RUNNING HEAD: Basic Meanings of <u>You Know</u> and <u>I Mean</u>

Basic Meanings of <u>You Know</u> and <u>I Mean</u>

Jean E. Fox Tree and Josef C. Schrock

University of California, Santa Cruz

Biographical Sketches:

Jean E. Fox Tree is an Assistant Professor of Psychology at the University of California Santa

Cruz (A.B. Linguistics, Harvard; M.Sc. Cognitive Science, Edinburgh; Ph.D. Psychology,

Stanford). She studies spontaneous speech production and comprehension, with a particular

focus on discourse markers, *um* and *uh*, and prosody.

Josef C. Schrock is a graduate student at the University of California Santa Cruz (B.A.

Mississippi State University). His particular focus is on the interface between cognitive and

social aspects of language use.

Abstract

Although <u>you know</u> and <u>I mean</u> are frequent in spontaneous talk, researchers have not

agreed on what purpose they serve. They have been thought by some to be used similarly and by

others to be used differently. Similarities of uses at a surface level encouraged historical

discussions of these two markers in the same breath. The current synthesis details how both the

apparent multifunctionality of <u>you know</u> and <u>I mean</u> and their surface similarities can arise out of

each discourse marker's basic meaning, with <u>you know</u>'s basic meaning being to invite

addressee inferences (Jucker & Smith, 1998), and <u>I mean</u>'s basic meaning being to forewarn

upcoming adjustments (Schiffrin, 1987).

Basic Meanings of <u>You Know</u> and <u>I Mean</u>

" I mean I don't know how I got any food down me at all, I mean I'm not used to

drinking anyway, and having had this glass of sherry, I was a bit woozy, and everything I

put in my mouth felt like rocks, you know, including the soup!" (adapted from Svartvik

& Quirk, 1980: 1.3.665)

Although <u>you know</u> and <u>I mean</u> are frequent in spontaneous talk, researchers have not

agreed on what purpose they serve. In fact, the indeterminacy of function can be seen as a

hallmark of their overarching category, <u>discourse markers</u>. Virtually every discourse marker has

been described as serving a wide range of functions, such as aiding in language production or

comprehension, aiding in turn management, and aiding in creating a congenial interpersonal

atmosphere. Nonetheless, some markers have struck researchers as more related than others. <u>You

know</u> and <u>I mean</u> are two markers that share a historical affinity because of their apparent

similarities in function. In the current paper, we explain how the apparent multifunctionality of

<u>you know</u> and <u>I mean</u> and their surface similarities can arise out of each discourse marker's basic

meaning, with <u>you know</u>'s basic meaning being to invite addressee inferences (Jucker & Smith,

1998), and <u>I mean</u>'s basic meaning being to forewarn upcoming adjustments (Schiffrin, 1987).

By basic meaning, we mean something akin to Heritage's (1984, 1998) generic meaning, Jucker's (1993) core meaning, Östman's (1995) abstract meaning, or Fox Tree and Schrock's (1999) underlying meaning. The basic meaning forms only a starting point, a conventional meaning, for interpreting the talk the expression occurs in. Heritage (1984) discusses how oh's generic meaning is particularized by the goals of the talk it occurs in (such as informing or repairing) and at what point it is used, with oh's various "senses" (Heritage, 1998, p. 327) arising from conversational inference. For example, oh's basic meaning of indicating a change of state is "most commonly used to accept prior talk as informative" (Heritage, 1984, p. 335), but it can be used for "noticing; having one's attention drawn to something; remembering; being reminded, informed, or corrected; [and] arriving at discoveries and realizations of various kinds" (Heritage, 1984, p. 337). Fox Tree & Schrock (1999) build on this by demonstrating that oh is used systematically by listeners. Jucker (1993) discusses how well's basic meaning of indicating that "[w]hat seems to be the most relevant context is not appropriate" can tie together what otherwise seems to be separate uses (p. 438).

We believe that you know and I mean have basic meanings, like other stereotypical words. One reason that you know and I mean have been treated differently may be because they operate on the metacommunicative level rather than the propositional level; that is, they contribute to successful communication rather than to the "official business" of the

communication (Clark, 1996, p. 241). But otherwise, they are similar to other words, and give rise to similar theoretical problems. For example, like other words, there is currently no clear picture of how, precisely, basic meanings give rise to apparent meanings.

Our synthesis ties together a wide array of disparate claims made by many researchers using different corpora, and we believe that this approach can offer a lot by way of analogy for investigations of other discourse markers. Consequently, we will review the claims made for <u>you know</u> and <u>I mean</u>, present proposals for basic meanings, and then show how the apparent uses can arise from the basic meanings. Claims can be divided into those that consider them to be randomly sprinkled into speech and those that consider them to be used at the moment that they are needed for a particular function. The proposed functions can also be divided into five categories: interpersonal, turn management, repairing, monitoring, and organizing. Random sprinkling has been proposed only for the interpersonal category, but moment-of-use has been proposed for all categories. We will discuss random sprinkling proposals first, moment-of-use proposal that equate <u>you know</u> and <u>I mean</u> second, and moment-of-use proposals that differentiate <u>you know</u> and <u>I mean</u> third. We will then show how all proposals can be recast in terms of basic meanings.

<u>Random Sprinkling</u>

The traditional English teacher's approach to you know and I mean is that they are

"verbal garbage" (discussed in Schourup, 1985, p. 94; see also discussion in Schiffrin, 1987, and

Stubbe & Holmes, 1995) sprinkled into speech with no distinction between saying one or the

other (Fromkin, 1973: 42; O'Donnell & Todd, 1991: 69). The observation that people are not

good at detecting how often they say you know or I mean (Broen & Siegel, 1972) adds more fuel

to the fire. Some proposed functions highlight this sprinkling quality, claiming that they "add

liveliness to the conversation" (Stenström, 1990a, p. 152) or that they create a "*you-know* mood"

(Östman, 1981, p. 41). Speakers are seen as using you know and I mean to keep from being

bores, and as such could utter these words at any point. In fact, you know's and I mean's

apparent lack of being tied to a particular position has been used to argue that they are in a

separate class from other discourse markers (Fraser, 1990: 392).

Looked at more systematically, sprinkling you knows and I means into speech has been

thought to provide three types of interpersonal information: (1) information about the speaker,

(2) information about the situation, such as its formality or intimacy, or (3) information about the

level of politeness. Each proposal has been challenged.

Proposals that you know and I mean indicate something about speakers include that using

them implies speakers are anxious, uncertain, or lacking in self-confidence (Lalljee & Cook,

1975; Ragan, 1983; see Holmes, 1986, for review) and that using them marks a speaker as

coming from a certain social class, age group, or gender category (see Östman, 1981, and Stubbe

& Holmes, 1995 for reviews). But it has also been claimed that <u>you know</u> is used when speakers

are certain, not uncertain, with <u>sort of</u>, <u>I guess</u>, and other devices marking uncertainty (Erman,

1987: 32), and that <u>you know</u> and <u>I mean</u> are not tied to speaker characteristics (Erman, 1987;

Holmes, 1986, 1990; Lalljee & Cook, 1975; Östman, 1981; Stubbe & Holmes, 1995).

Proposals that <u>you know</u> and <u>I mean</u> indicate something about speaking situations include

that using them implies informality, amusement, and a quick pace (Erman & Kotsinas, 1993: 91;

Holmes, 1986: 12; Holmes, 1990: 192; Lalljee & Cook, 1975: 305). And indeed, <u>you know</u> and <u>I</u>

<u>mean</u> are, on average, twice as common in conversations than in formal interviews (Stubbe &

Holmes, 1995: 77, 80). Speakers themselves may not be aware of their uses; one study found that

speakers thought they had fewer <u>I mean</u>s and <u>you know</u>s, among other markers and disfluencies,

in their conversations as compared to their monologues, even though they in fact had more

(Broen & Siegel, 1972: 225). But here too there are some contradictions: <u>you know</u> and <u>I mean</u>

are more common in "considered talk" than in spontaneous talk (Freed & Greenwood, 1993,

cited in Stubbe & Holmes, 1995, p. 82), although spontaneous talk should be more

conversational, casual, and fast. Likewise, they are more common in narrative sections of a

conversation than in sections with frequent turns (Holmes, 1986: 15; Östman, 1981: 16), though

at the same time, they are more common in opinionated talk than in narratives (Huspek, 1989:

667), although opinionated talk seems more likely to have more turns. Conversations among

family members at a dinner table have fewer <u>you know</u>s than conversations with guests (Östman,

1981: 19), but conversations with friends have more <u>you know</u>s than conversations with

strangers (Jucker & Smith, 1998: 193; Redeker, 1990: 375).

The third approach to the functions of <u>you know</u> and <u>I mean</u> on the interpersonal level is

to relate them not to a type of person or situation, but to the type of face-saving necessary for a

particular type of person or situation. One type of face-saving is to express shared understanding

(Holmes, 1986: 17; Stenström, 1990a: 141; Stubbe & Holmes, 1995: 65, 70), sometimes called

<u>positive politeness</u> (Brown & Levinson, 1987). Another type is to show speaker imprecision,

allowing addressees more room to express their opinions (Holmes, 1986: 7, 1990: 199; Ragan,

1983: 167; Stubbe & Holmes, 1995: 64, 70), sometimes called <u>negative politeness</u> (Brown &

Levinson, 1987). Because negative politeness functions are best seen within the moment-of-use

framework instead of random sprinkling, they will be discussed in the next section.

Proposals that <u>you know</u> and <u>I mean</u> indicate something about positive politeness include

that using them makes speech more casual and decreases social distance (Stubbe & Holmes,

1995: 66, 80), such as by marking the desire for or presence of shared experience (Östman, 1981:

19; Schourup, 1985: 109, <u>you know</u> only in both cases) or even increasing the status of

addressees (Östman, 1981: 19, <u>you know</u> only). This could explain the observation that it is

inappropriate for a supervisor to use you know when talking to a subordinate, presumably

because the supervisor wants to maintain distance (Jefferson, 1973: 74). But in contrast to these

proposals, at least you know need not be polite. Turn-final you know with declarative intonation

can be used to close off a point, as in "I won't say anything more" (Östman, 1981, p. 27).

In addition to politeness, another interpersonal function you know and I mean might

serve is self-presentation. You know, in particular, may be used between disjoint utterances to

give a veneer of continuity or to counteract the negative effects of a pause (Schourup, 1985: 110,

124). Problematically, however, you know has also been thought to be a liability in self-

presentation. Speakers reduce their use of you knows and I means as well as other markers and

hesitations when they believe self-presentation is important, although it's not clear what the

individual effect on the numbers of you knows and I means is in this research because of the

grouped design (Broen & Siegal, 1971).

Perhaps the most compelling evidence against random sprinkling proposals is that it

matters where the you know or I mean falls in an utterance. Compare the following originals and

alternatives that shift location of the original you know or I mean (adapted from Svartvik &

Quirk, 1980: 1.3.496, 1.4.848; periods and dashes in this and other examples indicate short and

long pauses):

(1)   Original: me and the Edinburgh girl got together after dinner late in the

evening and decided they'd really got us along to make it look right, <u>you know</u> they had

after all had candidates from other universities

    Alternative: me and the Edinburgh girl got together after dinner <u>you know</u> late

    in the evening and decided they'd really got us along to make it look right they

    had after all had candidates from other universities

(2)   Original: but I don't think it's feasible . <u>I mean</u> I know this is the first time

I've done it, and I'm not in a main line paper, but I'm sure it'll take me all my time to do

it in three weeks

    Alternative: but I don't think it's feasible . I know <u>I mean</u> this is the first time

    I've done it, and I'm not in a main line paper, but I'm sure it'll take me all my

    time to do it in three weeks

In (1) Original, <u>you know</u> comments on what is means to "look right," in (1) Alternative it

comments on what "after dinner" means. In (2) Original, <u>I mean</u> comments on why the speaker

says "I don't think it's feasible," without overwriting the statement, but in (2) Alternative, <u>I mean</u>

comments on "I know," retrospectively treating it as a false start. If it matters where they fall,

then their locations cannot be random.

<u>Using Either One, But When Needed</u>

You know and I mean are used when they are needed. But what are they needed for? Proposals that equate you know and I mean but do not consider them to be randomly sprinkled fall into two categories: repair and turn management.

You know and I mean can contribute to repairs in at least three ways. One is by substituting for a pause, repairing or avoiding the break in fluency caused by the pause (Fromkin, 1973: 42; Holmes, 1986: 6). A second is by stalling for time as speakers complete various stages of the speech production process, including planning what to say, selecting words, or restarting a false-started utterance (Erman, 1987: 58, 173; Holmes, 1986: 6, 10). A third is to explicitly forewarn upcoming adjustments to what has just been said, even what kind of adjustment to expect (Erman, 1987: 58; Levelt, 1989: 482). Listeners are less likely to complete a speakers' repair after you know and I mean than when no marker is used (Erman, 1987: 173), consistent with both the stalling for time and forewarning proposals, if forewarning is taken to also imply that speakers should be allowed to complete the repair themselves. Nonetheless, there is a difference between stalling for time and forewarning and it's not clear how addressees know which applies in a particular case.

You know and I mean can contribute to turn management in three ways as well. Aggregating across researchers' positions, you know and I mean have been thought to aid in turn-taking (Schourup, 1985; Erman & Kotsinas, 1993; Holmes, 1986, 1990; Redeker, 1991;

Schegloff, 1987), turn-holding, or turn-relinquishing (Duncan, 1972; Erman, 1987; Erman & Kotsinas, 1993; Stenström, 1990a). The turn-holding function may seem most likely given the high rate of turn-medial you knows and I means. In one analysis of spontaneous conversations, around 86% of you knows and I means were turn-medial (Erman, 1987: 50; Erman, 1986: 132). Additionally for you know, turn-medial position can be viewed as a natural result of a proposed function of eliciting backchannels from addressees while maintaining the floor (Schourup, 1985: 132, 135). Different pronunciations may help identify which turn management role the you know or I mean is playing; this would be particularly useful in identifying whether a non-initial you know or I mean was turn-holding or turn-relinquishing (Schiffrin, 1987: 292).

One problem with turn management proposals is that there is little independent evidence that position in a turn is related to turn management, even if the you know or I mean is pronounced differently at different points in the turn. You know or I mean may fall at the beginning, middle, or end of a turn for reasons unrelated to turn management. Even within turn management explanations, it is difficult to say which turn management strategy applies. For example, a you know that appears to be turn-medial, and therefore turn-holding, may have been a failed attempt at turn-relinquishing. In fact, it's been suggested that you know can be used to politely offer a turn without forcing addressees to take it (Holmes, 1986: 6; Jefferson, 1973: 74); when the addressees don't, this intended turn-final you know appears turn-medial.

Another problem is that the frequencies of markers' positions are themselves up for

debate. <u>You know</u>s have been argued to be both frequent (Erman & Kotsinas, 1993: 88;

Stenström, 1990b: 225) and infrequent turn-finally (Erman, 1987: 53). Turn-final <u>I mean</u>s do

appear to be infrequent, accounting for only 4 exemplars out of a 60,000 word corpus, all of

which the analyst defined as interruptions and not planned turn-endings (Erman, 1987, p. 199).

However, at least one of these examples was analyzed by the current authors as a planned turn-

ending (Example 8 below).

And there is yet a third problem, which is a difficulty for both the using-either-one-when-

needed repair proposals and the turn taking proposals: <u>you know</u> and <u>I mean</u> are not

interchangeable. Compare the following originals and alternatives that interchange turn-medial

<u>you know</u>s and <u>I mean</u>s (adapted from Svartvik & Quirk, 1980: 1.2.889, 1.3.305):

(3)   Original: and I was the only person there that was sort of remotely . <u>you</u>

              <u>know</u> competent to speak

          Alternative: and I was the only person there that was sort of remotely . <u>I mean</u>

              competent to speak

(4)   Original: the interview was - it was all right <u>I mean</u> I handled it like a

              competent undergraduate - I didn't handle it like a graduate who

          knew . where she was going . cos I didn't.

Alternative: the interview was - it was all right <u>you know</u> I handled it like a

competent undergraduate - I didn't handle it like a graduate who

knew . where she was going . cos I didn't.

In (3) Original, <u>you know</u> comments on what the speaker was remotely able to do, but in (3)

Alternative, <u>I mean</u> in <u>you know</u>'s place suggests a correction, such as removing "sort of

remotely" to yield "and I was the only person there that was competent to speak." In (4)

Original, <u>I mean</u> presages an upcoming adjustment, suggesting in this case that perhaps it wasn't

as "all right" as the speaker initially claimed. But in (4) Alternative, <u>you know</u> in <u>I mean</u>'s place

presages an example, without a similar qualification on how "all right" is was. If they cannot be

substituted for one another, then they must have distinct functions.

<u>Using the Right One at the Right Time</u>

Proposals that differentiate <u>you know</u> and <u>I mean</u>, albeit that their functions may be

related, fall into four categories: (1) interpersonal functions tied to moment of use (negative

politeness), (2) repair functions that distinguish between <u>you know</u> and <u>I mean</u>, (3) monitoring,

and (4) organizing.

Unlike the random sprinkling approaches to other interpersonal functions, negative

politeness functions are tied to their moment of use. Speakers might use <u>I mean</u> or <u>you know</u> to

reduce their commitment to or distance themselves from a face-threatening utterance. <u>I mean</u>

may presage a less-face-threatening rephrasing (Erman, 1987: 207; Ragan, 1983: 169-170; Stubbe & Holmes, 1995: 70) as a kind of interpersonal repair. <u>You know</u> may blunt the blow of face-threatening talk that precedes or follows it (Erman & Kotsinas, 1993: 84; Kotthoff, 1993: 199; Östman, 1981: 21). The following demonstrates both functions (adapted from Svartvik & Quirk, 1980: 1.11040):

    (5)   how do you get on with this fellow Hart? I mean he's a nice fellow normally, but

    he's a hell of a - he's a big head in some ways you know Reynard

If "How do you get on with this fellow Hart?" is taken to imply that the speaker has trouble getting along with Hart, then <u>I mean</u> may be presaging the less-threatening rephrasing "he's a nice fellow normally." Likewise, if "he's a big head in some ways" is taken as threatening, then the subsequent <u>you know</u> may be softening the blow.

A problem with these proposals is that they don't always work. Consider the following (adapted from Svartvik & Quirk, 1980: 214.987):

    (6)   she appears to be perfectly happy - . I mean she can't be a hundred per cent

    happy, nobody is, but she appears to be happy

In contrast to the negative politeness proposal, the phrase preceding the <u>I mean</u> seems less threatening than the one following it. Of course, the <u>I mean</u> could be serving a different function here, such as repair. But if this were the case, proposals should detail when the function is repair

and when it is negative politeness, but they don't. Another possibility is that it isn't the <u>you know</u>

or <u>I mean</u> that determines politeness at all, but something about the words in the surrounding

utterance (Schourup, 1999: 250). "He's a nice fellow normally" would be a less threatening

rephrasing of "how do you get on with this fellow Hart?" with or without the <u>I mean</u>.

Repair proposals that differentiate between <u>you know</u> and <u>I mean</u> include that <u>you know</u>

indicates a relatively predictable leap from repair to reparandum but that <u>I mean</u> indicates a less

predictable leap (Schourup, 1985: 125). That is, <u>you know</u> implies addressees can figure out

corrections on their own (Schourup, 1985: 125), as demonstrated in the following example

(adapted from Svartvik & Quirk, 1980: 1.5.967):

(7)   A: you can hold the top - - administrative job in college, and if you haven't got a

degree, - . you just can't set foot beyond a certain . you know

B: but if you've got a degree, this is magic

<u>I mean</u>, on the other hand, implies unexpected changes (Schourup, 1985: 125), such as with word

replacements (Erman, 1987: 58; Levelt, 1989: 482) like "but your customers I mean your clients"

(Svartvik & Quirk, 1980: 2.2.655). <u>You know</u> is frequently used to hedge a single word (Östman,

1981: 17) or in word searches (Erman, 1987: 179), but according to this proposal the hedge or

word sought should be predictable.

Oddly for this continuum hypothesis, however, <u>I mean</u> can be used to deliberately leave the repair up to the addressee, implying predictability (Schourup, 1985: 148), as in the following example (adapted from Svartvik & Quirk, 1980: 2.1.932):

(8)   A: if the response is enthusiastic, well then I mean - -

B: yes then you'd get you might get somebody else to

A: exactly

Neither <u>you know</u> nor <u>I mean</u> require repairs. This contrasts with other repair markers. Compare the following original and hypothetical examples with <u>oh</u> (adapted from Svartvik & Quirk, 1980: 1.1.330):

(9)   Original: that would be Dell plus somebody wouldn't it . oh . no there are two

external advisers

Hypothetical: that would be Dell plus somebody wouldn't it . oh [end of

utterance]

<u>Oh</u> cannot be used in reparandum-repair sequences without supplying overt repairs.

Unlike interpersonal and repair proposals, all monitoring proposals apply to the moment of use and distinguish between <u>you know</u> and <u>I mean</u>. Both markers encourage addressees to think about the comprehensibility of what has just been said (Schiffrin, 1987: 310), with comprehensibility defined in many ways, including word choice, syntax, or the relevance of

what's said to the topic (Schourup, 1985: 124-125, 127-128). But speakers' uses of them in

monitoring differ. <u>You know</u> is thought to be used to elicit addressee feedback about their

comprehension, either visually, such as with nods, or auditorilly, such as with backchannels like

<u>uh huh</u> (Schourup, 1985: 135; Schiffrin, 1987: 272). <u>I mean</u> is thought to be used to focus

addressees' attention (Schiffrin, 1987: 309), but without explicitly requesting addressee

feedback, although speakers may monitor understanding in addressee replies. But not much is

known about <u>I mean</u> and monitoring, and support for the <u>you know</u> proposal is equivocal.

If <u>you know</u> elicits responses, backchannels should be frequent after <u>you know</u>, but they

aren't. Backchannels and other addressee responses follow only 12% of <u>you know</u>s that end

syntactic or semantic units (Erman, 1987, p. 195). Of course, this could be seen as frequent,

considering that no responses follow <u>I mean</u>s in analogous positions (Erman, 1987: 194). Other

evidence for <u>you know</u>'s and <u>I mean</u>'s use in monitoring is that 66% of <u>you know</u>-introduced

phrases and 77% of <u>I mean</u>-introduced phrases have listener responses at the end of the idea

introduced by the marker (Erman, 1987, p. 198). This contrasts with other markers, like <u>you see</u>,

which has responses only 38% of the time (Erman, 1987, p. 198). At the same time, the eliciting

or deferring of responses could be caused by other factors co-occurring with <u>you know</u> or <u>I

mean</u>, such as rising or falling intonation.

Notably for you know, monitoring answers to the literal question "Do you know this to be true?" is not occurring, as some laypeople might think. People say you know when addressees could not possibly know, as in "Yesterday I was in my bedroom you know?" (adapted from Schourup, 1985, p. 126). Some have argued that it is precisely when the addressee does not know that you know is used, noting that the first time a story is told, there are many you knows, but upon retelling, the number of you knows drops (unpublished manuscript by Newsome, 1980, cited in Östman, 1981, p. 18). Of course, this drop could be caused by something else, such as a reduced likelihood of speaker repair and consequently reduced need for you know in retellings.

Like monitoring, organizational proposals also apply to the moment of use and distinguish between you know and I mean. You know and I mean are thought to aid in organization by introducing topic shifts, although each marker is thought to be used for different kinds of shifts. Some argue that the changes you know foreshadows are on a more local level than those of I mean. That is, you know is used to provide background information, close off one kind of discourse, or to foreshadow a cause, effect, or clarification of the preceding utterance (Erman, 1986: 135; Erman, 1987: 31, 52; Holmes, 1986: 11), and operates with a "narrow scope often confined to the clause, phrase and word levels" (Erman, 1987, p. 176). In contrast, I mean is used to introduce commentary, justification, and phrasal level modifications (Erman, 1986: 137, 140; Erman, 1987: 176, 207; Schiffrin, 1987: 302; Stenström, 1990b: 225). At the same

time, some argue the reverse, pointing out that the connection between <u>I mean</u> and the

surrounding context is more precise than <u>you know</u>, with <u>I mean</u> being used to adjust a

phonological, syntactic, or content error on what's just been said (reviewed in Schourup, 1985:

147) and with <u>you know</u> being used to introduce justifications (Erman & Kotsinas, 1993: 87).

The proposal that <u>you know</u> helps focus attention on the thrust of a narrative (Schiffrin, 1987:

281-282) also contradicts this local-global distinction.

There are also a number of other organizational uses that have been identified for <u>you</u>

<u>know</u> and <u>I mean</u>, including that <u>you know</u> is used to introduce given information but <u>I mean</u> is

used for new information (Erman, 1987: 201), that <u>you know</u> is used to instruct an addressee to

seek a referent in common ground (Aijmer, 1984: 122), that <u>you know</u> is used to introduce

quoted speech (Erman & Kotsinas, 1993: 87; Redeker, 1990: 374), and that <u>you know</u> is used to

highlight information (Erman & Kotsinas, 1993: 83; Holmes, 1986: 8).

It seems like <u>you know</u> and <u>I mean</u> can take on new meanings every time they are used.

But there is at least one commonality most researchers agree on, and that is that <u>you know</u> and <u>I</u>

<u>mean</u> have forward-looking functions. This is unexpected for <u>you know</u> from the layperson's

view that <u>you know</u> is a backward-looking tag added to the ends of phrases, as in "because I

never seem to throw anything away you know" (adapted from Svartvik & Quirk, 1980: 2.2.90).

In fact, analyses reveal that <u>you know</u> usually points forwards (Erman, 1987: 115, 205; Erman &

Kotsinas, 1993: 86), although some argue that when <u>you know</u> and <u>I mean</u> co-occur, <u>I mean</u>

takes the forward looking role of introducing the new segment, and <u>you know</u> is used to close off

the prior discourse (Erman, 1987: 94). But even with the agreement that they are both forward-

looking, the multifunctionality of each marker is still worrisome. If <u>you know</u> and <u>I mean</u> can do

so much, how do we know what they are doing at all?

<div align="center">Basic Meanings</div>

The wide range of possible functions for <u>you know</u> and <u>I mean</u> compromises any theory

of <u>you know</u> or <u>I mean</u>'s usefulness. An addressee could hear a marker, but not know whether to

take it as a sign that there will be, for example, a repair, a continued turn, or a decrease in social

distance. Some researchers argue that the function of a marker depends on where in the sentence

the marker falls or how it is pronounced (Erman, 1987: 182-185; Östman, 1981: 21-23; Schiffrin,

1987: 291-294; Stenström, 1990a: 145), and others argue that discourse markers are always

multifunctional (Erman, 1987: 141; Holmes, 1986: 5; Stubbe & Holmes, 1985: 85). We believe

that the disparate functions can be reanalyzed in terms of basic meanings. Because the basic

meanings are different for <u>you know</u> and <u>I mean</u>, we will discuss each marker separately.

<u>You Know</u>

There have been two proposals for the basic meaning of <u>you know</u>. One is that <u>you know</u>

is used to check on or to demonstrate shared views (Schourup, 1985; Schiffrin, 1987), or as

Östman wrote, to show that "The speaker strives towards getting the addressee to cooperate and/or to accept the propositional content of his utterance as mutual background knowledge" (1981, p. 17). This may seem to be a vacuously broad claim because everything a person says should eventually become mutual background knowledge. But the idea is that <u>you know</u> highlights particular utterances requiring extra consideration. The other proposal is that the basic meaning is to signal to addressees that they fill out unspoken intention; Jucker and Smith argue that "*You know* thus invites the addressee to complete the argument by drawing the appropriate inferences" (1998, p. 196), or, said another way, "invites the addressee to recognize both the relevance and the implications of the utterances" (1998, p. 194).

There is some relationship between these two proposals: in order to fill out speaker's meaning, addressees need to adopt shared views. However, Jucker and Smith's (1998) proposal is more specific because it proposes that speakers strive towards acceptance of a particular unspoken intention, rather than acceptance of whatever was said as background knowledge. It's not that speakers say <u>you know</u> to appeal to shared views as much as to get addressees to make the right inference. This refinement covers more data (Jucker & Smith, 1998: 195).

<u>Interpersonal</u>. People from a certain community might use <u>you know</u> more often not to show that they are members of that community, but because they are more willing to appeal to addressee inferences. <u>You know</u> may be more common in talking to friends than strangers

because friends share more mutual knowledge; that is, speakers may be more likely to invite

addressee inferences when they believe inferences drawn will approximate their thinking. At the

same time, <u>you know</u> may be more common with guests than family if the family has developed

a style of not inviting inferences, say to avoid misunderstanding. <u>You know</u> may be common in

opinionated talk because speakers may desire addressees' filling out ideas along the lines of

speakers' opinions. At the same time, they may be common in casual talk because speakers may

not feel that they have to fill out all their ideas, or because speakers may be more willing to

accommodate addressees' interpretations.

   <u>You know</u>'s basic meaning can consolidate conflicting information about its role in

marking uncertainty. Instead of viewing <u>you know</u> as marking uncertainty or confidence

depending on whether it referred to the words in the utterance or how information was accepted

by addressees (Holmes, 1986), <u>you know</u> could be viewed only as inviting addressee inferences,

which could be either at the word level or the interpersonal level, with differing effects at each.

Because word level invitations might frequently be followed by speakers choosing different

words, <u>you know</u> might appear to signal uncertainty. Because interpersonal level invitations

might frequently be followed by listeners agreeing with speakers, <u>you know</u> might appear to

signal confidence. That is, the apparent uncertainty or confidence may be a product of the

subsequent discourse rather than the <u>you know</u>.

<u>You know</u>'s basic meaning can also explain its role in conveying politeness. By saying <u>you know</u> and leaving ideas less filled out, speakers can distance themselves from potentially face-threatening remarks and invite addressees' interpretations, achieving negative politeness. Inviting inferences may also result in more shared views, which can accomplish both negative and positive politeness. Shared views may achieve negative politeness by reducing the potential face threat of introducing or changing a topic (Schourup, 1985: 110). Shared views may also achieve positive politeness by increasing people's feelings of familiarity. But <u>you know</u> need not imply politeness. As mentioned earlier, <u>you know</u> can be used at the end of arguments to express "I won't say anything more" (Östman, 1981, p. 27). But in these uses, <u>you know</u> does turn the floor over to addressees (Östman, 1981), which can be seen as a way of inviting addressee inferences, especially because the speaker is unwilling to continue. As with uncertainty, politeness may be a product of the situation, not the presence or absence of a marker.

    <u>Turn management</u>. <u>You know</u> may occur turn-initially, turn-medially, or turn-finally not because <u>you know</u> is being used to accomplish the turn coordination, but because at any point in the turn speakers may want to invite addressee inferences. Inviting inferences need not imply that the speaker stops talking; addressees can think about what inferences to draw while the speaker is talking, as would be the case with a turn-initial <u>you know</u>.

Repair. Instead of being used to forewarn an upcoming adjustment, or to hedge a word,

you know may occur at these moments in conversation because it is precisely these times when

speakers want to heighten addressees' inference processes. That is, you knows, speaking trouble,

and hesitations co-occur (Erman, 1987: 187; Fox Tree & Clark, 1997: 162), but this doesn't

mean you knows signal the other problems. One telling piece of evidence is that the more

complex the repair, the more likely it is to be marked (Erman, 1987: 172-173). This suggests that

you know is used when speakers are having extra trouble expressing themselves, to encourage

addressees to infer the intentions. The proposal that you know is used to buy time while speakers

repair problematical speech can also be reanalyzed as you know's co-occurring with

problematical stretches of speech for addressee-inference reasons rather than for buying time.

Furthermore, you know may occur in predictable repairs, as discussed above, because its use

presumes that addressees could draw the desired inferences. This presumption of addressee-

inferrability is not present for I mean.

One piece of data mentioned earlier seemingly belies the basic meaning proposal. That is

that addressees are less likely to complete a speaker's repair after you know (and I mean) than

when no marker is used (Erman, 1987: 172-173). However, while you know may be used for

addressee's filling out of intention, it is not necessarily used to request addressees' adoption of

the speaker's syntactic and semantic structure in an explicit completion. When addressees do

complete speakers' utterances after <u>you know</u>, the completion may have been prompted by other

speech signals, such as marked pronunciations (Fox Tree & Clark, 1997), as in the following

(adapted from Svartvik & Quirk, 1980: 1.71095; <u>thiy</u> is used to represent the marked

pronunciation of <u>the</u> that rhymes with <u>see</u>):

> (10)   A: well this brew I made, I . I picked a bottle up, just after you'd gone actually, .
>
> there was a filthy mess of yeast, - where it had pushed the cap off . and it was a filthy .
>
> you know, not not nasty but, quite a k thick creamy sort of scum of yeast, on thiy um it
>
> was dried, you know, .
>
> > B: on the floor .
> >
> > A: on th- on thiy well on thiy s- you know on thiy hatchway there
> >
> > B: oh yeah

The completion could be to produce either "It was dried on the floor," prompted by <u>you know</u>, or

"Quite a thick creamy sort of scum of yeast on the floor," prompted by <u>thiy</u>. As another example,

the following completion was begun before the <u>you know</u> was finished (adapted from Svartvik &

Quirk, 1980: 2.7.136; asterisks indicate overlap):

> (11)   A: but . I really couldn't face the film festival thing, with with all the . *you
>
> know*
>
> > B: *slips*

A: filling up - . thanks -

In another example, no completion follows <u>you know</u> (adapted from Svartvik & Quirk, 1980:

3.1.251; A and B are interviewing C):

(12)   A: um . your essay . if I may just cut across for one moment . um - - uh we'd like

you to uh re-read this little passage beginning . thiy last paragraph as an example that's

the one over the page you see . to the end of (untranscribable)

B: where you talk about *connections in that paragraph - *

C: *terrible yeah - -* I'm sorry, I'm terribly unused to writing essays, I haven't

written them . for so long now, . this . came as . you know

A: try to read it, as if you're not . yourself

But this is to be expected if <u>you know</u> is not requesting completion, but rather inference-drawing.

Furthermore, <u>you know</u> only invites addressee inferences, it doesn't require them.

<u>Monitoring</u>. Rather than being a way to monitor understanding, <u>you know</u> may merely

coincide with times of insecurity about what's understood. Inconsistent backchannelling is

expected if <u>you know</u> is inviting addressees' inferences rather than addressees' confirmation of

understanding. The addressee backchannels that do occur may be a result of rising intonation

rather than the <u>you know</u> (Holmes, 1986: 10). Indeed, the more questioning the intonation, the

more likely a backchannel (Östman, 1981: 23). Nevertheless, some backchannels after <u>you know</u>

might be expected, because in inviting inferences that "recognize both the relevance and the

implications of the utterances" (Jucker & Smith, 1998, p. 194), addressees may choose at times

to verbally display the status of the inferences they drew, as in the following (adapted from

Svartvik & Quirk, 1980: 1.61036):

(13)   A: Faulkner's uh relaxed, but not too relaxed, you know

         B: m

But even this example requires careful analysis, as the immediately prior turn exchange makes

clear (adapted from Svartvik & Quirk, 1980: 1.61033):

(14)   A: Faulkner in this department's, a good lecturer

         B: m

There is no <u>you know</u>, but still an <u>m</u>, leading to the question of whether the <u>m</u> in the later

exchange is a response to the <u>you know</u> or something else. It may be appropriate to have

backchannels after <u>you know</u>, but it is not necessary.

Organization. <u>You know</u>'s proposed organizational uses can be broken down into three

categories: (1) topic shifts, such as closing off prior discourse, foreshadowing a cause, effect, or

clarification, introducing background information or justification, and presaging reported speech

as enquoting devices, (2) emphasis, such as highlighting a particular point or the thrust of a

narrative, and (3) reference, such as to introduce given information or request a referent to be

searched for in the common ground. In each case, <u>you know</u> may be indicating speakers' desires

for addressees to infer something, rather than presaging particular organizational events.

Consider this passage (adapted from Svartvik & Quirk, 1980: 2.1.272):

(15)   I don't really know why Cambridge turned it down, - - I mean it's got to be done

by, a university press, because it's not going to be a remunerative - thing . you know

A number of organization-enhancing utterances could follow, such as: (1) "One day I do hope to

write a book that appeals to the public at large," a closing off of prior discourse; (2) "They must

not like my style of writing," a cause; (3) "Now I don't know where to turn with this

manuscript," an effect; (4) " 'We're awfully sorry, take it elsewhere,' but where?," a quote; (5)

"Can't I ever get a break?," highlighting the thrust of a narrative; (6) "They also turned down my

other one," searching for a referent. In this case, it happened to be (adapted from Svartvik &

Quirk, 1980: 2.1.277) "it, well it's not a best-seller," a clarification. According to the basic

meaning proposal, <u>you know</u> informs addressees that an inference is requested, but does not

provide information about what kind of inference. That is, rather than forewarning a clarification,

the <u>you know</u> invites addressees to infer something about what was just said.

<u>I mean</u>

<u>I mean</u>'s basic meaning may be to indicate upcoming adjustments, from the word level

on up to the negotiation of meaning (Schiffrin, 1987: 304).

<u>Interpersonal</u>. <u>I mean</u> may be used more by some speakers, and in some kinds of talk, because these speakers, or these speakers in these situations, are more willing or able to make adjustments on the fly.

<u>I mean</u> may be more common in thoughtful and opinionated talk, as discussed above, if speakers are being more careful about expressing exactly what they mean to express, and so using <u>I mean</u> to adjust their speech. This may also be true of narratives. On the other hand, <u>I mean</u> may be more common in conversations than interviews if speakers are talking more spontaneously in conversations. If talk is planned in advance, or considered carefully before articulating, as it might be in interviews, there is less need for on-the-spot adjustments. Likewise, <u>I mean</u> may be linked with positive politeness because using it reminds conversational participants of more casual talk. At the same time, it may be linked to negative politeness by decreasing face threat; saying <u>I mean</u> may be like saying "I'm not committed to what I just said and will adjust if you are offended."

<u>Turn management</u>. <u>I mean</u> may occur turn-initially, turn-medially, or turn-finally not because <u>I mean</u> is being used to accomplish the turn coordination, but because at any point in the turn speakers may want to forewarn adjustments. For example, turn-initial <u>I mean</u> may indicate that the speaker will contribute an adjustment to the speaker's prior turn, skipping over the other speaker's turn in-between, as in the following two examples (adapted from Svartvik & Quirk,

1980: 2.3.819, 1.1.909; in the first one below, the discussion is about how "peacetime talents"

differ from "wartime talents"):

> (16)   A: they tend not to be so dramatic, do they,
>
> B: - I I think it is true that, . a sort of
>
> A: I mean you're not going to get a sort of medal for uh, . drafting a beautiful new
>
> bill or something like that

> (17)   A: and uh I'm I'm determined, to get that sort of stuff, into the comprehension
>
> questions, . rather than all this high-faluting literature stuff, where they can set . imagery,
>
> and all that kind of thing, because the *scientists don't want that sort of stuff,*
>
> B: *m, . fa far further from* . from the students' experience, and so on, - - yes, .
>
> A: I mean they . they talk about uh uh thuh . by all means encourage the scientist
>
> to read this sort of stuff, . but that's very different matter from compelling them, .
>
> to deal with that sort of material, at what is an important examination

Similarly, turn-medial <u>I mean</u> may indicate that the speaker will adjust what the speaker just

said, and turn-final <u>I mean</u> may indicate that the speaker means something else, but will leave the

adjustment off record.

Repair. <u>I mean</u>'s use in repair conforms with its basic meaning to forewarn upcoming

adjustments. With a broad view of repair that extends beyond local phonological or syntactic

adjustments, this basic meaning can accommodate many of the other observations, such as that <u>I mean</u> forewarns parenthetical remarks or a change of mind (Erman, 1987: 175). The forewarning adjustments function treats the predictability or the local-globalness of repairs as irrelevant, so the conflicting findings presented earlier pose no threat.

<u>Monitoring</u>. The forewarning adjustments function also sits well with speakers' increased monitoring of addressee comprehension after an <u>I mean</u>. If speakers have just forewarned an adjustment, they might seek an acknowledgement of understanding from the addressee after the adjustment has been made.

<u>Organizational</u>. Forewarning adjustments can also account for <u>I mean</u>'s uses in topic shifts, such as introducing commentary, justification, phrasal level modification, and new information.

<div align="center">Discussion</div>

Most researchers describe <u>you know</u> and <u>I mean</u> in multifunctional terms. We believe that the markers are not doing as much as has been claimed, and what they are doing can be reanalyzed in terms of basic meanings. Our analysis further explains the apparent similarities that led to <u>you know</u> and <u>I mean</u>'s historical twindom in the research literature.

In particular situations, <u>you know</u>'s and <u>I mean</u>'s uses can appear similar. For example, both can occur turn-finally, as in the following examples repeated here (adapted from Svartvik & Quirk, 1980: 1.5.967, 2.1.932):

(18)   you can't step foot beyond a certain . you know

(19)   if the response is enthusiastic, well then I mean

But instead of being used interchangeably to mark the end of a turn, we believe that in the first example, <u>you know</u> is suggesting that addressees infer what "you can't step beyond," whereas in the second example, <u>I mean</u> is suggesting that addressees recognize that the speaker would adjust what was just said but wants to leave the adjustment off record. The distinction might be missed were all examples of <u>you know</u> and <u>I mean</u> of this sort. But they aren't. In many situations, the uses are markedly different, as in the following examples repeated here (adapted from Svartvik & Quirk, 1980: 1.2.889, 1.3.305):

(20)   and I was the only person there that was sort of remotely . <u>you know</u> competent to

speak

(21)   the interview was - it was alright <u>I mean</u> I handled it like a competent

undergraduate

In the first example, the speaker uses <u>you know</u> to invite addressees to follow along the same wave length. An <u>I mean</u> cannot work in its place because there is no upcoming adjustment. In the

second example, in contrast, the speaker uses I mean to forewarn an adjustment to what is meant

by "alright." A you know in its place would mean something else: that the addressee could

already infer that to be "alright" meant to be "like a competent undergraduate."

One counterargument to the basic meaning proposals for you know and I mean is that

they seem so general, they could account for any use. Whatever function is proposed, the basic

meaning can be made to wear it. But our approach does make testable predictions not only about

when a you know or I mean might occur, but also about when they are less likely to occur.

If you know is an invitation to infer the speaker's intentions, then there should be

situations where this is not a desired strategy, and where, correspondingly, you know should be

infrequent. One such situation is airline flight crew communication. In this situation, incorrect

inferences can lead to serious negative consequences. Increasing precision and avoiding

inferences would predict a decrease in you knows. Although you know by itself was not

examined, the use of agreement-requesting discourse markers did decrease in problem flight

conditions (Linde, 1988). Another situation in which you know might be infrequent is in the

speech of high-status conversational participants. Higher status addressees may not desire to

invite addressees' inferences or to distance themselves from what they are imposing on lower-

status addressees. Although you know by itself was not examined, higher status speakers were

more direct in making face-threatening requests of lower status addresses (Ervin-Tripp, 1976;

Becker, Kimmel, & Bevill, 1989; Holtgraves, 1986). A third situation in which you know should

be infrequent is when the addressees form a large group; in these cases, addressees are less likely

to all draw similar inferences and speakers may be aware of that. Although this has not been

tested, a consistent piece of evidence is that you know did not occur in any of the 16 recorded

inaugural addresses, from F.D.R.'s first address to Clinton's 1993 address, although plenty of

other conversational elements did, such as other discourse markers, hesitations, and the use of

short sentences (Kowal, O'Connell, Forbush, Higgins, Clarke, & D'Anna, 1997).

If I mean is forewarning upcoming adjustments, then there should be times when this is

not a desired strategy, such as when speakers are trying to present themselves as having thought

through an issue in advance. In accordance with this hypothesis, I mean also did not occur in any

inaugural addresses (Kowal, O'Connell, Forbush, Higgins, Clarke, & D'Anna, 1997).

Another prediction about the use of you know and I mean is that they should be

differentially avoidable in speech. Because you know is used to invite addressee inferences, it

should be avoidable when addressee inferences are not desired, and evidence suggests this is the

case. But I mean might only be avoidable when it is forewarning higher-level adjustments, such

as rephrasings of an idea; a speaker may choose to let the first phrasing stand instead of risking

an I mean and the consequent addressee revision. I mean may not be avoidable when it is used to

forewarn low-level adjustments stemming from speech production problems, such as alternative

word choices or syntax, because these speech production problems themselves are unavoidable, even with prepared speeches, as the data on inaugural addresses show (Kowal et al, 1997). Evidence consistent with this hypothesis is that there were more you knows in dialogues than in monologues, but not more I means (Fox Tree, 1999b), showing that people were able to reduce their numbers of you know but not of I mean. Of course, there are alternative accounts for this discrepancy, such as that you know is increased by dialogue, but I mean isn't. Future research will help clarify this issue.

You know may be increased in dialogue because its basic meaning focusses on addressees, by inviting addressee inferences, whereas I mean's basic meaning focusses on speakers, by forewarning speaker adjustments. Another way of viewing this is that you know encourages listeners to focus more on their own thoughts, and that I mean encourages listeners to focus more on speakers' thoughts. This view touches base with the proposal that you know is addressee oriented, but that I mean is speaker oriented (Schiffrin, 1987: 309; Stubbe & Holmes, 1995: 70). The distinction helps explain an observation made by laypeople and researchers alike regarding the quantity of you knows and I means used by some speakers. The claim is that you know and I mean may serve nondetrimental and even beneficial functions when they occur in small doses, but when they are frequent, they become detrimental to comprehension. Frequent use alters the words' functions from beneficial discourse markers to annoying "speech habit"s,

with some researchers even creating a special functional category for overuse (Östman, 1981, p.

27). But there may be no need for a special category. Magnifying the underlying uses as they

relate to speaker or addressee orientation can accommodate the overuse observations. Saying <u>you</u>

<u>know</u> frequently may cause addressees to do more work than they like, and may cause

addressees to feel resentful of speakers' lack of filling out ideas. Saying <u>I mean</u> frequently may

cause addressees to focus more frequently on speakers than they like, and may also make the

speakers appear self-focused and impolite (see Schiffrin, 1987: 311 for similar arguments).

     <u>You know</u> and <u>I mean</u> occur frequently in conversation because their functions are tied to

the naturalistic, unplanned, unrehearsed, collaborative nature of spontaneous talk (see discussion

in Fox Tree, 1999a). It is in talking on the fly that speakers are motivated to invite addressees to

fill out their inferences by saying <u>you know</u> or to forewarn upcoming adjustments by saying <u>I</u>

<u>mean</u>. A prepared speech allows speakers to plan the best way to express their ideas in advance.

There is less need for <u>you know</u> because the speaker has planned most inferences in advance,

and there is less need for <u>I mean</u> because the speaker has worked out most kinks and adjustments

already.

References

Aijmer, Karin (1984). 'Sort of' and 'kind of' in English conversation. <u>Studia Linguistica,</u> <u>38</u>, 118-128.

Becker, Judith A., Kimmel, Herbert D., & Bevill, Michael J. (1989). The interactive effects of request form and speaker status on judgments of requests. <u>Journal of Psycholinguistic</u> <u>Research, 18</u>(5), 521-531.

Broen, Patricia A., & Siegel, Gerald M. (1972). Variations in normal speech disfluencies. <u>Language and Speech, 5</u>, 219-231.

Brown, Penny & Levinson, Stephen C. (1987). <u>Politeness: Some universals in language</u> <u>usage</u>. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Clark, H. H. (1996) <u>Using language.</u> Cambridge University Press; Cambridge, England.

Duncan, Starkey, Jr. (1972). Some signals and rules for taking speaking turns in conversations. <u>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 23</u>(2), 283-292.

Erman, Britt (1986). Some pragmatic expressions in English conversation. In G. Tottie & I. Bäcklund (Eds.), <u>English in speech and writing</u> (pp. 131-147). Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International.

Erman, Britt (1987). <u>Pragmatic expressions in English : A study of you know, you see,</u> <u>and I mean in face-to-face conversation</u>. Stockholm, Sweden: Almqvist & Wiksell International.

Erman, Britt, & Kotsinas, Ulla-Britt (1993). Pragmaticalization: The case of *ba'* and *you know*. In J. Falk, K. Jonasson, G. Melchers, & B. Nilsson (Eds.), <u>Stockholm studies in modern philology</u> (Vol. 10, pp. 76-93). Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International.

Ervin-Tripp, Susan M. (1976). Is Sybil there? The structure of some American English directives. <u>Language in Society, 5,</u> 25-66.

Fox Tree, J. E. (1999a). Coordinating spontaneous talk. In Wheeldon, L. R. <u>Aspects of Language Production</u>. Philadelphia: Psychology Press.

Fox Tree, Jean E. (1999b). Listening in on monologues and dialogues. <u>Discourse Processes, 27,</u> 35-53.

Fox Tree, Jean E. and Clark, Herbert H. (1997). Pronouncing "the" as "thee" to signal problems in speaking. <u>Cognition, 62,</u> 151-167.

Fox Tree, J. E., & Schrock, J. C. (1999). Discourse markers in spontaneous speech: Oh what a difference an oh makes. <u>Journal of Memory and Language, 40,</u> 280-295.

Fraser, Bruce. (1990). An approach to discourse markers. <u>Journal of Pragmatics, 14</u>, 383-395.

Fromkin, Victoria A. (1973). Introduction. In V. A. Fromkin (Ed.), <u>Speech errors as linguistic evidence</u> (pp. 11-45). Paris: Mouton.

Heritage, J. (1984). A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement. In J.

M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), <u>Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis</u>.

Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heritage, John (1998). Oh-prefaced responses to inquiry. <u>Language in Society, 27</u>, 291-

334.

Holmes, Janet (1986). Functions of *you know* in womens' and men's speech. <u>Language in

Society, 15</u>, 1-22.

Holmes, Janet (1990). Hedges and boosters in women's and men's speech. <u>Language and

Communication, 10,</u> 185-205.

Holtgraves, Thomas (1986). Language structure in social interaction: Perceptions of

direct and indirect speech acts and interactants who use them. <u>Journal of Personality and Social

Psychology, 51</u>(2), 305-314.

Huspek, Michael (1989). Linguistic variability and power: An analysis of YOU KNOW/I

THINK variation in working-class speech. <u>Journal of Pragmatics, 13,</u> 661-683.

Jefferson, Gail (1973). A case of precision timing in ordinary conversation: Address

terms in closing sequences. <u>Semiotica, 9,</u> 47-96.

Jucker, A. H. (1993). The discourse marker 'well': A relevance theoretical account.

<u>Journal of Pragmatics, 19,</u> 435-452.

Jucker, Andreas H., & Smith, Stephen W. (1998). *And people just you know like 'wow'*: Discourse markers as negotiating strategies. In A. H. Jucker & Y. Ziv (Eds.), <u>Discourse markers: Descriptions and theory</u> (pp. 171-201). Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Kotthoff, Helga (1993). Disagreement and concession in disputes: On the context sensitivity of preference structures. <u>Language in Society, 22</u>(2), 193-216.

Kowal, Sabine, O'Connell, Daniel C., Forbush, Kathryn, Higgins, Mark, Clarke, Lindsay, & D'Anna, Karey (1997). Interplay of literacy and orality in inaugural rhetoric. <u>Journal of Psycholinguistic Research, 26</u>(1), 1-31.

Lalljee, Mansur G., & Cook, James M. (1975). Anxiety and ritualized speech. <u>British Journal of Psychology, 66</u>(3), 299-306.

Levelt, Willem J. M. (1989). <u>Speaking: From intention to articulation.</u> Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Linde, Charlotte (1988). The quantitative study of communicative success: Politeness and accidents in aviation discourse. <u>Language in Society, 17</u>(3), 375-399.

O'Donnell, William R., & Todd, Loreto. (1991). <u>Variety in contemporary English</u>. (2 ed.). New York: Harper Collins Academic.

Östman, Jan-Ola (1981). <u>You know: A discourse functional approach</u>. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Östman, Jan-Ola (1995). Pragmatic particles twenty years after. In B. Wårvik, S.-K. Tanskanen, & R. Hiltunen (Eds.), <u>Organization in discourse: Proceedings from the Turku conference</u> (pp. 95-108). Turku, Finland: Anglicana Turkuensia.

Ragan, Sandra L. (1983). Alignment and conversational coherence. In R. T. Craig & K. Tracy (Eds.), <u>Conversational coherence: Form, structure, and strategy</u> (pp. 157-171). Beverly Hills: Sage.

Redeker, Gisela (1990). Ideational and pragmatic markers of discourse structure. <u>Journal of Pragmatics, 14,</u> 367-381.

Redeker, Gisela (1991). Linguistic markers of discourse structure. <u>Linguistics, 29</u>, 1139-1172.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. (1987). Recycled turn beginnings: A precise repair mechanism in conversation's turn-taking organisation. In G. Button & J. R.E. Lee (Eds.), <u>Talk and social organisation</u> (Vol. 1, pp. 70-85). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters, Ltd.

Schiffrin, Deborah (1987). <u>Discourse markers.</u> Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schourup, Lawrence C. (1985). <u>Common discourse particles in English conversation</u>. New York: Garland.

Schourup, Lawrence C. (1999). Discourse markers. <u>Lingua, 107,</u> 227-265.

Stenström, Anna-Brita (1990a). Lexical items peculiar to spoken discourse. In J. Svartvik (Ed.), <u>The London-Lund corpus of spoken English: Description and research</u>. Lund: Lund University Press.

Stenström, Anna-Brita (1990b). Pauses in monologue and dialogue. In J. Svartvik (Ed.), <u>The London-Lund corpus of spoken English: Description and research</u>. Lund: Lund University Press.

Stubbe, Maria, & Holmes, Janet (1995). You know, eh and other 'exasperating expressions': An analysis of social and stylistic variation in the use of pragmatic devices in a sample of New Zealand English. <u>Language and Communication, 15</u>(1), 63-88.

Svartvik, Jan & Quirk, Randolph (Eds.). (1980). <u>A corpus of English conversation.</u> Lund: CWK Gleerup.

Author Note