Self-Monitoring Discourse Markers
in Classroom Monologue Narratives

Chihsia Tang

National Tsinghua University

In a monologue narrative, the speech floor is by and large occupied by an individual speaker; rarely are verbal interactions between interlocutors observed. Inaccurate utterances, if there are any, are seldom corrected by addressees so that the speaker's positive face can be maintained in public. Without listeners' active utterance-checking activities to ensure the appropriateness of their speech, addressers tend to self-monitor their words attentively while doing their presentations. As speakers are monitoring their speeches, a number of pragmatics particles are uttered sub-consciously. In this study, function, distribution, and frequency of those self-monitoring devices in monologue narratives are focused on. The data of the present investigation were collected from students' presentations and professors' lectures in a university located in northern Taiwan. In this corpus, the Chinese markers *heh*, *hao*, N[1], and *dui* as well as the English markers *alright*, *right*, *okay*, *yeah*, and *yep* are observed. These particles can be functionally classified into four groups—self-confirmation markers, self-assurance markers, current-utterance completeness markers, and utterance-internal completeness markers. These markers' pragmatic functions are not arbitrarily derived; instead, they are highly grounded on their lexical interpretations. Restrictions on forming compound monitoring mechanisms and how those pragmatic functions are derived from their lexical interpretations are also discussed.

Keywords: self-monitoring discourse marker, monologue narrative, Chinese-English bilingual

1. Background

While listening to others, not only do people receive messages, they also generate cues to hint to their interlocutors that they are focusing on the content of the speeches either by making body gestures, nodding, or producing oral responses. On the other hand, while delivering speeches, especially if the speech floor is occupied by a single speaker for a long period of time, the speaker sub-consciously utters various self-monitoring particles.

Take example (1) for illustration. The addresser in the excerpt is discussing the influences of political power on languages, and people's willingness to learn socially authoritative codes on account of the power vested in them. As the topic is thoroughly discussed, the speaker utters *hao* and moves on to the next example. *Hao* in this instance embodies the addresser's intention to end the preceding sub-section as it is fully covered. The textual function of *hao*[2] evidently shows that the speaker keeps an

---

[1] The capitalized *N* in this study stands for a syllabic nasal; that is, it stands for 嗯 in written text.

[2] The three successive markers in this extract, i.e., *oh hao na*, should be considered as three individual units instead of a compound complex device because of their phonological discontinuity and their

eye on his[3] discussion while doing the presentation. Put differently, some of the speaker's attention is set aside for speeches right under construction (cf., Nooteboom, in press). Self-monitoring particles, such as *hao* in the first extract, abound particularly in monologue narratives, and the probability to notice speakers' applications of speech monitoring devices is higher in extensive speeches than in brief talks.

(1) …ruguo shuo zhege zhimindi de   difang ta   benlai
     if   COMP this   colony ASSOC place 3.SG. originally
     jiu yi ge yuyan   danyude，   jiu hen rongyi yinwei
     just one CL language monolingual then very easy   because
     zhengzhi yinsu de   yingxiang，ranhou jiu hui   xuexi
     political factor ASSOC influence next   then would learn
     ta   tamen qiangshi de   yuyan   oh (1-second pause)，[hao]，
     3.SG. their dominant NOM   language   PRT   PRT
     na   lizi   san ne，zhege Tamati ta   zhu zai niuxilan，
     then example three PRT this   3.SG. live in   New.Zealand
     na   ta，yibanlaijiang   ta   dou shi jiang yingwen[4]…
     PRT 3.SG. generally.speaking 3.SG. all COP speak English
     '…If a colony at first has just only one language, it is very likely that its people will learn the governors' language, which is more powerful on account of the political triggers. Okay. Then, in example three, Tamati lives in New Zealand, and he always speaks English…'

    Apart from *hao* in the above illustration, many other self-monitoring pragmatic mechanisms can also be observed in naturally-occurring utterances. Chui (2002), You (2004), and Wang (2005) have done studies on related issues; however, their discussions center on only one marker each and chiefly focus on identifying diachronic developments of these pragmatic devices. Discussions on the self-monitoring function of the mechanisms are fairly limited. In addition, the data in

---

semantic connection with their adjacent constituents. The marker *oh* preceding *hao* is a sentence final particle, which is applied to soften the tone of the speaker and phonologically belongs to the sentence in front. (cf., Chao 1968, Li and Thompson 1981) The marker *na* following *hao* encodes an information transition point (cf., Lin 2002) implying the speaker's readiness to shift to a new sub-section. *Na* is phonologically attached to its following sentence. *Hao* stands out as an individual unit phonologically, but pragmatically it marks the completion of the preceding sub-topic. Even though *oh* and *hao* are pragmatically close to the preceding proposition, there is no such need to regard the two markers as one entity owing to a perceivable pause between them.

[3] In the present study, 'his' is used as the genitive form of the neutral third person singular pronoun, i.e. 'he'. The actual referent of the neutral pronoun can be male or female. Also, 'himself' and 'he' are neutral pronouns.

[4] The full terms of the abbreviations in the gloss are available in appendix.

the preceding investigations are based on extracts from conversations. Utterances from monologue narratives, however, are not particularly examined.

In this study, particles with the speaker's self-monitoring implication will be explored. These markers' functions can be textual or interactional depending on the purpose they serve in discourse. The data of the present corpus are from students' presentations and in-class lectures.[5] In total, 553 tokens of self-monitoring markers are found, and Chinese and English devices are both observed. Participants in the study are Chinese native speakers but do not have serious problems communicating in English.

2. Reasons for speakers to self-monitor their words in monologue discourse

The reason why Chinese speakers employ *dui* to show truth of their utterances has been discussed in Chui's (2002) study of the diachronic developments of this Mandarin Chinese predicate. According to Chui's analysis, in interactive conversation, after the speaker completes a proposition, the addressee habitually asks *zhende-ma* 'true-QST marker?' meaning 'really', or *shi-ma* 'copula-QST marker meaning 'is that so' to confirm the truthfulness of the speaker's words and the speaker habitually uses *dui* to respond as in example (2). When this repetitive oral interaction is ritualized, the speaker reinforces the correctness of his speech spontaneously without the listener's questioning as in example (3).

(2) A: youde yu   yuruan   hen   haochi。
       some fish fish.eggs very   be.delicious
    B: shi   ma ?
       COP   Q
    A: dui   a。
       right   PRT
    A: 'Some fish…fish eggs are very delicious.'
    B: 'Is that so?'
    A: 'Right.'

(3) B: [ta]   qu   niujin。
       3.SG. go   Oxford
    C: ziji   qu   ma？bushi suisuibianbian jiu   keyi jinqu   de   ye。
       self   go   Q   NEG   be.easy   then   can   enter   NOM   PRT

---

[5] Most papers presented by the participants were written in English, but speakers generally use Chinese in their oral presentations; therefore, the extracts in this study include English and Chinese.

B: ta ， ta shi ， zenme jiang ， ta ye mei gen wo
　 3.SG. 3.SG. COP how say 3.SG. also NEG with 1.SG.

　 jiang shuo ta shi ruhe neng jinqu de ， [dui] 。
　 say COMP 3.SG. COP how can enter NOM PRT

B: 'He went to Oxford.'

C: 'Did (he) go by himself? It's by no means easy to go (to Oxford).'

B: 'He…he…how (should I) put this? He also didn't tell me how he could go (to Oxford). Right.'

In addition to Chui's claim, speakers may monitor their own utterances for themselves. First, one's spontaneous examination of his own utterances can attribute to the speaker's desire to maintain his positive face, which refers to people's desire to be appreciated, admired, or ratified at least by some others (cf., Brown and Levinson 1987). In excerpt (3), as Speaker B reacts to speaker C's wonder, he hesitates at the very beginning of the reply since he does not know how to respond appropriately, which is evidenced by Speaker B's self-questioning, i.e., *zenme jiang* meaning 'how (should I) put this'. Speaker B later explains that he actually does not know the details very well. On account of his hesitation prior to answering, Speaker B employs *dui* to strengthen his standpoint after making himself clear in order to win over the interlocutor's trust. That is, the particle *dui* fortifies what the speaker says after he shows signs of uncertainty so that the speaker's positive face can be maintained as he gains the listener's trust. Second, in a one-speaker narrative, such as the classroom presentation, rarely do listeners initiate questions to confirm correctness of received messages. If the addressees have any questions over the content of the presentations, most discussions are launched after the talk unless there emerges an intolerable mistake that may twist the addressees' understanding of the addresser's later messages. Most addressees tend to participate less actively while the speech is being delivered as they know the speech floor mainly belongs to that individual presenter. If one addressee keeps interrupting the presentation, he may be considered rude since he deprives others of their rights to listen to the talk. As a consequence of listeners' intended passiveness in monologue narrative, presenters must inspect their words keenly to ensure appropriateness of the messages. Consequently, self-monitoring particles abound in one-speaker presentations.

Briefly, self-monitoring mechanisms are manifestations of speaker's active self-checking activities and they also disclose language users' self-confidence in their own words.

3. Functions of self-monitoring markers in classroom discourse

Chinese *N*, *dui*, *hao, heh*, and English *alright*, *right*, *okay, yeah* are self-monitoring particles found in the present corpus. Those pragmatic units may function as self-assurance markers, self-confirmation markers, and/or completeness markers, which can be further divided into utterance-internal completeness markers and current-utterance completeness markers depending on the particle's location in utterance. The following sections will elaborate upon and demonstrate the function of each self-monitoring mechanism. Since the aim of this study is to investigate self-monitoring particles in monologue narratives, markers arising from addressee-addresser interactions, such as *dui* in the following example, are not included.

(4) (B stops speaking and keeps silent while looking for an example in his notebook.)
   A: ershisi ， ershisi　　　 de　　 lizi。
   　　twenty.four twenty.four ASSOC example
   B : dui ， jiushi shuo ， jiushi zhao na shu shang de
   　　PRT　　namely say　　namely find that book up　　ASSOC
   　　lizi ，　 yinwei wo zuotian　 you　 ba　 ta
   　　example because I　 yesterday have BA　3.SG.
   　　xiexialai　　 le...
   　　write.down　 PFV
   A: 'Twenty-four, example twenty-four.'
   B: 'Right, namely... That is to look for the example in the book because I already wrote it down yesterday...'

In excerpt (4), Speaker B encounters some difficulties while looking for instances in his notebook; as a result, his speech suddenly comes to a halt. To help the addresser out of his plight, Speaker A hints to Speaker B that the anticipated example should be the twenty-fourth instance. Speaker B, later, replies with *dui* to confirm the accuracy of the hint and also acknowledges that the message is received. *Dui* in this example is a confirmation marker, yet it verifies the utterance of Speaker A rather than the utterance of Speaker B himself. Markers of this kind will not be analyzed in the present discussion.

3.1 Self-assurance marker

When encountering difficulties finding words or losing their train of thought for a

moment, speakers generally stop talking for several seconds; nevertheless, as soon as they come up with an appropriate expression for the following topic, they frequently utter a pragmatic marker before resuming the preceding incomplete speech. Speakers' employment of discourse mechanisms in this situation implies that they are confident of the correctness of the going-to-be-articulated messages or their preparation for the following speech is completely done and they are ready to restart. In the present corpus, forty-seven tokens of assurance markers are collected (8.50%). Most of the particles are preceded by unfinished descriptions (40.43%) and are followed by continuations of the preceding incomplete talk (46.80%). Self-assurance markers include *okay*, *yeah*, *yep*, *N*, *hao*, and *dui*; among them, *okay* and *hao* imply completion of the speech preparation and *yeah*, *yep*, *N,* and *dui* denote satisfaction with the prepared talk. Excerpts (5) and (6) illustrate the applications of the self-assurance marker.

(5) …na   women keyi dengyixia ye   lai   kan   jieshi   zhe
    PRT 1.PL.   can   later   also   come see   explain   this
    si   ge   zenmeyang，N ，zhe   si   ge   mudi de   zhe
    four CL   how   PRT   these four CL   goal   ASSOC this
    san   ge   ren ，   tamen zenyiang qu   biaoxian ，na
    three CL   people   3.PL.   how   go   perform   PRT
    na   disi   dehua ， uh(prolonged) (2-second pause)，
    PRT forth if.so   PRT
    okay ，jiushi   shuo   women dengyixia jiu   keyi lai   kan
         namely   say   1.PL.   later   then   can   come see
    zenyang jiu   kouyu limian qu   biaoxian ，N   qu   hanwei
    how   aim.at oral   inside go   perform   PRT go   defend
    ziji   oh…
    self PRT
    '…Later we can also check how these three people realize the four goals. Then, then, number four, uh, okay, that is to say we can see how they carry out the actions orally, yeah, (how) to defend themselves...'

In excerpt (5), as soon as the lecturer completes the preceding sub-section, he proceeds to another part of the talk. However, the presenter does not spare himself any time to organize the succeeding discussions; instead, he guides the listeners to the next issue right after finishing the previous issue. The speaker, however, cannot come up with the right wording when the new sub-topic is initiated with the discourse marker *na* (cf., Lin 2002). In order to get out of the embarrassing situation, he utters a

prolonged marker *uh* to create a 'filler' (cf., Maclay and Osgood 1959) in order to maintain the speech floor and create a sense of continuity of the speech. During that moment, the speaker manages to systematize the ideas he has in mind for the up-coming oration and, in the meantime, prevents interruptions from other interlocutors. As soon as the idea-arranging processes are done, the self-assurance marker *okay* is uttered, signaling that the presenter's message-arranging activity is complete and is ready to continue the preceding incomplete discussion. The continuation of the speech initiated with *jiushishuo*, meaning 'that is to say' pragmatically ushers in further extensions of the topic at hand.

(6) …na   dier   lei   ne，   jiushi   laizi   yingyu   de
    PRT second kind PRT   namely come.from English ASSOC
    zhexie zihui ，   ta   de   yuyi   hui   kaishi   kuochong，
    those   vocabulary 3.SG ASSOC meaning would   start   expand
    huoshi shiyong，   jiushi   yongfa ne ，   hui ，   jiushi   guang，
    or   use   namely   usage   PRT   would   namely (ext)end
    jiushi   tuiguang dao qita   bufen ，   xiangshi catch，   ranhou
    namely   extend   to other   parts   like   PRT
    (1-second pause) ，   dui ，   ranhou zhe lei   zihui   jiushi   yi
                          PRT   PRT   this type vocabulary   namely use
    dongci zuiduo…
    verb   mostly
    '…Second, the interpretation of the words from English starts to extend or use…That is to say its applications extend, such as 'catch'. Then…right… then words in this category are mainly verbs.'

In excerpt (6), the addresser is clarifying the semantic property of English loanwords and pointing out that the verb 'catch' is one of the examples. Following this example, the narrator attempts to shift to another section related to the preceding issue by saying *ranhou*, which is analyzed as a sequence marker pragmatically (cf., Lin 2002). After *ranhou*, the narrator is expected to present his further opinions immediately; however, a short pause emerges. The speaker's mental lapse conceals his uncertainty about the subsequent discussion. After the speaker checks the accuracy of the upcoming messages in his mind, *dui* is immediately uttered. The talk then resumes with a repetition of the preceding sequence marker. *Dui* standing at the initial position of a new section functions as a self-assurance particle, displaying the accurateness of the forthcoming speech.

3.2 Self-confirmation marker

In her master's thesis discussing the function and application of *dui* in Mandarin spoken discourse, You (2004) suggests that the particle *dui* can be a confirmation marker in our speech. In her research, a confirmation marker is considered as a pragmatic marker for speakers to demonstrate their assertion to both articulated and not-yet-revealed propositions. However, it is better to distinguish particles for displaying exactness of uttered and going-to-be-uncovered speech since uttered and unuttered speeches are processed in different parts of the brain. Our speech comes into our comprehension system through two different paths where the covert not-yet-uttered language goes through the inner path and the overt phonologically realized utterances go through the other path with audio-stimulation. (cf., Nooteboom, in press, Levelt 1989, and Levelt et al. 1999). Therefore, the suitability of the unproduced speech needs to be realized with a self-assurance marker and the articulated utterances are shown to be accurate with a confirmation device. As such, the speakers' objective to compare his original intention with his undisclosed inner speech or with the message still under construction before it is phonologically realized can be transparent. Albeit that the connotation behind applications of the confirmation markers is to signify accuracy of the utterances chiefly to the speakers themselves, simultaneously the addressees are indirectly informed that messages delivered have been already approved by speech givers. The addressees' trust strengthens the speakers' positive face.

In the present study, 107 tokens are self-confirmation markers (19.35%); most are preceded by the end of a sub-section (76.64%) and followed by the start of a new section (68.22%). *Right*, *yeah*, *N,* and *dui* are possible self-confirmation markers. Excerpt (7) is an illustration.

(7) …meiguoren   gen   low proficiency learner zhe   yi   zu
     American.people   with   this   one   CL
     you   chayi   ，   na   bijiao   high proficiency   ta
     have   difference   then   comparatively   3.SG.
     yijing   jiejin   native   de (prolonged)   native like ，(1-second pause)
     already   approach   ASSOC
     N̲ ，   ranhou   zhe   shihou   na   zuozhe   you   shuo ， instructions…
     PRT   PRT   this   moment   that   author   have   say
     '…There are differences between Americans and the ones with the low (language) proficiency. The ones with high (language) proficiency have already had a native-like command. Then, at this moment, that author mentions that instructions…'

The narrator in excerpt (7) compares the language proficiency of learners from two different levels and claims that students with better abilities are reaching a level not so different from native speakers. The presenter intends to convey this notion with the expression *native like*; nonetheless, the anticipated phrase is not successfully articulated on his first attempt. He thus halts for a while and modifies the original phrase *native de…* into the expected phrasing. At the same time as the repair finishes, *N* is uttered to indicate that the altered expression fits the addresser's intended meaning. The speaker's earlier uncertainty of his words provokes the face-threatening effect (cf., Brown and Levinson 1987); therefore, in order to guard his self-esteem, the narrator employs a confirmation marker to show the listeners that the modified talk is accurate.

Not all utterances verified by speakers themselves are truly proper, though. The confirmation markers may be uttered out of the speaker's haste before the speech is actually checked, meaning that the speaker's articulators are activated before verifications of the messages are done. Presenters' unconscious speech deviations shore up Seuren's (1978) argument that language construction is an underground process where speakers have no access to the processes of speech production; instead, only the linguistic output is able to be approached (cf., Herriot 1970). As any confirmation marker is uttered sub-consciously prior to the activation of the output-checking mechanism, confirmed but unexpected messages appear. Nevertheless, speakers soon manage to repair their speech as an alarm is delivered to the central monitoring system. "Self-repairs imply the existence of specialized control devices or 'monitors' which verify the correctness of ongoing motor activity and response output." (Postma 2000:98)

In excerpt (8) the presenter explains how to use *ain't* in English asserting that it

replaces the past-tense application of the verb *be* and *have*; later, *N* is uttered to confirm such a statement. The speaker, however, does not notice the deviations within his speech while the messages are delivered. Fortunately, his temporary mental lapse is instantly perceived and the addresser soon self-negates the preceding statements by uttering *budui* meaning 'not right' to redirect the listeners toward the anticipated messages. The speaker also manages to repeat the modified notion so as to wipe out errors from listeners' memorization system. It has been repeatedly observed that speakers start the repair almost immediately after the deviation (cf., Du Bois 1974, Nooteboom 1980) and the particle after the "reparandum" or "trouble spot" (e.g., *dui* in this excerpt) is of course to warrant the accuracy of the "repaired proper" (cf., Levelt 1983:44).

(8) ain't ta hui ，   ta uh (prolonged)，   ta   hui   gen
         3.SG. would 3.SG. PRT   3.SG. would with
suoyou de ， nage ， jiushi ge zhong de
all   ASSOC PRT   that.is each kind ASSOC
zhuci heyong ，   ranhou ta daiti de weizi
subject use.unitedly PRT 3.SG. replace NOM place
shi nage be gen have de   guoqushi ， (2-second pause)
COP PRT   with   ASSOC past.tense
N ， ei ， bu dui ， shi xianzaishi ，   present tense ， yeah
PRT PRT NEG right COP present.tense
(1-second pause) ， dui fouding xianzaishi ， dui ， ranhou
               PRT negative present.tense PRT PRT
zai xiamian dehua ， zuozhe jiu tidao shuo ， zhe
at below if   author then mention COPM this
jiu zhong non-standard English de   feature…
nine kind   ASSOC
'… 'Ain't', it would it uh…cooperates with any kind of subject and then it replaces 'be' and 'have' in the past tense, yeah. Not correct. It should be the present tense; yeah…it should be negative present tense, right. In the next section, the author mentions the features of these nine non-standard English…'

3.3 Current-utterance completeness marker

Not only do addressers inspect the accuracy of the speech content while giving speeches, but they also take the completeness of their discussion into consideration. Current-utterance completeness markers are for displaying inclusiveness of a

discussion. Once the current-utterance completeness marker is applied, it displays the speaker's belief that the current talk is complete and the speech floor is ready to be handed over to another participator or the current talk is going to be closed. Sixty-one tokens of current-utterance completeness markers are found in the present corpus (11.03%). Due to the speaker's intent to wrap up his discussion after the marker is uttered, most of the current-utterance completeness markers are followed by silence (32.79%), which strengthens the speaker's determination to conclude his discussion. Current-utterance completeness markers in the present corpus comprise *okay*, *N*, and *hao*. Excerpt (9) is an illustration.

(9) …zhege ba wan ren lai ziyu hen duo
　　　this eight ten.thousand people come from very many
　　　difang ，shenzhiyu lai zi guowai ，suoyi yingyu ting de
　　　place even come from abroad so English hear CSC
　　　yuelaiyueduo ，danshi Mandarin ye hui shiyong yuelaiyuedou ，
　　　more.and.more but also would use more.and.more
　　　danshi kejiahua xiangduide shiyong de shao la ，
　　　but Hakka comparatively use CRC little PRT
　　　jiushishuo zhege hao ，zhe shi ，zhege shi buchong
　　　namely PRT PRT this COP this COP supplementary
　　　shuoming 。
　　　explanation
　　　'…Those 800,000 people are from many places. Some of them are even from foreign countries. So, (people in Hsinchu) listen to more and more English and use more and more Mandarin. But, the opportunities to use Hakka are decreasing. That is…okay, this is the supplement.'

In excerpt (9), the addresser is reporting the linguistic ability of the Hakka residents in Hsinchu City. As soon as the speech is done, *hao* is articulated to inform listeners that it is the end of the present talk. Following *hao*, the speaker elucidates that his argumentation is a complementary explanation; he at this moment overtly unveils his intention to relinquish the speech floor. Indeed, the addresser says no more afterwards. Owing to the location of *hao* in the discourse, the marker should be regarded as a current-utterance completeness marker, disclosing the presenter's intent to end that speech.

3.4 Utterance-internal completeness marker

It is unnatural or even impossible for any narrator to talk without any pauses since it surpasses an individual's physical ability and mental capacity. For a smooth presentation, addressers partition their extensive speeches into small sub-sections. Addressees, on the other hand, need recesses to digest information while listening to an extensive speech. Put differently, any speech is built upon numerous small chunks of information instead of a large message unit on account of speakers' physical and mental limitations and listeners' inability to parse a lot of new information at one time.

A speech can be sub-divided into smaller components with the speaker's applications of utterance-internal completeness markers. The size of the information chunks, however, is not unified. A fragment can be a sentence, or a sub-topic according to the position where the utterance-internal completeness marker stands in discourse. These particles signal comprehensiveness of any information unit at the interval of a talk. Markers with this function take the largest share in the data where 338 tokens are gathered (61.12%). Most utterance-internal completeness markers in this corpus are preceded by the end of a section (74.85%) and followed by a new section of the speech (76.63%). *Alright*, *okay*, and *hao* are possible devices.

(10) …zai discourse litou a   shi   zhi   zhe   xiangtong
          at   inside PRT COP   refer DUR identical
          de   dongxi ，danshi ne ， shishishang in terms in the real
          NOM thing   BUT   PRT   actually
          world of course ，zheyige zhe zhong qianti   bu   shi
                                  PRT   this kind   prerequisite NEG COP
          yiyiang de ，zhishishuo zimianshang shi   yao
          same   NOM but   literally   COP want
          yiyang de ，(3-second pause) hao   okay ，zheyige
          same   NOM   PRT   PRT
          dier   ge   shi   impure textual deixis …
          second CL COP
          '…In discourse, (it) refers to the same thing. But in reality, in terms of the real world, of course, the presuppositions are different, namely. But, literally, it should be the same…okay, okay. Then, the second (one) is the impure textual deixis…'

The presentation in the above example can be divided into two sections. As the

speaker completely discusses the first concept of the concerned topic, he pauses for three seconds and then soon utters *hao okay* to terminate the preceding issue. The discourse device in this example appears at the junction of two sub-topics signaling the end of the foregoing theme. The short break preceding the concerned particle obviously exhibits the current speaker's monitoring progression. Right after the discourse marker is uttered, the narrator moves to the next sub-topic on the textual deixis.

4. Correlations between self-monitoring markers' pragmatic functions and lexical interpretations

Not every self-monitoring marker observed in the present study possesses identical function(s). Before discussing how these lexical items' pragmatic functions are derived, let us check what function(s) these markers are claimed to have. From Table 1, we can get a whole picture of every marker's derived function(s). *Okay* and *hao* can be current-utterance completeness markers. *Okay*, *hao*, and *alright* are utterance-internal completeness markers. *Dui*, *N*, *yeah*, *okay*, *hao*, and *yep* function like self-assurance markers. *Dui*, *N*, *yeah*, and *heh* serve as self-confirmation markers.

Table 1. Functions of self-monitoring markers

	Current-utterance Completeness Marker	Utterance-internal Completeness Marker	Self-assurance Marker	Self-confirmation Marker
dui			✓	✓
N			✓	✓
yeah			✓	✓
okay	✓	✓	✓	
hao	✓	✓	✓	
alright		✓		
yep			✓	
heh				✓

In the following paragraphs, how those particles' extended functions are derived from their lexical interpretations will be examined. Also, the lexical interpretation of mechanisms with the same function will be checked to find out whether they uphold

any analogous lexical reading in the dictionary.[6] Content interpretations of these Chinese markers are based on Jiaoyubu Zhongbian Guoyucidian Xiudingben.[7] For the English data, the Random House Dictionary, and the American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language[8] are consulted.

4.1 Lexical interpretations of the tri-functional markers

4.1.1 *Hao*

Hao can function as an adjective to mark the good condition of a certain object as in example (11). *Hao*'s goodness reading brings out the interpretation of satisfactoriness and completeness of an action; at this stage, *hao* has been turned into a grammatical marker (cf., Wang 2005) as in example (12) where *hao* denotes the completion of writing a manuscript.

(11) wan   hao   ru   chu
      intact   good   as   beginning
      '(Something is) in its good condition as it was before.'

(12) gaozi   xie   hao   le
      manuscript   write   ASP   PFV
      'The manuscript is done.'

Obviously, the functional application of *hao* as a grammatical phase marker reinforces its development as a textual marker in discourse indicating one's completion of a speech. In Miracle's (1991) and Wang's (2005) discussion, *hao* is used within a turn controlled by a specific speaker for idea management, and indicates the closure of a prior topic. That is, *hao* in their studies has been regarded a discourse mechanism denoting a speaker's completion of his talk. *Hao*'s interpretation of completeness then facilitates its development into an assurance marker, which signals the speaker's full preparation for the forthcoming speech. Nevertheless, none of *hao*'s lexical application manifests the accurateness interpretation, which explains why *hao* does not mark correctness of the uttered speech.

---

[6] On account of the limited number of tokens of *alright* and *heh* in the corpus, their lexical readings will not be included in the following discussion.
[7] Revised Mandarin Chinese Dictionary of MOE, http://dict.revised.moe.edu.tw/index.html.
[8] http://www.dictionary.com.

4.1.2 *Okay*

Okay or *OK* in abbreviation can be employed to display adequateness of an action as in example (13). The interpretation of adequateness licenses *okay* to serve as a textual marker for speakers to suggest completeness of a sub-section in one speech or completion of a talk. In addition, the completion of speakers' speech organizations can also be encoded with *okay* thanks to its lexical interpretation of adequateness. In other words, *okay* can be an assurance marker indicating that speakers are well-prepared for their upcoming speeches. Put differently, the assurance marker in discourse uncovers the message that the speaker's going-to-be-disclosed speeches are prepared adequately.

(13) The job they did was okay, nothing more.

(14) Is this suit OK to wear to a formal party?

Okay also upholds the explanation of correctness in the dictionary as in example (14); its interpretation, nevertheless, is more close to 'acceptable' or 'appropriate' instead of 'accurate'. The speaker in example (14) is asking whether it is 'appropriate' to wear that suit for that formal party instead of asking whether the suit is the 'exact' or 'right' piece for that occasion. On account of *okay*'s weak interpretation of accurateness, it is less appropriate to regard *okay* as a discourse device for showing correctness of an utterance.

4.2 Lexical interpretations of the di-functional markers

4.2.1 *Dui*

Along with Chui's (2002) analyses, *dui* initially sets out as a verb bearing the assertive interpretation. It discloses the messages that what has been uttered is right or true as in example (15), where the speaker announces that the number is not correct.

(15) shumu   bu   dui
      number   NEG   correct
      'The number is not correct.'

Thanks to *dui*'s lexical interpretation of correctness, it has developed into a confirmation marker and assurance marker, which encodes accurateness of people's

given utterances and ready-to-be-disclosed words respectively. Nonetheless, for *dui* to function as a completeness marker is not applicable since it does not yield the interpretation of completeness lexically.

4.2.2 *N*

Different from *dui*, *N* stands out as a functional word meaning that it does not have any lexical reading. In the dictionary, *N* is used in interactive situations for speakers to show allowance, astonishment, and confusion to their interlocutors as in example (16). The following instance demonstrates how *N*'s allowance interpretation is applied in an interactive situation. The speaker inside the example permits his listener to act in a certain way with the employment of *N*.

(16) N   jiu   zheme   zuo   ba
      PRT   according.to   this.way   do   PRT
      'Okay, do it this way!'

It is the agreement interpretation that empowers *N* to be applied as a confirmation particle in the one-speaker narrative. Self-confirmation *N* clarifies that speakers permit themselves to transfer the messages in mind to the listeners which ultimately implies that the information under construction complies with the speaker's intended speech. As *N* develops into a self-assurance marker, which is uttered before a proposition is disclosed, its correctness implication is stronger since as the message is permitted to be forwarded to listeners, the ready-to-be-uttered speeches must be accurate.

4.2.3 *Yeah* and *yep*

Both *yeah* and *yep* are informal representations of 'yes'; functional derivations of the two mechanisms will be discussed jointly. 'Yes' according to the dictionary definition can be an affirmative reply, a strong expression of approval or satisfaction; more specifically, it is said to claim that something under consideration is correct or true. In the illustration below, Speaker B when asked if he owns the pen that Speaker A is questioning replies with 'yes' to make it clear that he is the person who has the ownership of the pen.

(17) A: Is this your pen?
      B: Yes, it is.

The assertiveness interpretation behind 'yes' enables its counterparts, i.e., *yeah* and *yep*, to be employed as confirmation markers or assurance markers in discourse; they indicate correctness of speeches either uttered or ready-to-be-uttered. The application of *yep* as a confirmation marker is not observed in the present corpus but its absence does not imply its inability. *Yep* holds the same interpretation of correctness that *yeah* advocates; there is no reason to eliminate the possibility for *yep* to function as a confirmation device. However, neither *yep* nor *yeah* functions like a completeness marker since 'yes' does not yield the reading of adequateness lexically.

With closer observations of these lexical interpretations of the self-monitoring markers concerned, we can draw the conclusion that lexemes with the reading of completeness or acceptableness can function as textual markers disclosing the completeness of an utterance and/or as interactive markers displaying one speaker's assurance of his own talk in discourse. The completeness markers are for displaying entirety of the given speeches and the assurance markers with the lexical reading of completeness are for showing speakers' full preparation for their forthcoming discussions. In certain situations, self-assurance markers are employed by narrators to mark correctness of their phonologically unrealized speeches; however, only the lexemes with a lexical interpretation of accurateness yield this function in discourse. The accurateness reading also facilitates the derivation of confirmation markers. But, self-confirmation markers indicate correctness of the phonologically realized messages instead of the undisclosed ideas.

In summary, the self-monitoring pragmatic function upheld by each discourse marker is highly grounded on each particle's content interpretations and also, particles with identical pragmatic functions have analogous lexical readings. Self-monitoring functions of each lexeme are not arbitrarily derived.

5. Frequencies and functional distributions of self-monitoring markers

The frequencies and the functional distributions of the devices in the present corpus will be discussed in this section.

5.1 Frequencies of markers by category

Table 2. Frequency of single-unit markers

Marker	Frequency
alright	1
okay	106
right	1
yeah	3
N	35
hao	173
dui	60
Sum	**379**

In the present investigation, 553 particles with the self-monitoring function were collected, where 379 tokens are single-unit and 174 markers are compounded into eighty-six complex pairs, which are either bi-unit or tri-unit. Complex markers comprise *okay hao*, *hao okay*, *okay yeah*, *N hao*, *yeah okay*, *N dui*, *okay yep*, *dui heh*, *hao yeah*, *hao okay yeah*, and *N okay hao*. The occurrence of *okay hao* is the highest; sixty out of eighty-six possible pairs are found. Single markers include English *alright*, *okay*, *right*, *yeah*, and Chinese *N*, *hao*, and *dui*. Among all single markers *okay* and *hao* are the most frequently observed device in English and Chinese respectively.

Table 3. Frequency of multiple-unit markers

Marker	Frequency
Bi-unit	
okay hao	60
hao okay	6
okay yeah	6
N hao	5
yeah okay	2
N dui	2
okay yep	1
dui heh	1
hao yeah	1
Tri-unit	
hao okay yeah	1
N okay hao	1
Sum	**86**

Since English is widely spoken around the world nowadays, *okay*, an English interjection for expressing approval or agreement is commonly used in Taiwan. The abundance of *okay* in the corpus of the present study can be regarded as a manifestation of naturalization of *okay* in the Chinese-speaking society. However, since all subjects in this investigation are Chinese native speakers, the opportunity for them to use Chinese particles is still higher than using the English ones; therefore, the Chinese devices outnumber the English mechanisms in this study. Frequencies of single-unit and multiple-unit markers are shown in Tables 2 and 3.

5.2 Frequencies of markers by function

The functions of the concerned particles and the frequencies of functions that each device has in the present corpus will be presented in this section. The restrictions on compound markers will also be canvassed. In Tables 4 and 5, functions of each monitoring device are panoramically shown.

It can be easily observed that utterance-internal completeness markers have the highest percentage among the four categories. In total, 338 tokens are found (63.41%). The abundance of the utterance-internal completeness marker is a reflection of every speaker's need to segment his utterance into finer sections. Utterance-internal completeness markers offer brief but essential breaks for narrators to mark the

boundary between sections and, in the meantime, their listeners can analyze and picture messages received.

Table 4. Functions of markers with single units

Markers	Functions			
	Current-utterance Completeness Marker	Utterance-internal Completeness Marker	Self-assurance Marker	Self-confirmation Marker
alright		1		
okay	9	89	8	
right				1
yeah			2	1
N			2	33
hao	7	150	16	
dui			9	51
Total	**16**	**240**	**37**	**86**

Table 5. Functions of markers with multiple units

Markers	Functions			
	Current-utterance Completeness Marker	Utterance-internal Completeness Marker	Self-assurance Marker	Self-confirmation Marker
okay	25	48	4	
yeah				10
yep			1	
N			1	7
dui				3
hao	20	50	4	
heh				1
Total	**45**	**98**	**10**	**20**

To amalgamate single-unit markers into compound devices, each single marker's function and distribution in discourse should be taken into consideration. Particles carrying the same function might be combined into a uni-functional compound marker. These uni-functional compound devices strengthen speakers' confidence in their utterances. Both *okay* and *hao*, for instance, can be an utterance-internal completeness marker, a current-utterance completeness marker, or a self-assurance marker. Because

of their resemblance in function, the combination of *okay* and *hao* is observed. As *hao okay* are applied contiguously in speech, they appear either at the interval between sub-sections or at the very end of a speech to mark the completeness of the talk. Moreover, Chinese *N*, *dui*, *heh* and English *yeah* can be self-confirmation markers; their functional similarity implies the possibility to be applied as a compound mechanism. There should be no pragmatic restriction on devices possessing an identical discourse function that appears consecutively. Nonetheless, only the combination of *N* with *dui* and *dui* with *heh* are found. The unavailability of some potential combinations in this corpus should not be attributed to the markers' combinational impossibility. It is the speakers' habitual application of particular particles that reinforces the availability of certain combinational patterns. Also, the speakers' language inability affects the markers' combinational possibility; for example, if Minnan (i.e., the Southern Min language) is out of one speaker's linguistic repertoire, the chance is slim that the Minnan marker *heh* will be coupled with another device. To put it differently, people's use of a self-monitoring marker is conditioned by their language abilities to a certain extent. For better understanding of these potential but unavailable combinations, it is better to examine more data so as to decide whether the absence of some combinations is just an accidental gap or is caused by some grammatical and/or social restrictions.

In addition, it is possible to couple particles with distinct functions into complex devices. Still, elements to be pooled are not arbitrarily chosen; only mechanisms resembling each other in position can be combined and the results are bi-functional compound devices. In the present study, only the self-confirmation marker and the completeness marker can occur at the same place in discourse. Accordingly, multi-functional markers are composites of a completeness device with a self-confirmation mechanism, including *okay yeah*, *N hao*, *yeah okay*, *hao yeah*, *N okay hao,* and *hao okay yeah.* It must be particularly noted that the tri-unit marker does not acquire an additional function because of that extra component. *Okay hao* in *N okay hao* and *hao okay* in *hao okay yeah* are uni-functional joint markers; in other words, *okay hao* and *hao okay* are compounds with a single function each and the pairs are later merged with *N* and *yeah* respectively, turning into tri-unit devices. Briefly, every complex self-monitoring marker holds two functions maximally.

Among those complex devices, it is also noticed that the ordering of the elements does not change the role each single device plays in speech. For example, *okay hao* and *hao okay* are conjoined markers with identical components but the arrangement of their constituents is reversed. Nevertheless, to our surprise, the functions of *okay hao* and *hao okay* are indistinguishable, which means the linear sequence of the particles inside the complex markers does not alter each element's pragmatic interpretation.

Pragmatic functions of the discourse devices are determined by their lexical interpretations and contextual information, but the sequence of the particles does not affect their interpretations in discourse.

6. Discussions and conclusions

Previous studies on discourse markers largely concentrated on analyzing functions of pragmatic devices in conversation, whereas pragmatic functions of discourse particles in monologues were rarely examined. Based on data from students' presentations and professors' lectures, the present study investigated monitoring functions of markers in one-speaker discourse. From earlier studies in speech repair (cf., Schegloff et al. 1977, Levelt 1983, and Postma 2000) we can learn that when individuals give speeches, they set aside part of their attention to check their words. The application of self-monitoring markers is a realization of a speaker's inner language checking activity. There are no self-monitoring markers in written texts as a result of the non-simultaneous production of the printed languages.

Following Fraser's (1996) suggestion, self-monitoring devices should be categorized as the message idiom which marks the entire basic message of the utterance and they fall in to Fraser's category of the pragmatic marker, allocating speaker's self-verifications to the messages in discussion. With these self-monitoring mechanisms, the completeness and correctness of the information in monologues are revealed. In addition, Fraser (ibid) divided these discourse markers into four subclasses in accordance with their semantic interpretations, including contrastive markers (e.g., *on the other hand*), elaborative markers (e.g., *for example*), inferential markers (e.g., *consequently*), and temporal markers (e.g., *meanwhile*); nonetheless, self-monitoring markers cannot be assigned into any of the aforementioned categories. Along with this investigation, and the diachronic studies in prior research (cf., Chui 2002, You 2004, and Wang 2005), a number of markers in our speech certainly hold the function of monitoring; it would be more inclusive if this category were added into Fraser's model.

In the data of the present investigation, addressers habitually accentuate the correctness of the ready-to-be-articulated and the just-uttered speech. Comprehensiveness of the talk is also attended to. Discourse particles in the present corpus encompass English *okay*, *yeah*, *yep*, *alright* and Chinese *hao*, *dui*, *N*, *heh*. These particles can be functionally classified into four groups, e.g., the self-confirmation marker, self-assurance marker, current-utterance completeness marker, and utterance-internal completeness marker. The classification of these particles is determined by their lexical interpretations, contextual information and

completeness of a discussion. The self-confirmation marker unveils the speaker's certainty toward the given speech and tends to occur at the end of a complete proposition. Moreover, when speakers experience mental lapse, or unconscious slips of the tongue, self-confirmation markers may follow speakers' self-correction of the repairable. The self-assurances marker discloses the message that the discussion going-to-be-uncovered is already confirmed by the presenter himself or the speaker's preparation for the forthcoming speech is done. The presenters' confidence to unveil their messages can be perceived from applications of this device. It commonly appears at the beginning of a topic that is about to be launched and is followed by manifestations of new information. The utterance-internal completeness marker shows comprehensiveness of sub-sections within a discussion. Since they signal the termination of sub-topics, utterance-internal completeness markers are frequently found at the joint of two sections in utterance. The current-utterance completeness marker is in charge of marking an end of a speech. A speaker makes public his readiness to hand over the speech floor to another participator or to close up the entire talk as soon as the current-utterance completeness marker is uttered. Devices in this category are generally found at the very end of a speech because of their duty to mark the conclusion of a discussion.

Derivations of those pragmatic functions are not arbitrary. Lexemes with the lexical interpretation of acceptableness or adequateness facilitate the development of the markers to show completion of the speech or readiness of the speaker to initiate a talk. Particles with the content reading of accurateness are developed into the mechanism that encodes correctness of the given speech and the one still under construction.

References

Brown, Penelope, and Stephen Levinson. 1987. *Politeness*: *Some Universals in Language Use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Chao, Yuen-ren. 1968. *Language and Symbolic Systems.* London: Cambridge University Press.

Chui, Ka-wai. 2002. Ritualization in evolving pragmatic functions: A case study of *dui*. *Language and Linguistics* 3:645-663.

Du Bois, John W. 1974. Syntax in mid-sentence. *Berkeley Studies in Syntax and Semantic*s 1:1-25.

Fraser, Bruce. 1996. Pragmatic markers. *Pragmatics* 6:167-190.

Herriot, Peter. 1970. *An Introduction to the Psychology of Language*. London:

Methuen & Co.

Levelt, Willem J. M. 1983. Monitoring and self-repair in speech. *Cognition* 14:41-104.

Levelt, Willem J. M. 1989. *Speaking: From Intention to Articulation*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Levelt, Willem J. M., Ardi Roelofs, and Antje S. Meyer. 1999. A theory of lexical access in speech production. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 22:1-75.

Li, Charles N., and Sandra A. Thompson. 1981. *Mandarin Chinese: A Functional Reference Grammar*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Lin, Xiou-ru. 2002. Two Discourse Markers：*Na* and *ranhou* in Chinese Spoken Discourse. MA thesis, National Tsinghua University.

Maclay, Joanna H., and Charles Egerton Osgood. 1959. Hesitation phenomena in spontaneous English speech. *Word* 15:19-44.

Miracle, William Charles. 1991. Discourse Markers in Mandarin Chinese. Doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University.

Nooteboom, Sieb G. 1980. Speaking and unspeaking: Detection and correction of phonological and lexical errors of speech. *Errors in Linguistic Performance: Slips of the Tongue, Ear, Pen, and Hand*, ed. by Victoria. A. Fromkin, 87-96. New York: Academic Press.

Nooteboom, Sieb G. In press. Monitoring for speech errors has different functions in inner and overt speech. *Theoretical Validity and Psychological Reality*, ed. by Martin Everaert, Tom Lentz, Hannah De Mulder, Øystein Nilsen, and Arjen Zondervan. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Postma, Albert. 2000. Detection of errors during speech production: A review of speech monitoring models. *Cognition* 77:97-131.

Schegloff, Emanuel A., Gail Jefferson, and Harvey Sacks. 1977. The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language* 2:361-382.

Seuren, Pieter A. M. 1978. Grammar as an underground process. *The Child's Conception of Language*, ed. by Anne Sinclair, Robert. J. Jarvella, and Willam. J. M. Levelt, 201-223. New York: Springer.

Wang, Hsiao-ling. 2005. The Grammaticalization of *hao* in Mandarin Chinese. MA thesis, National Tsinghua University.

You, Ka-wai. 2004. The Function and Application of *dui* in Mandarin Spoken Discourse. MA thesis, National Tsinghua University.

Graduate Institute of Linguistics
National Tsinghua University
Hsinchu, TAIWAN
Chihsia Tang: tangchihsia@gmail.com

Appendix

This table shows the full terms of the abbreviations in the gloss.

Abbreviation	Term
ASSOC	associative
BA	ba
CL	classifier
COMP	complementizer
COP	copular
CSC	complex stative construction
DUR	durative aspect
NEG	negation
NOM	nominalizer
PFV	perfective aspect
PL	plural
PRT	discourse particle
SG	singular

課堂獨白演說的自我修正標記

唐綺霞

國立清華大學

在獨白裡，說話者大多只專注於自己的發言，鮮少與聽話者有口語上的互動。爲了維護說話者的面子以及演說的流暢度，即便是報告內容有誤，聽話者也不常主動糾正。因此，說話者必須積極檢視自己的言談，以確保談話內容正確、適切。說話者在執行自我監聽時，會下意識地發出某些特定的言談標記；本文的重心便是在探討這些自我監視標記在獨白中的語用功能、言談分佈、使用頻率與其語義的歷史演變過程。本文的研究對象爲大學教授與其修課學生；語料取自於課堂中的長篇口頭報告，收集到的語料包含中文標記「嘿」、「好」、「嗯」、「對」以及英文「alright」、「right」、「okay」、「yeah」與「yep」。這些顯示說話者執行自我監聽的言談標記依功能可分爲四類：自我證實標記、自我確認標記、全篇話語完成標記、篇中話語完成標記。研究結果顯示，篇中話語完成標記使用頻率最高。此外，這些標記的言談語義與其原始意義有密切的關聯。並且，說話者對某語言的熟悉度會影響該語言言談標記的使用頻率。最後，獨立標記在言談中的分佈決定複合標記的構成方式。

關鍵詞：言談分析、自我修正言談標記、獨白演說、中英雙語