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Abstract

This dissertation is a bid to clarify the status of discourse markers, DMs from now onwards, a tough task due to the large diversity and opposing approaches regarding this field of study. In the last 30 years, the research of discourse markers experienced an ever increasing interest; thus, under the same body of research we find various labels to refer to the members of this category, including discourse connectives, discourse operator, discourse markers, discourse particles, pragmatic expressions, pragmatic markers and pragmatic particles among others. In line with this, the main aim of this paper is the study of discourse markers in present-day written and spoken English with particular attention to one of the most frequent ‘well’ in written and spoken English.

Most scholars do agree on the idea that discourse markers are words or expressions that relate and organise discourse. However, there is little agreement as to how they are to be defined or what their primary functions are. In order to shape a coherent definition and a proposal of their syntactic and semantic properties, I will rely on various approaches provided by different scholars, on previous theoretical research.

All things considered, I define discourse markers as multifunctional linguistic items that occur within discourse, yet they are not part of the propositional content of the message and do not contribute to the meaning of the proposition. In addition, they are seen as free morphemes that occur in initial position, even though they can be also found in medial and final position, and they are used to mark the relationship within discourse. Moreover, they must follow the sequence S1-DM-S2, where S1 and S2 are understood as discourse segments; in some cases, the elision of the DM may have taken place, an issue to take into account in the analysis.
List of Tables

Table 1: Frequency of *well* as DM in spoken English (BNC)  35
Table 2: Types of *well* by genre (BNC)  37
Table 3: Frequency of *well* as DM in written English (BNC)  38
Table 4: Types of *well* in writtenness by genre (BNC)  40
Table 5: Frequency of *well* as DM in spoken and written English (BNC)  42
Table 6: Types of *well* in spoken and written contexts by genre (BNC)  42
Table 7: Frequency of *well* as DM in spoken English (COCA)  44
Table 8: Types of *well* in spokenness (COCA)  45
Table 9: Frequency of *well* as DM in written English (COCA)  47
Table 10: Types of *well* in writtenness by genre (COCA)  48
Table 11: Frequency of *well* as DM in spoken and written English (COCA)  49
Table 12: Types of *well* in spoken and written contexts by genre (COCA)  49
Table 13: Frequency of *well* as DM in spoken British (BNC) and American English (COCA)  51
Table 14: Types of *well* in spoken British and American English (BNC) vs (COCA)  52
Table 15: Frequency of *well* as DM in written British and American English (BNC) vs (COCA)  53
Table 16: Types of *well* in written British and American English (BNC) vs (COCA)  54

List of Figures

Figure 1: Screenshot of the general search of *well* in BNC  26
Figure 2: First ten examples of a random list of *well* in BNC  26
Figure 3: Screenshot of the general search of *well* in COCA  27
Figure 4: First ten examples of a random list of *well* in COCA  28
# Table of Contents

**Abstract**

Chapter 1. DMs: general overview  
1.0. Introduction 1  
2.0. Primary hardships of the field 2  
2.1. Theoretical frameworks 2  
2.2. Terminology 3  
3.0. Conceptual background 6  
3.1. Discourse markers: definition 6  
3.2. Discourse markers: main features 8  
3.3. Discourse markers: main functions 14  
3.3.1. Set of functions 15  
3.3.2. Textual and interpersonal functions 17  
4.0. Discourse markers: taxonomy 18  
5.0. Context of occurrence and importance of intonation in speech 20

Chapter 2. The DM *well*: analysis 23  
6.0. Empirical study 23  
6.1. Introductory remarks 23  
6.2. Methodology 24  
6.2.1. British National Corpus (BNC) 24  
6.2.2. Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA) 26  
6.3.1. *Well*: introduction 28  
6.3.2. *Well*: functions 30  
6.3.3. *Well*: BNC evidence and analysis 34  
6.3.3.1. *Well*: data scrutiny and analysis 34  
6.3.3.2. *Well*: spokenness 34  
6.3.3.2.1. *Well*: frequencies in spokenness 34  
6.3.3.2.2. *Well*: pragmatic functions in spokenness (BNC) 36  
6.3.3.3. *Well*: writtenness 38
6.3.3.3.1. \textit{Well}: frequencies in writtenness 38
6.3.3.3.2. \textit{Well}: pragmatic functions in writtenness 40
6.3.3.4. \textit{Well}: spokenness vs writtenness 41
6.3.4. \textit{Well}: COCA evidence and analysis 43
   6.3.4.1. \textit{Well}: data scrutiny and analysis 43
   6.3.4.2. \textit{Well}: spokenness 43
   6.3.4.2.1. \textit{Well}: frequencies in spokenness 44
   6.3.4.2.2. \textit{Well}: pragmatic functions in writtenness 45
   6.3.4.3. \textit{Well}: writtenness 46
   6.3.4.3.1. \textit{Well}: frequencies in writtenness 46
   6.3.4.3.2. \textit{Well}: pragmatic functions in writtenness 47
   6.3.4.4. \textit{Well}: spokenness vs writtenness 48
6.4. \textit{Well}: BrE vs AmE comparison 50
   6.4.1. \textit{Well}: frequencies in spoken (BNC) vs (COCA) 51
   6.4.2. \textit{Well}: pragmatic functions in spoken (BNC) vs (COCA) 52
   6.4.3. \textit{Well}: frequencies in written (BNC) vs (COCA) 53
   6.4.4. \textit{Well}: pragmatic functions in written (BNC) vs (COCA) 54
6.5. Discussion 55
7.0. Summary and concluding remarks 61

Bibliography 64

Appendix A: \textit{well} in BrE 71
Appendix B: \textit{well} in AmE 77
Chapter 1

DMs: General overview

1.0. Introduction

Not too long ago, linguistic items such as oh, because, you know, you see, uh huh, o.k., really, anyway, mind you, well, so, right, I mean, like or actually were “merely considered ‘fillers’ used in spoken language, or optional items empty of lexical meaning that were assumed not to contribute anything to the proposition of the utterance or sentence in which they occur” (Callies, 2009: 29-30).

During the last 30 years, around the decade of the 1990s, the research of what is broadly referred to as DMs experienced an ever increasing interest concerning theoretical and practical approaches, generating a vast body of research (Callies, 2009: 29-30). As a result of a steady growth on the study of discourse markers, there is a good deal of relevant books in this area, namely Schiffrin (1987), Fraser (1990), Brinton (1996), Jucker & Ziv (1998), Lenk (1998), Hansen (1998), Schourup (1999), Andersen & Fretheim (2000), Fischer (2000), Aijmer & Simon (2006), to mention some of the most relevant and widely known. It is to point out that the study of discourse markers is a field of linguistics inquiry, that is to say, the study of discourse markers belongs to the field of linguistics.

Bearing in mind the sources just mentioned, I shall set forth herein what seems to be, in my humble opinion, a coherent and constructive definition of what discourse markers are.

On the one hand, in Chapter 1, I will review previous theoretical works fully devoted to their theoretical particularities; in other words, I will provide an overview of their main linguistic features regarding their definition, depiction and formal characteristics. Following this, attention will be paid to the syntactic, semantic and pragmatic features of the members of this category.
On the other hand, Chapter 2 will be of a practical nature and it will be fully devoted to the analysis of the discourse marker *well*, aiming at closely examining whether it is more frequent in spoken or written language, the ways it functions in both contexts, and the similarities and differences between its use in British and American English. This analysis is carried out analysing material extracted from two central corpora: BNC (*British National Corpus*), and COCA (*Corpus of Contemporary American English*). It is to consider that relevant variation will be found in their frequency of appearance depending on whether they are used in spoken or written language, and also according to the variety of English in question, British English versus American English. This dissertation will conclude with a number of reflections on the basis of data analysed which will hopefully make a contribution to this particular field of study.

2.0. **Primary hardships of the field**

2.1. **Theoretical framework**

The wide load of research works in this area of analysis, as previously listed above, is the result of the study of DMs under several and different frameworks, among them; discourse analysis, relevance theory, argumentation theory, empirical analysis, etcetera, as suggested by Aijmer & Simon (2006: 1).

Nonetheless, despite such an extensive body of research, a general model was not established and consensus was not reached among scholars (Aijmer & Simon, 2006: 1). After all, a general framework concerning theory is currently lacking and, as a consequence, the recognition of what is meant by discourse markers results in an arduous task. This implies that difficulties are encountered in the definition and classification of DMs, mainly their classification at the semantic...
and pragmatic stages (Aijmer & Simon, 2006: 1-2). Likewise, issues are also found in the identification of the various functions of these linguistic items.

In this respect, it is to mention that Jucker & Ziv (1998: 1) refer to some of the functions of the members of this category as “discourse connectors, turn-takers, confirmation-seekers, intimacy signals, topic switchers, hesitation markers, boundary markers, fillers, prompters, repair markers, attitude markers and hedging devices.”

Therefore, in order to provide a general framework with reference to DMs, some concerns such as what is considered by discourse markers as well as the dimensions of their context need to be solved (Aijmer & Simon, 2006: 1-2). Thus, these issues will be dealt with over the course of my dissertation. However, especial attention will be paid in Chapter 1 since it is fully devoted to a theoretical framework, as a result, these matters will be tackled in close detail.

2.2. Terminology

In the current section of my dissertation I will discuss the lack of general agreement on terminology and, by the same token, I will provide a justification for the use of the term ‘discourse marker’ instead of any of the others presented in the list below.

As mentioned above, the study of DMs, in spite of being a recent field of study, has been a main subject matter, leading to a good deal of studies during the last 30 years. In fact, the existence of diverse terms in order to refer to this category is prompted by the existence of a wide range of varied frameworks previously specified, an extensive number of studies together with a high number of approaches (see section 2.1).

As a result of this, a vast number of different terms were coined depending on the purpose or perspective adopted in the study in question. More to the point, a sample of the terms used in
different works with different purposes, expanded from the original list by Brinton (1996: 29), are illustrated hereafter: comment clause, connective, continuer, discourse connectives, discourse-deictic item, discourse operator, discourse markers, discourse particle, discourse-shift maker, discourse word, filler, fumble, gambit, hedge, initiator, insert, interjection, marker, marker of pragmatic structure, phatic connectives, parenthetic phrase, pragmatic connective, pragmatic expression, pragmatic markers, pragmatic particle and reaction signal.

Due to the little consensus on terminology, the initiative of choosing a suitable term among the listed before, already in use, may end up in a fuzzy or puzzle-solving task. The term I shall propose and use over the course of this paper is that of discourse marker, there, I will refer to some of the principles I have considered to come to this final decision.

According to Aijmer & Simon (2006: 2-3), the terms ‘pragmatic markers’, ‘discourse markers’, ‘pragmatic particle’ and ‘discourse particle’ are used by some scholars as synonyms although some others disagree as they claim these terms partly overlap categories. She also suggests that “the diversity of terms may reflect different linguistic approaches of the markers” (Aijmer & Simon 2006: 2-3).

Firstly, it is to notice that a discrepancy arouses among the use of whether marker or particle; yet, according to Brinton (1996: 29), the term marker is advisable to either word or particle since she suggests that the use of marker, instead, covers either single-words items such as so as well as phrases i.e. you know. What is more, Brinton (1996: 29) maintains that particle is a term used for ‘modal particles’ and may describe a different syntactic class.

Secondly, another issue that raises concern is whether the term discourse or pragmatic should be used to refer to the members of this category of DMs. Following the guidelines provided by Brinton (1996: 30), both of these terms are suitably broad, that is to say, items which denote a function on a level above the syntax of the individual clause and not to a particular function as is the case of filler, for instance.
At this stage, therefore, the arguments just mentioned led me to the conclusion that marker is the most suitable term, covering a wide extent of concepts under the same umbrella. However, at this point, there is an issue that raises concern; both pragmatic and discourse seem to be suitable terms to refer to this category of linguistic items, I have already chosen one of the two terms though.

As a consequence, I shall shed some light hereafter on the theories that let me come to this conclusion, more accurately, to the choice of discourse upon pragmatic. In order to choose one of these two terms, I relied on the argument provided by Jucker & Ziv (1998: 2) who claim that “one with the widest currency and the least restricted range of application: one that enables us to include a broad variety of elements under a single conceptual umbrella, being discourse marker a versatile and convenient cover term”.

Furthermore, for Schourup (1999: 242), “the term discourse marker typically refers to a more or less open class of syntactically optional, non-truth-conditional connective expressions”, where there seems to be a certain degree of approval as to the defining criteria. Moreover, Schiffrin (1987: 41) defines DMs as verbal and non-verbal devices, not restricting the term to only lexical items but also non-lexical ones. On that basis, the term discourse marker does not imply a pejorative connotation as, for instance, the words fumble or gambit (Aijmer & Simon, 2006: 2-3).

Once the choice was made, this enables me to sub-classify discourse markers according to detailed functional and formal characteristics.
3.0. Conceptual background

3.1. Discourse markers: definition

It is necessary to mention, beforehand, the little agreement as to what is the finest and most accurate definition of the members of this category, hence, the following collection of definitions hold little resemblance to one another (Brinton, 1996: 30). Opposite to Fraser (2009: 298), I shall refer to discourse markers as linguistic items as it is, to my knowledge, a more inclusive and versatile category than lexical items. However, in spite of the fact that Fraser (2009: 298) refers to this set of items as lexical ones, he further maintains that discourse markers do not only consist of lexical expressions. In my view, Fraser’s approach regarding lexical items excludes “syntactic structures, prosodic features such as stress, pauses, and intonation, and non-verbal expressions such as a grunt or a shrug.” (Fraser, 2009: 298). In this respect, conversely, Schiffrin (1987: 41) approaches DMs as “discourse markers […] members of a functional class of verbal and (non-verbal) devices”, however, it is also to point out that she did not supply a non-verbal discourse marker.

Once we reach the section 3.3, all these differences will become more clear since I will be dealing with the wide range of the functions of discourse markers, including here those which are considered to be primary.

Therefore, in order to proceed to a definition, I shall display a list based on Brinton’s one (1996: 30). Such a list will be divided into five different approaches as to what the main functions of discourse markers are. Likewise, each and every of the approaches gathers together different pieces of evidence listed (A-O). Nevertheless, the major amount of scholars came to the same conclusion, the range (A-E) of functions are seen as primary, therefore, they forge a broad-based consensus on the definition. For this simple reason, these functions will be tackled at the very beginning in this following listing.
• Discourse markers express a relation or relevance between the preceding utterance or context and the current utterance or context in which they occur, that is to say, DMs are:

A. Expressions used in order to indicate the relevant dependence of one discourse segment on another (Blakemore, 1987: 125).

B. Expressions used to signal the relationship of an utterance to the immediate context (Redeker, 1990: 372) with the primary function of bringing to the listener’s attention a particular sort of linkage of the forthcoming utterance with the immediate discourse context (Redeker, 1991: 1168).

C. Marking devices that demonstrate the speaker’s understanding of the contribution’s sequential relation or relevance to the information set as established by the immediately preceding contributions (Goldberg, 1980: 141).

D. Devices that signal a sequential discourse relationship as well as how the speaker intends the message that follows to relate to the previous discourse (Fraser, 1988: 21; 1990: 387-392).

E. Sequentially dependent elements which bracket units of talk (Schiffrin, 1987: 31), in other words, elements that work on a discourse level, not on smaller units of talk that conform discourse.

• Discourse markers are primarily structural as the central function, that implies:

F. Certain set of signals in the talker’s speech used to introduce level shifts within the conversation or to prepare listeners for the next turn in the logical argument (Keller, 1979: 220).

G. Expressions that help the speaker divide the message into chunks of information and hence helping the listener decode the information units (Erman, 1986: 146).

H. Vehicles for demarcation and concatenation which specifically express organisational relations both locally and formally (Even-Zohar, 1982: 179-170).

• Discourse markers seen as response signals, in other words:
I. They constitute the range of conventionalised responses in English mediating between the covert thinking of participants and displayed verbal behaviour (Schourup, 1985: 3).

J. They indicate, quite often in very complex ways, how the utterance that contains discourse markers is a response to, or a continuation of, some portion of the previous discourse (Levinson, 1983: 87-88).

- Discourse markers as a means to achieve conversational continuity, which entails:

K. They are conventionalised ways of plugging potential gaps, reducing those gaps to such an extent that these are not even perceived by the interlocutor (Edmondson, 1981: 154).

L. They are used to maintain the continuity of discourse (Crystal & Davy, 1975: 88-91).

M. They fill the silence and maintain the speaker’s right to speak while they organise the information they want to say (Brown, 1977: 109).

- Discourse markers should be regarded as ‘essentially interactive’ (Stubbs, 1983: 70); that means,:

N. Markers which implicitly anchor the act of communication to the speaker’s attitudes towards aspects of the on-going interaction (Östman, 1981: 5; 1982: 152).

O. Vehicles for the establishment and maintenance of interpersonal relations between interlocutors (James, 1983: 193).

3.2. Discourse markers: main features

Hereafter, I shall provide a numbered list, for ease of reference, that includes some of the main and common features or characteristics of discourse markers. The fact that there is not a consensus, in relation to such characteristics of discourse markers, led me to gather together the most remarkable ones suggested by different authors.
Taking Schiffrin’s 1987 work as a referential point in the light of the effect she caused on this field of study of discourse markers, I shall start this list of common features focusing on the ones supplied by this author.

As Schiffrin suggests, the magnitude of such an approach does not only request knowledge of the shared characteristics of a vast and, most importantly, varied group of expressions, but also analysis across different languages in order to find out other linguistic resources as to what makes a certain expression a discourse marker.

On top of it all, Schiffrin (1987: 328) makes a tentative suggestion as to what specific linguistic conditions allow a particular word or expressions to be used as a marker, that is, the delimitation of discourse markers as to what sorts of words or expressions are considered to be markers. Thus, according to Schiffrin (1987: 328):

I. A discourse marker has to be syntactically detachable from a sentence; in other words, separable from the clause. Consider, for example, the following:

(1) **In other words**, lack of financial resources can contribute to homelessness (BNCF87S_meeting)

II. It has to be commonly used in the initial position of an utterance although it can also be found medially and in final position.

(2) The rest, **of course**, is history. (BNCCH1W_newsp_tabloid)

III. It has to have a range of prosodic contours (e.g. tonic stress and followed by a pause, phonological reduction). Obviously, this feature can only be applied to speaking contexts.

(3) They will have to pick us up **cos** our pass is not valued till eight o’ clock. (BNCD95S_meeting)

---

1 The examples here included have all been extracted from the British National Corpus and they have been referenced according to the codes provided by this corpus. S stands for spoken where W represents writing.
IV. It has to be able to operate at both local and global levels of discourse as well as on different planes of discourse.

(4) The traditional forces for voting, namely party loyalty and social class (BNCW_ac-Polit_law-Edu)

V. It either has to have no meaning, a vague meaning, or to be reflexive (of the language, of the speaker).

(5) Client reports and things like that. (BNCFUKS_meeting)

Zwicky (1985: 303-304), prior to Schiffrin, suggested that DMs tend to occur at the beginning of sentences to serve as a mechanism for continuing conversation. Moreover, he also argues that DMs are prosodically separated from their surrounding context by means of pauses and intonation breaks. However, Zwicky notes they are usually monomorphemic, yet morphologically complex and syntactically isolated; in other words, they are isolated from the sentence or context in which they occur.

In addition, Schiffrin makes a generalisation, noting that any expression that operates within at least one discourse component has the particularity of being able to become a marker that operates within other discourse components, simply due to the integration among components. In order to support her own approach, the author provides the reader with a brief explanation of what she means by this. She says that those expressions by means of which speakers show their orientation toward a proposition, “e.g. an adverb such as surely, an interjection such as God, a polarity term such as yeh”, have the particularity of being able to become markers of other discourse components. Likewise, some other expressions such as those used by speakers either to organise action and exchange structures or to structure ideas and information states, also share this particularity of being able to become markers (Schiffrin, 1987: 329).
Jucker & Ziv (1998: 3) condense the conditions provided, previously, by Hölker (1991: 78-79) as to what a discourse marker entails. One aspect to bear in mind, as pointed out by Jucker & Ziv (1998: 3), is the fact that Hölker (1991: 78-79) approached these linguistic items as pragmatic markers, an event that reinforces the idea of such a fuzzy terminology tackled previously (see section 2.2). Hölker (1991: 78-79) applied the following features to discourse markers:

VI. They do not affect the truth conditions of an utterance.

(6) Well, I think that er, you know, just didn’t happen like that. (BNCD95S_meeting)

VII. They do not add anything to the propositional content of an utterance, for instance, well in the previous example.

VIII. They are related to the speech situation and not to the situation talked about.

(7) Of course, we haven’t got there yet. (BNCW_fic_drama)

IX. They have an emotive expressive function rather than a referential, denotative, or cognitive function.

(8) Wow, it’s working. (BNCW_Newsp_other_report)

Jucker & Ziv (1998: 3) go a step further, categorising the features VI and VII as semantic in nature, the VIII as pragmatic and, last but not least, the IX as functional.

Jucker & Ziv (1998: 3) were responsible for the adaptation and abbreviation of Brinton’s (1996) list, a longer one including the basic features of DMs. However, it may lead to confusion due to no further explanation, in this case, I shall not stick to Jucker & Ziv (1998: 3) as I consider their proposal vague regarding some of the characteristics of discourse markers. For the purpose of offering a clarifying list that allows a better understanding of such features, I shall adopt the division illustrated by Jucker & Ziv, a reordered list which gathers together features that belong to the same level of linguistic description, going back to some particular features originally provided in Brinton’s whole list.
• Phonological and lexical features:

X. They are short and often phonologically reduced.

XI. They form a separate tone group with falling-rising or rising intonation. (see section 5.0)

XII. They are marginal forms and hence difficult to place within a traditional word class.

• Syntactic features:

XIII. They are said to be restricted to sentence-initial position, or may always occur sentence initially. However, as Brinton (1996: 33) points out, basing herself on different studies of individual markers, they frequently appear sentence medially and finally as well.

XIV. They occur outside the syntactic structure or they are only loosely attached to it and hence have no clear grammatical function.

XV. They are optional rather than obligatory features. Schiffrin (1987: 55) claims that ‘the structure and the meaning of an argument can be preserved even without markers’.

• Semantic features:

XVI. They have little or no propositional meaning, or at least difficult to be difficult to specify lexically. Brinton (1996: 33) relied on Schiffrin’s meaning-minimalist view (see section 3.2. V) in order to propose this characteristic.

• Functional features:

XVII. They are multifunctional, operating on several linguistic levels simultaneously such as on the local (i.e., morphophonemic, syntactic, and semantic) and on the global (i.e., pragmatic), as well as on different planes within the pragmatic component.

• Sociolinguistic and stylistic features:

XVIII. They are a feature of oral rather than of written discourse and are associated with the informality of oral discourse and the grammatical ‘fragmentation’ caused by the lack of planning time characteristic of spoken contexts (Östman, 1982: 169).

XIX. They appear with high frequency in oral discourse.
They are stylistically stigmatised and negatively assessed owing to their high frequency and oral nature, especially in written or formal discourse. They are regarded as a cue of non-fluency and carelessness. This feature is closely related to (see section 3.2. XVIII; XIX), features characteristic of spokenness.

They are gender specific and more typical of women’s speech. For instance, Östman (1981: 72; 75-76) finds you know to be more frequent in women’s than in men’s speech. However, Holmes (1986: 4) finds you know as frequent in women’s than in men’s.

In my mind, the clarification that Jucker & Ziv (1998: 4) make concerning Brinton’s list is highly relevant, claiming that not all the features displayed in Briton’s are equally diagnostic. More precisely, as they propose, the three first levels (phonological/lexical, syntactic/textual and semantic) are those which provide the litmus tests as to what is considered to be as discourse marker or not.

Likewise, Jucker & Ziv (1998: 4) suggest that those features mentioned on the functional and on the sociolinguistic/stylistic levels are primarily descriptive. Moreover, Jucker & Ziv (1998: 4) point out that sociolinguistic and stylistic distribution can only be applied once an item has been identified as a discourse marker. In addition, Jucker & Ziv (1998: 4) assert that occurrence either in oral or written contexts is not particularly helpful for the purpose of diagnosis and classification of DMs.

Andersen & Fretheim (200: 40) also illustrate a list of characteristics of DMs taking as a reference the model introduced by Briton (1996: 32-35), a more diffuse one than the one reorganised and abbreviated by Jucker & Ziv (1998: 4). Conversely, Andersen & Fretheim (2000: 40) deal with the importance rendered to non-propositionality as an essential feature of discourse markers, yet, they claim that this feature should be considered as usual but not as essential.
As a conclusion, relying on the perspective adopted by Jucker & Ziv (1998: 4), the list previously provided above is a suggestive proposal of the range of properties discourse markers may display. Jucker & Ziv (1998:4) further argue that discourse markers may fulfil all of these characteristics or just a single one, yet, the higher the number of features is manifested by a certain discourse marker, the higher the possibility to consider such an item as a member of this class.

3.3. Discourse markers: main functions

With regard to the features previously mentioned, we come to the conclusion that DMs are grammatically optional since they do not disrupt the grammatical correctness in both spoken and written contexts.

However, where discourse markers are not present, the hearer has no lexical clue as to the relationship intended between the two segments (Fraser, 1999: 944). Nevertheless, Fraser also discusses that *since, while, whereas* and *because*, among others, are cases of DMs in which there are syntactic reasons why discourse markers cannot be deleted nor omitted.

Furthermore, they are semantically empty, that is to say, as we previously assumed, DMs do not contribute to the proposition of the utterance or sentence in which they occur. However, they are not pragmatically optional or unnecessary, as they do contribute to a largely range of pragmatic functions (Brown, 1977: 107; Svartvik 1980; Erman, 1987: 2). In this respect, according to Brinton (1996: 35), a bid to omit such markers will not have an effect on grammar, that is, the discourse will be grammatically acceptable, conversely, this event will lead to an “‘unnatural’, ‘awkward’, ‘disjointed’, ‘impolite’, ‘unfriendly’, or ‘dogmatic’” communicative context. When discourse markers are missing within the communicative context, the factor of comprehension for the listener...
might be compromised, and highly affected in the case of the speaker (Svartvik, 1985: 352), leading
to a high likelihood of breakdown within the communicative context (Fraser, 1990: 390).

Thus, according to Even-Zohar (1982: 180), DMs aid participants of a communicative
context to navigate along a certain discourse, both encoder and decoder. Conversely, Ötsman (1982:
153) claims that DMs are to be solely and exclusively pragmatic in function, that is to say, their
function is to hook the propositional content. The latter idea held by Ötsman (1982: 153) sheerly
opposes one of the main features listed above (see section 3.2. XVII), as well as to the
quintessential character of discourse markers previously admitted, multifunctionality (see section
2.1).

3.3.1. Set of functions

Determining the functions of discourse markers is a complex and challenging task. As a result, in
order to provide a set of functions of such linguistic items, it is necessary to focus on previous
studies, preferably on those that adopt a general approach, setting aside those studies whose main
centre of attraction is just a single discourse marker, as they may lead us astray, sticking out from
our purpose.

The reason why studies of individual markers are avoided is that these studies attribute a
vast range of meanings to a single discourse marker and, as a consequence, some of these meanings
might overlap. Therefore, I shall present a reorganised and abbreviated list, divided into textual and
interpersonal functions, based on the proposal made by Brinton (1996: 35-40):

- Textual functions, for instance, used:
  1. To initiate and close discourse, including claiming the attention of the addressee.
  2. To help the addressee in acquiring or relinquishing the floor.
3. To serve as a delaying tactic used to maintain discourse or hold the floor. This is characteristic of spokenness.

4. To mark topic shifts, that is, to mark a boundary between utterances or sentences, to indicate the introduction of a new topic, a partial shift in topic (correction, elaboration, specification, expansion), or to resume a previous topic (after an interruption or digression).

5. To designate either new information (Erman, 1987: 201; Schiffrin 1987) or old information (Quirk et al., 1985: 1482; Schiffrin 1987).

6. To mark ‘sequentially dependent’ elements (Schiffrin, 1987: 31), to restrict the importance of one clause upon the preceding one by making explicit the conversational implicatures relating such clauses, or to indicate how an utterance matches cooperative principles of conversation by means of conversational implicatures (Levinson, 1983: 128-129, 162-163).

7. To repair either one’s own or others’ discourse.

• Interpersonal functions, for instance, utilised:

8. Subjectively, to express a response or a reaction to the preceding discourse or attitude towards the following discourse, including also ‘back-channel’ signals.2

9. Interpersonally, to reach cooperation, sharing, or intimacy between addressor and addressee, including confirming shared assumptions, checking or expressing understanding, requesting confirmation, expressing deference, or politeness.

This appreciation regarding the division into two different categories, textual and interpersonal, as well as each and every of the functions, is based on Brinton’s approach (1996: 38), as mentioned above. Likewise, in order to shape these two set of functions, Brinton (1996: 38) relied on two modes or functions of language proposed by Halliday (1970; 1979), and they will be dealt with in the following section (see section 3.3.2).

---

2 Back channel signal: “A signal given by the listener to show that he or she is paying attention. Back-channel signals may be simple noises, such as mm, uhuh, words or phrases such as quite, of course, I see, or merely nods and facial expressions. (The Social Art: Language and Its Uses, 1994: 210)
3.3.2. Textual and interpersonal functions

For the purpose of explaining the reason why the previous set of functions was gathered together into two different sub-set of functions, I will take Brinton as a reference, who claims that it is clear that either the ‘subjective’ and the ‘interpersonal’ functions are framed within Halliday’s interpersonal component.

“The ‘interpersonal’ mode is the expression of the speaker’s attitudes, evaluations, judgments, expectations, and demands, as well as of the nature of the social exchange, the role of the speaker and the role assigned to the hearer. The interactive mode consists in the speaker’s intrusion into the speech event” (Brinton, 1996: 38).

As regards the textual functions, they are defined as follows:

“In the ‘textual’ mode, the speaker structures meaning as text, creating cohesive passages of discourse; it is ‘language relevance’, using language in a way that is relevant to context. […] To understand functions (1-7) as ‘textual’ one needs a more global conception of the textual component than Halliday uses, one which moves beyond the level of the sentence to the structure of the entire discourse; one requires as well a recognition of the different text-structuring requirements of oral conversation and written discourse, particularly narrative (Brinton, 1996: 38-39).

Thus, after having gone through the whole set of functions as well as the definition of ‘textual’ mode illustrated above, I came to the conclusion that every function included under the cover of ‘textual functions’ has a common feature, they give coherence and cohesion to the text whether in written or spoken contexts as well as they serve as structural and reformulating elements, we can then understand why functions (1-7) belong to the textual component of language (Brinton, 1996: 38-39). The dual function of discourse markers regarding textual and interpersonal domains is recognised by Ötsman and Schiffrin, despite some differences (Brinton, 1996: 39). Although, to my knowledge, they are not relevant enough to be tackled within this dissertation.
4.0. Discourse markers: taxonomy

Considering the pieces of evidence previously mentioned, it is assumed that it is not an easy task to find a suitable definition for these linguistic items since there is little consensus regarding primary functions and main characteristics.

As a conclusion, it is impossible to provide a list containing each and every discourse marker, especially, owing to the lack of agreement as to what sorts of linguistic items should be included under the category of DMs in Present-day English. Brinton (1996: 32-33) points out that the items included in the same category may broadly differ depending on one’s definition of discourse markers.

“Fraser (1988: 26-27, 1990: 388, 392) restricts membership severely, excluding oh because it is an interjection, because because it is a subordinating conjunction expression content, and two of the most frequently cited expressions, y’know and I mean, because they are separate utterances signaling “a speaker attitude of solidarity”. Östman ((1982: 153) excludes aspectual particles (just, now, too), hedges (kinda), conjunctive particles (but), and modal particles (I suppose, maybe). In fact, Östman’s core list, I mean, you know, like, well, oh, ah, uh, say, blood, man, and I guess (1982: 155), has only well and say in common with Fraser’s” (Brinton, 1996: 32).

In my mind, this event clearly proves the different views maintained by scholars in this respect, regarding the primary functions and features of discourse markers tackled above.

According to Brinton (1996: 32), she suggests that in order to determine which markers should be members included in the category of discourse markers we might get to a general agreement, perhaps, by focusing on those that were studied in previous works, that is, those to which scholarly attention was paid. As a result, Brinton (1996:32) provided the following inventory of DMs in English, result from a compilation of diverse studies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ah</th>
<th>if</th>
<th>right/all right/ that’s right</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>actually</td>
<td>I mean/ think</td>
<td>so</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>after all</td>
<td>just</td>
<td>say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>almost</td>
<td>like</td>
<td>sort of/kind of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and</td>
<td>mind you</td>
<td>then</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and {stuff, things} like that</td>
<td>moreover</td>
<td>therefore</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If we pay close attention to the list, we will realise that not all of the items displayed correspond to the definition of lexical items. For this simple reason, I consider linguistic item as a more suitable and inclusive term that lets us classify a large range of items under the same umbrella.

Nevertheless, it is not clear what kind of words or expressions should be included under the term DMs. Because of this, to determine it I shall discuss a pattern proposed by Fraser (2009: 297): “S1+DM+S2, where S1 and S2 are discourse segments, each representing an Illocutionary Act, although elision may have occurred.” Without further ado, I will point out that this idea provided by Fraser is closely linked to the one proposed by Schiffrin (see section 3.1. E).

In addition, Fraser (2009: 297) furthers discusses that for an expression to be considered as a discourse marker it must fulfil three essential conditions detailed hereafter:

“Condition 1: A DM is a *lexical expression*, for example, *but*, *so*, and *in addition*.
Condition 2: In a sequence of discourse segments S1-S2, a DM must occur as a part of the second discourse segment, S2.
Condition 3: A DM does not contribute to the semantic meaning of the segment but signals a specific semantic relationship which holds between the interpretation of the two Illocutionary Act segments, S1 and S2.” (Fraser, 2009: 299).

It should be borne in mind that the first of these conditions is just partially true owing to the restrictive way Fraser approached DMs (see section 3.1). As previously mentioned, by approaching DMs as lexical items we automatically exclude “syntactic structures, prosodic features such as stress, pauses, and intonation, and non-verbal expressions such as a grunt or a shrug” (Fraser, 2009: 298); however, I decided to stick to Schiffrin’s approach as she includes “discourse markers [...] members of a functional class of verbal and non-verbal devices.” (Schiffrin, 1987: 41)
Nonetheless, Fraser (2009: 300) proposes a wide list of DMs which is, in my mind, highly useful as it gathers together a vast number of DMs and a further classification into three different classes. On the one hand, it makes DMs more appreciable and so easily recognisable. On the other hand, such a classification is interesting regarding their uses as these are devices that are present in our everyday language use. It is to bear in mind that this list only includes lexical items, the way Fraser decided to approach DMs, a more restrictive way than the approach followed throughout this dissertation:

- “CONTRASTIVE MARKERS (CDMS) where a CDM signals a direct or indirect contrast between S1 and S2 (but, alternatively, although, contrariwise, contrary to expectations, conversely, despite (this/that), even so, however, in spite of (this/that), in comparison (with this/that), in contrast (to this/that), instead (of this/that), nevertheless, nonetheless, (this/that point) notwithstanding, on the other hand, on the contrary, rather (than this/that), regardless (of this/that), still, though, whereas, yet...)."
- ELABORATIVE MARKERS (EDMs), where an EDM signals an elaboration in S2 to the information contained in S1 (and, above all, after all, also, alternatively, analogously, besides, by the same token, correspondingly, equally, for example, for instance, further (more), in addition, in other words, in particular, likewise, more accurately, more importantly, more precisely, more to the point, moreover, on that basis, on top of it all, otherwise, rather, similarly, ...).
- INFERENTIAL MARKERS (IDMs), where IDM signals that S1 provides a basis for inferring S2 (so, all things considered, as a conclusion, as a consequence (of this/that), as a result (of this/that), because (of this/that), consequently, for this/that reason, hence, it follows that, accordingly, in this/that/any case, on this/that condition, on these/those grounds, then, therefore, thus).” (Fraser, 2009: 300-301).

Fraser (2009: 301) also suggests that the first of the markers provided at the beginning of each class is the one that holds the broadest meaning of all the markers that belong to that particular class of DMs. Likewise, Blakemore (1992) also claims that DMs fall into three classes or groups, closely linked to the ones proposed by Fraser (2009).

5.0. Context of occurrence and importance of intonation in speech

This kind of devices is found in both speaking and written contexts, even though it is certain they are more likely to occur in spokenness than in writtenness. If we return to the issue in question, as I suggested over the course of this paper basing myself on several authors, many of the characteristics
are only applicable to speaking contexts; however, those that are applied to written do not exclude speaking contexts. In other words, those features characteristic of discourse markers in spokenness do not negate the occurrence in writtenness, but we cannot say this does work the same the other way around, an idea that suggests their highly presence in speaking contexts. Moreover, according to Aijmer & Simon (2006: 155), the number of studies devoted to the analysis of DMs is steadily growing owing to their crucial importance in spoken interaction, a piece of evidence that supports the important role they play in speech.

Despite the fact that this analysis of DMs is fully devoted to the way certain expressions are used in order to structure and organise conversational interaction, it is important to bear in mind the role of intonation. The effect a certain expression may entail to in a certain conversational interaction closely depends on the way it is said, in other words, the way an utterance is performed may have an impact on the meaning of such an utterance in such a context (Schiffrin, 1987: iv).

“For example, oh with a rising intonation might be interpreted as a request for confirmation, as in: A: I think the party’s called for six o’clock. B: Oh? But the same expression with a falling intonation might be interpreted not as a request for confirmation, but as an acknowledgement:

A: I think the party’s called for six o’clock. B: Oh.”” (Schiffrin, 1987: ix).

Fraser (2009: 298) further argues that DMs count on an intonation contour that separates it prosodically from the rest of the segment of discourse in which they occur, but this is an issue that depends on the DMs in question as well as on the linguistic context.

Taking for granted that DMs are highly likely to appear in spoken contexts in comparison to written contexts, the role intonation plays in conversational interactions is an aspect that must be included. Apart from this, there is barely anything else to point out in terms of intonation for the purpose of this analysis.
6.0. Empirical Study

6.1. Introductory remarks

Section 6 aims to study in close detail a particular discourse marker: *well* in Present-day English in line with the description made in the first part of this dissertation. The afore-mentioned DM was chosen as a basis for this research due to its wide range of functions and its high frequency of appearance in everyday language use. Therefore, attention will be paid to its context of occurrence and its degree of spokenness or writtenness. I will also study up to what extent this discourse marker is more closely associated with a particular genre and its general frequency in British and American English on the basis of the analysis of comparable corpora samples.

Regarding *well*, a total of 400 examples, 200 taken from BNC (*British National Corpus*) and 200 from COCA (*Corpus of Contemporary American English*), were first selected in terms of their possible interpretation. The collected data were entered in a data-based (see Appendix A; B) and classified into three main categories, *frame marker*, *mitigator* and *pause filler* (Jucker, 1997). I will refer to each of them in detail below.

The results were calculated and discussed accordingly in order to discover some linguistic regularities typical of the members of this category of linguistic items.
6.2. Methodology

As mentioned above, this investigation is fully based on the data retrieved by means of online computer software, which was later on gathered together and stored by means of Microsoft Excel in order to be, subsequently, closely analysed. This means that this is a corpus-based study. The BNC (British National Corpus) and COCA (Corpus of Contemporary American English) were both crucial for collecting and categorising the range of real language examples. Such examples were accommodated according to their respective categories; function, level and label. It is to bear in mind that those samples in which well displays the functions of adverb, adjective, noun or verb were disregarded in the analysis as they are not considered to be DMs but false positives. Apart from raw frequencies, normalised frequencies were also provided. Since the number of tokens in each corpus and genre varies significantly from one to another, as we will see in the two upcoming sections, normalises frequencies per 1,000,000 words were calculated to make the corpora and all the samples comparable.

6.2.1. British National Corpus (BNC)

BNC was, as explained on its website, “originally created by Oxford University Press in the 1980s - early 1990s, and it contains 100 million words of texts from a wide range of genres (e.g. spoken, fiction, magazines, newspapers, and academic)”. Furthermore, the original idea was to design a corpus which could be regarded as representative of the British English from the later part of the 20th century, both spoken and written. Although the accomplishment of the corpus took 3 years, from 1991 to 1994, and no new texts have been added after its completion, it was slightly revised prior to the release of the second edition of the BNC World (2001) and the latest edition, the BNC XML Edition which was released in 2007.
The BNC, according to its website, meets the following characteristics: 1) it is a monolingual corpus, in other words, although the corpus tackles only modern British English used in Britain, it also contains some non-British English as well as foreign language words. 2) It is synchronic, this means that it does not focus on the historical development of British English but on the late twentieth century. 3) It is general, that is, it contains many different styles and varieties, not being constrained to a certain subject field, genre or register. Furthermore, it includes examples of both spokenness and writtenness. 4) Samples of 45,000 words extracted from single-author texts (excerpts), and shorter than 45,000 words extracted from multi-author texts (magazines, newspapers, etc.) in full version.

It is a very useful source of data for tracking down the contemporary use of a chosen linguistic element in British English and provides the chance of retrieving and analysing an amount of data otherwise inaccessible. In fact, sampling allows for a wider coverage of texts within the 100 million limit, and avoids over-representing idiosyncratic texts.

BNC is as large as any other structured corpus of contemporary English and it contains real language examples collected within the time period of the late twentieth century. The corpus allows to retrieve a chosen number of randomly selected samples, a pivotal feature in the following investigation. Due to the vastness of the data available in this corpus (141,317 tokens of well), I decided to select 200 randomised tokens of this DM in particular, providing examples of the way it is represented in the corpus. Having gathered 200 real language examples from BNC, in total, was done automatically by means of the corpus utility.

Figure 1 and 2 show how the data was accessed.
6.2.2. Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA)

It is to bear in mind that both the BNC and the COCA are fully comparable corpora since they represent present-day British English and American English, respectively, and they have been designed following the same criteria regarding their organisation and structure. COCA is, as stated on its website, 5 to 6 times as large as the BNC. Furthermore, it supplies data for lower-frequency constructions that are not accessible from the BNC. Indeed, the American Corpus includes more than 560 million words of text, result from adding 20 million words each year from 1990 to 2017. What is more, it is equally divided among spoken, fiction, popular magazines, newspapers, and
academic texts. The corpus most recent addition of texts dates from January 2016, and it was accomplished in December 2017.

COCA is certainly a very useful tool that allows us to trace the use of a certain linguistic element in contemporary American English. Furthermore, it helps you recover and analyse such an extent of data which would be otherwise inaccessible. The COCA can be regarded as the largest structured corpus of contemporary American English and it contains real language examples collected within the time period of 1980-2017. The corpus is a systematic collection of texts stored on computer, thus, provides a vast number of randomly selected samples, specifically (693,977 tokens of *well*). As a consequence of this and for the purposes of this study, I selected a second set of examples of 200 randomised tokens for the DM *well*, gathered together automatically by means of the corpus utility. Both corpora were accessed through BYU (Brigham Young University).³

Figure 3 and 4 show how the data was accessed.

Figure 3: Screenshot of the general search of *well* in COCA

³ BNC-BYU: <https://corpus.byu.edu/bnc/>, last access 25/06/18. COCA-BYU: <https://corpus.byu.edu/coca/>, last access 25/06/18.
6.3.1. Well: introduction

Despite the fact that well sometimes displays the functions of a noun, an adverb, an adjective or a verb, it is difficult to characterise its uses basing the analysis on any of these classes. Thus, this points out that the use of well is not only based on semantic or grammatical status, however, it goes a step further (Schiffrin, 1987). Therefore, there are many studies on the use of well that have been observed, one of them is investigated by Schiffrin (1987: 102). In her study she approached well from the perspective of a response marker, hence, well is described from the point of view of the interlocutor’s answer in a conversation. In addition, this is a research study in which she further argues that well “anchors its user in an interaction when the upcoming contribution is not fully consonant with prior coherence options […] it functions in the participation framework”.

Likewise, De Klerk (2005: 1190) finds out and explains the tendency for well to start utterances in a natural way “since discourse markers typically act as a guide to addressees as to how to react to what is about to be said”.
In fact, the next important study on discourse markers is carried out by Biber et al. (1999:1086) and suggest that *well* is “a versatile discourse marker, but appears to have the general function of a ‘deliberation signal’ indicating the speaker’s need to give (brief) thought or consideration to the point at issue”. What is more, Biber et al. (1999:1096) also provide the frequency of *well* in English conversation, confirming that *well* is more frequent than, for instance, *you know* and *I mean*, either in British and American English.

Fung (2007) claims that the DM *well* is of a great importance and that it has a great impact on someone’s own use of language. In addition, they suggested that as speakers improve their fluency in English, generally, we can expect them to use *well* both to take the turn and to signal a break in the utterance.

However, Jucker (1997) approached the discourse marker *well* in the history of English, trying to condense each and every of the uses of *well* as a discourse marker, concentrating on the occurrence in written texts and on the diversity of forms and functions. He proposes that the distinct uses of *well* can be properly accommodated into four different categories depending on the use at issue: 1) as a *frame marker* which either introduces a new topic or prefaces direct reported speech; 2) as a *qualifier marker* that prefaces a reply which is only a partial answer to a question; 3) as a *face-threat mitigator marker* that prefaces a disagreement; 4) as a *pause filler* that bridges the interactional silence. (See examples for each of these below in my analysis). For the purpose of this investigation, I will rely on Jucker’s proposal as I consider it to be the most adequate and comprehensive, hence, it will be developed into close detail. Nevertheless, I will suggest a slight variation from Jucker’s proposal as is sheerly based on written texts, and it might mislead the purpose of this study, since he suggested some categories attending the uses of *well* either on-stage and off-stage, in literary works.
6.3.2. *Well*: functions

As mentioned above, although there are many different existing categories of *well* in modern English, for the purpose of this dissertation, I will rely on Jucker’s (1997: 93) proposal, who claims that in contemporary English it can be classified under the following categories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adverb, adjective</td>
<td>Propositional</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse marker</td>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>Frame marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse marker</td>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td>Face-threat mitigator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse marker</td>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td>Qualifier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse marker</td>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td>Pause filler</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Jucker, 1997: 92).

Jucker 1997 work suggests that on the propositional level, *well* can be used as an adverb or an adjective as in *well-educated* or *everything is well*. He further argues that under no circumstance can *well* be considered as a discourse marker in these cases as it lacks textual and interpersonal functions (see section 3.3) since it clearly functions as a lexical item typical of the adjectival or adverbial category. In this respect, I must say that I fully concur with Jucker, but I must add a slight objection; *well* can be also used as a noun as in “By this time all the *wells* had run dry”\(^4\) with the meaning of pit or in contrast to woe,\(^5\) or as a verb as in “As she read the letter tears welled in her eyes”\(^6\) with the meaning of the emergence of a liquid,\(^7\) hence, it is also at the propositional level, thus, it does not meet the functions to be considered as a discourse marker either. In this respect, I

---

\(^4\) Example taken from the Cambridge Dictionary.

\(^5\) The OED records for example the following: "Most ethicists point out that personal matters have moral importance not just because they give people power over each other, for well or for woe". [http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/226979?rskey=6Ay4y0&result=2&isAdvanced=false#eid](http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/226979?rskey=6Ay4y0&result=2&isAdvanced=false#eid), last access 25/06/18.

\(^6\) Example taken from the Cambridge Dictionary.

\(^7\) The Cambridge Dictionary records for example the following: “(of a liquid) to come to the surface or into view”. [https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/well](https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/well), last access 25/06/18.
must make clear that I will not take into consideration those uses of *well* in which it does not strictly work as a discourse marker and they will thus be addressed as false positives.

*Interpersonal* and *textual* functions are not mutually exclusive, which means they do not occur separately, both are present in each and every discourse marker. However, one of the functions is usually predominant over the other, that is, one of them gains importance at the expense of the other. Jucker (1997) discusses that this particular feature makes it easier for us to classify these linguistic items into the four different uses afore-mentioned. Nonetheless, depending on the approach taken, the outcome might result biased or deviated, that is why some of the data could be interpreted in different ways, hence, the final outcome should be understood as guidance notes and not as universal truths.

The first of the uses is *frame marker*, which means that *well* is used whether to indicate a change in the topic or to introduce reported speech. Svartvik (1980) and Jucker (1997) contend that in both cases *well* is operating at the textual level as a means of text-structure device. (Examples provided in the analysis).

The second of the uses of *well* is *face-threat mitigator* and, as Jucker (1997) explains, it shows some insufficiencies on the interpersonal level. According to Owen (1981, 1983), *well* is an indicator and a mitigator of some kind of confrontation between the addressee and the addressee. For example, this might be the case in which an assessment is followed by disagreement rather than agreement. (Examples provided in the analysis). As we can notice, these are situations in which the image of the participants is being threatened and needs to be saved, hence, this common practice forms the second of the uses. In this respect, I would like to add that the use of *well* as a *face-threat mitigator* is an indicator of politeness,⁸ that is, it is used in order to save the face either of the addressor, of the addressee, or of both of them. In accordance to Jucker’s proposal, I strongly

---

believe that the use of *well* in such cases indicates, on a regular base, a denial, a refusal or any sort of objections to a given utterance.

The third of the uses of *well* is that of a *qualifier*,\(^9\) in other words, as Jucker (1997) points out, it may indicate the existence of a problem on the content level of the current utterance or of the previous one. Furthermore, Lakoff (1973) tackled the discourse marker *well* in the context of questions and answers, and noted that it is used in those cases in which respondents are aware that they are not providing directly the information that the questioner required (1973: 458), that is to say, in those situations in which they sense some sort of insufficiency in their answers (1973: 463). This insufficiency in their answers is due to the fact that addressees leave it to the addressees to add the information missing, or because the addressees want to add some additional information themselves (Jucker, 1997: 94).

With regard to the latter ideas previously mentioned, it seems to me that these two labels namely *face-threat mitigator* and *qualifier* overlap one another. Consequently, I would briefly like to argue my proposal. For this purpose, I will rely on Schiffrin (1987: 102-127) who notes that *well* tends to be used in those situations in which the answer supplied does not fit the context or it is not coherent with the preceding question because the respondent cannot provide the information requested by the questioner. This does not mean that the respondent does not know the right answer; however, they avoid it, an event that actually leads to the use of *well* with the aim to mitigate, in other words, to save one own’s face or to avoid threatening someone else’s image. In the case of a respondent providing such a response, it could lead them to compromise the interaction, to threaten the image of one or more of the interlocutors and to add a certain tension to the interaction activity. It is to bear in mind that the tone of the interaction can be elevated already, hence, providing a response might result in a conflict.

---

\(^9\) “This term, which denotes a very different concept in syntactic studies, has been used by both Svartvik (1980) and Carlson (1984: ch.5) for the discourse marker *well* […] and there is little danger of confusion with syntactic qualifiers”. (Jucker, 1997: 94)
As a consequence, I came to the conclusion that they try to avoid such an event by means of breaking one or more of Grice’s maxims. In this respect, in what I consider a crucial piece of evidence for the acceptance of the proposal previously announced, Schiffrin (1987: 102-127) further debates that when the respondent does not provide the missing element of a *wh*-question, or a clear confirmation or denial to a *yes/no* question *well* is likely to occur; however, when a respondent does follow the response options given by the question, they are unlikely to use *well*. In the light of the above, these two categories suggested by Jucker (1997) could, in my view, be merged together into a single category to which I will henceforth refer to as *mitigator*. To my mind, this is possible since both of the labels that Jucker (1997) proposed work exactly on the same level, for this reason, no sort of disruption is caused.

The fourth of the uses of *well* suggested by Jucker (1997) is that of a *pause filler*, which will be treated as the third and the last of the uses of *well* over the course of this investigation. He explains that it is used to bridge interactional silence. However, although Jucker (1997) claims that the DM *well* works on the “interpersonal” level, I do believe it works on the textual level as well. This previous assumption is based on the explanation displayed in the section 3.3.2, backed up by Brinton’s (1996: 38) contribution. (Examples provided in the Discussion section, 6.5).

As a conclusion, for the purpose of this dissertation, based on the evidence afore-mentioned, I will suggest a simplified categorisation for the members of this category of linguistic items:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adverb, adjective</td>
<td>Propositional</td>
<td>False Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse marker</td>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>Frame marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse marker</td>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td>Mitigator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse marker</td>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>Pause filler</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

10 Grice’s maxims: 1) Quantity: Make your contribution as informative as required; 2) Quality: Do not say what you do not certainly know it is true, or it is false; 3) Relevance: Be relevant; 4) Manner: Avoid to be obscure or ambiguous, be brief and orderly (Grice, 1975: 45-47).
6.3.3. **Well**: BNC evidence and analysis

6.3.3.1. **Well**: data scrutiny and analysis

Taking into consideration the wide range of examples taken from BNC (200), this first set of examples was subjected to scrutiny. As a result, a number of 104 examples in which *well* does work as a DM will be studied in close detail. For this reason, in order to make my study as objective and trustful as possible, I will take into account the different genres provided by the corpus in which examples are classified.

6.3.3.2. **Well**: spokenness

The analysis of *well* in spoken contexts will be carried out within two different sections. The first of these two sections will tackle frequencies, while the second one, the types of the DM at issue. Therefore, at a first stage, I will display in Table 1 the outcome of the spoken data analysed, providing general frequencies in each of the spoken genres. Likewise, in order not to deviate the findings in my analysis, I will also provide the normalised frequencies (per 1,000,000) in those cases in which *well* works as a DM. Accordingly, at a second stage, I will deal with the pragmatic functions of the DM in question.

6.3.3.2.1. **Well**: frequencies in spokenness

Table 1 below shows the frequencies of *well* in the spoken data of the BNC:
Table 1: Frequency of *well* as DM in spoken English (BNC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context Genre</th>
<th>Samples Retrieved</th>
<th>DMs</th>
<th>NF*</th>
<th>False Positives</th>
<th>Unclear</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Spoken Conversation</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>10.15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Spoken Interview Oral History</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Spoken Meeting</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Spoken Classroom</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.83</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Spoken Lecture Humanities Arts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19.41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Spoken Consult</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Spoken Broadcast</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.81</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Spoken Speech Unscripted</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Spoken Unclassified</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (Spoken)</strong></td>
<td><strong>102</strong></td>
<td><strong>79</strong></td>
<td><strong>79.53</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NF* Normalised frequencies per 1,000,000 words

To begin with, I will deal with false positives since I will not study them in close detail, I will just mention those particularities that I consider relevant.\(^\text{11}\)

(9) Yeah but they were we-- like they shot Catholics (unclear) (SP:PS03W) Yeah. (SP:PS03Y) as well! (SP:PS03W) (laughing) That's right. Yeah I know. (SP:PS03Y) (laugh) (SP:PS03W) Yeah. (BNCKBDS_conv)

In extract (9), *well* is used as an adverb, hence, it is not relevant for the purpose of this dissertation since it works on the propositional level. Nonetheless, after having observed the way in which *well*

\(^{11}\) The examples here included has been extracted from the British National Corpus and it has been referenced according to the codes provided by this corpus. S stands for spoken.
works, an event that drew my attention is that 11 out of 22 of the cases of *well* as a false positive, in spoken contexts, corresponds particularly to the collocation illustrated above. In the light of the previous assumption, another event that called my attention is that 10 out of these 11 collocations are found at the end of an utterance.

Setting false positives aside, and moving on to my analysis, the data retrieved shows that 79 out of 102 are cases in which *well* works as a discourse marker, a percentage of around 77%. This is an event that should, at least, from my point of view, draw our attention. Likewise, this premise points out that *well* is likely to work as a DM when happening in speaking contexts. However, contrary to what I had expected, my data shows that *well* as a discourse marker in spoken contexts is more frequent in (lecture, humanities, arts) which stands first, followed by (classroom) that stands second, (broadcast) third, and (conversation) that stands fourth. At the very beginning of my analysis, I expected *well* to be more frequent in conversation rather than in any other genre, notwithstanding, my data opposes this assumption.

### 6.3.3.2.2. *Well*: pragmatic functions in spokenness

Albeit *well* meets the function of DM, does it work on the same level? In order to answer this question, I will base my analysis on the proposal previously suggested, (see section 6.3.2). As a consequence, I aim at displaying in Table 2 the data regarding the types of this DM, in the spoken component of the BNC. Likewise, I will also provide the normalised frequencies for each of the genres.
Taking into consideration the data retrieved and analysed, I believe that the primary level in which *well* operates is on the *textual* one (see section 3.3.2), since it consists of both *pause filler* and *frame marker*. However, the reason why I studied the normalised frequencies is that I aimed at answering the following question: which of the three labels, hence, types into which *well* was classified is the most prevailing one depending on the genre? After having analysed my data, this points out that *pause filler* is the most predominant type, of this DM at issue, since it is mainly found in all the different genres but one (spoken, speech, unscripted), being the use of *well* as *pause filler*, in this particular genre, equal to the two remaining types, *frame marker* and *mitigator*. Therefore, I

### Table 2: Types of *well* by genre (BNC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DM Type</th>
<th>Pause Filler</th>
<th>Frame Marker</th>
<th>Mitigator</th>
<th>Total DMs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NF*</td>
<td>NF*</td>
<td>NF*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spoken</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversation</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>24.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spoken</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview Oral History</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spoken</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spoken</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spoken</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture Humanities Arts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19.94</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spoken</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consult</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spoken</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadcast</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spoken</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Unscripted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spoken</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Total (type)**   | 48           | **57.19**    | **10.34** | **12.49** | **79**    |

NF* Normalised frequencies per 1,000,000 words.
contend that in spoken contexts the prevailing type of well is that of a pause filler. As a result, in line with what has been said above, considering well more likely to occur as a frame marker than as a mitigator, just because they belong to the textual and interpersonal levels, respectively, may lead to a biased assumption, hence, this is a practice to be avoided.

6.3.3.3.  Well: writtenness

As before, the analysis of the written component of the BNC will be tackled in two different sections. In the first one, I will display in Table 3 the outcome of the written data analysed and the general frequencies of well, while in the second one, the types of the DM in question. Besides, in order to maintain the findings of my analysis as trustful and objective as possible, I will also provide the normalised frequencies (per 1,000,000).

6.3.3.3.1.  Well: frequencies in writtenness

Table 3 below shows the frequencies of well in the written data of the BNC:

Table 3: Frequency of well as DM in written English (BNC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context Genre</th>
<th>Samples Retrieved</th>
<th>DMs</th>
<th>NF*</th>
<th>False Positives</th>
<th>Unclear</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Written Fiction Prose</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Fiction Drama</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21.69</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written News Script</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Newspaper</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Pop</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The data retrieved shows that only 25 out of 98 are the cases in which *well* works as a discourse marker. The first question that comes to my mind is: whether *well* is likely or not to happen in written contexts. The second one is whether there any written genre in which *well* is more likely to occur. The answer to the first question, based on the data retrieved, leads to a premise which claims that *well* is unlikely to happen in written contexts, an assumption that I truly expected from the very beginning. The answer to the second question, yet, requires a detailed examination of the data retrieved. During the course of my analysis, I came across a wide range of genres such as newspapers and academic, in which a large number of samples were retrieved, and in none of them *well* functions as a DM. Nevertheless, this is not what certainly draws my attention since they are false positives. What truly interests me are those cases of *well* in written contexts in which it works as a DM, as they constitute the subject matter of my dissertation.

Until the analysis had been accomplished, I have got no clue about the fact that the DM *well*, in spoken contexts, is more frequent in (fiction) which stands first, followed by (miscellaneous) that stands second and (non-academic) that stands third. In my view, it is of interest that all those uses of *well* as a DM are mainly registered within the same genre, fiction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genre</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Well Works</th>
<th>Well As DM</th>
<th>Total Works</th>
<th>As DM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Written Academic</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Non-Academic</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Religion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Biography</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Commerce</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Miscellaneous</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total (Written) 98 25 23.66 73 0

NF* Normalised frequencies per 1,000,000 words.
These questions that come to my mind, at this point, will be displayed in the next section, where, when possible, I will try to provide an answer to all of them.

6.3.3.3.2. *Well*: pragmatic functions in writtenness

Having already answered the first set of questions, a new one emerged: what is the most prevailing pragmatic value of *well*? For this purpose, I will tackle the written component of the BNC in Table 4, displaying the classification of the uses of *well* by genre into the three different types aforementioned (see section 6.3.2). Likewise, I will also provide the normalised frequencies for each of the genres.

Table 4: Types of *well* in writtenness by genre (BNC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DM Type</th>
<th>Pause Filler</th>
<th>NF*</th>
<th>Frame Marker</th>
<th>NF*</th>
<th>Mitigator</th>
<th>NF*</th>
<th>Total DMs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Written</strong> Fiction Prose</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Written</strong> Fiction Drama</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Written</strong> News Script</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Written</strong> Newspaper</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Written</strong> Pop</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Written</strong> Academic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Written</strong> Non-Academic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Written</strong> Religion</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Written</strong> Biography</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Written</strong> Commerce</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At this stage, we may claim that the prevailing use of *well*, in fiction, is that of a *frame marker*. However, it is also to be borne in mind its use as *pause filler*, since they both function on the *textual* level. Therefore, I contend that the main level in which *well* operates, in fiction, is on the *textual* one. Thus, the question is: is this assumption applicable to any other genre within writtenness? Indeed, based on the results provided by Table 4 above, I confirm that the prevailing use of *well* in all the genres analysed within the written component is that of *frame marker*,

Due to the fact that the predominant use of *well* is, in written contexts, that of *frame marker*, I aim at examining whether they are used in order to indicate either a change in the topic of the conversation or to preface direct reported speech. Correspondingly, my data confirms that the most predominant use of *well* in written contexts as a *frame marker*, is to preface direct reported speech.

### 6.3.3.4. *Well*: comparing spokenness vs writtenness in BNC

In this section, I briefly aim to illustrate the differences and similarities, regarding the uses of *well*, between spokenness and writtenness in British English. In Table 5 I show the outcome of spoken and written data submitted to analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Written</th>
<th>Miscellanous</th>
<th>Total (type)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NF* Normalised frequencies per 1,000,000 words
One of the main aims that this dissertation pursues is to get to know the variation in the frequency of occurrence of the DM *well*, depending on the media of expression, that is, speech versus writing. The data obtained clearly indicated that the DM *well* is more likely to appear in spoken contexts. However, this does not mean that it is a DM that exclusively occurs in spoken contexts although here its frequency drops significantly.

In spite of the fact that *well* is more likely to appear in spokenness than in writtenness, particularities were noticed by tackling each of the genres in close detail. Table 6 shows the classification of *well* by genre into the three different types afore-mentioned.

Table 6: Types of *well* in spoken and written contexts by genre (BNC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DM Type</th>
<th>Pause Filler</th>
<th>NF*</th>
<th>Frame Marker</th>
<th>NF*</th>
<th>Mitigator</th>
<th>NF*</th>
<th>Total DMs</th>
<th>NF*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spoken</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>7.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (type)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>8.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Despite the fact that *well* is much more likely to occur in spoken contexts, my data indicates that it also appears in written ones, nonetheless, there are slight differences in its uses. In both media of expression, *well* takes place at the *textual* level. Thus, this is a feature that does not vary depending
on the context of occurrence. Nonetheless, as previously suggested, the way in which *well* behaves depending on whether it occurs in spokenness or writtenness varies. The main use of the DM *well* is to bridge interactional silence, and everything that this entails, a characteristic extensible to all of the genres in spokenness and writtenness but fiction (writtenness), which deviates this use of *well* to a particular use, *frame marker*, that implies the addition of direct reported speech.

6.3.4. *Well*: COCA evidence and analysis

6.3.4.1. *Well*: data scrutiny and analysis

Due to the wide variety of samples taken from COCA (200), this list of randomly chosen examples was scrutinised. Thus, once the scrutiny of the data was accomplished, the outcome is a list that consists of 98 examples in which *well* does work as a DM. As well as with the data taken from BNC, I will take into consideration the different genres provided by the corpus into which examples are classified. This classification is made into different genres in comparison to the ones provided in the BNC. COCA supplies in regard to spokenness, just spoken, and regarding writtenness, fiction, news, magazines and academic. There are then clear differences in this respect.

6.3.4.2. *Well*: spokenness

Once again, the analysis of *well* in spoken contexts will be carried out within two different sections. The first section will be devoted to frequencies, while the second one to the different types of the DM at issue. To begin with, I will display in Table 7 the outcome of the spoken data analysed. Since there is no distinction among genres, regarding the spoken component, as in the BNC, I will only
display a table that shows the frequencies of well, in spoken contexts in general. As before, normalised frequencies (per 1,000,000) will be provided since the examples corresponding to the different media of expression and genre are different. Accordingly, at a second stage, I will tackle the pragmatic functions of the DM in question.

6.3.4.2.1. **Well: Frequencies in spokenness**

Table 7 below shows the frequencies of well in the spoken data of the COCA:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context/ Samples Retrieved</th>
<th>DMs</th>
<th>NF* Normalised frequencies per 1,000,000</th>
<th>False Positives</th>
<th>Unclear</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spoken</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (Spoken)</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NF* Normalised frequencies per 1,000,000 words

At this point, once the data have been presented, I will proceed to analyse and comment on everything that, in my view, is of interest to my analysis. To get started, I will deal with an example of a false positive:¹²

(10) water in rural Belarus. " My mom had gotten some water out of the well, and she suspected that the water wasn't very good. So she would. (COCA2015NEWSAust)

Regarding false positives, it is to mention that, in this occasion, contrary to the data extracted from the BNC, I did find uses of well as a noun as in extract (10).

Moving on, and leaving false positives aside, the data retrieved indicates that 75 out of 104 are the cases in which well works as a DM, that is, a percentage of around 72%. This is a fact that

---

¹² The example here included has been extracted from the Corpus of Contemporary American English and it has been referenced according to the codes provided by this corpus.
points out that *well* is highly likely to occur in speaking contexts as a DM. A premise expected from the very beginning. Since there is no spare genre to study as in the BNC, it is time to move on to the next section.

6.3.4.2.2. *Well*: pragmatic functions in spokenness

Albeit *well* meets the function of DM, does it work on the same level? In order to answer this question, in Table 8 I aim at displaying the data regarding the types of this DM in the spoken component of the COCA. Nonetheless, it is to be borne in mind that one of the examples that I consider as a DM, hence it is counted, is unclear in terms of its classification. Thus, in order not to deviate my analysis, the column ‘unclear’ is added.

Table 8: Types of *well* in spokenness (COCA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DM Type</th>
<th>Pause Filler</th>
<th>Frame Marker</th>
<th>Mitigator</th>
<th>Unclear</th>
<th>Total DMs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spoken</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (type)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NF* Normalised Frequencies per 1,000,000 words.

At this point the exhibition of data has been accomplished, consequently, I will proceed to analyse and comment on everything that, in my view, is of interest to my analysis. To get started, I will deal with the unclear example:¹³

(11) Thank you. Thank you very much, folks. Thank you. Okey-doke. *Well*, thanks so much. Please be seated. Make yourselves at home. This (COCA1995SPOKInd_Limbaugh)

¹³ The example here included has all been extracted from the Corpus of Contemporary American English and it has been referenced according to the codes provided by this corpus.
I consider extract (11) unclear because the turns of the interlocutors were not included in this excerpt, hence, I discard it. Additionally, I will also discard the 29 cases of *well* as a false positive, as for instance example (10) above.

Getting into the analysis, my data points out that the primary type of *well* is that of a *pause filler* that stands first, *mitigator* would stand second and, last but not least, *frame marker* would occupy the third position. Thus, I contend that the main level in which *well* works is on the *textual* one since it may function not only as a *pause filler* but also as a *frame marker*. However, although the *interpersonal* level consists of just the *mitigator* function, this does not mean that *well* is more likely to occur as a *frame marker* rather than as a *mitigator*.

### 6.3.4.3. *Well*: writtenness

In order to analyse the written component of the COCA, it will be tackled, as before, in two different sections. Firstly, I will display in Table 9 the outcome of the written data analysed and the general frequencies of *well* and, secondly, the types of the DM in question. Furthermore, I will also provide the normalised frequencies (per 1,000,000).

#### 6.3.4.3.1. *Well*: frequencies in writtenness

Table 9 below shows the frequencies of *well* in the written data of the COCA:
My data shows that only 23 out of 96 are the cases in which *well* works as a discourse marker, that is, a percentage of about 20%. Therefore, this event indicates that *well* is unlikely to occur in written contexts, a presumption expected from the very beginning. However, there is a genre in which it seems to be slightly used, fiction. Although *well* does not work as a DM in a large number of cases, those in which it does will be analysed. Once again, I did not expect *well* to be mainly used in written contexts, in fiction. Nevertheless, the fact is that fiction stands first, followed by magazines that stands second and news that stand third and academic that stands fourth.

### 6.3.4.3.2. *Well*: pragmatic functions in writtenness

Again the question is: what is the most predominant type of *well*? For this purpose, I will tackle the written component of the COCA in Table 10, showing the classification of the uses of *well* by genre. Likewise, I will also provide the normalised frequencies for each of the genres.

---

Table 9: Frequency of *well* as DM in written English (COCA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context Genre</th>
<th>Samples Retrieved</th>
<th>DMs</th>
<th>NF*</th>
<th>False Positives</th>
<th>Unclear</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Written</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiction</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magazines</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (Written)</strong></td>
<td><strong>96</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.18</strong></td>
<td><strong>71</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NF* Normalised frequencies per 1,000,000 words
Table 10: Types of *well* in writtenness by genre (COCA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DM Type</th>
<th>Pause Filler</th>
<th>NF*</th>
<th>Frame Marker</th>
<th>NF*</th>
<th>Mitigator</th>
<th>NF*</th>
<th>Total DMs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Written</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiction</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magazines</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (type)</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td><strong>0.06</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td><strong>0.05</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NF* Normalised frequencies per 1,000,000 words

At this stage, although the major proportion of the uses of *well*, in written contexts, were registered in fiction, I cannot find a clear difference that lets me assert which of the three types is the prevailing one since differences are minimal. The only hypothesis we can extract from these data is that the main level in which *well* operates, in fiction, is on the *textual* one. In this vein, it is to mention that this DM mainly works on the textual level in all of the genres. However, this particular type of *well* in written contexts is connected with its use as a *frame marker*, either to introduce a new topic in the conversation or to preface direct reported speech. Unfortunately, this is a feature that I could not achieve to know since their frequencies at both uses of the DM *well as frame marker* are rather similar.

6.3.4.4. *Well*: spokenness vs writtenness (COCA)

In this section, I aim to illustrate the differences and similarities, regarding the uses of *well*, between spokenness and writtenness. In Table 11 I will show the outcome of spoken and written data submitted to analysis.
One of the targets that this dissertation seeks was to get to know the frequency of appearance of the DM *well*, depending on whether it is used in spokenness or writtenness. Thus, basing my analysis on the data extracted from the COCA (*Corpus of Contemporary American English*), it can be gathered that the DM *well* is more prone to appear in spoken than in written contexts. Yet, this does not mean that it is a DM that exclusively fits in spoken contexts.

Whereas *well* is more likely to appear rather in spokenness than in writtenness, peculiarities were observed by dealing with each and every genre in close detail. Table 12 shows the classification of the different types of *well* in spoken and written contexts.

Table 11: Frequency of *well* as DM in spoken and written English (COCA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contexts</th>
<th>Samples Retrieved</th>
<th>DMs</th>
<th>NF*</th>
<th>False Positives</th>
<th>Unclear</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Spoken</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Written</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NF* Normalised frequencies per 1,000,000 words

To begin with, I will explain why in the event of summing up the row of the spoken component, that is, *pause filler* (44), *frame marker* (9) and *mitigator* (21), the figure obtained does not coincide with the total (75). Likewise, the total sum of the all the types, *pause filler* (53), *frame marker* (18),
and mitigator (26), does not either coincide with the total (98). The reason why these two sums do not coincide with their respective totals is given by the fact that I identified one of the cases of well as a DM, but I could not classify it under any of the categories used since turns in conversation are missing in the transcription.

Although well is much highly probable to occur in spoken language, my data also shows that it also appears in writing; however, the frequency of appearance drops dramatically and there are slight differences in its uses. Regarding the main level on which well takes place is on the textual in both contexts, spoken and written. Thus, this is a feature that does not vary depending on the context of appearance. Well seems to be mostly used in order to bridge interactional silence, a feature extensible to spokenness and writtenness. However, it is to notice that, in fiction, the uses of well steadily increase going from a general use as pause filler to a particular use as frame marker, which entails either a new topic in conversation or direct reported speech.

6.4. Well: BrE vs AmE comparison

In this section, I seek to display the differences and similarities of well in British and American English. For this purpose, both contexts, spoken and written, will be tackled. This comparison will be carried out in two different sections, the first one devoted to spokenness and the second one to writtenness. Likewise, the frequencies of well and its pragmatic functions will also be dealt with. I will advance, from the very beginning, that I could not find any example of well as a verb, neither in spokenness nor in writtenness.
6.4.1. *Well*: frequencies in spokenness (BNC) vs (COCA)

In this section, I display the differences and similarities of *well*, between British and American English. Table 13 shows the outcome of spoken data submitted to analysis.

Table 13: Frequency of *well* as DM in spoken British (BNC) and American English (COCA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variety</th>
<th>Samples Retrieved</th>
<th>DMs</th>
<th>NF*</th>
<th>False Positives</th>
<th>Unclear</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>7.92</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>206</strong></td>
<td><strong>154</strong></td>
<td><strong>8.56</strong></td>
<td><strong>51</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NF* Normalised frequencies per 1,000,000 words

This dissertation aims to know the variation in the frequency of occurrence of the DM *well* in spoken language, depending on whether it is used in British or American English. Since the COCA has far more words than the BNC, 560 million and 100 million respectively, these normalised frequencies per 1,000,000 may lead us astray. It is not the same to find 79 cases in 100 million words than 75 in 560. Thus, I cannot assert in which of the two varieties of English, the DM *well* is more likely to occur. Therefore, based on the data randomly retrieved from the BNC (*British National Corpus*) and the COCA (*Corpus of Contemporary American English*), I can just mention that the raw frequencies show that *well* was slightly more frequent in British English than in American English.

As I mentioned above, contrary to what I expected after having looked up in the OED, I did not find any use of *well* as a verb in any of the two varieties of English.
6.4.2. *Well*: Pragmatic functions in spokenness (BNC) vs (COCA)

Taking for granted that *well* meets the function of DM I aim to know whether it works on the same level in both British and American English. Table 14 shows the data regarding the types of this DM, in the spoken component of the BNC and the COCA. Besides, I will also supply the normalised frequencies for each of the types.

Table 14: Types of *well* in spoken British and American English (BNC) vs (COCA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DM Type</th>
<th>Variety</th>
<th>Pause Filler</th>
<th>NF*</th>
<th>Frame Marker</th>
<th>NF*</th>
<th>Mitigator</th>
<th>NF*</th>
<th>Total DMs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>British</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>American</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (type)</td>
<td></td>
<td>92</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NF* Normalised frequencies per 1,000,000 words.

Firstly, I must make it clear why when summing up each of the types within the row of American English, the total is 75 instead of 74. The reason why this sum does not coincide is given by the fact that I could not classify one of the examples of *well* under any of these categories although it clearly functioned as a DM.

Taking into consideration the data analysed, I believe that the primary level in which *well* operates is on the *textual* one since it consists of both *pause filler* and *frame marker*. However, the reason why I studied the normalised frequencies is that I aimed at answering the following question: which of the three labels, hence, types is the most prevailing one depending on the genre? My data reveals that that of the *pause filler* is the most predominant type in spoken contexts in both British and American English. Still, thinking of *well* to be more likely to appear as a *frame marker* than as a
mitigator, because they work on the textual and interpersonal levels, respectively, may lead to a biased presumption, hence, this is to take into account.

6.4.3. **Well: frequencies in written (BNC) vs (COCA)**

6.3.4.3.1. **Well: frequencies in writtenness**

Table 15 below shows the frequencies of well in the written data of the BNC and the COCA:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variety</th>
<th>Samples Retrieved</th>
<th>DMs</th>
<th>NF*</th>
<th>False Positives</th>
<th>Unclear</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (Written)</strong></td>
<td><strong>194</strong></td>
<td><strong>48</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.33</strong></td>
<td><strong>144</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NF* Normalised frequencies per 1,000,000 words

My data indicates that only 48 out of 194 are the cases in which well works as a discourse marker in written British and American English, that is, a percentage of about 25% of the total. Therefore, this event points out that well is unlikely to happen in written contexts, a presumption expected from the very beginning. However, based on my data I cannot assert that there is a difference in frequency of appearance between British and American English. However, although my raw frequencies are truly low, it does not seems to be a great difference in frequency between British American English.
6.4.4. *Well*: pragmatic functions in written (BNC) vs (COCA)

What is the most prevailing type of *well*? In this section, the written component of the BNC and the COCA will be tackled. Table 16 shows the classification of the uses of *well* by type in written British and American English. In addition, I will also supply the normalised frequencies for each of the types in both varieties.

Table 16: Types of *well* in written British and American English (BNC) vs (COCA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DM Type</th>
<th>Pause Filler</th>
<th>NF*</th>
<th>Frame Marker</th>
<th>NF*</th>
<th>Mitigator</th>
<th>NF*</th>
<th>Total DMs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>British</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>American</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (type)</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.09</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.14</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.07</strong></td>
<td><strong>48</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NF* Normalised frequencies per 1,000,000 words

At this stage, I cannot state which is the major type of *well* in written contexts since the difference is minimal. However, it seems that as a *frame marker* it stands first, *pause filler* as second and *mitigator* as third. As regards the function of *well* as *frame marker*, it was not possible to determine whether it is used to introduce a new topic in conversation or to preface direct reported speech in American English. However, as previously mentioned, my data shows that in written British English *well* is mainly used as a device to preface direct reported speech. Nonetheless, my data shows that in both British and American English, the most prevailing level in which *well* works is on the *textual* one, formed by its use as *pause filler* and *frame marker*.
6.5. Discussion

After having analysed the data from the BNC and the COCA, the question that comes to my mind is: do these categories shape an absolute categorisation of the DM *well*? Can we talk about subtypes within these three categories depending on the purpose for which they are used? As I explained before, the structure of my dissertation, regarding the classification of *well*, is based on Jucker’s (1997) proposal. His proposal, as well as mine, does not deny the existence of any other sort of approach such as *well* as a response marker, as an initiation marker, turn initiator or as a pre-closing device. However, what I mean to do, following these three types suggested, is to propose the different ways, or subtypes, in which, in my view, *well* functions.

To get started, I will deal with the categories that I consider to work on the *textual level*, *pause filler* and *frame marker*, but they both have different functions that I will comment on.

In those cases of *well* used as a *frame marker*, we may find it; either to introduce a new topic in conversation or to preface direct reported speech:

(12) originally. (SP:PS03S) Well they don't look like there's, the boots (SP:PS03T) Well they're damn clean! Now, nip all that up and eat it.¹⁴ (BNCKBBS_Conv)

(13) her friend died in the (unclear)2. (SP:KBEPSUNK) (unclear) (SP:KBEPSUNK) Listen me Blanche she said, *well* I knew the truth she said (unclear) was a friend to me. (SP:KBEPSUNK) Yeah. (BNCKBES_Conv)

In line with this, I have nothing else to add apart from what Jucker (1997: 93) suggested. In extract (12), *well* marks the introduction of a new topic brought into the conversation. As we can observe in this example, *well* has little to do with the previous utterance, hence, it is used in order to move onto a new topic in conversation. The speaker may need to change or shift the present topic for various reasons, but this may lead to incoherency, for this reason, *well* is introduced in order to indicate a

¹⁴ SP:[…] stands for a particular speaker in a particular conversation.
switch in the topic and to keep the coherency in the conversation, in other words, to avoid the switch to be abrupt. In my opinion, this way of using *well* may overlap, to some extent, with the function of *mitigator*, as I will explain later on. Witness the following:

(14) the door open with it. (SP:PS535) Yeah. (SP:PS532) My feet ache. (SP:PS532) Well I can't cook cos I've got (SP:PS535) Well my feet ache as well. (BNCKCAS_Conv)

To my mind, this event makes the classification of *well* as a DM difficult, especially taking into account that these functions work on different levels.

However, despite sharing the label *frame marker*, in extract (13) we find a different use. As Jucker (1997: 93) claims, it introduces direct reported speech separating the reported speech from the immediately preceding reporting clause “she said”. Furthermore, he argues that this practice implies a deictic reorientation (Jucker, 1997: 93). In my view, this happens due to the action of reporting a speech, which entails a reformulation of the original utterance, not due to the presence of *well*. It is to be borne in mind that *well* in these cases is likely to occur preceded by reporting verbs such as “said” or “suggested”.

In those cases in which *well* is used as a *pause filler*, it implies a use that suggests bridging interactional silence:

(15) they're always mucky! (pause) I think they're horrible they are! (SP:PS03S) Well they look mucky in the shops! And that's (SP:PS03T) Well no they do. (BNCKBBS_Conv)

Based on Jucker (1997: 95), *well* as a *pause filler* is used in order to bridge interactional silence, further arguing that it signals a speaker’s claim to the floor. I do believe, as well, that the main purpose of using *well* as a *pause filler* is claiming the floor, however, its particular purpose may differ from one situation to another. In extract (15) the speaker is just claiming the floor because there is something else to be added to the conversation. Therefore, *well* signals the switch of turns between speakers and who is the one who holds the floor at a specific time. Analysing the data retrieved from both corpora, I came to the conclusion that, in these cases, *well* is likely to appear,
for instance, followed by I think, I suppose or I believe. Whether these collocations are present or not, *well*, in my view, is used with the aim to add a personal opinion, as in (15) and (16).

(16) found she couldn't get anything better. That's probably nearer the truth (SP:PS4BU)

*Well* I think, I've got ta say that I think it might be ha—. (BNCJN7S_meeting)

However, something that called my attention was that there are also instances where we find *well* followed by, for instance, I think, I suppose and I believe, in which it functions as a *mitigator*, therefore, this will later on explained.

Although *well* is used in order to claim the floor, there are also instances in which it does not work, in other words, it does not fulfil its initial function:

(17) next year. (SP:PS27U) Mhm. (SP:PS27T) Have we decided for next year? (SP:PS27R)

*Well* (SP:PS27S) Well I think we are round to any other business I suppose. (SP:G59PSUNK). (BNCG59S_meeting)

In extract (17), we can clearly see that the use of *well* in this situation does not work as it is intended to, since the speaker is not allowed to say anything else, on the contrary, the interaction is interrupted by another speaker.

(18) that subsidy should continue? (SP:PS5VG) Well, whether I think it should or (SP:PS5VF) *Well*, but I ask you that one. (SP:PS5VG) Whether I think it should or. (BNCKRKS_brdcast_discussn)

Extract (18) can be considered as a good example of how *well* may be used in order to claim the floor and interfere in a conversation while somebody else is speaking. The speaker (SP:PS5VG) uses *well* as a way to claim the floor and interact in the conversation, however, the exchange is interrupted by the other speaker, (SP:PS5VF). The latter of the speakers uses *well* in order to interrupt the person who is speaking. This event is, to my mind, an illustrative example since the speaker (SP:PS5VG) cannot finish the utterance at a time, and finishes it once (SP:PS5VF) has intervened.
These two are not, in my opinion, the two single ways of using *well* as a *pause filler*, as in my estimation, another way of claiming the floor while using *well* is as follows.

(19) just because of promises either, you know, not generally. (SP:PS03W) No. Well no, I mean, a-- (pause) tha-- even tha-- that one the other day. (BNCKBDS_Conv)

In extract (19) what the speaker is trying to do is to claim the floor but, actually, what I believe is that *well* is used in order to keep the floor in situations of hesitation. The speaker is, then, looking for something to say or searching the right words. To my knowledge, the speaker is trying to bridge the silence as Jucker proposes, but the reason why *well* is used is that the conversation needs to be reorientated. This occurs since we are tackling spoken contexts, a context in which participants do not have time to think about what they are going to say. This event prompts the appearance of *well*, in these cases, accompanied by many other DMs such as *I mean*, as we can see in the example, *actually* or *yeah*, filling up the gaps within the conversation. Furthermore, it is also probable to find it followed or proceeded by several repetitions, which point out the lack of time, hesitation, and the reorientation of the utterance. Likewise, it is highly probable to find *well* surrounded by pauses, as the one in the example above.

On the other hand, I will deal with the category of *mitigator* that, to my mind, works on the *interpersonal* level (see section 3.3.2). On this level, *well* can be used as a way to save someone own’s face or someone else’s face, with the purpose of being polite, as in the following extracts:

(20) which they are funded and (SP:PS5VF) Do you think that subsidy should continue? (SP:PS5VG) Well, whether I think it should or (SP:PS5VF) Well, but I ask you that

In extract (20) I believe that *well* is used with the purpose of mitigating, of not compromising someone own’s face. The answer to a *yes/no*-question is avoided by breaking Grieece’s maxims, above mentioned. The speaker in this extract tries to avoid to answer by using *well* and replying with something that is not to be expected from such a question.
(21) firm and I think that you have a feather one haven't you? (SP:PS1F2) Well I always have a feather one and I, I have (SP:PS1F1) Yeah (SP:PS1F2) two. (BNCKCSS_Conv)

In extract (21), yet, well is used with the purpose of mitigating, but in this case, the speaker (SP:PS1F2) tries not to compromise someone else’s face, the face of the speaker (SP:PS1F1), indeed. The speaker (SP:PS1F2) not wanting to attack the image of the others uses well and asserts that not only one, but two feathers. Furthermore, the absence of well, in this case, would lead to impoliteness by the speaker (SP:PS1F2). This event, made me reflect upon the absence of well in those cases in which, in the event of being missing, it would lead to impoliteness:

(22) are! (SP:PS03S) Well they look mucky in the shops! And that's (SP:PS03T) Well no they don't, not originally. (SP:PS03S) Well they don't look like. (BNCKBBS_Conv)

This extract illustrates that in the event that well had been missing, it would have led to an impolite behaviour. I consider this assumption relevant since it is likely to happen in those cases in which one of the speakers is opposing any other speaker in the conversation, for instance, invitations that result in rejections. In other words, the absence of well in such cases would lead to changes in the politeness level of the utterance or even of the conversation.

As a conclusion, I believe that the two ways of using well as a mitigator are bounded to the event of adding strain or taking it away from the conversation. Thus, they are supposed to happen since they mitigate any kind of bad feeling, misunderstanding, disagreements, refusals, rejections and clashes within a conversation, keeping the image of all the participants safe and avoiding the tone of the conversation to be elevated.

To put an end to my analysis, I will show one of the examples that I previously mentioned, in which I notice, a certain degree of overlap between the two categories, mitigator and pause filler:15

15 The example here included (23) has been extracted from the Corpus of Contemporary American English and it has been referenced according to the codes provided by this corpus.
(23) TAVIS-SMILEY-1HOS# Those persons are Africans, though. We should point that out.

GRETA-VAN-SUSTEREN# Well, yes, but the thing is that, also, I should say -.

(COCA2012SPOKABC_ThisWeek)

In extract (23), I consider *well* to be used as a mitigator, however, it was difficult to determine whether it was *pause filler* or *mitigator*. Likewise, it could also be interpreted as *pause filler*, yet, as in many other cases, everything I could do was to resort to the context in order to conclude its use. Thus, in a wide number of occasions, I had to rely on the context in order to classify the uses of such a versatile DM, *well*. 
7.0. Summary and concluding remarks

The main purpose of this dissertation was to study the nature and function of discourse markers in present-day written and spoken English, with particular attention to one of the most frequent in both contexts, ‘well’. This means to present a proposal that may clarify the complex status of these items. DMs have been investigated in this dissertation by considering the work of some linguists who over the last few years have shed some light on this topic. Thus, the first chapter reviewed the main theories and research studies conducted to clarify the status of these words.

First of all, I relied on the arguments provided by Jucker (1998), Schourup (1999), and Schiffrin (1987) that let me make a choice as regards terminology, ‘discourse marker’. Taking Brinton’s 1996 work as a starting-point, in order to shape a definition of DMs, I displayed a general list divided into five different approaches as to what the main functions of discourse markers could be. As I pointed out above (see section 3.1), the range (A-E) of this list is regarded as the primary set of functions by a wide amount of scholars. Section 3.2, taking Schiffrin’s 1987 and Jucker’s 1998 works as a referential point in the light of the effect they caused on this field of study of discourse markers, presented the main features of DMs. Section 3.3 was devoted to the discussion of the main functions based mainly on the arguments supplied by Brinton (1996) and Fraser (1999). The latter gained importance in section 4.0 where the taxonomy of discourse markers was dealt with. Finally, section 5.0, based on what Schiffrin pointed out in her 1987 work, was devoted to the contexts of occurrence broadly speaking, and to the importance of intonation in speech.

After this brief review of the theoretical background, I analysed in close detail the ‘well’ as a DM in spoken and written British and American English. For this purpose, I selected two main corpora, the BNC (British National Corpus) and COCA ( Corpus of Contemporary American English) (see section 6.2).
Their different registers in both spoken and written language seemed highly suitable for this in-depth analysis given that the main objective was to observe up to what extent *well* is used in present-day British and American English, according to the context of occurrence.

After a general review of the DM *well*, all the potential occurrences of this selected DM in the BNC and COCA were examined and contrasted (see section 6.3.3; 6.3.4). The second step was to separate those hits that could not be considered as actual cases of DM. Therefore, they were addressed to as false positives, separated from those that represent true cases of this DM, hence, not taken into consideration in my analysis. The classification of the uses of *well* was carried out relying on Jucker (1997); however, discrepancies were found and commented in section 6.3.2.

One of the most immediate conclusions drawn from the analysis of *well* in BNC and COCA is that it is far more frequent in spokenness rather than in writtenness. A reasonable explanation could be that DMs are, to some extent, more characteristic of spoken language and related to a certain degree of informal registers. Another issue that my data shows and, thus, undeniable is that *well* as a DM works on the textual level and that applied to both media of expression, speech and writing. For further observations see Discussion section, 6.5, where I discuss the different uses of *well* in particular instances.

Nevertheless, the data used for this dissertation, although useful to obtain a glimpse of the behaviour of the DM *well* in spoken and written British and American English may be insufficient to make solid statements about their use in present-day English. It would be very interesting to carry out further research by expanding the sample selected and by using other types of corpora that may contain meta-information about the speakers. Attention could also be paid to how *well* is used in ELF instances and whether they are used in the same way a native speaker does.
Bibliography

Primary sources

British National Corpus <https://corpus.byu.edu/bnc/>, last access 25/06/18.
Cambridge Dictionary <https://dictionary.cambridge.org>, last access 25/06/18.
Corpus of Contemporary American English <https://corpus.byu.edu/coca/>, last access 25/06/18.

References cited

Aijmer, Karin & Simon-Vandenbergen, Anne-Marie.

Andersen, Gisele & Fretheim, Thorsteim.
2000 Pragmatic Markers and Propositional Attitude. Amsterdam & Philadelphia:


Blakemore, Diane.

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

Brown, Gillian.

Brown, Penelope & Levinson, Stephen C.


Callies, Marcus.


Carlson, Lauri.


Crystal, David & Derek, Davy.


De Klerk, Vivian.


Edmondson, Willis J.


Erman, Britt.

1987  *Pragmatic Expressions in English: A Study of “you know”, “you see”, and “I mean” in Face-to-Face Conversation*. Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell.

Even-Zohar, Itamar.


Fischer, Kerstin.


Fraser, Bruce.


Fung, Loretta & Carter, Ronald.


Goldberg, Julia Anna.


Grice, Paul H.

Halliday, Michael A. K.


Hansen Mosegaard, Maj-Britt.


Hölker, Klaus.


Holmes, Janet

1986 Functions of you know in Women’s and Men’s Speech. Language in Society 15: 1-22

James, Allan R.


Jucker, Andreas H. & Ziv, Yael.


Östman, Jan-Ola.


Quirk, Randolph, Greenbaum, Sidney, Leech, Geoffrey & Svartvik, Jan.  


Redeker, Gisela.  


Schiffrin, Deborah.  


Schourup, Lawrence C.  


Stubbs, Michael.  


Svartvik, Jan.

Svartvik, Jan & Stenström, Anna-Brita.


Zwicky, Arnold.

Appendix A: well in BrE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nº</th>
<th>Genre</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>KBB</td>
<td>S_conv</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>Pause fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>KBB</td>
<td>S_conv</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td>Mitigator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>KBB</td>
<td>S_conv</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>Pause fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>KBB</td>
<td>S_conv</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>Frame Marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>KBB</td>
<td>S_conv</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td>Mitigator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>KBB</td>
<td>S_conv</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Positive Propositional</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>KBB</td>
<td>S_conv</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>Pause fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>KBB</td>
<td>S_conv</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>Pause fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>KBB</td>
<td>S_conv</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>Pause fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>KBB</td>
<td>S_conv</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>Pause fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>KBB</td>
<td>S_conv</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>Pause fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>KBB</td>
<td>S_conv</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td>Mitigator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>KBB</td>
<td>S_conv</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>Pause fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>KBB</td>
<td>S_conv</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>Pause fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>KBB</td>
<td>S_conv</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>Pause fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>KBB</td>
<td>S_conv</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>Pause fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>KBB</td>
<td>S_conv</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>Pause fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>KBB</td>
<td>S_conv</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>Pause fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>KBB</td>
<td>S_conv</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>Pause fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>KBB</td>
<td>S_conv</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>Pause fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>KBB</td>
<td>S_conv</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>Pause fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>KBB</td>
<td>S_conv</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>Pause fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>KBB</td>
<td>S_conv</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>Pause fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>KBB</td>
<td>S_conv</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>Pause fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>KBB</td>
<td>S_conv</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>Pause fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>KBB</td>
<td>S_conv</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>Pause fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>KBB</td>
<td>S_conv</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>Pause fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>KBB</td>
<td>S_conv</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>Pause fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>KBB</td>
<td>S_conv</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>Pause fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>KBB</td>
<td>S_conv</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>Pause fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>KBB</td>
<td>S_conv</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>Pause fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>KBB</td>
<td>S_conv</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>Pause fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>KBB</td>
<td>S_conv</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>Pause fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>KBB</td>
<td>S_conv</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>Pause fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>KBB</td>
<td>S_conv</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>Pause fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>KBB</td>
<td>S_conv</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>Pause fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>KBB</td>
<td>S_conv</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>Pause fill</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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97

Genre

Function

Level

Label

Remarks

38 K/D8 _S_conv_ do that then? (SP:PS50LK) The full turn in (pause) count. (SP:PS50LT) Suppose, well (pause) imposing we count ins and outs and the (SP:PS50L) Yeah, (SP:PS50LT) sample. DM Textual Pause Filler Restructuring speech. Well +

39 K/D8 _S_conv_ and you're just adding bits (SP:PS50K) No. (SP:KDBPSUNK) to it or something. (SP:PS50K) Well no I did it last week and one of the referencing I couldn't remember DM Interpersonal Mitigator +Negation

40 K/D8 _S_conv_ , right, and, and if you actually knew what you were doing and well aware of what you're doing you would do it a hundred times better and I DM Textual Pause Filler EDMs

41 K/D8 _S_conv_ minds up (SP:PS50N4) That's right (SP:PS50N3) er and I sort of, I thought well you know, I mean, I mean, I've sort of that end of that and I DM Textual Pause Filler

42 K/D8 _S_conv_ were a new one. (SP:PS51HP) What are all those different colours for? (SP:PS51HN) Well it's (pause) blue. (SP:PS51HP) Mm. (singing) Doo be doo doo. (pause) You DM Textual Pause Filler Restructuring speech. Well +

43 K/E0 _S_conv_ lot of this then? (SP:PS50NK) Wednesday. Wednesday, it must have Thursday, well (pause) he sat in the store as they called him (unclear2? (laugh) (SP:PS50SY) Mm. (SP:PS50N)

44 K/E6 _S_conv_ to bits, try to move everything in here that she wouldn't chew (SP:PS50NX) Well you couldn't? (SP:PS50NX) No. DM Textual Pause Filler +Negation

45 K/P0 _S_conv_ get bought and (SP:KDBPSUNK) He'll sit on them. (laugh) (SP:KDBPSUNK) (unclear) (SP:KDBPSUNK) Well no but if I do bad' em (SP:KDBPSUNK) Whether or not they are DM Interpersonal Mitigator +Negation

46 K/P9 _S_conv_ the door open with it. (SP:PS53ST3) Yeah (SP:PS53ST2) My feet ache. (SP:PS53ST2) Well I can't cook cos I've got (SP:PS53ST5) Well my feet ache as well DM Textual Frame Marker New Topic. It could also be seen as a mitigator as

47 K/P9 _S_conv_ My feet ache. (SP:PS53ST2) Well I can't cook cos I've got (SP:PS53ST5) Well my feet ache as well DM Interpersonal Mitigator I'm sorry to let you know that

48 K/P9 _S_conv_ Well I can't cook cos I've got (SP:PS53ST5) Well my feet ache as well DM Positive False

49 K/P9 _S_conv_ We've got (SP:PS53ST5) Well my feet ache as well I, my legs as well (SP:PS53ST2) Twenty past twelve we finished last DM Positive False

50 K/P9 _S_conv_ I've got (SP:PS53ST5) Well my feet ache as well I, my legs as well (SP:PS53ST2) Twenty past twelve we finished last (SP:PS53ST5) That's what I DM Positive False

51 K/P9 _S_conv_ (SP:PS50ST5) So what's the difference between black (unclear) and (pause) Malcolm X (SP:PS53ST5) Well actually I like Margaret Thatcher cos she's a (SP:PS55ST5a) Well there's more DM Textual Pause Filler Restructuring speech.

52 K/S _S_conv_ you're? (SP:PS50ST4) Yeah. (SP:PS50ST3) She should've told me or (SP:PS6ST9g) She might as well be (unclear2? (SP:PS50ST9) Don't know. (SP:PS6ST9) Why? (SP:PS6ST9) She doesn't DM False False

53 K/S _S_conv_ you not got (unclear)? Oh I don't understand that! Oh! (SP:PS6ST9) Well she says (unclear) (SP:PS6ST9) Oh! Oh dear! DM False False

54 G/YU _S_interv_ ew_oral_history meet you until eleven o'clock. As-- as-- (unclear) of course and naturally I says DM Textual Frame Marker New Topic

55 G/YU _S_interv_ ew_oral_history you until eleven o'clock. As-- as-- (unclear) of course and naturally I says well why, why is he getting (unclear)? Is he in the building? No DM Textual Frame Marker Reported Speech

56 H/S _S_interv_ ew_oral_history (caught) (SP:PS52ST2) You remember Cliff Quay been developing? (SP:PS52ST2) I remember it very well. Well before I went to Hemel Hempstead, my father was dredging the first part of DM Textual Pause Filler Restructuring speech

57 H/D _S_interv_ ew_oral_history Mm. (SP:PS22ST9) he had a way with him and he was, got on very well with Mr (-----) and er he told us afterwards that erm the whole trouble was DM Positive False

58 J/G _S_interv_ ew_oral_history Harlow that sold (SP:PS51ST4) Oh yes at one time erm after the New Town got well started, after The Stow was built got to be, goes up to The DM Positive False

59 J/G _S_interv_ ew_oral_history got built to the, goes up to The Stow and be-- beyond er, well it's just, going on into em, er towards the swimming bath DM Textual Pause Filler

60 K/ST _S_interv_ ew_oral_history --in given that there weren't many women at that time er in (SP:K/PS50ST0) Well DM Positive False

61 F7C _S_meetin_g do (SP:PS51LT1) The blind people respond really (SP:PS51ST2) wanted to come back, yeah (SP:PS51LT1) well to somewhere they've been (SP:PS15LT7) Yeah (SP:PS15LT7) That's right DM Textual Pause Filler Claming the floor.

62 G/S _S_meetin_g next year. (SP:PS27STU) Mm. (SP:PS27STU) Have we decided for next year? (SP:PS27ST9) Well DM Textual Pause Filler Claming the floor

63 G/S _S_meetin_g that's an Annual General Meeting of it's full council. (SP:PS45ST5) Mm. (-----) (-----) DM Textual Pause Filler Claming the floor

64 H/YF _S_meetin_g --extend that er, later in the season. So, it's going well. (SP:HYFPSUNK) Erm, I seem to be remember that when we met earlier in the DM False False

65 H/YF _S_meetin_g right and I remember it correctly, whether that's still the view? (SP:PS30ST5) Well I think that I don't think we're meeting. I think that I've got to say that I think it might be. DM Interpersonal Mitigator Saving someone something

66 J/ST _S_meetin_g mean, otherwise we assume simply that people don't know. (SP:PS30ST5) Mm. (SP:PS30ST5) the answer to the first question is that, no we don't have DM Textual Pause Filler Restructuring speech. Doubting

67 J/G _S_meetin_g found she couldn't get anything better. That's probably nearer the truth. (SP:PS48ST8) Well I DM Textual Pause Filler Claming the floor

68 J/N _S_meetin_g I'm very much looking forward to being a member of N C V O as well as being a consumer of it's excellent services, and while I've got the DM True Positive

69 J/NK _S_meetin_g rather hope they do, it'll be a little while yet, we could well see a change in the security of tenure issue, which might make it easier DM False Positive
they don't, let us know.

Sister Cooney took it and shook it warmly.' They'll look after you.

what I'm giving you.

your case, why not? You're stunning,'' I suppose.

there, hammer some more tenterhooks in somewhere else and put it on there as.

增加 me pension and (unclear) was very good. (SP:JT5PSUNK) Right. Okay then.

so how do you know you're right and I'm wrong? (SP:PS5MU)

I got a video (pause) and, like, that's all we got a

and I agree with what you say. When we first started

we have a non-destructive policy. But I've been a member for many years

mine's the National Canine Defence League. (SP:PS30G) I see now that's one

Russians indeed feel oppressed in the Baltic and, and probably in other Republics as

at Lloyds who stake everything they have in order to rake in enormous profits.

are actually (pause) given any instruction on how to use them? Yes? (SP:FLRPS006)

Well they had a particularly bad time many of them lost absolutely everything and now they.

there, there are shades of democracy.

democracies erm aren't the same as we are, they're (unclear) (SP:FRRPSUNK) Yes well it's (unclear) (SP:FRRPSUNK) And there, there are shades of democracy.

twenty four hours yes. (SP:PS2C3) Oh aye, (unclear) yes (unclear) know them very

two double one

on the flat in England in 1990, and lot's more as well.

a copy of the Time Form's'
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nº</th>
<th>Genre</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>CCK</td>
<td><em>W_fct</em></td>
<td>accidental or deliberate? If we could host the Defos to the surface we might well find out.*</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>Propositional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>CCK</td>
<td><em>W_fct</em></td>
<td>the Defos to the surface we might well find out.*</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>Propositional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>AT7</td>
<td><em>W_fct</em></td>
<td>is Conway. But what the hell is she doing?* Well, you'd better ask her. Ma, hadn't you? As she</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>BP0</td>
<td><em>W_fct</em></td>
<td>marriage, I should have thought, is a false step you must have been well warned against. With such as you as his wife, how can a man</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>Propositional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>JT</td>
<td><em>W_fct</em></td>
<td>Stephen Holly’s voice carried a curious brusqueness. What did he want? Well, you don't tell two old people that a year and a bit too</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>JT</td>
<td><em>W_fct</em></td>
<td>that. We worked very hard to get him out of the Soviet Union — well, you know all that, Mr Carpenter will have told you, and he</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>JFB</td>
<td><em>W_fct</em></td>
<td>'s the Ketterings' dog. It seems to have come home.* Well, we can't be expected to look after it. Not on top of</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>FEE</td>
<td><em>W_fct</em></td>
<td>you go to explain that place, I should like to know? Well, never mind, Egalitarianism's never been my strong suit, but I overcame</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>PR0</td>
<td><em>W_fct</em></td>
<td>This is it, then,* she said. 'We might as well face it.* No way,' Bemice shouted bitterly.* I feel</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>Propositional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>FS3</td>
<td><em>W_fct</em></td>
<td>you were the father of Jane Davenant's son.* Will laughed.* Well, well,* he said,* people say that, do they?* What will</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>FS3</td>
<td><em>W_fct</em></td>
<td>the father of Jane Davenant's son.* Will laughed.* Well, well,* he said,* people say that, do they?* What will</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>GOE</td>
<td><em>W_fct</em></td>
<td>'Both of you! We're more to worry about.' Well,* just keep an eye on it,* said Davull,* without taking his</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>GIL</td>
<td><em>W_fct</em></td>
<td>said left and I said right.* Which was it?* Well, it was right, actually,* said Fenella.* We consulted the</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>G3E</td>
<td><em>W_fct</em></td>
<td>'s right, mate. This member of your staff anyway. I know damn well what you’re up to and I don’t like it. So show it</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>Propositional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>G7V</td>
<td><em>W_fct</em></td>
<td>I think you are probably mad. But I will stay.* Very,* said the stranger.* Now remember your promise. You’ve been</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>Propositional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>G7V</td>
<td><em>W_fct</em></td>
<td>when I was about fifty, and gone* through you know what, well* this Sunday I was feelin’ there wasn’t much left to go on.</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>B86</td>
<td><em>W_fct</em></td>
<td>got stiffened, then edged away in a fading mum-blle.* Well,* I suppose things must be rather trying for you, what with...*</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>B88</td>
<td><em>W_fct</em></td>
<td>know what I mean. Give them a chance to test themselves. Death as well as life. Not so different, a soldier's job, from the clump.</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>Propositional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>HA5</td>
<td><em>W_fct</em></td>
<td>‘Why should I? She assumed the air of sang-froid so well known to her acquaintances back in England,* I’m not so agree that</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>Propositional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>HA7</td>
<td><em>W_fct</em></td>
<td>‘s hush! Have you, now,* he said softly.* Well,* well,* it didn’t take you long,* did it? I’d</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>HA7</td>
<td><em>W_fct</em></td>
<td>‘ Have you, now,* he said softly.* Well,* well,* it didn’t take you long,* did it? I’d forgotten your</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>HGE</td>
<td><em>W_fct</em></td>
<td>and well cared for, he noted professionally. She was also a young woman well accustomed in having her own way — there was no doubt of that.*</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>Propositional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>BFI</td>
<td><em>W_fct</em></td>
<td>She’d put her finger on it. Sometimes it takes people years.* Well,* said Km,* don’t expect me to look after Apcot while</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>BGM</td>
<td><em>W_fct</em></td>
<td>‘ve got to work pretty intimately with the team, and we need you as well. Don’t worry about Jason,* I’ve promised there won’t be a</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>Propositional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>BGV</td>
<td><em>W_fct</em></td>
<td>she was still attired in the old cotton gown, now stained with blood as well as dirt. She sat, leaning her cheek on her hand, gazing down</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>Propositional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>BHA</td>
<td><em>W_fct</em></td>
<td>your mother and your brothers.* And as she remained stubbornly silent,* Well,* at least you’re going to take a look — and see just what</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>JWE</td>
<td><em>W_fct</em></td>
<td>‘ she said.* It’s fixed* Owen nodded.* it was always on the cards. He’s</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>J10</td>
<td><em>W_fct</em></td>
<td>(For his own’s face.</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>F4</td>
<td><em>W_fct</em></td>
<td>LADY DAVERS: Jeezey, sit down and don’t touch the creature. Well, child, how don’t find yourself. Thou’rt got into a fool’s paradise</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>K1N</td>
<td><em>W_news</em></td>
<td>Is reported to have said like Prince William and Prince Harry to enrol later as well. Then it was onto</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>Propositional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>AJP</td>
<td><em>W_news</em></td>
<td>better spending a weekend in Antwerp, about 15 miles to the east, less well preserved architecturally but with more comprehensive museums and galleries, and much more the feet</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>Propositional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>K4Y</td>
<td><em>W_news</em></td>
<td>Northern Gains the Northern League magazine with which we have some slight connection.* Well produced and excellent value for money, it has the professional look you</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>Propositional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>K5A</td>
<td><em>W_news</em></td>
<td>he said. Well, whatever the qualifications. He recovered from an opening 80 to beat par</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>Propositional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>BM4</td>
<td><em>W_news</em></td>
<td>football and almost went further ahead when Wiston headed just over. Chart were competing well and also had their chances. After the interval, with the wind and slope</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>Propositional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>CMB</td>
<td><em>W_news</em></td>
<td>Day (Chester 6f, Gd-Sft). Previously produced and excellent value for money, it has the professional look you</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>Propositional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nº</th>
<th>Genre</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>W_non_ac_s</td>
<td>difference is not usually of much consequence because in both cases the practical strengths are well below what they ought to be. The causes of weakness in adhesion are rather</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Propositional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>W_pol_law</td>
<td>as the month progressed it became clear that the scandal involved opposition party members as well as members of the LDP. A senior SDP legislator, Ryoichi Yamasue, agreed.</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Propositional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>W_non_ac_s</td>
<td>‘So I said, ‘Just coming out of my refreshments.’ Well, he said ‘it’s now six thirty-two. I’m reporting you</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>Frame Marker  Reported Speech. I asked to ‘he said’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>W_non_ac_s</td>
<td>old flat. And then arrangements had to be made to transport his cats as well as himself to the new flat. By discussion, planning and reviewing the achievements</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Propositional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>W_religion</td>
<td>and another. These comparisons and evaluations are also made by children. This is well recognised by parents who are invitably concerned that their children make friends with the</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Propositional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>W_non_ac_s</td>
<td>revenue loss resulting from smuggling by reducing duty levels to lower its profitability, as well as by strengthening the preventative service. By 1796 the yield from wine duties had</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Propositional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>W_non_ac_s</td>
<td>to what Advanced Micro says is classroom microcode, and other copyrighted programs, as well as the microcode that is acknowledged to come from Intel. Intel also notes that</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Propositional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>W_non_ac_s</td>
<td>‘ There is no negotiation with SunSoft,’ Cunningham says. He is well aware however, that if USL were to hold the keys for an industry</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Propositional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>W_religion</td>
<td>the building has been drawn in. There will usually be those who are quite well disposed towards the church but who are drifting. Some may be converted and disillusioned</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Propositional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>W_biogr</td>
<td>was crazy about football. He idolised Ibro. He had a bad back as well, you know, just like</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Propositional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>W_non_techn</td>
<td>by the constant tedium of work on the land. During Hannahl's childhood and well beyond. Dalestow lived in a closed world where to travel more than a dozen</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Propositional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>W_non_techn</td>
<td>of the heat would then be dissipated. A question: you may as well have it, but it's on the table! No! Anything</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Propositional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>W_biogr</td>
<td>the board of directors will, if insolvency is imminent, be well advised to put the interests of creditors (including those of employees) before those</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Propositional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>W_commerce</td>
<td>Act 1986, the board of directors will, if insolvency is imminent, be well advised to put the interests of creditors (including those of employees) before those</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Propositional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>W_non_techn</td>
<td>the Telford area. These hotels are offering competitive corporate business rates, as well as superior accommodation and leisure facilities which the Valley Hotel does not have. But</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Propositional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>W_non_techn</td>
<td>rare, although poor visibility caused through low cloud and rain is common (the well known Scotch Mist). However, we ran out of the fog somewhere near</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Propositional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>W_non_techn</td>
<td>table below shows IM Treasury forecasts for growth in components of aggregate demand, as well as total gross domestic product and manufacturing output, made at the time of the</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Propositional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>W_commerce</td>
<td>‘ So I said,’ Just coming out of my refreshments.’’</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>Frame Marker  Reported Speech. I asked to ‘he said’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>W_non_techn</td>
<td>moved her and her mother to a separate pen. Other breeds of goats may well be different but my Goldens are very kind to each other and have a strong</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Propositional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>W_misc</td>
<td>and the remedy lies partly in the hands of each one of us as well as in the hands of governments and large industries throughout the world. You'll</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Propositional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>W_unknown</td>
<td>noted regularly at other localities on the chalk and east of Hastings. There were well over 100 birds summering in 1976. The birds arrive on the cliffs in January.</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Propositional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>W_cork</td>
<td>‘It's not possible, building on the things that go well? 5; 8 Improvements Do you look at different ways of doing things and</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Propositional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>W_commerce</td>
<td>Convocation has met five times, receiving regular reports on the progress of CUCGA as well as dealing with Convocation affairs. Convocation was again represented on GRADUATION</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Propositional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>W_commerce</td>
<td>has been well cleaned. Once you have covered the mirror with the glass you may well find that several pieces of fluff have been trapped between the two, and are</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Propositional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>W_misc</td>
<td>something is more correct than 'to recommend that someone do something'. Well, well. Haan't Mr Brittlebrain ever heard of the subjunctive? I suggest that</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Propositional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>W_misc</td>
<td>is more correct than 'to recommend that someone do something'. Well, well. Haan't Mr Brittlebrain ever heard of the subjunctive? I suggest that he</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Propositional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>W_misc</td>
<td>about what others will understand when making off the cuff remarks to those you know well. Leave out obvious remarks, jargon, and private jokes, otherwise you'll</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Propositional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>W_misc</td>
<td>know why, so I asked him how much he knew about me? Well, we know a lot,' he said. 'But there's a</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Propositional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>W_misc</td>
<td>that it will now have considerably enhanced status and authority and will become even more well respected.' Simon N Davis FHCIMA Catering Audits &amp; A Note to say</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Propositional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>W_misc</td>
<td>the new Hospitality. Interesting, good use of colour, easy to read. Well done! Melvyn Green OBE FHCIMA Consultant to the hotel, food service and</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Propositional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>W_misc</td>
<td>vests like the one shown here, from the Decca range in Belgium, as well as into running shirts, thermal tops, leggings and other garments aimed at professional</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Propositional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix B: *well* in AmE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>Function Level</th>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>N B C</td>
<td>T o d a y</td>
<td>Show</td>
<td>A B C</td>
<td>Baby Driver with Anel Elgort and Jon Hamm, that's doing really, really well! so -- HODA KOTCH! Okay. All right. KATHIE-LEE-GIFFORD! How are you doing? HODA-KOTCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>N B C</td>
<td>T o d a y</td>
<td>Show</td>
<td>A B C</td>
<td>I liked seeing how they make it. I thought it was cool. SHENEHELLE-JONES! Well, it was really cool enough having you guys. I think the best.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>N B C</td>
<td>T o d a y</td>
<td>Show</td>
<td>A B C</td>
<td>Tain at home. Guess what? You can win a cruise at home as well. Thanks to Windstar Cruises, we're giving away one more Mediterranean cruise to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>P C</td>
<td>B k: G r a s e P r e d i c t i o n s</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A B C</td>
<td>parade. That gives us cheer! A toast, my dear! # All well and good - but are we on the soup, or the 温度? Who</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>P C</td>
<td>B k: E b b</td>
<td>T i d e</td>
<td>A B C</td>
<td>&quot; We all have work to do, ain't it? &quot; &amp; &quot; well, Sallie's excused from redding up the kitchen this morning. &quot; Mammy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>P C</td>
<td>N w</td>
<td>G l o b a l</td>
<td>R e v i e w</td>
<td>A C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>N E W</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>B i l l i m e r</td>
<td>S e e</td>
<td>A C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>P C</td>
<td>P B S</td>
<td>B r o o k l y n</td>
<td>A E</td>
<td>A C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>P C</td>
<td>F r e s h</td>
<td>S a t u r d a y</td>
<td>M o m</td>
<td>A C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>P C</td>
<td>B C</td>
<td>T h i n k</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>P C</td>
<td>N P R</td>
<td>F r e s h</td>
<td>A E</td>
<td>A C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>P C</td>
<td>C N N</td>
<td>S i t u a t i o n</td>
<td>R o o m</td>
<td>A C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>P C</td>
<td>F r i e d</td>
<td>A c c l e a r</td>
<td>E v e n t</td>
<td>A C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>P C</td>
<td>F i l m H i s t o r y</td>
<td>A c c l e a r</td>
<td>E v e n t</td>
<td>A C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>P C</td>
<td>S c o r e d</td>
<td>A c c l e a r</td>
<td>E v e n t</td>
<td>A C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>M A G</td>
<td>N a t u r a l</td>
<td>A c c l e a r</td>
<td>T r a v e l</td>
<td>A C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>M A G</td>
<td>P e o p l e</td>
<td>A c c l e a r</td>
<td>T r a v e l</td>
<td>A C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>M A G</td>
<td>S a f e</td>
<td>A c c l e a r</td>
<td>T r a v e l</td>
<td>A C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>N E W</td>
<td>A u s t i n</td>
<td>A c c l e a r</td>
<td>T r a v e l</td>
<td>A C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>A C A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E m e r g e n c y</td>
<td>A c c l e a r</td>
<td>T r a v e l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>P C</td>
<td>N B C</td>
<td>T o d a y</td>
<td>Show</td>
<td>A B C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>P C</td>
<td>P B S</td>
<td>B r o o k l y n</td>
<td>A E</td>
<td>A C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>P C</td>
<td>P B S</td>
<td>F r e s h</td>
<td>A E</td>
<td>A C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>P C</td>
<td>F r e s h</td>
<td>B e f o r e</td>
<td>A E</td>
<td>A C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>P C</td>
<td>N B C</td>
<td>T o d a y</td>
<td>Show</td>
<td>A B C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>P C</td>
<td>F r e s h</td>
<td>T h i n k</td>
<td>A E</td>
<td>A C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Network</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Function Level</td>
<td>Label</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>SPOK</td>
<td>ABC B C</td>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>Pause Filler</td>
<td>Restructuring speech. Well = comma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>SPOK</td>
<td>ABC B C</td>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>False Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>SPOK</td>
<td>ABC B C</td>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>False Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>SPOK</td>
<td>ABC B C</td>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>False Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>SPOK</td>
<td>ABC B C</td>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>False Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>SPOK</td>
<td>ABC B C</td>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>False Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>SPOK</td>
<td>ABC B C</td>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>False Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>SPOK</td>
<td>ABC B C</td>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>False Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>SPOK</td>
<td>ABC B C</td>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>False Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>SPOK</td>
<td>ABC B C</td>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>False Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>SPOK</td>
<td>ABC B C</td>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>False Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>SPOK</td>
<td>ABC B C</td>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>False Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>SPOK</td>
<td>ABC B C</td>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>False Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>SPOK</td>
<td>ABC B C</td>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>False Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>SPOK</td>
<td>ABC B C</td>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>False Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>SPOK</td>
<td>ABC B C</td>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>False Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>SPOK</td>
<td>ABC B C</td>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>False Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>SPOK</td>
<td>ABC B C</td>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>False Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>SPOK</td>
<td>ABC B C</td>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>False Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>SPOK</td>
<td>ABC B C</td>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>False Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>SPOK</td>
<td>ABC B C</td>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>False Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>SPOK</td>
<td>ABC B C</td>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>False Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>SPOK</td>
<td>ABC B C</td>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>False Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>SPOK</td>
<td>ABC B C</td>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>False Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>SPOK</td>
<td>ABC B C</td>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>False Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>SPOK</td>
<td>ABC B C</td>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>False Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>SPOK</td>
<td>ABC B C</td>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>False Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>SPOK</td>
<td>ABC B C</td>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>False Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N°</th>
<th>Geo</th>
<th>Func Levl</th>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>SPOK</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>FIC</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>FIC</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>MAG</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>FIC</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>SPOK</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>SPOK</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>SPOK</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>SPOK</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>MAG</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>A CA</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>SPOK</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>SPOK</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>SPOK</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>SPOK</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>SPOK</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>SPOK</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>FIC</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>MAG</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>SPOK</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>A CA</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>SPOK</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>SPOK</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>SPOK</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>MAG</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>SPOK</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>SPOK</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>MAG</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>SPOK</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>SPOK</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>SPOK</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>SPOK</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>SPOK</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>SPOK</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>SPOK</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>SPOK</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Textual</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
tuna is exported to the United States for hard currency.

sixteenth ravines than ditches or trenches. How big are those trenches? Mr. CORDESMAN: I guess KOPPEL All right. We'll pick we can understand this in American terms, would this be --

: Sam, we have a few seconds left- quick question. Mr. DONALDSON: To you, Mr. Suarez, the former president of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce. " Dean has done as

A few minutes ago, we heard that the women's rap trial. And, you know, all of a sudden the Kennedys --

ways again? Mr. SUAREZ: I would say my family stuck by me fairly

problems with the economy or not

argue with me. I mean, isn't that ridiculous? Sen. LOTT:

all Democrats. They're all Democrats. I will bet you, ladies and gentlemen, that of the Independents, well...

"s what the Clinton candidacy is about. That's why it's resonating so well in all regions in the country, among all demographic groups. That's why

... than the Olympics. In

improbability that France would stand by and do nothing, events in Somalia (as well as in Liberia) clearly demonstrate that Djibouti could fragment into fiefdoms controlled by local

... that all politics is local and it's

... as a history of

... and failures? What do you think of that, George? Mr. WILL: A few moments ago, I had -- I'm not. # # HARRY #

... in all regions in the

... in all regions in the

... to go in at night for one reason

... as a large number of relatively small changes. (n13) Not until 1993,

Well, if I died in childhood I can't have any more scripts and make

... that of the Independents, well...

... the next big war -- and it could very well have been Bosnia --

... good little boys and girls. # Then what happened? the women at the well always asked. # False Positive

... the well always asked. # False Positive

... the well always asked. # False Positive

... that of the Independents, well...

... well -- Suddenly, a donkey wandered by, and the kid started

... well -- I don't know. That's what I'm
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nº</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Tag</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>MAG AmSpepit</td>
<td>ABC</td>
<td>bidders, they cease being farmers and become water entrepreneurs. They might do quite well out of it, but the farming communities would suffer. The California Farm Bureau</td>
<td>False Positive</td>
<td>Propositional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>MAG History Today</td>
<td>ABC</td>
<td>as an artful game, seems occasionally to have been played in elegant courtyards as well as in the more familiar surroundings of the public tavern. # In the second</td>
<td>False Positive</td>
<td>Propositional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>N EW SanFrancChron</td>
<td>ABC</td>
<td>this may be the referential key to &quot; David and Goliath IV,&quot; as well. # The situation he sets up is novel with possible meanings, from</td>
<td>False Positive</td>
<td>Propositional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>SPOK ABC 2 8/20</td>
<td>ABC</td>
<td>people could have. Ms. LEET: I got the impression, &quot; Oh, well, you bought the dog, you got a lemon, so what?&quot;</td>
<td>DM Textual Pause Filter</td>
<td>Restructuring speech.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>SPOK CNN Crossfire</td>
<td>ABC</td>
<td>back in the Gulf to correct a much more difficult situation down the road KINSLEY Well, you disagree completely then with George Bush who in the Newsweek that just came</td>
<td>DM Textual Pause Filter</td>
<td>Restructuring speech.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>SPOK PBS NewsHour</td>
<td>ABC</td>
<td>to speak? You say there's evidence. What is it? MR-MILHOLLIN: Well, to export these devices, permits are required, and the permits are only</td>
<td>DM Textual Pause Filter</td>
<td>Restructuring speech.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>SPOK ABC Nightline</td>
<td>ABC</td>
<td>leadership, either. Why is that? JOHN AQUILINO, former NRA Employee: Well, quite the opposite of the reason that Dewey has. I think that there</td>
<td>DM Interpersonal Mitigator Politeness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>MAG RollingStone</td>
<td>ABC</td>
<td>control. # BIG MONEY, INDEED. TICKET SCALPING IN NORTH AMERICA may well be a $300-million-a-year business. Involving some of the biggest concert promoters, managers</td>
<td>False Positive</td>
<td>Propositional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>A CA Monit 10</td>
<td>ABC</td>
<td>complete justification must actually show that no other possible form of ownership can do as well. # 3. Ownership and Scarcity # In this section, I shall focus</td>
<td>False Positive</td>
<td>Propositional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>