli　shi ba.
　　not be say want　on purpose despise here　be P

37 *jiushi*{56}　yinwei zhe de chuangye jingshen queshi bu　ru nanfang.
　　JIUSHI　because here P　enterprise spirit　in fact　not compare southern

38 *jiushi*{57} zhe de fenwei　　bu　liyu　peiyang　zhe zhong jingshen.
　　JIUSHI　here　　P atmosphere not facilitate cultivate this kind spirit

In saying so, I do not have any other implication. I do not mean to despise Changchun on purpose. Is it right? I think so in particular because the spirit of enterprise is not as strong as that in Southern China. And I think so in particular because the atmosphere here does not facilitate the formation of this kind of spirit.

In lines 29 and 30, the presenter asks the caller whether there is any other difference between Changchun and those big cities in Southern China, and then he makes a sweeping generalization that the soft environment (referred by the caller to the interpersonal relationship and the institutional support) in Changchun is much inferior to that in Southern China. To this generalization, the presenter responds with two questions in line 34 ("How can you say that?" and "Is it true?") which are produced with a rising tone to indicate her discrediting the veracity of his generalization. Immediately after the end of the presenter's turn in line 34, he begins to explain why he

holds such an impression of Changchun by listing two facts in lines 37 and 38 that he

thinks that attest to the comparatively backwardness of Changchun. Judging from the

prosodic information evidenced in the recording, it seems that the caller takes the

questions posed by the presenter very seriously since by enunciating these two facts, he

seems to try to prevent the presenter from considering him as intentionally debasing the

city of Changchun which is also his hometown. These two facts are stated in two

statements in lines 37 and 38, with each prefaced by a token of *jiushi* which is designed

to reinforce the illocutionary force of the following statement. Moreover, on account of

the relationship that these two intonation units bear with the assertion that he proposes

in line 33, both of the two tokens of *jiushi* ({56} and {57}) reinforce the sincerity

condition of this assertion: that is, his claim that the soft environment of Changchun is

much inferior to that in Southern China is not unwarranted, rather it is based on the two

obvious facts stated in lines 37 and 38.

Apart from the sincerity condition of the speech act that *jiushi* reinforces as

demonstrated above, it is also noticed that a *jiushi* can also be deployed to reinforce the

attitude or inner state of the speaker when he or she tries to express something

emotional or affective, as is shown in Excerpt 13 taken from Conversation 19.

Excerpt 13

11 B: ni shi bu shi yinggai zai　　zixi　　guancha yi duan shijian**.**
　　　you be not be should again carefully observe one span time

　　You'd better spend more time in observing him carefully.

12 A: en   wo zhen   de juede meiyou biyao a.
        mm   I really   P feel   not   need P

   In fact, I do not think that there is any need to do so.

13 B: zheyang= ni ziji keyi zixi   kaolü yixia nimen shi bu shi heshi.
        thus   you self can carefully think once you   be not be   fit

   Thus, you can think more carefully whether you two can get along well with
   each other.

14 A: ni zhidao wo diyi ci jiandao ta jiu yinxiang   +tebie hao=
        you know   I first time see   he P impression very good

15: *jiushi* {21}wo juede ta de xingge   +ting   kailang。
    JIUSHI   I   feel   he P personality very   active

16: *jiushi*{22} ta dui ren   hai   +tebie tebie reqing。
    JIUSHI   he to people also   very very ready to help others

   As you know, when I saw him the first time, he left a very favorable
   impression on me. In particular, he is very active. And in particular, he is also
   ready to help others.

17 B: ta you zheyang de   youdian   dangran   hao.
        he have this   P strong points   of course   good

   Of course, it is good that he has such strong points.

   In this conversation, a college student calls in to seek advice from the presenter

concerning how to deal with her affections towards her classmate, since this is the first

time that she has fallen in love with a boy. At the beginning of the above excerpt, the

presenter advises her not to jump to any definite conclusion about this boy's personality

since it takes a long time to get a thorough understanding of a person. This suggestion,

however, seems not to be totally accepted by the caller, who describes how favorable

her impression of this boy is. To prove this, she mentions in lines 15 and 16 two aspects

of his personality that she appreciates most. Each of these two aspects is expressed in a speech act of assertion and each is prefaced with a token of *jiushi*, similar to the two tokens of *jiushi* in Excerpt 12. In connection with the central topic of this conversation and the excitement of the caller when she talks about the boy, both her attitude towards the boy and her psychological state are invested into these two assertive statements and this is why she employs one token of *jiushi* at the beginning of each statement to intensify the degree of her affective or emotional state associated with her favorable impression of the boy. The reinforcement of her affective state is more obvious in line 16, in which she duplicates the adverb "*tebie*" (meaning "specially" in English) to highlight the boy's warm-heartedness.

The practice of reinforcing the emotional inner state or affective feeling has been well documented by some studies which focus on the specific dimensions of language use that are reinforced or mitigated in natural conversations. For example, Holmes (1984) first noticed that one reason for the modification of the illocutionary force is to "express affective meaning or the speaker's attitude to the addresses in the context of utterance" (ibid.: 348) and this modification will in turn affect the speaker-hearer relationship. Based on the natural conversations from Italian, Sbisà (2001) also analyzes the cases of mitigation or reinforcement of the speaker's expressed attitudes and inner states. The only difference of this excerpt from the two studies cited above is that the caller is reinforcing her affective feeling associated with an absent party (the boy that she talks about).

In sum, *jiushi*, as an initiator of an intonation unit, can reinforce the illocutionary force of the following utterance in terms of the proportional content, the sincerity condition of the speech act or the speaker's inner state or attitude involved.

5.2.2. *Jiushi* as a marker of reformulation

The analysis of the data shows that when *jiushi* initiates an intonation unit, it can also be used as a marker of reformulation, as is the case where *jiushi* stands as an independent intonation unit.

Excerpt 14 is taken from Conversation 6, in which an undergraduate recalls how her friendship with three close friends, another girl and two boys, has broken down due to some misunderstanding.

17 B: jieguo   ne**.**
    result   P

   What was the result?

18 A: 〈M wo gen zhe ge tongxue ne。
      I with this cl classmate P

19   hai   you   lianxi=
    still   have   contact

20   danshi   lingwai liang ge ne**:** (0.2)
    but   another two   cl mm

21 ***jiushi***{32} wo gangcai   shuo   de na liang ge。
   JIUSHI   I   just now mention   P that two cl

22 ***jiushi***{33} xianzai hai zai yiqi   de   na   liang   ge**.**
   JIUSHI   now   still be together P   that   two   cl

23   yijing   gen   women jianmian ye   bu   shuohua   le**.**
   already   with   we   meet   P   not   say   P

24   ye +bu shi bu   shuohua**.**
   P   not be not   say

25   *jiushi*{34}   women jian le mian ye bu   tai   ziran**.** M⟩
   JIUSHI   we   meet P face P not   too   natural

The result now is that I still keep in contact with this classmate. But the case of the other two friends, that is to say, the other two that I have mentioned, that is to say, the other two that still remain together, is different. When we meet, we do not speak with each other. It is not the case that I do not speak with them. How to say? that is to say, when we face each other, we feel uneasy.

This extracted piece of monologue happens at the end of Conversation 6, where the undergraduate recounts how she feels after her friendship with her former friends breaks down due to some misunderstanding. The analysis focuses on the three tokens of *jiushi* ({32}, {33}, {34}). Syntactically, each of these three tokens prefaces a noun phrase, but an interpretation of their functions as delimiting the extension of the noun phrase as prescribed in Lü (1999) would be an oversimplification. To understand the functions of these three tokens of *jiushi* precisely, we should consider the relation between what is conveyed in the utterances both before and after *jiushi*, therefore, it is better to consider *jiushi* as a discourse marker which indicates how the utterance after *jiushi* is related to that before *jiushi*. For example, *jiushi* ({34}) is a typical discourse marker that signals reformulation between lines 24 and 25. After the participant says that they do not speak with each other when they run into each other, she uses a token of *jiushi* {34} to extend what she has said by adding that it is more the case that they feel uneasy before each other than the case that they have absolutely no word to say to each other. Examining the difference in the implicit meanings conveyed by these two

utterances linked by *jiushi*, we can come to the conclusion that in this example, *jiushi* ({34}) is used as a marker of reformulation to specify the content of the previous utterance. And the other tokens of *jiushi* ({32} and {33}) function in a similar way.

The last point to be made before ending this section is that when *jiushi* functions as a marker of reformulation either as an independent intonation unit or as an initiator of an intonation unit, the only difference between these two kinds of reformulation usages is a prosodic one, which differentiates its sequential locations within the conversational turn, i.e. the presence or absence of pause between *jiushi* and the following linguistic items.

Since a detailed analysis of *jiushi* as a marker of reformulation has been presented in Section 5.1.2.2, any further analysis would be redundant in this section but an additional remark might be in order. Although there is some pause that separates *jiushi* as an independent intonation unit from the preceding one, its function should be interpreted in terms of the relation between the intonation units both before and after *jiushi*, rather than simply in terms of its relation with the following constituents within the same intonation unit, as is practiced in Lü (1999).

5.3. *Jiushi* within an intonation unit

As noted at the beginning of this chapter, a scrutiny of all the tokens of *jiushi* yields the result that besides the majority of those tokens of *jiushi* that constitute independent intonation units or initiate intonation units, there are still a number of tokens that fall within an intonation unit, thus syntactically being integrated with the other constituents

in the same intonation unit. Functionally, these tokens of *jiushi* still function as adverbs

that modify the following constituents, most of which are verbs, adjectives or adverbs.

Excerpt 7

13 A: wo　　houlai　　you　qu　　le　　yici=
　　　　I　afterwards　again go　　P　　once

14　wo qu de difang ***jiushi*** {17}shangci wo he　ta chaojia de difang
　　　I　go　P place **JIUSHI**　last time　I with he quarrel P　place

　　That afternoon, I went again to just the place where we had the quarrel.

15 B: ***en.***
　　　mm
　　　Mm.

16 A: na　tian xiawu wo juede ting= (0.3)
　　　that day afternoon I feel　very

17　*jiushi*{18}(0. 2)
　　　　JIUSHI

18　ting　buhaoyisi**.**
　　very embarrassed

　　That afternoon, I felt very　very embarrassed.

19 B: na　houlai　ni　meiyou　zai　jieshi　yixia ma。
　　　then afterwards you　not　　again　explain once　P

　　Then afterwards, you did not explain it anymore, did you?

20 A: ou meiyou**.**
　　　oh not

21　danshi na　yihou
　　　but　that afterwards

22　***en***
　　　mm

23   *jiushi*{19}
     JIUSHI

24   wo   jiu   zai   ye mei yudao guo   zhe yang de kehu**.**
     I   particle again   P not   meet   P   this kind P customer

Oh, not. But since then on, mm☐I have not met such a kind of customer.

In line 14, within a single intonation unit, the caller conveys such information that he went to the place where they had a quarrel, therefore, both prosodically and syntactically, *jiushi* {17} is fused into the whole sentence structure represented by this intonation unit. Within this intonation unit, *jiushi* modifies the following noun phrase "the place where we had a quarrel", thus emphasizing the preciseness of the location of the place that he has gone to. In this case, the function of *jiushi* is compatible with the description in Lü (1999) concerning the adverbial usage of *jiushi*: when followed by a noun, it delimits the extension denoted by the noun phrase.

Excerpt 3, reproduced below, contains another token of *jiushi* functioning as an adverb.

66 A: (0.2) wo gen   ta shuo le   + hao   ji   hui   le**.**
          I   with he say   P   very   many time   P

67   buyao   zai   chuqu da   youxi le**.**
     not   again   out   play   game P

68   ta   ***jiushi*** {31}bu   ting=
     he **JIUSHI**   not listen

69   (0.4) hai ⟨S⟩
          Oh.

70   ni   shuo wo neng bu shengqi ma。
     you say   I can   not angry   P

Many times, I have warned him not to play games, but he just turned a deaf ear to my criticism. How do you think I can refrain from being angry with this?

71 B: *jiushi* {32}**.**
   JIUSHI

   All right.

72 A: haiyou   ta   ma   hai   xiangzhe   ta ⟨S⟩
      besides   he mother still side with   he

   Besides, his mother sides with him on this matter.

73 B: en=
      mm

74   ni   de xinqing wo hen   lijie=**.**
      you   P feeling   I very understand

75   qishi   zhe jian shiqing ni ye buyao +tai renzhen**.**
      in fact this cl   thing you P not   too serious

      Mm. I really understand you current feeling. But in fact, you do
      not need to be too anxious with this matter.

In line 68, the token of *jiushi* ({31}) precedes a negation marker "*bu*" (meaning "not" in English), which falls within the category of adverbs in traditional grammar. In accordance with Lü (1999), *jiushi* indicates the emphasis placed by the speaker on the adverb of *bu*.

In the following excerpt from Conversation 15 in which the caller describes how his mother has persuaded him out of investing a large amount of money in the stock market randomly, *jiushi* is concurrent with a particle *ye* to form a construction that produces a concessive implication.

Excerpt 15

13 A: wo ma　　shuo shenme ye +bu tongyi。

　　　 I　 mother say whatever P　 not agree

14　　 houlai　 wo zhihao ba suoyou de gupiao dou mai le.

　　　 afterwards I have to have all　　 P stock　　 all sell　 P

My mother did not agree with my plan no matter how I persuaded her, so afterwards, I had to have all the stocks sold.

15 B: ni　　 muqin zuo de shi dui de.

　　　 you　 mother　 do P be right P

16　 *jiushi* {23} jianglai lirun　　 huoxu　 hen gao　 *ye* yao　　 xiaoxin　 touzi.

　　 JIUSHI　　 future interests possibly very high　 P should carefully invest

17　　 gushi　　 de biandong　 hui　 hen da　 de≡

　　　 stock market P fluctuation will very big　 P

What your mother did is right. Even if the interests in the future may be very high, you still had better invest wisely now. The stock market fluctuates considerably.

In line 16, in order to show her agreement with what the caller's mother says, the presenter produces a concessive construction consisting of *jiushi* and *ye,* which means that "Even if the interests in the future may be very high, you still had better invest wisely now".

Two conclusions concerning *jiushi* can be made by virtue of the cases in this section where the adverbial functions of *jiushi* coexist with its interactional functions as pragmatic markers in the other sequential positions.

The first one is that the co-presence of these two sorts of functions proves that in the process of grammaticalization from an adverb to a pragmatic marker, the layering effect is at work in such a way that both the original adverbial meanings and its newly

assumedly pragmatic meanings are present in the daily use of *jiushi* in natural conversations. Hopper and Traugott (2003:124) defines the "layering" or "variability" effect as the "persistence of older forms and meanings alongside newer forms and meanings, whether derived by divergence from the same source or by renewal from different sources…at a particular synchronic moment in time". Given the fact that the emergence of any new lexical item or any new meaning thereof is a gradual process that may last for a long time, it is natural that the older forms and meanings will remain in use and interact with the newly developed ones (Hopper, 1991; Hopper and Traugott, 2003; Wischer, 2006). This coexistence is also borne out by Biq (2001), which documents the fact that among all the tokens of *jiushi* in her corpus of natural conversations, while more than half of them have acquired new pragmatic functions either as floor holders or as markers of further elaboration, 37% of them are still used in its adverbial and propositional senses.

And the second is that my present study, which proposes a novel interactional and corpus-based approach to the function of *jiushi*, does not mean that none of the generalizations of *jiushi*'s meanings as adverbs in Lü (1999) is tenable at all. As analyzed in this section, in many cases where *jiushi* remains prosodically and syntactically an inseparable part of an intonation unit, it still functions as an adverb, modifying its following constituent.

5.4. A schematic representation of *jiushi*'s various functions

At the end of this section, in order to marshal an array of *jiushi*'s functions as

enunciated in this chapter within a unified representation, I will adopt Chen and He's (2001) dichotomy between structural and pragmatic functions of lexical items used in the specific context. In their study in the functions of *dui bu dui* in the setting of Chinese classroom, they claim that this phrase evinces two fundamental meanings: a propositional and structural one as an A-not-A question which can be captured in the traditional grammar and a non-propositional and pragmatic one as a non-A-not-A question which can be described adequately in Fraser's taxonomy of pragmatic markers. Prompted by their practice, my diagrammatical representation of the various functions of *jiushi* will work on the following two assumptions:

A. When *jiushi* is integrated prosodically and syntactically into an intonation unit, it performs the structural function of an adverb as described in the traditional grammar;

B. When *jiushi* occupies all the other sequential positions in the conversational structure, i.e. either as an independent intonation unit or as an initiator of an intonation unit, its various functions as marking confirmation, positive evaluation, hesitation, reformulation and reinforcement, are all incorporated under the overarching category of pragmatic markers, where each function of *jiushi* falls within a specific subcategory.

	structural usage	adverb	
JIUSHI	pragmatic usage	basic marker	confirmation
			reinforcement
		commentary marker	positive evaluation
		discourse marker	reformulation
		parallel marker	hesitation

Table 3 The schematic representation of the functions of *jiushi*

CHAPTER SIX

FURTHER DISCUSSIONS

The previous detailing of a variety of functions of *jiushi* gives rise to two issues that need to be clarified before ending this thesis.

6.1. The possible pathways of grammaticalization of *jiushi*

The last two decades has witnessed a growing body of studies that investigate the grammaticalization of pragmatic markers or other particle-like words or phrases: those studies based on English include Andersen (2001) and Brinton (1996); and those based on Mandarin include Biq (2004a), Chui (2002), Liu (1997), Yu-Fang Wang (2006), Wang and Huang (2006), Wang et al.(2003), Wang and Tsai (2005), to name just a few. It is against such a background that the first question to be considered in this chapter is the grammaticalization of *jiushi*, i.e., the possible pathways along which *jiushi* has developed into its current status as a pragmatic marker and has acquired pragmatic weight in interactional discourse. Another reason that this question is worth considering is that no attempt to date has been made to present a comprehensive analysis of the evolution of *jiushi* and the underlying reason, except two studies that investigate its evolution from two perspectives. The first one is Biq (2001) who identifies two possible factors that contribute to its grammaticalization: the first one is the repeated daily use and the other is the linguistic contiguity with intonation unit boundaries, continuing intonational breaks and other discourse markers. The second one is Zhang

(2004) who mentions briefly the diachronic development of *jiushi*.

To date, there are several definitions of grammaticalization, which overlap significantly with each other, while exhibiting some minute nuances. In my thesis, I will adopt Hopper and Traugott's (2003) definition:

"the change whereby lexical items and constructions come in certain linguistic contexts to serve grammatical functions, and once grammaticalized, continue to develop new grammatical functions." (ibid.: 18)[15]

And it should be underlined that this process is led off originally by the contextually motivated pragmatical inferences which ultimately result to the routinized and grammaticalized linguistic forms with bleached semantic meanings (Hopper and Traugott, 1993, 2003).

Moreover, in order to account for the direction of meaning change in grammaticalization, Traugott (1989) proposes three general tendencies exhibited in this process by building on the three functional-semantic components distinguished as propositional, textual and expressive:

Tendency I:

Meanings based in the external described situation＞

Meanings based in the internal (evaluative/perceptual/cognitive)

---

[15] Here I employ a rather general version of grammaticalization, which applies to both lexical items and constructions, which certainly include *jiushi*, whether it is an adverb or a pragmatic marker. This definition is oppsed to that implied by an external examiner, who thinks that grammaticalization applies only to those morphemes, such as the locative marker *zai* in Mandarin, which grammaticalizes to express the progressive aspect.

described situation.

Tendency II:

Meanings based in the described external or internal situation＞

Meanings based in the textual situation.

Tendency III:

Meanings tend to become increasingly situated in the speaker's

subjective belief-state/attitude towards the situation.

Put in another way, these three tendencies amount to the prediction that during grammaticalization, the meaning change proceeds from the propositional (i.e., objective, ideational) level to the expressive (i.e., subjective, speaker-based) level, but not vice versa (Yu-Fang Wang, 2006). In other words, the process of meaning change involved in grammaticalization is "unidirectional" (Hopper and Traugott, 2003).

In the recent modification to this three-tendency model, Traugott (1995b, 1999) explicates another two notions, subjectivation and intersubjectivation, which are considered as more fundamental forces driving grammaticalization:

Subjectivation is the semasiological process whereby meanings come over

time to encode or externalize the SP/W's[16] perspectives and attitudes as

constrained by the communicative world of the speech event, rather than by

the so-called "real-world" characteristics of the event or situation referred to

(Traugott, 1999:1).

Intersubjectivation is the semasiological process whereby meanings come

---

[16] In Traugott (1999), SP/W refers to speaker/writer and AD/R addressee/reader.

over time to encode or externalize implicatures regarding SP/W's attention to

the "self" of AD/R in both an epistemic and a social sense (ibid.: 3).

Put together, these two definitions, in fact, do not run counter to the three

tendencies concerning the meaning change identified in Traugott (1989), since

Tendency III is symptomatic of subjectivation. What these two definitions contributes

to is the realization that language as used in the communicative event presupposes the

active participation both of the speaker and the writer (SP/W) on one hand, and of the

addressee and reader (AD/R) on the other, therefore, pragmatic inference that leads to

meaning change arises from nowhere else but from the constant negotiation between

the SP/W and AD/R, in which the (inter)-subjective evaluation of certain aspects of the

speaker-listener relationship will be encoded in the language use. And this

intersubjectivation is usually manifested characteristically in some linguistic

expressions which include "explicit markers of SP/W attention to AD/R, e.g. hedges,

politeness markers, and honorific titles" (Traugott and Dasher, 2002: 23).

In the following, I will make out a case for the argument that the

grammaticalization of *jiushi* is in accordance with these theoretical generalizations by

citing both the diachronic and synchronic evidence.

As noted in Chapter, 2, *jiushi* contains two morphemes: *jiu*, and *shi*. Cao (1987)

observes that the basic function of *jiu* before the 3th century A.D. was a verbal predicate,

and that the current adverbial functions did not emerge until the 11th century A.D.

Meanwhile, Xu (2006) notes the evolution of *shi* from a demonstrative extensively

used in the documents before the 4th century B.C. to a copula that became widespread in the 5th century A.D. Moreover, due to the "routinized contiguous relationship" (Biq, 2001) of them with some other discourse features or patterns, especially to the high frequency of the clustering of both *jiu* and *shi*, these two morphemes merged into a discourse pattern around the 14th century A.D, and at that time, this pattern was used as a discourse connective (Zhang, 2004). After this merge, *jiushi* has undergone significant syntactical changes along the adverbial cline proposed by Traugott (1995a), which begins with the clausal internal adverbial, through the sentence adverbial to the discourse particle that serves a variety of functions as pragmatic markers as evidenced in my study.

As to the semantic change that *jiushi* has experienced, it is suggested that from an adverb that indicates the speaker's emphasis to a pragmatic marker frequently used in interactive natural conversations, it has acquired much pragmatic weight associated with the subjective evaluation both of the speech situation and of the interpersonal relationship between the speaker and the hearer. Furthermore, as illustrated in Chapter 5, in which *jiushi* assumes such functions as confirmation, positive evaluation, hesitation, reformulation and reinforcement as a result of the joint accomplishment of the participants in talk-in-interaction, *jiushi* is undergoing the process of pragmaticalization in which the implicature of (inter)-subjectivation deeply rooted in the conversational interaction is conventionalized so that its meanings are enriched both semantically and pragmatically (Wischer, 2006; Zhuo, 2005).

6.2. The metalinguistic nature of the reformulation function of *jiushi*

Another issue should be raised here that the function of *jiushi* as a marker of reformulation is a metalinguistic one. The notion of metalinguistic nature of reformulation proposed here springs from several sources of theorizing, all of which share the essential observation that in interactive conversation, both the speaker and the hearer are oriented to the task of solving the problematic aspects of the prior talk so that the explicit sense of the gist of the talk thus far can be constructed (Drew, 2003).

The seminal work devoted to the study in the (re)-formulation of the prior talk is Heritage and Watson (1979: 135), which, in addition to proposing several types of formulations, argue that "formulations are themselves events or moves within the talk, and as such may be geared primarily to participants' ongoing, specific practical interactional task". Drew (2003) refers to these formulations as metacommunicative acts, by which he means those "expressions through which participants comment on the nature of the discourse in which they are engaged" (ibid.: 296).

The more explicit mention of the metalingual nature of the meaning negotiation is Biq (1999), in which she accords a primary role to the metalingual meaning negotiation in people's process of socialization. Most relevant to my current discussion are those typical targets of meaning negotiation exemplified by her, which include negotiations of naming and referring for the sake of word-world match and those of conversational implicatures for the sake of word-context fit. Furthermore, she also identifies side sequences and meta-talk devices as strategies employed to negotiate meanings, with the

latter including such linguistic markers as *wo shi shuo* ("I mean") and *ni shi shuo* ("you mean"), etc.

The most direct source of my proposal of the metalinguistic nature of reformulation comes from the notion of metalinguistic negation proposed by Horn (1988, 1989). He suggests that those conversational implicatures deduced from the Quantity Principle can normally be cancelled by metalinguistic negation, which is a device for rejecting the previous utterance on any ground whatever, including the implicatures that it potentially engenders, its morphosyntactic form, its style or register or even its phonetic realization.

A typical example of metalinguistic negation quoted by him is shown below:

(1) I eat some of the apples.

(2) I do not eat some of the apples.—In fact I eat all of them.

In this example, the Quantity-implicature "not all" as triggered by "some" in (1) is negated by "all" in (2).

Another example of metalinguistic negation:

(3) This word should be spelled as "BUTTERFLIE".

(4) I am sorry that you have made a mistake. The correct spelling should be "BUTTERFLY".

What (4) negates is the morphological form of "butterflie" in (3).

Following this line of thinking, the reformulation function of *jiushi*, whether it stands as an independent intonation unit or initiates an intonation unit, is also a

metalinguistic one in the sense that it can reformulate the previous utterance on any

ground. So far, the tokens of *jiushi* as cited in Sections 5.1.2.2 and 5.2.2 of Chapter 5,

together with other markers that signal reformulation, most often, reformulate the

prepositional or pragmatic meaning of the previous utterance, thus corresponding to

what Biq (1999) terms the negotiation of conversational implicatures. Some other

examples in the data, however, do indicate that this discourse operation of

reformulation can also be performed over any aspect of the previous utterance,

including the metalinguistic forms and the phonetic and phonological patterns of a

particular word or phrase.

The following is an example from Conversation 12.

20 B: en wo gangcai shuo ni dei qu \<gongzheng\>
　　 mm I just now say you must go notarize

　　 Just now, I said that you must get this document notarized.

21 A: ni shuo sha。
　　 you say what

22   ting   bu   qing。
　　 hear not   clearly

　What have you said? I can not hear what you said very clearly.

23 B: gongzheng**.**
　　　 notarize

24   *jiushi* {12}gongping de gong   zhengming de zheng**.**
　　 JIUSHI   justice P gong   prove P zheng

　　 Notarize. That is to say , the character "gong" is as in "gongping" ("justice"
　　 in English) and the character "zheng" as in "zhengming" ("prove" in English).

In this example, the participant wants to consult the presenter about some legal problem concerning his passport. In line 20, when the presenter suggests that he should get the photocopy of his passport notarized, some noise occurs, which causes "non-hearing or mishearing" (Biq, 1999) on the part of the caller, so he begs pardon to make further clarification by producing an utterance "what have you said?". Then the presenter repeats what she says, and this time, in order to make it more clear, she uses a token of *jiushi*{12} to paraphrase what she has said word by word. Corresponding to what Biq (1999) terms as the negotiation of naming, this reformulation marked by *jiushi* is a metalinguistic one, reformulating both the orthographical and phonological realizations of the word "notarization".

Thus far, the range of those aspects of the prior talk that are eligible for the metalinguistic reformulation have extended considerably those previously proposed by del Saz and Fraser (2003) and Fetzer (2003), which focus exclusively on the meanings conveyed, either implicitly or explicitly.

The final remark here is that the study in the function of linguistic items should not be divorced from the specific activity types (Levinson, 1992) in which they occur. This is also consonant with one fundamental consensus that has been reached so far by linguistic researchers, that is, as part of the inventory of linguistic structures which are responsive to the communicative demands in verbal interaction, the functions of pragmatic markers are highly sensitive to the extralinguistic factors, such as situational variables, interpersonal relationship, sequential positions in the conversational

unfolding and so on.

At least partially, this consensus can also explain the observed difference in terms of the functions of *jiushi* between Biq (2001) and my study because a more wealth of functions of *jiushi* are identified in the latter than in the former. Except from such functions of *jiushi* as markers of hesitation ("floor holder" in Biq's term) and reformulation ("marker of further elaboration" in Biq's term) that are shared by these two studies, several other functions (confirmation, positive evaluation and reinforcement) as identified in my study are not reported in her study although both of these two studies are based on the corpus of natural conversations. In fact, it should be admitted that this difference should be ascribed to many factors, among which, two are probably the most prominent, i.e., the difference between the two versions of Mandarin spoken in Taiwan and Northern China respectively, and the situational variation in the natural conversations collected in these two corpora since my study of *jiushi* is based on the natural conversations that take place within the semi-institutional setting of *Heart-to-Heart* phone-in program, which displays several formal differences from Biq's corpus that contains conversations that take place in miscellaneous contexts.

This consensus has a second implication that the functional approach to the study in language should work hand-in-hand with the linguistic corpus so that quantitative analysis will provide persuasive evidence uncovering the discourse regularities in language use (Biq, 2000).

CHAPTER SEVEN

CONCLUSION

In my thesis, an empirical reinterpretation of the functions of *jiushi* has been presented, since the traditional grammar which identifies it as merely an adverb with several meanings fails to capture its sensitivity to the local sequential positioning in the specific setting of interactive natural conversation. As an attempt to remedy the weaknesses in the previous descriptions, I have adopted an integral approach by taking into consideration such factors as its sequential statuses in relation to the intonation unit and the conversational turn, the characteristics of the *Heart-to-Heart* radio setting where the conversations examined take place, the discourse patterns in which *jiushi* co-occurs with other linguistic items and the grammatical features of *jiushi*, etc. Therefore, my study here possesses several features that make it diverge from the traditional structuralist intuition-based approach in that theoretically, my study draws on the recent interactional linguistics and conversation analysis, and methodologically, my study is based on a corpus of natural conversations. My discovery is that basically, *jiushi* is part of the linguistic resources available to the participants in talk-in-interaction, who utilize *jiushi* to accomplish a variety of social actions in the interactive conversational environment. The major findings concerning the specific interactional work performed by *jiushi* are summarized as follows:

In the entire data, *jiushi* displays three statuses in relation to the intonation unit

within the more macro conversational structure: as an independent intonation unit, as an initiator of an intonation unit or elsewhere within an intonation unit. As a free standing intonation unit, it can either occupy an entire conversational turn, marking confirmation or positive evaluation on the part of the speaker, or form part of a conversational turn produced by the same speaker, thus indicating the speaker's hesitation or reformulation of the previous utterance. When *jiushi* initiates an intonation unit, it indicates two operations performed by the speaker: reinforcement of the illocutionary force of the ensuing utterance or reformulation on the preceding utterance. When *jiushi* occupies any other position within an intonation unit, it is syntactically integrated with the other constituents in the same intonation unit, therefore, it still functions as an adverb, thus corresponding with the descriptions in traditional grammar. Inspired by Chen and He (2001) which sets up a dichotomy between the structural and pragmatic functions of a pragmatic marker, I present a unified schematic representation of *jiushi*'s functions, in which its adverbial function is considered as a structural one, while such functions as confirmation, positive evaluation, hesitation, reformulation and reinforcement are subsumed under the rubric of the pragmatic ones.

Besides, two related issues that arise from the analysis of *jiushi* are discussed. First, I make some explanatory remarks about the grammaticalization of *jiushi* by employing the recent theories proposed by Traugott, particularly the three general tendencies concerning the semantic change of a lexical item and the (inter)-subjectivation that

motivates grammaticalization. The basic conclusion is that from an adverb to a pragmatic marker, the propositional meaning of *jiushi* is fading away, while its subjective and intersubjective meanings that emerge from the speaker-hearer interaction becomes more and more prominent. At the same time, the frequently repeated discourse patterns also get this newly emerged meanings conventionalized and ossified. Second, I elaborate more on the reformulation function exhibited by *jiushi* since as a resource exploited by the speaker to reformulate the previous utterance, it can reformulate any aspect of the previous utterance, including but not limited to, the presupposition, the conversational implicature, the illocutionary force of a communicative act, the metalinguistic forms and even the phonetic and phonological patterns of a particular word or phrase and so on.

Given the findings thus produced so far, I should express my reservations that the above list of the functions of *jiushi* does not exhaust all its possible functions in natural conversations. And indeed, it is impossible to get any exhaustive list, due to the multi-functionality of pragmatic markers. According to Andersen, this multi-functionality has two senses, in that they

are not only multifunctional in the sense that they can serve different pragmatic functions in different contexts, but they are also multifunctional by virtue of displaying several pragmatic features at the same time (2001:64).

As emphasized at the end of Section 5.1.1, in which *jiushi* is demonstrated as marking hesitation and positive evaluation, it also marks a transition, both sequential

and topical, in that after *jiushi*, the floor will be seized by the other participant and the topic of the conversation will also shift to another one.

In the course of my analysis of *jiushi* in Chapter 5, I quote some studies in the linguistic markers in other languages (mostly from English) or some other dialects in Chinese (Cantonese, for example) for two purposes. On the one hand, such a comparison can highlight certain functions of *jiushi*, thus substantiating my analysis. On the other hand, the scattered cases of comparison between *jiushi* and other markers in other languages or dialects also suggests that it might be useful to adopt a comparative approach to the study of pragmatic markers, which, as predicted by Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen (2006), bears much theoretical significance in that a cross linguistic comparison will arrive at a functional typology of markers and provide robust evidence to the pathways of lexicalization or grammaticalization of markers.

All in all, my study falls within the broad functional and interactional research in syntactical structures and linguistic items which is now gaining momentum at a world-wide level. Quintessential to this theoretical paradigm are the tenets that the various components of the language system, phonology, syntax, semantics and so on, are part of a repertoire of devices that participants in talk-in-interaction use to accomplish an array of social actions, and that such actions result from the joint negotiation between the participants, rather than the unilateral efforts of a single speaker (Hayashi, 2003; Schegloff et al., 1996; Thompson and Hopper, 2001). Hopefully, my thesis will make a modest contribution to this enterprise that is aimed at

unraveling the working of language use, which in turn will be of help in obtaining a

comprehensive understanding of the working mechanism of linguistic competence.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aijmer, K. and Simon-Vandenbergen, A. 2006. Introduction. In K. Aijmer and A. Simon-Vandenbergen (eds.) *Pragmatic Markers in Contrast*. Oxford: Elsevier. 1-10.

Aijmer, K. and Stenström, Anna-Brita. 2004. Discourse patterns in spoken and written corpora. In K. Aijmer and Anna-Brita, Stenström. (eds.) *Discourse Patterns in Spoken and Written Corpora*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.1-13.

Andersen, G. 2001. *Pragmatic Markers and Sociolinguistic Variation*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Auer, P. 1992. Introduction: John Gumperz' approach to contextualization. In P. Auer and A. Di Luzio (eds.) 1992. 1-37.

Auer, P. and Di Luzio, A. (eds.) 1992. *The Contextualization of Language*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Bakhin, M.M. 1986. The problem of speech genres. In V.W. McGee (trans.) and C. Emerson and M. Holquist (eds.) *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*. Austin: University of Texas Press. 60-102.

Biber, D. 2006. Register: Overview. In K. Brown (ed.) (Vol 10) 2006. 476-482.

Biq, Yung-O. 1999. Talking metalingually: Meaning negotiation in Mandarin conversation. In Yuen-mei Yin, I-li Yang and Hui-chen Chan (eds.) *Chinese Languages and Linguistics Vol 4: Interaction in Language*. Taipei: Academia Sinica. 503-548.

Biq, Yung-O. 2000. Recent developments in discourse-and-grammar. *BIBLID* 18: 357-394.

Biq, Yung-O. 2001. The grammaticalization of *Jiushi* and *Jiushishuo* in Mandarin Chinese. *Concentric: Studies in English Literature and Linguistics* 27 (2):53-74.

Biq, Yung-O. 2004a. From collocation to idiomatic expression: The grammaticalization of *hao* phrases/constructions in Mandarin Chinese. *Journal of Chinese Language and Computing* 14 (2): 73-96.

Biq, Yung-O. 2004b. Construction, reanalysis, and stance: 'V yi ge N' and variations in Mandarin Chinese. *Journal of Pragmatics* 36(9): 1655-1672.

Blakemore, D. 1993.The relevance of reformulations. *Language and Literature* 2(2):101-120.

Brennan, S. E. and Williams, M. 1995. The feeling of another's knowing: Prosody and filled pauses as cues to listeners about the metacognitive states of speakers. *Journal of Memory and Language* 34(3):384-398.

Brinton, L. J. 1996. *Pragmatic Markers in English: Grammaticalization and Discourse Functions*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Brinton, L. J. 2003. I mean: The rise of a pragmatic marker. Unpublished manuscript.

Brown, K. (ed.) 2006. *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics* (2nd edition). Oxford: Elsevier.

Caffi, C. 1999. On mitigation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 31(7):881-909.

Cao, Guangshun, 1987. Shi shuo 'jiu' he 'kuai' zai Song dai de shiyong ji youguan de duandai wenti. *Chinese Language* 4: 288-294.

Carroll, D.W. 2004. *Psychology of Language* (4rd edition). London and New York:

Wadsworth/Thomson Learning Asia.

Chafe, W. 1987. Cognitive constraints on information flow. In R. Tomlin (ed.) *Coherence and Grounding in Discourse*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 21-51.

Chao, Yuen-ren. 1968. *A Grammar of Spoken Chinese*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Chappell, H. 2001. Synchrony and diachrony of Sinitic languages: A brief history of Chinese dialects. In H. Chappell (ed.) *Chinese Grammar: Synchronic and Diachronic Perspectives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.3-28.

Chen, Yiya and He, Agnes Weiyun. 2001. *Dui bu dui* as a pragmatic marker: Evidence from Chinese classroom discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics* 33(9): 1441-1465.

Chui, Kawai. 2002. Ritualization in evolving pragmatic functions: A case study of *DUI*. *Language and Linguistics* 3(4): 645-663.

Couper-Kuhlen, E. 1996. Intonation and clause-combining in discourse: The case of *because*. *Pragmatics* 6(3): 389-426.

Couper-Kuhlen, E.and Selting, M. (eds.) 1996. *Prosody in Conversation: Interactional Studies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Couper-Kuhlen, E.and Selting, M. 2001. Introducing interactional linguistics. In M. Selting and E. Couper-Kuhlen (eds.) 2001. 1-22.

Cuenca, M. 2003. Two ways to reformulate: A contrastive analysis of reformulation markers. *Journal of Pragmatics* 35(7):1069-1093.

De Fina, A. 1997.An analysis of Spanish *bien* as a marker of classroom management in teacher-student interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics* 28(3):337-354.

del Saz, M.M. R. 2003. *An Analysis of English Discourse Markers of Reformulation*. PhD thesis of University of Valencia.

del Saz, M.M. R. and Fraser, B. 2003. Reformulation in English. Unpublished manuscript.

Drew, P. 2003. Comparative analysis of talk-in-interaction in different institutional settings: A sketch. In P.J. Glenn, C.D. Lebaron and J. Mandelbaum (eds.) *Studies in Language and Social Interaction: In Honor of Robert Hopper*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum. 293-308.

Drew, P. and Heritage, J. 1992. Analyzing talk at work: An introduction. In P. Drew and J.Heritage (eds.) 1992.1-65.

Drew, P. and Heritage, J.(eds.) 1992. *Talk at Work: Interaction in Institutional Settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Drew, P. and Holt, E. 1998. Figures of speech: Figurative expressions and the management of topic transition in conversation. *Language in Society* 27(4): 495-522.

Du Bois, J. 1985. Competing motivations. In J. Haiman (ed.) *Iconicity in Syntax*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 343-365.

Dubois, J. W., Schuetze-Coburn, S., Cumming, S. and Paolina D. 1993.Outline of discourse transcription. In J. Edwards and M. Lampert (eds.) *Talking Data: Transcription and Coding in Discourse Research*. NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum. 45-90.

Fang, Mei. 2000. Reduced conjunctions as discourse markers. *Chinese Language* 5: 459-470.

Fetzer, A. 2003. Reformulation and common ground. Paper presented at the 8th IPrA

Conference, Toronto, CA.

Field, J. 2004. *Psycholingusitics: The Key Concepts*. London and New York: Routledge.

Fraser, B. 1980. Conversational mitigation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 4(4):341-350.

Fraser, B. 1990.An approach to discourse markers. *Journal of Pragmatics* 14(3): 383-395.

Fraser, B. 1996.Pragmatic markers. *Pragmatics* 6(2):167-190.

Fraser, B. 1999. What are discourse markers? *Journal of Pragmatics* 31(7):931-952.

Freed, A. and Greenwood, A. 1996. Women, men and type of talk: What makes the difference? *Language in Society* 25(1):1-26.

Goldman-Eisler, F. 1968. *Psycholinguistics: Experiments in Spontaneous Speech*. New York Academic Press.

Goodwin, C. 1981. *Conversational Organization: Interaction between Speakers and Hearers*. New York: Academic Press.

Greasley, P. 1994. An investigation into the use of the particle *well*: Commentaries on a game of snooker. *Journal of Pragmatics* 22(5): 477-494.

Gülich, E. and Kotschi, T. 1995.Discourse production in oral communication. In U.M. Quasthoff (ed.) *Aspects of Oral Communication*. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter. 30-36.

Gumperz, J. J. 1982 . *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gumperz, J. J. 1992. Contextualization revisited. In P. Auer and A. Di Luzio (eds.) 1992. 39-53.

Gumperz, J. J. 2003. Contextualization conventions. In C. B. Paulston and G. R. Tucker (eds.) *Sociolinguistics: The Essential Readings*. Malden MA: Blackwell.139-155.

Gumperz, J. J. 2006. Interactional Sociolinguistics. In K. Brown (ed.) (Vol 5) 2006. 724-729.

Günthner, S. 2005. Grammatical constructions in 'real life practices': WO-constructions in everyday German. In A. Hakulinen and M. Selting (eds.) 2005. 159-184.

Guo, Liangfu. 2000. *A Practical Dictionary of Chinese*. Beijing: The Commercial Press.

Guo, Jiansheng. 1999. From information to emotion: The affective function of right-dislocation in Mandarin Chinese. *Journal of Pragmatics* 31(9): 1103-1128.

Guthrie, A. M. 1997. On the systematic deployment of *okay* and *mmhmm* in academic advising sessions. *Pragmatics* 7 (3): 397-415.

Hakulinen, A. 1998. The use of Finnish *nyt* as a discourse particle. In A. H. Jucker and Y. Ziv (eds.) 1998. 83-96.

Hakulinen, A. 2001. On some uses of the discourse particle 'kyl(a)' in Finnish conversation. In M. Selting, and E. Couper-Kuhlen (eds.) 2001. 171-198.

Hakulinen, A. and Selting, M. 2005. Introduction. In A. Hakulinen and M. Selting (eds.) 2005. 1-14.

Hakulinen, A. and Selting, M. (eds.) 2005. *Syntax and Lexis in Conversation: Studies on the Use of Linguistic Resources in Talk-in-Interaction*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Hanks, W. F. 1990. *Referential Practice: Language and Lived Space among the Maya*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hayashi, M. 2003. *Joint Utterance Construction in Japanese Conversation*.

Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

He, Agnes Weiyun and Lindsey, B. 1998. 'You know' as an information status enhancing device: Arguments from grammar and interaction. *Functions of Language* 5(2): 133-155.

He, Agnes Weiyun and Tsoneva, S. 1998. The symbiosis of choices and control: A discourse-based account of *can. Journal of Pragmatics* 29(5): 615-637.

Helt, M. E. 1997. *Discourse Markers and Stance Adverbial Variation in Spoken American English: A Corpus-Based Analysis*. PhD Thesis in Northern Arizona University.

Heritage, J. 1984. *Garfinkel and Ethnomethodology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Heritage, J. 1985. Analyzing news interviews: Aspects of the production of talk for an overhearing audience. In T. A. van Dijk (ed.) *Handbook of Discourse Analysis (Vol 3): Discourse and Dialogue*. London: Academic Press. 95-117.

Heritage, J. and Greatbatch, D.1991. On the institutional character of institutional talk: The case of news interviews. In D. Boden and D. Zimmerman (eds.) *Talk and Social Structure*. Cambridge: Polity Press. 93-137.

Heritage, J. and Sorjonen, M. 1994. Constituting and maintaining activities across sequences: *And*-prefacing as a feature of question design. *Language in Society* 23: 1-29.

Heritage, J. and Watson, R. 1979. Formulation as conversational objects. In G. Psathas (ed.) *Everyday Language: Studies in Ethnomethodology*. New York: Irvington. 123-162.

Holmes, J. 1984. Modifying illocutionary force. *Journal of Pragmatics* 8(3):345-365.

Hopper, P. J. 1991. On some principles of grammaticalization. In E.C. Traugott and B. Heine (eds.) *Approaches to Grammaticalization* (Vol 2). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 17-35.

Hopper, P. J. and Traugott, E.C. 1993. *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hopper, P. J. and Traugott, E.C. 2003. *Grammaticalization* (2nd). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Horn, L. 1988. Pragmatic theory. In F. Newmeyer (ed.) *Linguistics: The Cambridge Survey* (Vol.1). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 113-145.

Horn, L. 1989. *A Natural History of Negation*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Huang, Shuanfan. 1999. The emergence of a grammatical category of 'definite article' in spoken Chinese. *Journal of Pragmatics* 31(1): 77-94.

Huang, Yan. 2006. Speech acts. In K.Brown (ed.) 2006. Vol 11: 656-665.

Hutchby, I. 1991. The organization of talk on talk radio. In P. Scannell (ed.) *Broadcast Talk*. London: Sage.119-137.

Hutchby, I. 1996. *Confrontation Talk: Arguments, Asymmetries and Power on Talk Radio*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum

Hutchby, I. 2006. *Media Talk: Conversation Analysis and the Study of Broadcasting*. McGraw-Hill: Open University Press.

Institute of Linguistics of Chinese Academy of Social Sciences. 1996. *A Dictionary of Modern Chinese*. Beijing: The Commercial Press.

Jucker, A. H. and Smith, S. W. 1998. *And people just you know like 'wow'*: Discourse markers as negotiating strategies. In A. H. Jucker and Y. Ziv (eds.) 1998. 171-201.

Jucker, A.H. and Ziv, Y. 1998. Discourse markers: Introduction. In A. H. Jucker and Y. Ziv (eds.) 1998. 1-12.

Jucker, A. H. and Ziv, Y. (eds.) 1998. *Discourse Markers: Descriptions and Theory*. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Kenny, A. 1973. *Wittgenstein*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Koshik, J. 2005. *Beyond Rhetorical Questions: Assertive Questions in Everyday Interaction*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Lei, Dongping and Hu, Lizhen. 2006. The study on the form, nature and function of "tage". *Linguistic Sciences* 4: 29-35.

Lerner, G. 1991. On the syntax of sentence-in-progress. *Language in Society* 20: 441-458.

Levinson, S.C. 1983. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Levinson, S.C.1992. Activity types and language. In P. Drew and J. Heritage (eds.) 1992. 66-100.

Li, Ing Cherry. 1999. *Utterance-Final Particles in Taiwanese: A Discourse-Pragmatic Analysis*. Taipei: Crane.

Li, Wenda. 2000. The pragmatic function of numeral-classifiers in Mandarin Chinese. *Journal of Pragmatics* 32(8): 1113-1133.

Li, Zongjiang. 2006. On the lexicalization and subjectivity of "huitou". *Linguistic Sciences* 4: 24-28.

Linell, P. 1982. *The Written Language Bias in Linguistics*. Linköping: Linköping University Press.

Liu, Mei-chun. 1997. From motion verb to linking element: Discourse explanations for the grammaticalization of *jiu* in Mandarin Chinese. *Journal of Chinese Linguistics* 25(2): 258-289.

Luke, K.K. 1990. *Utterance Particles in Cantonese Conversation*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Lü, Shuxiang. (ed.) 1999. *A Dictionary of Eight Hundred Words of Modern Chinese* (revised edition). Beijing: The Commercial Press.

Mazeland, H. and Huiskes, M. 2001. Dutch 'but' as a sequential conjunction: Its use as a resumption marker. In M. Selting and E.Couper-Kuhlen (eds.) 2001.141-170.

Mey, J. L. 2007. Focus-on issue: Discourse, information and pragmatics. *Journal of Pragmatics* 39(2):229-231.

Minsky, M. 1977. Frame-system theory. In Johnson-Laird, P. and Wason, P.C. (eds.) *Thinking: Readings in Cognitive Science*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 355-376.

Miracle, C.W. 1991. *Discourse Marker in Mandarin Chinese*. PhD Thesis in Ohio State University.

Moerman, M. 1988. *Talking Culture: Ethnography and Conversation Analysis*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Mori, J. 2006. The workings of the Japanese token *hee* in informing sequences: An analysis of sequential context, turn shape, and prosody. *Journal of Pragmatics* 38(8): 1175-1205.

Nielsen, M. F. and Wagner, J. 2007. Diversity and continuity of conversation analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics* 39(3): 441-444.

Ochs, E. 1979. Transcription as theory. In E. Ochs and B. B. Schieffelin (eds.) *Developmental*

Pragmatics. New York: Academic Press. 43-72.

Ochs, E., Schegloff, E. A.and Thompson, S.A. (eds.) 1996. *Interaction and Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rossari, C. 1994. *Les opérations de reformulation: Analyse du processus et des marques dans une perspective constrastive français-italien*. Peter Lang: Berne.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A. & Jefferson, G. 1974. A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language* 50(4): 696-735.

Sbisà, M. 2001. Illocutionary force and degree of strength in language use. *Journal of Pragmatics* 33(12): 1791-1814.

Schegloff, E.A.1987. Between macro and micro: contexts and other connections. In J. Alexander (eds.) *The Micro-Macro Link*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press. 207-234.

Schegloff, E. A. 1995. Discourse as an interactional achievement III: The omnirelevance of action. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 28(3):185-211.

Schegloff, E.A. 1996a.Turn organization: One intersection of grammar and interaction. In Ochs, E. et al. (eds.) 1996. 52-133.

Schegloff, E. A. 1996b. Confirming allusions: Towards an empirical account of action. *American Journal of Sociology* 102(1): 161-216.

Schegloff, E. A., Ochs, E. and Thompson, S.A. 1996. Introduction. In Ochs, E. et al. (eds.) 1996. 1-51.

Schiffrin, D. 1987. *Discourse Markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schourup, L. 1999. Discourse Markers. *Lingua* 107(3-4):227-265.

Schulze-Wenck, S. 2005. Form and function of 'first verbs' in talk-in-interaction. In A. Hakulinen and M. Selting (eds.) 2005. 319-348.

Searle, J. R. 1969. *Speech Acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Searle, J. R. 1975. A taxonomy of speech acts. In K. Gunderson (ed.) *Minnesota Studies in the Philosophy of Science 9: Language, Mind and Knowledge*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. 344-369.

Selting, M. and Couper-Kuhlen, E. (eds.) 2001. *Studies in Interactional Linguistics*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Shao, Jingmin and Zhu, Xiaoya. 2005. The discourse functions of *hao* and its evolution towards functional usage. *Chinese Language* 5: 399-407.

Sinclair, J. and Coulthard, M. R. 1975. *Towards an Analysis of Discourse: The English Teachers and Pupils*. London: Longman.

Slobin, D.I. 1971. *Psycholinguistics*. Glenview, IL: Foresman.

Stenström, Anna-Brita. 1994. *An Introduction to Spoken Language Interaction*. London: Longman.

Sun, Chaofen. 2006. *Chinese: A Linguistic Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Swales, J. 1990. *Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Swerts, M. 1998.Filled pauses as markers of discourse structure. *Journal of Pragmatics* 30(4): 485-496.

Tanaka, H. 2000. The particle *ne* as a turn-management device in Japanese conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 32(8): 1135-1176.

Tao, Hongyin. 1996. *Units in Mandarin Conversation: Prosody, Discourse and Grammar*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Tao, Hongyin. 1999. The grammar of demonstratives in Mandarin conversational discourse: A case study. *Journal of Chinese Linguistics* 27 (1): 69-103.

Tao, Hongyin. 2003. Towards an emergent view of lexical semantics. *Language and Linguistics* 4 (4): 837-856.

Thompson, G. and Hunston, S. 2006. Evaluation in text. In K. Brown (ed.) Vol 4. 2006. 305-312.

Thompson, S. A. 1992. Functional grammar. In W. Bright (ed.) *Oxford International Encyclopedia of Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 37-40.

Thompson, S. A. and Hopper, P. J. 2001. Transitivity, clause and argument structure. In J. Bybee and P. J. Hopper (eds.) *Frequency and the Emergence of Linguistic Structure*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 27-60.

Traugott, E.C. 1989. On the rise of epistemic meanings in English: An example of subjectivation in semantic change. *Language* 65 (1): 31-55.

Traugott, E.C. 1995a. The role of the development of discourse markers in a theory of grammaticalization. Paper presented at the 12th International Conference on Historical Linguistics. Manchester: University of Manchester.

Traugott, E.C. 1995b. Subjectivation in grammaticalization. In D. Stein and S.Wright (eds.) *Subjectivity and Subjectivation: Linguistic Perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 31-54.

Traugott, E.C. 1999. From subjectivation to intersubjectivation. Paper presented at the Workshop on Historical Pragmatics and 14th International Conference on Historical Linguistics. Vancouver: University of British Columbia.

Traugott, E.C.and Dasher, R.B. 2002. *Regularity in Semantic Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Verschueren, J. 1995. Interactional sociolinguistics. In J. Verschueren, J. Östman and J.Blommaert (eds.) *Handbook of Pragmatics* (manual). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 336-338.

Wang, Honglei. 2005. An Analysis of the Function of *Jiushi* as a Pragmatic Marker. Unpublished MA thesis at Jilin University of P. R. China.

Wang, Yu-Fang. 1998. The linguistic structures of agreement and disagreement in Mandarin conversation. Paper presented at the Joint Meeting of the 7th International Conference on Chinese and the 10th North American Conference on Chinese Linguistics. Stanford University.

Wang, Yu-Fang. 2006. Beyond negation: The roles of *meiyou* and *bushi* in Mandarin conversation. *Language Sciences*.

Wang, Chueh-chen and Huang, Lillian-M. 2006. Grammaticalization of connectives in Mandarin Chinese: A corpus-based study. *Language and Linguistics* 7(4): 991-1016.

Wang, Yu-Fang, Katz, A. and Chen, Chih-hua. 2003. Thinking as saying: Shuo ('say') in Taiwan Mandarin Chinese conversation and BBS talk. *Language Sciences* 25(5): 457-488.

Wang, Yu-Fang and Tsai, Pi-Hua. 2005. *Hao* in spoken Chinese discourse: Relevance and coherence. *Language Sciences* 27(2): 215-243.

Wischer, I. 2006. Grammaticalization. In K.Brown (ed.) 2006. Vol 5: 129-135.

Wittgenstein, L. 1958. *Philosophical Investigations*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Wu, Ruey-Jiuan, R. 2004. *Stance in Talk: A Conversational Analysis of Mandarin Final Particles*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Wu, Ruey-Jiuan, R. 2005. 'There is more here than meets the eye!': The use of final *ou* in two sequential positions in Mandarin Chinese conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 37(7): 967-995.

Xu, Dan. 2006. *Typological Change in Chinese Syntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Zhang, Yisheng. 2004. "Jiushi" de xianjie, qingtai gongneng yi qi xuhua licheng. Xiandai Hanyu Fuci Tansuo (Investigations in Modern Chinese Adverbs). Shanghai: Xuelin Chubanshe.

Zhu, Dexi. 1982. Yufa Jiangyi (Lectures on Grammar). Beijing: The Commercial Press.

Zhu, Dexi. 1985. Xiandai Hanyu Yufa Yanjiu (Studies in Modern Chinese Grammar). Beijing: The Commercial Press.

Zhuo, Jing-Schmidt. 2005. *Dramatized Discourse: The Mandarin Chinese ba-Construction*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

APPENDIX: TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS AND GRAMMATICAL GLOSSES

(Adapted from Dubois et al., 1993; Chen and He, 2001)

A	caller that participates in the program
B	presenter of the radio program
+	emphasis signaled by pitch or volume
.	falling intonation
˚	rising intonation
﹐	falling-rising intonation
﹑	rising-falling intonation
[ ]	overlapping talk
-	cut-off
=	latched talk
{ }	the time that *jiushi* has occurred in each conversation
:	prolonged sound or syllable
( )	measured pause roughly in seconds (measured more according to the relative speech rate of the interaction than to the actual clock time)
< >	additional recorded phenomena (background music or noise, etc.)
⟨M M⟩	speech bounded by soft music
⟨S⟩	sigh uttered by the speaker
⟨L⟩	a fit of laughter
⟨L L⟩	speech bounded by a fit of laughter
cl	classifier in Mandarin
P	semantically empty particle