Englishes Today

Englishes Today:

Multiple Varieties, Multiple Perspectives

Edited by

Cristina Suárez-Gómez
and Elena Seoane

Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing

Englishes Today: Multiple Varieties, Multiple Perspectives

Edited by Cristina Suárez-Gómez and Elena Seoane

This book first published 2015

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN (10): 1-4438-8386-7
ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-8386-3

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The scholarly articles included in this volume are based on presentations delivered at the international conference *Englishes Today: Theoretical and Methodological Issues*, held on October 18-19, 2013, in Vigo. For generous financial support, we gratefully acknowledge the Spanish Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness (grants FFI2011-26693-C02-01, FFI2011-26693-C02-02, FFI2014-53930-P and FFI2014-51873-REDT) and the Regional Government of Galicia (grant GPC2014/060). We are also grateful to those who made both the conference and this volume possible. Our gratitude goes to Lucía Loureiro-Porto, University of the Balearic Islands, and a member of our research project *Morphosyntactic Variation in English Worldwide* (ViEW), and to Javier Pérez-Guerra, University of Vigo and coordinator of the research group *Language Variation and Textual Categorization* (LVTC), for their invaluable support. Other members of LVTC were also crucial in the organization of the conference: Loli González-Álvarez, Ana Martínez-Insua, Esperanza Rama-Martínez, Rosalía Rodríguez-Vázquez and Nuria Yáñez-Bouza. Special thanks to our student helpers, Sofía Bemposta-Rivas, Carla Bouzada-Jabois, Eduardo Coto-Villalibre, Yolanda Fernández-Pena, Evelyn Gandón-Chapela and Úrsula Kirsten, who contributed with their diligent and enthusiastic work to the smooth running of the conference.

This volume would not exist without its contributors and thanks are due to the authors of the different chapters, for their collaboration and their patience. It has been a pleasure working with you, and we hope that you have found the experience as rewarding as it has been for us. We are also greatly indebted to the following colleagues who acted as external reviewers for their valuable comments and insights: Mario Cal-Varela, Fátima Faya-Cerqueiro, John Kirk, Lucía Loureiro-Porto, Javier Pérez-Guerra and Carlos Prado-Alonso.

We would like to thank everyone at Cambridge Scholars Publishing for their unfailing commitment to this project. We are particularly grateful to Carol Koulikourdi and Sam Baker for their detailed correspondence and the valuable assistance they have provided over the course of the whole process. Last, but not least, our sincere thanks to Teresa Fanego, University of Santiago de Compostela, for all her sound advice and unfailing support.

THE EDITORS

INTRODUCTION

ENGLISHES TODAY: MULTIPLE VARIETIES, MULTIPLE PERSPECTIVES

CRISTINA SUÁREZ-GÓMEZ

The volume *Englishes Today: Multiple Varieties, Multiple Perspectives* is a response to the recent emergence of English as "the world's first truly global language" (Crystal 2004, 4), currently spoken by nearly a third of the world population. The idea of English as a transnational language has motivated new fields of research with a primary focus on the English language in this context, and will form the thematic backbone of the present volume.

The expansion of English around the world has led to the development of distinctive first, second and foreign varieties. Accordingly it has been necessary to coin a term which captures the diverse multicultural identities and the new sociolinguistic realities involved. It is no longer possible to speak of an English language, but rather of *Englishes* (Kachru 1992, 357) to refer to the new sociolinguistic reality. Several attempts have been made to classify the different Englishes that exist today, the most influential being that of Braj Kachru. This model classifies varieties into three concentric circles (Inner, Outer and Expanding), these representing how the English language emerged in different countries and the status it currently has in each context. The Inner Circle includes countries where English is a first or native language, such as the US, the UK, Canada, Ireland and New Zealand; the Outer Circle comprises countries in which English is considered a non-native variety or a second language, as in Singapore, Sri Lanka and South Africa. Finally, the Expanding Circle includes countries in which English is used as a foreign language or lingua franca, such as Japan or Spain. This tripartite classification serves as the general structure for the present volume.

The spread and globalization of English has proved to be of interest in the study of diverse linguistic phenomena. From a methodological perspective the study of Englishes poses a challenge, and attempts have been made to address these in corpus linguistics, sociolinguistic fieldwork and variationist studies. With the current collection we intend to contribute further to this fascinating field of research with new ideas from different frameworks and approaches dealing with English today.

The volume offers a stimulating selection of original papers that reflect current trends in English linguistics research and can be characterized broadly in terms of (i) the study of the different diatopic and diastratic varieties of English, and (ii) the adoption of various theoretical and methodological perspectives. Hence it contributes to this increasingly fashionable but still somewhat under-explored field of research by drawing together ideas from different frameworks and approaches. The papers deal with the globalization of English in itself and with the origin, development and status of varieties of English, often seen as a testing ground for different frameworks and research traditions, including typological linguistics, second language acquisition, contact linguistics and sociolinguistics.

The collection is organized into three parts. The first part ("Native Varieties of English") contains in-depth studies on several native varieties of English (American English, British English, Canadian English, Irish English, New Zealand English and Ulster Scots). In Part II ("Non-native varieties of English") the focus is on non-native varieties in the Asian (Sri Lankan English and Singapore English) and African (South-African English) contexts. Both Part I and Part II contain contributions which address crucial aspects of language variation and change, either through the analysis of linguistic features in specific varieties of English or by comparing and contrasting a range of varieties; differences between World Englishes and the parent varieties are often explained here within a framework of contact linguistics and language acquisition. Part III ("English as a Foreign Language, English as a Lingua Franca") presents research on English as a Foreign Language (EFL), a discipline in English linguistics that is currently the subject of much interest and debate. Another hot issue discussed here is that of the repercussions of the globalization of English on the teaching and learning of English as a foreign language, and here a plea is included for the implementation of necessary changes in this area.

This volume also reflects on traditional and new methodologies in the description of English(es) today. Sociolinguistic interview data, elicitation instruments, verbal reports, metalinguistic comments and acceptability

judgments by speakers are discussed, both in isolation and in combination with corpus-based methods, including multidimensional analyses. The best known and widely used resource is the *International Corpus of English* (ICE) collection of corpora, together with the *British National corpus* (BNC) and the *Corpus of Contemporary American English* (COCA), but several contributions to this volume provide their own data on a variety of languages.

Additionally, new sources of data are suggested, such as role-plays, which open the door to a new analysis of ethnolinguistic realities. These new sources will undoubtedly prove crucial for future work on the complex reality of multilingual and multifocal settings.

Part I ("Native Varieties of English") opens with two studies drawing on the exciting field of language variation, and illustrates the use of vernacular features in first-language varieties of English. Chapter 1, "Element-final *like* in Irish English", by Mario Serrano-Losada, explores Irish English through an analysis of element-final *like* in the Irish component of the ICE corpus. It shows how a pragmatic marker, obsolete in most English varieties, becomes an entrenched feature of Irish English. Serrano-Alonso illustrates how this distinctive trait is not necessarily restricted to the realm of private communication, as is often the case with vernacular features, but often extends to public settings, such as classroom discussions or business transactions.

Barbara Balle-Mascaró and Cristina Suárez-Gómez analyse the morphological variation found in the preterite and past participle forms of the verbs *burn*, *learn* and *sink* in four different varies of English (British, American, Canadian and New Zealand English). Basing their analysis on the corresponding components of the *International Corpus of English*, they show that the geographical variety is one of the most important factors conditioning the distribution of forms, in that American English and Canadian English clearly favour the use of regular forms (*burned* and *learned*), as opposed to British English and New Zealand English, which show a higher degree of fluctuation, with the preference for one form or another appearing to be lexically determined. Of special relevance is the case of New Zealand English, due to the various different linguistic pressures to which it has been subjected.

Another variety featured in this section is Ulster Scots, analysed here by Göran Wolf in the paper "Does present-day written Ulster Scots abandon tradition?". In an attempt to answer this question, the author compiles his own web-based corpus of written texts, MUST-C (*Miscellaneous Ulster-Scots Texts-A Corpus*). He defends the linguistic status of Ulster Scots, the northern Irish language variety, which has also

been strengthened recently by a renaissance in literary production, although the status of this has been a controversial issue. He also demonstrates that Ulster Scots has changed from the traditional variety, illustrating this through an analysis of spelling in a sample of 40 words that belong to the present day lexicon of Ulster Scots. Through this study he is able to observe that the graphical evolution of such words shows divergence, which he attributes to ethno-political issues, and processes of language-contact.

The second grouping of chapters, in Part II, focus on "Non-native varieties of English", with chapters 4 and 5 further illustrating grammatical variation in English with the analysis of linguistic features in second-language varieties developed in postcolonial contexts, and chapter 6 addressing the issue of identity in the multi-ethnic reality of South Africa.

Eduardo Coto-Villalibre, in Chapter 4, takes *get* + past participle constructions as its reference point. In "Down the passive gradient: from agentive to borderline *get* + past participle constructions in Singaporean English" he proposes an innovative classification of such constructions along a gradient in terms of degrees of passiveness ranging from more passive, illustrated by central *get* passives, to less passive, illustrated by so-called resultative *get* constructions. He exemplifies this gradient with constructions from Singaporean English, drawing from the Singaporean component of the *International Corpus of English*, and classifies the constructions using criteria of a syntactic, semantic and pragmatic nature.

The following paper "*Be going to* and *have to*: a corpus study of Sri Lankan English usage in comparison to British and American English", by Manel Herat, provides a most original comparative analysis of the 'quasi-modals' *be going to* and *have to* with the modal verbs *will* and *must* in Sri Lankan English, British English and American English. She uses the Sri Lankan component of the *International Corpus of English* for the Sri Lankan data, the BNC for the British English data, and the COCA for the American English data. Her findings reveal that *have to* is on the increase in Sri Lankan English in comparison with the traditional modal *must*, irrespective of genre. This is explained in terms of a trend which diverges from British English. Nevertheless, such a trend does not seem to affect the distribution of *be going to* and *will* in expressions of volition (intention). Here the former is favoured in speech-like contexts, and the traditional *will* becomes the default option.

The closing essay in this section revises the status of the English language in the multilingual reality which affects most individuals of South Africa. As Pedro Álvarez-Mosquera shows, the role of English among these speakers is strongly associated with issues of identity, both at

a social level (how you are perceived) and at a personal level (how you define yourself). The ethnic groups of interest in this study, White Afrikaans speakers and Black speakers of African languages, coincide in their positive evaluation of the use of English; however, by over-using English, especially those of the latter ethnic group, speakers run the risk of attracting in-group derision and being labeled *coconuts* or *cheese girls*. Additionally, the use of English enters into conflict with their mother tongues, which embody their traditional identities.

The third and final part of the volume focuses on the most peripheral English varieties, those from the Expanding Circle. "English as a Foreign Language, English as a Lingua Franca" includes two contributions based on case studies, one from Japan and the other Spain. Amy Aisha Brown, in "A portrait of English and its users in Japanese junior high school textbook", compares six different textbooks authorized by the Japanese Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT). She shows that these textbooks present an "imbalanced picture of English use in the world today". In her analysis she observes that individually these textbooks display an "unexpected amount of diversity," in that they present not only Japanese characters but also inner circle speakers. However, speakers belonging to countries in the expanding and outer circles, mostly Asian, are very rarely found. Of special interest is her comparison between intranational and international interaction, rather than between native and non-native speakers, as was the case in a previous, comparable analysis by Matsuda (2002). Brown justifies her decision here in relation to the issue of the native speaker, claiming that there is no longer any empirical evidence of what counts as a native speaker. The article concludes with a plea to the Japanese Textbook Authorization and Research Council for "implementing guidelines to ensure that more balanced views of English usage are presented in the future".

This section, and the whole volume, closes with Chapter 8, a paper entitled "Apologies in interlanguage pragmatics: the role of retrospective verbal reports in oral production." Interlanguage pragmatics has been a favoured topic of research in the field of language teaching and acquisition since the 90s. On these lines Beltrán-Palanques and Martínez-Flor report on a study conducted among students of English as a Foreign Language. A particularly notable feature of this research is that it includes participants who are bilingual in Spanish and Catalan, and who in addition are studying English, hence introducing a context of trilingualism. The study seeks to analyse the language of thought (i.e. Catalan, English or Spanish) of these participants in reporting apologies, plus attended aspects during task performance and speakers' pragmatic knowledge. These features were

examined through the combination of role-plays featuring situations which entailed the use of apologies, and retrospective verbal reports, these immediately following the role-plays, with participants asked to report their thoughts when carrying out tasks. Ultimately, the paper also emphasizes the relevance of incorporating the formal instruction of pragmatic knowledge into the foreign language classroom in order to achieve more successful communication.

Taken together, these eight chapters constitute an inspiring collection of essays which together serve as a fine illustration of the multiple varieties, approaches, perspectives and methodologies that characterize the study of the English language today.

References

Crystal, David. 2004. *The Language Revolution*. Malden, MA: Polity Press.

Kachru, Braj. 1992. "Teaching world Englishes". In *The Other Tongue: English across Cultures*, edited by Braj Kachru, 355-366. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Matsuda, Aya. 2002. "Representation of Users and Uses of English in Beginning Japanese EFL Textbooks". *JALT Journal* 24: 182-200.

PART I:

NATIVE VARIETIES OF ENGLISH

CHAPTER ONE

ELEMENT-FINAL *LIKE* IN IRISH ENGLISH: NOTES ON ITS PERVASIVENESS, INCIDENCE AND DISTRIBUTION[1]

MARIO SERRANO-LOSADA

Element-final *like* is one of the most distinctive features of Irish English despite being an obsolescing trait in most English varieties. This chapter explores the incidence and distribution of this pragmatic marker in Hiberno-English with the aim of determining whether element-final *like* is used beyond private communication, i.e. in public communication situations. For this purpose, I analyze the public spoken dialogue component of ICE-Ireland (Kirk and Kallen 2007). The comparison of my results with those of previous accounts (Kallen 2006; Columbus 2009) sheds some light on the distribution and frequency of this pragmatic marker in Irish English. My findings suggest that element-final *like* often crosses into formal public settings despite being much more frequent in informal private conversation. Moreover, my data reveal that far from being a receding dialectal marker, element-final *like* is well entrenched in Irish English.

1. Introduction

Pragmatic (or discourse)[2] *like* is undoubtedly one of the most prominent traits of present-day vernacular Englishes (D'Arcy 2005, 2) and a widely acknowledged linguistic feature.[3] Overtly stigmatized, it is usually associated to the speech of adolescents and young adults (Andersen 2001; Tagliamonte 2005; D'Arcy 2007) and has been often considered a trait of non-standard and even careless speech frequently used as a 'filler' for lexical indecision (Underhill 1988, 234; Miller and Weinert 1995, 366). Nevertheless, the use of pragmatic *like* is pervasive across varieties of English (Miller and Weinert 1995; Dailey-O'Cain 2000;

Andersen 2001; Tagliamonte 2005; Levey 2006; D'Arcy 2008; Miller 2009; Schweinberger 2012).

As a pragmatic marker, *like* is well known for its "functional complexity and distributional versatility" (Andersen 2001, 210). In fact, its numerous functions have been described extensively in the literature; however, these descriptions have dealt almost exclusively with clause-initial and clause-medial instances of *like*. Element-final instances of the marker—i.e. instances at right periphery (Traugott 2012, 2013; Degand 2014)—such as (1), have received little scholarly attention:

(1) It's up to you, *like* <ICE-IRL S1B-016$A>[4]

Despite the stigmatization of pragmatic *like*, the written record reveals that the particle has been performing discourse-pragmatic functions for quite a long time. In fact, examples in which *like* is used parenthetically to qualify a preceding statement are frequent in descriptions of traditional dialects from the late nineteenth century onward, and the feature is attested in the OED as early as 1778 (Miller and Weinert 1995, 367-368; Andersen 2001, 222). In such early instances pragmatic *like* generally appears in utterance-final position (D'Arcy 2005, 4).

Element-final *like* has generally been considered a dialectal feature typical of the 'northern' varieties of the British Isles (Hedevind 1967; Miller and Weinert 1995; Andersen 2001; D'Arcy 2005). Recent research points towards the decline of this right peripheral marker in some of these varieties (cf. Bartlett (2013) for a study of the feature in Tyneside English). However, it is robust in Hiberno-English (Kallen 2006, 14). In fact, element-final *like* can be considered a distinctive trait of vernacular Irish English,[5] a feature of spoken informal interaction used, among other functions, to focus or hedge.

This chapter aims to examine the incidence and distribution of element-final *like* in Irish English. With this purpose in mind, I analyze the public spoken dialogue component of ICE-Ireland (Kirk and Kallen 2007) in order to determine whether the feature surpasses the sphere of private communication and crosses over into the sphere of public communication. I also draw on other studies derived from ICE-Ireland, namely Kallen's (2006) overview of element-final *like*, Columbus' (2009) study of this feature in the private spoken component of the same corpus, and Schweinberger's (2012) sociolinguistic study of discourse marker *like* in Irish English. The comparison of my results with those of previous accounts sheds some light on the distribution and frequency of element-final *like* in Irish English. My findings show that even though the marker is much more recurrent in informal and private communication than in

formal and public communication, it does often cross into more formal settings. Moreover, my data show that far from being receding or dialectal, element-final *like* is a well-established marker in Hiberno-English.

The chapter is organized as follows. Section 2 establishes some theoretical background and basic notions on pragmatic markers and *like*. Section 3 describes the corpus from which the data were extracted and the methodology that was followed. Section 4 presents the results. Section 5 is devoted to the analysis of my findings. Finally, in section 6 I set out my main conclusions and recommendations for future research.

2. On pragmatic markers and *like*

There is no easy way to define a pragmatic marker, nor is there consensus as to what constitutes one. According to Brinton (1996, 35), pragmatic markers are a "heterogeneous set of forms which are difficult to place within a traditional word class". These include items such as *ah*, *just*, *like*, *really*, *well*, *I mean*, *I think* and *you know* and are predominantly features of spoken discourse. Such markers are high-frequency items which are generally stylistically stigmatized and considered to have little or no propositional meaning (or at least to be difficult to specify lexically). Moreover, they are considered to be optional rather than obligatory features, occur either outside the syntactic structure or loosely attached to it, and have no clear grammatical function. Pragmatic markers may be multifunctional, operating simultaneously on the local and global levels, as well as on different linguistic planes (including textual and interpersonal levels) within the pragmatic component (Brinton 1996, 33ff.). Nevertheless, as Andersen notes:

> It is important to point out that the term 'pragmatic' is not meant to suggest that markers are void of semantic content or that the meanings they contribute are entirely inferred on an ad hoc basis. On the contrary, pragmatic markers convey meanings that are linguistically encoded, but these may be […] difficult to specify in terms of lexical import. Pragmatic markers are associated with aspects of communication that are to a great extent context-based, such as the identification of a speaker attitude towards an expressed proposition, where attitude includes notions such as speaker commitment, affective evaluation and evaluation of 'newsworthiness' (Andersen 2001, 22)

Taking these general observations on pragmatic markers into account, in the following I first provide a brief overview of *like* and its different

grammatical and pragmatic functions, then turn to a more detailed characterization of pragmatic *like* in element-final position.

2.1. *Like* as a pragmatic marker

Like is one of the most ubiquitous and multifunctional lexemes in the English language (D'Arcy 2006, 339). On a grammatical level, it may function as (2a) a lexical verb, (2b) a noun, (2c) a preposition, (2d) a conjunction, or (2e) a suffix:

(2a) I don't *like* that style of shoe. <ICE-IRL S1A-019$A>
(2b) It's too dangerous when you look at the *likes* of Bobby Nelson. <ICE-IRL S1A-097$B>
(2c) It looks *like* a key-ring. <ICE-IRL S1A-075$A>
(2d) And from time to time, you feel *like* you just want to walk away. <ICE-IRL S2B-025$A>
(2e) I found the negotiations we had with Fianna Fáil […] a lot more open and business-*like*. <ICE-IRL S1B-046$B>

Furthermore, *like* can also be a part of the quotative complementizer BE *like* (Romaine and Lange 1991; Buchstaller 2001, 2006; Tagliamonte and D'Arcy 2004). The construction BE *like*, as in (3), constitutes a unit with the specialized function of demarcating sequences of reconstructed dialogue, i.e. quoting. Thus, BE *like* here functions as a verb, synonymous to *say*, which can be inflected both for tense and agreement and whose omission would cause ungrammaticality:

(3) And he *was like*, "oh my God! You're never going to believe what just happened!" You know? And I'*m like*, "what?" So he said, "uhm, basically what'd happened was his ex-girlfriend […]" <ICE-IRL S1A-044$A>

However, *like* can also perform a number of discourse and pragmatic functions (Andersen 2001; D'Arcy 2005, 2006). *Like* can be used (4) clause-initially as a discourse marker encoding textual information and relating the utterance to previous discourse (Schiffrin 1987; Brinton 1996), or (5) clause-medially as a discourse particle signaling pragmatic information such as the speaker's epistemic stance (Andersen 2001), among others (D'Arcy 2006, 339-340):

(4) The whole family is devastated […]. *Like* we'd all been at sea for twenty-one years. <ICE-IRL S2B-007$C>

(5) (a) He was *like* really winded but he managed to *like* grab her. <ICE-IRL S1A-044$A>
(b) This really is *like* a land under occupation. <ICE-IRL S2B-024$A>

The syntactic functions of *like* in examples (4) and (5) are not as precise as those in (2) and (3), and the omission of the word in (4) and (5) would not cause ungrammaticality. Whenever *like* does not have a clear lexical meaning and does not serve one of the ordinary syntactic functions illustrated in (2) and (3), it is considered a pragmatic marker (Andersen 2001, 212). One of the characteristic traits of pragmatic markers is their lack of lexical meaning: "As both a marker and a particle, *like* meets the semantic emptiness criterion, imbued instead with pragmatic meaning(s)" (D'Arcy 2006, 340). It is amongst these discourse and pragmatic functions that we find element-final *like*.

2.2. Element-final *like*[6]

Unlike the instances of pragmatic *like* exemplified in (4) and (5), utterance-final *like* (examples (6) and (7)) does not precede the information to which it is attached but follows it, appearing as a conversational tag on the right periphery:

(6) He used to race bikes, *like*. He said he'd be working on chains every week, *like*. <ICE-IRL S1A-093>
(7) Ah no, I'm not saying that I don't know anything about acting, *like*. <ICE-IRL S1A-032>

Pragmatic *like* at right periphery remains one of the marker's least studied positions (Kallen 2006; Columbus 2009; Bartlett 2013). In a recent study on discourse *like* in Irish English, Schweinberger (2012, 197, author's capitals) states that "clause-final LIKE with backward scope is the most frequently used variant in the Irish data and does not appear to wane as in North American varieties of English", despite the fact that its use "has decreased among speakers younger than 25 years of age" (Schweinberger 2012, 196). The vigor of element-final *like* in this variety of English is also supported by studies on second language acquisition. For instance, Nestor et al. (2012, 343) have shown that migrants learning Irish English are prone to acquire pragmatic *like* in clause-marginal positions (including utterance-final position), which are the positions favored by L1 speakers of Irish English.

According to Corrigan (2010, 79), the idiosyncratic Hiberno-English utterance-final *like* is used in a similar manner to *you know* in the standard. However, as we will see later on, *you know* and final *like* are not exactly equivalent; in fact, they may co-appear, as in examples (13) and (15).

> The particular use of *like* in [Northern Irish English/Ulster Scots], which therefore seems rather more unusual in the context of vernacular Englishes (though variants of it are attested in varieties that have been influenced by them […]) is the sentence-final form […]. In fact […] far from focusing or introducing new information, it often acts as a closing for a narrative. As such, *like* in this position marks the end of old information. Moreover, it doesn't appear to function inherently as a focuser and may even have similar properties of mitigation which Kallen (2005) argues for *I'd say/you know* (Corrigan 2010, 100).

Even though Corrigan doubts the marker's function as a focuser, Kallen (2006, 12) argues that element-final *like* may be used to focus attention on a particular segment, as well as to mitigate the impact of an assertion (or to signal the end of old information), or to allow for a less exact commitment to a particular position, among others. Kallen's functions are in line with the functions attributed by Miller and Weinert to clause-final *like* in Scottish English ("retroactive focusing power"; "countering potential interferences, objections or doubts", Miller and Weinert 1995, 388-389).

3. Corpus and methodology

All of the data were drawn from the *International Corpus of English: Ireland Component* (ICE-Ireland), co-directed by John Kirk (formerly Queen's University Belfast) and Jeffrey Kallen (Trinity College Dublin). The *International Corpus of English* (ICE) project was first envisaged by Sydney Greenbaum (1988), who advocated the need for compiling materials to facilitate comparative studies of standard varieties of English worldwide. Thereafter, linguists around the globe started to develop the ICE project. Each ICE corpus comprises one million words of spoken and written English produced after 1989 and follows a common corpus design. Moreover, every text included in these corpora is produced by authors and speakers aged 18 or older who have at least completed secondary education through the medium of English. The *Ireland Component* of the ICE project is one such corpus. First released in 2007, ICE-Ireland provides 300 transcribed spoken texts belonging to 15 different communicative situations and 200 written texts both from published and

unpublished sources. These texts—compiled in two phases between 1990 and 2005—cover a range of formal and informal discourse situations. Given Ireland's geopolitical status, each written and spoken text category contains an equal number of texts from the Republic of Ireland and Northern Ireland, which gives the corpus a unique cross-border and international comparative approach (Kallen and Kirk 2008, 3-5).

As mentioned above, this study aims to analyze the spoken public component of ICE-Ireland. Table 1-1 provides a full account of the spoken dialogue component of ICE-Ireland (Kirk and Kallen 2007, 9):

Table 1-1. ICE-Ireland spoken component

Text category	**Text-id**	**No of texts**	**Words**
Dialogue		**180**	**401,971**
Private		*100*	*231,213*
Face to face conversation (FTF)	S1A-001-S1A-090	90	210,540
Telephone conversation (TEC)	S1A-091-S1A-100	10	20,673
Public		*80*	*170,758*
Business transactions (BUT)	S1B-071-S1B-080	10	21,447
Classroom discussion (CLD)	S1B-001-S1B-020	20	43,345
Broadcast discussion (BRD)	S1B-021-S1B-040	20	42,632
Legal cross-examination (LEC)	S1B-061-S1B-070	10	20,013
Parliamentary debate (PAD)	S1B-051-S1B-060	10	22,390
Broadcast interview (BRI)	S1B-041-S1B-050	10	20,931
Monologue		**120**	**250,995**
Unscripted		*70*	*148,984*
Spontaneous commentary (SPC)	S2A-001-S2A-020	20	43,028
Unscripted speeches (UNS)	S2A-021-S2A-050	30	62,777
Demonstrations (DEM)	S2A-051-S2A-060	10	22,069
Legal presentations (LEP)	S2A-061-S2A-070	10	21,110
Scripted		*50*	*102,011*
Broadcast news (BRN)	S2B-001-S2B-020	20	40,579
Broadcast talks (BRT)	S2B-021-S2B-040	20	40,964
Scripted speeches (SCS)	S2B-041-S2B-050	10	20,468
Total Spoken Texts	S1A-001-S2B-050	**300**	**652,966**

In an unpublished paper, Columbus (2009, available online) explores the functions of Irish English element-final *like* as an invariant tag (i.e. a tag question that does not change form such as Canadian English *eh?*, e.g. 'He hates math, *eh?*'). To this aim, she analyzes the private spoken conversation component of ICE-Ireland (face-to-face conversation and telephone conversation, S1A 001-S1A 100), a total of 231,213 words. She retrieves 169 instances in the private spoken subcorpus (+23 unclear uses), i.e. 73.09 instances per 100,000 words. Her study concludes, among other things, that invariant tag *like* in Irish English is clearly a focus marker (cf. Miller and Weinert 1995; Kallen 2006; Schweinberger 2012). Given that Columbus (2009) analyzes the private spoken component of ICE-Ireland, this chapter centers on the spoken public component of the corpus.

In order to have a corpus comparable in terms of size to that of Columbus (2009), the following text categories were selected for a total of 211,722 words:

Table 1-2. Text categories included in the subcorpus (public spoken dialogue + broadcast talks)

Text type	Texts	Words	No. of texts
Classroom discussion (CLD)	S1B-001-S1B-020	43,345	20
Broadcast discussion (BRD)	S1B-021-S1B-040	42,632	20
Broadcast talks (BRT)	S2B-021-S2B-040	40,964	20
Parliamentary debate (PAD)	S1B-051-S1B-060	22,390	10
Business transactions (BUT)	S1B-071-S1B-080	21,447	10
Broadcast interview (BRI)	S1B-041-S1B-050	20,931	10
Legal cross-examination (LEC)	S1B-061-S1B-070	20,013	10
Total		**211,722**	**100**

Although broadcast talks are classified under scripted monologue and not under public spoken dialogue, I decided to include them in the subcorpus because (a), in most cases, these texts contain dialogue and (b) the immediacy of some of the texts give rise to some spontaneity. Most importantly, unlike other scripted text categories which do not yield any results, broadcast talks do provide examples for utterance-final *like* (something hard to imagine had these been truly scripted texts). Table 1-3 provides the overall percentage distribution of words by text category in the subcorpus:

Table 1-3. Percentage word distribution by text category

Text type	Words	Percentage
Classroom discussion (CLD)	43,345	20.5%
Broadcast discussion (BRD)	42,632	20.1%
Broadcast talks (BRT)	40,964	19.3%
Parliamentary debate (PAD)	22,390	10.6%
Business transactions (BUT)	21,447	10.1%
Broadcast interview (BRI)	20,931	9.9%
Legal cross-examination (LEC)	20,013	9.5%
Total	**211,722**	**100%**

The selected text categories were analyzed individually using AntConc 3.4.3[7] in order to obtain the concordances for *like* in utterance-final position as well as to register frequency and relevant contextual data. Element-final *like* instances were selected manually, removing all non-final, adverbial, verbal and quotative occurrences. Due to its multiple syntactic functions and its common use as a pragmatic marker, the form *like* appears in a vast number of contexts in the subcorpus, and a thorough reading of the context was necessary (often full text-files) in order to select the relevant examples.

4. Results

From a total of 727 occurrences for *like*, 97 occur before a pause and only 41 (+5 unclear cases) are element-final instances of *like*. However, utterance-final *like* does not always appear before a pause: it may be followed by other pragmatic markers, namely *you know* (6 out of 41 occurrences, e.g. "Or through sports and stuff *like you know*" <ICE-IRL S1B-075$B>) and *so* (1 out of 41 occurrences, e.g. "And they didn't know they were together, and that kind of thing *like so*" <ICE-IRL S1B-017$B>). Due to the ubiquity and multifunctionality of *like* and the fragmentary nature of spoken discourse, transcription alone does not always suffice to account for the value of the marker. Thus, considering the transcription alone may result in ambiguous readings of an utterance between, for instance, a right peripheral and an interrupted left peripheral *like*, such as in (8), or between a non-marker reading and a marker reading:

(8) The trouble about somebody like Fowles you see is that <,> well it <,> I suppose *like* <,> most of these novelists <,> is that they are writing in response to other novelists […] <ICE-IRL S1B-019$A>

In (8), it is not clear whether the utterance "I suppose *like* <,> most of these novelists" has been disrupted or the particle is an instance of element-final *like*. In fact, *like* in (8) may well be considered a hesitational or linking device. As Andersen (2001, 255) points out, *like* can appear where a speaker interrupts his or her utterance without continuing. However, at first glance, this 'terminated' utterance may also appear to be an instance of element-final *like*. Thus:

> There is frequently a need for a multi-level analysis of pragmatic markers, as considerations of aspects such as phonology, prosody, context and topic are required where the grammatical analysis arising from a mere browsing of computer lists of examples will not suffice (Andersen 2001, 215).

Given the fact that ICE-Ireland (version 1.2) is not fully annotated and that I did not have access to the voice recordings, ambiguous cases such as (8) arose. Examples such as this have been considered under the label 'unclear cases'.

Table 1-4 offers a detailed account of element-final *like* occurrences by text type. A comparison of the results in Table 1-4 with Columbus' (2009) results (169 occurrences [+23 unclear cases]) is most revealing. The private spoken component yields 73.09 occurrences per 100,000 words, while the public spoken component yields only 19.37 occurrences per 100,000 words. As expected, element-final *like* is far more recurrent in private communication than in public communication. However, this pragmatic marker is also present and indeed widespread in public communication, at least in certain text categories.[8] Furthermore, not all the text types considered within public communication require the same degree of formality. In fact, the number of instances of *like* seems to be inversely proportional to the degree of textual formality (Legal cross-examinations being the most formal, with no results). Despite its widespread use, utterance-final *like*, as other variants of pragmatic *like*, remains a rather stigmatized marker and is generally considered a feature of private and informal communication.

Table 1-4. Element-final *like* in the public spoken dialogue component of ICE-Ireland

Text type	Words	Texts	Element-final *like*		NF (per 100,000 words)
			Tokens	Unclear cases	
Classroom discussion (CLD)	43,345	20	22	3	50.76
Business transactions (BUT)	21,447	10	10	2	46.63
Broadcast interview (BRI)	20,931	10	3		14.33
Broadcast discussion (BRD)	42,632	20	3		7.04
Broadcast talks (BRT)	40,964	20	2		4.88
Parliamentary debate (PAD)	22,390	10	1		4.47
Legal cross-examination (LEC)	20,013	10	0		0
Total	**211,722**	**100**	**41**	**5**	**19.37**

Kallen's (2006) analysis of the full ICE-Ireland corpus (1 million words) accounts for 400 instances of element-final *like*. Although my own analysis does not cover the entire corpus, Kallen's numbers seem rather high. The total number of occurrences for element-final *like* in the spoken dialogue component of ICE-Ireland (c. 400,000 words) lies between 210-238 (given that some of the items tagged as 'unclear cases' might or might not be utterance-final instances of *like*). Therefore, the spoken dialogue component would account for 52.5% to 59.5% of the claimed 400 total occurrences. Consequently, the remaining spoken component (monologue) and written component (which amount to c. 900,000 words) should account for the 162-190 instances left (that is, 40.5% to 47.5% of the alleged 400 occurrences). However, a preliminary examination of the written component of ICE-Ireland does not yield any results for element-final *like*. This is only natural for a pragmatic feature which is characteristic of spoken registers. Moreover, the remaining spoken component of the corpus (scripted and unscripted monologue) does not seem to provide enough occurrences to account for the missing 162-190 items needed to complete the 400 claimed by Kallen. Such differences in numbers could very well be the result of trying to analyze pragmatic features in transcribed spoken documents without access to the audio

recordings or to properly annotated texts, as explained regarding example (8). Further research should be carried out to provide a more accurate count of utterance-final *like* in the corpus. The use of SPICE-Ireland in future research—a version of the spoken component of ICE-Ireland that has been annotated to display aspects of pragmatics, discourse, and prosody (Kallen and Kirk 2012) —may help overcome such shortcomings.

Table 1-5. Alleged occurrences of element-final *like* in ICE-Ireland

			Occurrences		**Percentage**	
			-	+	-	+
Spoken dialogue ICE-IRL	Private dialogue	Columbus (2009)	169	192	42.25	48
	Public dialogue	This study	41	46	10.25	11.5
	Total Spoken dialogue		*210*	*238*	*52.5*	*59.5*
Remaining ICE-IRL	Spoken monologue +Written component		190?	162?	47.5?	40.5?
Total ICE-IRL		Kallen (2006)	400		100%	

5. Analysis

The following sections are devoted to an analysis of the results for each specific text type category. Although examples will be provided, not every instance of element-final *like* in the subcorpus will be accounted for.

5.1. Classroom discussion (CLD)

CLD makes up 21% of the corpus and accounts for 22 of the total of 41 occurrences in the corpus (53.65% of the occurrences; 50.75 instances per 100,000 words). Three unclear cases were also registered, among which example (8) above is found. As a text type, classroom discussions are less formal than, say, formal lectures. The texts compiled are small tutorial group discussions in which a lecturer and a few students converse.

(9) Can you use any age group <ICE-IRL S1B-001$H>
Aoife <#> Uhm <ICE-IRL S1B-001$A>
I mean can you use like a teenager *like* <ICE-IRL S1B-001$H>
Well <,> yes there is nothing to stop you using whatever age group you want <ICE-IRL S1B-001$A>

Example (9) is taken from text S1B-001, a Sociolinguistics CLD. (A) is a female student in the 19-25 age band.[9] In spite of being public academic communication, the environment is fairly relaxed. Thus, the use of utterance-final *like* seems permissible, and even lecturers employ it, as shown in examples (10) and (11):

(10) Yeah <#> Well I mean it's up to yourself <,> it's up to you *like* <ICE-IRL S1B-016$A>
And I have to do the other essays then <ICE-IRL S1B-016$E>
(11) No it doesn't matter *like* <,> but it just meant that you know <ICE-IRL S1B-018$A>

Example (10) belongs to text S1B-016, an Old English CLD. (A) is a male lecturer (unknown age band). This lecturer uses element-final *like* up to three times (out of the six times that it appears in the text). In (11) (from S1B-018, a Clinicians' CLD) another lecturer uses element-final *like* three out of the four times that it appears in the text. (A) is a female lecturer in the 34-41 age band.

(12) <X> <#> It depends how many people there are in the conversation *like* <#> Because if there's more than say <.><ICE-IRL S1B-004$B>

Text S1B-004 is a Sociolinguistics CLD. In (12), (B) is a female student belonging to the 19-25 age band. However, she is not a native speaker of Irish English. Even though (B) studies in Belfast, she grew up in England.[10] Her use of utterance-final *like* is the only one uttered by a non-Irish speaker in the subcorpus. Nevertheless, it is rather revealing: although it is possible that the speaker's native variety of English features this trait (e.g. Tyneside English), it is also quite possible that she has picked up the marker in Ireland. Just as non-native speakers of English have been shown to acquire element-final *like* (cf. Nestor et al. (2012) for the case of *like* and Polish migrants in Ireland), it is plausible that speakers of other varieties of English assimilate the feature due to extensive exposure to it.

As demonstrated by the examples above, the use of element-final *like* seems rather widespread in CLD. Whenever used in this context, utterance-final *like* seems to express insecurity or lack of confidence (i.e., it functions as a hedging device). Although students (younger speakers) seem more prone to employ it, lecturers (one of which was in the 34-41 age band) use it as well: six (plus one unclear case) out of 22 occurrences in CLD are uttered by lecturers. CLD, which is probably the least formal

text type in the subcorpus, yields the most instances. Thus, element-final *like* appears to be associated with more informal styles (in fact, informal text types such as this one returned the most examples).

5.2. Business transactions (BUT)

BUT account for 10% of the total words in the subcorpus and for ten out of the 41 utterance-final *like* occurrences in the subcorpus (24.39%; 46.63 instances per 100,000 words). Two unclear cases were registered. Right peripheral *like* seems to allow reinforcement by means of a second pragmatic marker, as three of the ten examples are followed by *you know*. Examples (13) and (14) are instances of such concatenation of markers:

(13) And then I thought well you know she mightn't be that stupid *like you know* <ICE-IRL S1B-075$B>
(14) I'd I'd take four if it was last <,> the last choice *like* <,> *you know* <#> If I had a proper look around at the other places first <ICE-IRL S1B-077$B>

Example (13) is taken from text S1B-075 (WEA interview). (B) is a female community worker (unknown age band). Example (14) belongs to S1B-077 (Flatfinders). (B) is a male, presumably a student looking for accommodation. Element-final *like* seems fairly widespread in BUT. The situations portrayed in this text category are diverse and reflect different degrees of formality (e.g. flat hunting, job interviews, student meetings). However, such situations are still rather permissive and allow the use of the marker.

As regards the concatenation of pragmatic markers, the co-appearance of utterance-final *like* with *you know* would indicate that in spite of claims which consider both markers equivalent (Corrigan 2010, 79), in reality they are not. In fact, unlike *you know*, element-final *like* does not explicitly engage the interlocutor (the interlocutor's approval is not directly sought-after). While *you know* is intersubjective, utterance-final *like* is subjective. This agrees with Traugott's claim that expressions at right periphery do not necessarily need to be intersubjective (Traugott 2012, 22).

5.3. Broadcast interview (BRI)

BRI account for three occurrences (7.32%; 14.33 instances per 100,000 words), all followed by *you know*. BRI represents 10% of the subcorpus. Utterance-final *like* seems to be less frequent in the media, probably due to