A PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS OF
TURKISH DISCOURSE PARTICLES: YANİ, İŞTE AND ŞEY

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO

THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

OF

MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

ERKAN YILMAZ

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

IN

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE EDUCATION

APRIL 2004

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

_____

Prof.Dr. Sencer Ayata
Director

I certify that this thesis satifies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

_____

Prof.Dr. Wolf König
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quantitiy, as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

_____

Assoc.Prof.Şükriye Ruhi
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Assoc.Prof.Şükriye Ruhi   _____

Prof.Dr. İclal Ergenç   _____

Prof.Dr. Deniz Zeyrek   _____

Assist.Prof. Bilge Say   _____

Assist.Prof.Nurdan Özbek   _____

ABSTRACT

A PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS OF
TURKISH DISCOURSE PARTICLES: YANİ, İŞTE AND ŞEY

Yılmaz, Erkan

Ph.D., Department of English Language Education

Supervisor: Assoc.Prof.Dr. Şükriye Ruhi

Nisan 2004, 280 sayfa

Adopting an eclectic analytic perspective of discourse analysis, conversation analysis and functional approaches, this study conducts an in-depth pragmatic analysis and describes the function of three pragmatic particles *yani*, *işte* and *şey* in casual, conversational Turkish. All three particles have multiple functions, which are described by reference to occurrences in utterances within three different domains of conversation. While utterance initial occurrences of *yani* are mainly connective and continuative, the utterance final placement of *yani* mainly acts as a situating particle with a strongly interactional nature. The utterance medial occurrences are basically 'self-editing' whereby the speaker marks the clarification of a point in his/her prior talk. *İşte* mainly acts as a frame particle demarcating utterances as containing detailed, highlighted, and reported information as well as connecting distant pieces of utterances. The third particle *şey* basically marks the speaker's temporary mental effort of extracting the linguistic information from the memory. In addition to its major role in repair organisation whereby marking its producer's verbal planning and word search, *şey* displays caution and discretion and marks politeness when assessing/asserting something about the self or the other.

Keywords: Discourse Particles, Pragmatics, Conversation Analysis, Turkish, Yani, İşte, Şey

ÖZ

TÜRKÇE SÖYLEM BELİRLEYİCİLERİNİN EDİMBİLİMSEL AÇIDAN İNCELENMESİ: YANİ, İŞTE VE ŞEY

Yılmaz, Erkan

Doktora, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Doç. Dr. Şükriye Ruhi

Bu çalışma, söylem çözümlemesi, konuşma çözümlemesi ve işlevsel yaklaşım inceleme yöntemlerini bir çatı altından birleştirerek, detaylı bir edimbilimsel inceleme gerçekleştirmekte ve *yani*, *işte* and *şey*'den oluşan üç söylem belirleyicisinin günlük konuşma Türkçe'sindeki işlevlerini tanımlanmaktadır. Üç ayrı konuşma işlevsel alanında bulunan sözcelere göre tanımlanan üç söylem belirleyicisinin hepsi de birçok işleve sahiptir. *Yani*'nin sözce başındaki kullanımları çoğunlukla bağlayıcılık ve süreklilik işlevlerine sahip iken, sözce sonunda kullanılan *yani*, çoğunlukla etkileşimsel özelliği bulunan konumlandırma söylem belirleyicisi olarak rol alır. Sözce ortasında yer alan *yani* kullanımı esas olarak, konuşmacının kendi konuşmasına ilişkin bir bölümü açıklamayı işaret eden kendini-düzeltme işlevidir. Birbirinden uzak sözceleri birleştirmenin yanında, *işte* çoğunlukla detaylı, ön plana çıkarılmış ve başkasına ait konuşmaları içeren sözce parçacıklarının sınırlarını belirleyen çerçeveleme işlevini gerçekleştirir. Üçüncü söylem belirleyicisi olan *şey*, konuşmacının çıkardığı bilgiyi işaretleyen bir işlev yüklenmektedir. Sözel planlama ve kelime bulma işlevlerini işaret eden hata düzeltme organizasyonundaki önemli rolüne ilave olarak, *şey* sakınma göstergesi olarak rol oynar ve konuşmacının kendi ya da diğer konuşmacıyla ilgili bir değerlendirme/iddiada bulunurken gösterdiği inceliğe işaret eder.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Söylem Belirleyicileri, Edimbilim, Türkçe, Konuşma Çözümlemesi, Yani, İşte, Şey

To My Beloved Father and Family

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Date: Signature:

TABLE OF CONTENTS

x

LIST OF TABLES

TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS

The following are the basic transcription conventions that are followed throughout the study.

1- Participant Identities are represented by capital letters.

```
1 D: = evet
2 E: vallahi bak
```

2- Attention has been paid to transcribe all sounds produced as closely and accurately as possible (e.g. 'Tü', which is cut off as it was meant 'Türkiye'):

```
D: aa: kantinde var = en azından Tü- şey Essexde
```

3- The inaudible or incomprehensible stretch of talk are indicated (as italicised) with the literal word in square brackets [*anlaşılmıyor*] [*incomprehensible*]:

4- Pauses and silences are noted in terms of a measured interval, for example, (0.5) indicates half a second and (2) indicates three seconds etc.

```
1 D:sen zaten şey yapmıştın (1) çekilmiştin
2 E:koyayım mı seninkini
   (2)
3 D: camomile tam olarak ne Nilüfer? = papatya mı?
```

5- The sign (//) is used to indicate the point where another speaker's talk occurs in overlap:

```
1 I: yani // pubda serbest
2 D:       // iki üç tane pub var  üç tane pub var = üç tane // pub
```

```
     var
```

6- An equals sign (=) indicates that a next utterance is latched directly onto a prior one, with no gap.

```
I: = biz yedik ya = gerçekten
```

7- Stretching of certain words is indicated by embedding full colons (::) into words at the point where the stretched syllable occurs (for example, the interjection 'ya::'):

```
B: ya:: ÇELİŞKİLİ ŞEYLER var = detayına girersek = mesela mm ilanda
[devam ediyor]
```

8- Words that have been spoken very loudly have been CAPITALISED (as shown in the previous example just above).

9- A question mark (?) at the end of a phrase represents a rising intonation. A period (.) represents a downward intonation, and a comma (,) marks continuing intonation.

```
1 E: EVET? (2) bakalım = Cenk Cenkle görüşüyomusun ya? = biz sana
2    onu sorucaktık
```

10- The turns where the particle in question is being discussed occurs are indicated by an arrow (→) and written in bold.

```
→1 M: bir iki kere gittim  yani fazla gitmedim şeye mm fitnesa
  2    = gitmem lazım burda iyice hantallaştım böyle
```

11- The conversational fragments are typed with Courier (10) compared to Times New Roman (12) in the rest of the thesis. Courier 10 in italicised form is used for the translations as well.

```
  1 E: ne oteli olacak
→2 A: işte Buttim içinde bi otel
```

12- In order to make it more distinguishable, dotted line will be drawn between the Turkish extracts and their English equivalents.

```
→1 D: bi mektup veriyolar = işte görev izinli gelmiştir görevinden
  2   diye  şu şu tarihler arasında = vermiyoruz iki seferdir
  3   konutfonu
.................................................................
→1 D: they give you a letter = işte it says the person in question
  2   is on leave  between these certain dates shown = we did not
  3   have to pay the housing tax for the last two times
```

13- For the 'word search' function of the particle *şey*, its transliteration is also provided.

```
→D: {şey+do\past-agreement}
```

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Defining Discourse Particles

Discourse Particles (henceforth DisPs, as suggested by Ruhi, P.C.) have an important place in communication and an extensive body of pragmatic and linguistic research deals with this functionally related group of expressions[1] (Takahara, 1998: Schourup, 1999). Defining this group of expressions is admittedly a difficult task, as they do not belong to a single grammatical class (Schiffrin, 1987: Schourup, 1995 and (ibid.): Norrick, 2001: Trillo, 2002: Macaulay, 2002: Fox Tree and Schrock, 2002). They include a variety of items such as adverbs (*frankly*, *well*), lexical phrases (*you know*, *I mean*), conjunctions (*but*, *since*, *and*) and interjections (*oh*) amongst other things (Fox Tree and Schrock, 1999: Fuller, 2003). It is this variety of items which function as discourse particles and they have been various referred to as connectives, fillers, hedges, fumbles, hesitation phenomena, starters, cajolers, conversational greasers, gambits, compromisers, discourse particles, discourse markers (DMs) and so on (Rey, 1997: Takahara, 1998: Schourup, 1999, Archakis, 2001).

There have been few attempts in the literature to define and delineate what should and should not be referred to as a particle. Some of the commonly accepted attributes underlying what items and expressions can be referred to as particles are:
1-Their syntactic independence: for example, they appear as independent and detachable from the constructional unit they occur in.

---

[1] What is referred to as DisPs in this study are also known as Discourse Markers. Original way of reference by researchers quoted here will be preserved.

2- Their syntactic flexibility: for example, they may appear at the beginning, at the end or in the middle of a constructional unit (Syntactic flexibility of the three particles in question here is further discussed at the beginning of each analysis chapter).

3-Their lack of meaning; their omission, for example, does not affect the syntactic or semantic acceptability of the constructional unit in which they appear. Therefore, the importance of particles lies not with the syntactic or semantic aspects of the constructional unit, but with the pragmatic aspects of message construction, which is the reason for their use in particular communicative contexts.

Some of the qualities of DisPs have also been recognised by native speakers as reported in the small-scale study (see section 3.4). It is possible to propose here that with their layman observation, native speakers are capable of distinguishing DisPs from ordinary lexical items with a certain propositional value. It has to be emphasised here that saying that DisPs lack meaning does not mean that they do not carry meaning at all. This fact is illustrated by the different terminology in the field such as external and internal relations (Halliday and Hasan, 1976), procedural and conceptual (Blakemore, 1987) and metacommunicative level and propositional level (Fox Tree and Schrock, 2002). The more commonly cited one is Blakemore's terminology, in which conceptual representation refers to the truth-conditional or canonical meaning of a linguistic construction and procedural representation is the inferential aspect. In this view, DisPs carry procedural, not conceptual, information about the inferential face of communication.

1.2 The Motivation for the Study

Within the perspective of early linguistic studies, which focused mainly on phonology and morphology and syntax little attention was paid to discourse particles. Similarly, in traditional approaches to Turkish linguistics (Demircan, 1979; Demirezen, 1988; Ergenç, 1989 and 1991) the scope of linguistic investigation has been largely limited to the study of syntax, phonetics and phonology, the linguistic phenomena, which can be explained within sentence boundaries.

More recently, linguists studying Turkish have begun to look specifically at spoken discourse as an area worthy of study in itself and using naturally occurring spoken language, they have broached a range of issues in Turkish linguistics (Durmuşoğlu, 1988 on 'the discourse of fortune telling'; Erguvanlı-Taylan, 1987; Özünlü, 1991 on 'Humorous discourse'; Zeyrek, 1992 on 'Turkish narrative; Bayraktaroğlu, 1992 on 'Disagreement in Turkish troubles-talk'; Yılmaz, 1994 with a 'Comparative study on *Şey* and *Well*' , Ilgın and Büyükkantarcıoğlu, 1994 on '*yani*', İşsever, 1995 on 'Connectives' and Özbek, 1995 and 1998 on 'Turkish discourse markers').

There have been few studies on DisPs in Turkish. For instance, Ilgın and Büyükkantarcıoğlu (1994) analysed the various functions of *yani* in spoken and written texts and explained these functions affected the direction of interaction. Yılmaz (1994) carried out a comparative study between '*şey*' in Turkish and '*well*' in English and tried to explain if the stereotypical notion of *şey* and *well* doing similar jobs in both languages. İşsever (1995) carried out a study on sentence connectives, which, he claims, contribute semantically and functionally to the coherence of the text. His analyses of items were not on discourse particles, which is the main difference between his study and the others. Özbek (1995) carried out a comparative study of what she terms 'discourse markers' in Turkish and English casual conversations. Özbek's study is the most comprehensive study on particles in Turkish. Her study being a comparative one, she was mainly concerned with the contrastive analysis of all the markers and expressions in both languages. Her descriptive study aimed at finding the differences and similarities in the discourse marking systems in Turkish and English by trying to match up pairs of markers with similar discourse functions.

The purpose of this study is to continue to broaden the perspective of Turkish linguistics focusing on conversational discourse by carrying out an analysis of a selected group of these linguistic items in Turkish. While the role of discourse particles in natural conversation has attracted considerable attention and has seen book-length as well as smaller scale studies from linguists working with English (Goldberg, 1982; Östman, 1981; Schiffrin, 1985 and 87; Heritage, 1984; Schourup,

1985-1999: Trillo, 2002: Fuller, 2003 just a few among many), this subject has been largely ignored by researchers in Turkish linguistics. The majority of the studies on particles have so far been carried out on the ones in the English language. Therefore, this is a fact concerning not only Turkish linguistics, but linguistics of other languages as well. As Malmud-Makowski (1997:4) rightly observes:

> Most of the work in the area of discourse markers has been done in English, just one of the languages spoken in the world today. What in English, or any other language for that matter, is not necessarily representative of what happens in all languages. In order to achieve the ultimate goal of understanding human language in general, many other languages need to be investigated as well.

Similarly, the significance of the research findings on the meanings, functions and distribution patterns of those lexical items is also emphasised in terms of reaching cross-linguistic functional categories of these items (Hansen, 1998 (cited in Takahara) and Trillo, 2002).

In this connection, it is deservedly justified that there is a need to carry out more research on markers in other languages. In addition, as any researcher involved in Turkish linguistics would commonly agree, almost any area in Turkish linguistics is in need for research. More specifically, the issue of discourse particles is one in which there is a wide research gap. Among the quite few studies done on particles in Turkish, Özbek's study (1995) is the most comprehensive study on particles in Turkish. Özbek carried out a comparative study of what she terms 'discourse markers' in Turkish and English casual conversations. The discussion of DisPs here in this study should be seen as a contribution to the ongoing debate in particle research about the contexts and functions of DisPs. In this connection, the general aim of this study is to fill this gap by providing an empirical study in an area, in which analysts in Turkish linguistics have not shown much interest.

This study can be regarded as original as it examines the particles on a number of levels in conversation (Conversational Structure, Interpersonal and Content Domains). In other words, (to the best of the researcher's knowledge) this study will

be the first of its kind to do a detailed analysis of particular DisPs within conversation and discourse analytic, and functional approaches. In this sense, it will also be regarded as novel and may eventually pave the way with its contributions as well as shortcomings for further future research in this field on Turkish. In this study, the discourse particles *yani*, *işte* and *şey* will be pragmatically investigated in some depth with the aim of discovering, describing and accounting for the various uses and pragmatic functions together with their distributional patterns that they display in conversational Turkish. By the same token, this study will also be an example of analysis of the under-investigated non-English corpora since their investigation is necessary for determining the generality of conversational rules (Sacks et at. 1974). In this connection, it is reasonable to expect such research to contribute to our understanding of Turkish as well.

Particles being one of the most salient features in a language, it is commonly accepted that they are under-represented in language education programmes. In this sense, while this study mainly aims to discover and explicate the role and functions of the most frequent particles *yani*, *işte* and *şey* with a certain analytic perspective in mind, an objective of this study is also to provide a linguistic analysis that could be used for raising learners' pragmatic awareness in the use of particles. It is this point, which is further explicated below.

The particles under investigation in study have been chosen for several reasons. The present researcher did a comparative study on Turkish and English particles (Yılmaz, 1994) for his masters thesis and the result of the M.A. study showed that the topic is worthy of further inverstigation. As far as the word-count in (Yılmaz, 1994) and the small-scale study on native speaker intuitions (see section 3.4) are concerned, the three particles in question are the most common ones in conversational Turkish. This is also confirmed by Özbek (1995) as she considers them among the most frequent ones.

As has been mentioned before, there is a great deal of stereotypical evaluations of DisPs. According to some of the views of them in the literature, they are redundant

5

elements of languages referred to as 'silly words' and 'verbal garbage' (a fact also ratified by some Turkish native speakers as explained in the small-scale study reported in section 3.4). However, they are commonly used (almost in all languages) and one of the most salient features in a language. Despite their abundance in everyday language usage, pradoxically they are also the kind of items whose meaning langauge users are not very sure about. Also paradoxical is the fact that, while so salient in languages, they are one of the last to be learnt by language learners. As Wierzbicka (1976) observes, the consequences of the misuse of a DisP could be more detrimental to the communication than basic grammatical mistakes. It is not unnatural to think that learning such linguistic items can empower students with more natural speech, conversation strategies, smooth transitions and logical flow, which are among the very basic contributions of DisPs to conversational talk.

As has been mentioned above, the dilemma between common usage in languages and langauge users' uncertainty about their meanings, between their salience in everday language usage and their being one of the last items to be learnt, and between their (lingustically-speaking) insignificance (according to some linguists) and contribution to the negotiation of meaning make them worthy of research. The gap between saliency of use and functional importance, and the failure to properly learn (by langauge learners) them can be narrowed down by empirical research. As the meanings and functions of DisPs can be made clearer through research, the integration of those research results are very likely to be reflected in foreign/second language instructions and practices and can then be used to propose ways of raising learners' pragmatic awareness in the use of particles, which are eventually likely to empower language learners in making their language sound more natural, more confident and fluent in expressing themselves.

1.3 Purpose of the Study

The last ten years have seen an explosion of articles and books on DisPs representing different theoretical frameworks, approaches and languages. It has become clear that an important property of DisPs is their flexibility and multifunctionality. It is equally clear that DisPs need to be analysed from many different perspectives. The purpose

of this study is to approach to the study of DisPs in an understudied language like Turkish with an integrative perspective and contribute to the study of DisPs by showing how the integration of various methods can account for the description of DisPs and increase our understanding of what these three DisPs are doing in Turkish conversational discourse.

It is widely accepted that DisPs point to the speaker's epistemic attitude to the utterance and affective attitude to the hearer as well as to the preceding and following discourse (Ruhi, 1994; Östman, 1995; Aijmer, 2002; Smith and Jucker, 2002; Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen, 2003). According to Östman (1995) and Aijmer (2002), this flexibility explains their enormous usefulness and high frequency in discourse. They are, in a way, used to grease the relations between speakers, to create coherence, to avoid conversational 'bumps', simplify on-line planning or simply to fill a pause.

In the present study, the DisPs are seen to be multifunctional since they can be functional within all the domains available. A classification has been proposed of their different meanings on the Content, Conversational Structure and Interpersonal Domains (see Framework of Analysis, 3.2). In the following analysis chapters, a detailed investigation of their actual usage will be undertaken. Much of the linguistic work in the following analysis chapters will consist in analysing the contexts where DisPs can occur and proposing functional categories and descriptions. The natural Turkish conversational corpora provide a great help as they provide a large number of illustrations of the use of DisPs and make it possible to study the use of DisPs in extended discourse.

1.4 The Focus of the Study

After the Literature Review (Chapter 2) and Methodology (Chapter 3) Chapters, the following three chapters will deal with the actual analysis of each individual particle. With their recurrent and systematic patterns and uses displayed by their occurrence within natural data, the analysis to be followed will try to describe and explain the details of the discourse particles *yani*, *işte* and *şey* in an attempt to describe the

details of the interactional phenomena in a language other than English, whose lexical items in question will be approached with an eclectic analytic perspective. More specifically, the aim of this study is to discover and describe the organisation and systematic properties behind the use of these particles, and the specific roles and functions they each have within their specific environments representing the three Conversational Domains.

As earlier studies (Wierzbicka, 1976; Östman, 1981; Schiffrin, 1987; Trillo, 1997; Smith and Jucker 2002) have shown, the meanings of particles are particularised with reference to specific context of their use in which they are recurrently deployed. Throughout the analysis, we will see the role of context in trying to discover and explain the production and interpretation of the particles. Some central organising principles of conversation such as topic, repair and turn-taking constitute the contexts and these contexts are the background against which various functions of each particle are described and explicated (Levinson, 1983). Therefore, using a small body of data, we will try to show that the three particles can be more adequately explained by a method of analysis, which goes beyond syntactic evidence and utilizes the surrounding discourse as a primary source of information. In this connection, the theoretical framework draws from the theory and methodology of conversation, discourse analysis and functional approach with an integrative perspective in an attempt to overcome the inherent weaknesses of each approach. It has to be noted here that all the results are to be interpreted as provisional and may evolve as more data of this kind become available. Therefore, some of the interpretations are open to alternative readings and the results in the present study may not lend themselves to absolute replicability. What is replicable is the framework that forms the basis for the present analysis.

The following is the brief outline of the thesis: Chapter 2 mainly deals with the literature review and definitions of basic analytical terms. Chapter 3 is the methodology chapter in which the data and its analytical tools is described. Chapters 4, 5 and 6 will comprise the analyses of the particles *yani*, *işte* and *şey* respectively, and present the detailed examination of each particle. Each analysis chapter will

comprise a definition and explanation followed by the exemplification of each and every function of the particle in question.   Each chapter will have its own brief conclusion. Chapter 7 is the general conclusion where the results of the analyses are summarised and implications for further study proposed.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

It would not be incorrect to state that discourse particles in general have not attracted much attention until the last decade, during which there has been a remarkable increase in interest in the analysis of naturally occurring language, especially everyday conversation. The linguistic elements falling under the term of discourse particles were often thought to be meaningless and empty words that filled pauses in discourse (Feldman, 1948; Baker and Sorhus, 1976 (cited in Goldberg, 1982); Fowler, 1978). Folk perceptions of any given language as to what such expressions do in talk tend to be of the kind of such expressions that they help you think about and plan what you are going to say next (Wierzbicka, 1976 and 1986; Hymes and Locke cited in Wierzbicka, 1986). Before full-scale studies were carried out on these particular linguistic elements, there was a mixture of descriptions. Andersson and Trudgill (1990:18) regard the use of discourse particles as 'sloppy speech' (fumbles, hedges, fillers, evincives, starters, conversation greasers and compromisers are some other terms commonly used) and classify these expressions as 'fillers and small words':

> Sloppy speech actually seems to mean quite a number of different things. Something it certainly refers to is the frequent use of expressions such as *well*, *y'know*, *sort of*, *kind of*, and *like*. Many people find this irritating and complain about the inarticulateness of people who say things like *it's*, *y'know*, *sort of*, *kind of good*, *like*.

A study carried out in a family gathering by Watts (1989) reveals that while seemingly being unaware of their frequent use of these expressions themselves, speakers in this gathering were inclined to claim that their use is an indication of inarticulateness and uneducatedness (Watts, 1989). This dismissive perception of discourse particles may have to do with the fact that they appear to make no contribution to the informational content of discourse and that they are mainly a conversational phenomenon (Biber, 1988: Norric, 2001: Fox Tree and Schrock, 2002). Their profuse presence in natural conversation is not without a reason. Despite their lack of capability to convey substance, Smith and Jucker (2002) point out the ability of DMs to facilitate the exchange of propositional content and propositional attitude. As they obviously have discourse-marking functions, they can be regarded as the main organizers and facilitators of discourse (Levinson, 1983: Schiffrin, 1987: Fuller, 2003: Smith and Jucker (2000) cited in Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen, 2003). DisPs can occupy various places in turns and turn constructional units. For instance, when they are used in the initial position, they also reduce the abrupt impression of the speech to the listener (Mohan, 1979). Goffman emphasises (1974) that DisPs in the initial position of an utterance have more important functions because it establishes an episode and define 'what kind of transformation is to be made of the materials within the episode'. What they do in conversation include highlighting important elements in a narrative, helping listeners follow a speaker's train of thought, helping listeners recover from a repair, allowing advance planning time, helping speakers in organising and expressing their ideas and explicitly showing the relationship between two utterances (Erman, 1986: Jucker, 1993: Schiffrin 1987: Schourup, 1999: Archakis, 2001). In support of this view, Quirk et al. (1985:178-79) explain that they (i.e. *well*, *y'know*, *really*) are 'sharing devices' and 'intimacy signals' in everyday conversation:

> It is easily demonstrable that these play, from the point view of grammatical structure, no part in transmission of information, yet not only is our present-day colloquy constantly embellished with them, but popular talk stretching back to Shakespeare and beyond has been similarly peppered with these apparently useless and meaningless items...since the desire to feel that the hearer is sharing something with one seems to be

fundamental in the urge to speak, these sharing devices, these intimacy signals in our everyday talk, are of considerable importance.

They are typically among the first words that are distinguished when a stream of conversation is attended to in a newly experienced foreign language. Wierzbicka (1976) suggests that if the learner of a language fails to master the meaning of its particles, his/her communicative competence will be significantly impaired. These linguistic items have been and still continue to be studied today. The following is an account of DisPs according to how and by whom they have been studied in the field.

2.2 Present-day Approaches

The acceptance of discourse particles as worthwhile ground for linguistic investigation has led to their recognition, and since the 1970s some prominent researchers in the field have begun to produce important and influential studies on discourse particles. In the following, an overview of discourse particle research is presented.

It has to be noted at the outset that the studies reported below all share the same two basic approaches in the way they have conducted their analysis; the conversational and/or discourse approach (a textual function for the role of particles in structuring the conversation) and the functional approach (an interpersonal perspective). It should also be noted here that even though Wierzbicka (1976) claims that there is no difference between these two approaches and both could be considered functional, they are worthy of an elucidation.

The conversational/discourse approach, which focuses on the use of various particles in terms of their function in structuring discourse, views them as 'cohesive devices' serving to link up pieces of conversational turns. The role of particles within this perspective pertains to the organisational management of conversation. They mainly display how the current stretches of conversation relate to prior ones. This perspective on the use of particles as devices relating to stretches of talk is particularly represented in the work of Grimes (1975), Edmondson (1981), Goldberg (1982), Heritage (1984), Schiffrin (1987),

Watts (1989), Fraser (1990, 1993), Sorjonen (1996), Norrick (2001). Levinson (1983) also acknowledges this approach.

Schiffrin's (1987:31) famous definition of 'markers' as 'sequentially dependent elements which bracket units of talk' is strongly supported by Fraser (1990:383), who also defines 'discourse markers', as far as their sequential relationship is concerned, as "..expressions...which signal a sequential relationship between the current basic message and the previous discourse". Smith and Jucker (2002) argue that the meaning of a marker can be said to come from its role in the interactional sequence. Levinson (1983: 87-8) states that their function is marking the relationship between utterances:

> There are many words and phrases in English, and no doubt most languages, that indicate the relationship between an utterance and the prior discourse. Examples are utterance initial usage of 'but', 'therefore', 'in conclusion', 'to the contrary', 'still', 'however', 'anyway', 'well', 'besides', 'actually', 'all in all', 'so', 'after all', and so on...What they seem to do is indicate, often in very complex ways, just how the utterance that contains them is a response to, or a continuation of, some portion of the prior discourse. We still await proper studies of these terms.

Aijmer (1986), too, in her analysis of *actually*, emphasises its 'relational' function and argues that it "functions as a signal or a cue to the listener how two utterances are related to each other" (p.123), a function which can be attributed to most of the discourse particles in general. It is also possible to see Blakemore's study within this perspective as she terms the particles as 'discourse connectives'. Mainly rooted in Relevance Theory (see Sperber and Wilson, 1986), her study looks at how the relevance of one discourse segment is dependent on another.

The functional approach, on the other hand, recognises them as constituting a productive source for the expression and regulation of interpersonal relations in conversation. Furthermore, discourse particles are seen as vehicles contributing to the establishment and maintenance of interpersonal relations between conversational participants.

13

Wierzbicka (1976), Östman (1981) and Schourup (1985) are representatives of this approach.

Wierzbicka (1976) describes the meaning of particles as 'remarkably complex', adding that "Their meaning is crucial to the interaction mediated by speech; they express the speaker's attitude towards the addressee or towards the situation spoken about, his assumptions, his emotions" (p.327). According to Östman (ibid.), particles serve the speaker's interactive needs. He says that sometimes they indicate the speaker's planning or his/her indirectness, which is "employed as a politeness strategy to mitigate the effect of an utterance" (p.9). Schourup's (1985) use of the term 'evincives' suggests that these items (particles) function on a cognitive level, revealing the cognitive process and thinking activities the speaker is involved in before making his/her contribution to the discourse unit in question.

What is also made clear throughout the approaches reported above is the recognition of the other approach in terms of the functions that particles in questions are engaged in performing. For example, according to Schiffrin's (1987) structure of discourse, particles function on 'informational' (related to cognitive capacities of speakers) and 'participation' (related to interactional capacities of speakers) levels as well as 'ideational' (related to cohesive relations). Similarly, Östman (1981) makes it quite clear that *you know* as well as other particles have a turn-taking function. Although James (1983) focuses on the 'relational' function of discourse particles, he also emphasises their 'interpersonal function': " a general relational function is common to these items. They serve to relate stretches of discourse in a purely continuative role as well as serving to relate properties of the utterance on the interpersonal dimension" (p.193). Smith and Jucker (2002) also suggest that even though DMs (in their terminology) are not considered to be able to carry substance themselves, they are used to facilitate the exchange of propositional content and propositional attitude. Similarly, Trillo (1997), in his account of particles, describes them as serving to organise the turn-taking system, the onset of a repair, the beginning of a topic as well as providing signals

14

to the addressee about the stance of the speaker. In their recent paper, Fox Tree and Schrock (2002) describe particles as serving a 'wide range of functions'. Fuller (2003) also recognises the markers in his analysis as performing various functions depending on the context. In sum, while the two most common approaches clearly help analysts of conversation to provide a perspective into the detailed analysis and description of discourse particles, their integration also seems to offer us a way to analyse and account for these linguistic items in a more comprehensive manner.

At this point, it seems relevant to repeat and argue Wierzbicka's (1976) observation that "discourse and functional approaches are the same" seems to be quite logical and realistic. Indeed, Schiffrin's, Östman's, Trillo's, Fox Tree and Schrock's and Fuller's accounts of particles seem to be evidence that Wierzbicka (1976) could be right in her observation. This is because both approaches are rooted in functional linguistics. They both have discourse analytic and conversation analytic (to be reported below) perspectives. It is because both discourse and conversation analysis are centrally concerned with giving an account of how coherence and sequential organisation in discourse are produced and understood, even though they have their own particular differences. The following account of the previous researches will be described according to their theoretical orientations. We first start with the conversational/discourse approach and then describe the functional and finally focus on integral approaches. In each section we report each relevant study according to its researcher with a chronological progression.

2.2.1 Conversational/Discourse Orientation

Grimes (1975) is one of the first to identify the category of discourse particles (cross-linguistically). He has labelled them 'pesky little particles'. He describes them thus:

> Most languages have particles whose use seems to be related to gluing the parts of discourses together but which are never easy to pin down. In English they are words like *now, either, moreover* when used to relate more than one sentence.   (p.93)

15

In his study of the Uto-Aztecan language Huichol, Grimes has noted that in addition to lexical items, enclitics and affixes can also be used to carry out a cohesive function in discourse. With his 1983 book, 'Pragmatics', Levinson, one of the earliest to recognise these phenomena, is seen to be representative of serious systematic research into English discourse particles which began in the 1980s. Levinson suggests that:

> …there are many words and phrases in English, and no doubt most languages, that indicate the relationship between an utterance and the prior discourse... It is generally conceded that such words have at least a component of meaning that resists truth-conditional treatment...What they seem to do is indicate, often in very complex ways, just how the utterance that contains them is a response to, or a continuation of, some portion of the prior discourse.   (p.87-88)

Levinson's description above illustrates how these elements show the logical and propositional relationship between parts of the discourse while they have 'at least a component of meaning that resists truth-conditional treatment'.   Because of this resistance, it seems that these elements can only be studied in specific contexts, since their meaning and function depend on the surrounding linguistic environment.

Goldberg (1980) is among those who argue that discourse particles have specific functions in conversation and what they do is not simply to fill pauses or signal hesitation. In her study on the expressions *you know, I mean, well and actually*, she develops a system of moves (introducing, holding, progressive holding, re-introducing) and examines the role of particles in relation to the topical structure of conversation. Goldberg argues that there is a correlation between the move types and the discourse particles used; for instance, *you know* is often used with 'introducing moves' while *well* goes with 'holding moves'.

A relatively altered framework may be found in the work of Edmondson (1981). In his model for the analysis of spoken discourse, which is based on speech act theory (see Austin, 1962), Edmondson has a brief look at 'discourse particles' under the title of

'fumbles'. He defines 'fumbles' as devices used to gain time and states that they are 'similar to false starts and other hesitation phenomena'. Edmondson divides fumbles into the five following groups:

1-Starters: They indicate that the speaker has something to say. The most common starter used in Edmondson's data is *well*.

2-Let-me explains: These expressions which are speaker-oriented indicate the fact that the speaker is trying to communicate (e.g. *I mean*).

3-Underscorers: These are message-oriented devices drawing attention to a following, preceding or ongoing communicative act (e.g. *really, actually, in fact*).

4-Cajolers: Cajolers are hearer-oriented devices that are used by a speaker as an appeal for understanding (e.g. *you know, you see, just think*).

5-Asides: Asides fill a conversational gap (e.g. *let's see, what have we got*).

Blakemore (1987), who examined certain English expressions, states that linguistic devices "cannot be defined in terms of a contribution to propositional content, but must be analysed in terms of constraints on the relevance of the proposition that has taken to be expressed" (p.14). Blakemore deals with items such as *and*, *after all*, *you see*, *but*, *moreover*, *furthermore* and *so*, which she calls 'discourse connectives'. She suggests that the function of these discourse connectives is to indicate how the relevance of one discourse segment is dependent on another. In other words, she defines particles as being conceptually empty but possessing what she calls *procedural meaning*. The distinction between procedural and conceptual meaning results from the basic observation that for inferential comprehension to take place both the construction and manipulation of conceptual representations are necessary. Therefore, one might expect a linguistic construction to encode either information contributing to the content of conceptual representations or information about how conceptual representations are to be made use of in the inferential phase of comprehension. Blakemore's study is clearly rooted in Relevance Theory.

While Schourup calls these words 'discourse particles' and Östman 'pragmatic particles', Schiffrin (1987), like Fraser and Watts, uses the term 'discourse markers'. According to Schiffrin, discourse markers operate on a level above that of the sentence. She claims that the main function of discourse markers is to contribute to the integration of discourse, and the analysis of discourse markers is part of the more general analysis of discourse coherence: This has to do with how speakers and hearers jointly integrate forms, meanings and actions to make overall sense of what is said.

Schiffrin suggests that discourse markers are 'contextual co-ordinates'. Their operation on different discourse planes provides clues to discourse contexts. In other words, markers locate utterances on particular planes of talk. Markers provide participation and textual co-ordinates within these contexts. Schiffrin claims that discourse markers index an utterance to the local contexts in which utterances are produced and in which they are to be interpreted. Therefore, Schiffrin claims that this is the very reason why discourse markers are used as 'contextual co-ordinates'.

Watts (1989) simply views discourse particles as 'coherence devices' which eventually help the speaker to achieve coherence in the developing discourse. Watts sees discourse particles as devices among what Gumperz (1982) calls 'contextualisation cues' through which participants negotiate meaning. Watts looks at speakers' use of discourse particles as one of the most perceptually salient features of oral style apart from obvious dialectal features. His list of other features includes tag questions, non-lexical speech segments such as *oh*, *mm*, filled and unfilled pauses, and formulaic utterances amongst others. In his analysis of a piece of conversation, Watts employs Schiffrin's approach to discourse particles, which takes them on different discourse levels. Unlike other researchers, Watts uses a different way of classifying discourse particles in relation to their places of occurrence. When a particle prefaces a tone unit, Watts calls it a 'lefthand discourse bracket' and when it concludes a tone unit, he calls it a 'righthand discourse bracket'.

In his account of discourse particles, Fraser (1993) starts by analysing sentence meaning into two distinct types of encoded information. The first one is content meaning, also referred to as the 'propositional content' of the sentence; it is related to the state of affairs that the speaker is talking about. Basically, it is what the sentence is about. The second one, pragmatic meaning, on the other hand, signals the different messages intended to be conveyed by the speaker through the direct, literal communication.

In Fraser's model 'Sentence Meaning' is divided into 'Content Meaning' and 'Pragmatic Meaning'. 'Pragmatic Meaning' is further divided into 'Basic Pragmatic Markers', 'Commentary Pragmatic Markers' and 'Parallel Pragmatic Markers'. Fraser argues that within this framework, discourse markers are one type of commentary pragmatic marker, and he basically sees them as lexical expressions.

In his inspiring study, Heritage (1984) reports his preliminary findings on the work, which the particle *oh* accomplishes in natural conversation. The evidence from the placement of *oh* in various conversational contexts demonstrates that it is mainly deployed to display the change that has taken place in the current state of knowledge, information and orientation of its producer. Such a particle, Heritage claims, is conducive to the achievement of some interactional tasks. In this study, Heritage focuses on two major types of conversational environments where, he claims, this particle is regularly used in response to prior turns at talk. These environments are 'informings' and 'repair'.

Sorjonen (1996) mainly tries to explicate the meanings of *niin* and *joo*, the most common response tokens in Finnish conversation. She claims that the observations reflected in the particles, which she analyzes, constitute social actions in Finnish conversation. Among the several aspects of usage (such as affirmative answers to a set of yes-no interrogatives as continuers displaying an understanding that the coparticipant has not yet finished his/her talk), the aspect Sorjonen focuses on is the use of the particles to provide a response to a repeat. What Sorjonen also aims to achieve with this

study is to contribute to a general understanding of types of actions achieved through repeats and their sequential and activity contexts.

2.2.2 Functional Orientation

In her discussion of particles, Wierzbicka (1986), who is distinct from other analysts, looks at the approaches taken by different scholars in order to analyse particles. Wierzbicka (ibid.:519) calls particles "little words like *well*, *why* or *even* which are what distinguishes human languages from the languages of robots".

She adds to this list other lexical and grammatical devices such as interjections, swear words, etc. She claims that these small words and expressions 'pertain to the very essence of human communication'.   In her 'subjective' illustration of different approaches to particles by different scholars, Wierzbicka starts off with:

-The 'lexical equivalent' approach; which, she claims, is the simplest way of dealing with particles. That is, to explain them in terms of one another. This is the way that most dictionaries try to deal with this problem. This approach leads to circularity and allows one-to-one correspondence, which even worsens the situation. To support this view, Wierzbicka quotes Locke, who argues that:

> They (particles) are all marks of some action or intimation of the mind: and therefore to understand them rightly, several views, postures, stands, turns, limitations, and expectations and several other thoughts of the mind, for which we have either none or very different names, are diligently to be studied.   (p.522)

-The 'example of use' approach; in which analysts often try to supplement the 'synonyms method' by means of examples, which illustrate the actual use of particles in question.

-The 'functionalist' approach; after an examination of many examples of use, attempts to characterise the function of a particle in a given context by means of functional statements.

-The 'conversational or discourse' approach; in this approach, since conversation analysis deals with the relations between the structure of conversation and linguistic structure, particles have come to prominence.

-The 'abstract explanation' approach; refers to abstract descriptive labels attached to particles such as *yet* 'additive', *rather* 'corrective', *anyway* 'resumptive', etc.

-The 'logical' approach; consists in translating certain particles into the target language.

-The 'performative' approach; attempts to analyse particles via performative verbs.

-The 'scalar' approach; tries to present a number of different particles in terms of relative positions they hold within a particular semantic 'continuum'.

-The 'radical pragmatic' approach; assigns to particles, in contrast to the scalar approach, semantic explications.

-The 'paraphrase' approach; this approach is accepted as a common-sense approach and it is used on occasion by the representatives of all other approaches. Since paraphrasing is a 'conscious and rigorous' method, the particle is simply paraphrased.

-The 'semantic primitives' approach: also aims at capturing the semantic value of a particle and expressing it by means of a paraphrase.

-The 'Lockian' approach; suggests that particles contain in them 'postures of the mind' and that they have, therefore, the sense of 'a whole sentence contained in them'. In this approach, in order to explain the meaning of a particle, the sentence that contains the particle has to be reconstructed; and this reconstruction is possible through introspection. We must also observe what is going on in our minds, which is the only direct observation.

-The 'Leibnizian' approach: is complementary with respect to Locke's. The basic assumptions are the same. Leibniz, on the other hand, proposes a formula that should satisfy all the examples: moreover, he makes it clear that if necessary, we have to adopt several formulas. He accepts that 'polysemy' is a fact of life. He sees no reason why it never occurs in the area of particles while it occurs frequently in other areas of the lexicon.

According to Wierzbicka, since both discourse and conversation analysis are centrally concerned with giving an account of how coherence and sequential organisation in discourse are produced and understood, even though they have their own particular differences. This is because both approaches are rooted in functional linguistics. They both have discourse analytic and conversation analytic perspectives.

Östman (1981) seeks a universal characterisation for discourse particles in his study of *you know*. He rejects the term 'pragmatic devices' in the study of such expressions arguing that this is an 'uninformative' term because of the variety of functions they have. The term 'pragmatic devices', according to Östman, includes a variety of things such as variations in tense, aspect and modality; variations in sentence-type, intonation and other prosodic phenomena, word order, variations in syntactic constructions, clichés and other frozen expressions, pragmatic expressions, phrases and particles (e.g. *like*, *I guess*, tags and other hedges *well*, *why*, *just*) and some interjections. The more specific term Östman chooses to use to characterise expressions such as *you know* is 'pragmatic particle'.

Within his universal perspective, Östman offers some criteria for the characterisation of pragmatic particles;
a- A pragmatic particle is short
b- It is prosodically subordinated to another word
c- It resists clear lexical specification and is propositionally empty
d- It tends to occur in some sense cut off (semantically) from the rest of the utterance. At the same time it tends to modify that utterance as a whole.

His characterisation comprises two approaches: 'functional and structural'. Functionally, it is claimed that pragmatic particles perform the same functions irrespective of specific language; and structurally, he argues (a) that there is a similarity between their surface-linguistic features in different languages and (b) that one particle or set of particles in one language might have a functionally corresponding particle or

22

set of particles (but not necessarily a one-to-one correspondence) in another language. Östman suggests that (c) this leads us to the possibility that each pragmatic particle has a prototype meaning or function of its own; and this function is independent of and can be extracted from its occurrence.

In reference to the structural side, Östman believes that there are two kinds of 'architectures' which pragmatic particles can assist in building up; a clausal and a textual one. For example, if the pragmatic particle *I guess* is used in an utterance to indicate the speaker's degree of certainty towards his statement, this particle refers to the 'clause-level' architecture; on a textual level, pragmatic particles focus on the relationship of one utterance/text/turn to another.

All pragmatic particles, he argues, potentially rely on all of these aspects in discourse. It is therefore clear that pragmatic particles both can and do display any one or several of these features simultaneously. In order to allow for an overall characterisation of pragmatic particles, Östman argues, both structural and functional perspectives are necessary. As a potential origin for the occurrence of pragmatic particles, he sees an organic relation between pragmatic particles and impromptu speech. As is commonly accepted, pragmatic particles occur very frequently in spontaneous, face-to-face interaction. Östman sees a close relationship between the occurrence of a pragmatic particle and the 'spontaneity' of discourse. He suggests that the existence of one implicates another; impromptu speech is partly created by the occurrence of pragmatic particles and by the same token, the occurrence of pragmatic particles implies that the discourse is impromptu in nature. For example, when a pragmatic particle in an utterance is used, the grammatical flow of that utterance is interrupted; consequently, that utterance becomes grammatically fragmented, often giving rise to what he terms a grammatically deviant sentence. Östman suggests here that grammatical deviance implies spontaneity.

He claims that actual language usage is closely related to general human behaviour. He believes that there are socio-psychological causes and processes that lie behind communicative output. The two significant factors of human behaviour, Östman claims, which affect the occurrence of pragmatic particles in impromptu speech are 'planning' and 'politeness'. Planning, he claims, is speaker-oriented and directly affects both content and form of the utterance. Politeness, on the other hand, is interaction-oriented and its effects on both content and form can be more 'indirect accomplishments'. Östman openly claims here that pragmatic particles appear in discourse as a reflection of planning. The speaker can plan his utterances silently (pauses) as well as linguistically (markers such as 'mm'); however, in order to make sure that the addressee does not mistake this silence for 'transition-relevance place', the speaker can hold the floor by using the appropriate pragmatic particle.

In his two-way universal description, the planning-hesitation function of pragmatic particles has to do with their structural aspects. Whereas 'planning' stands out as one of the reasons for using a pragmatic particle in a discourse, the other important factor that is conducive to their occurrence is 'politeness'[2]. Similarly, while 'planning' focuses on the cognitive aspects of human linguistic behaviour, 'politeness', on the other hand, is an interactive and social notion.

In sum, Östman emphasises that pragmatic particles in general are not arbitrarily occurring phenomena in language, but that they are governed by both linguistic and communicative discourse constraints. In order to produce an adequate description of pragmatic particles first in English and then in other languages within the universalist framework, Östman suggests that one has to take into consideration not only their linguistic characteristics, but also their interactional properties and functions.

---

[2]There is no link between Östman's and Brown and Levinson's use of the term 'Politeness'. In other words, Östman does not talk about politeness in the commonly accepted understanding of the term since Brown and Levinson's introduction of the notion as a linguistic term. Östman's use of the concept of politeness includes both traditional and the stylistic strategies of distancing. Östman here uses the term 'politeness' in the general sense, as the layman understands it.

In his Ph.D. dissertation, 'Common Discourse Particles in English Conversation', Schourup (1985), unlike any other researcher in the field, portrays 'discourse particles' and some interjections as related to disclosure of covert thinking. He uses the term 'evincive' for many items occurring in ordinary conversation. According to Schourup (ibid.:23):

> 'Evincive' is a linguistic item that indicates that at the moment at which it is said the speaker is engaged in, or has just then been engaged in thinking; the evincive item indicates that this thinking is now occurring or has just now occurred, but does   not completely satisfy its content.

He claims that discourse particles constitute responses to problems created because of the 'invisibility of undisclosed thinking'. At the beginning of his analysis of discourse particles, Schourup takes it for granted that speakers in a conversation do engage in unexpressed thinking. Referring to the studies of sociologists such as Sacks, Schegloff, Jefferson (1974) and some others, who mostly worked on conversational structure, Schourup states that speakers voice their thoughts, but retain, shape, reshape or place them, which, for the most part, requires a certain kind of creativity. Speakers generally form overall judgements, plan provisional responses, rank and revise them, store questions, etc. What is more, they routinely do these things while someone else is talking or the speaker himself/herself is holding the floor. Therefore, Schourup characterises the speakers as thinkers with one foot in the collaborative world of talk and the other in the internal world of their thoughts. However, they are free to display it or not. Schourup further supports this idea by referring to Goffman (1978:4):

> There is of course also mental activity involved in the routine processing of speech. Beyond the basic cognitive process involved in production and comprehension, we draw inferences, devise and notice implicatures, distinguish given and new...While basic cognitive processing is automatic and unconscious, many aspects of linguistic processing <u>can</u> be consciously noted and verbalised or not, as the speaker chooses.

Meanwhile, Schourup also confesses that not many researchers in the field are interested in investigating what is 'invisible'. He emphasises that it is important to acknowledge

the existence and importance of what is invisible. According to Schourup, in spite of many analysts' inclination not to consider psychological processes, speakers do recognise them. In order to describe the position of participants in a conversation, he offers a model which he calls a 'tripartite' model; in this model, there is the 'private world' that represents the covert thinking of the speaker: what the speaker has presently in mind and may or may not disclose. There is the 'shared world' in which what is on display as talk and other behaviour is available to both the speaker and others. And finally, the 'other world' which displays the covert thinking of other speakers. Using this model as a basis, Schourup attempts to describe the disclosure problem this way: "current undisclosed material in the private and other worlds may be relevant to what the speaker is now doing or has just now done or will just now be doing in the shared world" (p.40).

In his discussion of discourse particles, Schourup also recognises the question of 'routinization'. He states that many particles have come to be closely associated with a particular discourse situation: sometimes to the extent that they may be considered conventional responses to these situations. Routines are, Schourup (ibid.:42) explains " highly conventionalised prepatterned expressions (or single words) whose occurrence is tied to more or less standardised communication situations". In his analysis of discourse particles, Schourup emphasises that both the routinisation of particles with different functions and their basic or core use should be kept in mind. Schourup's position in his study is that the basic use of each particle can be dominated by its specific routine functions. Consequently, he argues that the particles he has discussed are related to the general problem of disclosure in terms of three worlds of conversational participants (private, shared and other worlds).

2.2.3 Integrative Orientation

With its focus on the functions of two DMs *well* and *but*, Norrick (2001) tries to demonstrate that the two markers in question act as a special sort of DMs in oral narratives. Following Fraser (1990), Norrick claims that DMs signal sequential

discourse relationship; specifically narrative DMs provide particularly clear evidence of an independent function. Norrick's claim is that different from their usual grammatical meanings and discourse marker functions, the two markers fulfil particular functions in oral narrative.

In their paper, where they discuss the English DMs *you know* and *I mean*, Fox Tree and Schrock (2002) look at their meanings and functions within spontaneous talk. Similar to the many researchers' findings in the field, they agree that almost every discourse marker is described as serving a wide range of functions. Therefore, Fox Tree and Schrock (ibid.) explain the multifunctionality and their surface similarities coming from each marker's basic meaning.

In her paper, Janet M. Fuller (2003) examines the use of various DMs in English (*you know*, *like*, *oh*, *well*, *yeah* and *I mean*) in two speech contexts, interviews and casual conversations. Her aim is to determine the role of those markers in marking and negotiating speaker roles. Fuller's study shows that the roles of speakers in an interaction, together with the relationship of the interlocutors, play a role in the use and distribution of certain DMs. She provides evidence that certain markers such as *well*, *oh* and *you know* show different patterns of use based on different speech context.

Apart from these approaches to the study of discourse markers, there are also studies based on the analysis of individual markers. These are as follows: Murray (1979) on 'well', Bald (1980) on 'yes' and 'no', Merrit (1984) on 'O.K', Svartvik (1980) on 'well', Owen (1985) on 'anyway', Aijmer (1986) on 'actually', Holmes (1986) on 'you know', Schiffrin (1985) on 'well' and (1986) on 'and', Stenstrom (1986) on 'really', Viitanen (1986) on 'only', Holmes (1988) on 'of course', Beach (1993) on 'okay', Jucker (1993) on 'well', Chodorowska (1997) on 'me entiendes' in Spanish, Trillo (1997) on (a comparative study on attention-getting devices in English and Spanish), Takahara (1998) (a comparative study on pragmatic functions of DMs in English and Japanese), Fox Tree and Schrock (1999) on 'oh', Archakis (2001) on 'several Greek markers',

We have seen an explosion of articles and books on DisPs representing different theoretical frameworks, approaches and languages in the last ten years. The flexibility and multifunctionality have turned out to be two important properties of DisPs. As the researches with various orientations illustrated above have demonstrated, it has become necessary to approach and analyse DisPs from many different perspectives. In this connection, the purpose of this study is to approach to the study of DisPs in an understudied language like Turkish with an integrative perspective and contribute to the study of DisPs by showing how the integration of various methods can account for the description of DisPs and increase our understanding of what these three DisPs are doing in Turkish conversational discourse.

In the present study, the DisPs are seen to be multifunctional since they can be functional within all the domains available. A classification has been proposed of their different meanings on the Content, Conversational Structure and Interpersonal Domains (see Framework of Analysis, 3.2).

2.3 Major Underpinnings of Research Orientation

The increasing attention paid to this long-neglected part of naturally occurring language has clearly been reflected in the number of studies reported above. One reason for this increase in attention seems to be due to the contemporary emphasis on 'pragmatics', on the study of how language is used, which developed largely in reaction to Chomsky or, as Levinson (1983) puts it, as an "antidote to Chomsky's treatment of language as an abstract device, or mental ability, dissociable from uses, users and functions of language" (p.35). The two commonly referred to perspectives used for the analysis of particles seems to need some clarification at this point.

Discourse analysis (DA) uses both the methodology and the kinds of theoretical principles and primitive concepts typical of linguistics. DA should be seen as an attempt to extend the successful techniques of linguistics beyond the unit of the sentence. DA deploys procedures, such as the isolation of a set of basic categories or units of

28

discourse, and the formulation of a set of rules stated over those categories, separating coherent discourses from incoherent ones. DA has an appeal towards intuitions about what is and what is not a coherent or well-formed discourse. What DA is inclined to do is to take one or a few texts which have been constructed by analysts and try to give an in-depth analysis of all the interesting features of this limited domain.

Conversation analysis (CA), on the other hand, is an empirical approach, which primarily avoids premature theory construction. The methods are generally inductive. Recurring patterns are searched across many records of naturally occurring conversations. Instead of the theory of rules as used in syntactic descriptions, CA has an emphasis on the interactional and inferential consequences of the choice between alternative sequences. Unlike DA, there is as little appeal as possible to intuitive judgements. Although there is limited impact of intuition on the research, they do not account for the theories or they do not limit the data. The emphasis of CA analysts is on what can be found to occur. In CA there is a tendency to examine as many instances of some particular phenomenon as possible across texts. In sum, CA's main aim is to discover the systematic properties of the sequential organisation of talk and the ways in which utterances are designed to manage such sequences.

Given the accounts of the principles of the DA and CA perspectives, the analytic tendencies displayed in the studies reported above become clearer. For example, the fact that coherence is the main focus and intellectual interest of DA analysts is apparent in Schiffrin's, Fraser's, Schourup's, Östman's, Fox Tree and Schrock's, and Fuller's studies. The discourse models they all propose, which are basically constituted of identical principles even in terms of contents but labelled differently (as they themselves admit) are based on the notion of coherence. Schiffrin also terms hers a 'coherence model'. CA analysts, on the other hand, are more interested in what people do. Rather than trying to account for what makes two utterances a text or what makes it coherent, but how people accomplish actions which are recognisable as certain things such as agreeing/disagreeing, emphasising, shifting the course of the topic amongst a few. As

we have seen above, with a method of triangulation, it is possible to integrate the two perspectives under one analytical framework.

The DA approach has already proved its strength through its ability to integrate linguistic findings about intra-sentential organisation with discourse structure.   By taking many CA principles such as repair, preference, development of topic, turn-taking, this study aims to look at discourse particles in a specific way. It should be emphasised here that this study views both perspectives as complementary. It is the presence of differences between the two frameworks that makes it possible to be able to carry out analysis of particles with quite a wide range of meanings and functions. That is, in its attempt to try to be eclectic, this study will make use of relevant notions from both perspectives in analysing and accounting for the three particles in question.

2.4 Conversation Analysis and its Theoretical Background

As far as the analysis in this study is concerned, it would not be untrue to say that it is grounded in a data-driven empirical approach, which is strongly influenced by the conversation analytic perspective. While CA proves to be a good starting point, this study aims to take what is useful from each perspective and triangulate them. CA methodology together with DA has an important role to play in this study. Given that CA forms the nature of our research orientation, it is this analytic perspective to which we will now turn to gain more insight into it and its theoretical background.

2.4.1 Conversation Analysis in General

Social interaction has long been a phenomenon of interest to students of social life. A major problem has been how to study interaction, discover ways in which various social actions are organised, and describe and analyse the features, using rigorous methods, which will allow other researchers to discover the same phenomenon (Goodwin and Duranti, 1992).

Conversation analysis presents a methodological approach to the study of mundane social action. It has developed rigorous and systematic procedures for studying social actions. It takes up the problem of studying social life 'in situ', in the most ordinary of settings, examining the most routine, everyday, naturally occurring activities in their concrete details (Schegloff, 1992). Its basic position is that social actions are meaningful for those who produce them and that they have a natural organisation that can be discovered and analysed by close examination. Its interest is in finding the machinery, the rules and the structures that produce and constitute the orderliness (Heritage, 1984).

The discovery of structures, methodological procedures and the machinery of the production of orderliness in interaction was an important finding in the development of conversation analysis. The main aim of research in this field has been to document discoveries, to focus on subsets of recurrent phenomena, and systematise the findings. What often seem to be irrelevant observations of some interactional phenomena can turn out to reveal an organisation, an orderliness. Then, if possible, the systematic properties of that organisation can be described and formulised. The key issue is to examine how participants in a conversation make sense of what is said. Thus, meanings are dependent, locally accomplished, situated and conventional. This science, in Sacks' (in Atkinson & Heritage, 1984:21) own words "..describes methods persons use in doing social life...(and shows) the detailed ways in which actual, naturally occurring social activities occur and are subjectable to formal description".

The methodological perspective adopted by conversational analysts is characterised as an analytic approach that seeks to describe and analyse social actions, the organisational features of various naturally occurring interactional phenomena[3]. In its methodology, order is assumed; order in discourse practices, in the sayings/tellings/doings of members

---

[3]The examination of interactional phenomena, consisting of talk and action in a situation, refers to how they are patterned, arranged and organised in the course of their production by participants. Questions as to the meanings of actions are answered by direct examination of 'what happened before' and 'what follows next' taking into account the manner in which participants themselves indicate that they make sense of what occurs.

of society. The problem is to discover, describe and analyse that order (orderliness).
According to Heritage (1984:33):

> The work in 'pure' conversation is inspired by the realisation that ordinary conversation is the predominant medium of interaction in the social world. It is also the primary form of interaction to which, with whatever simplifications, the child is initially exposed and through which socialisation proceeds. There is thus every reason to suppose that the basic form of mundane talk constitutes a kind of bench-mark against which other more formal or institutional types of interaction are recognised and experienced.

As was made clear by Heritage, casual conversation plays an important role in setting the stage for the analysis of other more formal or 'institutional' types of interaction.

2.4.2 The Methodology of Conversation Analysis

The field of Conversation Analysis developed within sociology as an application of the theory and methods developed by Harold Garfinkel and Erving Goffman for the study of everyday phenomena. Their work is known as ethnomethodology. Garfinkel (1967:11) himself defines ethnomethodology as "the investigation of the rational properties of indexical expressions and other practical actions as contingent ongoing accomplishments of organised artful practices of everyday life".

Indexical expressions are those phenomena whose understanding and interpretations are tied to the context in which they appear. Rather than shy away from indexical expressions in his study and theorising, Garfinkel argues that all social phenomena are inherently indexical and thus indexical expressions should be a prime focus of social study. The investigative methodology (Sharrock and Anderson, 1986:38) can be described as follows:

    1- treat activities as reflexively accountable[4]; 2- treat settings as self-
     organising and commonness as an occasioned corpus of knowledge;
     3- treat social actors as inquirers into those settings and accounts.

---

[4]The reflexive accountability of activities is to be noted (Garfinkel, 1967) in that 'the means by which members of a society produce, organise and manage a set of actions is identical to the means by which they themselves understand that activity'. (p.1)

Based on the foundation of ethnomethodology, conversation analysis is the application of this theoretical orientation and methodology to the study of everyday conversation, which is a particular type of everyday social activity. The primary goal of researchers in CA is clearly described by Heritage and Atkinson (1984:1):

> The central goal of conversation analytic research is the description and explication of the competencies that ordinary speakers use and rely on in participating in intelligible, socially organised interaction. At its most basic, this objective is one of describing the procedures by which conversationalists produce their own behaviour and understand and deal with the behaviour of others.

Heritage (1989:22) provides a further explication of the foundations of CA:

> The basic orientation of conversation analytic studies may be summarised in terms of four fundamental assumptions: 1- interaction is structurally organized; 2- contributions to interaction are both context-shaped and context-renewing; 3- these two properties inhere in the details of interaction so that no order of detail in conversational interaction can be dismissed a priori as disorderly, accidental or interactionally irrelevant[5]; and 4- the study of social interaction in its details is best approached through the analysis of naturally occurring data.

The initial assumption is based on the observation that participants in a conversation (or any sort of social activity) are able to make sense of their interaction, hence this behaviour has an organisational basis, one which is accessible to the participant and to the outside observer as well. Assumption (2) is based on the observation that a participant's contribution to conversation is influenced or shaped by the preceding talk (context-shaped) while at the same time it influences or shapes the subsequent talk (context-renewing). The following assumption (3) takes the form of a methodological directive; do not overlook any aspect of the conversation, no matter how seemingly

---

[5]It is because an instance of something is an occurrence. One instance is sufficient to attract attention and analytic interest. The instance is, after all, an event whose features and structure can be examined to discover how it is organised. That this particular social action occurred is evidence that the machinery for its production is culturally available, involves members' competencies and is therefore possibly reproducible.discover how it is organised. That this particular social action occurred is evidence that the machinery for its production is culturally available, involves members' competencies and is therefore possibly reproducible.

trivial. Even for researchers, it is generally difficult to know prior to the investigation what aspects of conversation are relevant to the understanding of its organisation; this knowledge can only come after the analysis. The last assumption (4) is also of considerable methodological import and is closely tied to (3) above. As Sacks (1984:25) pointed out:

> ..however rich our imaginations are, if we use hypothetical, or hypothetical-typical versions of the world we are constrained by reference to what an audience, an audience of professionals, can accept as reasonable...We will be using observations as a base for theorising, by showing that they happened.
> We can then come to see that a base for using close looking at the world we can find things that we could not, by imagination, assert were there. We would not know that they were 'typical'. Indeed, we might not have noticed that they happen.

This leads us to the other significant point about the recordings of naturally recording data: that detailed and repeated analysis can be possible not only for other researchers to duplicate and empirically verify one's work, but also for the data later to be reanalysed in the light of new empirical and theoretical findings. In summary, with its emphasis on natural data and the patterns recurrently displayed within, CA is strongly oriented towards the systematic description of the details of interactional phenomena.

Finally, Levinson (1983) suggests that CA has the most to offer in the way of substantial insights into the nature of conversation, conversation being 'the predominant medium of interaction in the social world' (Heritage, 1989). Although CA as a methodology offers ways of discovering the elaborate and detailed architecture of conversation, Levinson (ibid.:296) draws our attention to one particular issue, namely that almost all the work done on CA is based on English data:

> we simply do not know at the present to what extent these findings extend to other languages and cultures. But although the findings here may be in part culturally specific, the methods employed should be of quite general application.

Clearly, there is a great need to carry out studies on the linguistic items in question in languages other than English, though there has been a noticeable rise in them in recent years (Fox Tree and Schrock, 1999: Archakis, 2001). With every single study carried out in a different language, the methodological strength of different perspectives will become more obvious and a possibility of a universal approach towards analysis could eventually be attained. In this connection, the present study, trying to be eclectic and viewing the perspectives as complementary, aims to employ the findings of CA and DA, and whatever else is useful to help us delineate the items in question as comprehensively as possible in the Turkish language, a language which is to be studied for the first time with this kind of eclectic analytic perspective.

2.5 Definition of Analytic Concepts and Terms

In this section we will present some of the basic aspects of conversation analysis, which will be shown to be instrumental in the characterisation of the discourse particles in question.

2.5.1 Turn-Taking

An obvious initial observation is that conversation is characterised by the organisation of 'turn-taking'. The turn-taking system operates over sequences of turns. Turn-taking is a basic form of organisation for conversation and its organisation in talk is fundamental to conversation (Sacks et al., 1974).

The most general principle governing turn-taking in a conversation is that only one person speaks at a time. There may be overlaps and brief interruptions, but it is generally clear which speaker has the floor at any particular moment. Moreover, speakers usually give up the floor voluntarily, that is, they willingly hand over the turn to someone else. While only one person talks at a time, someone is speaking at all times. Although there are cultural differences regarding what amount of silence would be discomforting (e.g. North Germanic societies and Indians tolerate longer silences)

silence is generally not tolerated in conversation; therefore, pauses are usually kept very short and speaker follows speaker in rapid succession. The turn-taking system is a 'local management system' (Sacks et al., 1974); its operation allows turn-size and turn-order to vary and be under local management of the participants.

There are various units from which turns at talk are constructed. These units include sentences, clauses, phrases, words and so on. Sacks et al. (ibid.) termed these units 'turn constructional units' (hence TCUs)[6]. For a unit to be characterised as a TCU, "each unit has to have a projectable completion point" (p.702). Initially a speaker is assigned one of these TCUs. The end of such a unit constitutes a point at which speaker change becomes relevant (transition relevance place, or TRP), but not necessarily always accomplished. The rules that govern the transition of speakers come into play at a TRP. These rules are:

1-If the turn is constructed so as to involve the 'current speaker selects next' technique, the person so selected has both the right and obligation to speak and no one else has such a right or obligation.
2-If the turn is not so constructed, then another speaker may self-select at the next transition-relevance place, but no one has to self-select. If self-selection is instituted, the first person to do so gets the turn and turn exchange occurs there.
3-If the 'current speaker selects next' technique is not being used, and no one else has self-selected, then the current speaker may continue, but need not.
If neither of the first two rules has applied, and the current speaker continues to speak as allowed by the third rule, the rules recycle and are in effect at the next transition-relevance place and continue to apply recursively until there is an exchange of turns. While the above rules explain how the next speaker comes to be selected, they do not explain how the next speaker knows when the current speaker has finished, and when s/he can begin. This is obviously important in order to avoid overlap and silence.

---

[6] The same term has been and is still being used by reference to Sacks et al. (1974) by others (Schegloff, 1982: Levinson, 1983: Schegloff, 1996 and Fox, Hayashi and Jasperson, 1996).

As Sacks (1971-76) suggests next speakers are not concerned with completed utterances because one can never be sure that an utterance is complete; it is always possible to add more to an apparently complete utterance, and speakers frequently do it. For this reason, next speakers are concerned more with points of *possible completion*. As Sacks (ibid.) observes, turns consist of one or more TCUs: Thus, speaker change takes place at the end of a TCU. As Coulthard (1977) suggests, turns to speak are valued and sought, and thus the majority of turns in any conversation consists of only a single sentence, unless permission has been asked for a longer turn, perhaps to tell a story or a joke, and so on. So far *possible completion* points have been described grammatically and semantically. While speaker change takes place at *transition-relevance places*, which occur at *possible completion points* of TCUs, features such as intonation have to be taken into account.

There is evidence that speakers also signal paralinguistically and kinesically to the other participants the TRPs (Duncan, 1974: De Long, 1974). Lee (1981) observes that voice qualities such as loudness, pitch, tone and speed play an important role in turn emergence. Jefferson (1973:58) observes that the ability to come in as soon as a speaker has reached a possible completion point requires a high degree of skill on the part of the participant: "The recipient of an ongoing utterance has the technical capacity to select a precise spot to start his own talk 'no later' than the exact appropriate moment". Therefore, the recipient needs to be able both to understand an ongoing utterance in order to recognise when it is possibly complete, and also to produce immediately a relevant next utterance.

2.5.2 Adjacency Pairs

Schegloff and Sacks (1973) observe that a conversation is 'a string of at least two turns'. Some turns are related more closely than others. Schegloff and Sacks (ibid.) isolate a class of sequences of turns called *adjacency pairs*. Adjacency pairs are composed of turns produced successively by different speakers: The first one must belong to the class of *first pair parts*, the second to the class of *second pair parts*. The utterances are related in that not any second pair part can follow any first pair part, but only an

appropriate one. The first pair part often selects the next speaker and thus helps to set up a *transition-relevance place*. In other words, the first part of a pair predicts the occurrence of the second. For example, a question is almost always followed by an answer. Other pairs include offer/acceptance or offer/refusal, greeting/greeting, etc.

Adjacency pairs are considered as the basic structural units in conversation. For instance, they are used for opening and closing conversations (Schegloff, 1968; Schegloff and Sacks, 1973). They play an important part in conversations both for operating the turn-taking system by enabling a speaker to select the next speaker and also for enabling the next speaker to avoid both gap and overlap.

Schegloff and Sacks (ibid.) argue that, whereas the absence of a particular item in conversation may not pose a serious problem, the absence of a second pair part of an adjacency pair is 'noticeable and noticed'. They report that conversation sequences, which consist of different types of pairs, are quite common. They suggest that this structural complexity arises from speakers avoiding potentially embarrassing or annoying situations; so, whenever, a speaker makes a request, an invitation or an offer, s/he is exposing herself/himself to a possible rejection. Speakers avoid possible rejection by producing what Schegloff and Sacks call a *pre-sequence*, another pair which determines whether the invitation, offer, etc., will be accepted. Participants can easily recognise *pre-sequences* and indicate this recognition in their replies.

It is obvious that the structures described so far have been 'linear', in which one pair follows another. Schegloff (1972) reports 'cases of embedding' where one pair occurs inside another. Schegloff calls these embedded pairs *insertion sequences*. For instance, in the cases of failure to understand an utterance, lack of commitment to do something or simply of stalling, the next speaker is likely to produce not a second pair part, but another first pair part. Coulthard (1977:73) calls adjacency pairs 'normative' structures: "The second part ought to occur, and thus the other sequences are inserted between the first pair part that has occurred and the second pair part that is anticipated".

38

As has been mentioned above, not all the potential second parts of an adjacency pair are appropriately equal. There is a ranking operating over the alternatives, which is *preference organisation*. There is at least one preferred and one dispreferred category of response. Preferred seconds mainly occur as structurally simpler turns. In contrast, dispreferred seconds are produced by various kinds of structural complexity such as some delays, prefaces and accounts etc.

2.5.3 Repair

Since the exchange of talk is vulnerable to trouble or revision that can arise at any time, an 'organisation of repair', a central conversational device (Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks, 1977) operates within and across turns and addresses recurrent problems in speaking, hearing and understanding. As Schegloff et al. (ibid.) note, repair is not restricted to errors or mistakes. The concept of repair is wide enough to include word recovery problems, self-editings, replacements etc. Repair could be seen from two perspectives: the initiation and the solution. The initiation of repair takes place in the 'repair initiation opportunity space', which is around the trouble source or 'repairable'. With respect to the possibility of repair, the organisation casts the parties in the conversation into two categories: 'Self' is the speaker of the trouble-source and 'other' is all the others.

Repair opportunities and their initiation are distributed differentially between self and other. Therefore, the organisation of preference is operative in setting up a ranking order across the opportunity spaces. This ranking corresponds to the most frequently used to the least used resources. For example, the speaker of a turn in which trouble occurs has the initial opportunity to deal with that trouble in the same turn in which the trouble occurs. So the initiation and solution of the repair by the current speaker within the same turn 'self-initiated self-repair' is preferred over the initiation of the repair by another speaker, but eventually solved by the producer of the repairable 'other-initiated self-repair'. It is clear that self overwhelmingly has the first opportunity to complete the repair even if it is an other-initiated one. The least used repair source is the repair

initiated and carried out by another speaker 'other-initiated other repair'. So, the repair apparatus has a tendency both for a preference for self-initiation of repair and for a preference for self-repair over repair by others. Clearly, the contribution of the organisation of repair to a natural language is to provide a mechanism for dealing with its intrinsic troubles. Closely related to the notion of repair is the maintenance of intersubjectivity (Heritage, 1984). Intersubjectivity is 'the common social grasp of the talk and the other conduct in the interaction by its participants'. Clearly, the routine display of participants' intersubjectivity as well as the resources for recognising its breakdown and for repairing it is provided by the organisational features of ordinary conversation. Most important of these provisions is adjacent positioning of actions within turns. So, the public understanding of a prior turn's talk that is displayed in a current turn becomes available for third turn comment or if necessary, correction by the producer of the initial turn. It is, therefore, by means initially of adjacent positioning that various forms of failures can be recognised and then by means of repair that corrections can understandably be attempted.

2.5.4 Topic

The data fragments used in conversations are always parts of a whole conversation and the analyst always has to decide where each fragment begins and ends. And it is often the case that speakers do not provide clear clues so as to determine the topical boundaries of the conversational discourse. Analysts, therefore, for the most part become dependent upon intuitive notions about where one part of a conversation ends and another begins so that they can divide up conversational data into chunks. Basically, it is the intuitive notion of topic that analysts mostly refer to. Schiffrin (1987) states that the intuitive notion of topic corresponds to the notion of goal. She also argues that the topic of the conversation is what the speaker intends to talk about. Similarly, Maynard (1980) suggests that one common sense notion is that the topic is what the conversation is about. Conversation analysts regard topic management as an organisational mechanism (Sacks et al., 1974). Since abrupt changes are not desirable, topics are 'placed' and 'fitted' into the conversation (Maynard, ibid.). Sacks et al. (ibid.)

see topicality as an achievement of the conversationalist and regard it as something organised and observable in systematic ways that can be described. In other words, Sacks et al. (ibid.: 728) suggest that "a speaker regularly exhibits understanding of prior talk in a current turn-at-talk".

Therefore, topicality is not only a matter of content, but is partly related to the procedures participants in a conversation use in order to display their understanding and accomplish their turn's fit with a prior one. Although the display of understanding of prior utterances is mostly achieved, there are occasions when there is a difference or even a change in the relationship of a current utterance to a previous one. So, these occasions make a shift or a change in the topicality of the talk relevant and provide the chance to introduce a different line of talk. These shifts and changes do not take place randomly. They mostly occur in specific environments and in describable ways. The table (2.1) below illustrates the brief summary of definitions of analytic concepts and terms in a tabular form.

Table 2.1: The Brief Summary of Definitions of Analytic Concepts and Terms.

Turn-Taking: is a speech exchange system used for the ordering of moves talk.
Adjacency pairs: are composed of turns produced successively by different speakers.
Repair: is a mechanism used for dealing with its intrinsic troubles of a natural language.
Topic: corresponds to the notion of goal. The topic of the conversation is what the speaker intends to talk about.

CHAPTER 3

This chapter has a number of central points that are important for the study.   First of all, it explains the data used in this study and the methodology of their collection. Secondly, it describes the framework within which the data has been analysed.

3. Method of Data Collection

The data used in this study are basically unstructured, natural Turkish conversations and were collected by recording native speakers of Turkish in everyday situations. As Fox Tree and Schrock (1999) point out, one of the ways spontaneous talk differs from planned talk is the presence of discourse particles. The presence of these linguistic elements creates a naturalistic conversational effect.   Natural conversation is not the same as other forms of talk.   As Schegloff (1993) suggests, it makes sense to discriminate ordinary conversation from interviews, meetings and courtroom proceedings and the like simply because the participants conduct themselves differently and understand the conduct differently in these different domains. Therefore, it has to be emphasised here that the conversations recorded and used as data in this study were not produced by their participants for a sociolinguistic study, but parts of the participants ongoing progression of participants' everyday and real lives. The researcher tried to make his presence available during the data collection process with his recorder.

The reason why this kind of data were used is that the connection between particles and naturally occurring conversations is quite clear. For instance, Östman (1981) argues that while discourse particles are present in all forms of language, they are most prevalent and perhaps characteristic of 'impromptu speech'. Similarly, Trillo (2002), using his

own terminology, describes the ample availability of discourse particles in 'pragmatic track' where cognitive, affective and socio-cultural factors are available for natural language contact. For this reason, an in-depth study of Turkish discourse particles can most efficiently and reliably derive from the analysis of a considerable body of natural conversation in Turkish.

The data-gathering experiences of Labov (1984) and Milroy (1987) and their respective associates have shown that the most effective means of recording vernacular speech are through participant observation and the use of group recordings. As far as the researcher could tell (based on his earlier data collection experiences, e.g.Yılmaz, 1994), the tape-recorder to be used for data collection had a minimal influence because the participants in natural conversations generally talked about subjects, which were quite intimate to them. This intimacy generally resulted in the participants' getting used to the presence of the tape-recorder.

Care was taken that the speech was spontaneous. This extemporaneous quality is crucial feature, since it is particularly conducive to the use of discourse particles (Östman, 1981; Watts, 1989; Smith and Jucker, 2002). Extra care was also taken that all the data used in this study shared the characteristic of constituting 'natural language' in the sense that they were produced by native speakers in the course of their everyday lives, not for the use of linguists or other analysts.

A personal audio recorder (walkman-type) with an external microphone was used and in the case of surreptitious recordings the recorder could be hidden to enhance the naturalness of the data. It should be noted here that as far as the surreptitious recordings were concerned, the participants were asked for their permission after the completion of the recording.

There are twelve different conversations. The duration of the conversational data collected are of various lengths, in total eighteen hours. The length of each conversation

was naturally varied since they were natural ones. The duration of conversations ranged from thirty minutes to one and half hours. Obviously, one cannot predict the duration of a natural conversation. The impromptuness of the conversations was preserved, as the researcher himself did not have any control on their length, nor the topics talked about at all. It has to be emphasised here once again that the data were collected while the participants simply conducted their lives and in many cases, the researcher was incidentally present -with his recorder there and then.

The numbers of participants present in each conversation are varied and were not predetermined. The researcher made sure that their number ranged from two to five participants, because, with more participants, transcription would be more difficult to handle. In all the twelve conversations, there were 39 participants in total. 25 of them were males and 14 were females. The researcher also made sure that all these spontaneous conversations in the data were recorded in natural environments where people normally carried out their ordinary lives such as indoor and outdoor social gatherings, offices and student-dormitory kitchens. Specifically, 5 conversations were recorded in kitchens, 3 in offices, 2 in study rooms and 2 in open-air gardens. Therefore, on the whole, we can say that the Turkish data collected and used in this study is as representative as possible in that they represent the features of casual everyday conversational behaviour, not produced for the sake of a sociolinguistic study.

3.1 Transcription Conventions

The transcription conventions to be used are those commonly used in the field, which is a constructed version of the actualities and particularities of the interaction (Psathas and Anderson, 1990). The written transcription[7] is part of an effort to analyse the produced interaction in terms of its constitutive features. It is the written version of aural experience of the parties who were actually engaged in the interaction. That is, transcription is a constructed version of the actualities and particularities of the

---

[7]In common with all CA practitioners, we understand that the tape is the data, not the transcription. We do an analysis of the tape and the transcription is just the representation as accurately as possible of what is on the tape. The transcription itself is an analysis.

interaction (Psathas and Anderson, ibid.). Transcription represents a transformed version of the original phenomena in order to provide repeated and systematic access to those phenomena for the reader.

As Psathas and Anderson (1990) point out, there is not, and cannot be, a 'neutral' transcription system and the only neutral presentation of a conversation is its actual and original production. In other words, it is not possible to reproduce any piece of conversation in all its complexity through transcribing it or to give the reader a real and full effect as if s/he had been in the actual context, as every discourse has its own peculiar features of context.

As Psathas and Anderson (1990) state, different studies require different types of transcription conventions and the type of decisions involved in the transcription of a conversation depends on what the analyst is concerned with in his/her study. In this connection, in this study we will try to stick to a simplified version of the Jeffersonian Transcription System (as explained in Psathas and Anderson, ibid.) as much as possible, still with the notion in mind that there have not been many prior examples of Turkish conversational data transcribed in this way. The following are the basic transcription conventions that have been followed throughout this study based as much as possible on the system mentioned above:

In each conversational extract, capital letters that preface turn are the first letter of the participant's name and represents each of the parties in a single conversation.

An effort will be exerted towards capturing in written form the actual words as spoken. Since sounds uttered may not always be words, attention has been paid to transcribe all sounds produced as closely and accurately as possible (e.g. 'Tü-', which is cut off, illustrated by (-) as it was meant 'Türkiye'). In an effort to hear the words correctly, some mishearings or ambiguous hearings are possible because of the inferior quality of some recordings or of uncontrollable external noises. The resulting inaudible or

incomprehensible stretch of talk will be indicated (as italicised) with the literal word in square brackets [*anlaşılmıyor*] [*incomprehensible*].

It is not the words alone, which will be transcribed, but also the silences between and among words and sounds as well. With Sacks et al. (1974) observation for the persons' ability to produce talk with no-gap and no-overlap and the generally accepted negativity of silences (only in some contexts), the interactional significance of such spaces will be recognised. Pauses and silences will be noted in terms of a measured interval, for example, (0.5) indicates half a second, (1) indicates one second and (3) indicates three seconds etc. It has to be noted, however, that these timings may not always be perfectly correct. There are also pauses, which are, in a way, filled pauses as represented by one 'm' or two 'mm' depending on the length of the pause.

Overlaps are a fact of conversations. When some overlapping is been observed in the data, especially at the initiation or completion of turns, the sign (//) will be used to indicate the point where another speaker's talk occurs in overlap. For example:

```
1 I: yani // pubda serbest
2 D:      // iki üç tane pub var  üç tane pub var = üç tane // pub var
3 I:                                          //pubda ve student
4   unionda serbest
```

During the transcriptions, it becomes clear that there is a distinction between content (what is said) and the process (how something is said). This is obviously related to the pace of the talk. Therefore, this pace will be displayed in the transcription in that where a next utterance is latched directly onto a prior one, with no gap, this will be indicated by an equals sign (=) either between utterances (if they are by the same speaker) or at the start of a next turn's utterance (if they are by different speakers). The equals (=) between utterances (by the same speaker) can also be seen as a 'rush-through' whereby the speaker speeds up to make clear that what is usually TRP is not marked intonationally as TRP (as in speaker I's turn below).

46

```
1 D: = evet
2 E: vallahi bak
3 I: = biz yedik ya = gerçekten
```

Related to the process of producing talk is the way in which certain words are stretched. This will be indicated by embedding full colons (::) into words at the point where the stretched syllable occurs (for example, the interjection 'ya::').

Another aspect of this attention paid to this process will be to shifts in volume. Words that have been spoken very loudly have been capitalised throughout. For example,

```
B: ya:: ÇELİŞKİLİ ŞEYLER var = detayına girersek = mesela mm ilanda
[devam ediyor]
```

Punctuation is not used to demark sentences or clauses in any grammatical sense in the transcript (Psathas and Anderson, 1990). Rather, punctuation symbols will be used in this study to display intonation; for example, a question mark (?) at the end of a phrase represents a rising intonation. A period (.) represents a downward intonation, and a comma (,) marks continuing intonation.

In presenting the data, a number of other transcription conventions will also be used in order to facilitate the reader's understanding and/or appreciation of the interaction. Firstly, all three particles in the data used in the transcripts will be italicised and be made bold. It has to be noted that the turns where the particle in question is being discussed occurs will be indicated by an arrow (→). Utterances with particles that are not arrowed may well be considered elsewhere. Secondly, in a similar fashion, the conversational fragments used in the analyses chapters and elsewhere will be typed with a different format and different size, which is Courier 10 compared to Times New Roman 12 in the rest of the thesis.

Thirdly, following each Turkish conversational fragment, its English translation[8] will be provided. The researcher will make sure that the English version has been translated as accurately (semantically) as possible to its original Turkish version. The same procedure of different format (Courier 10, but in italicised form differentiate them from the original Turkish form) will be followed for the translations as well. In order further to make more distinguishable, dotted line will be drawn between the Turkish extracts and their English equivalents.

And finally, it seem it will be necessary to provide the transliteration for the 'word search' function of the particle *şey*. Therefore, the Turkish conversational fragments used to explicate the above-mentioned function of the particle in question are initially followed by its transliteration, which is then followed by the English translation.

3.2 Framework of Analysis

Research on DisPs and similar phenomena has expanded continually throughout the 1980s and 1990s, with the result that such items now figure prominently not only in pragmatic and discourse analytic research but in research on sociolinguistic topics such as gender variation and code-switching. Although in the 1990s particle research became an accepted field of linguistic research and witness the regular stream of papers in mainstream journals (*Journal of Pragmatics* and *Pragmatics and Beyond Series*) and book-length accounts (Schiffrin, 1987; Aijmer, 2002) representing different theoretical frameworks, approaches and languages, all these efforts did not lead to a unified framework that suited all researchers theoretically and methodologically. As there is wide interest in this area, DisPs have been investigated within a large number of frameworks reflecting divergent research interests, methods and goals. As a result, as

---

[8]After the data collection in Turkish was completed it was first transcribed and then the fragments to be used in the analysis were translated into English. Translation of the representative fragments is clearly for English-speaking readers of the thesis, who cannot be expected to know Turkish. The translations were made as close as possible to their original Turkish meanings.

Schourup (1999) observes, DisPs research has become a testing ground for hypotheses concerning the theories of discourse structure and utterance interpretation.

The fact that DisPs are elements that have no apparent meaning or grammatical ascription, are elusive to classification, but play a fundamental role in the pragmatic structure of interaction have led researchers to make functional descriptions of their appearance and of their variation in discourse. Mostly with the functional approach in view, different studies of DisPs distinguish several domains where they may be functional, in which are included textual, attitudinal, cognitive and interactional parameters. Accordingly, DisPs have been analysed (Östman 1981, Levinson 1983, Schiffrin 1987, Fraser 1990, Fox Tree and Shcrock 2002, Aijmer 2002) as text-structuring devices (marking openings or closings of discourse units or transitions between them), as modality or attitudinal indicators, as markers of speakers-hearer intentions and relationships and as instructions on how given utterances are to be processed.

DisPs seem to be dispensable elements functioning as signposts (e.g. Fox Tree and Schrock 1999, Archakis 2001, Enfield 2003) in the communication facilitating the hearer's interpretation of the utterance on the basis of various contextual clues. The 'signposting' aspect of DisPs refers to their perhaps unarguably the most important property, which is indexicality. This property explains that DisPs are linked to attitudes, evaluation, and types of speakers and other dimensions of the communication situation. Van Baar (1996) and Knott and Sanders (1998) noted that many particles were acting as the bridge between a referential unit and the context. This functional characterisation of DisPs as bridging units can be related to indexicality. According to Ochs (1996), to index is to point to the presence of some entity in the immediate situation at hand and an index is considered to be a linguistic form that performs this function. Words, phrases and grammatical structures can be indexed to the speaker and the hearer, to spatial and temporal dimensions of the speech situation, to an epistemic stance such as certainty or uncertainty and to affect (attitudes towards the hearer or to particular speech acts).

Ochs (ibid.) also observes that knowledge of the indexical properties of lexical items is at the core of linguistic and cultural competence.

The socio-cultural environment is ubiquitous in communication. In this connection, DisPs due to their potential of indexicality are special in that they display dimensions of this environment as part of their functional set-up. As a result of conventionalisation, DisPs act as stereotypical links that can develop between discourse parameter and words (e.g. between DisPs and attitudes). In this respect, it is possible to propose that DisPs act like linguistic codes such as pronouns, which require a considerable amount of inferencing above their decoding. Like pronouns, DisPs are cognitively salient as hearers listen for them and use them as help for interpretation in conversation.

Given the indexical nature of DisPs, it is not an easy task to establish functions to particles. The indexical properties of DisPs and grammaticalisation may play a major role explaining what becomes conventionalised. Andersen (2001:65) suggests that the discourse particles (on the textual and interpersonal level) give rise to inferential processes:

> I argue in favour of the understanding of pragmatic markers as having multidimensional meanings/functions, and that assigning a particular function to a marker on a particular occasion is a matter for pragmatic inference.

According to Aijmer (2002), discourse particles are 'slippery customers', which have a 'double meaning' and shift in their meaning depending on the context. The different functions of DisPs may be the result of their investigation in their emerging contexts. Smith and Jucker (2002) also regard emerging sequential context as 'invaluable analytical tool', as it, they suggest, helps the analyst to establish how the conversational participants interpret the DMs. However, the multifunctionality of DisPs does not seem to cause problems in communication since there are some linguistic and contextual clues functioning as interpreting strategies.

In this study an integrative approach where discourse/conversation and functional approaches (see Chapter 2) are combined, which, it is hoped, will eventually contribute to the study of DisPs by showing how the integration of various methods can account for the description of DisPs and increase our understanding of what these three DisPs are in doing Turkish conversational discourse.

It has been common to distinguish certain major functions for DisPs. In an attempt to analyse some Turkish DisPs, we will also make some functional distinctions. It is commonly accepted that DisPs have been a major topic in pragmatics and discourse analysis since the publication of Schiffrin's seminal work (1987) the book entitled *Discourse Markers*. Accoring to Traugott (1999), after Schiffrin (ibid.), there has been a tendency to divide the domain into markers that signal relationship between clauses and that mainly serve interpersonal functions (hedging or turn-taking). For instance, Schiffrin (1987) analyses DMs (her terminology) as deictics indexing texts and participants. Östman (1995) recognises the multifunctional nature of DisPs by referring to three parameters in accordance with which communication takes place (Coherence, Politeness and Involvement). Fox Tree and Schrock (1999 and 2002) divide the proposed functions of DisPs into five categories: interpersonal, turn management, repairing, monitoring and organising.

In the present study, the different functions of DisPs in their emerging contexts in a corpus of Turkish conversational discourse will be accounted for as they are indexed to attitudes, to participants and to the text. The core functions of the three DisPs will be defined in terms of what they are doing on the conversational structure (information) content and interpersonal level, which are accepted to be the host domains on which the different functions of discourse/conversation and functional approaches can be collected and analysed with an integrative perspective. It has to be accepted, as Coupland and Jaworski (1997) rightly observes, that an analysis of communication should draw from 'whatever analytical materials available', adding that 'the analysis of actual data thus gets priority over partisan theorising'. What we have below is the analytical framework

in tabular form and the following sections describe and illustrate each domain respectively.

Table 3.2: The Analytic Framework.

Conversational Structure Domain	Interpersonal Domain	Content Domain
		Frame Function and Qualifying Function

3.2.1 Conversational Structure Domain

In the conversational structure domain, a number of different functions, which are mainly to do with conversation management, are available. Floor-holding is one of the main functions where the aim is to draw the attention of the hearer to the fact that the current speaker is not finished yet and there is more to come. Other functions include to initiate and close a conversation and to signal conversational repair.

DisPs with conversational structure function are also considered to be part of the planning process especially when they occur with pauses or with other particles. For instance, a particle may be used to fill in a gap when the speaker is trying to find the right word. The speaker's planning difficulties and indetermination are emphasised by certain DisPs such as pause-markers. The following are some natural conversational extracts from the corpus where the Turkish particles in questions are shown to index some of the functions found in the Interpersonal and Conversational Structure Domains.

Example-1

→1 I: *İŞTE* bunlar Chomskyci aslında (1) ve hiç bi zamanda kalkıp real

  2   data uygulayamaz çünkü uygulanamaz

  3 E: evet

  4 I: bu olay bu kadar basit *yani* (1)// ama

```
→5 M:                              // YANİ bana çok yanlış gelmiyo onların
  6    şey yaptıkları da = eksik gibi // görünüyo
  7 I:                                    // yok doğru gibi görünüyo =
  8    eksik eksik
  9 E: evet
→10 M: YANİ cognitive contextin içine neler giriyo social contexi
 11     koymuyolar galiba
.............................................................
→1 I: İŞTE they are Chomskian (1) and they can never use real
  2    data because it cannot be used
  3 E: right
  4 I: this is as simple as that yani (1)// but
→ 5M:                            // YANİ what they do doesn't seem
  6    wrong to me = it just look // insufficient
  7 I:                            //no it looks right = it's
  8    insufficient insufficient
  9 E: right
→10 M: YANİ what does cognitive context include I don't think they put
 11     social context in it
```

In example (1), all the arrowed turns prefaced by a particle show that the conversationalist uses the particles *işte* and *yani* as turn initiators.

Example-2

```
 1 C:...size diyor iki diyor ilginç olay anlatayım diyor
→2    öbürünü hatırlıyamadım   bir tanesi aklımda   adamın biri mm şey
 3    mm bir evde kadınla kadınla kocası televizyon seyrediyorlar
      [devam ediyor]
.............................................................
 1 C: ...he says I'll tell you an interesting story I can't remember
→2    the other one  I can remember just this one   a man mm şey mm a
 3    husband and a wife are watching television at home [continues]
```

In example (2) above, the speaker C, during her account of a story, feels the need to stop and think to try to remember a particular word in order to be able to continue her

account. The speaker C marks her pause with the particle *şey* together with nonverbal markers 'mm', which eventually helps to make longer the time span needed to remember the right word. Example (2) also serves to illustrate function of the particle *şey* here, which is to hold the floor for the current speaker. By inserting the particle *şey* here, the speaker is clearly marking the floor-holding and signals to other participants in the conversation that the speaker has not finished yet.

One of the functions of the particle *şey* is to mark 'mitigation', which enables its producer to avoid the direct use of the actual word in order to mitigate the intended meaning of the resulting negative assessment/assertion of 'self' or 'other'.

Example-3

```
 1 E: EVET? (2) bakalım = Cenk Cenkle görüşüyomusun ya? = biz sana
 2    onu sorucaktık
 3 D: mhm
 4 I: ya adamla aramızda varya on dakka minübüsle on dakka mesafe var
 5 E: = mhm
 6 I: = galiba bir kaç kere şey bir kere gittim evine = bir kaç kere
 7    değil  ondan sonra devamlı telefon ettim  o hiç telefon etmedi
→8    hani bu adam bizle herhalde şeyi var yani = ordayken böylemi
 9    arkadaşlık yaptı? = bende başka yorumlar tabi uyandı
10 E: = mhm
      (1)
→11 I: sonra gelirken dedim ya yine şeylik bizde kalsın = arada birde
 12    telefon edeyim
 13 E: = aradınmı
 14 I: (1) telefon ettim = bi sefer Ankarada çalışıyomuş herhalde
..............................................................
 1 E: YES? (2)  let's see  Cenk do you see Cenk at all? = we have
 2    always wanted to ask you about him
 3 D: mhm
 4 I: the distance between him and me is just ten minutes
 5 E: = mhm
 6 I: = I think I went to his house couple of times şey just once =
```

```
  7   not couple of times and then I rang him very frequently  he never
→8   rang me back I started thinking  he must have şey against me yani
 9    = was he this sort of friend over there? = of course I started to
 10   have other kind of interpretations
 11 E: = mhm
     (1)
→12 I: then before I came here I thought I should be şey enough = I
 13    decided to contact him now and then
 14 E: = did you contact him then
 15 I: (1) I gave him a ring = this time it turned out that he went to
 16    Ankara for business
```

The particle *şey* in the extract above displays the interactional difficulty being experienced by its producer and enables him to mitigate the effect of this interactionally difficult situation by being hesitant, indirect and cautious.

The particle *işte* functions as a preface for dispreferred seconds in which it indexes that the upcoming response is not the complete one to the prior question.

Example-4

```
  1 A: orayı çılgın bi yer yaptılar zaten
  2 E: ne oteli olacak
→3 A: işte Buttim içinde bi otel
...............................................................
  1 A: they have magnificently transformed that place
  2 E: which hotel is it going to be
→3 A: işte an ordinary hotel within the Buttim complex
```

The initiation of the turn and prefacing of the response specifically by *işte* in this slot demonstrates that the upcoming response is not necessarily the complete answer. When we focus on the TCU in the first pair part, it is clear that by 'ne oteli' (line 2), speaker E is after the name or the corporate company, which aims to open up the hotel there. So using a 'wh' question in this first part of the adjacency pair, speaker E requires to hear a specific name. It is at this point that the initiation of the turn and its prefacing by *işte*

55

signals that the upcoming TCU does not contain the exact information as required by the previous question. Indexing the upcoming TCU as a dispreferred second pair part, the particle, by its recurrent deployment, forms a conventional pattern in Turkish conversational discourse for prefacing incomplete responses to first pair part questions.

3.2.2 Interpersonal Domain

An intrinsic feature of particles, as almost commonly accepted by every researcher studying markers (Schiffrin, 1987; Östman, 1981-1995;Wiezrbicka, 1978; Bazzanella, 1990;Trillo, 1997; Archakis, 2001; Aijmer, 2002) is their ability to mark the inherent relations between the speaker (its producer) and his/her orientation towards the turn constructional units s/he produces during the constructional process of a topic.

Particles with an Interpersonal Function (phatic discourse particles) express attitudes, feelings and evaluations. DisPs are used as hedges expressing uncertainty and as hearer-oriented appeals to the hearer for confirmation. According to Bazzanella (1990) DisPs with interpersonal function mainly perform a phatic function in the discourse thus underlying the interactive structure of the conversation. Brinton (1996) states that particles with this function can be regarded as 'evidentials' at least in some of their uses such as expressing attitudes to or modes of knowledge. DisPs within interpersonal domain with evidential function act as hedges or boosters on illocutionary force.

Other examples of interpersonal function are particles expressing a response or a reaction to the preceding utterance and backchannelling. Particles within this functional domain can also be analysed in terms of face and politeness. According to Bazzanella (ibid.) politeness, face-saving and indirectness are characteristics of everyday conversation and involved in the use of DisPs with interpersonal function. Holmes (1988) explains that some evidential meanings such as imprecision and approximation seem to signal the speakers desire to reduce social distance between herself and the addressee.

Example-5

```
  1 D: sigara içilen bölümü yokmu
  2 I: yok
  3 M: = hiç yok
→4 D: aa: kantinde var = en azından Tü- şey Essexde
.................................................................
  1 D: isn't there a smoking section
  2 I: no there isn't
  3 M: = nothing at all
→4 D: aa: we have got one in the coffee-bar = at least in Tu- şey in
  5    Essex
```

What example (5) above shows us is one of the two kinds of sequences where free-standing *şey* performs its marking function within repair operation. In one of these kinds of sequences, as soon as the speaker realises that what s/he has just said is not 'right', she immediately stops, produces the free-standing *şey*, then produces the right/correct word and then proceeds as normal. In such contexts, the current speaker makes clear by the use of *şey* in her attempt to correct a prior error, where, *şey* as well as signalling the upcoming repair, also indicates that the speaker is closely monitoring her speech production.

3.2.3 Content Domain

Content function is concerned with the textual resources the speaker has for creating coherence. Textual meaning in the content domain is relevant to the context: to the preceding (and following) text and the context of situation. It is generally agreed that we can distinguish between DisPs functioning on the global or local level of the discourse. According to Schiffrin (1987), conversation is essentially locally managed, i.e. on a turn-to-turn basis, and particles contribute to the hearer's understanding of the coherence of the conversation on the local level. Her model of discourse therefore focuses on local coherence.

It is clear that speakers also organise the discourse considering the relevance of an utterance within the larger context of the discourse. Lenk (1998) tried to expand Schiffrin's model by taking into account DisPs functioning on the global coherence level. Particles acting globally would be similar to the category of 'frames' which Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) identified in classroom discourse. It has to be noted, however, here that many DisPs function both on the local and global discourse level. In this study, the term 'frame' function will be used when a DisP has global coherence function and 'qualifier' function for a particle with a local coherence function.

3.2.1.1 Frame Function

DisPs with a frame function are required in the interaction when there is a need to draw the hearer's attention to a transition or a break in the conversational routine. It is possible to expect such situations where the speaker assumes control over conversational structure at a high level.

In the content domain, within the frame function, a number of different functions are available and they are signalled by a specific particle: to signal transitions (topic changes), to constrain the relevance of adjacent utterances. Also, DisPs are required to elaborate or comment on a preceding discourse act.

Fraser (1996) sees one set of DMs (his own terminology) as indicating that the speaker sees the following utterance as a departure from the current topic. The notion of topic can be applied to more than a single utterance. Therefore, a particle marking a topic change can probably serve to relate a single utterance to a property of a longer stretch of discourse. Fraser's use of the term of topic change markers opens the possibility that DMs, when they connect elements of text, mark not only local pairwise relations between utterances, but also more global relations. Speakers change topics not only at utterance boundaries but also in the middle of an utterance. They may make sidetracks from the main topic. Return to a previous topic and retrospective evaluation are recurrent as well as projections forwards to a new expansion in the discourse. Fraser's

notion of topic change is also shared by Lenk (1998), who sees her 'globally oriented' DMs performing 'topical actions' such as closing digressions, returning to prior topic, changing topics and introducing a new topic.

The frame functions of DisPs on the Content level are:

1-'marking transitions' (e.g. topic shifts, introducing a new aspect of the topic, opening and closing conversation)

2-'introducing an explanation, justification, background'

3-'introducing or closing a digression' (push-markers, return-pops)

4-'self-correction of the message information'

5-'introducing direct speech'

3.2.1.2 Qualifying Function

In the qualifying function, a DisP signals that some qualification is needed because the conversational interaction does not go well. DisPs as qualifiers come at the beginning of a disagreement, in adjacency pairs such as question-answer pairs or before argument. In question-answer exchanges, for instance, a DisP occurs if the response is defective and in request exchanges where the requester's expectation are not met. Similar to the 'frame' function within the content domain, certain particles have some roles to play in 'qualifying' function. The following are the qualifier functions of DisPs:

1-'indicating agreement/disagreement'

2-'response to a question' (a request)

3-indicating comparison or contrast'

4-'listing'

The following are natural conversational extracts from the corpus where the Turkish particles in questions are shown to index some of the functions found in the Content Domain.

Example-6

```
 1 M: çok az = eleştiri hiç yok zaten (1)  tahtaya kaldırdı =
```

59

```
    2  bilmem şunu yazdırdı (2.5)  yani bunlara dedimki siz mezun

    3  olduktan sonra buna bakacaksınız  Yıldırım lisesindeki

    4  heyecanlarınızı hatırlayacaksınız = nasıl dersi = ayaklarının

→5  titrediğini yaz icabında bilmemne falan = hiç anlamamışlar yani.

       (3)

  6 D: ne yapsam acaba = alsammı [devam ediyor]
..................................................................
  1 M: not enough = there is no criticism at all (1) we were called

  2   to the blackboard = asked to write something (2.5)  yani I told

  3   them at the very beginning that it will be a memorabilia for

  4   you after your graduation  you'll remember your excitement at

  5   Yıldırım High School = how the lesson = even write down how you

  6   were shaking because of excitement and everything = it seems

→ 7   they did   not understand  at all yani.

       (3)

  8 D:  I wonder what I should do = should I take them [continues]
```

The particle *yani* here in the example above constitutes the last linguistic item in the current speaker's turn signalling that she has finished her current topical content for the time being and is ready to relinquish the turn.

Example-7

```
  1 E: sen bi ara bodye gidiyodun

→2 M: bir iki kere gittim  yani fazla gitmedim şeye mm fitnesa

  3   = gitmem lazım burda iyice hantallaştım böyle
..................................................................
  1 E: you were once going to body [gym]

  2 M: I have been there couple of times  yani I haven't much been to

→3   şeye fitness = I have to go regularly since I have been so

  4   passively lazy
```

In this example, the speaker M himself is repairing the content of what he has just said in the immediately preceding utterance where the number of times the speaker M has been to the gym, which was 'couple of times' is corrected to 'not many times', which was obviously fewer times than what he originally meant earlier and this self-correction

60

is clearly marked by the turn-medial use of the particle *yani*. In the analyses chapters of each DisP, their functions will be illustrated and described in detail.

3.3 Basic Statistical Information About the Frequency of Occurrences of the Three DisPs

The Turkish conversational data used for the investigation of the descriptions and proposed functions of the three particles in question present us some basic information about their frequency of use in terms of their direction of placement with regards to their host utterances. In the twelve different conversations of various lengths, the DisP *yani* statistically is the most frequent with the total of 1032 occurrences. When we further analyse their placement with regards to their direction of placement within utterances, we see that 503 uses are utterance-initial, 229 are utterance-medial and 300 are utterance-final. One distinction we have to make here is when *yani* occurs at the outset of a linguistic unit. Out of 503 utterance-initial uses, 129 of those are turn-initial ones where the particles starts the turn as the very first linguistic element used. The second most frequent DisP is *şey* with the total of 851 occurrences. Of these, 92 are utterance-initial, 737 are utterance-medial and 22 are utterance-final. *İşte* emerges as the least frequent among the three with the total of 473 occurrences. 202 occurrences of *işte* are utterance-initial while 198 are utterance-medial and 73 are utterance-final. While table (3.3) below provides the basic statistical information about the three particles with their percentages, it has to be noted here that each particular function of the three DisPs in each domain has also been counted and the relevant statistics are illustrated in Appendix-B.

Table 3.3: Basic Statistical Information About the Three DisPs According to their Place of Occurrence.

DisP	Initial	%	Medial	%	Final	%	Total
Yani	503	**49**	229	**22**	300	**29**	1032
İşte	202	**43**	198	**42**	73	**15**	473
Şey	92	**11**	737	**88**	22	**1**	851

3.4 Native Speaker Intuitions On DisPs

At this point there will be an account of a small-scale study carried out by the present researcher, who tried to get an idea about native speaker intuitions about particles. Ten native speakers have been interviewed. Six of those were males and the rest were females. Their ages and educational backgrounds were various. The age ranged from twenty-five to sixty and educational backgrounds from at least high school to university graduates. The respondents were interviewed with face-to-face first by showing them a small real Turkish conversational dialogue, which included many instances of DisPs, and then asking them, after reading, what was the most noticeable thing in it. Every respondent immediately noticed the frequent use of the Turkish particles. Then I asked them various questions about particles in general. The question included the specific meaning and function of the particles, why and how they were used, in what kind of talk and by whom they were used, if and/or how often they used them (through intuitive self-monitoring) and how they may be learnt. Despite its limited range in terms of the number of participants, some of the preliminary results are noteworthy and worth mentioning here.

One of the things that almost all the participants of this small study have unanimously agreed on is that these particles belong to natural, everyday conversations, a point which is unanimously shared by almost everyone in the field. They all say that DisPs mostly

occur in informal interactional speech activities and mostly among acquaintances, there is an upsurge in the use of these lexical items.

Another significant finding is to do with the detachability of particles and their meanings. Almost all respondents have again indicated that these items do not have any meaning except their use in a particular context. It seems to be clear to all the respondents that particles on their own do not have any significance, and their occurrence in a specific context is what gives them a particular meaning and a conversational function.

It seems to be clear that most of the native speakers have been unaware of their use of particles (at least how often they use them) and there has even been a denial on the part of some speakers that they do not use them 'that often', which has in many cases been refuted by their subsequent use of one of these items in the speaker's immediate explanatory utterance. This observation is also supported by Watts (1989). Similarly, I also found a negative reaction toward those who are perceived to use particles very frequently.

Native speakers have had differing opinions about the function and contribution of particles to conversation. While some have been dismissive about their function with a general intuitive comment like 'particles are a kind of redundancy', others have been surprisingly correct and even spot-on about some of their functions and general role in the conversations (e.g. the linking of information units, marking hesitation, emphasis, smooth flow of conversation). For example, an emphasis marked by a particle, some have claimed, makes it easy for the recipient to grasp a particular point calling it 'facilitation in comprehension as well as expression'. Due to the frequency of hesitancy particles, the respondents reported that the DisPs had a negative impact in the flow of information and also partially gave away the insufficiency of topical knowledge on the part of the current speaker. Those who have had a more positive attitude about the role of particles have indicated that even the hesitancy particles contribute to conversation in

a certain way such as the steady flow of information, the maintenance of turn-taking and the topical line of talk, which are, indeed, among the commonly accepted functions of particles.

All the respondents unanimously agreed that it is not at school or through books, but through socialisation that one can learn to use particles appropriately. Since the occurrence of particles is closely associated with informal conversation, many have responded that people simply pick them up during their acquisition process. In support of this view, the present researcher, who has paid special attention to the use of particles in pre-school children (including his four year-old son and his then-five-year-old niece) and in some foreigners (the researcher's own observations of an American teacher's Turkish learning experience), who lived in Turkey for a while, has come to realise that particles have been used correctly and appropriately by them.

This small-scale study aimed to have access to the intuitive perspective of the real users of particles. Although the intuitions of native speakers cannot be used as a guide, they may prove to be tools by which the endorsement of certain findings and possible explanations of some occurrences can be confirmed and explicated. It has to be noted here that a questionnaire has also been prepared and applied to those who could be regarded as the linguistic professionals (those who have been involved in discourse and/or conversation analysis). The questionnaire contained some of the same conversational extracts used for the analysis here in this thesis for each particle and a table, which showed the possible functions. The respondents were asked to make their choice for the functions for each example and mark it on the relevant table at the end of each group of extracts. If they thought another function was relevant, which was not identified in the table, they were asked to specify it in the extra column provided on the table.

However, there have not emerged conclusive results regarding the particular functions. One possible reason for it could be the unfamiliarity of the respondents to the specific

terminology and concepts used in the analysis. It has to be noted that the same concepts in the field are sometimes referred to by different terminology. Therefore, this might have caused some confusion. In addition, since assigning roles and functions is not an easy task, it is to be expected that the respondents assigned different functions to the same particle occurrences. It has to be noted here that as was stated in the literature review, there were some dismissive accounts of particles even by prominent professionals. In this sense, some of my respondents might have been dismissive too. In this section, we try to describe the limitations that this study has.

3.5 Limitations of the Study

1- In this study, even though care was taken to have participants in the conversation from various age and educational backgrounds and equal amount of males and females, there was not any special attempt to control the age, sex or educational background of the participants.

2- Conversation, as has been indicated before, is the most basic form of talk. Spontaneity of conversation is actually conducive to their recurrent occurrence (Östman, 1982; Smith and Jucker, 2002). Therefore, the data to be used are conversational and informal. However, more work will be needed in more formal or institutional types of interaction in order to discover similarities as well as dissimilarities between these different forms of talk.

3- This study focuses on three particular particles. Future studies on particles could easily include the other particles available and prevalent in conversational discourse. Similarly, particle combinations have not been included in this study. Since there are many different variations, particle combinations could be added to a future list of particles to be investigated. An attempt in this direction is sure to help for a more detailed description of Turkish and provide further impetus and motivation for potential researchers to broaden the scope of sociolinguistic studies in Turkish. However, it has

to be remembered that in-depth analyses of particles seem to require a limit on the number.

4- To choose more specific conversational tasks such as agreement, disagreement, troubles-in-talk etc., in order to characterise the interactional strategies that speakers are engaged in seems to be a point future analysts might pay attention to. It should be noted that a specific focus on these sorts of tasks requires the collection of more specific data. Therefore, it might help to know in advance what sort of conversational tasks to focus on and then deal with them directly.

5- Paralinguistic features, body movements, direction of gaze, humour and sarcasm have not been a part of the analyses.

As far as the present study is concerned, regardless of its relative shortcomings, open-ended readings and tentative results, it is hoped that future researchers are to view it as a stepping stone in order to further improve their perspective and eventually accomplish better results.

CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS OF YANİ

4.1 Introduction

Based on the inspection of a relatively large body of natural conversational data, this chapter reports the findings on the role and functions accomplished by the particle *yani*. Similar to the findings of Özbek (1995) and Yılmaz (1994), *yani*, according to the results of the data analysis, is the most frequently occurring discourse particle in conversational Turkish, more than any other particle recorded in the data. In one of the few studies on the particle *yani*, Ilgın and Büyükkantarcıoğlu (1994) state that regardless of educational and social background, almost all the Turkish speakers very often make use of this particle. As will be revealed below, it is through the placement of *yani* within turns and TCUs which are themselves always located within larger sequential and activity contexts that it is possible to assign various roles and functions to it (Ilgın and Büyükkantarcıoğlu, 1993; İşsever, 1995). It is because the meanings of particles are particularised by reference to the specific context of their use in which they are recurrently deployed (Wierzbicka, 1976; Östman, 1981; Schiffrin, 1987; Özbek (1995); Trillo, 1997; Archakis, 2001; Aijmer, 2002; Smith and Jucker, 2002). In our attempt to analyse and explicate what *yani* is observed to be doing, we will focus on the various organising principles of conversation (Levinson, 1993), which provide the context; and it is against the background of each context that the roles and functions of *yani* will be described. In this connection, the following analysis will reveal how the same particle *yani* can be discriminated into many different kinds with different significances on the basis of their occurrence in various contexts. We will also observe throughout, by means of the detailed analysis of individual segments of talk, how important the role of simultaneous placement in

different contexts can be in the assignment of multiple functions to the same particle. Statistically, *yani* occurred 1032 times in total in all the twelve conversations. When we further analyse its occurrence with regards to their direction of placement, we find that 503 occurrences are utterance-initial, 229 are utterance-medial and 300 are utterance-final. One distinction we have to make here is when *yani* occurs at the outset of a linguistic unit. Out of 503 utterance-initial occurrences, 129 of those are turn-initial ones where the particles starts the turn as the very first linguistic element used. The table (4.4) below illustrates the place of occurrence of *yani* in tabular form with respective percentages.

Table 4.4: Basic statistical Information About *Yani* According to its Place of Occurrence.

DisP	Initial	%	Medial	%	Final	%	Total
Yani	503	**49**	229	**22**	300	**29**	1032

With the existence of such particles as *yani* and *şey* both with relatively high percentages of occurrence together with about sixty other particles employed by speakers in everyday conversational discourse (Ilgın and Büyükkantarcıoğlu, 1994; Özbek, 1995), Turkish seems to be one of those languages in which Östman (1981: 82) claims, "[i]t is almost impossible to say an utterance without using them". Table (4.5) below outlines the Domains and the different functions of *yani* within them, which will also be the order of the analysis.

Table 4.5: Functions of *Yani* Found in Three Domains of Conversation.

Conversational Structure Domain	**Interpersonal Domain**	**Content Domain**
*Turn Initiation (Turn-Entry Device) *Turn Completion (Turn-Exit Device) *Floor-Holder *Repair Organisation *TCU-Initial Self-Repair *TCU-Medial (Built-in) Self-Repair *Response to a Question	*Speaker's Emphasis *Emotional Effect *Response Particle	**Frame Function** *Topic Expansion *Topic Expansion at Local Level *Topic Expansion at Conversational Level *Summary/ Assessment/Recapitulation

4.1.1 The Position of *Yani* in Utterances

We will now look at all the possible positions of *yani* in utterances. Before commencing this description, we will make an attempt to establish and have an insight into the various locations and typical features (such as phonological) of *yani* within turns and TCUs. *Yani* basically occurs in all three possible positions in turns and TCUs, which are turn and TCU-initial, final and medial (parenthetical use) positions. The following illustration of samples of some segments of talk demonstrate the possible structural positions in which *yani* recurrently occurs. In the conversational extract in example (1), participants talk about the trade capacity and its whereabouts of two business and shopping centers, and make a comparison between them with a particular focus on one of them.

Example-1

```
  1 A: Kapitoldeki çok büyük evet  işte esas //merkez şey
  2    Maslak
  3 C:                                     //öbürü
  4    Maslaktakinden    büyükmü
  5 A: değil
→6 H: yani? büyük değil ama yinede güzel
  7 A: ama çok yakındır bence
  8 H: = çok çeşit var
  9 A: evet
     (2.5)
  10 A: Akmerkezdeki mağazaların çoğu iş yapıyo zaten (1)
  11    çatır çatır mal satıyolar
  12 C: = Avrupada bir numara seçilmiş Akmerkez
     (1)
→13 H: yani? seçilsin artık
  14 M: = ben görmedim daha hiç orayı
.........................................................
  1 A: the one in the Kapitol is quite big işte the main
  2    //center is   şey in Maslak
  3 C:                //is the other one bigger than
  4    Maslak
  5 A: no it isn't
→6 H: yani? it is not bigger but it is as nice
```

```
 7 A: but it should be quite close to it
 8 H: = a great variety of items available
 9 A: yes
      (2.5)
10 A: most of the shops in Akmerkez do quite good
11    Business (1) they sell very well
12 C: = Akmerkez was already chosen as the number one
13     shopping centre in Europe
→14 H: yani? very well does it deserve that choice
15 M: I have never been there yet
```

In the first conversational extract above in example one, we observe *yani* in turn-initial position in two different turns by the same speaker (lines 6 and 14). The data analysis reveals that *yani* can sometimes be the very first linguistic element to be produced by the current speaker in his/her attempt to initiate the turn. The fact that *yani* is turn-initial is also equivalent to saying it is TCU-initial since it prefaces the very first TCU of the newly-initiated turn. As far as intonation is concerned, *yani* in turn-initial position is uttered with a rise. Given the direct motivation of the turn-taking system on the prosodic and syntactic signalling of turn initiations and completions, the use of rise-intoned *yani* in this position is justified (see Levinson, 1983).

One of the most noticeable features of *yani* in this position is that it constitutes the first linguistic element produced, which may bring to mind the question 'why is it turn-initial'? The most straightforward response to it would be to propose that it is responding to something, or following an idea or is a follow-up of what is immediately preceding. The detailed analysis will illustrate what it is that *yani* is doing in its specific slot. Secondly, we have another sample where *yani* presents itself in a different sequential environment.

In example (2) below, speaker M, a university lecturer, expresses his dissatisfaction and criticism of the final year ELT students's failure to grasp how to prepare their assessments of the School Practice.

Example-2

```
 1 M: çok az = eleştiri hiç yok zaten (1)  tahtaya kaldırdı =
 2   bilmem şunu yazdırdı (2.5)  yani bunlara dedimki siz mezun
 3   olduktan sonra buna bakacaksınız  Yıldırım lisesindeki
 4   heyecanlarınızı hatırlayacaksınız = nasıl dersi = ayaklarının
→5   titrediğini yaz icabında bilmemne falan =hiç anlamamışlar yani.
     (3)
 6 D: ne yapsam acaba = alsammı [devam ediyor]
```
....
```
 1 M: not enough = there is no criticism at all (1) we were called
 2   to the blackboard = asked to write something (2.5)  yani I
 3   told them at the very beginning that it will be a memorabilia
 4   for you after your graduation  you'll remember your excitement
 5   at Yıldırım high school = how the lesson = even write down how
 6   you were shaking because of excitement and everything = it
→ 7  seems they did   not understand  at all yani.
     (3)
 8 D:  I wonder what I should do = should I take them [continues]
```

What this second conversational fragment illustrates is another, quite the opposite placement of *yani* compared to the one we have just seen above. The turn-final placement of *yani* literally constitutes the very final word produced by the current speaker in that turn (line 5). When we look at the intonation of *yani* in this position, we see, as with the turn-initial one, a close association with conventional turn completion prosody where *yani* is produced with falling intonation. As the second example above demonstrates, what immediately follows *yani* is a potential TRP. And as is the case in most of the occurrences of *yani* projecting a TRP, the rules that govern the transition of speakers come into play and speaker transition takes place by the 'self-selection' rule. The placement of *yani* in turn-final position is just one part of the picture, which is, as Ruhi (1994) refers to, 'a single component of discourse structure'. This occurrence of *yani* in this position is the post-predicate position, which is related to pragmatics. In this connection, Ruhi (1994 and 1994a) points at the 'interpersonal' discourse functions, fulfilled by elements found in this slot including discourse particles, through which 'different voices are introduced into the

discourse world'. Ruhi (1994) further states that one aspect of the pragmatic function of the slot is the general function of processing cues.

The same segment in example (2) above contains an example of the other sequential placement of *yani* recurrently found in the data. This TCU-initial *yani* is employed within the boundaries of a turn already under construction (line 2). As is clear by its occurrence above, *yani* prefaces a seemingly new TCU of the same turn, but indeed this could also be looked at as a new turn, which subsequently follows from the prior turn by the same speaker after a relatively long pause. What example (2) illustrates is that a continuation-turn is initiated and this is signalled by *yani*. While this is one of the ways of occurrence, as the data reveals, *yani* can also preface a TCU with no gap or pause after the previous one. This particular occurrence of *yani* is that of a particle which properly fits the commonly accepted description of particles (Schiffrin, 1987 and Levinson, 1983) that they function as a 'connection' between the current and previous TCUs. Regarding the intonation of *yani* in this position, we notice a similar feature to the turn-initial one, that of a rise. This similarity might be to do with the fact that they both signal continuation of some sort. Therefore, conforming to the generalisation that 'rise in pitch signals incompletion' (Cruttenden, 1986), TCU-initial occurrences of *yani* are produced with a rise in intonation.

Example-3
```
 1 M: işte bende gidip bi İnciye hayırlı olsun demeye gittim
 2    (1)  birazda bilgi alayım
 3 D: mhm (1) hocam sizde yani emekli olduktan sonra rahat rahat bu
→4    tür işler yapabilirsiniz (1)  yani şimdiden aslında
 5    sondaj mondaj
.................................................................
 1 M: and I went up there to wish İnci good luck for the new
 2    language school (1)  I also wanted to get some information
→3 D: mhm (1) sir you can yani after you retire easily find these
 4    sorts of teaching jobs (1)  yani you can even make some
 5    contacts now
```

We have now come to the last type of occurrence of *yani* found in the data. The typical feature of *yani* in this position is its built-in occurrence (parenthetical use). That is, speakers, as illustrated in example (3) above, tend to use *yani* in an attempt to insert some sort of extra or last moment information during the course of their already-under-construction TCU. The TCU that *yani* is inserted in could be in any position within the turn; it could be a turn-initial, turn-final as well as turn-medial TCU. Intonationally, *yani* here once again demonstrates very similar features to those of turn and TCU-initial uses for the same reason just explained above.

To sum up, we have seen that there are basically three different sequential positions in which *yani* is found in the Turkish conversational data analysed. Each placement of the particle, as expected, comes with its own structural and prosodic features. It is thus these features combined with their occurrence within the larger contexts (the three organising domains of conversation), as will be illustrated in the analysis below, that characterise the different functions of the same particle.

In the present study, a classification has been proposed (see Framework of Analysis, 3.2 and Table 4.5 above) of their different meanings on the Conversational Structure, Content and Interpersonal Domains. The DisPs are claimed to be multifunctional since they can be functional within all the domains available. In the remainder of the present chapter, there will be illustrations of the various functions of *yani* found to occur in the domains where they are operative, which provide the contexts where a more detailed investigation of their actual usage will be undertaken.

The description of the particle *yani* has been organised into three main Domains, which provide the context in which each occurrence of *yani* is assigned a different role and function. The following analysis will account for the description of each function of *yani* within the relevant domains. The structural placement of *yani* in all the possible three positions, it has turned out, is valid for all the domains in question. So, the description of the role of the particle will be explicated according to its function within the relevant domain. The same text fragments will sometimes be referred to for different aspects of the description throughout the analysis. Each

function within each domain will be illustrated with various representative examples. The functions of *yani* within the Conversational Structure Domain will be the first one to look at since some of the most recurrent occurrences of *yani* are found within this one.

4.2 Conversational Structure Domain
4.2.1 Introduction

The data analyses have revealed that some of the functions of *yani* are clearly characterised in relation to the role they play in organising the constructional development of talk in terms of 'turn-taking' system (Sacks et al., 1974). The contribution of particles to turn-taking has been notified by various researchers. Levinson (1983: 365) observes that "there are many particles in languages that seem to function only explicable in relation to the turn-taking system".

In her book-length study, Östman claims that *you know* definitely has a turn-taking function. Similarly, in her comprehensive study of discourse particles in English, Schiffrin (1987) draws the reader's attention at some stage to the turn transition and turn exchange aspects of some markers. In a recent article Trillo (1997: 4) emphasises the discourse organising function of particles, pointing out "in the flow of conversation, there are markers which serve to organise the turn-taking system".

Yani indeed acts in certain conversational environments in Turkish conversation just like Trillo (ibid.) describes above where it performs various structural roles within 'turn-taking' organisation in the Conversational Structure Domain. According to the results of the data analysis, some of the placements of *yani* within turns and TCUs have certain structural roles within the Conversational Structure Domain. For instance, when the turn-initial placements of *yani* where it prefaces the first TCU of a new turn and is produced with a rise in intonation, it basically functions to signal turn transition in which the producer of *yani* claims possession of the new speaking turn by directly initiating it with *yani* (Example-1).

It has also been clear throughout the data that the TCU-final employment of *yani* with falling intonation projects the end of a turn of the current turn-holder, thus similarly projecting a potential TRP (Example-2). Closely related to the use of *yani* marking topic development that we have seen at the outset of the analysis is the TCU-initial use of *yani* whereby it marks holding of the floor by its producer, maintaining the turn and signalling the continuation of speakership (Example-1).

Before we move on to the analysis of further examples, one point needs clarification. The functions attributed to the various placements of *yani* within the system of turn-taking are not the only ones. In other words, each placement of the particle is multi-functional. For instance, turn-initial occurrence (Example-1) is closely related to topic continuation and possibly its expansion whereas turn-final (Example-2) placement is highly likely to mark the summary assessment of its producer. Similarly, TCU-initial occurrence within an ongoing turn has the potential to index that the current speaker is not yet ready give up the floor and has more to say (Example-3). In his analysis of 'you know', Östman (1981) states, there is no sense to draw up a discrete line between these kind of simultaneous functions, "they (the two functions) blend into each other, but they can be simultaneously operative within one and the same occurrence" (p.24-25).

While our focus is on the role and functions of *yani* within the organisation of turn-taking in the Conversational Structure Domain, the accompanying simultaneous function will also be mentioned. In the following, we illustrate the detailed analysis of each of the functions briefly mentioned above.

4.2.2 Turn Initiation (Turn-Entry Device)

As was noted above, it is mainly the occurrence of *yani* in turn-initial environments where it conventionally signals that the producer of *yani* is the new holder of the current turn. The data analysis confirms that the turn transition, which is signalled and indeed initiated by yani mainly, takes place by the 'self-selection' rule of the 'turn-taking' system.

The participants in the example below, who are all Ph.D. students studying linguistics, are engaged in a relaxed and informal discussion about 'relevance theory'. In the initial part of this segment, there are 'so-called' accusations by speaker I about the advocates of 'relevance theory', calling them 'Chomskyans'.

Example-4

```
 1 I: işte bunlar Chomskyci aslında (1) ve hiç bi zamanda kalkıp
 2    real data uygulayamaz çünkü uygulanamaz
 3 E: evet
 4 I: bu olay bu kadar basit yani (1)// ama
→5 M:                          // YANİ bana çok yanlış gelmiyo
 6    onların şey yaptıkları da = eksik gibi // görünüyo
 7 I:                                        // yok doğru gibi
 8    görünüyo = eksik eksik
 9 E: evet
→10 M: YANİ cognitive context in içine neler giriyo social contex i
 11    koymuyolar galiba
.............................................................
 1 I: işte they are Chomskian (1) and they can never use real
 2    data because it cannot be used
 3 E: right
 4 I: this is as simple as that yani (1)// but
→5 M:                          // YANİ what they do doesn't
 6    seem wrong to me = it just look // insufficient
 7 I:                                 //no it looks right = it's
 8    insufficient insufficient
 10 E: right
→11 M: YANİ what does cognitive context include I don't think they
 12    put social context in it
```

The two TCU-initial uses of *yani* by the same speaker above (lines 5 and 10) demonstrate that during the process of turn transition, it is through self-selection that speaker M, by prefacing her turn by *yani*, claims and initiates her new speaking turn. By the same token, the kind of turns *yani* initiates are fundamentally opinion/assessment turns in which the stance of the speaker towards the incipient piece of information is marked off.

In the first instance (line 5), for example, there is a case where turn transition takes place at the end of the overlapping turns of speaker I and M (lines 4 and 5). The turn-final *yani* of speaker I's turn (line 4) together with the falling intonation make it clear that the TCU is complete at this point. The overlap basically occurs on the one-second pause of speaker I and the *yani* of speaker M (lines 4 and 5). After his initial projection of TRP by *yani* at the end of his turn, speaker I makes another move to continue after what turns out to be a one second pause. However, speaker M also starts to speak at this point thus resulting in an overlap. In line with requirements of the 'turn-taking' system, speaker I stops and speaker M continues. What is important here is that in her orientation to the upcoming TRP, speaker M prefaces and initiates her turn by *yani* and becomes the next speaker (line 5). And the effect of *yani* here is to signal its producer's orientation to the incipient turn transition and help her to make a signalled entry to the turn. One point that needs to be mentioned is the intonation used on *yani* by speaker M. In this specific case where speakers I and M compete for a speaking turn when their contributions overlap, speaker M indexes her claim for the floor by an emphatic intonation of the particle *yani* (line 5). This emphasis on her effort to claim the next speaking turn pays off when speaker I stops, while speaker M continues.

Another aspect of *yani*'s structural role in turn-initial position within this system as the segment below reveals is, to use Sacks and et al.'s terminology, 'turn-entry' device at a potential TRP.

The five participants are engaged in the comparison of shopping and business centres in İstanbul, with each of the participants presenting their own informational contributions in turn.

Example-5

```
 1 A: Kapitoldeki çok büyük evet...işte esas // merkez şey Maslak
 2 C:                                         //öbürü Maslaktakinden
 3    büyükmü
 4 A: değil
→5 H: yani büyük değil ama yine de güzel
 6 A: ama çok yakındır bence
```

77

```
 7 H: = çok çeşit var
 8 A: evet
        (2.5)
 9 A: Akmerkezdeki mağazaların çoğu iş yapıyo zaten (1) çatır çatır
10     mal satıyolar
11 C: = Avrupada bir numara seçilmiş Akmerkez
        (1)
→12-H: yani seçilsin artık
13-M: = ben görmedim daha hiç orayı
.............................................................
  1 A: the in the Kapitol is quite big...işte the main// center
  2    is şey in Maslak
  3 C:                                        // is the
  4    other one  bigger   than Maslak
  5 A: no it isn't
→ 6 H: yani it may not be bigger but it is as nice (as the big one)
  7 A: but it should be quite close to it
  8 H: = a great variety of items available
  9 A: yes
       (2.5)
 10 A: most of the shops in Akmerkez do quite good business (1)
 11    they very well
 12 C: = Akmerkez was already chosen as the number one
 13    shopping centre in Europe
       (1)
→14-H: yani very well does it deserve that choice
 15-M: I have never been there yet
```

When the current speaker has hearably reached a TRP, potential (next) speakers may enter the conversation by prefacing their turn by *yani*. Speaker C's overlapping inquiry above (line 2) is immediately responded to by speaker A by a response token (line 4). Speaker A does not continue after this token and subsequently through self-selection, speaker H makes her entry into the conversation by prefacing her turn by *yani* (line 5). The occurrence of *yani* in this sequential location sufficiently establishes speaker H's speakership until she completes her informational contribution. Basically acting as a 'turn-entry' device, *yani* successfully accomplishes the signalling of turn transition.

Similarly, later in the sequence (line 12), the transition of a turn at a potential TRP is successfully indexed and initiated by *yani*. Speaker C's minimal TCU in length in line 11 is not immediately followed by any participant at this potential TRP, but what turns out to be a one-second pause. Without allowing this pause, which lasts only one second, to turn into a lapse or a gap (the gap here refers to silence after a possible completion point and the lapse refers to periods of extended silence), speaker H self-selects at this TRP and prefaces her new turn by *yani* (line 12). Being the very first element in speaker H's turn and signalling the upcoming transition of turn, *yani* once again is employed as a device, which indexes a successful entry to the ongoing conversation.

There is one point that needs explaining concerning the examples (examples 5 and 6) above. Close attention to the sequential development makes it clear that what is as valid as the turn-entry function of *yani* in turn-initial positions above is its function to mark a dispreferred assessment. For example, in example (5), in her *yani*-prefaced turn, speaker M partially disagrees with what the previous speaker says subsequently offering her own assessment ' ***yani** bana çok yanlış gelmiyo onların şey yaptıkları da eksik gibi görünüyo*'. Similarly, the *yani*-prefaced turn in example 6 '***yani** büyük değil ama yine de güzel*' is designed in response to the previous speaker's assessment. Speaker H in line 5 accepts the fact that there is a difference in size between the two business centres, but she also emphasises that the one she refers to is nothing short in terms of physical attraction.

We have seen above that in environments where it prefaces a turn, *yani* has a role to play within the 'turn-taking' organisation. The role of *yani* being the very first lexical item to be produced by the speaker is to signal that its producer is to claim the next turn slot. The role that *yani* fulfils here can also be interpreted as a signal that its producer has recognised the completion of the previous speaker's turn and the potential TRP, and subsequently self-selecting as the next speaker. What has also been evidenced as a simultaneous function is to mark the dispreferredness of the turn/TCU it prefaces. The following function is also related to initiation of a turn, but this time marking a speaker's response to a question.

4.2.3 Prefacing Response to a Question

In this particular function, the particle *yani* prefaces a speaker's response to a question asked by one of the participants to the conversation. The point that has to be mentioned here is that regardless of whether the question is directed to a particular speaker (example 8) or one of the participants self-select to provide response to the question (example 7), we still see the particle yani prefacing and marking the current speaker's response to the question. In other words, it is possible to propose that *yani* in this usage functions to signal its producer's continuation in terms of topic expansion based on what has just gone before, thus connecting the two pieces of conversation.

Here in this example, the topic of the talk is about a common friend's regret of having been involved in the administration of Turkish Society at the foreign university where all the participants are students.

Example-6

```
 1 B: gidiyomusunuz toplantılara falan
 2 E: gitmiyoruz
      (2)
 3 E: yani Nilüfer şimdi pişman yani m bütün bu societylerle
 4    ilgilendiğine ettiğine
 5 B: geçen sene içinmi
 6 E: tabi
 7 B: niye
→8 D: yani bütün çalışmalarını etkiledi şudur budur
 9 E: iki haftada bi toplantı oluyodu  yemekler yapıldı  sonra
10    kızcağız hasta falan oldu
.................................................................
 1 B: are you attending the meetings
 2 E: no we aren't
      (2)
 3 E: yani Nilüfer is now regretful yani m having been involved all
 4    this society stuff
 5 B: is she regretful about last year
 6 E: of course
 7 B: why
→8 D: yani all this society work badly affected all her studies and
```

80

```
 9    stuff
10 E: there was a meeting every two weeks   we have also had a
11    society buffet    meanwhile she got sick
```

Speaker B's question (line 1) set the stage for speakers E and D to explain that Nilüfer's, (who was the ex-president of the Society and who is not one of the participants) involvement in the Society's administration caused her to lag behind her studies and affected her social life as well (line 3). Knowing that the person in question has been involved in the Society before in different administrative positions, speaker B wants to make sure if her regret is about 'the last year' when she was the president (line 5). Receiving an affirmative response to his question (line 6), speaker B further enquires about its possible reasons (line 7). Although it was speaker E who supplied the affirmative answer in the previous turn (line 6), this time it is speaker D, who provides the response to speaker B's question (line 8). In her attempt to respond to the question, speaker D prefaces her turn with the particle *yani*, where she supplies the reason for Nilüfer's regret for involvement. It is clear here that speaker D self-selects as the next speaker after speaker B's question and indexes her response to the question by the particle *yani*. We see here that speaker D continues to move the discourse and responds to a question, not directly put to her, by self-selecting, and prefaces her response by the particle *yani*.

The extract below is about an electronic device, which is owned by speaker E, who has realized that, two other people to whom speaker E calls elder brother also own the same device.

Example-7

```
 1 E:= bir sene oluyor (1) mm buradan aynısını Yunus abi ve Halil
 2    abi almışlar  aynısını  iki sene önce almışlar  benden bir
 3    sene önce yani
 4 C: Yunus la Halil e abi mi diyosun
→5 E: yani mm Yunus abi ona Yunus abi diyorum da
 6 C: bundan sonra bana da
.........................................................................
 1 E:=it has been a year (1) mm Yunus abi and Halil abi have bought
 2    the same one here  they bought it two years ago  one year
 3    before I bought mine yani
```

81

```
 4 C: do you call Yunus and Halil abi
→5 E: yani mm Yunus abi I call him Yunus abi but
 6 C: from now on you should call me
```

Speaker E expresses his surprise (lines 1 through 3) to find about that the electronic device he owns is also owned by two other people. Speaker C seems to be surprised to find out (line 4) that speaker E refers to those two persons as '*abi*' and inquiries why he calls them '*abi*'. Speaker C's inquiry is directed to speaker E, who supplies a reply by prefacing it by a *yani*-initiated TCU. Different from the previous example above in which the speaker D replies a question through a *yani*-prefaced TCU by self-selecting, in this example speaker E prefaces his response by *yani* again in response to a question put directly to him. The function of *yani* we have seen clearly indexes continuation, however, the following function will look at below is somewhat opposite of what we have seen above.

4.2.4 Turn Completion (Turn-Exit Device)

The ends of conversational turns are also frequently marked by particles (Biq, 1990). In final position the presence of a particle can be interpreted as what Sacks et al. (1974) call a 'transition relevant place' since it usually marks the end of a syntactic unit. Ruhi (1994) also states that post-predicate position is a place for marking discontinuity. However, the other interlocutors may or may not be free to take this opportunity to take over the floor. This is normal since the particle does not necessarily signal a desire or intention to yield the floor.

As smooth negotiation of turns is cohesive in conversations, turn-final particles are also cohesive in two ways: They relate the turn being completed to the previous talk by indicating that it is finished. They also link the turn being finished to the subsequent talk by indicating that the next turn may begin. According to the results of data analysis, *yani* with its capacity at the turn and TCU-final positions has a signal job to mark the decisive completion of its user's turn to which it is appended since, as Schegloff (1996: 95) states that "beginning a turn with the beginning of a TCU is occasioned by the recognizable ending of a prior TCU/turn by another".

With its provision as a resource for signalling the end of turns and thus the beginning of new ones by other incipient speakers, TCU/turn-final *yani* represents a structural property of conversational discourse with relatively high occurrence and also represents a crucially important structural pattern for the transition of turns in the organisation of 'turn-taking' in the Conversational Structure Domain of conversational discourse.

In example (8) below, analysed as example (2) earlier, speaker M, a university lecturer, expresses his dissatisfaction and criticism of the final year ELT students's failure to grasp how to prepare their assessments of the School Practice.

Example-8

```
  1 M: çok az = eleştiri hiç yok zaten (1)tahtaya kaldırdı = bilmem
  2   şunu yazdırdı (2.5) yani bunlara dedimki siz mezun
  3   olduktan sonra buna bakacaksınız  Yıldırım
  4   lisesindeki heyecanlarınızı hatırlayacaksınız = nasıl dersi
  5   = ayaklarının titrediğini yaz icabında bilmemne falan =
→6   hiç anlamamışlar yani.
       (3)
  7 D: ne yapsam acaba = alsammı [devam ediyor]
.......................................................................
  1 M: not enough = there is no criticism at all (1) we were called
  2   to the blackboard = asked to write something (2.5)  yani I
  3   told them at the very beginning that it will be a
  4   memorabilia for you after your graduation  you'll remember
  5   your excitement at Yıldırım high school = how the lesson =
  6   even write down how you were shaking because of excitement
→7   and everything = it seems they did not understand at all yani.
       (3)
  8 D:  I wonder what I should do = should I take them [continues]
```

In terms of the place of occurrence, turn-final *yani* in marking its producer's exit from his/her speaking turn is exactly the opposite of its 'turn-entry' function, which we have observed above. This is the TCU and turn-final occurrences projecting the end of the turn as a 'turn-exit' device (Example 9). Basically, *yani* produced with a falling intonation constitutes the last linguistic unit of either the only or the last

utterance of the turn in which the current speaker uses it. The effect of *yani* in this sort of environment is to indicate that the current speaker is ready to relinquish the turn, which is mostly of conclusive assessment. Schegloff (1996) describes the occurrence of elements following the possible completion of a TCU or a turn 'post-position stance markers'. He states (ibid.: p.121), however, that post-position stance marking is not grammaticalised in English "In languages such as Korean, Japanese, and some other languages of China, grammaticalised resources such as particles are used to similar ends".

This point is also confirmed by Takahara (1998), who proposes the same function for some Japanese turn-final particles, which mark the end of speaker's turn with 'an emotional effect' (see section on Interpersonal Domain for emotional effect). Turkish is typologically in the same category as those languages Schegloff mentions in his quotation above. Occupying the same space as described above, *yani* is clearly one of those elements by means of which TCUs, and the turns they occupy are brought to closure with such endings.

In the fragment that we have below, we observe that two of the three participants of the conversation try their best to describe a particular German student to speaker G. Example-9

```
 1 G: adı ne işte = adını biliyomusunuz
 2 M: adını bilmiyorumda hep böyle şakalar yapar bişeyler yapar
→3 E: hiç Alman gibi değil yani.
 4 M: mhm evet evet = öyle soğuk değil yani = böyle İtalyan gibi
 5    lan herif duruyo  yolda görsün bi atlar bi konuşmaya
→6    başladımı zaten tamam [gülüyor] kitliyo herif yani.
    (2)
 7 E: bitirelimmi yavaş yavaş çocuklar
.........................................................................
 1 G: what's his name işte
 2 M: I don't know his name but he always makes jokes and stuff
→3 E: he is not like a stereotypical German yani.
 4 M: mhm yes yes = he does not shy away from people = he is
 5    more like an Italian  when he sees you in the street he
 6    comes to you and promptly starts talking [laugh] it's
```

```
→7    like he takes you as a prisoner yani.
      (2)
 8 E: shall we wrap it up now guys
```

After speaker G's basic inquiry (line 1) for the name of this particular person speaker M is clearly unable to provide the name; instead he describes his behaviour, which is anecdotal (line 2). Subsequently, speaker E proffers his assessment in the form of recapitulation marked by utterance-final falling-intoned *yani* (line 3). Given that a 'fall in pitch in a TCU signals its upcoming completion' (Lewis, 1967), the production of *yani* in this particular environment indicates that the current speaker is about to give up the turn. In other words, the turn-final occurrence of *yani* in line 3 above, which clearly constitutes the last linguistic element in the current turn, marks off the completion of the turn thus projecting an upcoming TRP, and speaker M only self-selects at this TRP.

The completion of speaker E's summary assessment about the German student is clearly marked by *yani*. The conclusive assessment about the student in question, which is apparently contrary to stereotypical expectations is immediately followed by speaker M' turn, who initially clearly sees eye to eye with speaker E on his summary assessment with '*mhm evet evet* (line 4). Moreover, speaker M proposes his own stereotypical descriptive frame within which he tries to fit the German student due to his relative behavioural difference (lines 4 through 6). He further claims he is more like 'an Italian', whose elaboration he provides subsequently with '*yolda görsün bi atlar bi konuşmaya başladımı zaten tamam*'. Speaker M himself laughs at this relatively 'funny' anecdote and then proceeds to produce a summary based on his immediately preceding descriptions. This summary is, once again, marked out by the turn-final occurrence of *yani* (line 6). As was mentioned above previously, *yani*, which is placed at the end of a summary assessment and uttered with a falling intonation, additionally projects and signals the termination of its producer's current turn. Eventually, another participant, speaker E takes over the turn by self-selection after two-seconds pause and then proceeds (line 7).

As the above example has clearly demonstrated, the falling-intoned occurrence of *yani* in the utterance-final position to a large extent contributes to turn-transition in terms of projecting the upcoming TRP. In conversational Turkish, speakers tend to signal by means of *yani* that they are ready and about to stop to relinquish the turn of conclusive assessments.

It is relevant to observe here that there is indeed an additional aspect, which strengthens the signalling effect of the projected turn-transition: That is the utterance-final placements of *yani*, which marks the current speaker's summary assessment. In the majority of the cases in which *yani* serves for the effect of signalling summary, it simultaneously functions as a 'turn-exit' device to mark out the completion of the turn and a potential turn transition. What we have in the following is the last identified function of *yani* within 'turn-taking' system of the Conversational Structure Domain.

4.2.5 Floor-Holder

Closely related to the use of *yani* marking expansion that we have seen at the outset of the analysis is the use of *yani* (this time within the same organisation of turn-taking of the Conversational Structure Domain) to hold the floor, maintain the turn and signal continuation of speakership. As has been clear throughout the data, the particle *yani* is used TCU-initally where they hold onto their turn indicating that they have more to say. Prefacing turns by *yani* signals some additional TCU(s).

In the extract below, speaker M expresses first his complaint of high school English teachers' dominance in private language tuition and then his sadness about not being regarded deservedly by the public.

Example-10

→1 M: onlar başladı = onlar piyasayı kapmışlar zaten = **yani** bizim

  2   aslında adımızdan başka hiçbişeyimiz yok o yönden

  3 D: mhm

→4 M: **yani** ne esnafın umrundayız ne velilerin umrundayız *yani* (0.5)

  5   onlar lise öğretmenleriyle Anadolu lisesi öğretmenleriyle

  6   piyasayı paylaşmışlar [*devam ediyor*]

```
.......................................................................
  1 M: they started first = the market is under their control anyway
→2    = yani all we have left is nothing but our titles
  3 D: mhm
→4 M: yani we have lost our self-esteem in the eyes of the public
  5    yani high school and Anadolu high school teachers share
  6    the market among themselves [continues]
```

In our case here, while *yani* marks the connection of idea units through 'expansion', its occurrence simultaneously operates on the turn-taking level where it marks speaker M's attempt to hold his/her turn and continue to maintain his/her status of speakership rather than allowing transition of turns to take place (line 1). It is worth drawing attention to the fact that *yani* as a 'continuation-marker' or 'floor-holder' within the Conversational Structure Domain, simultaneously operates with its 'expansion marking'. Similarly, after the confirmative continuation token of 'mhm' by speaker D, speaker M continues his speakership marking it by *yani* (line 4). Where 'same-turn, same-speaker' or 'different-turn, different-speaker' expansion is marked off by its utterance-initial occurrence, the same particle *yani* (line 4) (the first one only since the second is TCU-final with a different function) simultaneously performs the function of signalling the progress of speakership on the 'turn-taking' aspect of conversation within the Conversational Structure Domain. Once again, when a speaker uses *yani* in one of these situations, the signalling effect of the particle is that s/he is willing to hold the floor and continue to be an active speaking party for some more time.

In the extended fragment below, there is initially a critical comparison of social science and laboratory-based science studies. All the four participants complain about the fact that they have to rely on and work with human beings whereas they claim their friends, who study Biology and Physics, simply deal with living organisms and carry out various experiments, which supposedly do not create a lot of complications.

Example-11
```
  1 D: bizim biyolojidekiler bilmemendekiler
  2    laboratuara giriyorlar=işte bakteri geliştiriyorlar =
```

```
      3   bilmem bişeyler //yapıyolar = kontamine  olabiliyor ama
      4 E:                  //gerçi bakterilere kızıyolar ama
→  5 D: = mm yani bi şekilde onunla uğraşıyolar = onun çok
      6    bi fonksiyonu olmuyo
      7 I: evet
→  8 D: ama burda insan = yani ne yapacağını hiç kestiremiyorsun
      9    hiç bilemiyorsun
     10 I: biz şimdi geldik plan yaptık = [devam ediyor]...intermetiate
     11    grubu oluşur = oluşturur  tamam gayet net  mantıklıda dimi
     12 D: evet
     13 E: evet
→14 I: yani çünkü şey alıyosun üçün kötüsünü alıyosun ikinin
     15    iyisini alıyosun   [devam ediyor]
.........................................................................
   1 D: our friends in the biology department basically work in
   2    the labs = işte they grow bacteria = they do these kind
   3    of //things = they   may be contaminated anyway
   4 E:   //in fact they get angry at the bacteria
→5 D: = mm yani they mainly deal with the bacteria = that's all
   6    they do
   7 I: yeah
→8 D: but we have human beings to deal with = yani they are so
   9    unpredictable = you are just confused
  10 I: we made some plans when we first came here  [continues]
  11    we thought we would form the intermediate group  that's
  12    quite clear  that's sensible isn't it
  13 D: yes
  14 E: yes
→15 I: yani it's because you take the worst of third years and
   16   the best of second years  [continues]
```

Speaker D initially begins to describe from her experience what her friends in
Biology department deal with in the course of their studies (lines 1 through 3).
Talking about the cons as well as the pros, speaker D's last utterance (line 3) is
overlapped by speaker E's assessment, which describes their friend's reactions when
faced with problems (line 4).   With the completion of speaker E's overlapped
assessment, speaker D subsequently attempts to continue by reclaiming the turn (line

5 and 6). The pause-filler 'mm' immediately followed by *yani*, which prefaces the upcoming utterance together enable the speaker to claim the floor. In fact, since her seemingly last TCU is overlapped with speaker E's assessment, though it is difficult to know if she would have continued or stopped there otherwise, speaker D has every right to proceed. We observe that *yani* functions doubly here and marks more generally both an attempt to continue by its producer and specifically the expansion of where she left off before the overlap. In fact, it is possible to see this *yani*-prefaced turn as an extension to her previous turn before the overlap. Speaker D's signal and attempt to carry on in turn three receives a further continuation token by speaker I with '*evet*' (line 7) subsequent to which she indeed proceeds.

Speaker D's introductory utterance in line 5 is immediately followed by further assessment prefaced by *yani*. With the hearable completion of speaker D's speaking turn followed by the creation of the first possible TRP, speaker I, who claims the turn by self-selection (lines 10 and 11), begins to move from generalisation to their (including his wife's) specific case. Having completed his description, speaker I seeks confirmation by a tag question for the plausibility of their project design (line 11). The confirmation is immediately provided with 'yes' from both speakers D and E (lines 12 and 13 respectively). With the full description of their design and receipt of confirmation, speaker I is hearably finished, which creates another occasion for a possible turn transition. We observe that it is speaker I again, who self-selects and takes over the turn, continues to hold the floor (line 14), and expands his previous point all marked by one and the same particle *yani*. Given the work accomplished at this point here, it is true to say that *yani* simultaneously contributes to its producer's entry into the turn, hold the floor after his entry and then expand the topical line of talk. In addition, we also see a possible link-up by means of *yani* with what he previously said while expansion is being marked.

Finally, *yani* with its TCU-initial and sometimes also turn-initial occurrence marks the elaboration attempt of its producer, thus simultaneously signalling the maintenance and continuation of a speaking turn. The elaboration, it has turned out, is closely involved with signalling a connection to what was previously said. All in

all, *yani* enables the speaker to hold the floor and indeed marks the fact that its producer will keep the current turn at least until the next potential TRP.

In sum, the role that *yani* plays within the 'turn-taking' organisation in the Conversational Structure Domain consists of marking turn transition, TRP projection and floor-holding. In its performance of each of these roles, *yani* significantly contributes to various aspects of the organisation of turn-taking in conversation. The final characterisation of *yani* within the Conversational Structure Domain is Repair Organisation.

4.2.6 Repair Organisation

One of the major conversational environments in which *yani* regularly occurs is in 'self-editings' in which the producer of the marker makes a brief explanation and/or clarification about a point just established before the talk progresses. Since the attempt to clarify something is initiated and eventually accomplished by the current speaker within the boundaries of his/her own speaking turn, this particular function is termed as 'self-editing' (see Levinson, 1983).

For the characterisation of *yani* within 'repair organisation', we will exploit the notion what is known as 'organisation of repair' (Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks, 1977). What is aimed at with this general description is to have an insight about the role of *yani* within this organisation and at which point throughout this process that *yani* becomes an active part. Schegloff et al. (1977:361) describe the 'organisation of repair' as a 'central conversational device' saying that "it is addressed to recurrent problems in speaking, hearing, and understanding".

The organisation of repair, they suggest, is the self-righting mechanism, which displays how a natural language handles its intrinsic troubles. Schegloff et al. (1977) note, repair is not limited to error-correction; there are many instances in which no error is made. The range of phenomena compiled under the concept of repair is wide, including word recovery problems, corrections proper (i.e. error replacements, self-editings) where no discernible 'error' occurred and much else besides.

90

Schegloff et al. (ibid.) claim, 'this system handles the repair of all these problems'. Schegloff (1979) clearly recapitulates the aim of repair as 'the quick achievement of success in dealing with a trouble-source'. Schegloff (1979:277) proceeds to state that "The effect of success is, and is displayed by, the resumption of the turn-unit as projected before the repair initiation or, if the repair operation involves reconstruction of the whole turn-unit, production of the turn-unit to completion".

Successful repair, therefore, characterises and displays the continuation of talk 'post-repair'. Schegloff et al. (1977) differentiated between repair initiation and solution in this system where a preference for self-repair and a preference for self-initiation of repair are more commonly operative. In fact, they state, as repeated by Schegloff elsewhere (1979:268) "self-initiated, same-turn repair is, by far, the most common form of repair".

As has been noted above, the broad category of repair includes self-editings where no 'replacement or correction' occurs. The following analysis will focus on how *yani* displays the editing that the current speaker engages in to clarify a point in his/her prior talk. It is to be noted at this point that topic expansion and repair of self-editing are the functions performed by *yani* in similar environments. In order to be able to distinguish them, it should be born in mind that while topic expansion is closely involved in expanding a general idea or concept into more specific; self-editing, on the other hand, mainly characterises the detailing of a specific point in the immediately prior TCU in the following one. Topic expansion mostly involves a series of sequentially relevant TCUs, whereas self-editing takes place within the two subsequent TCUs in a turn.

It is this point that the use of the particle *yani* becomes relevant for repair in Turkish conversational discourse, a point that is also confirmed by İşsever (1995). The main function of *yani* in these sort of environments is to mark the initiation of repair by the speaker of the trouble source in his/her current turn, that is, in the turn in which the trouble source occurred. The following is an example displaying such a repair.

Speakers are talking about the difficulty of finding Turkish equivalent to some of the English linguistic terms.

Example-12

```
 1 I: Coşan ise itile iletişimci diyomuş  iletişimci yöntem
 2    diyomuş  ama şey dedi yani güzel bi terim bulmuşsun = bu
 3    belkide daha iyi benimkinden falan dedi
 4 M: belki vardır canım. = burdada bi linguistik community var
→5    yani bu işlerle uğraşan bilim adamları
........................................................................
 1 I: Coşan calls it communicative = he calls it communicative
 2    method but he said şey yani you found a good term for it = he
 3    said maybe my term is better than his
 4 M: there may be one anyway = there is a linguistic community
→5    here as well yani the scientists who are involved in
 6    these specific subjects
```

Example (12) above includes an instance of the type of self-editing that is quite frequent in conversational Turkish. The *yani*-prefaced TCU is the self-editing in which a point in the prior TCU is made more specific (line 4). The point where *yani* occurs constitutes the initiation of the repair whereby the self-editing is due in the incipient TCU. The noun phrase of 'bi linguistic community' in object position is made more specific with the self-editing to 'bu işle uğraşan bilim adamları'. It is quite clear from this example that with the completion of the prior TCU, *yani* initiates self-editing, which includes a relatively long noun phrase of adverbial clause and it mainly aims to make the object in this case more specific.

We have demonstrated that there are two ways in terms of placement in which *yani* marks the initiation of repair in the current turn. One of them is TCU-initial repair and the other one is TCU-medial (built-in) repair. In the following, both types will be analysed in turn.

4.2.6.1 TCU-Initial Self-Repair

The exchange of talk, Schegloff et al. (1977: 362) claim, is "indigenously vulnerable to trouble that can arise at any time". In this sense, repair is then potentially and

systematically relevant to any turn constructional unit and the repair that is done is in syntactic environments that accommodate the trouble source. As we have mentioned above, one of these environments in Turkish conversation is the space between the completion of a prior TCU and the beginning of a new one. The following extract contains an instance of such an environment.

The topic below is the time limitations due to the workload of studies to get some exercise and speaker M's efforts to regularly attend the gym sessions.

Example-13

```
 1 E: sen bi ara bodye gidiyodun
→2 M: bir iki kere gittim  yani fazla gitmedim şeye mm fitnesa
  3    = gitmem lazım burda iyice hantallaştım böyle
.............................................................
  1 E: you were once going to body (gym)
→2 M: I have been there couple of times  yani I haven't much been
  4    şeye fitness = I have to go regularly since I have been so
  5    passively lazy
```

Yani occurs between the first and the second TCUs of speaker M's turn above and prefaces the second one thus displaying the connection between the two (line 2). This connection could be seen as one in which a particular point in the first TCU is detailed in the second one (i.e. reformulation). And in most cases, the detailed information contained in the second TCU prepares the background for the following TCU, should there be one (i.e. example 16). The role that *yani* in this environment plays is to mark off the connection in general and its initiation and the immediately incipient occurrence of this connection in the form of self-editing in specific. The second TCU that is edited mainly includes more specific detailed information about a particular point in the prior talk. The first TCU 'bir iki kere gittim' informs us of the number of times the speaker has been to the gym. Instead of moving onto another information chunk, the speaker starts to edit an earlier point by detailing it and the issue of 'visits to the gym' is edited to include some detail, which is actually an assessment 'fazla gitmedim şeye mm fitnesa'. The piece of information of assessment about the frequency of 'visits to the gym' sets the stage for the following

93

TCU in the same turn 'gitmem lazım' in which the need for more frequent visits is expressed.

What the extract above shows us is that when editing a certain point in the prior TCU is relevant in terms of the provision of details, speakers establish the connection and display it by means of *yani* (line 2). Unlike topic expansion where an idea or concept is described or paraphrased, the self-editing of a repair is concerned with the detailing (reformulation) of a previously specific point. The following is another extract where *yani* is twice involved in its producer's editing of one of his immediately prior points.

In the example below, speaker M is engaged in giving the details of a boat trip to a sunken city in the southwest coast of Turkey, in a response to a question put by speaker E in the prior turn.

Example-14

```
 1 E: nasıl dedin sen
→2 M: ya orda tanıdıklar falan var  yani Kaştaki otel sahipleri
  3    falan  onlarla tekne gezisine çıktık özel tekne gezisine
→4    şinorkelle baktık böyle abi caddeler gözüküyor (2) yani cadde
  5    dediğim böyle şehrin sokakları
..........................................................................
  1 E: how did you dive over there
→2 M: we have some acquaintances there yani some hotel owners
  3    in Kaş  we had a boat tour together a private boat tour
  4    we could see the streets with the diving equipment (2)
→5    yani what I mean by streets is the streets of the sunken city
```

Hearing speaker M's earlier claim that he himself and some others managed to dive in the site of a sunken city, an inquiry is made by speaker E about this 'illegal' act since it is a national heritage, and about who were actually involved in it. Speaker M starts to respond to this inquiry by telling about the identities of the other people with whom he managed to perform the act of diving (lines 2 through 5). Having done so in his first TCU, speaker M proceeds to initiate another TCU, which is prefaced by *yani*.

What is initiated in this second TCU is self-editing, informational modification of what has just been produced in the previous TCU. So, 'ya orda tanıdıklar falan var' in the first TCU (line 2) is modified and detailed in the following *yani*-prefaced TCU (line 3), and the general description of '*tanıdıklar falan*' (some acquaintances) is edited and modified into more specific '*otel sahipleri falan*' (some hotel owners). It is clear in this case that what *yani* does once again is to mark that the upcoming TCU is closely related to the prior one in the sense that it contains edited and modified information about the immediately preceding TCU. Once again, the act of editing on the part of the speaker leads to informational modification in the content of the second TCU in which some detailed information is supplied. Similar to the previous extract, this modified information is immediately used in the following TCU.

Subsequent to this TCU containing modified, explanatory information, speaker M proceeds to provide further details on how they travelled to the site of the sunken city (line 3), which is followed by his descriptive assessment of what they managed to see in their limited time on the site with some diving equipment (line 4). This assessment in which he provides the final result and its description of their 'adventurous trip' '*şinorkelle baktık böyle abi caddeler gözüküyor*' is hearably the concluding remark of his turn. Despite the subsequently emerging TRP after speaker M's conclusive assessment, turn transition does not take place since no one attempts to take the turn. This case actually confirms Schegloff's (1979) claim that 'though possible completion of a turn makes transition to a next turn relevant, turn-transfer may not occur at each such point'. After a two-second gap (line 4), speaker M continues to hold the floor by means of another *yani*-prefaced TCU, which contains further modification of the prior TCU. The repairable '*caddeler*' in the prior TCU of '*şinorkelle baktık böyle abi caddeler gözüküyor*' is edited and modified into '*şehrin sokakları*' in following the TCU '**yani** *cadde dediğim böyle şehrin sokakları*' (lines 4 and 5). It is obvious that '*caddeler*' is repeated in the repairable TCU, which actually is 'a common feature for same-turn repair' (see Schegloff, 1979). It is noticeable that what *yani* does is to initiate as well as signal that the upcoming constructional unit contains self-editing about a point in the prior TCU.

It has to be noted here that there is an additional element here that supports the cause of self-editing repair. That is the expression '*cadde dediğim*', which is placed between *yani* and the rest of the TCU (lines 4 and 5). While an expression like '*cadde dediğim*' inherently signals the repair of upcoming self-editing, the effect is doubled when it is accompanied by a particle like *yani*. The repair could have, to a great extent, been achieved by '*cadde dediğim*', but it is clear that the particle *yani* that has occurred before the expression is there to establish, by its signalling effect, the incipient relevance of self-editing.

4.2.6.2 TCU-Medial (Built-in) Self-Repair

We have just seen above that TCU-initial placement of *yani* constitutes a pattern for Turkish speakers whereby they signal, initiate and carry out self-editing of information. The placement of the particle in the TCU-initial position does explain that speakers provide their explanations and clarifications in a new upcoming TCU. However, it is equally commonplace for speakers in conversational Turkish to signal and indeed accomplish their informational modifications while the TCU is still in progress. Self-editing, it has turned out, is possible even while the TCU is still under construction: It should, however, be noted here that the placement of *yani* within a TCU is not random. The data analysis shows that *yani* is mostly placed right after the subject of the TCU has been established. The placement of *yani* declares the immediately prior element as the repairable since it is the starting point of editing within the TCU. As well as declaring the prior element a repairable, *yani* displays and actually initiates the self-editing. Similar to the editing when yani is TCU-initial, the editing signalled by *yani* TCU-medially, which provides some details about the repairable, serves informationally as background for the rest of the TCU. With the completion of self-editing by appending the detail intended, the rest of the TCU is produced as normal.

Data analysis demonstrates to us environments where it is noticeable that the production of a TCU, which is well underway, is promptly cut off and subsequently the particle *yani* is inserted to signal the incipient self-edited explanatory information. The following extracts will illustrate the case in question.

96

Having previously talked about private language tuition and language course, in the extract below, speaker E offers speaker M some teaching position projections after his retirement.

Example-15

```
  1 M: işte bende gidip bi İnciye hayırlı olsun demeye gittim
  2    (1) birazda bilgi alayım
→3 E: mhm (1) hocam siz de yani emekli olduktan sonra rahat rahat
  4    bu tür işler yapabilirsiniz (1)  yani şimdiden aslında
  5    sondaj mondaj
.............................................................
  1 M: and I went up there to wish İnci good luck for the new
  2    language school (1) I also wanted to get some information
→3 E: mhm (1) sir you yani after you retire can easily find
  4    these sorts of teaching jobs (1)  yani you can even make
  5    some contacts now
```

In example (15), for instance, the TCU is cut off right after the subject 'hocam sizde' (line 3) and the editing comes in the form of an adverbial complement clause. Signalled and initiated by means of *yani*, this self-edited, extra information-loaded clause comes to completion and the TCU that housed it resumes again with the rest of the elements of the unit in place. Without self-editing, the TCU would have been like this: '*hocam siz de rahat rahat bu tür işler yapabilirsiniz*'.

In the extract below, speaker E tries to explain to the other participants the general and specific difficulties that he has had in doing conversational data transcription.

Example-16

```
  1 E: FARKINA VARMIYOSUN = ben transcription ederken bile m bişeyi
→2    üç defa dinliyorum...küçücük bi utterance yani üç dört
  3    kelimeden bile oluşsa (0.5) bi dinliyorum iki dinliyorum
  4    yazıyorum = üçüncüde bi daha dinliyorum [devam ediyor]
.............................................................
  1 E: YOU ARE NOT CONSCIOUS OF IT = even when I am
  2    doing transcription  I listen to the same thing at least
→3    three times  a small utterance yani even if it consists of
  4    three or four words (0.5)  I write it down after a couple of
  5    listenings = if necessary I listen to it for a third time
```

97

The production of a noun phrase in the second TCU as the subject of his new TCU, we see that the progress of the construction of the unit is cut off at this point where *yani* is inserted (line 2). This point is the starting point of the repair and is followed by a piece of additional information appended. On close examination, this additional chunk of information turns out to be editing that mainly provides further details about the subject of the unit. So the noun phrase subject '*küçücük bi utterance*' where the size of the utterance is in question is further modified to include the details of its size '*üç dört kelimeden bile oluşsa*'. By temporary syntactic cut-off of the TCU under construction, the role of the particle *yani* here is to bracket the self-initiation of same-turn repair and mark the upcoming of immediate edited information squeezed within the TCU it is accommodated in. With the addition of brief clarification squeezed within the TCU in progress, the hearer(s) simply tend to assess the additional new information accordingly.

As the examples above have illustrated, speakers in talk sometimes make last moment clarifications and/or brief explanations concerning the immediately prior element within the same TCU. Instead of cutting the progression of the utterance and inserting the necessary information abruptly, we have seen that one of the 'central' features of conversation, repair organisation, provides a device like *yani* with the structural placement as described which, with its signalling capacity, marks upcoming self-initiated repair whereby the details of a locally specific point is provided. The functions of *yani* within the Content Domain will be the next one to look at as we find some of the most recurrent occurrences of *yani* in this Domain.

4.3 Content Domain

4.3.1 Introduction

As has been mentioned above (see Framework of Analysis, Chapter 3.2), the Content Domain is mainly concerned with the textual resources the speaker has for creating coherence. Textual meaning in the content domain is relevant to the context: to the preceding (and following) text and the context of situation. In this study, as was

explained above, we will distinguish between DisPs functioning on the global or local level of the discourse. It will be illustrated here that many DisPs function both on the local and global discourse level. In this study, the term 'frame' function will be used when a DP has global coherence function and 'qualifier' function for a particle with a local coherence function. We will first take a look at *yani* when it has functions to fulfil within the 'frame' concept.

4.3.2 Frame Function

Yani functions as a boundary marker between conversational actions both in monologue (between utterances by the same speaker) and dialogue (basically for turn-taking purposes). This shows us that not all conversational actions are the same. Telling a story is different from answering a question. In a dialogue, an initiating move is followed by a reactive move and a follow-up move (if necessary). A monologue (a narrative or argumentation), on the other hand, is divided into paragraphs or episodes, which are further separated by boundaries functioning as backgrounds in the continuous flow of activity. A DisP like *yani* may mark the boundaries between these units. *Yani* may combine with other boundary markers (e.g. pauses), but it can also stand alone as a boundary marker. The following example shows the segmental structure of an extract from the data:

The participants below are engaged in a linguistic discussion where speaker I mainly talks about his own study and area of interest.

Example-17

```
  1 D: var evet = syntax //zaten
  2 I:                   //syntax var   ama spoken discourse çalışan
→3   hemen hemen hiç yok = corpus study diye bişey yok  yani corpus
  4   study yi ben nası anlatıcam mesela  corpora (1) anlatamıyorum
→5   yani sen ne çalışıyosun diye soruyolar (0.5) şimdi corpus tan
  6   çıkartıyorum = datan nerden geliyo diye soruyolar  ee: corpus
  7   tan diyecem = HADİ anlat bakalım corpusu
..........................................................................
  1 D: yes they exist = syntax //already
  2 I:                         //they do syntax studies but there is
  3   almost nobody studying spoken discourse = there is no such
```

99

```
→4    thing as corpus study  yani how will I account for corpus
→5   study for instance  corpora (1)  I can't explain  yani people
  6    ask me what I am studying here (0.5)  I take it from a corpus
  7    = they ask me where my data come from =  ee: I'll just say
  8    they come from corpus = NOW the trouble is explain first
  9    what corpus is
```

Here we can identify a number of structural positions where *yani* occurs as a boundary marker. *Yani* here functions as a connective (line 3) between elements in the topic structure in the Frame Function when there is, for instance, a topic change (line 5) or a main boundary between discourse units. The connective *yani* may cooccur with other DisPs, with pauses and with grammaticalised changes such as a switch from a declarative to a question.

Yani can also mark background relations like justification or explanation or the elaboration of a preceding topic. Other prototypical contexts where *yani* occurs are parenthetical comments and requests. Within the Frame Function of the content domain, a number of different functions are available, which mainly are: 'marking transitions' (e.g. topic shifts, introducing a new aspect of the topic, opening and closing conversation); 'introducing an explanation, justification, background'; 'introducing or closing a digression'; 'self-correction of the message information'; 'introducing direct speech'. We will be concerned with each function in the following.

The use of *yani* regarding the topic in a conversation seems to be various. For instance, topic management is regarded as an organisational element of the conversational mechanism (Sacks et al. 1974; Levinson, 1983). Topics are 'placed' and 'fitted' into the conversation (Maynard 1980) rather than changed suddenly. Sacks (1972: 15-16) proposes a stepwise transition in topic change:

> A general feature of topical organisation in conversation is movement
> from topic to topic, not by a topic-close followed by a topic beginning,
> but by a stepwise move, which involves linking up whatever is being
> introduced to what has just been talked about, such that, as far as

anybody knows, a new topic has been started, though we are far from wherever we began.

The results of the data analysis indicate that the functions of *yani* in topic organisation are to signal 'topic expansion', 'emphasis/highlight of a part of a topical element' and 'summary/conclusion' before a possible topic shift. We will initially be concerned with the more common function of 'topic expansion'.

The frame functions of DisPs on the textual level are:

1-'marking transitions' (e.g. topic shifts, introducing a new aspect of the topic, opening and closing conversation)

2-'introducing an explanation, justification, background'

3-'introducing or closing a digression' (push-markers, return-pops)

4-'self-correction of the message information'

5-'introducing direct speech'

4.3.2.1 Topic Expansion

The concept of 'expansion' of a topic is used as a cover term, which is realised by giving an example, shifting and re-introducing a topic. In this connection, the concept of 'topic expansion' used in this study can be characterised in terms of expanding an idea or concept by describing, paraphrasing or giving an example to explain the concept.

There are two ways in which *yani* performs its function of signalling topic expansion: While one of these functions is realised at a 'local level', the other is realised at a 'conversational level'. When *yani* indexes expansion of the topic at the local level, the expansion is realised within a single turn by its current producer, whereas expansion at conversational level is carried out at different turns by different speakers as well as by the same specific speaker. Below are some instances from various conversational segments in which *yani* indexes topic expansion at both levels.

4.3.2.1.1 Topic Expansion at Local Level

To have an insight about the way *yani* functions to mark expansion at a local level, the conversational segment below provides good evidence in the sense that there are two different occasions where different speakers index their expansion of the topic both locally and conversationally. But we will initially concentrate on the local one.

In the extract below, speakers D and E are basically providing information about universities in general to speaker G, who will be going to the UK for higher education. In the part of the exchange here, speakers D and E provide more detailed information from their own experience at their university.

Example-18

```
  1 D: herkese bi masa düşmüyo
→2 E: = düşmüyo  herkes aynı anda gelmiyo = yani en fazla
  3    dört kişiyiz ama yinede daha fazla şey olması ne
  4    bileyim ofislerde birer ikişer bilgisayar olabilirdi
  5    mm fotokopi makinaları daha rahat olabilirdi
  6 G: = ama biz Türkiyeden alışkınız bu tür şeylere
→7 D: = öyle = yani bizi çok fazla hakkaten etkilemiyo
       [devam ediyor]
...........................................................
  1 D: there is not a specific desk for each person
  2 E: = not for each person not everybody comes at the same time
→3   = yani there are at most four or five of us at
  4    the same time but there should be more şey I don't know
  5    there could be one or two computers in the offices mm
  6    copying facility could be more accessible
  7 G: = but we are used to these sort of stuff here
       [lack of facilities]
→8 D: = that's right = yani that [lack of all these facilities]
     does not affect us a great deal [continues]
```

Regarding the extract above, as far as its placement is concerned in this particular function, *yani* always occurs TCU-initially. The Framing Function of *yani* becomes clear here when it marks a break between two parts in the extract above. More

specifically, *yani* signals the upcoming expansion of what his/her producer has just locally uttered in the immediately preceding TCU.

In confirming speaker D's assertion (line 1), speaker E subsequently self-selects and repeats one part of speaker D's TCU '*düşmüyo*' (line 2). Subsequently his second TCU follows in which he describes the current situation saying 'not everybody comes at the same time' (lines 2 and 3). This is immediately followed by another TCU prefaced by *yani*, which signals the expansion of the immediately preceding point. While '*herkes*' is the main part of speaker E's assertion (line 2), the *yani*-prefaced TCU '*en fazla dört kişiyiz*' constitutes the expansion. So, '*herkes*' is expanded into '*en fazla dört kişiyiz*' and this upcoming expansion is signalled by means of the TCU-initial *yani*.

It should be noted here that what the conversational segment above illustrates is expansion at the local level (monologic), that is, the current speaker's effort to expand by way of explanation/clarification what he has just said in his previous TCU. However, the second occurrence of *yani* in this segment constitutes signalling of expansion at the conversational level (dialogic), which will be dealt with shortly below.

We have the example below in which speaker D has been explaining to speaker G how they are going to carry out her data collection methodology of applying a specific teaching method to two of speaker G's actual teaching classes.

Example-19

```
     1 D: sen farklı bir microteaching ben farklı bir microteaching
     2    uygulıycaz? sonuçta sonuçları değerlendiricez. acaba çocuklar
→    3    ne kadar alabilecekler = yani neyi ne kadar anlıycaklar mm
     4    anlıyabildinmi? bunlar compare gibi işte comparison olmuş
     5    olacak //sonuçta
     6 G:        //mhm tamam
→    7 D: ama m şeye bakmıycaz başarı durumuna bak yani başarı
     8    durumuna sadece ben tezim için bakıcam = işte kim daha ne
     9    kadar aldı teaching practicedeki notlardan falan = onuda
    10    zaten sen ben not vermiycez? diğer bağımsız hocalar not
```

```
    11    vericek ki objectif olabilelim? mm bide öğrencilerin
    12    attitudelarına bakıcaz.
.............................................................
  1 D: you and I will be applying different microteaching projects?
  2     we will each eventually assess them. we will try to see how
→ 3     much they (the students) will obtain = yani how much they
  4     will   be   able   to   understand   what   we   teach   mm   do   you
        understand?
  5     = it's like comparison = işte it will eventually //be a
  6     comparison
  7 G:                                          //mhm I see
→8 D: but m we won't look at şey level of success yani I'll myself
  9     look at the level of success for my thesis = işte who got
  10    what sort of marks from their practice = that sort of
  11    marking has got nothing to do with us anyway? it is the
  12    other objective teachers at practice schools? mm we will
  13    also look at the student's attitudes.
```

In her first turn above (lines 1 through 5), speaker D initially produces a multi-unit turn in which she explains, together with its aim, the specific teaching method to be used both by herself and the teacher in question, that is speaker G. In her third TCU (lines 2 and 3), speaker D briefly explains the expected outcome '*acaba çocuklar ne kadar alabilecekler*'. What immediately follows is a *yani*-prefaced TCU (line 3) in which the verb '*alabilecekler*' in 'how much they will obtain' is by explanation made more specific to 'anlıyacaklar' (line 3). It is worth noting here that *yani*-prefaced TCUs involve a similar type of expansion whereby, while the first mention is more general, the second mention is more specific. So, within the Frame Function marking the connection between the two text segments, by signalling the upcoming explanation of the prior statement, *yani* assists its producer to expand her part of the current topic further and signal this expansion to the other participants.

After speaker G's brief understanding confirmation token (line 6), speaker D proceeds to expand the topic (line 7), the application of her specific teaching method. After speaker G's understanding token (line 6), speaker D asserts (line 7) that the level of success will not be the concern of speaker G, which is immediately signalled

to be explained in the following TCU. So, while initially asserting '*şeye bakmıycaz başarı durumuna*' (line 7), the speaker expands this last point into '*başarı durmuna sadece ben tezim için bakıcam*' (lines 7 and 8).

We have seen above that the current holder of turn uses *yani* to signal expansion at the local level. That is, as far as the immediately preceding TCU is concerned, *yani* indexes that the TCU it prefaces is a local expansion within the boundaries of the same speaker and the same turn. Next is the expansion of the topic marked by *yani* at conversational level.

4.3.2.1.2 Topic Expansion at Conversational Level

When *yani* signals expansion at conversational level, the expansion in question is carried out across several turns by the close co-operation of participants in the conversation. Out of the three representative fragments in which *yani* is evidenced to mark expansion at the conversational level, we have below the detailed analysis of example (4) repeated here as (20) for ease of presentation. Since they are all parallel cases, examples (9) and (10) show exactly what is happening in example (11).

The participants in the example below, who are all Ph.D. students studying linguistics, are engaged in a relaxed and informal discussion about 'relevance theory'. In the initial part of this segment, there are 'so-called' accusations by speaker I about the advocates of 'relevance theory', calling them 'Chomskyans'.

Example-20

```
 1 I: İŞTE bunlar Chomskyci aslında (1) ve hiç bi zamanda
 2    kalkıp real data uygulayamaz çünkü uygulanamaz
 3 E: evet
 4 I: bu olay bu kadar basit yani (1) // ama
→5 M:                          //YANİ bana çok yanlış
 6    gelmiyo onların  şey yaptıkları da = eksik //gibi görünüyo
 7 I:                                        //yok doğru
 8    gibi görünüyo = eksik eksik
 9 E: evet
→10 M: YANİ cognitive context in içine neler giriyo social contex i
 11    koymuyolar galiba
```

105

```
.................................................................
  1 I: İŞTE they are Chomskian (1) and they can never use real data
  2     because it cannot be used
  3 E: yes
  4 I: this is as simple as that yani(1)// but
→5 M:                             //YANİ what they do doesn't
  6     seem wrong to me = it just //looks insufficient
  7 I:                             //no their claims may be accurate
  8   = but their methodology is insufficient
  9 E: right
→10 M: YANİ what does cognitive context include I don't think they
  11    put social context in it
```

After speaker E's continuation token with '*evet*' (line 3), speaker I continues producing *yani*-final conclusive assessment TCU followed by a one-second pause, which creates a potential TRP (line 4). During the course of the one-second pause (line 4), as is clearly illustrated in the segment, both speaker I and M self-select and start to speak simultaneously creating an overlap in their first words (lines 4 and 5). One party, expectedly (according to turn-taking rules) speaker I in this case, stops (line 4) and the other overlapping party, speaker M continues (line 5).

In her *yani*-initiated turn, speaker M, as we notice, signals to expand the topic further. The expansion in question takes place here at the conversational level in the sense that one speaker takes up at the point at which the previous speaker has left off. So, where speaker I left the topic off with his accusations of the proponents of the theory in question, the expansion as indexed by *yani* comes in the form in which speaker I partly disagrees with speaker I '*YANİ bana çok yanlış gelmiyo onların şey yaptıkları da*', which is further supported by the assessment '*eksik gibi görünüyo*' (lines 5 and 6).

In response to speaker M's partial disagreement with his earlier assertion, speaker I overlappingly agrees with speaker M, doubly repeating speaker M's adjective '*eksik eksik*' (reduplication of a word in Turkish adds further emphasis) (line 7 and 8). Speaker I's doubling is followed by another continuation token by speaker E (line 9).

And subsequently speaker M self-selects once again initiating her turn by *yani* (line 10). What *yani* indexes here is similarly the expansion of the topic on the conversational level. This time speaker M continues to expand by re-introducing other aspects of the topic. The aspect of 'cognitive context' is re-introduced and speaker M proceeds to develop the topic from the last point where it was previously left.

The topic in the conversation below is the difficulty of having to cook for oneself when one's partner leaves, which is the case for speaker B.

Example-21

```
 1 E: şimdi zor geliyodur
 2 B: çok zor geliyor (1) bide kendi başına çok sıkılıyosun.
 3   = yapamıyosun
 4 D: mhm tek başına olmuyo?
 5 E: = tek başına
 6 B: bide birisi beğenmesi iyi bişey yani [herkes gülüyor; üç
      saniye]
 7 E: güzel
    (3)
 8 D: mm ben yanlız olunca yapamıyorum
→ 9 E: yani ne kadar yapacaksın kendi kendine
```
....
```
 1 E: it must be difficult now
 2 B: very difficult (1) also you get very bored by yourself
 3 D: mhm it is not easy on your own
 4 E: = on your own
 5 B: = also it is nice to be appreciated [for your cooking] yani
    [three seconds of laughter]
 6 E: that was good
    (3)
 7 D: mm I can't cook when I am by myself
→8 E: yani you just don't want to do it
```

In the conversational extract below, referred to as example (1) earlier, participants talk about the trade capacity and its whereabouts of two business and shopping

centers, and make a comparison between them with a particular focus on one of them.

Example-22

```
 1 A: Kapitoldeki çok büyük evet  işte esas //merkez şey Maslak
 2 C:                                  //öbürü Maslaktakinden
 3    büyükmü
 4 A: değil
→5 H: yani büyük değil ama yine de güzel
 6 A: ama çok yakındır bence
 7 H: = çok çeşit var
 8 A: evet
      (2.5)
 9 A: Akmerkezdeki mağazaların çoğu iş yapıyo zaten (1) çatır çatır
10    mal satıyolar
11 C: = Avrupada bir numara seçilmiş Akmerkez
      (1)
→12 H: yani seçilsin artık
13 M: = ben görmedim daha hiç orayı
```
....
```
 1 A: the in the Kapitol is quite big işte the main //center is şey
 2    in Maslak
 3 C:                                  //is the other
 4    one bigger than Maslak
 5 A: no it isn't
→6 H: yani it is not bigger but it is as nice
 7 A: but it should be quite close to it
 8 H: = a great variety of items available
 9 A: yes
      (2.5)
10 A: most of the shops in Akmerkez do quite good business (1)
11    they sell very well
12 C: = Akmerkez was already chosen as the number one
13    shopping centre in Europe
→14 H: yani very well does it deserve that choice
15 M: I have never been there yet
```

Before moving on to the next function, one point of interest is the potential interactional work accomplished by *yani* here at a conversational level. The

interactional work here reflected through the lexical similarity in the design of *yani*-prefaced turn as opposed to the previous speaker's one. Heritage and Sorjonen (1994) describe a similar case in English (*and*-prefacing) as showing your attention to the previous speaker. So, through this attention, one actually makes a connection between his/her own turn and/or TCU and the previous one. In example (21), for instance, the same compound verb *'(yemek) yapmak'* (to cook) is repeated by speaker E in his *yani*-prefaced TCU in turn eight '***yani** ne kadar yapacaksın kendi kendine'*. Similarly, the adjective '*büyük'* (big), in example (22), is also repeated in speaker H's *yani*-prefaced TCU in turn five '***yani** büyük değil ama yine de güzel'*. Though the same is true for example eleven, it is not as clear as examples (9) and (10). So, in addition to its capacity to mark expansion at the conversational level within its framing function, *yani*-prefaced turn-initial TCUs also mark its producer's attention to the previous turn/TCU.

We have seen so far that within the Frame Function of marking transitions, there are two ways that the particle *yani* indexes the upcoming expansion. When it marks expansion at the local level (monologue), the current speaker expands his/her last point within the same turn by explanations or giving examples. Expansion at the conversational level (dialogue) comprises a co-operative development of the topic by any of the participants of the conversation. Initiating the new turn by *yani*, its producer signals that s/he is picking up the topic where it was left off. As we have just noted, while marking expansion at the conversational level, its producer shows his/her attention to the previous turn/TCU by *yani*-prefacing the upcoming turn/TCU. In both cases of expansion, while the *yani*-prefaced TCU contains information, which is basically specifying what is preceding, the particle helps to connect the two parts in the text, marking the transition to move the topic and the discourse forward.

4.3.2.2 Summary Assessment/Recapitulation

The data analysis has revealed that one of the conversational environments related to topic within the Frame Function of Content Domain is summaries of assessments in which *yani* marks its producer's (upcoming emotional or evaluative utterance)

summary/conclusive assessment of what has been established in the topic until that point.

Within the Frame Function, topic organisation comprises assessments of the information exchanged during the constructional course of a topic. Assessments here represent the possession of 'the knowledge that s/he is assessing and are produced as products of participation' (see Pomerantz, 1984). With a certain amount of information built-up with the contribution of all the participants towards establishing 'intersubjectivity', speakers offer their personal assessments to summarise/recapitulate the aspect of the topic in question. As Aijmer (1996, 2002) observes, 'discourse markers are helpful when the speaker summarises information'. It has been observed in our data that *yani* prefaces the TCUs in which its producer standardly signals that the upcoming information is his/her summary of that certain aspect of the topic covered up to that point. Below are some fragments from various conversational data with a detailed analysis.

In example (23) here, the topic is speaker G's broken floppy disc, which he tested on different computers to see if it was really the case.

Example-23

```
  1 E: şeyde denedinizmi lablardaki bilgisayarlarda
   2 M: aynısı
→3 E: mhm (2) o zaman yani bayağı anlayan birine göstermek lazım
→4 G: buda demektir ki yani aynı zamanda hem lablardaki hem de
  5    burdaki a drive ı bozuk olması demektir
....................................................................
  1 E: did you try it in şey in the computers in labs
  2 M: the same [result]
→3 E: mhm (2) then yani you need to let someone who knows well
  4    about them have a look at it
→5 G: it means that yani the a drives of both this and the
  6    computers in the labs are not working
```

Speaker G mentions about the problem he is having with one of his floppy discs containing his assignments. He expresses his despair that having tested the floppy on

his computer, he realised that it was not working.   Speaker E in the first turn above (line 1) enquires if he tested the floppy on the computers in the university's computer labs. Having received a reply from speaker G (line 2) that his test produced the same result, he evaluates the situation in the form of suggestion that he should let an expert see the floppy to sort the problem out. Speaker E marks his evaluative suggestion (line3) by prefacing his topical contribution with the particle *yani* collocated with 'o zaman'. Speaker E's assessment is subsequently followed by another assessment, this time by speaker G, who evaluates (line 4 and 5) the speaker M's problematic situation from another perspective. Although it has already been established until that point that the floppy in question is problematical, speaker G assesses the topic (line 4 and 5) in such a way that in the case of the floppy in being proper working order, the computers (their 'A' drives) the floppy was tested on had to be broken. As the example above shows, the two evaluative remarks by two different speakers are marked by *yani*.

In the conversational context below, we have speaker D, who is explaining to speaker G an important aspect of the project to be cooperatively carried out by both speakers. Since speaker D is responsible for the project in question, she does most of the talking in her attempts to make instructions to be followed.

Example-24

```
 1 D: üzerinde çok fazla durulmadığı için veya kaydedilmediği için
 2    hemen çocuklar biz bunu düşündük ettik tamam biz bunu
 3    yapalım diye aktive edemezler o düşüncelerini.
 4 G: mhm
 5 D: dedimki böyle bi defter onu aktive edebilir (1)
 6    düşüncelerini reflectionlarını ki bunu daha
 7    sonra okuduklarında da kendileri uygulamaya koyabilirler,
 8 G: mhm
→9 D: yani amaç oydu //dairy tutmadaki
10 G:                 //artı (0.5) yine birşey daha sormak
11    istemiştim sana = birbirlerine okusunlarmı defterlerini
.................................................................
 1 D: since they have not concentrated on that long enough
 2    the students can't seem to activate that thought saying
 3    let's do it.
```

111

```
 4 G: mhm
 5 D: I thought a notebook like that could activate it (1)
 6    their thoughts and reflections could be activated and they
 7    may then put them into practice,
 8 G: mhm
→9 D: yani that was the main aim in //their keeping the diary
 10 G:                                //plus (0.5) I just wanted
 11    to ask you one more thing = shall I let them read the
 12    diaries to each other
```

In response to speaker D's explanation of instructions, speaker G produces two understanding tokens of 'mhm' at TCU-completion points in lines 4 and 8 above. And in the turns she takes (lines 1 through 3 and 4 through 7), speaker D explains the reason behind the students' keeping a diary during the application of her project, which is 'to foster their reflection'. And in her last turn (line 9), after the second understanding token by speaker G (line 8), speaker D starts *yani*-prefaced and initiated a new TCU in which she produces the conclusive assessment of what she has been explaining '**yani** *amaç oydu diary tutmadaki*' (line 9). With this assessment as indexed and initiated by *yani*, the speaker brings the topic to a point after which a possible shift or even a 'stepwise' topic change may be relevant. As expected, this is indeed what happens when speaker G picks up the turn again with an overlap and shifts the topic to another relevant direction with a question (lines 10 and 11).

We have seen that participants to a conversation during the course of the conversation make certain contributions in the direction of various topics within the Frame Function. And as a result, various sorts of assessment are made along the way. *Yani* in these conversational environments signals its producer's intention and attempt to make a conclusive summary of the topic built-up up to that point. The last domain that we analyse *yani* in is the Interpersonal Domain.

4.4 Interpersonal Domain

4.4.1 Introduction

Particles with an Interpersonal Function express attitudes, feelings and evaluations and underlying the interactive structure of the conversation (see Framework of Analysis, 3.2). The occurrence of *yani* in certain conversational sequences is significant in the sense that they 'express speaker's (its producer's) attitudes and stance towards the addressee or towards the situation spoken. Ruhi (1994) regards elements found in the post-predicate slot where 'different voices are introduced into the discourse world'. For instance, *yani* in the post-predicate position specifically plays an important role in providing signals to the addressee about the general attitude of the speaker to what is being produced.

It is an intrinsic feature of particles to mark the inherent relations between the speaker (its producer) and his/her orientation towards the turn constructional units s/he produces during the constructional process of a topic. The stance the speaker takes towards his/her turn constructional unit becomes clearer in environments where it produces an effect. These effects include those where, for instance, the speaker wants to create an emotional effect, place his/her own emphasis on the TCU s/he produces and using the particle on its own marking his/her agreement with the previous speaker's point of view. The following are the effects created by the use of *yani* when it indexes the current speaker's attitude towards what s/he is producing.

4.4.2 Emotional Effect

As has already been mentioned, Ruhi (1994) regards the post-predicate slot as being related to pragmatics. Ruhi (1994: 222) further states "post-predicate slot guides operations by pointing towards elements that are presented as important for the speaker". Similarly, some of the clause and turn-final occurrences of *yani* seem to have a function within the Interpersonal Domain where its function is 'to end the sentence with emotional effect' and they greatly influence the responses of a hearer. *Yani* in these structural positions not only indexes the end of the current speaker's turn, but to end the turn with an emotional effect together with its user's personal

commitment to one or more aspects of the communicative act he is performing, thus enhancing the trustworthiness or credibility of the utterance.

In the extract below, participants are involved in a conversation where the topic is the problem one of their common friends has recently had in her examination.

Example-25

```
  1 E: tatil gibi bişey  ona Eylül e kadar izin falan vermişler//
  2    gibi?
  3 D:                                              //evet
  4 B: Türkiyeden
→5 E: mhm  ondan sonra şimdi ne yapacak bilmiyorum yani
      (1)
→6 B: şanssızlık işte yani
.........................................................................
  1 E: it's like a holiday they have given her some time off till
  3    // September
  3 D: //yes
  4 B: from Turkey
→5 E: mhm now I don't know what she is going to do yani
      (1)
→6 B: that's ill-fortune işte yani
```

Speaker B inquires about the possible future plans of a common friend not present in the conversation. Speaker E explains that she has been given some time off (line 1), which speaker B confirms, adding that the leave was granted to her by the institution she worked for in Turkey (line 4). Speaker E in turn four assesses the relative predicament of the person in question where he produces an evaluative statement '*mhm ondan sonra şimdi ne yapacak bilmiyorum yani*' (line 5). Where speaker E says that he has no idea about their friend's possible future plans, he ends his evaluative statement with the particle *yani*, which indexes an emotional effect to the statement and marks it as its producer's own perspective of the state of affairs and has be to be accepted as it is. After this assessment comes another one, which belongs to speaker B, who ends his evaluation with the same emotional effect. Speaker B reflects his perspective of the situation as '*şanssızlık işte yani*' (line 6).

The two occurrences of *yani* in the example above index the end of the current speaker's turn and also end the turn with an emotional effect together. The speakers, thus, express their personal commitment to the communicative act they are performing, thus enhancing the trustworthiness or credibility of their utterances.

Speaker N in the example below describes her unpleasant experience at the Turkish customs where she was asked to bribe so she could pass through the customs without paying $100 tax.

Example-26

```
 1 N: = mektup = onunla geçiyordum (1)bi kere bayağı şey istediler
 2 D: = mhm
 3 N: = rüşvet
 4 E: aa:
 5 N: tabi
 6 E: ne kadar ist
→7 D: ne kadarı yok YANİ
 8 N: ne kadarı mühim değil
 9 D: gör onları
10 E: yani açıkça istiyo = onu anlamadım
..............................................................
 1 N: a letter = it helped me get through (1) once they
 2     openly asked for şey
 3 D: = mhm
 4 N: = bribe
 5 E: aa:
 6 N: it just happened
 7 E: how much did they as
→8 D: it doesn't matter how much YANİ
 9 N: it is not important how much
10 D: you have to please them
11 E: yani they openly ask for it = that's what I did not
12     understand
```

While speaker D seems to be familiar with this story, speaker E openly shows his surprise in turn four when he hears the word '*rüşvet*' from speaker N (line 4). After he receives further justification for the story from speaker N in line 5 with '*tabi*',

speaker E tries to inquire about the amount that was asked. Speaker D subsequently self-selects and seems to treat speaker E's inquiry as 'irrelevant' in the face of what actually happened, '*ne kadarı yok YANİ*' (line 7). The placement of *yani* in the utterance-final position helps speaker D to make her point with an emotional effect that what matters is not the amount demanded but the fact that something like that actually happened. Speaker D wants this piece of information to be treated as her own opinion and given the credit for it by the other participants in the conversation. In the follow-up to speaker D's emphasis, speaker N subsequently recognises the point highlighted by speaker D and backs it up with a similar proposition, '*ne kadarı mühim değil*' (line 8).

In the short extract here, speaker I talks about a recent article he has read and expresses his various evaluative opinions of it.

Example-27

```
→1 I: güzel bi article aslında = fena bi article değil yani =
  2    bayağı güzel bi article = yani ben ilgilendim meraktan okudum
  3    da  yani ne  yöne gidiyo research diye merak ettim de  ama
→4    güzel yani. =işte (0.5) m farkında olmadığın bissürü şeyi (0.5)
  4    conversation a bakıyosun aa: bu böyleymiş diye = şoka uğruyosun
→6    yani = hayret  allah allah
.......................................................................
→1 I: infact it's a nice article = not a bad one at all yani = the
  2     article is quite good = yani I was interested and read it out
  3     of curiosity   yani I was interesred to find out which
→4     direction the research was going but it was good yani.= işte
  5     (0.5) m many things that you have not been aware of (0.5) you
  6     look at the conversations aa and realise that this is how it is
→8     = you are shocked yani = strange allah allah
```

As speaker I talks about the article, he first expresses his personal opinion about it and then provides his reason why he wanted to read it in the first place (lines 1 and 2). After the first evaluative remark, speaker I ends his second one with a TCU-final *yani*, thus marking it with an emotional effect (line 1). Subsequent to his assessment comes the reason why he read the article (line 3), which is followed by another

evaluative remark ending with an emotion-indexing TCU-final *yani* (line 4). Here the presence of '*ama*' functions to strengthen the effect being created by *yani*.   As speaker I continues to produce more on the current topic, he makes clear what he has gained out of reading the article in question. Having realised that he has a lot to learn from the article, speaker I produces another evaluative remark about his latest topical contribution, which he ends with one TCU-final *yani* (line 6).

As the conversational extracts above have demonstrated, the TCU-final occurrence of y*ani* help its producer to mark the end of the current speaker's turn with an emotional effect together with its user's personal commitment to the communicative act he is performing, which further helps to increase the credibility of the utterance. Closely related to the emotional function of *yani* is emphatic function as illustrated below whereby it emphasises its producer's point of view.

4.4.3 Speaker's Emphasis

It is an intrinsic feature of particles to mark the inherent relations between the speaker (its producer) and his/her orientation towards the turn constructional units s/he produces during the constructional process of a topic. The stance the speaker takes towards his/her turn constructional unit becomes clearer in environments where s/he, for instance, places his/her own emphasis on a particular piece of information within the topic being talked about.   It has to be noted here that being an Interpersonal particle and marking its producer's stance, the function of *yani* in this use is very close to the Emotional Effect function.

The particle *yani* occurs in environments in which speakers use it to mark his/her own emphasis to be placed on a particular point of the topic being talked about. This specific piece of information is the object of speaker's focus.   In other words, speakers tend to emphasize this particular point to be evaluated as his/her own point of view. While *yani* in these environments emphasizes its producer's focus on a specific piece of information, it also helps hearer(s) to pay extra attention and in general maintain their focus on the current speaker.

117

Structurally the more common structural pattern is the TCU-final employment where *yani* constitutes the last linguistic element of the constructional unit whereas, as our data reveals, speaker's emphatic perspective can be expressed TCU-medially. It has been noticed that while when *yani* is employed either TCU-finally or TCU-medially, the emphasis effect it indexes is directed towards the whole TCU in which it is used. Prosodically, while the whole TCU in which *yani* indexes its producer's emphatic perspective is uttered in with a rise in pitch, there may be cases as in example (29) where the speaker may choose to put extra emphasis on *yani* (capitalised *yani*). Examples of this case are illustrated below.

This use of *yani*, on the surface seems to be identical to the highlighting function of *işte* within the Content Domain (see the Chapter on *işte*). Those two functions may seem close, but definitely are not compatible with each other. That is, they cannot necessarily substitute each other. While *işte* marks the foregrounding of a piece of information from the surrounding talk, *yani* in this use indexes its producer's own perspective with an emphasis. Now let us look at some examples below where we can clearly see how this particular function occurs.

In the extract below, speakers B and E, who are two good friends, bump into each other by chance after not having seen each other for quite a while. In response to speaker B's earlier inquiry, speaker E begins to explain that his main reason for being there is to carry out his data collection. He also adds the information before he completes his turn that his wedding will also take place.

Example-28

```
  1 B: bu iki ay içindemi
  2 E: evet yılbaşından sonra kısmetse
  3 B: = yani gitmeden bu arada
→4 E: gitmeden tabi  kısmetse yani
  5 B: = ee: artık bizi de çağırırsınız
.............................................................
  1 B: is it within the next two months
  2 E: yes = after the Christmas hopefully
  3 B: = yani before you leave [for England]
→4 E: before we leave of course hopefully yani
```

118

```
5 B: = ee: I might well get an invitation as well
```

Speaker B inquires about timing of the wedding (line 1). Despite speaker E's earlier statement that the wedding would probably take place within the two months of the data collection period, which coincides with New Year period (line 2), speaker B wants to make sure about the exact timing and prefaces his request for more specific information by the particle *yani* (line 3). In response to this request, speaker E goes; '*gitmeden tabi kısmetse yani*' (line 4). Having provided the information in his initial utterance, there follows a subsequent TCU in which speaker E supports his wish by a conventional phrase '*kısmetse*', which is indeed emphasised by the placement of the particle *yani* at the end of the TCU (line 4). *Yani* here contributes to emphasize and marks out speaker E's focus on this wish that he wants things to work out all right. In trying to make clear to speaker B about the exact time and date, speaker E emphasizes it together with his expectations reflecting his own perspective. What follows the information emphasized by means of *yani*, is actually a shift of focus whereby speaker B begins to do light-hearted fishing in line 5 saying; '*ee: artık bizi de çağırırsınız*'. It has to be noted here that until the turn where *yani* is claimed to perform the function of emphasis, there is a certain degree of redundancy. Speaker E basically repeats the same response over few turns to the similarly designed question by speaker B. After his turn (line 4) where speaker E provides the same information once more, but emphatically this time by means of TCU-final *yani*, we see a shift of focus from the clarification of timing of the wedding to a joke whether 'a good friend' (like speaker B himself) will be invited to it. There is no more subsequent inquiry by speaker B about the matter.

In the example below, analysed as example (26) earlier, Speaker N describes her unpleasant experience at the Turkish customs where she was asked to bribe so she could pass through the customs without paying $100 tax.

Example-29
```
1 N: = mektup =onunla geçiyordum (1) bi kere bayağı şey istediler
2 D: = mhm
3 N: = rüşvet
4 E: aa:
```

```
   5 N: tabi
   6 E: ne kadar ist
→7 D: ne kadarı yok YANİ
   8 N: ne kadarı mühim değil
.......................................................................
   1 N: a letter = it helped me get through (1) once they
   2    openly asked for şey
   3 D: = mhm
   4 N: = bribe
   5 E: aa:
   6 N: it just happened
   7 E: how much did they as
→8 D: it doesn't matter how much YANİ
   9 N: it is not important how much
```

Speaker E expresses his surprise in turn four when he hears the word 'bribe' from speaker N (line 4). After he receives further justification for the story from speaker N, speaker E wants to find out the amount that was asked. Although it was speaker N from whom the bribe was asked, Speaker D subsequently self-selects and emphatically produces '*ne kadarı yok YANİ*' (line 7), treating speaker E's inquiry as 'irrelevant' in the face of what actually happened. The placement of *yani* in the utterance-final position '*ne kadarı yok YANİ*' helps speaker D to emphasize her point that what matters is not the amount demanded but the fact that something like that actually happened. What turns out to be an emphatic piece of information is to be treated as the current speaker's own emphatic perspective. In the follow-up to speaker D's emphasis, speaker N subsequently recognises the point highlighted by speaker D and backs it up with a similar proposition, '*ne kadarı mühim değil*'. The following is the final function of *yani* in the Interpersonal Domain.

4.4.4 Response Particle

The data analyses have demonstrated that *yani* can be deployed as a response particle in environments where the particle indexes that the speaker either categorically or partially accepts the interlocutor's point of view. *Yani* signals that its producer's assumptions are in tune with the assumptions held by the speaker as expressed in his/her utterance. There are some structural as well as prosodic features on this

occurrence of *yani* different from the functions of *yani* we have seen so far. *Yani*, being a seperate tone unit in this particular use occupies a structural position of a TCU. That is, *yani*, serving as a full turn, constitutes the only lexical element produced by the current speaker in his/her speaking turn, which comprises either a total or a partial agreement to previous turn, thus enabling its producer to economize.

The disparity between the two uses can only be differentiated by the prosodic cues on the particle. When *yani* with categorical agreement is relevant, prosodically, there is a vowel lengthening. If we think of *yani* as consisting of two syllables of '*ya*' and '*ni*', the vowel 'a' in the first syllable is lengthened. There is also a rise in pitch up to the end of lengthened 'a' and then a fall, which is on the syllable 'ni'. The vowel lengthening in the data analysis will be marked by the capitalisation of the first syllable in the particle as in '*YAni*'. In its use where it marks partial agreement, on the other hand, there is no lengthening on the vowel 'a'. The particle is articulated the same as in other uses. Similar to the first use, however, there is a rise in pitch up to the fist syllable 'ya' and then a fall. In order to be able to distinguish the second type from the vowel lengthened *YAni*, it will be illustrated as *yAni* in the analysis. These two types of *yani*s mark its producer's either total or partial agreement. In the following, we will illustrate the categorical and partial agreement marking respectively.

The example illustrated below is making a comparison between haircut prices in Turkey and in England.

Example-30

```
 1 E: ben de şeye gittiğimde (1)Bursa ya gittiğimde berbere gittim
 2    işte hemen orada mm hemen zaten konuştu  ne yaptın ne ettin
 3    kestirdinmi nasıl kesiyorlar ne ediyorlar  kaç lira falan
 4    işte valla dedim yani ben beş pound verdim mm normalde sekiz
 5   on paund arası dedim mm orada adam bedavaya kesiyo
 6    yani yılbaşında en son otuzbin lirayamı ne kestirdim
 7 C: tabi tabi öyle
 8 E: = yani bakarmısın abi otuzbin lira
 9 H: evet
10 C: bilemedin elli olsun  bir pound en fazla
```

121

```
→11 E:  YAni

       (1)

  12  H: bu yanlar gitmesi gerek  profil tamam bence  maşallah böyle
.............................................................
   1 E: when I went to şey (1) Bursa I went to the hairdresser işte
   2    the barber just kept asking me questions  what did you do
   3    did you get your hair cut  how much was it  işte  I said
   4    paid five pounds mm I said normally it is between eight and
   5    ten  pounds mm my barber cuts almost for nothing  yani last
   6    time I got it cut it was about thirty thousand liras
   7 C: yes cost of haircut is something like that
   8 E: = yani can you believe that it is just thirty thousand liras
   9 H: yes
  11 C: it could be the most fifty thousand liras  it is equal to
  12    just one pound
→13 E:  YAni
        (1)
  14 H: the sides have to go  from the profile it is fine for me  it
  15    is just right
```

Speaker E accounts the conversation between himself and the hairdresser back home, where he told his hairdresser friend all about his haircut experiences abroad (lines 1 through 6). The final point in his account is the price difference in the haircut cost in the two countries (lines 4 through 6). Speaker C, who also draws attention to the relatively huge gap in the two countries, also comments on this point (line 7). Speaker C, having heard the cost of haircut from speaker E, focuses on the difference in terms of the exchange rates between Turkish lira and English pound (line 10). Speaker C's rounding up the figures and coming to a figure, which is at least five times as expensive receives a response from speaker E, who only produces the particle *yani* in his speaking turn, where *yani* occurs as the only linguistic element with lengthening of the vowel 'a'. *Yani* is used here as a turn component categorically agreeing with the propositional content of the previous speaker's preceding utterance.

In the extract below, the speakers are being satirical about speaker C's recent experience of a badly done haircut.

Example-31

```
  1 C: beşer poundtan
  2 E: beşer poundtan
  3 H: on pounda pek ekonomik değil ama
  4 C: niye canım  town a gideceksin  yürüyeceksin  eziyet
  5    çekeceksin şurada tak tak tak yaparız
→6 E: yAni
  7 H: şakır şukur
  8 C: şakır şukur tabi
.......................................................................
  1 C: for five pounds
  2 E: for five pounds
  3 H: ten pounds is not very economical though
  4 C: why  you'll have to got to town  you'll have to walk there
  5    it'll be nuisance for you  we'll just do it for you here
  6    practically
→7 E: yAni
  8 H: practically
  9 C: practically of course
```

Speakers C and E jokingly advise speaker H that they may give him a haircut when he needs one the next time (lines 1 and 2). As a reaction to speakers C and E's price offer, speaker H tells it on the grounds that their offer is not economical (line 3). When speaker C takes the turn to speak, he tries to convince him by telling about the disadvantages of a haircut in the town (lines 4 and 5). Subsequently, speaker E takes the turn and only pruduces a single element, the particle *yani*, which is understood as a partial agreement with the information contained in speaker C's turn (line 6). Prosodically, different from the first type we have just seen above, there is no vowel lengthening, but just a rise in pitch up to the first syllable and then a fall, which is illustrated by the capitalisation of the vowel 'a' as in '*yAni*'. The two examples above illustrate that *yani* may occur as a single tone unit and functions as signal strongly accepting the previous speaker's turn component.

The table (4.6) below illustrates all the functions of *yani* within all the Conversational Domains where it displays all its functions. The numbers in square

123

brackets next to each function show which example illustrates which function for the purpose of quick reference.

Table 4.6: Functions of *Yani* Found in Three Domains of Conversation.

Conversational Structure Domain	Interpersonal Domain	Content Domain
*Turn Initiation (Turn-Entry Device) [5] *Turn Completion (Turn-Exit Device) [8] *Floor-Holder [10] *Repair Organisation [12] *TCU-Initial Self-Repair [13] *TCU-Medial (Built-in) Self-Repair [15] *Response to a Question [6]	*Emotional Effect [25] *Speaker's Emphasis [28] *Response Particle [30]	**Frame Function** *Topic Expansion [17] *Topic Expansion at Local Level [18] *Topic Expansion at Conversational Level [20] *Summary/ Assessment/Recapitulation [23]

4.5 Conclusion

According to data analysis results, the DisP y*ani* is the most frequently used one out of roughly sixty particles available in conversational Turkish (see Özbek, 1995 and Ilgın and Büyükkantarcıoğlu, 1994). *Yani* has proved to have multiple meanings and functions, which were characterised by reference to the three different domains of conversation, which play a significant role for the coherence of conversational discourse.   These different functions of *yani*, which Ilgın and Büyükkantarcığlu (1994) suggest, can be observed as being related to its user's intentions, idiosyncratic use and *even* psychological state (my emphasis). They continue to suggest that *yani* being short and prosodically unproblematic has made it very functional and one of the most fundamental lexical elements in casual Turkish conversation.

We have demonstrated that the basic conversational domains of Conversational Structure, Content and Interpersonal relations provided the contexts for the assignment of various functions to the DisP *yani*. The functions of *yani* within the

Conversational Structure Domain were mainly to do with the structural aspects and management of conversation such as 'turn initiation', 'turn completion', 'floor holding', 'prefacing a response to a question' and 'conversational repair'. The function of *yani* within the conversational repair was clearly involved in 'self-editing' whereby the speaker used the particle to mark the clarification of a point in his/her prior talk. It also appeared that the difference between the similar functions of topic expansion and self-editing was the expansion of a general idea/concept into specific of the former and the detailing of prior specific point.

Within the Frame function of Content Domain, the functions of *yani* consisted of marking 'topic expansion', which was realised at local and conversational levels, and 'summary assessment' of its producer's topical talk. When *yani* is used TCU-initially, it marks the speaker's upcoming modification of the meaning of his/her own prior talk. The modifications marked by *yani* include both expansions of ideas and explanations of intentions. *Yani* can preface expansions initiated by other interlocutors in the conversation as well as his/her own ideas. The particle also prefaces as well as ends explanations of intention particularly when the speaker wants the intended force of an action to be felt more strongly by the hearer(s). What is common to all of these uses is that *yani* is marking explanation or reformulation with what preceded. Therefore, y*ani* maintains speaker and hearer focus on prior material. It instructs the hearer to continue attending to the material of prior text in order to hear how it will be modified. Such a material is interpreted as more salient because of the creation of emphasis.

The final domain the particle *yani* was operative in was the Interpersonal Domain, where *yani* functioned to index 'speaker's emphasis', 'emotional effect' of its producer's speech act and as a 'response particle'. *Yani* in TCU-final position is not a connective particle, but rather a situating particle with a strongly interactional nature. It can be said to be involved in the management of the interaction and thus have a function on the interactional level of discourse. By means of *yani*, the speaker indicates his personal commitment with regard to one or more aspects of the communicative act he is performing thus enhancing the trustworthiness or credibility

of the utterance. In a way, *yani* is functioning as an epistemic marker that indicates speaker's degree of commitment to what he says. More specifically, y*ani* in TCU-final position marks the speaker's attachment to an idea and also marks an orientation through which a speaker commits him/herself to the proposition s/he has just expressed. From a through investigation of TCU-final *yani* in Turkish, it appears that *yani* functions primarily as an appeal to the involvement and cooperation of the addressee in the speech event. By using *yani*, the speaker confirms or suggests that there is a certain consensus between himself and his addressee. The speaker uses it to get the addressee to cooperate and/or to accept the propositional content of his utterance. In other words, the speaker uses the particle to mark the proposition as a personal opinion. The speaker regards the addressee as being on the same 'wavelength'. The speaker is presenting a proposition that represents his/her opinion or belief about some issue. In this connection, y*ani* is used to indicate commitment on the part of the speaker himself. Because the final particle is entirely optional, explicit use of it can suggest (by Grician maxims) that the speaker is explicitly calling the hearer's attention to something that the hearer seems to be unaware of.

CHAPTER 5

ANALYSIS OF İŞTE

5.1 Introduction

This chapter deals the analysis of the particle *işte* as found to be operative in natural Turkish conversations. *İşte* as a grammatical item is a demonstrative pronoun. According to TDK's online dictionary, it is used as a deictic expression when someone refers to or points at something. According to the results of the Turkish data used in this study, *işte* occupies the third place in terms of the frequency of use with the total of 473 occurrences. 202 occurrences of *işte* are utterance-initial while 198 are utterance-medial and 73 are utterance-final. The earlier studies of Yılmaz (1994) and Özbek (1995) also indicate that *işte* is among the most commonly used particles. Table (5.7) just below provides the basic statistical information about *işte* according to its place of occurrence with respective percentages.

Table 5.7: Basic Statistical Information About the DisP *İşte* According to its Place of Occurrence.

DisP	Initial	%	Medial	%	Final	%	Total
İşte	202	**43**	198	**42**	73	**15**	473

In our attempt to describe the role and function of *işte*, we will resort to a similar way in which *yani* and *şey* has been accounted for. The potentially various uses and functions *işte* are to be described below on the various Conversational Domains (see Framework of Analysis). The Conversational Structure and Content domains are the main ones within which various functions of *işte* are described and explained. Therefore, we will first focus on Content and then the Conversational Structure

Domain in our attempt to analyse the role and functions of *işte* found to be operative in the organisation of these Domains. Given that the relevant background information on both of these Domains have been provided in chapter four on *yani*, we will start straight with our functions and their analysis. Table (5.8) below outlines the Domains and the different functions of *işte* within them, which will also be the order of the analysis.

Table 5.8: Functions of *İşte* Found in the Relevant Domains of Conversation.

Conversational Structure Domain	Content Domain
*Marker of Extended Turns *Turn and Floor Claimer	**Frame Function** *Topic Closure *Exemplification/Detail *Highlight Marker *Marker of Reported Speech *Marker of Information Tie- Back
	Qualifying Function *Answer-Preface to Questions

5.2 Conversational Structure Domain

In the conversational structure domain, *işte* has a number of different functions, which are mainly to do with conversation management.

5.2.1 Marker of Extended Turns

This is a relatively significant function of *işte*, which is realised when speakers display an orientation to bid for an extended turn in an attempt to accomplish the telling of a story or narrative. This orientation comes in the form of a specific turn-initial TCU construction in which the particle *işte* is deployed. Before we start to witness some conversational extracts, which we will be using in our attempt to illustrate how this first function of *işte* within the Conversational Structure Domain

works, we will first provide some background information on the issue of extended turns.

Our examination of the transcripts demonstrates that some segments of conversations have been encountered in which participants are oriented to producing talk that will take more than a single turn constructional unit. It is perhaps where the demand for extended turns is usually the greatest. However, a problem is potentially posed for prospective tellers of stories in conversation since as Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson state (1974), the end of a (first) sentence potentially constitutes the end of a turn at talk and is a place at which some other party can elect to try to take a turn at talking. In the face of such an interactional problem, Sacks (1974) identified what he called a 'story preface' in his account of story telling in conversation. Since stories require 'a suspension of conventional turn-exchange' at a number of turn-transition locations, story-tellers mostly find themselves in a position to implicitly ask for permission in order to occupy a turn long enough to complete the story they have started. At this point, it seems quite relevant to observe that the display of the bid for more TCUs than normally allowed for a specific segment of conversation is also closely related to 'turn-taking organisation' in which the display of 'an intention to tell a story is considered as equal to that of floor holding'. As Sacks (1971:18) further points out, "basically what a story is in some ways is an attempt to control the floor over an extended series of utterances".

The fact that a forthcoming story is, in a way, seen as an attempt to secure a third slot in talk from the first further supports our observation that prospective stories and their possible display are relevantly concerned with the wider issue of floor holding.[1] In this connection, it should be noted that *işte* in its various occurrences in Turkish conversation acts in a capacity whereby it displays that its producer is implicitly

[1]Securing a third slot from the first could be achieved by a question or an open-ended statement in the first turn to be followed by an inquiry about it in the second turn and then comes the story. A similar case is illustrated in the extract below:
1 E: = abi herifi gördünüzmü gördünüzmü herifin son halini
1 E: = have you seen the man lately have you seen what he is like now
2 G: = naptı
2 G: = what is he like
3 E: = napmış biliyomusun peruk takmış gözlükleri atmış [devam ediyor]
3 E: = you know what he is like he has put on a wig his optical glasses are off [continues]

bidding for extended turns with a specific TCU construction. Sacks et al. (1974) suggest that speakers can indicate an interest in producing a multi-unit turn in various ways. They claim that even an entire turn may be devoted to turn-extensions (see footnote 9).

The specific TCU-construction of which *işte* is a significant part being explored here has the following features: After claiming the turn, the speaker first produces a turn-initial TCU as a preliminary to his/her story. Within the boundary of this preliminary TCU, the speaker inserts the particle *işte*. The speaker eventually opens up the floor for him/herself. As the data analysis reveals, *işte* can be placed at various points within this preliminary unit. The possible placement points are early in the TCU after the subject (examples 1 and 2), close to the completion of the unit (example 2) and as the final element in the TCU (example 2). Among the possible reasons for this *işte*- construction and the variability in its placement is the flexible word order in Turkish. The fact that Turkish has a flexible word order has a role to play in the emergence of such a construction. In his comprehensive book on the Turkish language, Lewis (1967: 241) points out that "in an inflected language like Turkish, one can take liberties with the conventional word order and still be intelligible".

The placement of *işte* within this turn construction is directly affected by the above-mentioned features in its capacity to project multisize TCUs. There is an additional aspect of this turn format, which greatly contributes to the current speaker's effort to successfully display his/her projection of an extended turn: It is intonation, which assists the speaker's efforts to secure multi-size TCUs (personal communications with native speakers also support the view). As Lewis (1967: 24) observes, the general rule is that "a rise in pitch denotes that the thought is not yet complete whereas a fall in pitch marks its end".

The projection of speakers of producing extended TCUs by means of this *işte* construction is further supported by intonation whereby the speaker produces the particle *işte* with a marked rise in intonation (marked by a question mark) thus giving

the whole unit a sense of incompleteness (In example (1) below, line 5; and in example (2), line 7).

The overall picture we have at the end of the description of this turn construction with the turn-taking organisation of Conversational Structure Domain in mind is that the *işte* construction-within the turn-initial TCU firstly displays its producer's claim to a new turn after the completion of the previous speaker's turn, and secondly, by projecting forwards, his/her bid for extended TCUs for the forthcoming telling and thirdly holding the floor for a certain number of next TCUs, which implicitly asks for the other participants to withhold their turns at the possible TRPs (Schegloff 1980 and 1982).

Before moving on to the analysis of some conversational fragments, an observation has to be noted about the conversational environment, which is conducive to the occurrence of the *işte*-construction. The possibility for the use of *işte* tends to arise when the self-selecting current speaker (the producer of *işte*) disjunctively shifts the topic in order to further develop the topic. When the topic is already well in progress, a person can always claim the floor and develop the topic, which is already known by all the participants present. However, when one of the participants is about to introduce a shift in the current topic for which an extended-turn is needed, s/he has to show that the incipient turn is disjunctive in some way. So, an extended-turn is claimed by means of the *işte*-construction to introduce the shift.

During the analysis of each conversational extract below, we will see how the other participants are actually orienting to the *işte*-construction within the turn, during and at its completion by withholding the talk at possible TRPs until the completion of the story being told (although turn transition becomes relevant at those points). In fact, it has to be borne in mind that the length of turn at talk is not controlled by one person. The bid for extended turns has everything to do with the manner in which that bid is responded to by other participants in the conversation. In the following, we will first elaborate on example (1) where the potential next speaker indicates from the beginning of the turn an orientation in producing more than one TCU. It should also

be noted here that beginning a turn this way recognises the contingency of turn-taking, and, by projecting a multi-unit turn, invites (the other) recipients to hold off talking where they might otherwise start.

Within the context of the example (1) below, the progressively quick infra and super-structural development of İstanbul is the focal point. As is clear from the extract, an informational contribution in each turn by each speaker towards the current topic is progressively made.

Example-1

```
 1 C: eskiden zaten (1) bayağı bir şehir dışıymış oraları
 2 A: = tabi tabi
 3 C: adamlar fabrika //kurmuşlar
 4 M:                //karpuz tarlasıymış orası
→5 A: bizim işte? üniversite kampüsü. (1.5)  benden bir sene önceki
 6    girişli çocuklar anlatıyodu(1.5)  kampüsü yapmışlar = kampüsün
 7    içinde inekler falan büyükbaş hayvanlar falan dolaşiyomuş= yan
 8    taraflar falan hep böyle gecekondu mahalleleriymiş orda (1.5)
 9    onun dışında başka hiç yerleşim yok (1)  işte Mövenpick
11    falan geldi bu arada  iyice büyüdü
12 E: o büyük çarşı duruyo dimi hala
.............................................................
 1 C: in the past (1) that area was considered out of town
 2 A: = right right
 3 C: they built up a factory //there
 4 M:                         //that area was a field of
 5    melons at the time
→6 A: our işte? university campus. (1.5) those friends who are one
 7    year senior to me once told me (1.5)  they built the campus
 8    =  they say the cattle were wandering around on the
 9    campus ground = the area was actually located by a shanty
10    town they say (1.5)  there was no other settlement (1)
11    işte Movenpick was built there later  and the area
12    gradually prospered
13 E: the big shopping centre is still there isn't it
```

Through lines 1 and 5 in this example, we see a good example of turn-taking whereby we observe that turn distribution is in operation. Since turn distribution organises interactive or potential enforcement of a minimisation of turn size, we clearly see participants in this conversation constructing minimal size TCUs whose ends, as is clearly seen above, constitute a possible completion of a turn in which they are used (lines 1 through 5). And possible completions of the turns are places at which potential next speakers appropriately start their next turns. By doing sequentially appropriate nexts, which contribute to the current topic, up to speaker A in line 5, the participants present clear evidence for Schegloff's (1982) observation that 'a great many turns at talk in conversation are one unit long'. In other words, in cases where more than one constructional unit is claimed, it has to be done in certain ways so that other participants understand that one is displaying a bid for that turn.

The turn in line 5 in example (1) above is initiated by speaker A after the completion of the previous speaker's (speaker M's) overlapping TCU in his turn (line 4) with that of speaker C (line 3). With the completion of speaker M's one-TCU-long turn (line 4), speaker A initiates and constructs his first TCU (line 5). The turn-initial TCU of speaker A actually conforms to the *işte*-construction within a turn as explained above. On closer examination, we realise that the construction of this unit constitutes a full TCU with its clear completion point. The fact that the particle *işte* is inserted within the boundary of this TCU, and that it is produced with a rise in intonation separates it out from ordinary turn-initial TCUs. Beginning a turn this way in conversational Turkish represents a mechanism for projecting more-than-one-TCU-long turn (multi-unit turn). Speaker A initially produces '*bizim işte üniversite kampüsü (1.5)*' (line 5) through which he registers that the turn he has just started will be composed of more than one turn constructional unit. As Sacks (1974) emphasises, the projection of a multi-unit turn is announced at the beginning of the turn. As speaker A's turn begins with a display of that projection, it remains for recipients to honour this projection and withhold talk at the points at which it would otherwise be appropriate.

As it has been mentioned above, the length of a turn cannot be controlled unilaterally, that is by one person only. Its extension has to be confirmed by the

133

other participants as well. Indeed, the occurrence of a one-and-a-half second pause '*bizim **işte** üniversite kampüsü (1.5)*' (line 5) at the end of speaker A's preliminary turn supposedly projecting more TCUs provides the first justification that the *işte*-construction early within the turn projects an extended turn, and confirmation that the recipients orient to speaker A's request for it. The presence of this relatively long pause clearly constitutes a potential TRP for the recipients to start their own turn, which is the second justification. The fact however that no one attempts to do so and speakers clearly withhold their talk at this point indicates that speaker A's projection and bid for more than one turn constructional unit has been granted to him, and as a result of this, those who have granted, will orient to this multi-unit turn until its completion. Subsequent to this pause throughout which 'permission' for a longer turn has been granted, speaker A once again starts the telling of his personal account and makes his contribution to the developing current topic. When we look at the remainder of this extended turn, we realise that speaker A gradually comes to a recognisable completion of his account when he first produces '***işte** Mövenpick falan geldi bu arada*' followed by '*iyice büyüdü*' (lines 9 through 12) in which a conclusive assessment is offered. It is quite clear that the account, which started with a description of the area as a 'cattle-grazing' one, is completed with the summary information that the construction of a big hotel clearly marked the expansion of the area. With the completion of this extended turn, turn transition takes place with 'split-second precision', whereby speaker E self-selects as the next speaker (see Schegloff et al., 1977).

It is clear from the extract above that the 'strategic' insertion of *işte* with the first TCU of the new turn enables the whole constructional unit to function as a possible projection for extension in turn size. The *işte*-construction is clearly supported by the intonational, sequential and semantic properties of the local context. We have also clearly observed that the positive response of the other participants to the projection of multi-unit turn is interactionally achieved. It is the request posited by the current speaker and subsequently granted by the other participants. We have a case here in which each participant orients to the other(s) and all orient to the underlying turn-taking organisation within the Conversational Structural Domain, which is itself interactionally driven and constrained.

It should also be noted here that there is a wider issue concerning the occurrence of the *işte*-construction within the turn. On close examination, we observe that there is an additional task implicitly achieved by the display of a multi-unit turn: It is that of floor holding and its immediate recognition of it by the participants' orientation to it in the conversation. Therefore, what the placement of *işte* with the turn-initial construction is additionally doing is to index a longer possession of the floor by the current speaker. While the speaker continues to hold on to the floor, the recipients, by not self-selecting at possible turn transition points, display their recognition and orientation to the act engaged in by the current speaker.

In the following, we will focus on and analyse another conversational fragment above in which the current speaker's *işte*-construction once again successfully secures her an extended turn for the telling of her story. In fact, as will be clear shortly, both speaker H and M project multi-size turns in succession in order to relate their personal accounts whereby the *işte*-construction has a role to play.

In trying to understand the topic of the next example, we see that all the participants are engaged in the comparison of Turkish and English cuisine. Despite the lack of first-hand experience of the latter, speaker H and M attempt to relate separately the experiences of their friends and relatives.

Example-2

```
 1 C: ana menü pirinç
 2 E: evet  bi bulguru bulguru kimse bilmiyo ya  aslında bulguru
 3    şu Avrupalılar bi keşfetse  özellikle vejeteryanlar için
 4    o kadar değerli bi besin ki  bilmiyorlar  biz kısır
 5    mısır götürüyoruz böyle bakıyor adamlar ne bu böyle diye
 6 A: bu ne ya = yiyelimmi yemiyelimmi  sakat bişeymi
→7 H:bizim Ahmet işte? Emmayla nişanlıyken şeye m İngiltereye işte?
 8    gezmeye gittiler. = işte burdan kemalpaşa tatlısı götürmüş =
 9    kurufasülye  götürmüş = mercimek götürmüş = sarı
10   mercimek götürmüş onlara bigüzel ziyafet çekmiş =
11   o kadar beğenmişlerki = hele kurufasülye falan çok
12   şey diyo değişik //geldi diyo
13M:                 //bizim bizim teyzeoğlu gitti
→14  ya işte? (2)  boğazınada düşkün böyle = sever yemek yemeyi
```

135

```
15   babada Antakyalı = Antakyanın kendine has yemekleri var tabi =
16   onları yerler evde genelde  İngiltereye bi gittim diyo =
17   ulan sabah bi kalktım diyo bezelye haşlama [gülüyor]
18   öğlen bilmemne haşlama = bu ne ya demiş = ikigün yemek
19   yemedim diyo
.................................................................
 1 C: the main menu is rice
 2 E: yes  not many people eat bulgar wheat though  infact it's
 3   high time the Europeans wake up to the bulgar wheat  it is
 4   such a [nutritionally] valuable food for vegetarians
 5   especially  they don't eat it much  kısır that we cook for
 6   our friends is not much appreciated
 7 A: what's that = shall I eat it or not  it there something
 8    wrong with it
→9 H: our Ahmet işte? when he was engaged to Emma they went to şey
→10   England işte? for a holiday. = işte he took kemalpaşa he
 11   took beans = he took lentils = he took red lentils = he said
 12  he cooked a feast for all the family = he said they just loved
 13 it = especially the beans tasted so different to them //he said
 14 M:                                      //our
 15   our   aunt's son
→16   went there işte? (2)he likes eating = he is very keen on it
 17   his father is from Antakya...Antakya has its own special food
 18   = they generally cook their own dishes  he says I went
 19   to England for the first time = he says I found boiled peas
 20   in front of me in the morning [laugh]  for lunch işte
 21   another  kind of boiled vegetable = what on earth is going on
 22   he says = he didn't have meals for two days he said
```

With speaker A's completion of his turn (line 6), there occurs a possible TRP and it
is speaker H (line 7), who self-selects, immediately initiating a new turn. Looking at
the size of speaker H's turn, it is clear that it is longer than the usual size of turns
(Schegloff, 1982). As soon as speaker H initiates her turn (line 7), she produces her
first and relatively long turn constructional unit, in which she produces not one but
two *işte*s within the same preliminary TCU, '*bizim Ahmet **işte** Emma ile nişanlıyken
şeye m İngiltereye **işte** gezmeye gittiler*' (line 7). Both of these particles are uttered
with a rising intonation. In this segment, speaker H reports about either a close

friend's or a relative's (with '*bizim Ahmet*', it is hard tell to which one) trip to England for a holiday. It is relevant to observe that this turn-initial TCU as a report is hearably incomplete after '*gezmeye gittiler*': that is, more should and will be told about the reported state of affairs. For example, what is the relation between these people (current turn) and the cuisine of the two nations (previous turn)? I'd like to argue here that with the absence of *işte* there, the first TCU would be an ordinary one, a TCU reporting a statement with a predictable completion after which a potential turn transition point emerges. Indeed, other native speakers in my personal communication with them have supported my argument on the completeness/incompleteness of this TCU and other similar ones. Although it would be rewarding to find cases where the completeness/incompleteness is clearer, the data at hand does not contain cases in which the participants should have, but did not use the *işte*-construction. After all, it seemed to be the right thing to provide the right signal when it was needed.

As for the two uses of *işte* within the same TCU, the possible explanation for it (since it is the only case with two occurrences) seems to do with the relatively complex syntactic structure of this *işte*-construction (when compared to the previous example) since it is composed of clausal units. While the first *işte* is inserted right after the noun phrase of the first part of the clause unit, the second occurrence of *işte* is placed between the object and subject of the second clause. It might be possible to think of the second *işte* here as a particle, in the current speaker's effort to start and tell a story, which helps him to hold the floor as he needs some time and space to organise his story. A question may spring to one's mind here as to whether it is always necessary and usual that more than one particle is used in the case of longer TCUs. Although the data do not provide counter-examples, once again my personal communication with some native speakers indicate that the occurrence of only one *işte* would just suffice here.

All in all, with its two occurrences, the *işte*-construction within the turn enables the speaker to project an extended turn in which she can continue with the details of the account she has just reported. Throughout the course of this extended turn, similar to the first case above, there is a clear orientation to this projection by the recipients,

who withhold their talk at possible turn-transition points. Towards the hearable completion of speaker H's extended turn with conclusive assessment, speaker M self-selects as the next speaker. However, the point he initiates his speakership overlaps almost with the last two elements of speaker H's hearably completing TCU. As Schegloff et al. (1977) state, transitions from one turn to a successive one, characterised by a slight gap or slight overlap, are as common as transitions with no gap and no overlap. In this case, as it seems, speaker M on hearing speaker H's projectable completion, overlaps with the last part of her turn to self-select as the next speaker.

Looking at speaker M's first TCU (line 13), we see a syntactic clause in which *işte* occurs as the last word and there is rise in intonation on *işte*. Though we will come to it later, the two-second pause that follows this *işte*-construction should be mentioned. When we syntactically look at the noun phrase of this utterance, we see a recycling of the first part of the clause '*bizim bizim teyzeoğlu*' (line 13). It seems that the reason for the repetition of this element is to make sure that it is still intelligible since that part of the utterance unit has overlapped with that of speaker H's last (see Schegloff et al. (1977) for repetitions in overlaps). Before moving on, it should be noted that the data analysis reveals that *işte* is not likely to occur turn-initially within a multi-turn bidding construction and the absence of counter-examples could be seen as a further support for this observation.

Similar to speaker H's turn and TCU initiation, speaker M is engaged in a turn initiation in which he produces the *işte*-construction within the turn whereby the extended turn projection is displayed. Similarly, speaker M also attempts to account for an identical experience of one of his relatives who went to England. This *işte*-construction includes the information that his aunt's son went there '*bizim bizim teyzeoğlu gitti ya işte*' (lines 13 and 14), which is followed by a two-second pause. Like the example (1) above, the presence of this rather long pause constitutes clear-cut evidence for the fact that while the projection of the extended turn by speaker M has just been displayed by the *işte*-construction, the recipients also indicate their recognition and orientation to this projection and subsequently display it by withholding their talk at this obvious TRP. Once again, it would have been

rewarding to provide counter-examples to support the case; however, it simply is not the case throughout the data that the current speaker is interrupted after the production of the *işte*-construction. As is clear from rest of the turn, speaker M proceeds to tell his personal account about his relative and completes it without interruption.

Once again, the wider issue of floor-holding is relevant here. With its capacity to project forwards and bid for an extended turn, the *işte*-construction within the turn basically displays its producer's orientation to hold the turn and floor for longer than usual. This is actually what the speaker is doing by using *işte*. S/he wants to hold on to the floor for longer and speak more in order to be able to complete his/her account. What is equally significant to note here is the interactionally reciprocal response of the recipient(s) to this act of display. What recipients do in return is to grant him/her the permission to have a continued possession of the floor for the account. Therefore, it will not be incorrect, as a result of this observation, to propose that a device like the particle *işte* has an important role to play in the transition as well as maintenance of turns. The conduct of an orderly and describable mechanism of extended turn projection and its successful recognition and honouring in interaction provides clear evidence for the fact that all the participants in the conversations above recognise the socially shared aspect of the talk and maintain it. And this maintenance is successfully contributed to by the help of a particle recurrently found as a construction within a specific turn format.

5.2.2 Turn and Floor Claimer

This occurrence of *işte* is mostly associated with contexts in which the speaker uses this particle to mark his/her entry into the sequence. In this use, *işte* always occurs turn and TCU-initially in this function within the Conversational Structure Domain. The role of *işte* in TCU-initial position as a turn/floor claimer could also be looked at within the framework of turn transitions. The initiation of a turn by a particle like *işte* seals the completion of a prior turn and the start of a new one, marking the transition of its producer from 'incipient next' to 'current'. In addition to claiming the turn and the floor, as Schegloff (1996) points out, there are always generic jobs to

be done with regard to the prior turn. For example, one of them, he claims, is disengaging from the informational projection of the prior turn. This point is important in that it indicates the difference between turn-initial occurrences of *yani* and *işte*. As was reported in Chapter 4, a turn-initial *yani* displays the connection between the current and previous speaker. The use of *işte* turn-initially, however, in certain contexts by the current speaker while claiming the turn and floor again is hearable as a disjunction marker, alerting recipients that what follows might not be related to what preceded, but something disjunctive with what preceded, which is mostly a tie-back to the original focus of the topic rather than potentially a new start of a new topic. An *işte*-initiated new turn thereby formulates the prior turn as the completion point of subtopic(s) and itself as a unit of re-focus mostly through the tie-back. In addition to claiming the turn and floor, the general trajectory of talk after *işte* in general indexes what is being done as a tie-back return initiated and controlled by the speaker him/herself.

The sequence seen in example 3 below is only a very small part of the talk, which started earlier. In the initial part of the topic, speaker İ and M first describe and then complain about the smoking restrictions imposed on smokers in certain venues at their university in the UK.

Example-3

```
 1 I: kahveyi alıyosun = gidiyosun = orda içiyosun = ee:
 2    bizim hakkımız ne olcak
 3 D: gülüyor
 4 E: gülüyor
 5 M: ben bile kızdım artık onlara = beraber oturup kantinde kahve
 6     //içemiyoruz
 7 I:  // bide demokrasiden dem vururlar
 8 M: bu sigarasız içmiyo çünkü
 9 D: kantini tamamen sigarasızmı yaptılar
 .
 .
 .
36 D: ve adam da tiryaki
37 E: acayip tiryaki hem de
→38 I: *işte* yani ben kendimi düşünüyorum = ben sigarasız düşünemem
```

```
39     bile  mesela ben kütüphanede niye çalışamıyorum
..........................................................................
 1 I: you take the coffee = you go there = and you drink it
 2    there = how  about our rights
 3 D: laughs
 4 E: laughs
 5 M:even I am cross with them = we just can't sit and drink coffee
 6    together  at the coffee-bar
 7 I: this is not democratic at all
 8 M: he just can't drink the coffee without a fag
 9 D: is smoking completely banned in the coffee-bar then
 .
 .
 .
 36 D: and he is an addict
 37 E: he is such an addict
→38 I: işte yani I can only relate to my own situation = I can't
 39   even  properly think without smoking  that is the main reason
 40    why I can't study in the library
```

When we look at the example above, we realise that there is another relevant part of the previously covered topic of 'smoking'. In order to clarify the co-text and context, it is relevant here to explain that speaker İ is the only smoker among this party of four interactants. In the subsequent development of the talk, all the participants collectively contribute to the topic with various degrees of shifts in several topical directions from their own personal experiences.

In the immediate sequential context up to speaker İ's the *işte*-initiated turn (line 38), speaker D and M are engaged in developing the topic by initially relating the general situation and then an example of a specific person. Before speaker İ's turn, both speaker D and E present their assessment of the degree of the smoking habit of the person in question (lines 36 and 37 respectively). It can relevantly be observed at this point that the issue of smoking, initiated and mainly revolved around speaker İ, the only smoker in the group, digressed into subtopics during which speaker İ's possession of the status of speakership and propositional contributions has gradually diminished. While the focus was initially on speaker İ's complaint about his

university's 'segregation' against smokers like himself and how it was difficult for him to smoke even at the university's cafes, it later moved on to how the same issue is handled in other participants' university. As is clearly seen in the sequence above, speaker D's assessment '*ve adamda tiryaki*' (line 36) in her own turn is partly recycled in speaker E's subsequent turn in which the adjective 'tiryaki' is clearly 'upgraded' (Pomerantz, 1984) with the addition of emphasis '*acayip tiryaki hemde*' (line 37). At the transition relevant place that emerged after the completion of speaker E's 'reflective assessment', speaker İ initiates his own turn with *işte* as the very first element of this new turn. The sequential context, when inspected closely, indexes that the occurrence of *işte* at this spot serves as a turn and floor claimer. What *işte* does and what its producer does by using the particle there is to make use of the potential TRP for turn transition, and subsequently initiate and establish his own speakership.

What has just been described above is clearly concerned with a turn-taking function of the particle within the Conversational Structure Domain of conversation. The speaker's turn and TCU-initial use of *işte* indexes the recognition of a potential TRP and an establishment of his speakership for the next turn. What is, however, being done through the talk with the claiming of the floor by breaking the ongoing talk, which is displayed by means of *işte*, is to tie the information content of his/her upcoming TCU to the earlier focal point of the topic. In the sequential context above, speakers D and E, having previously described their current situation at their university, end up with an example of what their smoking restrictions have done to people. With the transition of speaking turn to speaker İ, what he informationally does subsequently is not to follow what has just preceded, but to return and tie the informational content of his upcoming TCU to the original starting point of the topic, which was the problems he faced at his immediate physical context.

A similar kind of sequential environment relevant for the occurrence of *işte* can be found in example (4) below in which the conversational pattern of *işte* performing its function as described above both at the level of turn-taking organisation and on the level of larger ongoing activity is clearly seen. It would initially be relevant to reflect on the background context and co-text, which makes it possible for *işte* to

142

serve the function it conventionally does in these sort of conversational environments.

In the earlier segments of this conversational sequence, the participants concentrated their attention on the issue of private language tuition provided by individual language teachers in their hometown.

Example-4

```
 1 D: bide bu Anglodil galiba İngilteredeki bi okulun devamı gibi =
 2    sanki  onun temsilciligini almış gibi görünüyo = yada
 3    bilmiyorum o havayımı yaratıyolar
 4 E: varmı öyle bişey
 5 D: = sanki öyle bişeylerle reklam yapılıyo
→6 M: işte bende gidip bi İnciye hayırlı olsun demeye gittim (1)
 7    birazda bilgi alayım [okul hakkında]
 8 E: mhm (1) hocam sizde yani emekli olduktan sonra rahat rahat bu
 9    tür işler yapabilirsiniz (1)  yani şimdiden aslında
 10   sondaj mondaj
........................................................................
 1 D: also this Anglodil seems like a branch of an English school =
 2    it looks as if they are their representative here = or I
 3    don't  know they may be pretending that they are
 4 E: is it true
 5 D: = it's as if that's how they are promoting themselves
→6 M: işte I just went there to say good luck to İnci (1) I thought
 7    I could get some information as well [about the
 8    language school]
 9 E: mhm (1) sir you yani after you retire can easily find
 10   these sorts of teaching jobs (1) yani you can even make
 11   some contacts now
```

In the part of the extract provided above, the focus started to shift to private language schools, which provided the same service. At one point, speakers D and E pinpoint a particular school, which they thought must have recently opened up. And then comes the inquiry about it (lines 1 through 5). In his provision of the information sought, speaker M relates the specific situational context (lines 6 and 7) where he became acquainted with the sort of information he is currently presenting to the

143

recipients. At some point, as is illustrated in the example above, the focus is shifted by speaker D to the status of this language school about which speaker D expresses her assessment (lines 1 through 3) that this school may be a branch of an England-based language schools chain. Speaker E, who wants to receive confirmation (line 4) whether this rumour is true or it is just a 'promotional rumour', also pursues this particular assessment. Subsequently, speaker D, in her own turn, proceeds to strengthen her initial assessment (line 5). As soon as speaker D brings her turn to a hearable completion, speaker M makes use of the emerging TRP and initiates his speakership by using *işte* as the very first element of his new turn and initial TCU (line 6). Speaker M displays, with help of the particle *işte*, that with a hearable completion of previous speaker's turn, he declares it completed and himself as the next speaker.

A closer look at the sequence we have above clarifies the difference of focus, that is a break of focus, between speakers D and E (lines 1 through 5), and speaker M (line 6 and 7). Before speaker M's *işte*-initiated turn, speakers D and E had already moved the subject to a recently opened up specific language school. What started as speaker M's attempt to account for how he became acquainted with this school and the surprising coincidence of meeting one of his former class-mates (at the university) and finding out that she is now the director of this school after her retirement, subsequently turned to a topical direction in which speakers D and E pursued the same topic of this issue. The final point that speakers D and E have focused on is quite distant from where the topic first started. With speaker D coming to the end of her assessment in her last TCU, speaker M's production of *işte* at that particular point, in addition to the initiation of a new turn and claiming of the floor, provides a break from the continuity of what was last produced and links the upcoming propositional component back to the original starting point of speaker M.

A closer look at speaker M's turn reveals that the propositional content of his new turn does not follow from what has preceded, but can relevantly be traced back to his last turn on this issue earlier in the sequence (to note that as a tie-back function, this might, in Gricean terms, be considered as 'Hedge on Relevance', Brown and

Levinson, 1987). In sum, the orderly interactional import of the particle *işte* in contexts such as described above is not only to claim the speaking turn and the floor for its producer, but also to re-establish the relevance of original focus of the topic through tie-back.

5.3 Content Domain

The main functions of *işte* are mostly found within the Content Domain. The particle *işte* will be illustrated to have certain functions on the global level where it is a boundary signal between discourse units as well as functioning locally to mark dispreffered answers.

5.3.1 Frame Function

The occurrence of *işte* we will now discuss performs a function within the Frame Function of Content Domain. Its basic role is to index the ending of the current speaker's personal account. As we will see later in the chapter, while some uses of the particle function to move the discourse forward, *işte* in this particular environment helps the speaker to bring the discourse development to a close.

5.3.1.1 Marker of Exemplification/Detail

Based on the inspection of the data, this particular function displays a quite recurrent pattern with quite a high frequency of use in Turkish conversation. In our attempt to understand the operational basis for the use of this function of *işte*, we need to focus on the turns within which *işte* performs its function of exemplification/explanation. The initiation of *işte* within the contexts where it performs the function in question may be launched in the course of a turn as well as 'TCU-in-progress'. For instance, when *işte* is introduced within a turn, it mostly prefaces a turn constructional unit within whose boundaries it accomplishes its actual function. Similarly, the occurrence of *işte* within the TCU also constitutes another independent unit, which is normally smaller in size. Whether produced within a turn or inside a TCU-in-progress, *işte* functionally performs the same job of introducing the details of the point in focus. In both cases, the speaker, by means of *işte*, opens him/herself a

syntactic space within the ongoing construction of the turn or a TCU and inserts the relevant information, which is to facilitate the understanding of speaker's meaning.

As the actual function of *işte* makes clear, what is introduced as exemplification is indeed the follow-up of what is immediately preceding. Therefore, this extra bit of information has direct link as displayed by *işte*, between what goes before since it is introducing its details and what comes after because the understanding of the following is largely based on receiving what has been said before. While in the first example below, we have the case of *işte* used inside a turn constructional unit, the second example displays *işte* within the constructional boundaries of a turn.

Speakers D and G in example (5) are involved in a discussion in which speaker D is suspicious about the educational task that she asked speaker G's students to accomplish.

Example-5

```
 1 D: istemiyo olabilirler ayrı = bide birbirlerini etkiliyo
 2    olabilirler = ben bunu sana asıl soracaktım = acaba bu çocuklar
→3    birbirleriyle konuşup mm birbirlerinden etkilenip işte sen nası
 4    yazdın sen nası yazdın deyip kendileri analiz gibi birşey
 5    yaparlarmı diye düşündüm
.................................................................
 1 D: that they may not want it is different = also they may easily
 2    affect one another = this is what I wanted to ask you = I just
 3    thought to myself whether it might be the case that these
→4    students would talk to each other mm affect one another işte
 5    asking how do you do this how do you do that
```

Speaker D's suspicion stems from a basic fear that students might have affected and even copied from each other in carrying out this educational task, which is part of speaker D's data collection. With the fear of her data having been slightly contaminated, speaker D inquires from speaker G if there exists such a possibility (lines 1 and 2). During the productional course of this inquiry, speaker D uses two different verbs '*konuşmak and etkilemek*' in her attempt to expressively make her inquiry (line 3). Subsequent to these verbs, speaker D inserts in the particle *işte*,

146

which displays the opening up of the syntactically relevant informational space where the details of her inquiry are introduced; '***işte*** *sen ne yazdın sen ne yazdın'* (line 4). The two verbs, which express a general description of the situation, are immediately followed by a specific detailing, whose upcoming relevance has been clearly been indexed by *işte*. This detail is inserted inside the TCU and after its completion the speaker carries on as normal. The content of information of the insertion-TCU as initiated by *işte* is actually relevantly following from what is preceding it and is also contributing to the relevance of what is to come. The particle *işte*, in addition to signalling the introduction of details acts as a device that enables its producer to elaborate the details before it is too late to do so.

In the case below in example (6), we have the topic of 'housing tax', which, apart from few exceptions, all Turkish citizens have to pay when they leave the country to go abroad. Due to the ambiguity in the law, the students studying abroad mostly felt that they always fell victim to the mercy and goodwill of the custom officers whether they would have to pay it or not.

Example-6

```
→1 D: bi mektup veriyolar = işte görev izinli gelmiştir görevinden
  2   diye  şu şu tarihler arasında = vermiyoruz iki seferdir
  3   konutfonu
...........................................................................
→1 D: they give you a letter = işte it says the person in question
  2   is on leave between these certain dates shown = we did not have
  3   to pay the housing tax for the last two times
```

Speakers N and D relate to each other their individual experiences with custom officers at the airports. In the part of the topic not included above, speaker D breaks the news to speaker N that this problem has indefinitely been resolved. In response to an inquiry made by speaker N, speaker D attempts to explain that all it takes to avoid having to pay the tax is to obtain a particular letter from the institution you work for. Having mentioned such a letter, speaker D in her next move, attempts to give more details about the content of this letter (line 1). The initiation of this bridging TCU is marked by *işte* (line 1). The speaker, by means of *işte*, displays the

opening up of a space in which relevant extra information is to be appended, the kind of information which is to exemplify what has just gone before and which opens up a TCU slot.

We have seen so far that one of the functions of *işte* is to signal the introduction of detailed information on the current topic. As an either 'insertion' or a separate TCU, *işte* prefaces it and indexes that the upcoming TCU includes some details of what has just been said and is quite relevant to the following as well.

5.3.1.2 Topic Closure

This use of *işte* performs its function as collocated with the adverb 'böyle', thus forming the particle phrase '*işte böyle*'. The data analysis has revealed that the occurrence of *işte böyle* in Turkish conversation where it forms a regular pattern is used to project the ending of the current speaker's telling and turn, thus closure of the topic. In order to recognise this usage of *işte*, we need to look at the sequential and activity contexts. Aspects of sequential and activity context describe environments for the particle phrase *işte böyle* as a topic closure. *İşte böyle* is associated with contexts in which while one of the participants of the conversation does most of the talking on the topic relevant at that moment, the other participant(s) mostly listen(s) and contribute(s) to the topic through their insertion questions, backchannels etc. In such a context, the phrase particle *işte böyle* indexes that its producer has now reached the completion of his/her telling and has no more to say about it. The occurrence of *işte böyle* also projects forward, indexing a shift to another relevant issue, either by the current speaker him/herself as an increment to the prior turn or by another participant as a result of self-selection. When the speaker registers the particle as the closure of the current topic, the upcoming transition of the topic is accomplished in a stepwise fashion (Sacks, 1972).

In the extract below, the word 'recording' attracts the attention of speaker B, who, as a result, starts to inquire about the technical equipment required for it. In the part of the extract not included above, speaker E, in response to speaker B's suggestion to leave the scene of conversation to go somewhere else, seems to account for the

148

reason why he is in that particular physical environment, where he wouldn't normally be.

Example-7

```
 1 B: kasetlemi yani video kasetle teyplemi = nasıl yapıyosunuz
 2 E: = yok yok şeyle video (0.5) comcorder var burda
 3    onunla yapıyoruz (0.5) // m işte ben
 4 B:                              // şu teyp kasedine benzer
 5    kasetleri var
 6 E: = tabi tabi ondan = şu şu kasetler (0.5) şunları
 7  kullanıyoruz [gösteriyor] (1)  ondan sonra onun kaydını yaptım
 8 = şimdi Derya feedback  veriyo öğrencilere  eski m geçen haftaki
 9 veya evvelsi haftalarda kendi çektiği m dersleri şimdi gösteriyo
10 = onları video kasede çektik = onları gösteriyo ediyo(1)   ondan
→11   sonra işte böyle  sen sizde video varmı burda
.............................................................
 1 B: with cassettes yani do you use video tape = how do you record
 2 E: = no no şeyle video (0.5) we have a camcorder here = we use
 3   that (0.5) // m işte I
 4 B:      // those tapes that look like ordinary music tapes
 5 E: = yes yes those ones = these these tapes (0.5) we use these
 6  [showing] (1) and then I have just finished the recording = now
 7 Derya is giving feedback to the students  previous m last week's
 8  or previous week's recording which she herself made earlier are
 9  being shown now = we copied them on to video tapes = she is
→10 showing them now (1) and then işte böyle  have you got a video
   11 here
```

Before proceeding to account for the function of *işte böyle*, let us try to see how speaker E had to deal with speaker B's 'insertion' questions (line 1 through 7), which prevented him from having an uninterrupted space for his telling. Following the interruption to speaker E's story account, speaker B's inquiry about the technical equipment required for it starts (line 1). Subsequently in his attempt in providing the information inquired, speaker E once again attempts to resume his account (line 7). However, at the same time speaker B also starts a confirmation question (lines 4 and 5), which clearly overlaps with speaker E's story-preface '*işte ben*' (line 3). As expected in the case of overlaps (line 3), one party stops, who is speaker E in this

149

case and the overlapping party, speaker B, continues and completes his question (lines 4 and 5). It is possible to think that being already engaged in the construction of his own utterance, speaker B may have missed speaker E's story announcement marked by *işte* and simply carried on. After the completion of speaker B's confirmation question (line 5), speaker E provides his answer by physically showing the inquired object to speaker B (lines 6 and 7). Subsequently, having already signalled his orientation to narrate his account, speaker E attempts to do so (lines 7 through 11). As far as the narrative is concerned, '*onları gösteriyo ediyo*' (line 11) is hearably the final utterance of the story and speaker E subsequently pauses for one second. After the one-second pause, speaker E starts again with a continuation particle 'ondan sonra', which is subsequently followed by the particle phrase '*işte böyle*' (line 11).

The phrase marker '*işte böyle*' in this context enables the speaker to display that he has reached the end of his telling and has no more to say about it. Although the continuation particle '*ondan sonra*' used after the one-second pause may display that the speaker is to continue, the occurrence of '*işte böyle*' there confirms that it was a 'false start' since the speaker immediately signals the end of his account. '*İşte böyle*' provides the confirmation that there will be no more telling on the same topic and after that point, a topic change or shift is relevant. Speaker E's closure of the topic, indeed, has a sequential consequence whereby turn-transition as well as topic shift or change becomes relevant. The emerging TRP displays an orientation towards the normal procedure of turn-taking. While it is possible for the speaker himself to continue, another participant may well take the turn after which the conversation is likely to proceed in another topical direction. Clearly, the option of the current speaker himself continuing becomes relevant, but his self-selection is done only to direct a question to speaker B and they proceed from there.

In this context in example (8), speaker B mainly responds to speaker E's earlier inquiry about his brother since he has not heard any news of him for some time.
Example-8
```
 1 B: ordanda artık icabında anam babam acil hasta diye bi yalan
 2    patlatıp çat diye kalkıp iştese gelebilirdi = ama haber verdik
```

```
 3     biz = sırf kafası bulanmasın diye haber vermeyebilirdik =
 4     ordaki durumu  biliyoz
 5 E: anladım
 6 B: ben = söyledik annemle biz ikimiz de ama (0.5) şey yapmadı
 7 E: = ne kadardır calışıyo orda şimdi
      (2)
 8 B: altı ayı yaklaşık (0.5) altı ayı tam doldurmadıda = altı
 9   ayı belkide Aralıkta Ocakta dolduracak
10 E: mhm
11 B: = altı ayı doldurdu //aşağı yukarı
12 E:                     //iyi güzel
13 B: işte yılbaşında bi açıktan bi maaş ikramiye = yılbaşından
14    sonra bi zam oranı kardeşim düşünüyo
15 E: mhm
16 B: aile şirketi olduğu için böyle işçi m çalışanlara pek iyi
→17   bakmıyomuş = **işte böyle**  falan filan vesaire
.............................................................
 1 B: he could have made up a story that my mum or dad is sick and
 2    then just popped down here if he had wanted = but we did let
 3    him know = we could have kept this news from him not to let
 4    him be confused = we know how he is there
 5 E: I see
 6 B: I = both my mum and I told him but (0.5) he did not do şey
 7 E: = how long has he been working there
      (2)
 8 B: almost six months (0.5) not exactly six months = it'll
 9    have been six months maybe in December or January
10 E: mhm
11 B: = he has been there for almost //six months
12 E:                                //that's good
13 B: işte he'll have a bonus salary in the New Year = he also has
14    a certain figure of salary rise after New Year
15 E: mhm
16 B: because it's a family business it is said  they are not m
→17   very keen on the welfare of their workers = **işte böyle**  etc
18    etc
```

Speaker B mainly describes (lines 1 through 4) what his brother has been doing
lately, and specifically in the part of the conversation shown above, how his brother

missed a chance of a promising job in a multi-national company. In his first turn (lines 1 through 4), speaker B is describing how his brother actually wasted a chance for a better job and what he could have done in order to create a chance for himself to go to this job interview with the company in question. Speaker B also appends the detail (line 3) that there is no responsibility on the shoulders of the family since he and his mother did inform his brother of the job interview though they had the chance and a relevant reason not to do so in order not to cause any confusion in his brother's mind about his current job's prospects. At the next potential TRP, speaker E demonstrates his understanding by '*anladım*' (line 5), which functionally acts as a continuation particle for speaker B. Subsequently, speaker B resumes (line 6) to summarise his story at the end of which a slot is created which, as Levinson (1983) points out, 'this is the slot where story recipients can be expected to ask for further details or clarifications'. At this point, speaker E self-selects (line 7) and initiates a turn in which he asks speaker B a question to ask for further details. As this question is related to his story, speaker B resumes (line 8) again in an attempt to provide for more details. At one point, speaker B receives a continuation token from speaker E with '*mhm*' (line 10), indicating that he is expected to carry on. As speaker B repeating almost the same thing in line 11, speaker E shows an appreciation of the story with '*iyi güzel*' (line 12), which overlaps with the last part of speaker B's utterance. Subsequently speaker B proceeds (lines 13 and 14) by exemplifying the details about his brother's current job prospects. It should be noted here that speaker B starts his turn (line 13) with the particle *işte* where it marks the introduction of exemplification/detail, another function of *işte*, which we have looked at above.

Speaker B's specification turn receives another continuation token by '*mhm*' from speaker E (line 15) and then subsequently comes the turn (line 16 and 17) in which we see the marking (line 17) of the closure of the current telling that speaker B is engaged in. As far as the telling is concerned, what preceded the particle was the completion and the particle indexes the closure of the current topic. When we look at the immediate sequential environment, we see that it is speaker E's display of understanding with '*anladım*', which follows the closure. Subsequently, speaker B initiates a new turn in which he offers speaker E to go somewhere else to carry on the

conversation. This turn is important since it is the first one after the turn in which he indexed the closure of the previous topic. As is clear, he does not pursue the same topic.

What is even more significant is that what counts as his suggestion to speaker E has no connection to what has just preceded. That is, it is a sort of sharp change of topic. What the above-account of the immediate sequential context makes clear is that speaker B actually closed the topic of which he was doing most of the telling and it was the particle '*işte böyle*' which projected and indeed peformed its closure. What normally follows the particle '*işte böyle*' is, as Levinson (1983) emphasises, 'recognition of story endings can easily provide the suspension and resumption of normal turn-taking'. All the participants resume, maybe, with a new topic with the normal turn-taking in operation.

5.3.1.3 Highlighting Information Unit

Another environment where a recurrent occurrence of *işte* is found is in contexts in which the speaker uses it to strengthen the information content of the remark that s/he makes. The attempt by the current speaker to place emphasis on a particular piece of information is accomplished and displayed by *işte* in order to direct the focus of the participants. By foregrounding it from the surrounding talk, the speaker, by means of *işte*, marks this information as significant, which positively contributes towards the joint construction of the meaning. One point may be in need of clarification here, if we tend to compare this particular function of *işte* with that of *yani* as it mark speaker's emphasis (see Chapter 4.4.3). Highlighting information unit function of *işte* here, as the term itself suggests, is related to information unit it refers to rather than the speaker's stance to what s/he said, which is the case with *yani's* above-mentioned function.

When we look at the operational procedure as highlighting information unit, we observe that *işte*'s placement within a TCU does not have a fixed place of occurrence, but a number of different ones. One main reason for this variety of place of employment is closely related to the information unit within the TCU, on which

153

the speaker wants to place the emphasis. For instance, in cases where the focus is to be drawn on an information unit early in the TCU, *işte* is placed TCU-initially, whereas in the cases where the focal information unit is towards the end of TCU, the employment of *işte* comes TCU-finally. At this point, it can also relevantly be observed that the aforementioned flexible word order in Turkish plays a role in this flexible deployment of *işte* within a TCU. In the examples 5 and 6, the TCU-initial placements of *işte* indicate that the focal information that is to be emphasised is closer to the beginning.

We may illustrate this function referring to an extract below previously analysed as example (5) in Section 4.2.2. To reiterate, all five participants are engaged in the comparison of shopping and business centres in İstanbul. With each of the participants presenting their own informational contributions in turn, speaker A, in the extract below, confirms what the previous speaker just produced.

Example-9

```
→A: Kapitoldeki çok büyük evet  işte esas merkez şey Maslak
.............................................................
→A: the one in Kapitol is very big yes işte its headquarters is şey
    Maslak
```

Having converged with the information presented in the previous TCU in his first one, speaker A initiates and prefaces his second TCU by *işte*, which displays the emphasis on the remark. On closer inspection on the construction of this TCU, we see that it is '*merkez*', the headquarters of this chain of shopping centres, that speaker A wants to emphasise. So, *işte* is placed closer to the subject and this is the reason that it occurs TCU-initially. The adjective '*esas*' in the noun phrase '*esas merkez*' is also used by the speaker (though just to say '*merkez*' would perfectly be sufficient) to strengthen this bit of information and mark it as significant. Such treatment of pointing out a particular segment as 'significant' draws closer attention from the hearers. With its effect of highlighting on the rest of the utterance, *işte* tends to signal the foregrounding of information, which the speaker considers relevantly significant for the purpose of accomplishing joint construction of meaning and understanding.

The three speakers below air their views on the worsening economic situation in their country. Speakers G and E, being state-sponsored students, try their hands at explaining to speaker M how the then-recent change in monetary policy financially affected the ordinary people with a fixed revenue in their country including themselves.

Example-10

```
  1  E: şimdi elli elli //küsürbinlira
  2  G:                  //elliüç bin kat
  3  M: = hayret bişey ya  abi varya burda böyle bişey olsa yer
  4     yerinden oynar lan  ne demek lan yani yüz paunt birden
  5     kesiyorlar sizden
→6  E: ee: abi Türkiyede insanların durumu bu  işte realite bu
  7     Türkiyede
........................................................................
  1 E: it's now fifty fifty something //thousand liras
  2 G:                                 //fifty three thousand times as much
  3 M: = that's very dramatic  you know if something like that
  4    happens in this country there would be no stone unturned  what
  5    is it  yani they cut off from you hundred pounds in one go
→6 E: ee: this shows the situation of people in Turkey işte this is
  7    the reality in Turkey
```

The point of the discussion is that the high rate of inflation in recent years has put a great financial burden on the shoulders of the majority of the people with a fixed-revenue. As a result, the purchasing value of their revenue keeps gradually falling, which implicates that the fellow citizens in their country are gradually getting poorer and poorer. In an attempt to present a clearer picture to speaker M, who is a self-financed student, speakers G and E emphasise (lines 1 and 2) that as much as one hundred pounds has been cut off from their monthly salary as a result of this policy change. In response, speaker M makes no effort in his own turn (lines 3 through 5) to conceal his amazement at what he has heard. Initially he produces his own assessment (line 3) and then offers a scenario (lines 3 and 4) in which he makes a relative comparison of what the public's reaction would have been if the same thing had happened in the Western World. And in his final TCU (line 5), he once again repeatedly expresses his amazement and disbelief at what has actually happened.

155

After the completion of speaker M's turn, speaker E self-selects himself as the next speaker and produces (line 6) his conclusive assessment of the 'de facto' situation in Turkey. Subsequently in his second TCU, speaker E tends to express his assessment in a more concrete and direct fashion by saying '***işte** realite bu Türkiyede*' (line 6). It is observable that the noun '*realite*' is the key element here. It forms the subject of the TCU it is used in. The TCU-initial employment of *işte* is significant since it implies that the immediately following element is to be emphasised. Indeed, the subject '*realite*' is to be foregrounded from the surrounding talk by the emphatic effect of *işte*. Closer inspection of the informational content of the TCU reveals that the noun '*realite*' is important since it is the assessment of what the current speaker has said up to that point. *İşte* functions as a kind of 'tie-back' between the previous proposition and its subsequent assessment as produced by the same current speaker.

In the following examples (11) and (12), we will see another pattern of *işte* with the same effect of emphasis on the nearby constructional unit, but with different syntactic place of deployment within the TCU it is found. When the current holder of the turn draws the focus of recipients on a unit element located towards the end of TCU s/he has been constructing, s/he places the marker *işte* TCU-finally.

Speakers have been talking about the health consequences of over-studying. Speaker M and G earlier on have claimed that the regular schedule of studying very hard is responsible for their 'loss of hair' and 'premature ageing'. The speaker E tells the other two participants the story of one of his flat-mates, who has had a nervous breakdown due to the self-inflicted over-studying.

Example-11

```
  1 M: niye konuşamıyo = nedeni neymiş peki
→2 E: bilmiyoruz işte  sanırım şey mm sinir mm stres = kız kafayı
  3    yemiş resmen kafayı yemiş
.........................................................................
  1 M: why can't she speak = what's the reason then
→2 E: we don't know işte I think şey mm nervousness mm stress = she
  3    has gone nuts literally she has just gone nuts
```

156

Speaker M subsequently inquires about the reason (line 1) why the person in question was incapable of producing speech, that is, the medical consequence she is suffering from. In response speaker E subsequently goes '*bilmiyoruz işte*' (line 2) where the particle is used TCU-finally as a response to the inquiry. It has to be emphasised here that since this is a relatively short TCU, the TCU-initial placement would not have created the same effect. Although the sequential requirement of the adjacency pair has been met, the response, in terms of informational content, is not the sufficient one. The inability to supply the appropriate information is, however, not the fault of speaker E. Since the person in question has just been to the hospital, the diagnosis is at nobody's disposal. So, speaker E emphasises his response, by the help of *işte* that the finally accurate information is not available to him either. *İşte* functions here to display the place the speaker wants the recipients to focus on since it is significant for the meaning he is trying to construct. It is relevant to observe at this point that regardless of the position *işte* is placed at, we still see the 'tie-back' effect: The highlighted TCU by speaker E is produced in response to the immediately previous inquiry. So, interestingly, despite the location of *işte*'s deployment in this particular pattern, the TCUs by different speakers in their own turns are informationally tied to each other.

In the following, there is another example of the second pattern in which *işte* performs its conventional function of highlighting. Once again, *işte* is deployed closer to the constructional unit to be focused on.

In the case we have below, basically speakers İ and M account for their disappointment and resulting helplessness at their university's decision to ban smoking within the university complex. They even claim that it is in a way discrimination against smokers since many places have no special areas for smoking.
Example-12

```
  1 I: pubda ve student unionda serbest
  2 D: = hepsinde evet
→3 M: ama students union sürekli açık olmuyo işte
..............................................................
  1 I: you are allowed [to smoke] in the pub and students union
```

157

```
 2 D: = in all of them yes
→3 M: but the students union is not always open işte
```

In the early part of the conversation not present above, speaker D explains about the possible places where smoking is allowed at her university. Subsequently speaker D responds to speaker İ's repetitive inquiry for confirmation (line 1) to the options of smoking places available at her university. Having finally confirmed speaker İ's inquiry in her turn above, speaker D completes her turn (line 2) and subsequently speaker M self-selects and produces what seems to be a 'forcefully contrastive' TCU, in which she claims, that despite a similar situation at their university, the limited opening hours is what makes it problematic, '*ama students union sürekli açık olmuyor işte*' (line 3). The speaker M terminates her turn at this point by not proceeding. The TCU-final employment of *işte*, as a closer look at the construction of this TCU reveals, indexes that what the speaker considers as significant is towards the end of the unit. Informationally, the fact that the two venues in question, the pub and the students' union (bar), are not open and available during daytime is the key point in speaker M's assertion. The action is described at the end of the TCU. Therefore, since the focus is drawn on the action of the proposition, *işte* is used closer to it, which is TCU-final in this case.

When we look at the issue of 'tie-back', we see what is highlighted informationally, as displayed by *işte* in speaker M's turn, is not tied back directly to the immediately prior one, but to the one before that, which is that of speaker İ. Prior to the part of the extract reproduced above, both speaker D and İ were separately describing the actual situation at their own universities. So, what speaker D implies with '*hepsinde evet*' (line 2) is related to her own university, not that of speaker İ. Bearing in mind that speakers M and İ are students of the same university, speaker M's TCU is informationally tied back to speaker İ's turn, which is before the turn of speaker D.

It has appeared so far that *işte* is frequently found in contexts where the producer of *işte* uses it to highlight and emphasise a point in his/her utterance unit under construction. What is highlighted is foregrounded and attracts closer attention for the better understanding of the speaker meaning. Speakers tend to use it closer to the

point, which they want to emphasise. So, the difference in their place of deployment has to do with which part the producer of *işte* wants the focus to be placed on. It has also been observed that there is a close informational 'tie-back' between the TCUs in the case of same speaker, or between the turns in the case of turns by different speakers.

5.3.1.4 Marker of Reported Speech

The particle *işte* has been found to occur as a marker of direct quotation, which is a way of indicating a shift from narrator's perspective to other character's perspective. The particle *işte* in this use can also be seen within the context of exemplification. This function of *işte* is usually achieved within the context of reported speeches in which the current speaker uses *işte* seemingly to mark his/her shift from the evaluative remarks of the speaker to the reported conversation while s/he is actually shifting into exemplification in which detailed information is introduced. In this environment, the current speaker is mostly involved in doing the telling of a story. During its productional course, while the speaker attempts to change his/her stance from describing his/her point of view into appending those of other parties, who are not presently available, the placement of *işte* here helps the speaker to display this shift, which is actually a shift into the introduction of further details about what has just gone previously. What is exemplified in the form of reported speech comes as an independent TCU whose completion is subsequently followed by the resumption of the current speaker's normal stance.

İşte in this specific function also acts as a device, which marks the boundary between its own producer's assessment/assertions and those of third persons. Thus, the recipients have an access to a clear recognition of what is reported and what is the speaker's own remark, though the reporting takes the form of exemplification. It seems to be relevant to observe here that it is possible to claim here that *işte* with this occurrence also marks the speaker's 'change of footing'[2] whereby the speaker makes

---

[2]Goffman (1981: 128) describes the change of footing as 'a change in the alignment we take up to ourselves and the others. A change in our footing is another way of talking about a change in our frame for events'.

159

clear the boundary between his own talk and that of another person possibly not present at that moment.

The participants in the extract below are talking about a particular actor and his partnership with somebody else on a TV channel, whose focus later shifts to this particular TV channel's so-called funny but 'boring' commercials, in which products retailed by the same company that owned the TV channel are advertised.

Example-13

```
   1 M: TGRT yemi transfer oldu
   2 E: en son TGRTde Öztürk Serengille bir program yapıyordu o
   3 M: oğlum yanlız TGRT nin reklamlarını seyrediyormusunuz
   4 E: nasıl
   5 G: karın ağrısı aman aman karın ağrısı gibi
   6 E: nası nası
→7 M: abi çok komik ya  şimdi şey diyor işte (1) bir tane saç
   8    kurutma makinasıyla geliyor  işte bak karıcığım saç kurutma
   9    makinası aldım diyor  ondan sonra bak hem diyo hem aynı
  10    zamanda sıcak hem soğuk hava üflüyo  kadın aa: aa: aa:
  11 G: evet bunu hatırlıyorum ya = aman allahım
```
....
```
   1 M: has he been transferred to TGRT
   2 E: he has recently been putting up a show with Öztürk Serengil
   3    at TGRT
   4 M: do you ever watch TGRT's commercials
   5 E: how [are they]
   6 G: disaster oh my god they are just like a disaster
   7 E: how how
→8 M: it's so funny mate  now the guy says şey işte (1) he comes
   9    home with an hair drier  işte look honey I have bought a hair
  10    drier today he says and then it blows both hot air and cold
  11     air  the wife goes aa: aa:  aa:
  12 G: yes I do remember this one = oh my god
```

The initial inquiry by speaker M is indeed a shift of focus (line 1). While the focus is initially on the change of appearance of one of the staff of the TV channel in question, it is shifted to the commercials transmitted there. This focus shift is

160

immediately positively responded to by speaker E in line four where he basically requests more information. The initiation of request is subsequently followed by speaker G's evaluative assessment of the commercial in question in which he asserts they are no better than 'a disaster' (line 5). With the completion of speaker G's turn, speaker E once again repeats his request for more elaborate information (line 6).

And subsequently speaker M takes the turn in an attempt to provide the information. In turn seven speaker M starts with an initial assessment '*abi çok komik ya*' (line 7), which is a typical story-preface (Sacks, 1972) providing the relevance of the upcoming story. Subsequently at the initial part of the productional course of his story, speaker M immediately makes it clear that he is about to elaborate upon this specific TV commercial by describing the actual scene, '*şimdi şey diyor **işte*** (line 7) and subsequently he pauses for one second (line 7). Looking at what has been produced before and after the pause, it seems possible to conclude that it is a 'planning pause'. While speaker M is seemingly preparing to describe the so-called funny scene before the pause, we observe that after the one-second seemingly planning pause, he starts the provision of more information, which actually aims to lay the contextual background of the story (lines 7 through 10). As it is clear, right after the incremental information, speaker M begins to give the description of the dialogue (line 7) that takes place between the actors in the commercial. The completion of the TCU containing extra information subsequently sees the placement of *işte* (line 7) which prefaces and displays speaker M's report of the dialogue taking place between the actor and actress in the commercial. With the deployment of *işte* in this slot (line 7), speaker M is shifting not only from the status of 'assessing' to 'reporting', but also from describing to exemplifying of the details of the story under construction. By means of *işte* the speaker M also indicates the boundary between his own and those of the third persons currently not present. With the effect of *işte* in displaying the relevant boundary, speaker M resumes to elaborate with further details upon the dialogue in the commercial in his following TCU to its completion.

It has been clear that the deployment of *işte* in the environments revealed above indexes the clear separation between the speaker's own evaluative remarks and those

161

of the third parties (including those who may not be present). Together with further exemplification of what has just gone in the form of reported speech, the particle contributes towards a joint construction of meaning.

5.3.1.5 Marker of Information Tie-Back

One final function of *işte* that we can include within the Content Domain is related to tying two distant pieces of information across the same discourse as well as information in two distantly different conversations. Similar to the turn/floor claimer function, *işte* is found in the turn-initial position. What is done through the talk by claiming of the floor and by breaking the ongoing talk, the speaker by means of *işte*, ties the information content of his/her upcoming TCU to the earlier point of the topic. After the transition of speaking turn to the next speaker, what s/he does subsequently is not to informationally follow what has just preceded, but to return and tie the informational content of his upcoming TCU to the original starting point of the topic.

The participants in the extract below talk about a private language course, its owner and its manageress, who happens to be a familiar figure to all participants.

Example-13

```
 1  E: yeni bir dershane açılmış bu Anglo Dil diye hocam (0.5)
 2     duydunuzmu?
 3  M: Anglo Dil mhm//
 4  E:              // bu Ay Ayşe = eskiden burda çalışan bir Kıbrıs
 5     Türkü bi bayan vardı ya?
 6  M: = mhm
 7  E: = Ayşe Mustafa
 8  M: = tamam = o mu açmış
 9  E: = o açmış
10  M: müdürü de arkadaşım zaten = benim sınıf arkadaşım = bayan =
11     emekli olmuş = oraya müdür olmuş
 .
 .
 .
34  D: bide bu Anglodil galiba İngilteredeki bi okulun devamı gibi
35     = sanki   onun temsilciligini almış gibi görünüyo = yada
36     bilmiyorum o havayımı yaratıyolar
```

```
   37 E: varmı öyle bişey
   38 D: = sanki öyle bişeylerle reklam yapılıyo
→39 M: işte bende gidip bi İnciye hayırlı olsun demeye gittim (1)
   40    birazda bilgi alayım [okul hakkında]
   41 E: mhm (1) hocam sizde yani emekli olduktan sonra rahat rahat
   42    bu tür işler yapabilirsiniz (1)  yani şimdiden aslında
   43    sondaj mondaj
.........................................................................
   1  E: there is this new langauge course called Anglo Dil sir
   2     (0.5) have you herad about it?
   3  M: Anglo Dil mhm//
   4  E:           // this Ay Ayşe = remember the Turkish Cypriot
   5     lady who used to work here?
   7  M: = mhm
   8  E: = Ayşe Mustafa
   9  M: = ok = is it her who opened it
   10 E: = it is her who opened her
   11 M: its manageress is a friend of mine anyway = my old classmate
   12    = a lady = she is retired now = she has been made the
   13    manageress of the course
   .
   .
   .
   34 D: also this Anglodil seems like a branch of an English school
   35    = it looks as if they are their representative here = or I
   36    don't   know they may be pretending that they are
   37 E: is it true
   38 D: = it's as if that's how they are promoting themselves
→39 M: işte I just went there to say good luck to İnci(1) I thought
   40    I could get some information as well [about the
   41    language school]
   42 E: mhm (1) sir you yani after you retire can easily find
   43    these sorts of teaching jobs (1) yani you can even make
   44    some contacts now
```

In the part of the extract provided above, the focus is on a private language course. Speaker E seeks confirmation (line 1) from speaker M to see if he has heard of the course before. Speaker E continues to provide more information about the course,

specifically about the owner of the course (lines 4 through 9). Having received a confirmation about the owner of the course, speaker M explains that he has met the manageress of the course, who happened to be an old classmate of him. After this point, the conversation develops in the direction of various subtopic related to the course manageress and private language tuition. At some point, as is illustrated in the example above, the focus is shifted by speaker D to the status of this language school about which speaker D expresses her assessment (lines 34 through 36) that this school may be a branch of an England-based language schools chain. Speaker E, who wants to receive confirmation (line 37) whether this rumor is true or it is just a 'promotional rumor', also pursues this particular assessment. Subsequently, speaker D, in her own turn, proceeds to strengthen her prior assessment (line 38). As soon as speaker D brings her turn to a hearable completion, speaker M makes use of the emerging TRP and initiates his speakership by using *işte* as the very first element of his new turn and initial TCU (line 39). A closer look at speaker M's turn reveals that the propositional content of his new turn does not follow from what has preceded (line 38), but can relevantly be traced back to his turn on this issue earlier in the conversation (lines 10 and 11). Speaker M, with help of the particle *işte*, is able to tie the propositional content of an earlier piece of talk to his current turn.

The sequence seen in the example below is only a very small part of the talk, which started earlier. In the initial part of the topic, speaker İ and M first describe and then complain about the smoking restrictions imposed on smokers in certain venues at their university in the UK.

Example-15

```
 1 I: kahveyi alıyosun = gidiyosun = orda içiyosun = ee:
 2    bizim hakkımız ne olcak
 3 D: gülüyor
 4 E: gülüyor
 5 M: ben bile kızdım artık onlara = beraber oturup kantinde kahve
 6     //içemiyoruz
 7 I:  // bide demokrasiden dem vururlar
 8 M: bu sigarasız içmiyo çünkü
 9 D: kantini tamamen sigarasızmı yaptılar
```

164

```
               .
               .
               .
    36 D: ve adamda tiryaki
    37 E: acayip tiryaki hemde
→38 I: işte yani ben kendimi düşünüyorum = ben sigarasiz düşünemem
    39    bile  mesela ben kütüphanede niye çalışamıyorum
...............................................................
    1 I: you take the coffee = you go there = and you drink it
    2    there = how  about our rights
    3 D: laughs
    4 E: laughs
    5 M: even I am cross with them = we just can't sit and drink
    6    coffee together  at the coffee-bar
    7 I: this is not democratic at all
    8 M: he just can't drink the coffee without a fag
    9 D: is smoking completely banned in the coffee-bar then
               .
               .
               .
    36 D: and he is an addict
    37 E: he is such an addict
→38 I: işte yani I can only relate to my own situation = I can't
    39   even  properly think without smoking  that is the main reason
    40    why I can't study in the library
```

As we have seen before, all the participants collectively contribute to the topic smoking with various degrees of shifts in several topical directions from their own personal experiences. It has to be noted here that the issue of smoking, initiated and mainly revolved around speaker İ as he is the only smoker in the group. The focus was on speaker İ's complaint about his university's 'segregation' against smokers like himself and how it was difficult for him to smoke even at the university's cafes, it later moved on to how the same issue is handled in other participants' university. In the immediate sequential context, speaker D and M are engaged in developing the topic by initially relating the general situation and then an example of a specific person. At the next transition relevant place that emerged after the completion of speaker E's 'reflective assessment' (line 37), speaker İ initiates his own turn with *işte*

as the very first element of this new turn. As the focal point of the topic was speaker İ's own problem of smoking restrictions at his university, it gradually developed and moved onto other aspects regarding the issue of smoking. With the transition of speaking turn, we see that what speaker İ does in line 38 is not to informationally follow what has just preceded (line 37), but to return and tie the informational content of his upcoming TCU to the original starting point of the topic (line 1). We, therefore, see that speaker İ's specific complaint of not being able to smoke anywhere he wishes to in line 38 is linked to his initial focal point of the smoking restrictions mentioned in line 1.

In sum, the function of the particle *işte* in contexts such as described above is to re-establish the relevance of original focus of the topic and link them through tie-back. As it was stated at the beginning of the section, the particle *işte* can help to link two distant pieces of conversation in the same conversation as well as two distant conversations. Even though the data at hand does not provide any examples of this sort, the researcher of the thesis has recently observed a case in which the particle *işte* has helped to connect two pieces of the same topic, which was as far as two and half hours away from each other.

5.3.2 Qualifying Function

Some of the occurrences of *işte* have been found to be functioning on the local level within the Qualifying Function of the Content Domain. Below are the illustrations of the functions in question.

5.3.2.1 Answer-Preface to Questions

This occurrence of *işte* has a function within the Qualifying Function of the Content Domain where the occurrence of *işte* comprises a pattern that is recurrently found in adjacency pair contexts where the speaker initiates his/her response to the immediately previous question by prefacing it with *işte*. A closer look at the information load of the *işte*-initiated responses reveals that their content is relevantly concerned with the organisation of preference: the subsequent response from the current speaker is not necessarily the exact answer to the question asked. In other

words, although the response is a second pair part, what is produced as an answer does not give the exact information being sought. So, the organisation of preference is involved here, and the speaker displays by *işte* that the upcoming response is not a satisfactorily complete one to the question. Levinson (1983) describes the notion of preference 'not as a psychological claim about speaker's or hearer's desires, but as a label for a structural phenomenon'. Within the preference structure, preferred seconds to different and unrelated adjacency first pair parts have less material than dispreferreds. Levinson (1983) also points out that in addition to the structural aspects of preference organisation, a rule for speech production is also required: "try to avoid the dispreferred action, the action that generally occurs in dispreferred format". Referring to several other works on this issue, Levinson (ibid.) sums up the general characteristics of dispreferred seconds as having a possible combination of delays, prefaces, accounts and a declination component. Among these general characteristics, *işte* functions as a preface for dispreferred seconds in which it indexes that the upcoming response is not the complete one to the prior question.

In the piece of conversation here in example (16), the speakers are engaged in exchanging information about their city's biggest ever international business centre in an attempt to supply information to speaker E, who knows very little about its history and current situation.

Example-16

```
  1 A: orayı çılgın bi yer yaptılar zaten
  2 E: ne oteli olacak
→3 A: işte Buttim içinde bi otel
...................................................................
  1 A: they have magnificently transformed that place
  2 E: which hotel is it going to be
→3 A: işte a hotel within the Buttim complex
```

Spreading over a very large area and containing one of the tallest tower buildings in the country, speaker A above talks very highly of the final outcome of the complex referring to it as a *'çılgın bir yer'* (line 1). Speaker E in referring to the tower of the complex inquiries (line 2) about the future state of the building since the complex

167

was not yet complete. Speaker E, having previously heard that some part of the building will be turned into a hotel, puts the question '*ne oteli olacak*' (line 2), which forms the first part of the adjacency pair. Subsequently, speaker A to whom this question was directed provides the response to it, which is the second pair part and prefaces it by *işte* (line 3). The initiation of the turn and prefacing of the response specifically by *işte* in this slot demonstrates that the upcoming response is not necessarily the complete answer. When we focus on the TCU in the first pair part, it is clear that by '*ne oteli*' (line 2), speaker E is after the name or the corporate company, which aims to open up the hotel there. So using a 'wh' question in this first part of the adjacency pair, speaker E requires to hear a specific name.

However, the second pair part as produced by speaker A does not provide any name or anything to that effect whatsoever; '***işte** Buttim içinde bir otel*' (line 3). It is relevant to observe that speaker A himself does not possess any information about the name of the hotel. Otherwise, there is no reason why he would not provide the name of the hotel. It is at this point that the initiation of the turn and its prefacing by *işte* signals that the upcoming TCU does not contain the exact information as required by the previous question. Indexing the upcoming TCU as a dispreferred second pair part, the particle, by its recurrent deployment, forms a conventional pattern in Turkish conversational discourse for prefacing incomplete responses to first pair part questions.

Speaker G below is trying to describe a particular theatre critic, who would always be present at the annual University Theatre Festival. Speaker G's description of this hard-to-please critic is related to a TV comedy-show of which he was a part and which is a dire contradiction to his so-called literary criticism about the plays that he made at the festival.

Example-17

```
  1 E: ne oyun oynadı bizimkiler hatırlıyomusun
→2 G: ya işte Oğuz Atayın Tutunamıyanlarını oynamışlardı galiba
  3 M: Tutunamıyanlarmı onu oyunmu yapmışlar abi  Oyunlarla
  4    Yaşayanlar olabilir
  5 G: öylemi
```

168

```
6 E: ha Oyunlarla Yaşayanlar = tamam
7 M: = onun oyunu var
........................................................................
1 E: do you remember which play ours [university's theatre
2    company] have staged
→3 G: ya işte they have staged Oğuz Atay's Tutunamıyanlar I suppose
4 M: did you say Tutunamıyanlar  was it adopted to a play  it
5    could be Oyunlarla Yaşayanlar
6 G: really
7 E: that is Oyunlarla Yaşayanlar = that's it
8 M: = that [book] was adopted to a play
```

The occurrence of *işte* in the conversational context above is quite similar to what we have just seen above except it is coupled with *'ya'*, a very common Turkish interjection, in Lewis's (1967) words 'with a variety of functions in colloquial Turkish'. In his attempt to account for some of his actions during the festival, speaker G mentions that a fight almost broke out between the speaker E's university's theatre group and this infamous critic after his bitter criticism of their play. Speaker E immediately inquires in an attempt to find out which play they staged in the festival (line 1). With this question speaker E constructs the first part of an adjacency pair and automatically allocates speaker G as the next speaker by directing the question to him. Subsequent to the completion of speaker E's question, speaker G starts his turn (line 2) to produce the second pair part and prefaces it by *'ya işte'*. What follows this combined particle is the provision of the information in the form of response. During the course of the turn containing the first pair part, speaker E seeks the information, which is the title of the play performed by his university's theatre company. Speaker G initiates his turn of response by prefacing it by *'ya işte'* (line 2). Here again, we have the typical feature of dispreferreds whereby *işte* is further supported by another hesitation token *'ya'*. This combined particle prefaces and marks the dispreferred status of the upcoming response.

In this connection, there should be some sort of uncertainty about the title of the play provided in his one-TCU-long turn by speaker G. Indeed, the credibility of the response in which speaker G provides 'a' title to the play is further mitigated by the

addition '*galiba*' (line 2). It is observable that speaker G is not one hundred percent sure about the title he has just provided. So, the fact that the upcoming response may not be the complete one to the question is as indexed by the combined preface '*ya işte*' is further justified at the end of speaker G's TCU. Indeed, as the following exchange of turns reveals (lines 3 thruogh 7), speaker M issues a confirmation question in which he tries to make sure that the book *Tutunamıyanlar* by the playwright in question (Oğuz Atay) has been adapted to a stage play. Subsequently, over the course of his turn, speaker M offers another title (lines 3 and 4) by the same playwright for the same play in question. The suggestion of this name is immediately confirmed by speaker E as the correct one after speaker G's passively quiet acceptance '*öylemi*' (line 5). Speaker E's momentary recognition and confirmation upon hearing the candidate title is based on the fact that speaker E himself actually watched this play not long ago.

In sum, what such examples illustrate is that the particle *işte* (sometimes combined with other linguistic elements such as the hesitation token 'ya' as in the second example) is, as the above examples reveal, a conventional and standard way of prefacing and marking dispreferred second pair parts of adjacency pairs, which comtain only incomplete information to the questions in the first pair part. The numbers in square brackets next to each function show which example illustrates which function for the purpose of quick reference.

Table 5.9: Functions of *İşte* Found in the Relevant Domains of Conversation.

Conversational Structure Domain	Content Domain
*Marker of Extended Turns [1] *Turn and Floor Claimer [3]	**Frame Function** *Exemplification/Detail [6] *Topic Closure [7] *Highlight Marker [9] *Marker of Reported Speech [13] *Marker of Information Tie- Back [15]
	Qualifying Function *Answer-Preface to Questions [17]

5.4 Conclusion

The data analyses have revealed that *işte* ranks as the third most used particle after *yani* and *şey* in this study. Various functions performed by *işte* have been mainly described by reference to two Conversational Domains: the Conversational Structure and the Content Domains. The results of the analyses have illustrated that occurrence of *işte* with a specific turn-initial TCU-construction is observable as functioning to claim for a multi-size turn unit within the Conversational Structural Domain. That is, turn-initial or early in a turn uses of *işte* have narrative functions. Narrative is a type of talk with its own structural conventions and interactional relevance. Narratives differ significantly from regular turn-by-turn conversation in its sequential implications, so that we might expect *işte* to function with special organisation functions, not available in other forms of talk. In narratives, *işte* can introduce the initial expository section to set the action in motion as well as mark transitions to succeeding sections including the closure of the narrative. Although the DisP *işte* makes no semantic contribution to the story, it helps to give it a structure. Therefore, this *işte*-construction proves to be useful for conversationalists to bid for extended turn space for the telling of their personal accounts/stories in a competitive turn exchange environment. The other use of *işte* in this Domain is the

turn-initial occurrence of *işte,* which is mostly associated with contexts in which the speaker uses this particle to mark his/her entry into the sequence.

Within the Frame Function of the Content Domain, the exemplification/detail function of *işte* is related to the organisation of topic. This function is performed in environments where a speaker, during the topical development of his/her talk, uses *işte* to index the exemplification or detail of the preceding informational piece. Next, some occurrences of *işte* have certain Frame Functions where the turn-final use of *işte* combined with another item 'böyle', thus *işte böyle,* marks the closure of a topic by signalling that its producer has no more to say. The contribution of *işte* to informational aspect of conversation within the Frame Function is operative when it is used to highlight a particular information unit by foregrounding it, which is relevant for the interpretation of speaker's overall message. The position of *işte* is variable in this usage, mostly because of the flexible word order of Turkish. It is possible to find this function of *işte* in all positions depending on the information unit the speaker wants to highlight. The next function of *işte* found in this Domain is also closely related to exemplification whereby *işte* marks to distinguish the talk the speaker reported of someone else from his/her own. The TCU-initial occurrence of *işte* preceding the reported speech is a signal that the current speaker is not the provider of the information but that the upcoming is quotation.

The last function of *işte* found in this Domain is the tie-back function. Besides indexing longer turns at talk for personal accounts and ending of oral narratives, *işte* regularly serves to re-establish its user's main story line or theme following digressions and interruptions. Here we see that *işte* can also point back to utterances that are non-adjacent within the discourse in order to provide a coherent semantic interpretation. That is, a speaker's utterance-initial *işte* connects back to his/her own or another speaker's distantly previous utterance (as far as even few hours between the two pieces of discourse). In adjacency pair contexts within the Qualifying Function, it turns out that *işte* prefaces dispreferred answers to questions when there is informational insufficiency in the answer provided.

172

Finally, as we have stated in (5.2.2), the particle *işte* in claiming the turn and the floor as different from *yani*, makes it possible for its producer to signal that s/he is disengaging from the informational projection of the prior turn. This point is important in that it indicates the difference between turn-initial occurrences of *yani* and *işte*. While a turn-initial *yani* displays the connection between the current and previous speaker acting like a 'connective and continuative', the use of *işte* turn-initially, on the other hand, in certain contexts by the current speaker while claiming the turn and floor again is hearable as a disjunction marker, alerting recipients that what follows might not be related to what preceded, but something disjunctive with what preceded. An *işte*-initiated new turn thereby formulates the prior turn as the completion point of subtopic(s) and itself as a unit of re-focus mostly through the tie-back. In this connection, it seems to be plausible to propose that the distinction between 'adjunct and disjunct in the syntax level has its application through *yani* and *işte* with their capacities acting as continuative and disjunctive particles respectively on the discourse level as employed by speakers in Turkish conversation.

CHAPTER 6

ANALYSIS OF ŞEY

6. Introduction

This chapter describes the third particle in this study: *şey*, which is one of the unique particles recurrently found and used especially in natural Turkish conversations. *Şey* turns out to be the second most frequent DisP after *yani* with 851 occurrences in total. 92 occurrences are utterance-initial, 737 are utterance-medial and 22 are utterance-final. Table (6.10) just below provides the basic statistical information about *şey* according to its place of occurrence with respective percentages.

Table 6.10: Basic Statistical Information About *Şey* According to its Place of Occurrence.

DisP	Initial	%	Medial	%	Final	%	Total
Şey	92	11	737	88	22	1	851

Şey, according to Lewis (1967), has the ordinary grammatical category of 'noun' referring to 'unidentified objects'. In the *Langenscheidt's Standard* Dictionary of Turkish-English (1985), '*şey*' is defined as 1-*thing*, 2-*what-do-you-call-it*. While this use of *şey* as a noun is sometimes used for the semantic meaning as in the example '*insanlar saçma sapan şeyler konuşuyorlar'*, its overwhelming occurrence is found as a discourse particle in spontaneous talk whereby it serves to fulfil various interactional functions in connection with its structural placement, form and use.

An initial observation about the particle *şey* is that it is found in two different forms in Turkish. While the first one, the 'free-standing' occurrence of *şey* is, as we shall see, similar in terms of the place of occurrence and function to particles found in

other languages such as '*well*', '*oh*' in English and '*yani*', '*işte*' in Turkish, the second one, 'suffixed-*şey*', is unique to Turkish (for the reasons, see 6.4) and is closely to do with the fact that Turkish is an agglutinating language like Japanese, Korean, Finnish etc. Between the two types of occurrences, the suffixed-*şey* outnumbers the free-standing one and possible reasons for this will be explained later in the Chapter (see 6.4).

One important feature of the difference between the suffixed and free-standing *şey* (*galiba bir kaç kere şey bir kere gittim evine*) is that whereas all sorts of grammatical suffixes can be attached to the former, nothing is attached to the latter. In other words, as the term itself suggests, the latter form of *şey* stands 'unattached' in its structural position within a TCU. Furthermore, in order to emphasise the difference between the suffixed and unsuffixed (thus free-standing) *şey*, Özbek (1995) observes that the free-standing *şey* occupies a separate 'tone unit'. Another significant observation about both types of *şey* is that they can be found in various grammatical positions such as a verb '**şeyyaptılar**' (*sen iyi bayağı **şeyyapmışsın** ya (1) kilo vermişsin)*, an adjective '**şeydi**' (orası çok **şeydi** kötüydü), a noun '**şeyleri**' (*bunların **şeyleri** sıvıları falan çok pahalı*) etc., in a TCU (for 'location flexibility', see Schiffrin, 1987). More specifically, structurally free-standing *şey* is recurrently found in TCU-initial positions as well as TCU-medial. Suffixed-*şey*, on the other hand, attaches to any lexical item in its normal place within a TCU. As we shall see, when suffixed-*şey* functions as a replacement for a missing word (that is, during a word search for a lexical item), it is found in the syntactic position occupied by that 'missing' word.

There does not exist any intonational features such as fall or rise unique to either type of *şey*. Suffixed-*şey*, for instance, being embedded within a TCU, is subject to the intonation pattern across that unit as a whole. In other words, during the construction of a TCU, the lexical elements tend to be uttered with certain intonation patterns unique to that particular structural position. When suffixed-*şey* starts to function as a replacement for a missing lexical item, it takes not only the semantic form but also the intonational form of that missing item. One point that has to be noted here is that

suffixed-*şey* may sometimes be preceded by pauses of various lengths. Free-standing *şey*, on the other hand, occupies a 'separate tone unit'.

With the exception of suffixed-*şey* marking its user's politeness within the Interpersonal Domain, the most prevalent function of both types of *şey* at a general level, regardless of different contexts, is within the Conversational Structure Domain where the particle *şey* is to do with 'repair organisation' and 'verbal planning'. Mostly in spontaneous speech, speakers may feel the need to structure the continuation of discourse. At certain points in their discourse production, they need to plan and control the way in which they want to continue their telling, since the content of their message is not predetermined. Various verbal planning strategies help speakers to plan the follow up of their information flow. Section 6.2.2 provides more on verbal planning. (see Schourup, 1983; Holmes, 1988; Enfield, 2003 for verbal planning). The data analysis discloses that *şey* with both forms constitutes a systematic conversational pattern whereby it serves to provide its producer with 'verbal planning time' through the general function of delay. Let us note here that this particular function is to do with the organisation of preference whereby speakers preface their dispreferred assessments. To use the terminology referred to by Sacks (1971), speakers tend to be 'doing being hesitant' for particular interactional purposes (as will be explained below).

Within the Conversational Structure Domain again, *şey* is also closely involved with one of the 'central devices' (see Levinson, 1983) of conversation, 'repair organisation' (Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks, 1977) through which the delay function is accomplished. As conversational repair constitutes the main function, we will seek to explore how *şey* with its two forms is informed by the syntactic features of Turkish, in which it provides a systematic 'error correction format and strategy' within the Conversational Structure Domain. Table (6.11) below outlines the Domains and the different functions of *şey* within them, which will also be the order of the analysis.

Table 6.11: Functions of *Şey* Found in the Relevant Domains of Conversation.

ŞEY	Freestanding-*Şey*	Suffixed-*Şey*
Conversational Structure Domain	*Repair Initiator (Self-Initiated Self-Repair) *Preface for Other-Initiated Self-Repair *Verbal planning *Floor-Holding/*Turn Initiation	*Vagueness *Replacing Nouns *Replacing Verbs *No Immediate Replacement
Interpersonal Domain	*Politeness	

The rest of the chapter is organised as follows. Section (6.2) covers the analysis of *şey* in the Conversational Structure Domain. Section (6.3), similarly, focuses on *şey* in the Interpersonal Domain.

6.2 Conversational Structure Domain

6.2.1 Conversational Repair and the Particle *Şey*

One possible understanding of repair might be that repair is the process by which speakers in verbal interaction correct errors they have made in their immediately prior talk. However, as Schegloff et al (1977) note, repair is not limited to error-correction; that is, this 'wide concept of repair' (see Levinson, 1983) is inclusive of recovery problems, self-editings, error replacements, etc. They claim that the same system handles the repair of all these problems. When they differentiated between repair initiation and solution, they described a 'preference for self-repair and preference for self-initiation' of repair. Furthermore, they showed that the organisation of repair initiation operates in a restricted 'repair initiation opportunity space' where the 'trouble-source' or 'repairable' has occurred.

Schegloff (1979) notes that repair is, in principle, relevant to any 'sentence'. Furthermore, he continues, repair operations affect the form of sentences and the ordering of elements in them. As Schegloff (ibid.) makes clear, repair (same-turn self-repair) and syntax are interdependent and co-organising: each requires the other as part of its operation. Repair, as Schegloff (ibid.) further points out, cannot exist without syntax, since syntax organises the linguistic elements through which talk is

constructed, and without talk, there can be no (need for) repair. Similarly, syntax cannot exist without repair. It is always possible that at any point in the course of a TCU the speaker could not know how to continue, or might have selected an inappropriate lexical item. Schegloff's (1979) above-mentioned remark maintains its relevance here as well that any TCU projected in any turn is subject to some trouble of construction proper, hearing and understanding. In such cases, speakers must have access to mechanisms by which they can stop the TCU under construction before its completion.

With the strong claim by the researchers regarding 'repair organisation' about the interdependency between repair and syntax, it makes sense to assume that repair will be organised according to the syntactic structure of the language in question. The reason for this being that if we look at repair as a strategy for responding to certain 'interactional pressures' in a language, which actually itself consists of different syntactic practices for managing those pressures, then its procedures for repair will come from those practices, and repair in general will reflect the organisations of those practices. In this connection, it should be possible to argue at this point that the existence of a repair device like the particle *şey*, with its unique productional format, is justified in the light of the above hypothesis.

What we aim to do in this functional analysis of *şey* is to examine and explore the ways in which *şey* is systematically used by the speakers of Turkish in displaying much-preferred 'self-initiation of self-repair'. To this end, we will illustrate and analyse *şey* in both types in as many conversational contexts as possible and try to explain its systematic and overwhelmingly recurrent use by the Turkish native speakers in trying to achieve 'intersubjectivity' in their everyday conversational encounters.

6.2.1.1 Repair Initiator (Self-Initiated Self-Repair)

The data analysis has shown that the repair operation marked by free-standing *şey* is in a way more complex than the one marked by suffixed-*şey*. It is more complex in the sense that *şey* in free-standing form displays self-initiation of self-repair (the

178

preferred form) as well as the confirmation of other initiation of other repair. Within the basic format for same-turn repair, free-standing *şey*, as a repair indicator, marks the self-initiation of the repair followed by the candidate repair. In fact, the background information provided at the outset of this chapter about the repair operation in general in the context of suffixed-*şey* as an indicator of 'word search' is also relevant for this section. Below are some examples of *şey* with detailed analysis.

In order to make sense of the content of the repairable in the example below, some contextual background information seems necessary here. What is at issue in the example below is the problems that the participants experienced with customs officials at the airport. Both speaker N and D are relating their own experiences of the verbal quarrels with the officers, who, the participants claim, asked for a bribe in order to let them through customs without paying the $100 compulsory housing tax.

Example-1

```
 1 N: bi kere kavga ettim
 2 D: bende ettim = hemde kaç kere
 3 N: bi kere = öbürlerinde hiç vermedim  normal (0.5) bi izinlidir
→4    şey görevlidir diye mektup almıştım
.............................................................
 1 N: once I had a quarrel with them
 2 D: so did I = I've had it many many times
 3 N: (paid it)just once = never paid it in other times (0.5) I got
→4    a letter saying that I was on leave şey on duty
```

What this first example shows us is one of the two kinds of sequences where free-standing *şey* performs its marking function within the repair operation. In one of these kinds of sequences, as soon as the speaker realises that what s/he has just said is not 'right' (whether semantically or syntactically is beyond the concerns of this analysis here), s/he immediately stops, produces the free-standing *şey*, then produces the right/correct word and then proceeds as normal. The particle free-standing *şey* here basically enables the speaker to display to the other participants that she is about to initiate the repair in order to repair the prior linguistic element. The realisation that

179

what she has just said requires correction comes after she has completed the production of this particular repairable.

In her second turn speaker N explains (line 3) that she was made to pay only once and at other times she went through the customs without any problem. While she was just about to give details of the 'other times', she produces the adjective '*izinlidir*' in her third TCU within the same turn (line 3). It is at this point that repair initiation starts. Speaker N realises that the adjective '*izinli*' is not the correct one to use since it does not describe her situation correctly. Speaker N was going abroad as '*görevli*' (line 4). With the realisation of this difference on the part of speaker N, she subsequently marks this adjective as 'repairable' by the free-standing *şey*, which is immediately followed by the candidate repair, the correct adjective '*görevli*'.

This realisation on the part of the current speaker may also come when s/he is actually in the middle of producing the word, which is the case with the next example.

In the extract below, speaker M and I are complaining about the strict smoking rules in place in their university. Being a heavy smoker speaker I is especially upset by this 'unfair' regulation.

Example-2

```
 1 D: sigara içilen bölümü yokmu
 2 I: yok
 3 M: = hiç yok
→4 D: aa: kantinde var en = azından Tü- şey Essexde
..............................................................
 1 D: isn't there a smoking section
 2 I: no there isn't
 3 M: = nothing at all
→4 D: aa: we have got one in the coffee-bar= at least in Tu- şey in
 5    Essex
```

In this example (2), unlike the previous example above, speaker D's realisation of the error comes almost midway through its production when she cuts off the word. Subsequent to speaker D's inquiry (line 1) about the availability of any smoking

area, both speaker M and I respond to her negatively (lines 2 and 3 respectively). In her next turn (line 4), with a display of hearable surprise with '*aa*' to the non-availability of any smoking areas at their university, speaker D starts to construct a TCU in which the availability of a smoking section is made clear. While the TCU seems to have come to a hearable completion, speaker D, without stopping, continues with an addition of the geographical place where this smoking section is available. She utters the syllable '*Tü*' (line 4) obviously intending to say '*Türkiye*'. Clearly, with the realisation of the error after the production of this syllable, she cuts off the word by stopping, places *şey* to mark the initiation of the repair and then reformulates a candidate repair by saying '*Essexde*' (line 4). She then marks her attempt to initiate a repair by inserting a *şey* and does the repair and finishes the utterance. Free-standing *şey* is once again observed to index the prior word as a repairable followed by the candidate repair as a result of its successful accomplishment within the same turn, which is the preferred locus of error correction. In such contexts as we have seen where the current speaker makes clear by the use of *şey* in his/her attempt to correct a prior error, *şey* as well as signalling the upcoming repair, also indicates that the speaker is closely monitoring his/her speech production.

6.2.1.2 Preface for Other-Initiated Self-Repair

This particular repair format that *şey* takes part in is the least common and least preferred type of repair according to Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks (1977). This occurrence is one of the few instances of free-standing *şey* in which the particle clearly confirms that what has been initiated and corrected by the previous speaker is a repairable that belongs to him/herself. Schegloff et al. (ibid.) also state, in view of the substantial constraints operating to restrict the occurrence of other-correction, a small number of other-corrections occur. The format for other-initiated repair is different. Basically, other-initiated repair takes a multiple of turns, at least two to be successfully completed. The operations of locating the repairable and supplying a candidate are separated. After the occurrence of the repairable, the other-initiator locates the trouble. Two options are possible after this point. Either the other-initiator, after locating the trouble, offers a candidate repair, thus accomplishing

other-repair or the speaker of the trouble source proffers a repair, thus self-repair. The first option is the one free-standing *şey* is involved in; that is, other-initiation of other-repair. In fact, unlike the occurrences above where *şey* acts as an indicator of self-initiated self-repair, *şey* here is not directly involved in the initiation or accomplishment of the repair but only in its aftermath when it marks the confirmation of the repair as if it is a self-repair. Below is one of the few instances of *şey* marking the confirmation of other-initiated other-repair where the repaired item is repeated with a '*şey*' prefix.

In example (3) below, speaker M is describing the attitudes of some students in his class about their teaching practice to speaker D. His description mainly involves the 'student-teachers' basic complaints as a result of their 'poor' teaching performance in the class.

Example-3

```
 1 M: öyle yapılacağını zannediyolar yani  onun dışına çıkamıyolar
 2 kırkbeş dakika hocam işte anlamıyolar = Türkçe anlamıyo çocuklar
 3 D: İngilizce
→4 M: = şey İngilizce = anlamasınlar diyorum [devam ediyor]
.........................................................................
 1 M: they think that is the right way to do yani  they can't seem
 2 to think of anything else (1) during forty five minutes sir işte
 3 they don't understand = they don't understand when you speak
 4 Turkish
 5 D: English
→6 M: = şey English = I said let them not understand [continues]
```

According to speaker M's description (line 1), their main complaint was the medium of communication in the classroom where student teachers were expected to conduct the class in the target language, English, not the pupils' mother tongue, Turkish. Subsequently, speaker M described the target language as Turkish instead of English (line 2). Having located this error as a repairable, speaker D self-selects at the next potential TRP (line 3), which is the completion of the TCU containing the repairable. Claiming the floor by self-selection, speaker D offers the candidate repair '*İngilizce*' (line 3). Therefore, as well as initiating it, speaker D actually 'does' the repair by

offering the candidate repair. It is at this point when and where free-standing *şey* becomes involved in this organisation. In the third part of the resulting multiple turns of repairing, speaker M prefaces his repetition of the candidate repair by *şey* as if he confirms this other-repair (line 4). It is worth noting that the confirmation of the candidate repair as indexed by *şey* is similar to the self-repair part of the 'self-initiated-self-repair'.

As we have observed, one of the repair environments *şey* is involved in, though not directly, is other-initiated other repair. Instead of acting as a repair indicator, free-standing *şey* this time marks the confirmation of the repair initiated and done by one of the 'other' recipients.

6.2.1.3 Marking Turn Initiation/Floor-Holding

Another simultaneous function of free-standing *şey* as found in the data has again to do with the structural organisation of conversation when *şey* is deployed in turn-initial positions. The occurrence of free-standing *şey* in these positions enables the speaker to claim that specific turn. The fact that the turn/floor claiming function of *şey* co-occurs with that of planning is also supported by Yılmaz (1994) and Özbek (1995). Some illustrations and their analysis of this simultaneous function of free-standing *şey* found in the data are just below. In the following examples, free-standing *şey* is used turn-initially.

In example 4 below, the topic is the dinner speakers B and I have not attented and the recipe of lasagne cooked for the dinner.

Example-4

```
 1 E: öylemi  yani kaçırdınız lazanyayı  size ne güzel
      lazanya//yapmıştım
 2 B:       //hadi ya (1) senmi yaptın
 3 D: o yapıyo
 4 B: allah allah  şeyini layerını şeydenmi satın alıyosun
 5 E: layerlarını alıyoruz
   .
   .
   .
```

```
 14 D: bu çok soğuk olabilir = biraz şeyden karıştırayımmı?
 15 I: tamam
→16 B: şey ne diyecektim (0.5) KAVANOZDANMI koyuyosun (1) yani şey
        kavanoz nerden çıktı = konserve
.............................................................
  1 E: really  yani you missed the lasagne  it was meant to be//for
       you
  2 B:                                                   //really
       (1) did you make it yourself
  3 D: he does make it himself
  4 B: surprising  do you buy şeyini the layers from şey
  5 E: we buy the layers

     .

     .

     .

 14 D: this could be quite cold = shall I mix it with şey
 15 I: o.k.
→16 B: şey what was I going to say (0.5) do you use JARRED [tuna
       fish] (1) yani şey where did jar come from = canned
```

In example (4), there is the case of free-standing *şey* being used turn-initially as the very first linguistic element in a new turn after the completion of the previous speaker's turn (line 16). A closer look at the content of the current turn will reveal that both functions are simultaneously at work here. We see that there is an adjacency pair exchange taking place between speakers D and I (lines 14 and 15). Speaker D is pouring a glass of tap water for speaker I (line 14). During this action, speaker D asks I if he wants the cold tap water to be mixed to make it warmer. Speaker I affirmatively answers to speaker D's question with a minimum response token 'O.K' (line 15). With the hearable completion of speaker I's response turn, speaker B self-selects (line 16). It is quite noticeable here that in his self-selection, speaker B uses free-standing *şey* to initiate his new turn. What *şey* does in this turn-initial position for speaker B is to mark that the *şey*-prefaced turn belongs to him. He chose himself as the next speaker and this is to last until the next possible TRP.

Having observed that the free-standing *şey* enables its producer to claim the next turn, we will look at the evidence showing that 'claiming the floor' is not the only function *şey* performs here. What subsequently follows *şey* demonstrates that there is the marking of some planning at this point when speaker B produces the self-inquiring TCU '*ne diyecektim*' followed by a 0.5-second pause (line 16). This self-inquiry seems to make it clear to speaker B himself as well as others that he is currently involved in some planning. It is rewarding to hypothesise here that speaker B's clear and 'hearable' self-inquiry could be seen as a 'verbalised paraphrase' for verbal planning additionally facilitated and displayed by a free-standing *şey* in these environments. In addition to planning, the speaker can also be seen to be doing another conversational task, which is 'getting back to' some prior talk (Jefferson, 1984). The earlier topic of lasagne was interrupted at one instance. When speaker B self-selects in line 16, he not only initiates a new turn, but also displays an attempt to get back to the previously interrupted conversation, which he eventually achieves.

Below is another case of free-standing *şey*, this time coupled with the non-lexical hesitation marker '*mm*'. In example (5) below, the initial topic is the TV set that speaker C lends to one of the participants and then the reason for the delay of speaker C's work.

Example-5

```
 1 C: hayır ben onu mm alıp uğraşacak halim yok yani
    (1)
 2 H: üzerinde bir kaç saç kesti o kadar
→3 C: mm şey (1) kardeşimi yolcu ettim ondan sonra bu society çıktı
 4    sonra Münevveri götürdüm şeyyaptım mm (1)planımda pek gecikmedi
 5    neyse dün gece bitirdim (1) birazcık kompütürlük işi kaldı (1)
 6    yani tamda şey zamana denk getirdim konuşmayi  yani rahatladim
.........................................................................
 1 C: well I just mm can't do anything with it yani
    (1)
 2 H: he just had few pieces of hair cut on it
→3C: mm şey (1) I went to see my brother off  and then this society
 4 thing came up  then I helped Münevver out  I did şey mm (1) all
 5  is according to the plan now  I finally managed to finish off
 6  last night (1) I have to do some typing now (1) yani the timing
```

What we have in this particular conversational environment is the TCU-initial placement of free-standing *şey* together with the standard non-lexical hesitation marker '*mm*' and one-second pause in speaker C's turn (line 3). The placement of these two markers at this position by speaker C basically functions as a signal that he is about to initiate a new turn. Similar to the case above, we first observe the hearable completion of speaker H's turn (line 2). After speaker H's 'sarcastic' TCU in his own turn (line 2), we see speaker C self-selecting as the next speaker (line 3). To have a closer look at the way he performs this self-selection, it is clear that instead of directly starting to produce a constructional unit, speaker C prefaces his turn initially by hesitation markers '*mm*' and then the particle *şey* (line 3). Actually the ensuing one-second pause after *şey* is also notable here since it is part of the planning procedure. However, it is the presence of the two initial particles which is important since speaker C uses them as the very first linguistic element in the turn to mark that he is about to start a new turn. The placement of '*mm*' first and the subsequent *şey* mainly enables speaker C to make an entry to the turn and claim the floor (line 3). What is equally significant here is that as well as enabling its user to initiate a new turn, *şey* and '*mm*' in this case signal this upcoming speakership and floor-claiming to the other participants. The occurrence *şey* early in the turn, similar to the case above, performs the same 'getting back to' function. Speaker C displays a shift back to a subject (why his work has been delayed), which was the topic quite early in the conversation. Another function that this constellation of various particles signals is the standard verbal planning. The time period spent for the production of these hesitation markers provides speaker C with some time and space to plan what to say next since the floor has already been claimed for talk.

In this section, we have explored the way the second type of *şey*, the free-standing form, functions within naturally occurring Turkish conversation. The analyses revealed that free-standing *şey* mainly differs from the suffixed-şey not in terms of function but in terms of its structure. While the first type of *şey* is always used with various suffixes temporarily replacing the missing lexical item, the second type

186

basically stands alone within TCU acting more like a 'filler' mostly co-occurring with some other hesitation markers.

The placements of free-standing *şey* in turn/TCU-initial and medial positions basically marked its user's 'hesitation' as part of a 'verbal planning strategy'. Throughout the duration of hesitation, the current speaker was able to organise and plan what to say next. While marking its producer's 'verbal planning/organisation, free-standing *şey* also simultaneously enabled him/her to either claim the floor and start a new turn when used TCU-initially or to hold the floor during the planning pause when used TCU-medially.

In the final part of this section, we will focus on a conversational environment where free-standing *şey* performs a similar function to suffixed-*şey*. The analysis of the Turkish data shows that free-standing *şey* marks 'self-repair', repair within the same TCU as the repairable, which is subsequently corrected. The main difference between the self-repairs marked by both types of *şeys* is that while the suffixed-*şey* is involved in word searches, this repair as indexed by free-standing *şey* is indeed a case of error correction (replacement of prior lexical item by another one). Although the number of cases where free-standing *şey* indexes 'self-repair' is not as many when compared to the suffixed-*şey* cases (five or six cases of free-standing *şey* in comparison to tens of suffixed-*şey* in an hour long conversation), the correction carried, as the examples below will demonstrate, is quite clear-cut.

6.2.2 Verbal Planning and Free-Standing *Şey*

6.2.2.1 Introduction

In this section, we will be mainly concerned with the description of the second type, the free-standing *şey*. As its name suggests, this particle does not take any grammatical suffixes. Similarly, free-standing *şey*, unlike the suffixed-one, has nothing to do with the syntactic or unexpressed semantic structure of the constructional unit it occurs in. While the suffixed-*şey* becomes to be part of the syntactic and semantic structure of the TCU and turn in which it occurs, free-standing *şey* comes to be used as a 'filler' (see Beamen, 1984).

As has been mentioned at the outset of the chapter, despite two different types of occurrences, some uses of the both forms in fact tend to contribute to and perform the same general functional role of 'verbal planning'. According to Chafe (1980), verbal planning is an indispensable and characteristic feature of speaking and constitutes the main difference between speaking and writing. He suggests that since speaking is 'done on the fly', speakers do not have the time or the 'mental resources' to compose complex arrangements of clauses, which are the characteristics of written language. Chafe (1980) further states that the rapid rate of speaking and the need to monitor and control its flow make it all the more difficult to have an uninterrupted and 'linear' production of spoken language, which is the case in writing. In his conclusion, Chafe (ibid.) suggests, spoken language shows various devices used in the aid of verbal planning and control of information flow. It is at this point that it is relevant to observe how the particle *şey* fits the above-mentioned description and acts as one of the possible devices found and used in Turkish for displaying its producers' verbal planning in an attempt to monitor and control the flow of information as well as other simultaneous functions to be explored below.

It should be noted here that this general description of verbal planning strategy takes different forms (with different subtleties) when these two types of *şey* operate in various conversational environments. For instance, suffixed-*şey*, as we have observed so far, displays a 'search for a specific word' as part of verbal planning which, for one reason or another, proves difficult for the current speaker to recollect. What should be highlighted about this particular function is the specificity of the word that the search is made for.

With the free-standing *şey*, verbal planning is found in the form of obvious 'hesitation' whereby, while the presence of the particle *şey*, which indexes that its producer is 'doing being hesitant' (Good, 1979) as well as maintaining his/her ownership of the floor at the time, the speaker is actually deliberately pausing to plan/organise what to say next and how to proceed at that particular point. Chafe's (1980) observation that verbal planning is an indispensable part of spoken language whose 'predominant form is naturally occurring conversations' (see Heritage, 1984)

further justifies the existence of free-standing *şey* and the conversational function(s) it perform(s). More evidence for the justification of a particle similar to *şey* can be found in Schourup's (1985) study. He introduces the term 'evincive' and explains that the 'evincive' marker basically marks 'the speaker's thinking activity at the moment of its production' and this could well be seen as further evidence for the support of the generality of planning activity and also justification for the existence of devices marking this specific function.

Özbek (1995) also recognises this type of *şey* as different from the suffixed-one. She explains that free-standing *şey* occupies a 'separate tone unit'. Similar to the findings in this study as well as in Yılmaz (1994), Özbek (ibid.) explains the role of this 'second type of *şey*' as a 'planning marker'. When we look at the immediate environment of occurrence of *şey* in terms of the other relevant linguistic elements, both Özbek (ibid.) and Yılmaz (ibid.) as well as this study both agree that free-standing *şey* frequently co-occurs with anaphoric as well as cataphoric hesitancy devices such as '*mm*' and non-linguistic pauses of various time length (example, 4 above).

In terms of the place of occurrence, free-standing *şey* demonstrates similar flexibility to that of the suffixed-one. The placements of *şey*s in TCU-initial and early in the TCU respectively and the TCU-medial (or built-in) are the two most prevalent placements of the free-standing *şey* (example, 5 above). In fact, the TCU-medial placement proves to be rather flexible since it is closely related to the fact that it is not easily predictable where the speaker will need extra time for verbal planning. For example, *şey* could occur in any slot in the first TCU of speaker M's second turn in example twenty-three. In addition to the slot it originally occupies, which is early in the TCU, in '*birde şey mm (1) karayolunda bir tesisler var orda*', all the following combinations are possible: '*birde mm (1) şey karayolunda bir tesisler var orda*' or '*birde mm (1) karayolunda şey bir tesisler var*' or '*birde mm (1) karayolunda bir şey tesisler var*'.

6.2.2.2 Marking verbal planning

The following are some examples where the free-standing *şey* occurs and co-occurs with various other hesitancy elements and in various sequential positions.

In the example below, speaker C is relating a story he heard on a radio show about the latest gun-craze in America.

Example-6

```
  1 C:...size diyor iki diyor ilginç olay anlatayım diyor
→2  öbürünü hatırlayamadım  bir tanesi aklımda  adamin biri mm şey
  3  mm bir evde kadınla kadınla kocası televizyon seyrediyorlar
     [devam ediyor]
..............................................................
  1 C:...he says I'll tell you an interesting story I can't remember
→2  the other one  I can remember just this one  a man mm şey mm a
  3  husband and a wife are watching television at home [continues]
```

In example (6) here, we have a TCU-medial placement of *şey* both preceded and followed by two uses of the same hesitation marker '*mm*' (lines 2 and 3). During the construction of one of his TCUs, speaker C starts to hesitate and marks this hesitation by the use of *şey* at this point (line 2). This verbal planning in the form of hesitation is further supported by the non-lexical hesitation marker '*mm*'. This process initially starts off with non-lexical marker '*mm*' (line 2). This marker is subsequently followed by free-standing *şey* (line 2), which is also followed by another '*mm*' (line 3). Basically, all these elements perform the same function. The reason why few of them happen to be used together at the same time could be to do with the fact that the current speaker needs more time and space for his verbal planning. While speaker C is hesitating and displaying his deliberation through them, the other function these elements accomplish is the holding of the floor for the speaker and index his continuing speakership. So, instead of falling into an "awkward silence" (Beamen, 1984), speaker C clearly marks his hesitation by all these elements, which doubly function to provide planning time as well as floor holding. The following is another case displaying that its user is involved in two conversational activities at a time.

Speaker M and G both are M.A students at the same department. Earlier in the talk speaker G started talking about the party he had attended the previous night organised by one of the members of their department.

Example-7

```
 1 M: bir tanesi zenci
 2 G: (1) yoktu
 3 E: bu senin supervisorınmı anlattığınız
 4 M: Aletta mı
 5 E: mhm
```
→6 M: evet (1) *şey* (2) sen mm (1) akım takılıyorya [*gülüyor*] Dave
```
 7    takılıyo [gülüyor]
      (2)
 8 G: herneyse
```
....
```
 1 M: one of them is a black man
 2 G: (1) he was not there
 3 E: is it your supervisor you are talking about
 4 M: you mean Aletta
 5 E: mhm
```
→6 M: yes(1) *şey* (2) she has been involved in trends [laugh] Dave's
```
 7   friend [laugh]
      (2)
 8 G: anyway
```

In this occurrence of *şey* in example (7), due to the length of the pauses, it is possible to think that the planning that speaker M is involved in is taking more time. After speaker G's assessment of the success of the party and the news that '*Aletta*' was also there, speaker M asks G to tell him who else attended the party from his own specific 'subject' group. After speaker G attempts to describe a few people to speaker G (line 1), speaker E, who is an outsider to this topic, asks speaker M to confirm (line 3) if the person whose name was just mentioned was his supervisor. This confirmation question receives a straight positive response from speaker M in the form of '*evet*' (line 6). Speaker E's question (line 3) is critical here since, although it was asked at the next potential TRP after one of speaker G's responses, it came at a time while 'the inquiry and descriptions as a response' was still underway

191

for speakers G and M. When this information is added to the particular analysis of free-standing *şey* here, we have speaker E, who attempted to shift the focus of the main topic. It is possible to think that while speaker G tried to understand and provide a response to speaker E's question in a small exchange of turns, he needed some time to organise his thoughts and plan his next move while still holding the floor.

As we have seen, the free-standing *şey* in conversational environments such as above, displays that its producer is involved in some verbal planning. Additionally, the verbal display of thought organisation and planning also sends the signal to the recipients that the speaker G in this case is not ready yet to relinquish the floor and has more to say. In other words, during this period in which there is no language production lasting over three seconds, it is possible to observe that free-standing *şey* enables speaker G to continue to hold the floor within his possession until the completion of his verbal planning. It is also important to realise that the fact that no one attempted to take the turn during the two-second pause after the occurrence of *şey*, provides further evidence that free-standing *şey* succeeded in holding the turn for speaker M.

6.2.3 Vagueness and *Şey*

Vagueness and the words expressing vagueness, whether intentional or unintentional, are seldom discussed in linguistic theory. But they raise fascinating and fundamental questions about the nature of linguistic meaning. Speakers sometimes make use of vagueness to convey meaning in situations where they do not have at their disposal the necessary words or phrases for the concepts they wish to express. It is important to accept the account that there is a level of cognitive activity or representation, which precedes words, and that it is independent of them.

The two situations of word-finding difficulty and lexical lack in language production have been identified as the two situations where Turkish speakers might use a vague expression like *şey*. From the point of view of the speaker, the two situations are the same as s/he doe not have the necessary words at his/her disposal. Equally important

192

is the fact that from the point of hearer's understanding, the two situations are the same since the hearer must go through the inferential procedure of attending to identify what the speaker intends to refer to. From Grice's Conversational Maxims point of view, all these uses lead to violations of the maxim of Quantity since *şey* does not give enough explicit information.

To figure out what the vague expressions refer to on a given occasion, interlocutors must rely heavily on knowledge, which is assumed as being shared. In this sense, the Turkish expression *şey* illustrates the property of linguistic practice as 'joint action' (Clark, 1996). Let us look at one particular case where *şey* expresses vagueness.

Example-8

```
→1 G: ışık ışık yanıyor   tırmalıyor orada (2) fakat (1) şeyetmiyo
→2 M: allah allah acaba diskette bir şeylikmi var abi bir (1)
  3    sakatlıkmı var
.....................................................................
  1 G: the light the light is on  it's scratching over there (2) but
→2    (1) doesn't do şey
→3 M: it's strange I wonder is there any şeylik mate (1) is there
  4   any problem
```

When we look at the extract above, in speaker G's sentence '*ışık ışık yanıyor tırmalıyor orada (2) fakat (1) şeyetmiyo*' (line 1) with the verb phrase '*şeyetmiyo*', the speaker provides the hearer with no descriptive information about what he is referring to, but nonetheless he is likely to succeed in communicating what he means. Expressions of this kind are interesting not only because they explicitly depend on interlocutors' common ground, but also because they have meaning specifications, which subtly account for the interpretations hearers make. It is not the case that the expression *şey* is 'empty'. It emerges from the examples discussed in this study that expressions of this kind acquire meanings, which are explicitly oriented to the interactional nature of the speech context, drawing attention to the speaker's assumption that the listener can figure out what the speaker is referring to.

Şey and similar expressions are deictic expressions of a certain kind (i.e. recognitional deictics). One issue is the problem of where and how to draw the line between semantics and pragmatics in the description of those expressions and their use, and what to make use of the suggestion that the proposed meanings are merely 'conditions of use'. Within semantics are described those aspects of meaning which are unchanging across different occasions of utterance of a particular string or word; within pragmatics are characterised those aspects of meaning which are changeable across contexts. *Şey* in its basic use as a placeholder marking the temporary lexical gap, which occurs when a speaker cannot remember the next linguistic item relevant for his/her meaning construction, seems to have both semantic and pragmatic aspects to it.

For instance, what is required for *şey* to successfully denote in this case '*şeyetmiyo*' (line 1) by means of the inferential processes is to rely on mutually assumed cultural scenarios as well as immediately shared context as interpretative resources. And while successful reference in almost any communication requires this, the term *şey* provides next to no descriptive information to narrow down possible reference. In this case here, the interpretation is also constrained by stable context-independent semantics of the expression *şey*. For instance, by saying *şey*, the speaker refers to something, but can't say the word for it at that moment and provides much less specific constraints on interpretation than naming the actual lexical item there. However, the immediate context still provides concrete clues, namely that he was talking about something, that he could not produce the word for the thing at that moment, but he thought the hearer would know what he was talking about. These aspects of the expression *şey* can be viewed as part of its stable meaning. However, the fact that *şey* refers to a different lexical item belonging to a different grammatical category and therefore designating an item denoting different semantic specifications in every different use can be regarded as its pragmatic aspect. The noun *şey* is treated grammatically as a predication (i.e. taking tense, case, aspect and modality etc.). And in this use of *şey* here, identification of a referent is successfully achieved in the absence of any discourse antecedent or contextually present object.

194

The vagueness expressed by *şey* may have various consequences such as structural, social and cognitive. Turkish language seems offer different ways to deal with those. The resulting vagueness of word-searching or lexical gap is mainly dealt with by the 'repair' system, one of the central organisations of conversation in every language. The way in which the vagueness marked by the use of *şey* is clearly dealt with in quite a systematic method in conversational Turkish. The following is this systematic account.

When verbal-planning, word-search or lexical transpires in a speaker's propositional production, it is the repair system, which becomes relevant through the use of both types of *şey*. It has to be noted that as the speaker continues to contribute to his/her proposition under construction at the moment of speaking (real time online production), the occurrence of the particle *şey*, which can also be lengthened by the period of linguistic or non-linguistic pauses, crops up in the speaker's actual turn ownership during which the speaker has to be engaged in a temporary cognitive activity of coming up with what he is looking for. Unless this relatively short span of time is to be marked accordingly, the other participants in the conversation can easily take this period either for a turn-completion, or for an opportunity to self-select for the next turn or simply to interrupt the current speaker.

6.2.3.1 Suffixed-*Şey* Marking Vagueness

It has been emphasised earlier that of the two types of the particle *şey*, the fact that one of them is capable of being suffixed is the main difference between the two. One of the aims of this section is to demonstrate the systematicity found in the way various suffixes are attached to the particle *şey* in its functional role within the repair organisation in the Conversational Structure Domain. Included in the formal notion of vagueness are cases involving word recovery problems dealt with through repair. These cases constitute the conversational environments where suffixed-*şey* is recurrently found and is observed to be conventionally displaying the word search of its producer. This occurrence of suffixed-*şey* resembles what Schourup refers to as 'evincive', which is related to disclosure of covert thinking. Schourup's 'evincives' suggest that discourse particles function on a cognitive level. According to Schourup

(1985:23): "'Evincive' is a linguistic item that indicates that at the moment at which it is said the speaker is engaged in, or has just then been engaged in thinking; the evincive item indicates that this thinking is now occurring or has just now occurred, but does not completely satisfy its content". Schourup further claims that the evincive quality of particles may be relevant to the description of almost all discourse particles. In this sense, suffixed-*şey* seems to satisfy the quality of discourse particles.

All the conversational extracts we will see below contain *şey* attached to the various suffixes of tense, case, number, mood and person. The recurrent occurrence of *şey* with suffixes illustrates that it characterises a systematic use in conversational Turkish. It is an indicator of a conversational repair operation for a word search initiated by the producer of this particle. The repair initiation in the form of a search for a missing word is subsequently translated in majority of the cases into the successful accomplishment of this repair whereby the missing word has been found and placed in its proper semantic and structural position. The data used in this study reveal that the particle *şey*, subject to suffixation, constitutes a repair format and is as a recurrent device available to conversationalists in Turkish. If a 'certain stable form' emerges and recurs in talk, it should be understood as an 'orderliness' (see Schegloff, 1982).

The occurrence of *şey* in conversational Turkish very much conforms to this description. It is noteworthy that the suffixed-*şey* does not occur just anywhere, but in such a position as to locate rather precisely what is being thought about. In other words, the point of occurrence of the particle is very likely to be displaying the point at which a problem was foreseen and 'thinking-about-it' is undertaken. Similarly, what is closely associated with position of occurrence of this form of *şey* is the lexical form it eventually takes, which is mainly determined by the suffixes attached to it. Therefore, the structural slot in which *şey* appears directly determines the semantic value and structural form which it temporarily represents until the completion of the repair process. Furthermore, what are complementary to the lexical formation of *şey* in a certain structural slot are the grammatical and

196

inflectional suffixes attached to it. In majority of the cases, the suffixes attached in the course of word searches are subject to recycling when the repair process is finalised with the replacement of the missing word. Below are some instances where both types of suffixation are illustrated.

Speaker provides information about a special optical lens scheme of an optician.
Example-9

→I: *işte m **şeyleri** sıvıları bilmemneleri falan*

....

→I: ***şey**-plural-accusative*

....

→I: *işte m **şeyleri** the liquids and all the rest of it*

In example 9, there are two different suffixes attached to *şey* in '*işte m şeyleri sıvıları bilmemneleri falan*'. They are suffixes of number and case. Together with these suffixes, '*şeyleri*' occupies a subject position as a plural noun where the plural suffix '*lar* or *ler*' is followed by the accusative case suffix {-(y) I}.

We have various suffixes attached to *şey* in example one above. They are suffixes of number and case. The plural suffix '*lar* or *ler*' is followed by the accusative case suffix {-(y) I}.

Looking at a poster on the wall, speaker M wants to confirm whether the picture in the poster is *Kaleköy* in example (10) below.
Example-10

→M: *orası **şeymi** ya Kaleköymü orası*

....

→M: ***şey**-tense-question particle*

....

→M: *is that **şey** is that Kaleköy over there*

In the second example, we have the attachment of the question particle in '*orası şeymi ya Kaleköymü orası*' where '*mi*' marking the simple present tense is in the form of a question. The particle *şey* attached to the question marker '*mi*' is in subject

position again as a noun, but in interrogative form. The suffix '*mi*' that *şey* takes is a standard question suffix which converts standard SOV-TCUs into question forms without the movement of any lexical item within the TCU. As a standard question format, the suffix '*mi*' would have still been there, even without *şey*.

In example (11), speaker G wants the recording to be started even though the recording has already started.

Example-11

```
→G: sen bizim şeyimizi hazırla mm (1) recordingimizi
..............................................................
→G: şey-agreement-accusative
..............................................................
→G: will you prepare our şey mm (1) our recording
```

In example (11), there are some other suffixes. In '*sen bizim **şeyimizi** hazırla mm (1) recordingimizi*', '*şeyimizi*' is used as a pronoun in object position and is marked with the 1 person plural agreement and the accusative.

Speaker N below talks about their trip to America.

Example-12

```
   N:  beraber  gittik  =  zaten  yani  normal  şartlarda  pek
gidilemezdide
 →    zor olurdu gidilirdi de (1) Amerikada otel şeydi (1) mm (1)
      mutfağı  var  açık mutfağı
..............................................................
→ N: {şey-past}
..............................................................
  N: we went together = it would normally not be possible
     to go anyway we could still go but it would be difficult (1)
 →   the hotel in America was şey (1) mm (1) it had a kitchen
     an open kitchen
```

In example (12), we find a grammatical suffix of tense attached to *şey*. The particle *şey* in '*Amerikada otel **şeydi***' is found in the position of an adjective where the suffix {-IDI} consists of the defective copular and the past tense suffix.

198

The topic is about new regulations introduced about going abroad.

Example-13

```
→D: ona da şeyyaptılar engel getirdiler  öyle yeni bir
    uygulamayla...
    ................................................................
→D: {şey-do-past-3 Person plural agreement}
    ................................................................
→D: they did şey to it they forbade it  that's a new regulation
```

In the final example (13) above, we have the suffixation of *şey* with a verb particle in the past form, followed by third person plural suffix. The same particle '*ona da şeyyaptılar engel getirdiler*' is attached to a verb-forming suffix where it constitutes the verb phrase of the TCU it is used in. What is notable about this construction is that the verb stem '*yapmak*' in (*yaptılar*; *yapmak* + past + plural) together with another stem '*etmek*' are two verb forming suffixes which are regularly used in Turkish to construct phrasal verbs. The particle *şey* embedded with these two stems, as will be clearer later in the chapter, is recurrent and constitutes a major same-turn self-initiated repair format for verb phrases. As the above-extracts (9-13) illustrate, this form of *şey* occurs in different structural positions in a TCU and attached to various suffixes.

What we have observed so far are the lexical positions that *şey* is found together with the variety of suffixes that are attached to it. The cases above have demonstrated that the placement of suffixed-*şey* as a 'repairable' throughout the word search process is closely to do with part of the TCU in which the repair is required. That is, whichever part of the TCU under construction is problematic, *şey* attached to a proper suffix displays this simultaneously marking out the repair initiation, which is subsequently tackled within the same-turn that the repairable has occurred (see Schegloff, 1979 for same-turn repair).

What we will focus on in the following is closely associated with the structural position of suffixed-*şey* when it occurs within TCUs. The structural placement of the particle simultaneously complemented by the accompanying suffixation is important

in indexing the trouble source thus initiating the repair proper for a word that the speaker is unable to come up with momentarily.

Now, throughout our analysis for the description of the way the operation of repair for a word search is initially signalled and actually carried out by the particle *şey*, we will take as our focal point the lexical positions that *şey* is found in. These positions are especially significant because it is in and around these lexical environments that suffixed-*şey* fulfils its role as a DisP where it displays its producer's search for a word. The following analysis consists of the illustration of each of the lexical positions in which *şey* attached to various suffixes, most recurrently occurs. The occurrence of suffixed-*şey* in its ability to mark repair organisation follows a standard procedure, which will first involve the initiation, then the repair itself.

6.2.3.2 Suffixed-*Şey* Replacing Nouns

The occurrence of suffixed-*şey* as a noun takes place in various syntactic places such as subject and object. The following extracts will include all instances of *şey* as a noun.

Speaker M below seeks confirmation for the exact location of a specific retailer shop.

Example-14

```
→M: büyük Çarşı dediğin şeymi Akmerkezmi
.....................................................................
→M: şey-question particle
.....................................................................
→M: is what you mean by grand Çarşı şey is it Akmerkez
```

In example (14) here, we have a confirmation question posed by speaker M. The standard question particle is '*mi*' and it is the kind of suffixation that *şey* is subject to here. The occurrence of *şey* as a 'repairable' in terms of structural placement is in object position as a noun. Once the speaker utters *şey*, this constitutes the 'repair' and the initiation of the repair process for searching for the missing word. In majority of the cases, it is the suffix to which *şey* is attached is recycled, after the replacement of *şey* with the actual word. So, in the case above, acting as a pronoun as a repairable attached to the question particle '*mi*', *şey* is subsequently replaced by

the actual name of the place that speaker M was temporarily unable to remember. As we see in the example above that the question particle '*mi*' is recycled and attached to the name of the place after speaker M has uttered it, thus marking the completion of the search. The search initiated to recollect this particular place's name is successfully accomplished after the uttering of the place's name in question '*Akmerkezmi*'. One might think that recycling stops at this point because that is the end of the TCU. However, as will be illustrated in the following case, the recycling is limited to the suffixes attached to *şey* as other parts of the TCU produced after the repairable are not recycled.

Speaker I below relates his attempt to get in touch a long-lost common friend.
Example-15

```
→I: Ankaradaki (0.5) şeyine telefon ettim çalıştığı yere  işte şu
    anda yok dediler = odasında yoktu  sonra Buraktan öğrendim DPT
    de çalışıyo diye
..............................................................
→I: şey-agr-dative
..............................................................
→I: I telephoned (0.5) şey his workplace in Ankara  işte they said
    he is not there at that moment = he was not in his office
    later I found out from Burak that he was working for DPT
```

Example (15) consists of a relatively long turn that belongs to speaker I when he relates a part of an account of his attempt to get in touch with a common friend of all the participants present. The occurrence of *şey* as a repairable takes place early in the first TCU of the turn. Structurally, *şey* occupies a dative-marked object position and constitutes the particle '*şeyine*' as a repairable. The particle '*şeyine*' as a repairable in indirect object position is subsequently followed by the verb phrase of the TCU. The search for a specific word is normally signalled and initiated by the production of *şey* as a repairable. But in the case here, there occurs a half a second pause prior to *şey*, which contributes to the search process in terms of the provision of longer time and turn space. As will be illustrated in some other cases, there are cataphoric as well as anaphoric pauses with different duration.

We have an instance of a standard recycling pattern here, just as in the previous case. The repairable '*şeyine*' is subsequently replaced by the noun phrase '*çalıştığı yere*' in which the case suffixe '*e*' in '*çalıştığı yere*' is recycled (TCU ends after '*yere*'). What is involved in recycling once again is mainly the repetition of the suffixes that the particle *şey* was originally attached to after the production of the repaired segment. The verb phrase that followed the repairable as the last element of the TCU is not included in the recycling.

Speaker M makes an inquiry about the possible whereabouts of a specific academic personality.

Example-16

→1 M: Aykut Kansu **şeyde** mi M.I.T demi?

→2 G: M.I.T den onun **şeyi** doktorası

....

→1 M: **şey**-case-3 Person agreement

→2 G: **şey**-accusative

....

→1 M: *is Aykut Kansu at* **şey** *at M.I.T?*

→2 G: *his* **şey** *is from M.I.T his Ph.D.*

In example (16) above, we have a relatively representative case of two instances of the suffixed-*şey* as a noun in two different structural slots. Each case will be dealt with in turn. In both cases where the TCUs are clearly short, the particle *şey* with suffixes enables its user to display his attempt to search for a word he does not seem to remember at the moment of current TCU construction.

What we have in this extract is a standard adjacency pair of a question and an answer each made up of one TCU-long minimal turns (which justifies the case as claimed by Sacks et al. (1973) that "the turn-taking system of conversation in all cultures/languages initially allots one TCU to each current speaker" (p.705). In what constitutes the first part of the adjacency pair (line 1) in which first *şey* as a repairable occurs, we have a question where a standard SOV-TCU is converted into a confirmation question form with the addition of question particle '*mi*'. In other

words, it would have been a statement had the question particle '*mi*' not been there *(Aykut Kansu şeyde M.I.T de)*. As we have seen in the other examples above, it is not only the question particle '*mi*' this time that is attached to *şey*, but also another suffixation element: It is the 'locative' case suffix {-DE} which is initially attached to *şey*, which is a noun in object position in the first TCU.

In his inquiry about the possible whereabouts of a specific academic personality, even though speaker M initially produces the name of the person in question, speaker M subsequently cannot seem to remember the name of the university that the person in question works for. What occurs, instead of a noun or pronoun at this object position in this part of the TCU, is *şey* replacing the missing noun as object. During this placement, the particle *şey* as a repairable is attached to the locative case suffix '*de*'. This is the point where the initiation of repair is signalled. Additionally, since speaker M aims to elicit the confirmation of some information with this TCU, he also adds the question particle '*mi*' at the end of his TCU.

The occurrence of repairable *şey* with the attachment of locative case and question suffixes constitutes the starting point of the word search. As has been the case with the examples above, the repairable '*şey*' with the two suffixes is subsequently replaced with repaired segment, which is the actual word being sought 'M.I.T'. As part of the searching process, the recycling gets underway with the production of the repaired element, which is '*M.I.T*' in this case and subsequently the locative case suffix '*de*' and the question particle '*mi*' are recycled as an attachment to the repaired element.

The operation of repair for searching a particular word, a noun in object position here, is initiated with the uttering of the particle *şey* and it is successfully completed after speaker M comes up with the replacement for the name of the university being sought. As a requirement of adjacency pairs, the person to whom the question is directed automatically is selected as the next speaker. Thus, speaker G automatically becomes the next speaker, and initiates his response turn without any gap or delay as is clearly seen in the extract. It is interesting to see that the name of the institution as

the noun object sought for through the word search by speaker M above becomes the first element that speaker G produces as he initiates his response turn. The way speaker G constructs his next TCU signals that he is about produce a TCU in which the ablative marked object is fronted to the TCU and turn. The new subject (*M.I.T den*) of the prepositional phrase is followed by the repairable '*şey*i' as a noun phrase in the form of a pronoun with genitive case suffix attached. This repairable mainly consists of the particle *şey* attached to the genitive case marker '*i*'. Since this is the repairable, this point once again becomes the starting point of the repair. As in most repair operations, the repairable is followed by the repaired segment, which replaces the element for which this 'word search' was made. So, after the actual agreement-marked noun '*doktorası*' as a repaired segment follows the repairable '*şeyi*' in object position, the repair operation has been successfully completed.

It is quite clear from the instances above that the occurrence of *şey* with various suffixes constitutes it as a 'repairable' during a word search process. As well as displaying the initiation of a word search by replacing the word that the current speaker is trying to remember, *şey* also enables its producer during the construction of the current TCU a certain amount of time and structural space throughout which the repair operation can be successfully carried out within the boundaries of the same TCU. The completion of this repair operation constitutes the completion of the TCU under construction whose completion also constitutes that of the turn it is located in. After the completion of this confirmation question, turn transition clearly becomes relevant.

It is clear from the above examples that one of the grammatical functions the particle *şey* fulfils by means of the accompanying suffixes is to act as a temporary noun or pronoun in such structural places as object, subject etc. The occurrence of *şey* with various suffixes constitutes the particle as a 'repairable' through which it serves to display the search for a missing word engaged in by the current speaker. It is in this connection that the suffixed-*şey* is seen to be performing its interactional function within repair organisation. The role of suffixed-*şey* in this environment is to display the search for a word that is initiated and accomplished by the same speaker within

the same turn. Since 'word search' is a part of repair mechanism, the whole operation is an indicator of the fact that the speaker is having some difficulty in finding the appropriate lexical item. Therefore, as well as enabling its producer to mark the 'word search' that s/he is involved in because of some planning difficulty, *şey* clearly displays to the recipients that the current speaker is actually experiencing this difficulty.

We now move on to the next occurrence of suffixed-*şey* where it temporarily replaces a verb phrase in a TCU.

6.2.3.3 Suffixed-*Şey* Replacing Verbs

In the following cases, we will see the illustration of suffixed-*şey* performing its interactional function of displaying 'self-initiated self-repair' through the word search. This time, however, its structural placement is a verb (phrase) position marked again by suffixes. The following are some of the instances of the case in question.

The topic below is why the Turkish Society at the university failed to but a complimentary present for someone who greatly contributed to the society.

Example-17

```
 1 N: ne oldu = o çocuğun hediyesi mediyesi olmadı dimi?
 2 D: AMAN artık bizden çıktı
 3 E: biz biz artık yani mm (1) //söyledik kaç kere
→4 D:                         //sen zaten şeyyapmıştın (1)
 5    çekilmiştin
.............................................................
→4 D: şey-do-aspect-past-2 Person agreement
.............................................................
 1 N: what happened = a present for him has not been sorted out has
      it?
 2 D: THANK GOD it has nothing to do with us now
 3 E: we we have yani mm (1) //told them many times
→4 D:                    //you already did şey (1) stepped down
```

205

Another common structural position in which *şey* is recurrently found is that of predicate as the verb of the TCU. The repairable verb phrase '*şeyyapmak*' is a general predicate describing what is said about the subject of the TCU. Because of its generality, the repairable '*şeyyapmak*' is always replaced with the specific verb the speaker originally intended to use. And the ensuing recycling only includes the suffixation that *şey* is subject to. In example (17) here, it is in speaker D's overlapping TCU with that of speaker E that we observe the occurrence of *şey* as a repairable in predicate position. The repairable '*şeyyapmıştın*' basically consists of the semantically relatively empty verb 'do' to which also attached are the perfective aspect marker {-MIŞ}, past marker {-IDI} and second person agreement marker.

Acting as the verb of the TCU above '*sen zaten* **şeyyapmıştın** *(1) çekilmiştin*' (line 4), *şey* serves as a repairable to display the incipient word search, which is normally accomplished within the boundaries of the same turn once it has been initiated. So, while acting as a general predicate as a repairable, the particle, in the subsequent move of the speaker, is replaced with the verb '*çekilmek*', which it may be considered that the speaker indicates that he wanted to use it in the first place. We observe certain amount of recycling similar to *şey* replacing nouns. After the occurrence as a repairable '*şeyyapmıştın*', whose suffixation has been explained above, the replacement '*çekilmek*' is attached the same suffixes such as the tense suffix of past perfective aspect {-MIŞ} in '*çekil<u>miş</u>*' and the past marker {-IDI} together with second person agreement marker in '*çekilmiş<u>tin</u>*'. The one-second pause between the repairable and the repaired also marks the word search in terms of providing the speaker some more search time. Once again, the particle *şey* with a common predicate inflectional suffix displays the repair initiation of the current speaker to accomplish the search for a word that she was temporarily unable to remember. Below is another case in which *şey* acts as the predicate of its TCU.

Speaker C makes an inquiry about another speaker's decision whether to have an hair-cut.

Example-18

→C: peki Kıbrısa gitmeden **şeyyapacakmısın** bir daha kestirecekmisin

206

```
        saçlarını
.....................................................................
→C: şey-yapmak-future-question particle-2 Person singular agreement
.....................................................................
→C: then before you leave for Cyprus will you do şey will you have
    a hair cut
```

In example (18) here, we have a grammatically complex TCU in speaker E's turn in interrogative form in which the verb phrase of the main clause *'şeyyapacakmısın'* constitutes the repairable. Again, the same semantically relatively empty verb 'do' *'yapmak'* is attached to *şey*, which temporarily acts as the verb phrase. Once again, *'şey*yapmak' denotes a general predication about the action of the subject.

The search initiated here for the predicate of the main clause of speaker C's complex TCU is once again successfully accomplished as the actual verb phrase *'kestirecekmisin'* comes after the repair. The replacing predicate as a repaired segment is the verb *'kestirmek'* as a stem followed by the recycling suffixes of the kind as has appeared in the repairable. The future suffix in *'kestir<u>ecek</u>'* and question particle in *'kestirecek<u>mi</u>'* are finally followed by the second person singular tense suffix *'kestirecekmi<u>sin</u>'*. The particle *şey* attached to the same semantically relatively empty verb 'do' is structurally placed in the position of predicate. The generality of the predication denoted by the particle *'şeyyapmak'*, which fills in the position concerned while the speaker is engaged in word search, is subsequently replaced by the specific verb phrase with the attachment of the appropriate suffixes as a result of the successful accomplishment of word search.

All the three participants in the following conversation relate their experiences of haircuts and barbers in England. Their main point of departure is the basic differences and similarities between their own barbers back home and the ones in their town in England.

Example-19

```
  1 E: = ondan sonra ben hep oraya ilk dönem //gittim
  2 C:                                    //evet bende
→3 E: fena değil mm yani şeyyapıyor (1) fena kesmiyor  ilk
```

```
     4    kestirdiğimde çok iyiydi Türkiyeye gitmeden önce kestirdim ilk
     5    dönem  daha sonra bu dönem iki üç kere gittim  ikisindede
→6    memnun olmadım. yani ilk gittiğimde şeyyaptı mm güzel kesti
     7    tamam falan filan biraz ilk gitmiştim oraya...[devam ediyor]
...........................................................................
→ E: şey-yapmak-present; şey-yapmak-past
...........................................................................
   1 E: = and I have always been there in the first //term
   2 C:                                          //yes me too
→ 3 E: not bad mm yani he does şey (1) he doesn't cut badly in my
   4  first visit there it was great  I had a hair cut there before
   5  I went to Turkey in the first term  then I have been there
   6  couple of times this term I have not been happy in both times.
→ 7  yani on my first visit he did şey mm he cut well and
   8  everything it was my first visit there...[continues]
```

Example (19) is the one, which will be analysed in more detail. We actually have more than one occurrence of *şey* as a repairable. In both cases here, as we will shortly observe, the same verb particle suffix is attached to both occurrences of *şey* but with different suffixes. In the context above in which speaker E initially proffers his description of the one of the latest visits to the barbershop since speakers C and H have already done that previously. Having stated which barbershop he regularly goes to, speaker E above initiates his turn with an assessment *'fena değil'* (line 3), which is the first TCU of the new turn. This minimal TCU is immediately followed by a pause *'mm'*, which acts as a turn holding device. Speaker E uses his initial assessment and the following pause marker *'mm'* as a preface to the description he is going to give subsequently. The orientation of the recipients to this attempt is displayed by the fact that no one self-selects at this point. What provides further support for the speaker's continuation is the use of *yani*, which not only helps its producer to hold on to the floor but also indexes that what is coming up is explanation/development of what has just gone. Subsequently, speaker E produces another assessment TCU, which, this time is more grammatically complex than the initial one. However, this second assessment TCU *'şeyyapıyor (1) fena kesmiyor'* (line 3) comes with an initial repairable where *'şeyyapıyor'* is the verb phrase. As we have seen above and already mentioned at the outset of the chapter, the frequent

semantically empty verb 'do' (*yapmak*) once again is attached to the particle *şey* together with the present continuous tense suffix {-(I) yor}.

The one-second pause that ensues between the repairable and the repaired element clearly buys the speaker more time during his word search. Subsequently, the repaired segment of the predicate follows, marking the completion of the word search. As expected, with the production of the verb '*kesmek*' towards which the search was oriented, the same tense suffix together with the third person pronoun suffix are recycled eventually producing '*kesmiyor*'. Unlike other cases we have seen above that the speaker uses the negative form of the verb together with the addition of an adverb '*fena*'. In fact, it is the choice of this adverb, which determines the form of the upcoming verb. That is, in his attempt to clarify and upgrade his initial assessment in that particular context, speaker E continues to use the same form of assessment together with the addition of a verb phrase. So, the repairable '*şey*yapıyor' is converted into the repaired form of '*fena kesmiyor*' in which the adverb '*fena*' requires the verb to be in negative form in order to make a positive assessment. Once the search for a missing verb, which is temporarily filled in by the particle *şey*, has been displayed and marked out to have been initiated by the same particle, the successful accomplishment of word search within the repair system is completed after the replacement of repairable with the appropriate verb as the repaired segment.

After these two initial assessment TCUs, speaker E starts to relate his experience with this barbershop in question, which initially consists of the number of visits to the shop and their specific timing. Speaker E subsequently initiates further elaboration of his visits, which he marks by the particle *yani*. This *yani*-prefaced complex TCU (line 6) '*yani ilk gittiğimde **şeyyaptı** mm iyi kesti tamam falan filan*' contains another repairable of *şey* with verb suffix in the main clause. In fact, with the exception of verb and adverb, this repairable is almost semantically identical to the first one. After the complement clause of the prepositional time phrase 'on my first visit' whereby speaker E starts to elaborate specifically on his first hair-cut experience, the main clause is initiated by the production of verb suffixed-*şey* as a

repairable '*şeyyaptı*' (line 6). This repairable, similar to the other cases, consists of *şey* attached to the semantically empty verb 'do' (*yapmak*), which is also attached to the tense suffix of the past tense and person suffix of third person. The repairable '*şeyyapmak*' clearly indicates the point where speaker E is involved in his 'word search'. As a part of the systematicity of this operation, repair has been shown as being conducted within the boundaries of the same turn.

Subsequent to the occurrence of '*şeyyaptı*', 'mm' acting as a hesitation marker here is produced by speaker E, before he initiates the production of the repaired segment as a result of 'word search' operation. The repaired segment, which comes immediately after the hesitancy marker '*mm*', consists of a basic SOV-TCU in which the verb '*kesmek*' is uttered with the past tense and third person suffixes, producing '*kesti*'. Like the previous case above, the verb '*kesmek*' is modified by the preceding adverb '*güzel*' as a part of speaker E's ongoing assessments throughout his description. And after the production of the recollected verb '*kesti*' marking the completion of the repair operation, the speaker proceeds.

In sum, the particle *şey* attached to the common semantically empty verb 'do' (*yapmak*) in both of the cases above acts as a verb phrase and at this point displays the initiation of a standard repair operation involving the search for a specific verb. As a repairable, the particle '*şeyyapmak*' denotes a general predication whereby it simultaneously signals that the current speaker is having a difficulty in selecting the appropriate verb. So, the occurrence of the particle '*şeyyapmak*' initiates, as well as displays, that a potential repair is due in search for a verb phrase. In all the cases we have seen so far, the operation of the word search starting with the occurrence of the particle as a repairable is subsequently accomplished by its replacement with the repaired segment after the speaker's successful recollection of the predicate in question in the next conversational move.

As we have seen so, two of the most common structural positions that suffixed-*şey* appears in are the noun and predicate positions. The main task of *şey* is to display, as well as initiate, the preferred type of same-turn, same-speaker repair. With the

production of the actual missing vocabulary for which the repair operation was initiated, the word search is successfully accomplished and the talk resumes.

6.2.3.4 Suffixed-*Şey* with no Immediate Replacement

While the different grammatical suffixes *şey* is attached to play an important role for the accomplishment of the much preferred 'self-initiated self-repair', there occurs another recurrent pattern of suffixed-*şey* after which the repairable is not replaced with the repaired segment. In other words, there is a repairable as displayed by the suffixed-*şey*, but repair does not take place at all. In such cases, the issue of intersubjectivity becomes all the more important since the participants to the talk are left to deduce the meaning of the unreplaced word from their shared knowledge and the immediate context for the construction of a mutual meaning.

The following are some examples where there is obviously no replacement for the repaired segment of the prior repairable in the form of suffixed-*şey*. The examples contain occurrences of *şey* attached to various suffixes. As has just been mentioned above, the main difference between this particular occurrence and the previous one is the absence of a repaired segment after the repairable suffixed-*şey*.

Speaker EB is trying to convince speaker D not to go to a lot of trouble to find some references about a particular academician.

Example-20

```
 1 D: mm kiminle calışıyosunuz hocam = o İzmir deki bi hanım vardı
 2 EB: = Seçkin  yani calışıyodum (1) Angela [iki saniye okumaya
 3   çalışıyor] Hook mu okunur (4) bunların dışında = ben size yani
→4    şeyvermiş olmıyayım = bir Richard Todd un dışındaki şeylerden
 5   hiç yok bende (2) hangisi olursa olsun hiç önemli değil
 6 D: Richard Todd dediğiniz hocam nedir  ben bi bakayım = onun
 7   konusuna göre şey yaparım
```
....
→ EB: *şey*-give-perfective aspect
....
```
 1 D: mm who do you work with sir = there was this lady in İzmir
 2 EB: = Seçkin  yani I was working (1)  Angela [tries to read for
```

211

```
     3    two seconds]would you read it as Hook (4) apart from these = I
     4     just don't want to give you any şey = apart from Richard Todd
→5        şeyleri I simply have nothing (2) it doesn't really matter
     6     which  ones you bring
     7 D: what do you mean by Richard Todd sir I'll have a look for you
     8     = according to the topic I'll do şey
```

In example (20), speaker EB's first TCU contains *şey* with a verb suffix '*ben size şeyvermiş olmıyayım*' (line 4). This repairable suffixed-şey '*şeyvermiş*' is clearly not replaced. Speaker EB, instead of cutting off and continuing with another unit, could have produced the possible repair '*zahmet vermiş olmıyayım*'. What speaker EB subsequently does is to initiate another TCU without completing the repair, leaving the recipients to guess. The following TCU produced by speaker EB, in which we see another unreplaced repairable suffixed-*şey*, is subsequently followed by a two-second pause. The presence of this pause refutes a possible claim that the speaker did not have sufficient time to successfully complete the repair operation. After this relatively long pause, speaker EB begins with a new TCU, instead of following through with a repaired segment. The repairable '*şeyler*' (line 4) is left unreplaced since the speaker initiates another TCU after a two-second pause. Here the presence of this relatively long pause is important at this point clearly because it provides sufficient time for the current speaker to complete the word search successfully. However, speaker EB instead starts a new TCU. This problem of a concrete structural and semantic gap has to be interactionally overcome by the mutual efforts of all parties to the conversation in order to keep intersubjectivity intact.

The topic in example (21) below is the economic results of high rate of inflation and unexpected high-speed increase of US Dollar against the Turkish Lira.

Example-21

```
→1 M: Türkiyede memur işçinin cebindeki para biranda şeyoldu
  2 E: = öyle = dolarla karşılaştırdığında
..................................................................
→  M: şey-happen-past
..................................................................
→1 M: in Turkey the money in the pockets of the workers and civil
```

212

```
2    servants suddenly şey happened
3 E: = that's right = when compared to dollar
```

In example (21), in speaker M's turn, the particle *şey* as a repairable is attached to a
verb suffix '*şeyoldu*' (line 1). In fact, as the verb phrase of the TCU, '*şeyoldu*'
constitutes the last element of the speaker M's turn since a repaired segment does not
follow afterwards. What follows subsequently is the initiation of a new turn by
speaker E, who signals initially by his minimal response token of confirmation that
the meaning constructed by speaker M has been understood despite the lack of
substitute candidate.

It is interesting to note here that every occurrence of *şey* with suffixes in fact merits
special attention from the recipients of that talk since it is not possible to know at all
whether *şey* as a repairable will be replaced after its occurrence by a repaired
segment. The two examples below illustrate the comparison between the
accomplishment and non-accomplishment of the repair after its initiation.

To illustrate with another sample, in example (22), the issue under discussion is the
lack of proper terminology in Turkish for some linguistic concepts in English. The
two speakers (E and I) mainly complain about having difficulty in the definition and
explanation of their subject to their friends, who are outside as well as inside the
field.

Example-22
```
  1 E: ben conversation bile nasıl çevireceğimi bilmiyorum yani.
→2 I: sohbet dediğinde aynı şeyi vermiyo?
  3 E: = vermiyo   çok hafif kalıyo?
  4 I: ben ne çare buldum biliyomusun  mm konuşma İngilizcesi (1)
  5    üzerine çalışıyorum diyorum (1) ne diyeceksin başka
..............................................................
→I: şey-accusative
..............................................................
  1 E:I don't even know how I should translate the term conversation
  2    (into Turkish) yani
→3 I: when you say sohbet  you don't get the same şey
```

213

```
4 E: = no you don't   (it) is not as strong
5 I: I have found a solution for that mm I tell people (1) I study
6    spoken English (1) what else can you use
```

In example (22), we see in speaker I's turn (line 2) above a relatively short but complex clause '*sohbet dediğinde aynı **şeyi** vermiyo*' in whose main part there is a standard repairable suffixed-*şey* in object position, using the accusative case suffix '*i*'. Specifically, speaker I suggests the problem of terminology is so serious for him that he has to do a lot of explaining in order to make himself understood about his subject. In offering a Turkish alternative to the basic English term 'conversation', speaker I designs the TCU in his turn above. In this complex TCU, speaker I initially produces the subordinate clause '*sohbet dediğinde*', which is immediately followed by the main part '*aynı **şeyi** vermiyo*' (line 2) containing the repairable '*şeyi*'. This case marked repairable *şey* as the object of the main part of the complex clause is not repaired after its occurrence. Indeed, the repair does not take place at all. In other words, we have a display of the self-initiation of the possible word search within the repair operation for a repairable, but the repairing is not carried out, and the repairable is left as being deduced by the recipients of this talk from the immediate context and shared knowledge. The question may come to be asked at this point whether this 'unrepaired' element is really understood by the recipients.

Clearly, the production of the verb phrase, which is the last element of the clause, constitutes a potential TRP and what happens subsequently is the transition of a speaking turn. The way speaker E, who self-selects as the next speaker, initiates his turn may provide a response to the above question. It is interesting to see that speaker E begins his turn by the repetition of the same verb phrase as speaker I used. It would not be irrelevant to propose here that had speaker E not understood it he would not have repeated the verb following the repairable '*şeyi*' as the object of the TCU (for repetition in overlaps, see Schegloff, 1979). Indeed, speaker E's subsequent TCU constitutes a case through which he functionally supports his repetition by an 'upgrade assessment' '*çok hafif kalıyo*' (line 3) through which the speaker makes a further assessment (for assessments, see Pomerantz, 1984).

214

It is interesting to observe at this point that the 'unuttered' subject of this TCU, which is the prodropped inanimate third person, is actually the same unreplaced 'repairable' in speaker I's TCU. Despite the clear absence of the hard-to-recollect vocabulary in the form of repairable, which is only expressed by the suffixed-*şey*, the above case provides evidence for the fact that the absence of a form does not necessarily mean the absence of its meaning either. The meaning of an unexpressed linguistic element is clearly available to the participants of the talk through other means. For example, one of the important ones is the context (local and global). 'Pair-wise' development of the topical line of talk in the local context makes it possible for the participants to be vigilant about the details of the topic in question as well as its overall meaning. The participants' immediate involvement and their (informational) background may also have an impact on their access to the meaning of these unexpressed linguistic elements. What is relevant here is the role of suffixed-*şey*, which acts as a semantic as well as a syntactic element by replacing the missing vocabulary during the 'word search'. Next we have another case of suffixed-*şey* with no immediate replacement.

As we demonstrate below, we will be able to empirically show that participants actually often comprehend the meaning of the unreplaced suffixed-*şey* but also make it clear to its user when they do not. The following example clearly demonstrates that in case of failure to understand the unexpressed meaning represented by the particle *şey*, the participant in question brings it to the attention of the speaker.

The topic of the discussion below is about the famous industrialists, the Koç family. The focus of the topic is one particular member of this family and the social functions in which he is involved in the high society.

Example-23

```
 1 M: ne Koçtu o   Rahmi Koç
 2 E: Rahmi degil
 3 G: Mustafa Koç
 4 M: ha torununu diyosun
 5 E: şeyin Ra Rahmi Koçun oğlu
→6 G: o da tam şey ha böyle
```

```
    7 M: Koçun adasını gördünüzmü
    8 G: nerde
    9 M: şeyde tuzlanın karşısında
   10 G: mm söylediler
   11 M: çok güzel bir yermiş lan   haritasını falan gördum ben bi ara
→12 E: sen ne dedin o çok şey dedin
   13 G: tam böyle yani şey yeni kuşak burjuvazi
   14 M: Mus Mustafa mı
   15 G: mhm mm biniciliktir işte otomobil sporlarıymış ve adam
   16     heryerde şeyi var böyle (1) eli var [devam ediyor]
..................................................................
→6-G: 3 Person-şey
→12-E: şey-say-tense-2 Person agreement
..................................................................
    1 M: which Koç was that   Rahmi Koç
    2 E: not Rahmi
    3 G: Mustafa Koç
    4 M: ha you're talking about his grandson
    5 M: şeyin ra Rahmi Koç's son
→6 G: he is just kind of şey
    7 M: have you seen their [Koç's] island
    8 G: where
    9 M: şeyde across Tuzla
   10 G: mm I've heard about it
   11 M: they say it's very beautiful   I have even seen its map
→12 E: what did you say   you said he is very şey
   13 G: just like yani şey new generation bourgeoisie
   14 M: you mean Mus Mustafa
   15 G: mhm mm from horse-riding işte to automobile sports he şeyivar
   16    he is involved in every kind of activity [continues]
```

Example (23) here provides evidence for the fact that when participants are not clear about the meaning represented by the particle *şey* after it is not replaced by the actual word, they pursue it until the meaning is clearly made available. The extract above clearly consists of minimal turns being exchanged among the three participants of this particular conversation. It is necessary to focus on the turn-by-turn development

of the topic in order to have a clearer picture of how the repairable *şey* when left unrepaired can sometimes run the risk of not being understood.

In the first turn, speaker M tries to establish the identity of a member of the family (line 1). The name he ultimately selects is not correct, which is established by speaker E in the following turn (line 2). This confirmation is subsequently followed by the correct name proposed by speaker G in turn three (line 3). Speaker M, who subsequently self-selects, eventually realises who the other two speakers are talking about and establishes the actual identity of the person '*torunu*' (line 4). Speaker E, the next speaker, initiates his turn by a repairable '*şeyin*', attached to a case suffix of genitive (line 5). With the information presented in this TCU in turn five, speaker E further confirms the identity of the person in question. In turn six, speaker G initiates topic expansion by starting to comment on this person by saying '*o da tam şey ha böyle*' (line 6). As is clearly seen, the particle *şey* is attached to an interjection and is not followed by any replacement within the boundaries of that turn. What subsequently follows is turn-transition through self-selection whereby a shift of focus is introduced by speaker M's interrogative TCU in turn seven (line 7). Starting from turn seven onwards, speakers M and G exchange several turns talking about the 'island' this family has bought for themselves (lines 7 and 11). This exchange continues until turn twelve in which speaker E clearly asks speaker G to explain what he meant by the unreplaced repairable '*şey*' (line 12). After this issue of comprehension, speaker G tries to explain it.

The point of this example is that the meaning of the particle suffixed-*şey* as a repairable, when left unreplaced, is not taken for granted in its semantic comprehension in the sense that the participants make sure that they understand it. As the example above has demonstrated, until the meaning is made clear, recipients do not easily ignore it. This particular example also confirms that the recipients keep a good track of the conversation and not risk any chance of incomprehension or misunderstanding.

217

For the sake of objectivity, it has to be said that when the participants do not pursue the exact meaning of unrepaired *şey,* it does not necessarily mean that they always understand it. Likewise, when the speaker does not repair the repairable *şey,* it might simply be that it is not that important in the sense that it does not have any consequences for the action or activity being engaged in at all.

At this point, it might be rewarding to attempt to elaborate on the possible reason(s), apart from the shared knowledge, for what it is that enables one to deduce what *şey* is replacing and why sometimes it is not deducible. One thing seems to be clear that the immediate syntactic context does provide some evidence. What makes the evidence available is the presence of the suffixes attached to *şey.* A comparison between the deviant case above (example 19) and one of the cases of unreplaced *şey* (example 17) will be helpful for the clarification of the case at hand. *Şey* in speaker I's turn occurs in the TCU '*sohbet dediğinde aynı şeyi vermiyo*' whereas it occurs in speaker M's TCU '*o da tam şey ha böyle*'. Basically, the accusative case suffix helps to determine the word class of the lexical item that the repairable *şeyi* is substituting. Although a lexical item is not used, it is deducible by means of the suffix attached to *şey.* On the other hand, *şey* occurs as a repairable in example (23) in which it substitutes a potential adjective that is descriptive of the person in question. However, this missing potential adjective does not have any suffixes. The absence of a suffix makes it relatively difficult to determine the word class and eventually hard to deduce. It would not be untrue to say that unsuffixed *şey* in example (23) played a role in speaker E's pursuit to find out the descriptive assessment, which was not easily deducible.

In sum, as the examples and their analyses make clear, the particle *şey* attached to various suffixes could be considered within the framework of conversation analysis as fulfilling a function within repair organisation in the Conversational Structure Domain. The main role played by the particle *şey* within this organisation is to mark the initiation of repair to be completed by the same speaker within the boundaries of the same turn. This is the much-preferred repair type of 'self-initiated self-repair' (Schegloff et al., 1974 and Schegloff, 1979). The data also clearly reveal that in

some occurrences of the same particle where it similarly signals the initiation of the repair, the repair itself, however, does not materialise. That is, the speaker carries out his/her propositional production without replacing the repairable item. In most cases, the meaning of this repairable unexpressed word, substituted structurally as well as semantically by *şey*, is successfully inferred from the immediate context thanks to the suffixes attached and is sometimes actually shown (examples 20 and 21) by the recipients in their following turns. The examples together with the brief explanation above illustrated that the sort of environments where there was a lack of suffixes, it proved to be harder to construe the meaning of the missing lexical item by the participants. We have finally seen that should any of the participants fail to grasp the unexpressed meaning represented by *şey*, the attempts to find it carry on until it is eventually secured. What we have below is the analysis of the single function of *şey* within the Interpersonal Domain.

6.3 Interpersonal Domain
6.3.1 Suffixed-*Şey* marking Politeness
6.3.2 Introduction

Of the two possible occurrences of *şey*, we have seen throughout the analysis so far that the particle *şey* with suffixes has an important role to play within one of the central organisations of Turkish conversation with its capacity to mark its user's repair attempts of various problematic language production attempts. Even though the occurrence of *şey* with suffixes does not, on the surface, seem to act like other particles like *yani* and *işte*, the interactionally relevant function of repair performed to repair certain performance faults seems to justify our attempt here to regard this particular use of *şey* as an expression functioning as a DisP.

In this part of the analysis there will be the illustration of another task performed by the suffixed-*şey* as a proper functional DisP. This occurrence of suffixed-*şey* accomplishes an interactional goal beyond basic repair organisation, while there is still repair involved in this task. The achievement of this interactional task is closely associated with the phonemenon of Politeness (Brown and Levinson, 1987) and mainly takes place in the conversational environments in which the current speaker

219

experiences an interactional difficulty of having to speak with discretion and caution because of the delicateness of the situation.   Brown and Levinson (ibid.), who mainly deal with politeness in terms of 'face-preservation/saving', refer to Positive and Negative Politeness.   Positive politeness is associated with the positive self-image the hearer claims for himself/herself. "It anoints the face of the addressee by indicating that in some respects the speaker wants the hearer wants" (Brown & Levinson 1987:70). Negative politeness is oriented to 'the want of every "competent adult member" that his actions be unimpeded by other' (Brown & Levinson 1987:62). Negative politeness centres on the hearer's want not to be interfered with. (see Brown & Levinson, 1987 for more on Politeness). While protecting the face of others, there is also the issue of protecting our own face.

The interactional difficulties concerned include situations such as complaining, blaming, teasing etc.   The occurrence of suffixed-*şey* is mainly observed in these particular conversational environments by the speakers in conversational Turkish as part of a strategy to mark off a potentially delicate situation. The delicateness of the situation of course is not to do with behaviour of the speaker, who is engaged in it, but, as Bergmann (1992: 154) observes, "...the delicate and notorious character of an event is constituted by the very act of talking about it cautiously and discreetly".

By the same token, it is through the use of a suffixed-*şey* as a repairable, which is not followed by a candidate repaired segment that the interactional difficulty is displayed as the speaker avoids the naming of the descriptive assessment/assertion of the person in question. It can be suggested here that what the speaker conveys by the use of *şey* is that he does not know how to say what he is thinking of. A probable reason for this use in such cases (e.g. example 24) is that expressing his thoughts explicitly may run the risk of creating an uncomfortable situation for both of them. Thus, the suffixed-*şey* basically enables its producer to avoid the direct use of the actual word in order to mitigate the intended meaning of the resulting negative assessment/assertion of 'self' or 'other'. The vagueness represented by *şey* may be used as a safeguard against being later shown to be wrong.   In addition, the avoidance of a negative assessment/assertion may elude the speaker from being

accountable for it later. The use of unreplaced suffixed-*şey* could also be seen as a mitigator, which is described by Bergmann (1992:151) as "Descriptive elements, which generally weakens a claim or diminish the directness or roughness of an assertion".

Similarly, what the suffixed-*şey* does, while displaying the interactional difficulty being experienced by its producer, is to enable him/her to mitigate the effect of this interactionally difficult situation by being hesitant, indirect and cautious. Example (24) below is an illustration of the case in question.

The main point of the present sequence is basically speaker I's complaint that he is not being fairly treated by his long time friend in Essex after their departure to İstanbul. His complaint mainly centres on the issue that they have lost contact with each other despite his unilateral personal efforts.

Example-24

```
 1 E: EVET? (2) bakalım = Cenk Cenkle görüşüyomusun ya? = biz sana
 2    onu sorucaktik
 3 D: mhm
 4 I: ya adamla aramızda varya on dakka münübüsle on dakka mesafe
 5    var
 6 E: = mhm
 7 I: = galiba bir kaç kere şey bir kere gittim evine= bir kaç
 8    kere değil  ondan sonra devamlı telefon ettim  o hiç telefon
→9    etmedi hani bu adam bizle herhalde şeyi var yani = ordayken
 10   böylemi arkadaşlık yaptı? = bende başka yorumlar tabi uyandı
 11 E: = mhm
      (1)
→12 I: sonra gelirken dedim ya yine şeylik bizde kalsin = arada
 13    birde telefon edeyim
 14 E: = aradınmı
 15 I: (1) telefon ettim = bu sefer Ankarada çalışıyormuş herhalde
.................................................................
 1 E: YES? (2)  let's see  Cenk do you see Cenk at all? = we have
 2    always wanted to ask you about him
 3 D: mhm
 4 I: the distance between him and me is just ten minutes
```

221

```
 5 E: = mhm
 6 I: = I think I went to his house couple of times şey just once =
 8    not couple of times   and then I rang him very frequently   he
→9   never rang me back I started thinking   he must have şey against
 10   me yani = was he this sort of friend over there? = of course I
 12   started to have other kind of interpretations
 13 E: = mhm
        (1)
→14 I: then before I came here I thought I should be şey enough = I
 15    decided to contact him now and then
 16 E: = did you contact him then
 17 I: (1) I gave him a ring = this time it turned out that he went
 18    to Ankara for business
```

Speaker I initially starts to describe how close they live to each other by giving the duration of a public transport journey between their residences '*minübüsle on dakka mesafe var*' (lines 4 and 5). Subsequent to the continuation token by speaker E, speaker I proceeds to describe how he was let down. In his description (lines 7 through 10), he initially mentions 'his personal visit to Cenk's house' and then 'the continuous phone calls he made', which were never returned, as he relates. Subsequent to this information, speaker I produces the TCU '*hani bu adam bizle herhalde şeyi var yani*' (line 9). In this TCU where we see a TCU-final *yani*, which marks the speaker's emotional involvement in what he says. What is considered to be a repairable, suffixed-*şey* in this TCU takes the place of a word, for which a candidate repairable is not offered afterwards. In other words, the speaker holds himself off from using a contextually delicate word such as 'grudge' or 'antipathy', which would be heard as a 'self-deprecation'. So, speaker I' use of the suffixed-şey at this point is significant since this is where it both structurally and semantically replaces this critical 'descriptive' word in his story thus acting as a mitigator or 'downtoner' modifying the illocutionary force of his utterance. What the suffixed-*şey* undertakes here, beyond the more visibly local and structural role of being a 'self-initiated self-repair indicator', is the interactional task of marking off the delicateness of the situation. Speaker I obviously is not happy about the treatment he receives from what he considers to be a good friend and raises complaints about this

treatment, which is a 'face' issue for him in terms of protecting his own face. Speaker I tries to avoid placing a clear blame on his friend through the hesitation effect of self-repair. The situation speaker I is in at that time of speaking is a delicate one. So what he is doing in this situation is not just having difficulty, but also showing that he is having difficulty and in line with Bergmann's observation above, it is this display that constitutes the situation as delicate. In the rest of the turn, speaker I explains that this sort of treatment made him pessimistic about its possible reasons.

Subsequent to another continuation token from speaker E and one-second pause, speaker I proceeds to talk again. The first TCU in this new turn also contains an unreplaced repairable suffixed-*şey*, which actually goes on to mark off the same delicate situation on a different level where speaker I tries to mitigate the resulting effect of 'his mercifulness' by deciding to give Cenk another ring before coming to England for his congregation. In the TCU '*sonra gelirken dedim ya yine **şeylik** bizde kalsın*' (line 12), the repairable '*şeylik*' is left unreplaced through which speaker I once again tries to avoid sounding like 'discontent'. Similar to the case above, speaker I uses the suffixed-*şey* to mark the difficulty he is having to protect his own face as well as displaying that he is having it. Below is another case where the delicateness of the situation is once again marked by suffixed-*şey*.

The point of the discussion here is the disappointment experienced by one of their mutual friends about her studies, which a face-threatening act for the speaker's own face. The disappointment and the ensuing self-face threatening act felt on the part of their friend is not an easy thing to talk about for the participants since they know that their friend had very hard time in coping with it afterwards.

Example-25

```
 1 D: yapmak istiyo (2) o kadar çalışmam var = iyide diyo  datası
 2    hakkaten iyiymiş?
→3 B: tabi o kadar emek insan boşuna şey gibi oluyo yani
 4 D: öyle = büyükte bi çalışma yaptı etti
.................................................................
 1 D: she wants to try and do it again (2) I have done a lot = and
```

```
  2    it's good says she  they say that her data was really good
→3 B: of course after all those efforts you just feel like şey yani
  4 D: that's right = what she did was not of a small thing
```

In example (25), in her turn above (line 1), what speaker D is doing is to give credit to their friend's work and efforts by talking highly of it. With the completion of her turn, turn transition takes place by the self-selection of speaker B. Speaker B initiates his turn with a positive assessment marker '*tabi*' confirming that he agrees with what has just been said in the prior turn (line 3). Subsequently in the same turn, there follows speaker B's own assessment in which he tries to describe how it must have felt like to see one's efforts wasted. In this assessment, the particle *şey* as a repairable occurs halfway through the ongoing TCU replacing its adjective with which the description of the emotions would be made. However, what appears to be repairable is not repaired in the next move of the same speaker. What speaker B is doing here is to avoid describing a 'difficult situation' 'painfully' experienced by their friend. The discretion and caution is created and displayed by the occurrence of *şey* where it fills in an unreplaced 'descriptive' lexical item and enables the speaker to mitigate the resulting effect by avoiding a direct mention of this 'delicate' situation. In addition, the use of *şey* by its producer also serves to display that the speaker himself is experiencing this 'difficult situation'. Here is another example where the delicateness of the situation is marked off by *şey*.

In this particular case here, the embarrassment on the part of speaker I of not being able to keep up with the rest of the people, especially girls, in an aerobics class is the focal point of the discussion. Speaker I describes how embarrassed he was when he attended one of the aerobics classes whose majority is consists of female attendants. He basically claims he could not keep up with the pace of the class like the rest of the female attendants and was not as precise as them in doing the routine figures.

Example-26

```
  1 E: bi saat koşmaya razıyım
→2 I: hadi diyorum erkekliğe şeyetmiyeyim  erkekliğe şey
  3  dokundurmıyalım diyorum = baktım kızlar canavar gibi (gülüyor)
  4  ben yarı yolda kaldım
```

```
. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .
  1 E: I'd prefer an hour of jogging
→2 I: I said to myself I should not şey my manliness  I shouldn't
→3     let my manliness şey = when I looked at the girls around they
  4     were all great (laughs)  I just couldn't keep up with them
```

In the first TCU of his turn above (line 2), speaker I produces a repairable *şey* in predicate position whereby this predicate is intended to describe his action. However, the repairable '*şeyetmiyelim*' (line 2) is left unreplaced as part of the attempt to avoid further embarrassment by being direct and specific about his action. The mention of '*erkeklik*' as the object of the TCU already attracts enough attention on speaker I and in his next move he avoids what would have clearly described his embarrassment. This difficult situation is once again displayed by the particle *şey* where it, acting as an unreplaced repairable, marks off the difficulty experienced by its producer.

The following TCU in the same turn contains another *şey* as a repairable, once again left unrepaired. The repairable '*şey*' in this TCU should be taken into account together with the verb '*dokundurmak*' and the previous TCU's object but current TCU's subject '*erkeklik*' since this TCU constitutes an expression frequently used for these kinds of situations with the exception of the missing object replaced by *şey*. The point of this unreplaced repairable particle is to mitigate the effect of this relatively embarrassing situation through the avoidance of one of the key lexical elements in the TCU. The mitigation is marked by the production of the particle *şey*, which additionally displays that the situation is delicate for its user.

Despite the apparent involvement of repair in this variety of environments, the occurrence of suffixed-*şey* goes beyond the organisation of repair. What is additionally involved is the accomplishment of an interactional task whereby an interactional difficulty being experienced by the current speaker is displayed. The avoidance of a self-descriptive lexical element through the replacement of repairable suffixed-*şey* mainly enables its producer to mitigate the meaning of the resulting negative assessment of 'self' and/or 'other'.

The table (6.12) below illustrates the all the functions of *şey* within all the relevant Conversational Domains where it is functionally operative. The numbers in square brackets next to each function show which example illustrates which function for the purpose of quick reference.

Table 6.12: Functions of *Şey* Found in the Relevant Domains of Conversation.

ŞEY	Freestanding-*Şey*	Suffixed-*Şey*
Conversational Structure Domain	*Repair Initiator (Self-Initiated Self-Repair) [2] *Preface for Other-Initiated Self-Repair [3] *Verbal planning [6] *Floor-Holding/Turn Initiation [4]	*Vagueness [8] *Replacing Nouns [14] *Replacing Verbs [18] *No Immediate Replacement [21]
Interpersonal Domain	*Politeness [24]	

6.4 Conclusion

With a DisP like *şey* the speaker shows his mental process of producing utterances and his intention to continue the turn in spite of brief pauses. The DisP *şey* shows that the speaker is temporarily working on producing utterances in the memory, reflecting the speaker's thoughts while he is speaking. The speaker's use of *şey* here indicates his/her mental effort of extracting the linguistic information from the memory, assuming that the information has already been in the speaker's knowledge. This use of the particle is what would be described by Brown (1977) as a 'verbal filler' and Edmondson (1981) as a 'fumble' in that it allows the speaker time to find the desired expression. This usage is often stigmatised as indicating incoherent speech (Watts, 1989). However, one function is to provide a form of rhythmic pattern in fluent narrative, or act as a kind of oral punctuation marker, what Jefferson (1973) in Macaulay (2002) has called 'an utterance lengthener'. Far from indicating hesitancy, it can be used quite effectively by fluent speakers. Semantically *şey* could be regarded as an empty lexical item that results from habit or the pressures of on-line discourse planning. For instance, in the cases of suffixed-*şey*, the construction *şey* forms part of the syntax of the clause and could not be omitted. The particle becomes part of the clause, as it is not (prosodically) marked as a separate unit.

In this section, it has been illustrated that there are two different occurrences of *şey*. The first one has various forms of suffixes attached whereas the second one stands freely in certain structural slots. The suffixed-*şey* performs its main function within the Conversational Structure Domain in the form of repair organisation through which it marks the initiation of word search, which is carried out within the boundaries of the same turn. Serving as a repairable, which temporarily acts as the lexical item being searched, suffixed-*şey* in most cases is subsequently replaced by the appropriate item. We have also shown that despite the occurrence of the repairable, repair does not take place at all in some cases and it is left up to the recipients to infer its meaning from the shared knowledge and the immediate context. In addition to its major role in repair organisation, an interactional function of suffixed-*şey*, related to Interpersonal Domain, has been observed in certain conversational environments where it, while still marking its producer's word searches, simultaneously displays caution and discretion and marks politeness on the part of the speaker when assessing/asserting something about the self (or possibly about the other too).

The free-standing *şey* also mainly operates within the Conversational Structure Domain and marks speaker's verbal planning whereby s/he is able to organise/plan what to say next. Throughout verbal planning, free-standing *şey* has shown simultaneously to enable its user to claim the floor as well as to hold it. Free-Standing *şey* is also involved in marking repair. In addition to indexing the initiation of self-repair, free-standing *şey* also serves to confirm other-initiated self-repair.

It is commonly accepted that language is an interactional achievement in that mutual understanding is accomplished and displayed in talk. As He and Lindsey (1998) suggest speakers and hearers draw upon particles as a salient resource in the construction and interpretation of utterances (discourse). As the data analyses have illustrated, the particle *şey*, especially when it is not immediately replaced, the mutual understanding could be harder to achieve. How is it that participants are able to achieve mutual understanding in such a case when one of the linguistic items is missing? In addition, from Grice's Conversational Maxims point of view, the two types of *şey* lead to violations of the maxim of Quantity since they do not give

enough explicit information. As Schegloff argues (1992), the organisation of repair is closely bound up with the question of intersubjectivity in social life. To this end, by focusing on the sequential organisation of talk, we have analysed both types of *şey* in as many conversational contexts as possible and try to explain its systematic use by the Turkish native speakers in trying to achieve 'intersubjectivity' in their everyday conversational encounters. To figure out what the vague expressions refer to on a given occasion, interlocutors must rely heavily on knowledge, which is assumed as being shared. In this sense, the Turkish expression *şey* illustrates the property of linguistic practice as 'joint action' (Clark, 1996).

As we have seen, it is not the case that the expression *şey* is 'vacuous'. When a speaker uses *şey*, s/he speaker provides no descriptive information about the thing s/he is referring to, but nonetheless he is likely to succeed in communicating what he means. The interpretation of such expressions explicitly depends on the participants' common ground. As a result, in this use of *şey*, identification of a referent is successfully achieved in the absence of any discourse antecedent or contextually present object. The examples discussed in this study have illustrated that the particle *şey*, explicitly oriented to the interactional nature of the speech context, significantly contributes to intersubjectivity by drawing attention to the speaker's assumption that the listener can figure out what the speaker is referring to as a common ground.

At this point, it seems appropriate comment on and point out some of the possible reasons for the occurrence of a particle like *şey*, which has to do with the intrinsic syntactic practices of the Turkish language. We have seen so far that the first type of *şey*, termed as suffixed-*şey*, has to do with the marking off the general repair function of delaying the production of a next item due.

A comparison is necessary at this point in order to clarify the point of departure for the possible reason of occurrence for *şey*. The practice of delaying the next item due is also a 'common repair procedure for English as well as other languages' (see Schegloff, 1979 and Fox, Hayashi and Jasperson, 1996). According to Fox et al. (ibid.), recycling constitutes a procedure for delaying the production of a next item

due. The main source of items used in recycling in English is prepositions and articles, which always precede lexical items in a TCU. However, not only do articles, one of the main recycling sources in English, not exist, but also postpositions such as case particles follow lexical items in Turkish. So, while English speakers use prepositions and articles as materials to be recycled before lexical items, Turkish speakers do not have such non-lexical (prepositions, articles etc.) material to recycle available to them. In this connection, it is possible to conclude that because of the syntactic organisation of the two languages, English speakers can make use of preposition and article recycling as part of a delay strategy, while Turkish speakers cannot. As our data analyses have shown so far, Turkish makes available to its speakers a particle like *şey* in order to manage the practice of delaying for a word search as part of repair procedure as well as displaying it. In such cases, repair procedure involves the following elements of the particle *şey* attached to suffixes, followed by the candidate delayed lexical item. The particle suffixed-*şey* serves as a turn holder while the speaker searches for some lexically specific item. This is a useful strategy for speakers of a language with its own inherent syntactic practices and these syntactic practices provide both the reason and the justification why a particle like *şey* occurs in Turkish. To conclude, *şey* is one of those elements, which is indispensable in conversational Turkish. As Yılmaz (1994) observes, also supported by Özbek (1995), it is not possible or practical to think of a conversation in Turkish without *şey*.

CHAPTER 7

CONCLUSION

This chapter summarises the results of the analysis of discourse particles *yani*, *işte* and *şey* occurring in conversational Turkish and discusses implications for future studies.

7.1 Summary of Findings

Conversation is an 'interactional achievement', which involves a collaboration of all the participants present (Schegloff, 1982). As we have seen throughout, a DisP is a word or phrase that functions primarily as a structuring unit of spoken language. Referred to as pesky little elements, frequently appearing at the beginning or end of a structuring unit, DisPs are notoriously difficult to define and tend not to have any specifiable semantic meaning. DisPs are one aspect of language that is sensitive to both linguistic context and cultural settings. As they are pervasive in natural conversations and they clearly have pragmatic meaning, that is, they, as signpost elements, influence the way in which we interpret the utterance in which they occur. To the listener, a DisP signals the speaker's intention to mark a boundary in discourse, such as a change in the speaker, the beginning of a new topic or the expression of a response. DisPs allow speakers to express their thoughts and feelings without saying as much in so many different words (cf. *yani* as a Response Particle in 4.4.4). While utterances can occur without DisPs, the speaker's intention may change slightly depending on whether or not the DisPs are used. Although the speaker may not intend to change the meaning of the utterance with DisPs, it is indicative of functions of his or her interactive goals.

Interactive discourse is structured. DisPs reveal this structure and reflect the coherence of the interaction. For instance, interactional particles play an important role in linking and demarcating utterances (Matsumoto, 2003). DisPs seem to be essential to the cohesive structure of language in general. For instance, smooth negotiation of turns is cohesive in conversations. Not every conversational turn is initiated by DisPs, but these expressions are frequent. DisPs with interactive function occur at the beginning of turns or bids for turns where they connect the new turn to the previous talk. The ends of conversational turns are also frequently marked by particles. Turn-final particles are also cohesive in two ways: They relate the turn being completed to the previous talk by indicating that it is finished. They also link the turn being finished to the subsequent talk by indicating that the next turn may begin.

Östman (1995) sees communication as taking place simultaneously on two levels: the explicit propositional level, and the implicit level, where our attitudes and opinions are anchored to the context at large. Therefore, in interactional discourse we not only express propositions, but we also express different attitudes to them. The pragmatic particles, Östman (ibid.) continues, are the 'window' in the explicit surface level, 'through which one can see… what is being communicated on the attitudinal level "beneath"'. In other words, these 'window' particles in their affective and cultural-coherence functions signal, among other things, the attitudes and the involvement of the speaker.

The main aim of this study has been to help to broaden the perspective of Turkish linguistics with its attempt to concentrate on conversational discourse and carry out an in-depth analysis of one of its "frequently used", but "frequently unnoticed" intrinsic elements, discourse particles. A certain degree of eclecticism combining discourse, conversation analytic and functional perspectives has been adopted in order to carry out the present analysis of the particles *yani*, *işte* and *şey*.

Firstly, the predominant medium of interaction readily available in the social world, 'ordinary conversation' has been used. The focus of attention within naturally

231

occurring activities has been to discover and analyse the orderliness in the use of three particles in particular with the aim of finding the machinery, the rules and structures that produce and constitute this orderliness. More specifically, it has been the aim of this study to try to discover and describe the organisation and its systematic properties behind the use of these particles together with the specific roles and functions they each have within the specific environment of conversational Turkish. Throughout the analysis, we have seen the role of syntactic and social context in trying to discover and explain the production and interpretation of the particles.

Based on the inspection of a small body of data, we have shown that the above instances of the three particles can be more adequately explained by a method of analysis, which goes beyond syntactic evidence and utilizes the surrounding discourse as a primary source of information. My theoretical framework draws from the theory and methodology of conversation, discourse analysis and functional approach in an attempt to overcome the inherent weaknesses of each approach.

The three particles *yani*, *işte* and *şey* have been subject to rigorous analysis, each of which has constituted a separate chapter. In each chapter, an in-depth empirical analysis of each particle with illustrative data fragments has been carried out.

In each chapter, the different functions of DisPs in their emerging contexts in a corpus of Turkish conversational discourse have been accounted for as they are indexed to attitudes, to participants, and to the text. The core functions of the three DisPs have been defined in terms of what they achieve on the Content (information), Conversational Structure and Interpersonal levels.

The data analysis has demonstrated that of the three particles, *yani* has proved to be the most frequently used one (see Table: 3.3). Each different context (local as well as global) has provided the conditions for the occurrence of various functions for each particle. In this connection, it has been revealed that the basic conversational domains such as Content, Conversational Structure and Interpersonal were

232

responsible for providing the domains for the different functions that the three particles in question have been shown to perform.

In chapter 4, which concentrates on the use of *yani*, we have seen it as being operative in all the three domains. The findings concerning *yani* for these domains were as follows:

<u>Conversational Structure Domain</u>: is the first domain where its functions are mainly to do with the structural aspects of conversation such as 'turn initiation', 'prefacing response to a question', 'turn completion', 'floor holding' and 'repair organisation'. The turn initiation is closely related to the transition of turns whereby *yani* (as a turn entry device) mainly signals transfer of speaking turns mostly through 'self-selection'. It goes without saying that *yani* is always turn-initial in this function. Similarly, the particle *yani* prefaces a speaker's response to a question asked by one of the participants to the conversation. The 'turn-completion' function, similarly, has to do with the transition of turns and the role of *yani* here is to signal the upcoming completion of its user's turn to which it is attached as the last linguistic element (TCU/turn-final). Closely related to the use of *yani* in topic expansion is the use within turn-taking when it marks the holding of the floor when its producer is not ready to yield the floor and has more to say. Repair organisation in the Conversational Structure Domain also plays a role in the description of one of the basic functions of *yani*. The involvement of the particle in 'self-editing' (self-initiated self-repair) constitutes the function whereby the speakers tend to use it to mark the clarification of a point in his/her prior talk. It should be noted here that the superficial difference between the similar functions of topic expansion and self-editing is the expansion of a general idea/concept into specific in topic expansion and the detailing of prior specific point in self-editing.

<u>Frame Function of Content Domain</u>: The functions of *yani* within the Frame Function of Content Domain mainly are 'topic expansion' and 'summary assessment'. When *yani* is used TCU-initially, it marks the speaker's upcoming modification of the meaning of his/her own prior talk. The modifications marked by *yani* include both expansions of ideas and explanations of intentions. *Yani* can

preface expansions initiated by other interlocutors in the conversation as well as his/her own ideas. The relatively more common function of topic expansion is mainly realised by giving an example, shifting and re-introducing a topic and *yani* has been shown to perform it in two different ways. At the 'local level' where *yani* is always TCU-initial, expansion is realised within a single turn by its current producer. Expansion at the 'conversational level', on the other hand, is carried out at different turns by different speakers as well as the same speaker. The placement of *yani* at conversational level can be turn-initial (i.e. cases where next speaker picks it up where the previous one has left off) as well as TCU-initial. What is common to all of these uses is that *yani* is marking explanation or reformulation with what preceded. Therefore, y*ani* maintains speaker and hearer focus on prior material. It instructs the hearer to continue attending to the material of prior text in order to hear how it will be modified. The second function within the Frame Function is summary assessments of the information presented as part of the progressing topic. *Yani* in this function is again TCU-initial, where the TCU is mostly the last one in the turn or the last turn in the sequence.

Interpersonal Function: In its Interpersonal Function, the occurrence of y*ani* in TCU-final position is not a connective particle, but rather a situating particle with a strongly interactional nature. It can be said to be involved in the management of the interaction and thus have a function on the interactional level of discourse. By means of *yani*, the speaker indicates his personal commitment with regard to one or more aspects of the communicative act he is performing thus enhancing the trustworthiness or credibility of the utterance. More specifically, y*ani* in TCU-final position marks the speaker's attachment to an idea and also marks an orientation through which a speaker commits him/herself to the proposition s/he has just expressed. From a thorough investigation of TCU-final *yani* in Turkish, it appears that *yani* functions primarily as an appeal to the involvement and cooperation of the addressee in the speech event. By using *yani*, the speaker confirms or suggests that there is a certain consensus between himself and his addressee. The speaker uses it to get the addressee to cooperate and/or to accept the propositional content of his utterance. In other words, the speaker uses the particle to mark the proposition as a

personal opinion. The speaker regards the addressee as being on the same 'wavelength'. The speaker is presenting a proposition that represents their opinion or belief about some issue. The stance the speaker takes towards his/her turn constructional unit becomes clearer in environments where it produces an effect. These effects are an emotional effect reflecting speaker's sincerity, his/her own emphasis on the TCU s/he produces and using the particle on its own marking his/her (partial or total) agreement with the previous speaker's point of view.

Chapter 5 has focused on the third most frequent particle in conversational Turkish, *işte*. Similar to *yani* and *şey*, *işte* has been found to perform various functions within the relevant conversational domains. The findings concerning *işte* for these domains were as follows:

Conversational Structure Domain: Some of the functions *işte* is associated with performing are clearly described by a reference to the Conversational Structure Domain. Turn-initial or early in a turn uses of *işte* have narrative functions. The occurrence of *işte* within a specific turn-initial TCU-construction has been observable to be functioning to claim for a multi-size turn unit. This use of *işte* within this turn-initial TCU has proved to be useful for conversationalists when they bid for extended turn space for the telling of their personal accounts/stories in a competitive in turn exchange environment. The occurrence of *işte* in turn-initial positions has also been shown to serve the purposes of turn transition whereby the initiation of a new turn by a new speaker through self-selection is achieved. The turns initiated by *işte* are generally the ones containing topical information rather than topic changes.

While, in narratives, *işte* can introduce the initial expository section to set the action in motion, it has also been shown to mark transitions to succeeding sections including the closure of the narrative. The placement of *işte* in the turn-final position by the help of another deictic expression *böyle*, thus *işte böyle*, has been used for the transition of turns again, this time to project the upcoming TRP. The effect of *işte böyle* in this sort of environment has turned out to be to signal that its producer has

no more to say and is about to relinquish the turn and a possible completion of the current topic.

<u>Frame Function of Content Domain</u>: The use of *işte* in the environments where it functions to display 'exemplification/detail' has been closely related to the information aspect of Turkish conversation in the Frame Function of Content Domain. The function in question has been relevant in environments where the speaker, during the topical development of his/her talk, indexes the exemplification/detail of the preceding informational piece. The contribution of *işte* informationally in the Frame Function is not limited to exemplification only. The turn-medial occurrence of the particle has often been used to highlight a particular piece of information in order to foreground it from the surrounding talk.

The next function of *işte* has appeared to be closely related to 'exemplification'. The turn-medial occurrence of *işte* in such environments marks the boundaries and therefore distinguishes the talk of the current speaker from that of the person currently being reported within the marked boundary. The instance of *işte* preceding the reported speech is a signal that the current speaker is not the provider of the information but that the upcoming is a quotation.

As the final function of *işte* within Frame Function of Content Domain, we have seen that besides indexing longer turns at talk for personal accounts and ending of oral narratives, *işte* regularly serves to re-establish its user's main story line or theme following digressions and interruptions. Here we see that *işte* can also point back to utterances that are non-adjacent within the discourse through tie-back function in order to provide a coherent semantic interpretation. That is, a speaker's utterance-initial *işte* connects back to his/her own or another speaker's distantly previous utterance (as far as even few hours between the two pieces of discourse). Similar to the turn/floor claimer function, *işte* is found in the turn-initial position.

<u>Qualifying Function of the Content Domain</u>: The occurrence of *işte* in turn-initial position has been found to serve a particular function in the organisation of

236

preference within this domain. The role of *işte* in such environments has turned out to preface dispreferred responses as 'answer-preface' to questions.

The difference between turn-initial occurrences of *yani* and *işte* has to be noted here in that whether the particle is a signal that s/he is disengaging from the informational projection of the immediately prior turn or signal that instructs the hearer to continue attending to the material of immediately prior text in order to hear how it will be modified. While a turn-initial *yani* displays the connection between the current and previous speaker acting like a 'connective and continuative', the turn-initial use of *işte*, on the other hand, while claiming the turn and floor again, is used as a disjunction marker. It alerts recipients such that what follows might not be related to what preceded, but something disjunctive with what preceded.

The final analysis chapter has focused on another frequent particle in conversational Turkish. In chapter 6, attention has been turned this time to the role of *şey* to gain an insight on its use. We have discovered and illustrated that two different occurrences of *şey* are available for speakers of Turkish. The first one is called 'free-standing *şey,* as it stands freely in the structural slots it occurs whereas the second one is 'suffixed-*şey*' since it is capable of being attached to various suffixes. Using a DisP like *şey* the speaker shows his mental effort of producing utterances and his intention to continue the turn in spite of brief pauses. The occurrence of *şey* mainly shows that the speaker is temporarily working on producing utterances in the memory, reflecting the speaker's thoughts while s/he is speaking. The speaker's use of *şey* here indicates his/her mental effort of extracting the linguistic information from the memory, assuming that the information has already been in the speaker's knowledge. The findings concerning *şey* for the domains it was operative in were as follows:

Conversational Structure Domain: The free-standing *şey* mainly operates within the Conversational Structure Domain and marks speaker's verbal planning whereby s/he is able to organise/plan what to say next. Throughout verbal planning, free-standing *şey* has shown simultaneously to enable its user to claim the floor as well as to hold it, when the speaker has more to contribute to the topic at hand. Free-standing *şey*

also has a role to play in which it is involved in marking a certain type of repair. While indexing the initiation of self-repair through which, after a cut-off, the actual lexical item is used, free-standing *şey* has also proved to contribute to 'other-initiated self-repair' by serving to confirm it.

The suffixed-*şey* performs its main function within the Conversational Structure Domain in the form of repair organisation through which it marks the initiation of word search, which is carried out within the boundaries of the same turn. Therefore, it is relevant to term it 'self-initiated self-repair'. Serving as a repairable, which temporarily acts as the lexical item being searched, suffixed-*şey* in most cases is subsequently replaced by the appropriate item. We have also shown that despite the occurrence of the repairable, repair does not take place at all in some cases and it is left up to the recipients to infer its meaning from the shared knowledge and the immediate context.

Interpersonal Domain: In addition to its major role in repair organisation, an interactional function of suffixed-*şey*, related to the Interpersonal Domain, has been observed in certain conversational environments where it, while still marking its producer's word searches, simultaneously displays caution and discretion and marks politeness on the part of the speaker when assessing/asserting something about the self or other. To conclude, *şey* is one of those elements, which is indispensable in conversational Turkish. As Yılmaz (1994) observes, it is not possible or practical to think of a conversation in Turkish without *şey*.

It has been quite clear by the data analyses and the results of this study, as well as by the other studies reported in the review chapter, that the role and function of discourse particles cannot be confined to one single domain of conversation (Ruhi, 1994; Östman, 1981 and 1995; İşsever, 1995; Schourup, 1999). Not only do most of the particles operate on various domains of conversation but also they operate simultaneously (Östman, ibid.; Schiffrin, 1987). It has been revealed that all the three particles in question have multiple roles and functions, which they perform at the various aspects of conversational Turkish. For example, within the basic three domains of conversation we find what Levinson (1983) refers to as the main aspects

of conversation 'turn-taking', 'repair', 'topic', 'preference' and these are also the main context providers for the occurrences of various functions of discourse particles.

The placement of particles within turn constructional units as well as with the turns themselves are clearly significant in assigning roles and functions to them. For example, almost all the turn-initial and turn-final occurrences of all the particles have a role to play in the transition of turns marking their initiation as well as termination. Similarly, TCU-initial and TCU-final occurrences of all the particles can also be explained easily by referring to the certain type of informational as well as structural connections that they display (i.e. expansion, explanation, informational continuation etc.). The three particles also display the interactional strategies of their producers when they mark discretion (suffixed-*şey*), highlighting (*işte*), floor-holding (*yani* and *işte*) etc. With all the functions they have and specific roles they perform, the three particles have proved to have discourse organising and interactional functions, thus contributing to overall achievement of interaction.

If we accept the generally accepted the criteria for the common features of particles (see Sections 1.1 and 2.2.2), it can be said that the analysis carried out on the three particles analysed in this study have proved that criteria to be right (and it can be claimed to have potential for its universal application to the study of particles in other languages). For example, all of the three (except the suffixed-*şey*) are syntactically and semantically detachable from the constructional unit they appear in. They occur at various places within a TCU (initial, medial and final positions). It should be noted here that we do not quite see eye to eye with Schiffrin on this criterion since she only recognises the utterance-initial occurrence. However, languages illustrate a certain parametric variation. In this connection, with the Turkish possessing a flexible word order, DisPs can be found in all positions in utterances as different from English. They operate within various domains in discourse. On the basis of these results the following conclusions can be drawn from this study:

239

* The results of the data analyses demonstrate that despite the fact that the discourse and conversation analytic perspectives united with functional approach as applied in this study has been developed and mainly applied in English, its application in Turkish, a language belonging to a different language family from English has been possible and realistic.

* The current grammatical descriptions of Turkish, largely based on traditional or transformational-generative approaches should be reconsidered in the light of the results of conversation-oriented studies. As Erguvanlı (1984) points out, in addition to syntactic ones, semantic and pragmatic distinctions must be differentiated and investigated to achieve a better understanding of communication. In this respect, the present study breaks new ground in the description of conversational Turkish by enabling a detailed investigation of an under-represented area in Turkish discourse and conversation analyses.

* It has been made clear throughout that this study does not present a monolithic perspective for the analysis of the three discourse particles in question. Although there have been various approaches applied by different analysts including Östman, Schourup, Özbek and especially Schiffrin's seminal work, which actually constitutes the background of many studies, as the literature review has demonstrated, there is no single, coherent approach to the study of discourse particles in English either. Rather than being a sign of failure, this shows us the need for (the inclusion of) unified analytical methods like this study has tried to demonstrate.

* As a result of this unified approach to the study of discourse particles in question, all the results are to be interpreted as provisional and may evolve as more data of this kind become available. Therefore, some of the interpretations are open to alternative readings. This is no more a problematic issue than the open-ended readings of many turn-taking phenomena. In this connection, discourse particles display similar characteristics and similar problems of analytic readings. The results in the present study may not lend themselves to absolute replicability. What is replicable is the framework that has formed the basis for the present analysis of these items because

the local contextual features, which may constrain interpretation in each individual case, are likely to be quite different.

7.2 Implications for Further Research

Certain research directions are suggested by the present study. First of all, a comparison of certain selected particles with the same unified analytic perspective should be carried out. The results of a comparative study would help to endorse the validity of the perspective adopted.

As has been indicated before, conversation is the most basic form of talk. Moreover, it is where particles are found and put to use the most (Östman, 1982: Schourup, 1995: Macaulay, 2002: Fox Tree and Schrock, 2002). Spontaneity of conversation is actually conducive to their recurrent occurrence (Östman, ibid.). Therefore, the present data are conversational and informal. More work, however, is needed in more formal or institutional types of interaction in order to discover similarities as well as dissimilarities between these different forms of talk. One, however, has to remember to make absolutely sure that conversations used as data (like the ones deployed in this study) are actually real conversations naturally carried out by ordinary members of the speech community in question, not specially produced for the analytic purposes of sociolinguists (see Schegloff, 1993).

Even though the relatively large corpus of data used in this study has been able to provide sufficient evidence in order to fully justify the functions attributed to them, one line of pursuit for future research might be to use a more specific type of data such as narratives, discussions, informings, casual, and so on. The focus on more and specifically narrative data, for example, would probably help to further justify the extended-turn function of *işte*.

To choose more specific conversational tasks such as agreement, disagreement, troubles-in-talk etc., in order to describe the interactional strategies that speakers are engaged in seems to be a point future analysts might pay attention to. It should be noted that a specific focus on these sorts of tasks requires the collection of more

241

specific data. Therefore, it might help to know in advance what sort of conversational tasks to focus on and then deal with them directly.

Another point of interest with the discourse particles is native speakers' attitudes towards them. The small-scale study on native speaker intuitions whose results reported prior to the analysis chapter provided some insights into native speaker perception of particles and showed parallels with their general use and functioning. As far as preliminary observations are concerned, all the respondents to the study indicated that particles were closely associated with everyday conversations. Respondents quite rightly spotted the detachable quality of particles saying they were only meaningful in specific contexts. Although there was a general acceptance about the positive contribution of particles to conversation, some respondents indicated that an overuse of particles was to be avoided. It was also made clear that socialisation is conducive to the mastery of particles in the case of foreigners learning the language as well as in the case of children. The scale of such a study can simply be broadened to include concentration on the meaning and function of particular particles by initially recording some exemplary conversational performance of speakers and then discussing their use of certain particles.

Future studies on particles could easily include the other particles prevalent in conversational discourse. In addition to other particles as reported by Özbek (1995) as many as 60, particle combinations should be included in a future list of particles to be investigated. An attempt in this direction is sure to help for a more detailed description of Turkish and provide further impetus and motivation for potential researchers to broaden the scope of pragmatic and sociolinguistic studies in Turkish. A detailed description of the contexts and semantic/pragmatic functions of the three DisPs investigated can only enhance the field of Turkish linguistics, which has been quite reluctant to investigate phenomena that are generally considered features of spoken language. As far as the present study is concerned, regardless of its relative shortcomings, open-ended readings and tentative results, future researchers are sure to view it as a stepping stone in order to further improve their perspective and eventually accomplish better results.

As we have indicated above, although we can claim that DisPs share some universal features and often do similar discourse-pragmatic work across languages, as the analysis of the three DisPs demonstrate, more empirical studies of DisPs in the world's languages are needed before any generalisations can be made about their nature. Regardless of the typology of a language, there are words and expressions, which signal the interactional strategies of the participants. Agreement, listener involvement, emphasis are all expressed by one linguistic item or another (as well as other means available in the language). Languages are similar in this respect. What may be different, however, is the realisation of these functions by different features of the language. While there are perhaps universals of DisPs, there are also language-specific features in their form and function (like the occurrence of suffixed-*şey* in marking repair).

It has become clear in this study that DisPs are an essential part of naturally occurring speech and they signal a certain degree of informality between the participants. Despite their apparent interactional significance, as far as the present researcher's language learning experiences are concerned, particles are almost the last to be mastered in learning a foreign language. In fact, their frequent and correct use on the part of a language learner is closely related to the improvement in his/her mastery of the language. It has been indicated throughout that incompetence in the use of this 'sloppy speech' might create more important interactional consequences than ignorance of syntactic rules for, being indispensable elements of the predominant medium of our interaction in the social world, that is conversation, DisPs contribute significantly to its organisation and maintenance.

REFERENCES

Aijmer, K. (1986) Why is *actually* so popular in spoken English? In G.Tottie and I. Bäcklund (eds.) *English in Speech and Writing*: A Symposium.Uppsala: Studia Anglistica Uppsaliensia.

Aijmer, K. (1996) *Conversational Routines in English: Convention and Creativity*. London: Longman.

Aijmer, K. (2002) *English Discourse Particles: Evidence from a corpus*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Aijmer, K. and Simon-Vandenbergen, A. (2003) 'The discourse particle well and its equivalents in Swedish and Dutch'. *Linguistics* Vol.41, No.6

Akar, D. (1988) 'Some syntactic properties of Turkish interjections'. In S.Koç (ed.) Studies on Turkish lingustics: *Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference on Turkish Linguistics* (265-274). Ankara: Middle East Technical University.

Altunkaya, F. (1987) *Cohesion in Turkish. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis*. Hacettepe Universitesi.

Ameka, F. (1992) 'Interjections: the universal yet neglected part of speech'. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 18, 101-118.

Andersen, G. (1998) 'The pragmatic markers like from a relevance-theoretic perspective'. In Jucker, A.H. and Y.Ziv (eds.). *Discourse markers. Description and theory*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 147-70

Andersen, G. (2001) *Pragmatic markers and sociolinguistic variation*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Andersson, L. and Trudgill, P. (1990) *Bad Language*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Archakis, A. (2001) 'On Discourse Markers: Evidence from Modern Greek'. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 33, 1235-1261

Atkinson, J.M. and Heritage, J. (eds.). (1984) *Structures of Social Action: Studies in conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Austin, J. L. (1962) *How To Do Things With Words*. Oxford: Clarendon Pres.

Bald, W.D. (1980) 'Some functions of 'yes' and 'no' in conversation'. In Greenbaum et al., (eds.). *Studies in English Linguistics for Randolf Quirk* (179-191). London: Longman.

Banguoğlu, T. (1990) *Türkçe'nin Grameri*. Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi. Ankara.

Bateson, G. (1972) 'Why do things have outlines?'. In *Steps to an ecology of mind*, 27-32. New York: Ballantine Books. (Originally published 1953 in ETC: A review of general semantics XL.).

Bayraktaroğlu, A. and Bayraktaroğlu, S. (1992) *Colloquial Turkish*: Routledge. London and New York.

Bazzanella, C. (1990) 'Phatic connectives as interactional cues in contemporary spoken Italian'. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 14:639-47

Beach, W.A. (1993) 'Transitional regularities for 'casual' "Okay" usages'. *Journal of Pragmatics*, vol.19, 4, 325-352.

Beamen, K. (1984) 'Co-ordination and Subordination revisited: syntactic complexity in spoken and written narrative'. In D. Tannen (ed.) *Coherence in Spoken and Written Discourse* 45-80, Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.

Bermann, J. R. (1992) 'Veiled morality: notes on discretion in psychiatry'. In Drew, P and J. Heritage (eds.) *Talk at work*. p.132-167. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.

Biber, D. (1988) *Variation across speech and writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Biq, Y.O. (1990) 'Conversation, continuation and connectives'. *Text*, 10, (3), 187-208.

Blackmore, D. (1987) *Semantic constrains on relevance*: Blackwell.

Boeschoten, H.E. and Verhoveren, L.T. (Eds.). (1987) *Studies on Modern Turkish: Proceedings of the third conference on Turkish linguistics* (189-202), Tilburg: Tilburg University Press.

Bolinger, D. (1989) *Intonation and its uses. Melody in grammar and discourse*. London: Edward Arnold.

Brinton, L.J. (1996) *Pragmatic markers in English. Grammaticalization and discourse functions*. Berlin & New York. Mouton de Gruyter.

Brown, D. and Levinson S.C. (1978) 'Universals in Language usage: Politeness Phenomena'. In E. Goody (ed.), Questions and Politeness: *Strategies in Social Interaction*, CUP.

Chafe, W.L. (1980) 'The Deployment of Consciousness in the Production of a Narrative'. In Chafe, W.L. (ed.) *The Pear Stories: Cognitive and Linguistic Aspects of Narrative Production*. New Jersey: Ablex.

Chodorrowska, M. (1997) 'On the Polite Function of 'me entiendes' in Spanish'. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 28, 355-371

Clark, Herbert H. (1996) *Using Language*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Coulthard, M. (1977) *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis*. London: Longman.

Coupland, N and Jaworski, A. (1997) 'Relevance, accommodation and conversation: Modeling the social dimension of communication'. *Multilingua:Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication*. Volume 16-2/3.233-258

Cruttenden, A. (1986) *Intonation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Crystal, D. (1969) *Prosodic System and Intonation in British English*. Cambridge University Press.

Demirezen, R.M. (1988) 'Effects of borrowed words on Turkish phonology'. In S.Koç (ed.) Studies on Turkish linguistics: *Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference on Turkish Linguistics* (517-538). Ankara: Middle East Technical University.

Demirezen, M. (1991) 'Türkçe'ye İngilizce'den geçen sözcükler ve eşanlamlılık'. *Dilbilim Araştırmaları*, 133-136. Ankara: Hitit Yayınevi.

Devereux, R. (1985) 'The Turkish contribution to English'. *Lingue del Mondo*, 50 (4), 299-303.

Duncan, S. (1974) 'On the structure of speaker-auditor interaction during speaking turns'. *Language and Literature*, 3/2 p.161-80.

Durmuşoğlu, G. (1987) 'Cohesion in Turkish: a comparative analysis of cohesive markers in Turkish and English texts'. In H.E. Boeschoten and L.T. Verhoveren (eds.). *Studies on Modern Turkish: Proceedings of the third conference on Turkish linguistics* (189-202), Tilburg: Tilburg University Press.

Edmondson, W. (1981) *Spoken Discourse: A model for Analysis*. London: Longman.

Enfield, N.J. (2003) 'The definition of *what-d'you-call-it*: semantics and pragmatics of recognitional deixis'. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 35, 101-117

Ergenç, İ. (1989) 'Dilimizdeki Ünsüz Yığılmaları Üzerine Bir Deneme': *Ortak Kitap* 89, sayı 1, Ankara 1989, s.248-285.

Ergenç, İ. (1991) 'Türkçenin Söyleyiş Sözlüğü Üzerine'. *Dilbilim Araştırmaları* 1991, Hitit yayınları, Ankara 1991, s.5-10.

Erguvanlı-Taylan, E. (1984) The Function of Word Order in Turkish Grammar'. *Linguistics*, Volume 106, University of California Publications.

Erguvanlı-Taylan, E. (1987) 'Tense variation in Turkish narratives'. In H.E. Boeschoten and L.T. Verhoveren (eds.) (176-188).
Feldman, S. (1948) 'Mannerism of speech'. *Psychoanalytic Quarterly*, 17, 356-67.

Foolen, A. (1997) 'Pragmatic particles'. In Verschueren, J., Östman, J.-O., Blommaert, J. And C. Bulcaen (eds.). *Handbook of Pragmatics 1996 Installment.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Ford, C.E. and Thompson S.A. (1996) 'Interactional units in conversation: syntactic, intonational, and pragmatic resources for the management of turns'. In E.,Ochs, E.A., Schegloff, and S.A. Thomson (eds.) (1996) *Interaction and Grammar. Studies in Interactional Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fowler, D. (1978) *Modern English Usage*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.

Fox, B.A., Hayashi,M. and Jasperson, R. (1996) 'Resources and repair: a cross-linguistic study of syntax and repair'. In E.,Ochs, E.A., Schegloff, and S.A. Thomson (eds.) *Interaction and Grammar. Studies in Interactional Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fox Tree, J. E. and Schrock J.C. (1999) 'Discourse Markers in Spontaneous Speech: Oh What a Difference an *Oh* Makes'. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 40, 280-295

Fox Tree, J. E. and Schrock J.C. (2002) 'Basic meanings of *you know* and *I mean*'. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 34: 727-747.

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

Fraser, B. (1993) 'Discourse markers across language'. *Pragmatics and Language Learning, Monograph Series*, vol.4, 1-16.

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

Fuller, J. M. (2003) 'The Influence of Speaker Roles on Discourse Marker Use'. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 35, 23-45

Garfinkel, H. (1967) *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Goffman, E. (1978) 'Response Cries'. *Language*, 54, 787-815.

Goldberg, J. (1982) *Discourse Particles: Analyses of the Role of 'You Know', 'I Mean', 'Well' and 'Actually'*. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis. University of Cambridge.

Good, C. (1979) 'Language as social activity: Negotiating Conversation'. *Journal of Pragmatics*, vol.3, 2, 151-167.

Grimes, J.E. (1975) *The Thread of Discourse*. Berlin: Mouton.

Gumperz, J.J. (1982) *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gumperz, J.J. (1984) 'Communicative competence revisited'. In D. Schiffrin (ed.), *Meaning, form, and use in context: Linguistic applications* (Georgetown University Roundtable on Languages and Linguistics 1984), 278-89. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Hacıeminoğlu, N. (1968) 'De-da edatı üzerine'. *Türk Dili ve Edebiyati Dergisi*, 16, 81-100. İstanbul Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Halliday, M.A.K. and R. Hasan. (1976) *Cohesion in English.* London: Longman.

Hansen, M-J. (1998) 'The Function of Discourse Particles'. *Pragmatics & Beyond new series 53*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

He, A.W. and B. Lindsey. (1998) '*You know* as an information status enhancing device. Arguments from grammar and interaction'. *Functions of Language* 5:2: 133-55.

Heeman A. Peter, Byron, D and Allen F. James. (1998) 'Identifiying Discourse Markers in Spoken Dialog'. Paper presented at the AAAI Spring Symposium on *Applying Machine Learning and Discourse Processing*, Stanford, March 1998.

Heritage, J. (1984) 'A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement'. In J.M. Atkinson and J. Heritage (eds.) *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*, 299-345. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heritage, J. and Greatbatch, D. (1989) 'On the Institutional Character of Institutional Talk: The Case of News Interviews'. *Discourse in Professional and Everyday Culture*, P.A. Forstorp (ed.), 47-98. Linkoping Studies in Communication, University of Linkoping, Sweden. [A shortened version to appear in *Talk and Social Structure*. D.Boden and D.H. Zimmerman (ed.). Cambridge: Polity Press].

249

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

Holmes, J. (1986) 'Functions of 'you know' in women's and men's speech'. *Language in Society*, 15, 1-22.

Holmes, J. (1988) '*Of course*. A Pragmatic particle in New Zealand women's and men's speech'. *Australian Journal of Linguistics*, 8, 49-74.

Ilgın, L and Büyükkantarcıoğlu, N. (1994) 'Türkçe'de "YANİ" Sözcüğünün Kullanımı Üzerine bir İnceleme'. VIII Dilbilim Kurultayı Bildirileri, İstanbul Üniversitesi İletişim Fakültesi, İstanbul, s.:24-38

İşsever, S. (1995) *Türkçe Metinlerdeki Bağlantı Öğelerinin Metinbilim ve Kullanımbilim Açısından İşlevleri*. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Ankara Üniversitesi, Ankara.

James, A.R. (1983) '*Well* in reporting clauses: meaning and form of a lexical filler'. *Arbeiten aus Anglistik und Amerikanistik*, 8 (1): 33-40.

Jefferson, G. (1973) 'A case of precision timing in ordinary conversation: overlapped tag-positioned address terms in closing sequences'. *Semiotica* 9: 47-96.

Jefferson, G. (1974) 'Error correction as an interactional resource'. *Language in Society* 2: 47-96.

Jefferson, G. (1984) 'On stepwise transition from talk about a trouble to inappropriately next-positioned matters'. In J.M. Atkinson and J. Heritage (eds.) *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*, 191-221. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jucker, H.A. (1993) 'The discourse marker well: A relevance theoretical account'. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 19, 435-452.

Kendon, A. (1967) 'Some functions of gaze-direction in social interaction'. *Acta Psychologia*, 26:22-47.

Knott, A. and Sanders, T. (1998) 'The classification of coherence relations and their linguistic markers: An exploration of two languages'. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 30, 135-175

Kocaman, A. (1988) 'Modality in the Turkish discourse'. In S.Koç (ed.) Studies on Turkish Lingustics: *Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference on Turkish Linguistics* (463-468). Ankara: Middle East Technical University.

Kryk, B. (1992) 'The Pragmatic of Interjections: The case of Polish no'. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 18, 193-207.

Kuneralp, Z. (1981) *Sadece Diplomat*. 16-17. Istanbul.

Kuribayashi, Y. (1989) 'Accusative Marking and noun-verb constructions in Turkish'. *Gengo Kenkyu*, 95, 94-119.

Labov, W. (1984) 'Field methods of the project on linguistic change and variation'. In J. Baugh and J. Sherzer (eds.), *Language in use*, 28-53. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Lakoff, R. (1973) 'Questionable answers and answerable questions'. Issues in Linguistics. *Papers in honour of Henry and Renee Kahane*, 453-467, Urbana: Univ. of Illinois Press.

Langenscheidt's Standard Dictionary (1985) *Turkish-English: English-Turkish*.

Lee, N. (1981) 'Turn-taking negotiation in non-narrative discourse'. *Studies in English Language and Literature*. Vol.31 p.107-132.

Lees, R.B. (1973) 'Turkish Voice'. *Issues in Linguistics*: *Papers in honor of Henry and Renèe Kahane*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Lenk, U. (1998) *Marking discourse coherence. Functions of discouse markers in spoken English.* Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.

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

Lewis, G.L. (1967) *Turkish Grammar*, Oxford University Press.

Lewis, G.L. (1985) 'The present state of the Turkish language'. 'Special Academy Lecture': *Proceedings of the British Academy*.

Locke, John. (1959) *An essay Concerning Human Understanding*. Edited by A.C. Fraser. New York.

de Long, A. J. (1974) 'Kinesic signals at utterance boundaries in preschool children'. *Semiotica* 11/1, p.43-73.

Macaulay, R. (2002) 'You Know, it Depends'. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 34, 749-767

Malamud-Makowski, M. (1997) *Discourse Markers in Spanish*. Boston University, Ph.D. Dissertation.

Mardin, Y. (1976) *Colloquial Turkish*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Matsumoto, (2003) 'Unit linking in conversational Japanese'. *Language Sciences*, 25 433-455.

Maynard, D.W. (1980) 'Placement of topic changes in conversation'. *Semiotica*, 30-3/4, 263-290.

Merrit, M. (1984) 'On the use of *OK* in service encounters'. *Language in use*, 139-147.

Milroy, L. (1987) *Language and social networks*. Oxford: New York: B.Blackwell.

Murray, D. (1979) 'Well'. *Linguistic Inquiry*. vol. 10, 727-732.

Ochs, E. (1996) 'Linguistic resources for socialising humanity'. In Gumperz, J.J and S.C. Levinson (eds). *Rethinking linguistic relativity.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Pres. 407-37.

Owen, M. (1981) 'Conversational Units and the Use of Well...'. In Werth, P. (ed.) *Conversation and Discourse*. London: Groom Helm

Owen, M. (1985) 'The conversational functions of *anyway*'. *Nottingham Circular*, 14, 72-90.

Östman, J.O. (1981) *'You Know': A Discourse Functional Approach*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin B.V.

Östman, J.O. (1982) 'The symbiotic relationship between pragmatic particles and impromptu speech'. In N.E. Enkuist, (ed.) *Impromptu Speech: A Symposium*. 78, 147-77. Abo Akademi.

Östman, J.-O. (1995) 'Pragmatic particles twenty years after'. In Warvik, B., Tanskanen, S.-K. & R.Hiltunen (eds). *Organisation in discourse. Proceedings from the Turku Conference*. University of Turku, Turku, Finland, 95-108.

Özbek, N. (1995) *Discourse Markers in Turkish and English: a comparative study*. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis. Nothingham University.

Özbek, N. (1998) '*yani, işte, şey, ya*: Interactional markers of Turkish'. Proceedings of the *Ninth Interactional Conference on Turkish Linguistics*. August 12-14, 1998. Lincoln College, Oxford.

Özünlü, U. (1991) 'Türk gülmecesinde duvar ve kaldırım yazıları'. *Dilbilim Araştırmaları*, 122-132. Hitit Yayınevi: Ankara.

Padley, G.A. (1985) *Grammatical Theory in Western Europe 1500-1700*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pomerantz, A. (1980) 'Telling my side: *limited access* as a *fishing device*'. *Sociological Inquiry*, 50, 3/4: 186-98.

Pomerantz, A. (1984) 'Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes'. In J. M. Atkinson and J. Heritage (eds.) *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*, 57-101. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Psathas, G. and T. Anderson. (1990) 'The practices of transcription in conversation analysis'. *Semiotica*, 78 (1/2), 75-99.

Quirk, R., Sidney, G., Geoffrey, L. and Svartvik, J. (1985) *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. London: Longman.

Redeker, G. (1993) 'Discourse markers as attentional cues to discourse structure'. Poster presented at the *'Psycholinguistic Poster Session'*, LSA Annual Meeting, Los Angeles, January 1993.

Rey, J. (1997) 'Discourse Markers: a challenge for natural language processing'. *AI Communications*, 10, 177-184

Roach, P. (1983) *English Phonetics and Phonology: A Practical Course*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rona, B. (1989) *Turkish in Three Months*. East Kilbridge: Hugo's Language Books Limited.

Ruhi, Ş. (1994) 'Observations on the Function of Post-Predicate Elements in Written Text Processing'. *Journal of Turkology*. Vol.:2. Num.:2. 205-223

Ruhi, Ş. (1994a) 'Restrictions on the interchangeability of discourse connectives: a study on *ama* and *fakat*'. Paper presented at the *Seventh International Conference on Turkish Linguistics*, August 2-4, 1994, Johannes-Gutenberg University, Mainz.

Sacks, H. (1971-76) *Lecture notes manuscript*.

Sacks, H. (1971) *Lecture notes*. School of Social Science, University of California at Irvine.

Sacks, H. (1972) 'An initial investigation of the usability of conversational data for doing sociology'. In D.N. Sudnow (ed.) *Studies in Social Interaction*. 31-74. New York: Free Press.

Sacks, H. (1974) 'An analysis of the course of a joke's telling in conversation'. In: *Explorations in the ethnography of speaking*. Edited by R. Baumann and J. Sherzer. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sacks, H. (1984) 'Notes on methodology'. In J.M. Atkinson and J.C. Heritage (eds.) *Structures in Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*. 21-27. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sacks, H. (1992) *Lectures on Conversation*. 2 volumes. Edited by G. Jefferson, with Introductions by E.A. Schegloff. Oxford: Blackwell.

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

Schacter, P. (1985) 'Parts-of-speech systems'. In: T.Shopen, (Edc), *Language typology and syntactic description*, Vol.1: 3-61 Cambridge: CUP

Schegloff, E. A. (1968) 'Sequencing in conversational openings'. *American Anthropologist* 70. 1075-95.

Schegloff, E. A. (1972) 'Notes on a conversational practice: formulating place'. In Sudnow, 75-119.

Schegloff, E.A. (1979) 'The relevance of repair for syntax-for-conversation'. In T.Givon (ed.) *Syntax and Sematics* 12: *Discourse and Syntax*, 261-88. New York: Academic Press.

Schegloff, E.A. (1980) 'Preliminaries to preliminaries: *Can I ask you a question'. Sociological Inquiry*, 50 (3-4): 104-52.

Schegloff, E.A. (1982) 'Discourse as an interactional achivement: some uses of 'uh huh' and other things that come between sentences'. In D. Tannen (ed.) *Georgetown University Roundtable on Languages and Linguistics*, 71-93. Washington DC: Georgetown University Press.

Schegloff, E.A. (1987) 'Recycled turn beginnings: a precise repair mechanism in conversation's turn-taking organisation'. In G.Button and J.R.E. Lee (eds.) *Talk and Social Organisation* 70-85. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters, Ltd.

Schegloff, E.A. (1992) 'Repair after next turn: the last structurally provided defense of intersubjectivity in conversation'. *American Journal of Sociology* 97: 5 (March 1992), 1295-1345.

Schegloff, E.A. (1993) 'Reflections on quantification in the study of conversation'. *Research on Language and Social interaction* 26(1), 99-128.

Schegloff, E.A. (1996) 'Turn organisation: one intersection of grammar and interaction'. In E.Ochs, E.A., Schegloff, and S.A. Thomson (eds.) *Interaction and Grammar. Studies in Interactional Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E. A. and Sacks, H. (1973) 'Opening up closings'. *Semiotica* 8: 289-327.

Schegloff, E.A., Jefferson, G. and Sacks, H. (1977) 'The preference for self-selection in the organisation of repair in conversation'. *Language*, 53: 361-82.

Schiffrin, D. (1985) 'Conversational coherence: The role of well'. *Language*, 61: 640-67.

Schiffrin, D. (1986) 'Functions of *and* in discourse'. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 10 (1), 41-66.

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

Schourup, L. (1985) *Common discourse particles in English conversation: 'like', 'well', 'y'know'*. New York: Garland.

Schourup, L. (1999) 'Discourse Markers'. *Lingua*, 107, 227-265

Sharrock, W. and B., Anderson. (1986) *The Ethnomethodologist*. Chichester: E. Horwood; London: Tavistock.

Sinclair, J. McH. and R.M. Coulthard. (1975) *Towards an analysis of discourse. The English used by teachers and pupils.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Slobin, D.I. (1988) 'The development of clause chaining in Turkish child language'. In S.Koç (ed.) Studies on Turkish lingustics: *Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference on Turkish Linguistics* (27-54). Ankara: Middle East Technical University.

Smith, W. S. and Jucker, A. H. (2000). '*Actually* and other markers of an apparent discrepancy between propositional attitudes of conversational partners'. In *Pragmatic Markers and Propositional Attitude*, Gisle Andersen and Thorstein Fretheim (eds.), 207–237. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Smith, W. S. and Jucker, A. H. (2002) 'Discourse Markers as Turns: Evidence for the role of intersubjectivity in interactional sequences'. In Fetzer, Anita, Meierkord, Christiane. *Rethinking Sequentiality: Linguistics meets conversational interaction*. 158-178. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Sorjonen, M-L. (1996) 'On repeats and responses in Finnish conversations'. In E.,Ochs, E.A., Schegloff, and S.A. Thomson (eds.) *Interaction and Grammar*. *Studies in Interactional Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sperber, D. and D., Wilson. (1986) *Relevance: Comminucation and Cognition*. Oxford. Blackwell.

Stenström, A.B. (1986) 'What does *really* really do? Strategies in speech and writing'. In G. Tottie and I. Bäcklund (eds.). *English in Speech and Writing*: a Symposium. Uppsala: Studia Anglistica Uppsaliensia.

Stubbs, M. (1983) *Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Sudnow, N. (1972) *Studies in Social Interaction*. (ed.) New York. Free Press.

Svartvik, J. (1980) 'Well in conversation'. In: Greenbaum, G. and Svartvik, J. eds., *Studies in English Linguistics for Randolph Quirk*, pp.167-177. London: Longman.

Takahara, P. O. (1998) 'Pragmatic Functions of Discourse Markers in English and Japanese'. Plenary Talk at the *6th IPrA Conference*, Reims, France July 23, 1998

Tekin, T. (1958) 'de-da bağlacının türeyisi'. *Türk Dili* 8/78, 276-277

Tekin, T. (1991) 'Türkçe'de kelime vurgusu kuralları'. *Dilbilim Arastirmalari*. 1-4. Ankara: Hitit Yayınevi.

Traugott, E.C. (1999) 'The rhetoric of counter-expectation in semantic change: A study in subjectifation'. In Koch, P. And A. Blank (eds). *Historical semantics and cognition*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter

Trillo, J.R. (1997) 'Your attention, please: Pragmatic mechanism to obtain the addressee's attention in English and Spanish conversations'. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 27, 1-17.

Trillo, J. R. (2002) 'The Pragmatic Fossilization of Discourse Markers in non-native Speakers of English'. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *Journal of Pragmatics*, 34, 769-784

Van Baar, T. (1996) 'Particles'. In Devriedent, B., Goossens, L. and J. van der Auwera (eds). *Complex structures: A functionalist perspective*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 259-301

Viitanen, O. (1986) 'On the position of *only* in English conversation'. In G. Tottie and I. Bäcklund (eds.). *English in Speech and Writing*: a Symposium. Uppsala: Studia Anglistica Uppsaliensia.

Watts, R.J. (1986) 'Relevance in conversational moves: a reappraisal of *well*'. *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia,* 19 pp.37-59.

Watts, R.J. (1989) 'Taking the pitcher to the 'well': Native speakers' perception of their use of discourse markers in conversation'. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 13, 203-237.

Wierzbicka, A. (1976) 'Particles and Linguistic Relativity'. *International Review of Slavic Linguistics*, vol.1, no.2-3, 327-367

Wierzbicka, A. (1986) 'Introduction'. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 10, 519-534.

Yavaş, F. (1982) 'The Turkish Aorist'. *An International Journal of Linguistics*, 16 (1), 40-53.

Yılmaz, E. (1994) *Descriptive and Comparative study of the Discourse Markers 'well' in English and 'şey' in Turkish*. Unpublished M.A. Dissertation. University of Essex.

Zeyrek, D. (1992) 'Anlatılarda zaman ve kip'. In *20. Yıl yazıları* (133-139). Ankara: Karaca Dil Kursu.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

TABLES USED IN THE THESIS

Table 2.1: The Brief Summary of Definitions of Analytic Concepts and Terms.

Turn-Taking: is a speech exchange system used for the ordering of moves talk.
Adjacency pairs: are composed of turns produced successively by different speakers.
Repair: is a mechanism used for dealing with its intrinsic troubles of a natural language.
Topic: corresponds to the notion of goal. The topic of the conversation is what the speaker intends to talk about.

Table 3.2: The Analytic Framework.

Conversational Structure Domain	Interpersonal Domain	Content Domain
		Frame Function and Qualifying Function

Table 3.3: Basic Statistical Information About the Three DisPs According to its Place of Occurrence.

DisP	Initial	%	Medial	%	Final	%	Total
Yani	503	**49**	229	**22**	300	**29**	1032
İşte	202	**43**	198	**42**	73	**15**	473
Şey	92	**11**	737	**88**	22	**1**	851

Table 4.4: Basic Statistical Information About *Yani* According to its Place of Occurrence.

DisP	Initial	%	Medial	%	Final	%	Total
Yani	503	**49**	229	**22**	300	**29**	1032

Table 4.5: Functions of *Yani* Found in Three Domains of Conversation.

Conversational Structure Domain	Interpersonal Domain	Content Domain
*Turn Initiation (Turn-Entry Device) *Turn Completion (Turn-Exit Device) *Floor-Holder *Repair Organisation *TCU-Initial Self-Repair *TCU-Medial (Built-in) Self-Repair *Response to a Question	*Speaker's Emphasis *Emotional Effect *Response Particle	**Frame Function** *Topic Expansion *Topic Expansion at Local Level *Topic Expansion at Conversational Level *Summary/ Assessment/Recapitulation

Table 4.6: Functions of *Yani* Found in Three Domains of Conversation.

Conversational Structure Domain	Interpersonal Domain	Content Domain
*Turn Initiation (Turn-Entry Device) [5] *Turn Completion (Turn-Exit Device) [8] *Floor-Holder [10] *Repair Organisation [12] *TCU-Initial Self-Repair [13] *TCU-Medial (Built-in) Self-Repair [15] *Response to a Question [6]	*Emotional Effect [25] *Speaker's Emphasis [28] *Response Particle [30]	**Frame Function** *Topic Expansion [17] *Topic Expansion at Local Level [18] *Topic Expansion at Conversational Level [20] *Summary Assessment/Recapitulation [23]

Table 5.7: Basic Statistical Information About the DisP *İşte* According to its Place of Occurrence.

DisP	Initial	%	Medial	%	Final	%	Total
İşte	202	**43**	198	**42**	73	**15**	473

Table 5.8: Functions of *İşte* Found in the Relevant Domains of Conversation.

Conversational Structure Domain	Content Domain
*Marker of Extended Turns *Turn and Floor Claimer	**Frame Function** *Topic Closure *Exemplification/Detail *Highlight Marker *Marker of Reported Speech *Marker of Information Tie- Back
	Qualifying Function *Answer-Preface to Questions

Table 5.9: Functions of *İşte* Found in the Relevant Domains of Conversation.

Conversational Structure Domain	Content Domain
*Marker of Extended Turns [1] *Turn and Floor Claimer [3]	**Frame Function** *Exemplification/Detail [6] *Topic Closure [7] *Highlight Marker [9] *Marker of Reported Speech [13] *Marker of Information Tie- Back [15]
	Qualifying Function *Answer-Preface to Questions [17]

Table 6.10: Basic Statistical Information About *Şey* According to its Place of Occurrence.

DisP	Initial	%	Medial	%	Final	%	Total
Şey	92	**11**	737	**88**	22	**1**	851

Table 6.11: Functions of *Şey* Found in the Relevant Domains of Conversation.

ŞEY	Freestanding-*Şey*	Suffixed-*Şey*
Conversational Structure Domain	*Repair Initiator (Self-Initiated Self-Repair) *Preface for Other-Initiated Self-Repair *Verbal planning *Floor-Holding/*Turn Initiation	*Vagueness *Replacing Nouns *Replacing Verbs *No Immediate Replacement
Interpersonal Domain	*Politeness	

Table 6.12: Functions of *Şey* Found in the Relevant Domains of Conversation.

ŞEY	**Freestanding-*Şey***	**Suffixed-*Şey***
Conversational Structure Domain	*Repair Initiator (Self-Initiated Self-Repair) [2] *Preface for Other-Initiated Self-Repair [3] *Verbal planning [6] *Floor-Holding/Turn Initiation [4]	*Vagueness [8] *Replacing Nouns [14] *Replacing Verbs [18] *No Immediate Replacement [21]
Interpersonal Domain	*Politeness [24]	

FUNCTION-COUNT STATISTICS OF EACH PARTICLE

Table 13: Function-Count Statistics of *Yani*.

YANİ
Conversational Structure Domain
*Turn Initiation (Turn- Entry Device): 79 (turn-initial)
*Turn Completion (Turn- Exit Device): 40 (turn-final)
*Floor-Holder: 20 (turn-medial)
*TCU-Initial Self-Repair: 31 (turn-initial)
*TCU-Medial (Built-in) Self-Repair: 113 (utterance-medial)
*Response to a Question: 17 (turn-initial)
Interpersonal Domain
*Speaker's Emphasis: 61 (utterance-initial: 25; utterance-medial: 27; utterance-final: 9)
*Emotional Effect: 325 (all final)
*Response Particle : 10 (only item)
Content Domain
Frame Function   *Topic Expansion at Local   Level: 324 (utterance-initial)
*Topic Expansion at Conversational Level: 90 (turn-initial)
*Summary assessment/Recapitulation: 101 (utterance-initial)

Table 14: Function-Count Statistics of *İşte*.

İŞTE
Conversational Structure Domain
*Marker of Extended Turns: 40 (early in the turn)
*Turn and Floor Claimer: 43 (turn-initial)
Content Domain

Frame Function
 	
 *Exemplification/Detail: 173 (utterance-initial: 81;
   utterance-medial: 92)
 	
 *Topic Closure: 5 (turn-final)
 	
 *Highlight Marker: 234 (utterance-initial: 82, utterance-medial: 87;
   utterance-final: 65)
 	
 *Marker of Reported Speech: 23 (reported part-initial)
 	
 *Marker of Information Tie- Back: 19 (turn-initial)

Qualifying Function   *Answer-Preface to Questions: 8 (turn-initial)

Table 15: Function-Count Statistics of *Şey*.

ŞEY
Conversational Structure Domain
Freestanding-*Şey*
*Repair Initiator (Self- Initiated Self-Repair): 16
*Preface for Other- Initiated Self-Repair: 8
*Verbal planning: 182
*Floor-Holding: 19
*Freestanding-*Şey*: 87
Suffixed-*Şey*
*Vagueness:
*Replacing Nouns: 311
*Replacing Verbs: 94
*No Immediate Replacement: 213
Interpersonal Domain
*Politeness: 10

APPENDIX C

TÜRKÇE ÖZET

Söylem Belirleyicileri (SB) sözlü iletişimde yüklendikleri işlevler açısından önemli bir yere sahiptirler ve bir çok edimbilim ve dilbilim araştırmaları işlevsel anlamda görev yapan bu sözcüklerle ilgilenmektedirler. Tek bir dilbilgisel sınıfa ait olmayan bu sözcükleri tanımlamak oldukça zor bir iştir. SBler zarf, sözcük öbekleri, bağlaçlar ve ünlemler gibi çeşitli dilbilgisel kümelerden gelmektedir. Sblerin sergilediği bu çeşitlilik onların farklı terimlerle anılmalarına sebep olmuştur (connectives, fillers, hedges, fumbles, hesitation phenomena, starters, cajolers, conversational greasers, gambits, compromisers, discourse particles, discourse markers).

Literatürde, SB olma ölçütlerini belirleyen ortak çabalar olmuştur: Ait olduğu sözceden ayrı ve bağımsız olduğuna işaret eden 'sözdizimsel bağımsızlık'; içinde bulunduğu sözcenin değişik yerlerinde kullanılabilmesine işaret eden 'sözdizimsel esneklik'; ve yine çıkarılması durumunda içinde kullanıldığı sözcenin kabul edilebilirliğine yapısal yada anlamsal olarak herhangi bir etkide bulunmadığına işaret eden 'anlam yokluğu'. Bu nedenle, SBlerin önemi, içinde bulunduğu sözcenin yapısal ya da anlamsal özellikleriyle değil, bildirişimsel bağlamda kullanılmalarının ana sebebi olan önerme kuruluşundaki edimbilimsel özellikleridir. Bu açıdan, SBler bildirişimin kavramsal değil işlemsel yönüyle ilgili bilgi içermektedir.

Çoğunlukla sesbilim, biçimbilim ve sözdizimsel çalışmalara odaklanan önceki dilbilimsel çalışmalara bakıldığında, SBlere çok az ilgi gösterildiği gözlenmektedir. Aynı şekilde, Türkçe dilbilim çalışmaları çoğunlukla tümce sınırlarıyla açıklanabilen

266

sesbilim, biçimbilim ve sözdizim çalışmalarıyla sınırlı kalmıştır. Son zamanlarda, Türkçe üzerine çalışan dilbilimciler, özellikle konuşma diline kendi içinde araştırma değeri olan bir alan olarak bakmaya başlamışlar ve doğal olarak gelişen konuşma dilini inceleyerek, Türkçe dilbiliminde değişik konulara değinmeye başlamışlardır. Ancak yine de SBler üzerine Türkçe' de az sayıda çalışma bulunmaktadır.

Bu bağlamda bakıldığında, bu çalışmanın amacı, SBler gibi az çalışılmış bir konunun doğal konuşma dilindeki işlevlerini inceleyerek Türkçe dilbilim çalışmalarına katkıda bulunmaktır. SBlerin doğal konuşma dilindeki işlevlerini inceleyen çalışmalar İngilizce'de gerek kitap boyutunda gerekse makale boyutunda çok sayıda olmasına rağmen, bu konuya Türkçe dilbilimle uğraşan araştırmacılar fazla ilgi göstermemişlerdir. SBler üzerine yapılan çalışmaların çoğu İngilizce'deki SBler üzerine yapılmıştır. Bu anlamda, bu konuda yapılan çalışmaların azlığı sorunu, Türkçe ile beraber, İngilizce'nin dışındaki dillerde de az olduğu için diğer dilleri de ilgilendirmektedir.

Bu bağlamda, İngilizce'nin dışındaki diğer dillerdeki SBleri incelemenin haklı sebebi ortaya çıkmaktadır. Aynı şekilde, Türkçe dilbilim çalışmalarıyla ilgilenen her araştırmacının kabul edeceği üzere, Türkçe'nin her alanında bilimsel çalışmalara ihtiyaç vardır. Ancak, özellikle SBler üzerine yapılan çalışmalar az olduğundan, bu konuda daha fazla çalışmanın yapılması gerekmektedir.

Bu çalışma, SBleri farklı konuşma işlevsel alanında incelediği için özgün olarak kabul edilebilir (Konuşma Yapısı, İçerik, Kişilerarası İlişki İşlev Alanları). Diğer bir deyişle, konuşma çözümlemesi, söylem analizi ve işlevsel yaklaşım çerçevesinde Türkçe'deki SBler üzerine detaylı bir şekilde yapılan ilk incelemedir. Bu anlamda, bu çalışma bu konuya katkılarının yanında eksikleriyle de, Türkçe'de bu alanda çalışma yapacak araştırmacılara yol gösterici olmaktadır. Bu çalışmada, üzerinde durulan SBler olan *yani*, *işte* ve *şey*'i konuşma Türkçe'sinde sergiledikleri dağılım örüntüsüyle birlikte edimbilimsel işlevlerini ortaya çıkarma, tanımlama ve bunları açıklama amacıyla edimbilimsel olarak detaylı bir şekilde incelemektedir.

267

SBler bir dildeki en belirgin dilsel öğelerden biri olduğu halde, dil öğretimi programlarında hakettikleri yeri yeteri kadar almadıkları herkes tarafından kabul edilmektedir. Bu anlamda bu çalışmanın sonuçları dil öğrenen öğrencilerin edimbilimsel farkındalıklarını arttırmak için kullanılabilir.

SBler hemen bütün dillerde çok sıklıkla kullanılmaktadır ve en belirgin dilsel öğelerden biridirler. Ancak, bu kullanım sıklığına rağmen, dili konuşan ve bunları sıklıkla kullanan insanlar SBlerin dildeki işlevlerini tam olarak açıklayamamaktadırlar. Aynı şekilde, dildeki en belirgin dilsel öğelerden biri olmalarına rağmen, hem birinci dil hem de ikinci dil öğrenenler tarafından en son öğrenilen dil öğelerindendirler. SBlerin yanlış kullanımlarının bildirişim için yaratacağı zararın, dilbilgisel hatalardan daha fazla olacağı iddia edilmektedir.

Bu çalışmada, incelenen SBler bütün konuşma işlevsel alanlarında görev yüklendikleri için çok anlamlı olarak görülmektedirler. Bu anlamda, SBlerin Konuşma Yapısı, İçerik ve Kişilerarası İlişki işlevsel alanlarındaki temel işlevlerini belirleyip bunları açıklamaya yönelik bir sınıflandırma önerilmektedir.

Daha belirgin olarak, bu çalışmanın amacı, üç farklı konuşma işlevsel alanını temsil eden bu çevrelerde SBlerin kullanımlarının ardındaki düzen ve özgül rol ve işlevleri ortaya çıkarmak ve açıklamaktır. Daha önceki çalışmaların gösterdiği gibi, SBlerin işlevleri, sürekli olarak kullanıldıkları özgül bağlamlar çerçevesinde açıklanmaktadırlar. Bu çalışmada da, SBlerin işlevlerini bulup açıklarken özgül konuşma bağlamını kullanılmaktadır. Bununla beraber, konuşma konusu, hata düzeltme ve konuşma sırası gibi konuşmanın başlıca düzenleyici temelleri, konuşma bağlamını oluşturmakta ve yine bu bağlama göre SBlerin işlevleri ortaya çıkarılıp açıklanmaktadır.

Görece olarak küçük sayılabilecek bir veri kitlesi kullanarak, yapısal ifadelerin ötesine geçip, konuşma bağlamını çevreleyen bilgiyi esas alan bir çözümleme yöntemiyle üç farklı SB incelenip, çözümlenmiştir. Bu bağlamda, bu çalışmanın kuramsal çerçevesi, konuşma incelemesi, söylem çözümlemesi ve işlevsel

yaklaşımın kuram ve yönteminin ilgili kısımlarından yaralanan bütüncül bir yaklaşım sergilemektedir.

Bu noktada belirtilmelidir ki, bu çalışmanın sonuçları geçici geçerlilikle kabul edilmelidir ve benzer veriler üzerinde yapılan çalışmaların sonuçları ortaya çıktıkça gelişebilir. Bu sebeple, bu çalışmanın sonuçları farklı yorumlamalara açıktır ve aynı sonuçları başkaları tarafından tekrarlanmayabilir. Tekrarlanabilir olan, mevcut çalışmanın temelini oluşturan kuram ve yöntem çerçevesidir.

SBlerin dilbilimsel çözümleme açısından araştırmaya değer bir konu olarak kabul edilmesi, SBlerin genel kabul görmesine sebep olmuştur ve 1970'lerden itibaren bu alanın önde gelen araştırmacıları SBler üzerine önemli ve etkili araştırmalar yapmışlardır. SBler üzerine yapılan çalışmaların çoğu, SBlerin inceleme yöntemi olarak iki temel yaklaşımı paylaşmaktadırlar; konuşma incelemesi ve/ya söylem analizi yaklaşımı, ve işlevsel yaklaşımdır.

Bu çalışmada SBlerin incelemesi için kullanılan veri esas olarak, insanların günlük yaşamlarında hayatlarını devam ettirirken katıldıkları farklı sosyal ortamlarda kullandıkları önceden planlanmamış, doğal olarak gelişen Türkçe konuşmalardır. Doğal olarak gelişen konuşmaları, röportaj, ders anlatımı gibi planlı konuşmalardan ayıran en önemli fark SBlerin varlığı olarak görülmektedir. SBler gibi dilsel öğelerin varlığı bulunduğu konuşmaya bir doğallık havası katmaktadır.

Doğal gelişen konuşmalar diğer konuşma şekillerinden farklıdırlar. Günlük hayatta kullanılan ve doğal olarak gelişen konuşmaları röportaj, toplantı ve mahkemelerde yapılan konuşmalardan ayırmak, bu konuşmalarda bulunan katılımcıların hem kendilerini farklı şekilde ifade ettikleri hem de başkalarını farklı şekilde algılamaları açısından anlamlı görülmektedir. Bu sebeple, bu çalışmada kullanılan doğal konuşma örnekleri, bilimsel bir çalışma için değil, konuşmalarda bulunan katılımcıların hayatlarını devam ettirirken katıldıkları ortamlarda kullanmak için üretilmiştir.

269

Konuşmaların ses kaydı için, dışarıdan mikrofon takılabilen ve taşınabilir bir ses kayıt cihazı kullanılmıştır. Konuşmaların doğallığının korunması açısından ses kayıt cihazının gizlenmesi gerektiği durumlarda, ses kaydının tamamlanmasından sonra, konuşmaların inceleme verisi olarak kullanabilmesi için katılımcıların onayı alınmıştır.

Veri olarak toplam on iki farklı konuşma kullanılmıştır. Her konuşma doğal olarak geliştiğinden farklı sürelerdedir. Konuşmaların süreleri otuz dakikadan iki buçuk saate kadar değişik sürelerdedir ve toplam on sekiz saat civarındadır. Konuşmalarda bulunan katılımcıların sayısı da önceden planlanmadığı için birbirlerinden farklıdır. Konuşmalarda en az iki en fazla da beş katılımcı bulunmaktadır. Toplam sayısı on iki olan konuşmalara toplam otuz dokuz kişi katılmıştır. Bunların yirmi beşi erkek ve on dördü de kadındır. Veri olarak kullanılan konuşmaların kayıtları insanların doğal hayatlarını devam ettirdikleri açık ve kapalı sosyal mekanlarda gerçekleştirilmiştir. Bunlardan beş tanesi öğrenci yurtlarında bulunan mutfaklarda, üç tanesi çalışma ofislerinde, iki tanesi oturma odasında ve diğer iki tanesi de çay bahçesinde gerçekleştirilmiştir.

Analiz için kullanılan konuşma verilerinin çevri yazısından kullanılan kurallar, sözlü bildirişimi mümkün olduğu kadar doğru yansıtmaya yönelik, alanda çoklukla kullanılan kurallardır. Çevri yazı, okuyucuya tekrarlanabilen ve sistemli bir erişebilirlik sağlayabilmesi açısından, kullanılan verinin dönüşüme uğramış şeklidir.

Sözlü bildirişimin incelenmesi için, katı kuralcı bir kuramsallık yapmak yerine, mevcut bütün çözümleme yöntemlerinin kullanılmasının gerektiği ifade edilmektedir. Bu çalışmada, Türkçe konuşma dilinde kullanıldıkları bağlamlarda SBlerin farklı işlevleri, katılımcıların tutumlarına, katılımcıların kendilerine ve metne karşı gösterdikleri tavra göre açıklanmaktadır. Üç SB'nin temel işlevleri, konuşma yapısı, içerik, kişilerarası ilişki işlevsel alanlarında yüklendikleri görevler açısından bütüncül bir inceleme yaklaşımıyla açıklanmaktadır.

Konuşma yapısı işlevsel alanında, temel olarak konuşma yönetimiyle ilgili olan farklı işlevler mevcuttur. Sözü bırakmama işlevi, mevcut konuşucunun sözünün henüz bitmediği ve hala söyleyeceklerinin olduğuna dinleyicilerin dikkatini çekmektedir. Diğer işlevlerinin arasında, konuşmayı başlatma ve bitirme ve konuşmada yapılan hataların düzeltilmesine işaret etme bulunmaktadır.

Konuşma yapısı işlevsel alanında yüklenilen işlevler, SBler duraklarla beraber ya da diğer SBlerle kullanıldığında, konuşucunun sözce planlama sürecinin bir parçası olarak görülmektedir. Örneğin, konuşucu bir sözcüğü bulmaya çalışırken ortaya çıkan boşluğu doldurmak için de bir SB kullanılabilir. Konuşucunun planlama zorlukları ve kararsızlığı, duraklama SBler gibi dilsel öğeler tarafından vurgulanmaktadır.

SBlerin özelliklerinin arasında, konuşucu ve onun konuyu yapılandırma sürecinde ürettiği kuruluş birimleri arasındaki ilişkiyi işaret etme gücü bulunmaktadır. Kişilerarası ilişkiyi işaret eden SBler tutum, duygu ve değerlendirmeleri ifade eder. Kişilerarası ilişkiyi işaret eden diğer işlevler arasında, bir önceki sözceye karşılık bir yanıt ya da tepkiyi, inceliği işaret eden işlevler de bulunmaktadır.

İçerik işlevsel alanındaki işlevler, konuşucunun bağdaşıklık yaratmak için sahip olduğu metinsellik kaynaklarıyla ilintilidir. İçerik işlevsel alanındaki metinsel anlam mevcut konuşma bağlamıyla birlikte metnin öncesi ve sonrasıyla da bağıntılıdır. İçerik işlevsel alanı, sınırları içinde görev alan SBler bağlamında söylemin yerel ve genel bağdaşıklık yaratma işlevlerine işaret ettiğinden, 'çerçeveleme' ve 'niteleme' işlevleri olmak üzere iki yan işlevi bulunmaktadır. Çerçeveleme işlevi, bir SB'nin genel bağdaşıklık düzeyinde, niteleme işlevi de yerel bağdaşıklık düzeyinde görev yüklendiği zaman geçerlidir.

Çerçeveleme işlevi yüklenen SBler, dinleyicinin dikkatini konuşmada içindeki bir geçiş yada kırılmaya çekme ihtiyacı duyulduğu zamanlar da kullanılır. Çerçeveleme işlevine sahip olan SBlerin gerçekleştirdiği işlevler arasında, konu değişimi gibi geçişler, ardışık sözcelerin bağıntılılığını sınırlama, önceki söylem birimleri üzerine

271

geliştirme ya da yorumlama, dolaylı anlatıma işaret etme, mesaj bilgisini düzeltme işlevleri bulunmaktadır.

Niteleme işlevi kapsamında, SBler konuşma içinde niteleme gereksinimi duyulduğunda yüklendikleri görevlere işaret eder. Niteleme işlevi gerçekleştiren SBler işlevleri arasında, anlaşmazlıkların başlangıcını, soru-cevap gibi ardışık sözceleri ve tartışmaları işaret etme, soru-cevap gibi karşılıklı değişimlerde, verilen yanıtın eksik olduğu ya da rica ve dilek taleplerinde beklentinin karşılanmadığı durumları işaret etme ve listeleme işlevleri bulunmaktadır.

İncelenen üç SB için önerilen işlevlerin tanımlanmaları için veri olarak kullanılan toplam on iki Türkçe konuşma, içinde kullanıldıkları sözcelerin içindeki kullanım yerleri, sıklıkları ve dağılımları ile ilgili bilgi de sunmaktadır. Farklı uzunluklardaki on iki konuşmada, *yani* 1032 kullanım ile sayısal olarak en sık kullanılan SB olmuştur. *Yani*'nin içinde bulunduğu sözcedeki yeri bakımından 1032 kullanımın 503'ü sözce başı, 228'i sözce ortası ve 300'ü de sözce sonunda bulunmaktadır. Toplam 851 kullanım ile ikinci en sık kullanılan SB olan *şey*'in 92'si sözce başı, 737'si sözce ortası ve 22'si de sözce sonunda bulunmaktadır. Sıklık bakımından üçüncü sırada olan *işte* toplam olarak 473 kere kullanılmıştır. Bu kullanımların 202'si sözce başı, 198'I sözce ortası ve 73'ü de sözce sonunda bulunmaktadır.

Konuşma, ortamda bulunan bütün katılımcıların işbirliğiyle sağlanan 'karşılıklı etkileşimsel bir başarı' olarak kabul görmektedir. SBler genel olarak sözlü dili yapılandırmaya yarayan söz ya da öbeklerdir. Can sıkıcı küçük söz parçacıkları olarak anılan ve sözcelerin başında ve sonunda sıklıkla kullanılan SBleri tanımlamak oldukça zordur ve özgül anlamları yoktur. SBler hem dilsel bağlama hem de kültürel çerçeveye karşı hassas olan dil öğeleridir. Doğal konuşmalarda sıklıkla kullanıldıkları ve söylem içinde yol gösterici bir edimbilimsel anlama sahip oldukları için, SBler içinde kullanıldıkları sözceyi yorumlamamızı etkilerler. Dinleyiciler için SB kullanımı, konuşmacı değişimi, yeni bir konunun başlaması ve belli bir yanıt verme gibi konuşucunun söylem içindeki sınırları işaret etme niyetine işaret eder. SBler bir çok farklı sözcük kullanmadan, konuşucuya kendi düşüncelerini ve

272

duygularını ifade etmesine yardımcı olur. Sözceler, SBler olmadan da kullanılabilirler; ancak SB kullanılıp kullanılmamasıyla konuşucunun niyeti değişebilir. Konuşucu SB kullanarak sözce'nin anlamını değiştirmek istemese de, kendi etkileşimsel amacı olan işlevin bir göstergesidir. Etkileşimsel söylem yapılandırılmıştır. SBler bu yapıyı ortaya çıkarmakta ve etkileşimin bağdaşıklığını yansıtmaktadır. Örneğin, SBler sözceleri bağlama, ayırma ve sınırlarını belirlemede önemli bir rol oynarlar.

SBler genel olarak dilin bağlaşık yapısı için gereklidirler. Örneğin, konuşmalarda konuşma sırasının sorunsuz değişimi bağlaşıktır. Her sözce bir SB ile başlamasa da, bu sözcüklerin kullanma sıklığı fazladır. Etkileşimsel işlevi olan SBler konuşmanın başında ya da katılımcının konuşma sırasını almaya çalıştığı zaman yeni başlayan sözceyi bir öncekine bağlarken kullanılırlar. Konuşmaların bitiş noktaları da sıklıkla SBlerle işaret edilirler. Konuşma sonunda kullanılan SBler de iki şekilde bağlaşıktır: Tamamlanmakta olan konuşmanın bittiğini belirterek bir önceki konuşmaya bağlar. Aynı zamanda konuşmanın bitmekte olduğunu işaret ederek bir sonraki konuşmaya bağlar. Çözümleme sürecinde, SBlerin kullanım ve yorumlarının ortaya çıkarılıp, açıklanmasında yapısal ve sosyal bağlamın rolü daha önce de belirtildi.

Görece olarak küçük bir veri bütününün incelenmesi sonucunda, incelenen üç SB'nin kullanımları, yapısal göstergelerin ötesine geçen ve etrafını çevreleyen söylemi ana bilgi kaynağı olarak, çözümleme yöntemiyle uygun bir şekilde açıklanabileceğini gösterilmiştir. Kullanılan kuramsal çerçeve, konuşma ve söylem incelemeleri ve işlevsel yaklaşımdan her birinin güçlü taraflarını kullanmıştır.

Üç SB olan *yani*, *işte* ve *şey* titiz bir çözümlemeye tabi tutulmuştur ve her bir SB analizi ayrı bir bölüm oluşturmaktadır. Her bölümde, her bir SB açıklayıcı veri parçalarıyla derinlemesine bir deneye dayalı bir çözümlemeye tabi tutulmuştur

Veri çözümlemesi üç SB arasında *yani*'nin en sık kullanılan SB olduğunu göstermiştir. *Yani*'nin kullanımına odaklanan dördüncü bölümde, *yani*'nin üç işlevsel alanda da görev yüklendiğini gördük. Bulunan sonuçlar şöyledir:

<u>Konuşma Yapısı İşlevsel Alanı</u>: Konuşmanın yapısal görünüşünde *yani* 'konuşma başlatma', 'soruya verilen cevabı karşılama', 'konuşma bitirme', 'konuşmayı bekletme' ve 'hata düzeltme' gibi işlevler yüklenmektedir.

Konuşma başlatma işlevi, *yani*'nin konuşmayı başlatma aygıtı olarak, çoğunlukla 'kendini-seçme' yoluyla konuşma sırasının geçişini sağlar. Bu işlevde *yani* sürekli konuşma sırası başında bulunur. Aynı şekilde, katılımcılardan birinin sorduğu soruya verilen cevap *yani* ile başlayabilir. 'Konuşma bitirme', aynı şekilde, konuşma sırası geçişi ile ilintilidir ve *yani*'nin buradaki rolü mevcut konuşmacının tamamlanmak üzere olan konuşmasındaki son sözcenin son öğesi olarak, konuşmanın bitiminin yaklaştığına işaret eder. *Yani*'nin konu geliştirme işleviyle yakından ilgili olan başka bir işlevi de konuşmacının konuyla ilgili daha fazla söyleyeceklerinin olduğu için konuşma sırasını vermemesidir. *Yani*'nin temel işlevlerinden biri de hata düzeltme organizasyonu ile ilintilidir. Konuşmacının kendi konuşmasının bir bölümünü aydınlatmayı işaret eden işlevi 'kendini-düzeltme' işlevidir. Birbirine benzeyen konu gelişimi ile kendini-düzeltme işlevleri arasındaki fark, konu gelişiminde genel bir fikrin daha özelleştirilmesi, kendini-düzeltmede de konu ile ilgili biraz önce geçen bir noktanın detaylandırılmasıdır.

<u>İçerik İşlevsel Alanına ait Çerçeveleme İşlevi</u>: *Yani*'nin çerçeveleme işlevleri esas olarak 'konu genişletme' ve 'özet değerlendirme' dir. Sözce başında kullanıldığı zaman, *yani* konuşmacının, konunun az önceki bir noktasını değiştirip düzeltmesine işaret ediyor. Örnek verme, konu değiştirme ve bir konuyu tekrar gündeme getirme gibi işlevleri olan *yani* bunu iki şekilde gerçekleştirir. 'Yerel düzey' de *yani* mevcut konuşmacının olduğu kadar diğer katılımcıların da başlattığı konu geliştirmelerine işaret eder. 'Yerel düzey' de sözce başında bulunan *yani* konu genişlemesini konuşmacının sözü sırasında gerçekleştiğine, 'Genel düzey' de diğer katılımcıların da başlattığı konu gelişimlerine işaret eder. Bu işlevlerin ortak yönü, *yani*'den önce geçen noktanın açıklanmasına işaret eder. *Yani* böylece dinleyicilerin dikkatini konunun önceki bölümlerine odaklamalarına yardımcı olur. Diğer işlev olan özet değerlendirme de, ilerleyen konunun konuşmacı tarafından özet şeklinde değerlendirmesine işaret eder. Bu kullanımda *yani* yine sözce başındadır ve konuşmacının ya son sözcesinin ya da konuşmasındaki son sözcesini işaret eder.

Kişilerarası İlişki İşlevinde; sözce sonunda bulunan *yani*, sözlü bildirişimin yönetimiyle ilintili olduğundan bağlayıcı değil, etkileşimsel yönü ağır basan konumlandırıcı işlev yüklenmektedir. *Yani*'nin yardımıyla, konuşmacı gerçekleştirdiği bildirişim eylemine karşı gösterdiği kişisel bağlılığa işaret etmekte ve ürettiği sözcenin inanılırlığını arttırmaktadır. *Yani*'nin sözce sonundaki kullanımlarına bakıldığında, konuşmacı ve dinleyicilerin gerçekleştirdikleri bildirişimde gösterdikleri katılım ve işbirliğini işaret etme işlevini görüyoruz. Konuşmacı *yani*'yi kullanarak kendisi ve diğer katılımcılar arasında bir uzlaşma olduğuna işaret ediyor. Diğer bir deyişle, konuşmacı *yani*'nin yardımıyla, ürettiği önermenin kendi kişisel fikri olduğuna işaret eder. Konuşmacının ürettiği önermeye karşı takındığı tavır, *yani*'nin bir etki yarattığı çevrelerde açık bir şekilde ortaya çıkar. Bu etki, konuşmacının samimiyetine ve ürettiği önermeye yaptığı vurguya işaret eder. Konuşmacı kendi söz sırasında *yani*'yi tek başına kullandığında, bir önceki konuşmacının önermesine karşı gösterdiği kısmi ya da tam uzlaşmaya işaret eder.

Yani gibi incelenen ve çözümlenen diğer bir SB olan *işte* ile ilgili bulgu ve sonuçlar şöyledir:

Konuşma Yapı İşlevsel Alanı: *İşte*'nin konuşma başındaki kullanımlarının anlatı başlatma işlevine sahiptir. *İşte*, konuşma başında bulunan özgül sözce yapısı içinde kullanıldığında, rekabetçi bir konuşma ortamında kişisel anlatıların gerçekleştirilebilmesi için konuşma sırasının normalden daha uzun süre ile konuşmacıda olacağına işaret eder. Kendini-seçme yoluyla gerçekleşen konuşmanın *işte* ile başlatılması, konuşma sırası geçişlerine de işaret etmektedir. *İşte* ile başlatılan konuşmaların çoğu değişik ve farklı bir konu değil, mevcut konunun devamıdır.

Konuşma sırası geçişleri *işte*'nin sözce başındaki kullanımlarıyla sınırlı değildir. Başka bir gösterici ifade olan *böyle* ile birlikte '*işte böyle*' olarak kullanımı, bu sefer yaklaşmakta olan konuşma sonuna işaret etmektedir. Bu kullanımıyla *işte*, konuşmacının söyleyeceklerinin bittiğini ve söz sırasının başkasına geçebileceğine işaret eder.

İçerik İşlevsel Alanına ait Çerçeveleme İşlevi: Bu işlevsel alanda *işte*'nin esas işlevlerinden biri 'örneklendirme/detaylandırma' dır. *İşte*'nin bu kullanımıyla konuşmacı geliştirmekte olduğu konunun belli bir bölümüyle ilgili örnek ya da detaylı bilgi vererek, o bölümün sınırlarını belirler. *İşte*'nin bu işlevsel alanda diğer bir işlevi de, konuşulan konuya ait belli bir bilgi parçacığına dikkat çekerek, o bilgiyi yarattığı önermedeki diğer bilgi parçalarından ayırmaktır.

İşte'nin örnekleme yoluyla sınırlama işleviyle ilintili olan diğer bir işlevi de, mevcut konuşmacının yarattığı önerme içinde, kendisine değil başkasına ait olan bilginin sınırlarını belirlemektir.

Aynı işlevsel alanda *işte*'nin son bir işlevi de, konu değişimi yada farklılaşması sonucu konuşmacının daha önceki konuya dönüş yapmasına işaret eder. Böylece, ardışık bağlayıcılık ve süreklilik işlevlerini işaret eden *yani*'den farklı olarak, *işte*'nin sözce başındaki bu kullanımı geriye-bağlantı yoluyla birbiri ardına gelmeyen ama birbirinden uzak konuları bağlama işlevine işaret etmektedir.

İçerik İşlevsel Alanına ait Niteleme İşlevi: Bu işlevsel alanda, *işte*'nin sözce başı kullanımı tercih organizasyonunda, sorulan sorunun tam karşılığı olmayan bir cevabın başına gelip, onu niteleyerek bu işlevi gerçekleştirmektedir.

Son olarak çözümlemeye tabi tutunan SB olan *şey*' in iki ayrı kullanımı olduğu ortaya çıkmıştır. Sonek almayan *şey*, kullanıldığı çevrelerde herhangi bir ek almadan yalnız başına durabilmektedir. Sonek alabilen *şey* ise, çeşitli sonekler alabilmektedir. *Şey*, genel olarak, konuşucunun hatırlamaya ve çıkarmaya çalıştığı bilgiyi işaretleyen bir işlev yüklenmektedir. İncelenip çözümlenen son SB olan *şey* ile ilgili bulgu ve sonuçlar şöyledir:

Konuşma Yapı İşlevsel alanı: *Şey*, esas olarak, bu işlevsel alanda konuşmacının bir sonraki hamlesinde ne söyleyeceğine ilişkin eylemsi planlamasına işaret etmektedir. Eylemsi planlama süreci içinde, *şey* konuşmacının konuşma sırasının kaybetmemesine ve konuşma sırasını kendinde tutmasına da yardımcı olur. Sonek

alan *şey* konuşmacının kendi-hatasını düzeltme işlevine işaret etmeyle özgül bir hata düzeltme organizasyonunda rol oynamaktadır.

Sonek alan *şey*, konuşmacının kendi konuşma sırasında sözcük arama işlevini başlatan, 'kendi-başlattığı kendi hatasını-düzeltme' diye adlandırılan bir hata düzeltme türüne işaret eder. Sonek alan *şey*, aranılan sözcüğün geçici olarak yerine geçer ve çoğu kez de daha sonra uygun bir sözcük ile yer değiştirir. Aranılan sözcüğün bulunup kullanılamadığı durumlarda ise, konuşmacı, diğer katılımcıların sonek alan *şey*'in anlamını ortak olarak paylaşılan bilgiden ya da mevcut konuşma ortamından çıkarmaları bekler.

Kişilerarası İlişki İşlevi: Hata düzeltme organizasyonundaki önemli işleviyle ilintili olarak, bu işlevsel alanda, sonek alan *şey*, konuşmacının sözcük arama çabasına işaret ederken, eşzamanlı olarak, sakınma göstergesi olarak da rol oynar ve konuşmacının kendi ya da diğer katılımcılarla ilgili bir değerlendirme/iddiada bulunurken gösterdiği inceliğe işaret eder. Kullanma sıklığı ve doğal gelişen konuşma ve eylemsi söylemi yapılandırmadaki rolüyle beraber düşünüldüğünde, her iki tür *şey*'in her iki kullanımının Türkçe'nin vazgeçilmez bir öğesi olduğu görülmektedir.

Yapılan diğer araştırmalar ve bu çalışmanın veri çözümlemesi ve sonuçlarını değerlendirdiğimizde, SBlerin işlevlerini tanımlamanın tek bir işlevsel alan ile sınırlandırılamayacağı ortaya çıkmaktadır. SBlerin farklı işlevsel alanlarda görev yüklenmesinin yanında, bu alanlarda eşzamanlı görev yaptıklarından, incelenen ve çözümlenen üç SB'nin de konuşma Türkçe'sinin farklı görünüşlerinde çoklu işlevler yüklendiği ortaya çıkmıştır.

SBlerin konuşmayı yapılandırma birimleri içindeki konumları ve kullanımları, onlara yüklenen rol ve işlevleri ortaya çıkarmaktadır. Örneğin, SBlerin sözce başı ve sözce sonundaki kullanımları, konuşma sırasının geçişi ve konuşmanın başlaması ve bitişine işaret eden işlevleri yüklenmektedir. Aynı şekilde, yine sözce başı ve sonu kullanımları, konu ya da konuşma yapısıyla ilgili olarak, konuyu geliştirme, açıklama

ve konuşmayı devam ettirme işlevleriyle açıklanabilmektedir. Üç SB, aynı zamanda, sakınma (sonek alan *şey*), ön plana çıkarma (*işte*) ve konuşma sırasını bırakmama (her üç SB) gibi işlevlere işaret eden etkileşimsel stratejileri sergilemektedir. Sergiledikleri işlevler ve üstlendikleri bütün rolleri göz önünde bulundurduğumuzda, üç SB'nin de söylem yapılandırıcı ve etkileşimsel işlevler üstlenerek, bildirişimin sonuçta başarıya ulaşmasına katkıda bulunduğu ortaya çıkmıştır.

Veri incelemsi ve çözümlemesi sonucu, bu çalışmadan aşağıdaki sonuçları çıkarmak mümkündür:

* Veri çözümlemesinin sonuçları, esas olarak İngilizce için geliştirilen ve bu dilde uygulanan konuşma, söylem incelemesi ve işlevsel kuramsal yaklaşımlarının, Türkçe gibi farklı bir dil ailesine ait olan bir dilde de gerçekçi ve uygulanabilir olduğunu göstermiştir.

* Çoğunlukla geleneksel ya da dönüşümsel-üretimsel yaklaşımlara dayalı olarak üretilen Türkçe'nin mevcut dilbilgisel betimlemeleri, konuşma-çözümlemesine yönelik çalışmaların sonuçları doğrultusunda yeniden yapılmalıdır. Bu anlamda, mevcut çalışma, Türkçe'de söylem ve konuşma çözümlemesi alanında az çalışılan konu olan SBler gibi bir konunun detaylı bir şekilde incelenmesi, konuşma Türkçe'nin betimlenmesi açısından bir yeniliktir.

* Üç SB'nin bütüncül bir yaklaşımla inceleme sonucu, bütün sonuçların geçerliliği bu çalışmanın çerçevesinde yorumlanmalıdır ve benzer türde başka veri incelemesi sonuçları ortaya çıktıkça yapılan yorumlar gelişecektir. Bu sebeple, veri sonuçları alternatif yorumlara açıktır. Bu çalışmanın sonuçları tekrarlanamayabilir. Tekrarlanabilir olan, SBlerin incelemesinde kullanılan ve uygulanan, ve mevcut çalışmanın temelini oluşturan yöntemsel ve kuramsal çerçevesidir.

SBlerin evrensel bazı özelliklere sahip oldukları ve her dilde söylem-edimbilimsel görevler yüklendikleri iddia edilse de, daha önce belirtildiği gibi, bu çalışmanın sonuçlarının da gösterdiği gibi, SBleri tanımlayan özelliklerle ilgili genellemeler yapmadan önce, dünya'daki diğer dillerde de deneye dayalı incelemelerin yapılması

gerekmektedir. Dillerin yapısal özelliklerine bakmaksızın, her konuşmada katılımcılarının etkileşimsel stratejilerini gösteren sözcük ve ifadeler bulunmaktadır. Örneğin, uzlaşma, dinleyici katılımı, vurgu gibi işlevlerin mutlaka belli bir dilsel öğe tarafından ifade edilmektedir. Diller bu anlamda birbirlerine benzemektedirler. Ancak, farklı olan bu tür işlevlerin farklı dillerde farklı yollarla gerçekleştirilmesidir. Bu anlamda, SBler bazı evrensel özelliklere sahip olsalar da, dillere özgü SB özelliklerinin olduğu da kabul edilmelidir.

SBler doğal gelişen sözlü iletişimin önemli bir parçasıdır ve kullanılma sıklığıyla da bildirişime katılan katılımcılar arasındaki samimiyete işaret etmektedir. SBlerin belirgin etkileşimsel önemine rağmen, dil öğrenme sürecinde en son öğrenilen dilsel öğelerden biri olması da ilginç bir tespittir. SBlerin doğru kullanımının öğrenilmesi, kişinin dilsel yeterliğinin gelişmesiyle ilgilidir. Sonuç olarak, sosyal hayatın vazgeçilmez iletişim aracı olan sözlü bildirişimin sorunsuz yönetimi ve gerçekleştirilmesinde önemli rol oynayan SBlerin yanlış kullanımları, yapılan dilbilgisel hatalardan daha önemli etkileşimsel sonuçlar doğurabileceği de hatırlanmalıdır.

VITA

Erkan Yılmaz was born in Bursa on March 05, 1968. He received his B.A. degree in English Language Teaching from Uludağ University in June 1991 and after working as a research assistant at Uludağ University for two years, he went to England and received his M.A. degree from University of Essex, England in 1994. He has been a research assistant at METU at the Department of Foreign Languages for the last three years. His main areas of interest are Pragmatics, Conversation Analysis, Discourse Analysis and ELT.