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ABSTRACT

Spoken language in English is a major obstacle for non-native English learners since the informality of this kind of language includes unclear purposes and metaphorical meanings. However, the prevalence of spoken language makes it inevitable to study for greater comprehensibility (Tabatabaei, 2011). This study, which is a corpus-driven analysis, aims to examine pragmatic functions of the distinctive phrases in spoken language, i.e., why not and go ahead. They were chosen as spoken devices which are representative for the word band occurring in low frequency in conversations, but it is worth investigating their characters. In the process of examining them, film dialogues gained from 40 movie scripts, which represent face-to-face conversations in terms of functional use, were collected for composing a film dialogue corpus (Biber, 1988). The target phrases are explored in various aspects by necessary theories in analyzing spoken devices, namely, speech acts, response tokens and discourse markers. In addition, with regard to extracting the implications of the positional form, the present study also examines the significance of position in talking turn of the target phrases. After examining them within the self-invented corpus, the results reveal that the target phrases why not and go ahead can contain more than one function and purpose at a time. Their most popular use is to serve the function of maintaining the continuance and signaling the switching-turn in
conversation. Furthermore, the phrase *why not* is preferable to serve the purpose of demanding for explanation while the phrase *go ahead* tends to be used as a phrase of directive and statement. The pattern emerging is that the phrase *why not* is likely to occur in isolation with predictable purposes while the phrase *go ahead* shows randomness of occurrence in talking turn. Pedagogically, a self-invented corpus can provide convenience of self-directed study by its adjustable attribute. Still, there are some defects that learners should consider for improvement, such as, finding a suitable point to analyze target samples within a corpus to claim the generalization.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND

Spoken language has been regarded as a great barrier for non-native English learners for decades as it contains many sophisticated features such as idioms, figurative language, and colloquial language including informal phrases. Since the informality of this kind of language contains unclear purposes and metaphorical meanings, it causes those who are non-native speakers to misinterpret and not be able to continue in conversations. Obviously, learning and understanding spoken language is inevitable in English communication because of the prevalence of using such language (Tabatabaei, 2011). For this reason, many learners of English as a foreign language (EFL) and English as a second language (ESL), who are enthusiastic in English learning, have been seeking a trail to acquire more understanding of spoken English.

While the awareness of employing multimedia in pedagogy is widespread, English movies are favorable and accessible resources for learning spoken language through dialogues among the characters. Film dialogue is an important feature for analysis in terms of semantic usage in real situations due to the fact that both face-to-face and movie conversation are both the same in functional use. They both project high affective, interactional, and generalized context, representative of spoken language which is distinctive of an interpersonal character (Biber, 1988). That is to say, expressions which are available in film dialogue can be valuable resources for investigating in any facet.

Among the various phrases that have been found in film dialogue, why not and go ahead, are similar and interchangeable in the sense of purposes. However, their patterns in grammar are quite different. Although the two phrases are not often used by the film characters, they can be noted by their prominent characteristics which possess interesting aspects used to affirm or negate speech by interlocutors. In addition, they are different in terms of speech acts which are diversified in each specific context. Consequently, the vague purposes of using the phrases why not and
go ahead brings the opportunity to investigate them for the purpose of acquiring the essence of such phrases. To reach the goal of the study, the two phrases are considered regarding the extent of pragmatic functions which are essential keys to point out the characteristics. While these functions rely on observations of “language-in-use” under each circumstance, this leads to the assumption that the relationship between speech acts and the meaning in contexts should be considered (Adolphs, 2008). Following speech act theory, the study focuses on exploring the disparity between semantic form and actual meaning in context. Furthermore, the target phrases are also categorized according to their functional uses by inducing the theories of response token and discourse marker into the methodology. Not only does the categorization matter in this study but also the significance of position in talking turn since it can illustrate the purposes by scrutinizing contexts in conversations. Fortunately, all these aspects can be studied by employing a potential device entitled a corpus which is also used in the present study.

In order to carry out the investigation, a corpus of film dialogue was created from forty scripts of American and British movies through a computer program called Antconc. The genre chosen to store in the corpus is comedy due to the fact that it holds the richness of informal talk and gives more space to conversation than action, thriller, or adventure genres, which contain more paralanguage and action. The two target phrases are automatically detected in the film dialogue corpus and thoroughly scrutinized through the surrounding contexts to meet the premise aforementioned.

1.2 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

This study attempt to explore appropriate answers to the following questions:

1.2.1 What are pragmatic functions of the phrases why not and go ahead in film dialogue?

1.2.2 What is the significance of position in talking turn of the phrases why not and go ahead in film dialogue?

1.3 HYPOTHESES

1.3.1 The phrases why not and go ahead are the same in the sense of purpose by judging from pragmatic functions.
1.3.2 If that is the case, *why not* and *go ahead* can be completely interchangeable in informal conversations.

### 1.4 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

1.4.1 To acquire important attributes including purposes of using the phrases *why not* and *go ahead* in conversations.

1.4.2 To categorize the phrases *why not* and *go ahead* in terms of speech acts as well as response tokens and discourse markers.

### 1.5 DEFINITIONS OF TERMS

1.5.1 **Learners** refer to people who are non-native users of English and study English in non-English-speaking countries.

1.5.2 **Film dialogue** refers to movie scripts, which are available on the Internet for downloading, containing spoken dialogue in the form of a text file. In the present study, they include only the genre of comedy for the purpose of narrowing down the scope of study.

1.5.3 **Phrases** refer to word chunks which are not containing both a subject and a verb. In the study they are comprised of film dialogues that express some parts of characters’ thoughts.

1.5.4 **Movies** refer to English soundtrack movies with or without subtitles that learners have watched from any sources: in theaters, DVDs, television, or computer files.

### 1.6 SCOPE OF THE STUDY

1.6.1 This study aims to explore the pragmatic functions of the two phrases *why not* and *go ahead* because they own some characteristics that can be used interchangeably.

1.6.2 The study was conducted by compiling forty scripts of American and British comedy movies which are available on the Internet. The scripts are collected into a computer program called Antconc for the purpose of creating a corpus of film dialogue.
1.6.3 The target phrases *why not* and *go ahead* are investigated and categorized based on theories of speech acts, response tokens, and discourse markers, also positions in talking turns are taken into account.

1.7 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

1.7.1 The findings from the study can be used to encourage learners to gain more competence in English spoken language.

1.7.2 Learners can be made aware that corpora recently play a crucial role in self-directed English learning. At the same time, they can also notice that English soundtrack movies are favorable and accessible resources for investigating spoken language.

1.7.3 The present study can raise the awareness of not only phrases, fragments or word chunks occurring in high-band frequency of spoken corpora that are worth for exploring but also those that appear in low-band frequency.

1.8 LIMITATIONS

The present study has limitations as follows:

1.8.1 Since the study is conducted by gathering only the genre of comedy to create a corpus of film dialogue, the results could be restricted in terms of diversity in pragmatic functions and categorization.

1.8.2 The phrase *go ahead* tends to occur in a low quantity. This causes the narrow scope of *go ahead* in various contexts and limits the results that might be useful for the study.

1.9 ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

The rest of the paper is organized in the following way. In Chapter 2, a review of literature is provided. This involves the review about the two target phrases *why not* and *go ahead* and necessary theoretical backgrounds. Chapter 3 deals with the research methodology, while results are presented in Chapter 4. Finally, Chapter 5 reveals the summary of the findings, the discussion, the conclusion, and recommendations for future research.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter reviews the literatures relating to this study. Section 2.1 accounts for the theory of speech acts while Sections 2.2 and 2.3 introduce spoken devices, response tokens and discourse markers, respectively. To comprehend the role of spoken language in pedagogy, Section 2.4 provides information on spoken language for learners. Observations on employing the target phrases in spoken language is included in Section 2.5 including the prevalent use of phrases why not and go ahead. Following with Section 2.6, the significant role of movies and film dialogue is mentioned. As this is a corpus-based study, Section 2.7 describes the corpus as a productive device. The last past of this chapter, Section 2.8, is dedicated to the relevant researches that are beneficial for the present study.

2.1 SPEECH ACTS

There are many theories that facilitate the analysis of spoken language. Definitely, speech act is one of those theories which are used to extract communicative purposes between speakers and listeners. This effective tool aids learners to identify and label the differences of communicative functions through utterances of interlocutors. According to the theory, as pointed out by Adolphs (2008), that particular speech act can be illocutionary – the gist of an utterance that a speaker produces, and perlocutionary – the actual purpose of the saying which can be direct or indirect. For example, the question Are you with me? may be used to inquire about the audience’s attention or interrogate regarding a problem in following the talk, while I’m sorry can be a response to signal the need for restating the talk or employed as a spoken device for politeness. This contributes to the unpredictable nature of conversation. The hardship is created from the varieties of speaker intentions and ideas, whereas conversation relies on reciprocation from both speaker and listener. Since the function does not attach to the utterance itself but emerges from the speaker, it is impossible that an utterance possesses only one function and in turn most speech acts own various functions.
According to the property aforementioned, it is worth employing the theory of speech acts in the study to explore the two target phrases. Suggested by Bednarek (2008), types of speech acts can be recognized by considering the purposes of those who produce the utterance. There are many of them that clearly exhibit the intention, such as, accusation, answer, clarification, contradiction, disqualification, demand for explanation, demand for clarification, directive, explanation, greeting and statement, insincere apology, insincere thanks, irony, justification, and possible counter-claim, question. To reduce the complexity, all of these can be classified in three main categories comprising negative judgment, neutral, and positive judgment through the appraisal analysis. Throughout the whole context of each conversation in film dialogue, the actual purpose is drawn out for interpreting and categorizing. In other words, the phrases *why not* and *go ahead* are examined in terms of the speech acts towards listeners. To understand the relationship between semantic form and function, several factors should be included as essential components under the rules of speech acts such as stress and intonation, pausing and rhythm, as well as paralinguistic features. However, the study focuses on analyzing spoken discourse in the scope of semantic features as the major objective of the present study.

2.2 RESPONSE TOKENS

Generally, in conversation, speakers and listeners require smooth communication which reduces the distance in relationship between them. Apart from body expressions which are exploited to be delivered along with the message, response token is a common feature of spoken interaction. This device mostly exists in the form of short utterances, *yeah, right, is that right?, definitely not* including *why not* and *go ahead*, for example, which are conducted by listeners to accommodate speakers. In consequence, the speakers rely upon these as a signal of how far the massage is being received. Response tokens are categorized, according to O’keefee, McCarthy, and Carter (2010), into the following:

2.2.1 Continuer response tokens: The main function of continuer response tokens is as their name advises that they maintain smoothness in conversations by stimulating the current interlocutor to continue.
2.2.2 Convergence response tokens: At the point that participants agree in opinions, the convergence response tokens function appears in terms of collaboration that in turn can be whether to change to other topics or follow the same topic in closure details.

2.2.3 Engagement tokens: The function of engagement tokens is to impact in an emotional aspect by signaling the current speaker’s enthusiasm, shock, or sympathy, while the speaker speaks without the purpose to seize the turn.

2.2.4 Context-specific functions: In some cases, specific phrases could be firmly associated with particular contexts that tend to be irreplaceable from other response tokens.

As a renowned tool for interaction between interlocutors, response token is included in the study as a device for recognizing and categorizing the two target phrases.

2.3 DISCOURSE MARKERS

To cope with the target phrases why not and go ahead, the characteristics of both response tokens and discourse markers are taken into account in the area of categorization.

Actually, besides the feature of response tokens, the phrases why not and go ahead still overlap the characteristic of discourse markers that leads them to complexity. Discourse markers, the spoken device which is employed to organize the conversations and observe its progress, are similar to response tokens in the extent of use, still they do have trivial discrepancies which can be illustrated, relating to the study of Forchini (2010), by their functions as the following.

2.3.1 Telling-commenting function: As a device for working within general conversation, this function is used for several purposes – introducing background information, shifting the topic, and adding information or comments.

2.3.2 Turn-dealing function: In many situations discourse markers can be a turn-taking device which is employed as a marker at the end of conversation or as a tool to seek confirmation.
2.3.3 Emphasizing function: Similar to engagement tokens’ function, this function is created for drawing attention against interlocutors by showing an exaggerated expression.

2.3.4 Clarifying function: This function is considered as a strategy to elaborate a message relating exemplification or clarification.

Clearly, the harmony of both response tokens and discourse markers is the vital factor that allows them to be used as co-workers to investigate the essence of the target phrases. It is worth using diversified functions of spoken devices to extract the genuine characters of why not and go ahead as O’keefee, McCarthy, and Carter (2010) point out that in identifying an item possessing some ‘spoken significance’, it is valuable to employ the differences of spoken devices for the identification of certain situation factors.

2.4 SPOKEN LANGUAGE FOR LEARNERS

Spoken language includes informal words, phrases, expressions or even slang which are used in daily conversations, especially, informal conversations. This language is influenced by its prevalent use by people in society. The way in which spoken language has been employed pervasively is that people appear to be more comfortable to respond with their interlocutors than using formal language. Particularly, as Engkent (1986) suggests, formal language can cause native speakers to be inhospitable since the use of too formal conversation seems to be an oversimplification in many situations. Nevertheless, many learners, especially non-native speakers, tend to study only formal English. This leads them to the extent that their English over-emphasizes formal grammar and in turn they can be ill-equipped to converse with native speakers. Consequently, they forbid themselves from the novel frontier of English learning. Learning spoken language is one amid various schemes that carries learners to the closer aspects of English. To gain more competence, Culter and Clifton (1999) suggests that learners can be thought of as a tool for transforming vocalization of speakers into meaning and, intentionally, must understand the characteristics of spoken language. Especially, this kind of language relies on its discourse context that is related to thematic relationships.
However, spoken language is not a total device for communicating in the English language, the best answer is to realize variations of languages and suit them in proper circumstances. The evidence of Burkart (1998) reveals that to be competent, learners need to gain several aspects that are vital for target languages: linguistic, cultural, discourse, and strategic aspects. This may not guarantee that learners will be able to become as competent as native speakers, but they can cultivate all skills to accommodate themselves as efficiently as possible.

2.5 THE PREVALENT USE OF THE TARGET PHRASES

Although the phrases *why not* and *go ahead* are rarely analyzed by scholars, they can presumably be included in spoken discourse analysis by examining their functions most of which covers two categories, namely, response tokens and discourse markers. Since general conversation relies on various spoken devices including response tokens and discourse markers, *why not* and *go ahead* seem to occur in daily spoken communication.

![Figure 1: Frequency of *why not* and *go ahead* in spoken corpora (BNC = British National Corpus; COCA = Corpus of Contemporary American English)](image)

The prevalent use of the phrases *why not* and *go ahead* as shown in Figure 1 can be interpreted as showing that the popularity of using them appears more in American than British English and the outstanding aspect is that the phrase *why not* is unlikely to be stated in British English. This phenomenon is helpful to shape the idea...
of selecting more film dialogue of American movies than British movies into the study.

2.6 MOVIES AND FILM DIALOGUE

Among a wide range of sources, there is evidence that English soundtrack movies are favorable and accessible resources for exploring spoken language. It is suggested by Lindstrom (2015) that films are suitable media for delivering a living language to learners. The salient characteristic of films that offer “blanket coverage”, the combination of sound and visual information can display paralinguistic aspects of communication and bring learners into the proficient method of learning language (Lonergan, 1983). Undoubtedly, by watching movies, Jaen and Basanta (2009) reveal the solid evidence that learners can investigate native speakers’ conversations and absorb these languages into pragmatic use. Besides, through noticing conversations in the movies learners can improve their English spoken language skills, and the other benefits are cultural awareness and intercultural competence. By watching movies, learners can gain more cultural understanding and absorb intercultural differences at the same time. Likewise, learners can develop cultural knowledge or “the ability to discuss and reflect on living conditions, social issues and cultural features in different contexts and parts of the world where English is used” (Skolverket, 2013, p. 2)

According to the empirical corpus-based study of Forchini (2010), the linguistic features which characterized American face-to-face and movie conversation are not different to a great extent, especially to the extent of spontaneity by comparing them in multi-dimensional analysis. The results indicate that film dialogue supports various purposes in communicating information by comparison with face-to-face conversation in virtue of utilizing a movie dialogue corpus. This brings up the idea that one dominant advantage of movie content is dialogue which can be conveniently extracted to analyze it in the field of linguistics. Another aspect is that film dialogue plays a crucial role towards learners not only in storytelling but also in binding them into the set-up atmosphere with the functions of semantic devices. As its reputation is of reflecting conversations in reality, it is worth utilizing film dialogue in the study since the results can be beneficial for connecting to daily conversations in real life and in turn gaining more clarity about the two target phrases why not and go ahead in the
aspects of pragmatic functions as well as categorization for the interlocutor’s purposes.

2.7 THE CORPUS AS A PRODUCTIVE DEVICE

A corpus is defined, according to O’keefee, McCarthy, and Carter (2010), as a collection of specific texts which is representative for a particular purpose. A corpus can be utilized for investigating the elements and structural patterns in a language. At the same time, it has been used for comparison with other corpora to gain the knowledge of variation. Crucially, it can be analyzed in the area of the occurrence of phonological, lexical, grammatical, or pragmatic functions. The dominant attribute that causes the prevalent use of corpus is the ability of being compiled in computer software which in turn is convenient to analyze by researchers whether for qualitative or quantitative analysis. In addition, the adjustable feature of a corpus is another reason that motivates learners to a self-directed study relating word analysis. Nevertheless, as Kennedy (1998) points out, corpus linguistics did not occur from the advancement of computers but, inarguably, computers have fostered corpus linguistics with enormous encouragement by reducing much of the arduous work of text-based linguistic description and expanding the scale of databases that are necessary for analysis. Another remarkable characteristic of corpus linguistics is that it is one source of evidence to approve the structure and use of languages as well as to comprehend the process of learning languages.

Certainly, the present study relies on a corpus as a tool for conveniently storing film dialogue which are available on the Internet. For example, to analyze the two target phrases, the corpus provides useful functions that are necessary, refining the phrases *why not* and *go ahead* for investigation at each discourse context and counting the frequency to compare the occurrences between the two phrases. By means of film dialogue contained in comedy genre that more represents the atmosphere of informal conversation than others, the amount of movies in the corpus is adequate to display generalized features.
2.8 RELEVANT RESEARCH

Beside the theoretical background of spoken discourse relating to the phrases *why not* and *go ahead*, the study compiles the relevant studies that connect both the idea of exploring the component in spoken language and the capable tool to reach the goal. The following studies expose the prospective factors that are beneficial for investigating the target phrases. Moreover, some of them contribute to the fulfillment of the present study.

The study of Srivoranart (2014) explored the pragmatic use of *well* in the scope of a discourse marker by using the dialogue of the movie *Gone Girl*. The researcher used the whole movie script by checking at every single context surrounding the target phrase *well*. Although a corpus was not used in this study, the result reveals the significant finding that *well* in *Gone Girl* is used as a ‘pause filler’ by the main character when encountering the dilemma. The findings indicate pragmatic use of the target marker as a discourse marker which is most found in dialogues of characters under pressure circumstances. This study can also be observed through the part of the target phrase analysis for the benefit of the present study.

The study of Banchs (2012) accounted for the evidence of benefits towards research and development purposes by using a corpus. The researcher collected a large scale of a film dialogue corpus including 753 movie scripts and 132,229 dialogues, to investigate them in terms of statistics and characteristics. The results illustrate the beneficial data for exploring the semantic and pragmatic features of actual communication under the various contexts, scenarios, styles, and cultural aspects. The study further advises that the specific technologies and applications can provide convenience in linguistic investigation such as discourse and pragmatic analysis, narrative and colloquial style classification as well as genre classification. Apart from exposing the advantages of adapting modern technology for investigating semantic features, this establishes the decisiveness to utilize the corpus-based analysis into the present study.

Further solid evidence that shows the ability of corpora towards spoken discourse analysis is the study of Bednarek (2008). The study utilized a corpus linguistic perspective to evaluate emotion phrases in TV dialogue. The corpus was created by using dialogues from the TV series *Gilmore Girls* containing 1.5 million...
words. In order to reach the objective, the researcher proposed a three-pronged analysis comprising three different types of research namely large-scale quantitative corpus analysis, small-scale corpus analysis, and qualitative discourse analysis. The results reveal the various interesting aspects as follows. First, it displays that linguistic features can be employed as implicit cues to characterization and explain the significance of conflict, drama and surprise in an American TV series. Second, the study suggests that a corpus is a handy tool for exploring emotion in TV dialogue as well as displaying a trail to the more detailed analysis of selected features. Finally, the important feature of the fragment What and the word chunk What the hell, which are considered in terms of speech acts, show the purpose of irony in the TV series Gilmore Girls. The researcher also concludes that the investigation of semantic-pragmatic features can be accomplished in a small-scale corpus by qualitative analysis. Conversely, this is rather arduous in a large-scale corpus.

In the study of Lingabavan and Salway (2002), the information contained in film dialogues were extracted to analyze and categorize the purposes of utterances by employing a corpus. The corpus gathered 60 films comprising 516,299 words through a computer program, Antconc. Within the theories of film dialogue functions and speech acts, the researchers used the useful features of the corpus to draw out the significant characteristics of film contents. The results display that the unusual frequency of utterances in film dialogues compared with general sayings can be interpreted into two events. First, the statement of future intent that shows the consequent events after the character states it. Second, the statement of lack of knowledge which appears in the word patterns such as “I’m not gonna to...” and “I don’t wanna...”. This kind of utterance mostly intends to describe the mental states of the character. In addition, the study mentions that film dialogue plays a crucial role in exploring the high level of film content. Therefore, the present study adopts the idea of creating a corpus through the program Antconc which is depicted with convenience and utility throughout this relevant study.

There is a study that has contradicted the previous theory of Sinclair (2004), that movie language does not possess the feature of natural conversation and it is not representative of conversation in general use. In the study of Forchini (2010), the discourse marker you know was investigated by utilizing a new corpus of American
movie conversation in the aspect of multi-functionality. The results indicate that you know tends to occur with a telling function. For example, it appears in utterances by the speaker to narrate or comment on topics. The further analysis confirms this by the occurrences of you know in contexts, whether left or right collocates which are mostly classified in telling component. Besides, the target discourse marker you know gains the opportunity to occur with other function such as the clarifying function, the knowledge marking function and the time-stalling function. Furthermore, the empirical corpus-based study argues that the linguistic features which characterized American face-to-face and movie conversation are not different to a great extent, especially, in the extent of spontaneity by comparing them in multi-dimensional analysis.

Another study of movie corpus-driven analysis was conducted by the same researcher Forchini (2010). The study aimed to emphasize the functional nature of two discourse markers: you know and I mean, which were examined in many aspects such as the frequency, terminology, classification, multi-functionality utterance position and pragmatic function by utilizing American Movies Corpus. The findings in the study show that the two target markers occur in movie conversation with the highest occurrence in mid-position of utterance while they have been used under two circumstances: first to direct the interlocutor in the interpretation of the utterance and second to hold the time for the current speaker to find appropriate words. In addition, the study of American Movies Corpus has revealed a significant feature that is fruitful for the present study. It reveals that the genre of movies which are collected to create a corpus is the meaningful factor that is indispensably scrutinized.

According to Quaglio (2008), dialogues of the television series Friends were built to be the corpus and were analyzed for linguistic features such as hedges, discourse markers, and modals coordination tags. Particularly, the study picked up the discourse marker you know to investigate the frequency, collocations, and vague nature in conversation. The corpus-driven study reveals that you know in Friends dialogue is three-time more frequent than conversation in real life and often collocates with kind of and sort of. The higher frequency of you know in Friends suggests that in real conversation it seems to be far more vague than the conversation which is presented in Friends because its collocations kind of and sort of are the spoken
devices that are used to “clarity cut-off boundary” before the conversation is further incomprehensible.

It seems many studies have examined phrases and fragments which occur in the high-band of frequency in corpora such as you know...I mean, well, what. Nevertheless, phrases which appear in the lower-band but own the prominent characteristics are also remarkable and valuable to be brought into investigation. By the attribute of reflecting real informal conversations that many previous studies have shown, film dialogues are suitable for exploring the roles of target phrases in spoken discourse. This study aims to investigate the pragmatic functions of the phrases why not and go ahead through their speech acts and roles as response tokens and discourse markers. The following chapter accounts for the methodology which has been carried out to explore the research questions.
CHAPTER 3
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter elaborates on the method to examine the two target phrases, in the following way. Section 3.1 describes the reasons for choosing the phrases *why not* and *go ahead*, following with Section 3.2; the necessary materials are depicted in this part. Section 3.3 accounts for the procedures to prepare and collect the data. The last part of this chapter, Section 3.4, mentions the data analysis.

3.1 THE TARGET PHRASES

The two target phrases *why not* and *go ahead* are chosen as the goal of the study in the area of pragmatic functions and categorization for the reasons provided as follows:

3.1.1 The distinctive characteristics that have been found in film dialogue bring out curiosity of their surrounding contexts and in turn the real purpose of use.

3.1.2 The representative phrases, fragments, and word chunks which belong to the so-called low-band of frequency in spoken corpora still possess features that are worth studying.

3.2 MATERIALS

This present study proceeded by utilizing a self-invented film dialogue corpus for two main reasons. First, the film dialogue corpus, which consists of spoken dialogue, owns the ability to reflect the salient feature of conversation in reality. As Forcini (2010) notes, natural conversation possesses the prominent characteristic of spontaneity whereas movie dialogue also has a significant amount of spontaneous talk. For this reason, to analyze the target phrases *why not* and *go ahead*, which are included in spoken features, inevitably, the film dialogue corpus was created to serve the gold of the study. Second, the convenience of collecting material provided the motivation to build the self-invented corpus. In other words, the film dialogue corpus was able to be easily created by gathering text forms of movie scripts which were
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obtainable on the Internet. Accordingly, the film dialogue corpus is the convenient tool in the present study for investigating further.

In addition, to notice the prevalence both in daily use in conversation and the tendency to add them into film dialogue, the researcher also employed the British National Corpus (BNC) and the Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA) in the study. The preliminary investigation revealed that the target phrases carried an adequate amount of occurrence, especially the phrase *go ahead*, so that they are prepared for further exploration in the scheme of comparison.

3.3 PROCEDURES

This section describes the research design and the data collection.

3.3.1 Research Design

The present study is a corpus-driven analysis in which the phrases *why not* and *go ahead* extracted from the self-invented film dialogue corpus are utilized for investigation.

3.3.2 Data Collection

Since the program computer Antconc prefers raw data in `.text` files, movie scripts, all of which were collected on the Internet, had to be transformed to such a file type. The process was, first, the target movie script was copied as only text and pasted onto a Microsoft Word file. The next step was to export the file in the form of `.text` by selecting it during the *save as* function. By these methods, the raw data are properly prepared for storing in Antconc.

In order to set up a corpus of film dialogue, the program computer Antconc is used to store 40 movie scripts which contain approximately 650,000 words. In particular, there are 66 occurrences of *why not* and 28 of *go ahead* in the corpus. The movies in the study are comedy since the previous studies indicated the valuable aspect that this kind of genre held with the intensity of informal speaking and providing more space to conversation than others. The data were divided into two groups equally: the group of movies from 1990 – 1999 and the group of movies from 2000 – 2015, to compare the prevalence of use. Figure 2 on the next page displays the screen of Antconc and how the study can extract the target phrases among the innumerable words.
3.4 DATA ANALYSIS

The steps to investigate the target phrases in the aspects of both pragmatic functions and categorization as well as the prevalent use are as follows:

3.4.1 The phrases *why not* and *go ahead* were counted for occurrence through the function of the computer program Antconc. Apart from the frequency that appeared in film dialogue, the number of occurrence was divided into two groups, the movies from 1990 – 1999 group and the movies from 2000 – 2015 group.

3.4.2 The researcher copied each target phrase and surrounding context gained from Antconc and placed them onto an Excel spreadsheet, manually.

3.4.3 The target phrases were categorized based on the theories of response token and discourse marker as well as the position in talking turn as reviewed in the previous chapter. In the part of categorization, the present study applied the method of the research study of Forchini (2010).

3.4.4 On the Excel spreadsheet, each target phrase was scrutinized for the actual purpose through the theory of speech acts. The appraisal analysis to draw out the real objective of each context surrounding the target phrase was adapted from some parts of the study of Bednarek (2008).

Certainly, the processes in the methodology are designed to serve the main objectives of the study, to acquire important features, purposes, and categories of the...
phrases *why not* and *go ahead* by using theories of speech act, response token, and discourse marker. However, the aspect of the prevalence of use was added as the sub-objective to gain the useful evidence of analysis that reveals the interesting results in the following chapter.
CHAPTER 4
RESULTS

This chapter reports the results of a corpus-driven study of the two target phrases *why not* and *go ahead*. As aforementioned in the previous chapter, the method of the present study is partly adapted from the study of Forchini (2010) and Bednarek (2008). The results are divided into four sections in the following way. The popularity of the target phrases in film dialogue is depicted in Section 4.1. This is followed by Section 4.2, which briefly provides the necessary theories regarding response tokens and discourse markers and exposes the categorization of the two phrases. The vital part, Section 4.3 elaborates the real purpose of each phrase including its context based on the theory of speech act. In the last section of this chapter, Section 4.4, the data about the position in talking turn are examined and displayed.

4.1 POPULARITY OF THE TARGET PHRASES IN FILM DIALOGUE

After running data on Antconc, the target phrases *why not* and *go ahead* have been found in 66 occurrences and 28 occurrences, respectively. The present study requires a comparison of two groups of data which are divided by the periods - the movies from 1990 - 1999 and the movies from 2000 - 2015. The raw data that have been done by counting manually are transformed to the graphic charts as shown in Figure 3 on the following page:
Figure 3 above shows that the occurrences of *why not* mostly halve from 1990 – 1999 movie-band in which *why not* occurred 43 times to 2000 – 2015 movie-band which *why not* occurred in 23 times whereas the occurrences of *go ahead* are stable, according to the raw data that show 15 occurrences within 1990 – 1999 movie-band and 13 occurrences within 2000 – 2015 movie-band. According to the theoretical background reviewed in Chapter 2, in the point of prevalence of use between the two phrases *why not* and *go ahead*, the data extracted from the film dialogue corpus show that *why not* seems to be used more than *go ahead* in film dialogue, whether in the past or recent day, as opposed to the prevalence of use in reality that *go ahead* is used more than *why not* both in British and American English.

### 4.2 Categorization of the Target Phrases

To categorize *why not* and *go ahead* in the extent of response tokens (henceforth RTs) and discourse markers (henceforth DMs), the contexts that co-occur with them are carefully contemplated based on the theories which are previously reviewed in Chapter 2. Briefly, the main functions of RTs comprise four types -

- **continuer response token**: a spoken device for arousing continuous talks,
- **convergence response token**: a chunk of words or a phrase which signals co-agreement in conversation,
- **engagement token**: a phrase that creates emotional impact against interlocutor,
- **context-specific function**: purposes of some phrases that are properly
used for specific conversation. The same as RTs, judging by their functions, DMs can also be recognized into four types - telling-commenting function: a purpose for introducing or adding information, turn-dealing function: an intention for ending conversation or seeking confirmation, emphasizing function: a motive that is aimed at emotional effects, and clarifying function: a strategy to explain by giving details. Obviously, although engagement token of RTs and emphasizing function of DMs intervene in the sense of purposes, most of these functions possess unique characteristics. This leads to the idea that in the process of categorization, contemplating on the relationship between RTs and DMs, all these functions are considered simultaneously.

4.2.1 The Phrase why not in Categorizing

After examining the target phrase why not, including its context, the analysis exposes that why not can hold the functions of both DMs and RTs. As a spoken device with various functions, it can be categorized in four groups as shown in Table 1 below:

Table 1: Categorization of the Phrase why not in the film dialogue corpus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Amount (%)</th>
<th>Attribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Response tokens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5 (8%)</td>
<td>Engagement token</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>14 (21%)</td>
<td>Engagement token</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>39 (59%)</td>
<td>Continuer response token</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8 (27%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results show that why not tends to perform all functions of DMs while it certainly possesses the character of continuer response token as a dominant feature of RTs and turn-dealing function of DMs according to the data that reach to 59%. In
detail, starting with Group 1 occurring in a tiny minority, why not in this group is mostly used to clarify information or modify the previous utterance/expression and show the emotional effect as in the following examples:

Yeah, why not? You’re single, he’s single...makes sense. [The Holiday, 2006]
But then I thought, "Why not?" Why shouldn’t I take the poor little sod out for a meal? [About a Boy, 2002]
Sure. Why not? Shit! You guys! I have never had straight friends before. [Clueless, 1995]

The pattern of Group 1, according to the above examples, displays that why not always follows an expression or a phrase exposing some part of a speaker’s thoughts. In the next group, similar to Group 1, why not in Group 2 is used in the terminating extent in terms of explaining information. The difference is that while why not in Group 1 is usually used after exposing the idea, why not in Group 2 is used to lead an utterance that provides a reason in context as in the following examples:

Why not? I’m going alone. [A Lot Like Love, 2005]
Why not? We are neighbors, right? [13 Going on 30, 2004]
Why not? We’re really going around in circles here. Just accept the facts, okay? [About a Boy, 2002]

Distinctively, according to the data shown in Table 1, the band with the most frequent occurrence is Group 3 where why not holds the role of continuer response tokens of RTs and turn-dealing function of DMs at the same time. In this band, why not is used as a question to seek more information and a marker to return the talking turn to the interlocutor as in the following examples:

Casey: No, the point is I'm not gonna start out assuming the guy's a liar.
Sara: Why not?
Casey: Because that's how you wind up... [Hitch, 2005]
William: I wouldn't go outside.
Spike: Why not?
William: Just take my work for it. [Notting Hill, 1999]

As shown in the examples above, why not in this band tends to occur without context and performs as a key device in utterance. Still, there are some cases in this band in which why not co-occurs with other phrases/expressions.

A little pigs in, why not? [Wedding Crashers, 2005]
Wait, why not? [How to Lose a Guy in 10 Days, 2003]
Alright... why not? [Pretty Woman, 1990]

However, the functions of these cases are the same as the majority in Group 3. The last band of why not, Group 4, in the extent of a spoken device is that it plays the role of heading for narrative talk. Consequently, it possesses only one category, the telling function of DMs as in the following examples:

Why not just tell me what to do? I want you to think for yourself! [About a Boy, 2002]
Why not buy them milk or something, instead of Dr. Pepper? [Blast from the Past, 1999]
See? You want custody of my job? Why not just consider my wrist slapped and call me when you feel I've served my time? [Runaway Bride, 1999]

The examples above illustrate the role of the phrase why not that is used as some part of narration. Unlike the others, the phrase why not in this band is used only as fragments that are used to fulfill statements.
4.2.2 The Phrase go ahead in Categorizing

The target phrase go ahead is examined using the same criteria. Like the phrase why not, go ahead owns the characteristic of possessing diversified function by use in a time. Although the occurrences of go ahead are significantly less than the phrase why not, they can show the distribution of use in various functions. The phrase go ahead can be categorized in three groups as shown in Table 2 below:

Table 2: Categorization of the Phrase go ahead in the film dialogue corpus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Amount (%)</th>
<th>Attribution</th>
<th>Discourse markers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5 (18%)</td>
<td>Engagement token</td>
<td>Clarifying function + Emphasizing function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4 (14%)</td>
<td>Engagement token</td>
<td>Telling function + Emphasizing function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>19 (68%)</td>
<td>Continuer response token</td>
<td>Turn-dealing function</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data in Table 2 show that go ahead possesses the ability to expose all functions of DMs and it owns only two functions of RTs. The majority of use of go ahead also occurs in the band in which functions comprise continuer response token of RTs and turn-dealing function of DMs. In this group, the amount of occurrence reaches to 68%. The analysis in each group of go ahead displays interesting aspects that, starting from Group 1, are used as a device to arouse interlocutor and provide the reason in utterance as in the following examples:

Well, go ahead, ’cause I'm not going. [How to Lose a Guy in 10 Days, 2003]

Go ahead son, there's more. [American Pie, 1999]

Wanna pet her, sweetheart? Go ahead. She won't bite. You got this raging scoop disease, my friend. [One Fine Day, 1996]
According to the examples, the function of *go ahead* in Group 1 is likely to be a signal to deliver clarifying information whereas the pattern emerging is random in utterance. The uncertainty of occurrence shown in the utterance also exists in another band, in Group 2, the phrase *go ahead* can occur in any part of utterance. Nevertheless, not related to clarifying function, it is used to provide background information or describe the idea as in the following examples:

> *Like all families, mine has a deep dark secret. And since I’m spilling all this dirt, I might as well go ahead and confess it.* [Easy A, 2010]
> *I say we go ahead with our own presentation...and let her fall on her ass.* [13 Going on 30, 2004]
> *Cher, I'm really sorry. Oh, shit. Now I'm going to go ahead and cry.* [Clueless, 2004]

The last band, *go ahead* in Group 3 has the most frequency of use in the corpus by 68%. In this band, it is used as a device to encourage the interlocutor to converse continuously. At the same time, it exposes the function that allows the interlocutor to seize the talking turn completely. The examples below display how such functions are employed.

> *Marshall: Let me handle this, okay?*
> *Bretter: Go ahead.* [Forgetting Sara Marshall, 2008]

> *Will: Fiona, I've got to talk to you.*
> *Fiona: Go ahead.* [About a Boy, 2002]

Interestingly, the phrase *go ahead* in this band tends to co-occur with other phrases or expression as in the following examples:

> *Oh, sorry. Go ahead.* [A Lot Like Love, 2005]
> *Oh, no, excuse me. Go ahead.* [13 Going on 30, 2004]
> *Go ahead son, there's more.* [American Pie, 1999]
The analysis, based on theories of response token and discourse marker, of the target phrases *why not* and *go ahead* in the area of categorization reveals that both are used in the close extent of function. Still, there is a trivial discrepancy by considering the pattern form of use. The most convergent point is that they embrace the richness of continuer and turn-dealing function in utterance. Another function, by examining in their contexts, is the character of showing engagement in emotional effect - engagement token of RTs and emphasizing function of DMs. However, their characters can be more clearly elaborated by examining them with the theory of speech act that is presented later.

4.3 THE PURPOSES OF THE TARGET PHRASES

Since the two target phrases *why not* and *go ahead* hold diversified functions, their contexts are the vital factor to indicate the purpose of employing them. Not only does the existence of adjacent words matter in analysis but the nonexistence must also be taken into account. Furthermore, the target phrases are used for establishing the emotional judgment of talkers. That is to say, the more context relating the target phrases, the easier to interpret the purpose. This section utilizes the theory of speech acts to extract the objective of the phrases *why not* and *go ahead* in each utterance. As aforementioned in Chapter 2, relating to emotional appraisal, speech act is a significant tool to draw out an intention through the target phrases and their contexts. Clearly, its type can be various, such as, accusation, clarification, directive, explanation, irony, justification, and question. To fulfill the research question, the target phrases are evaluated into exact bands within those types of speech acts reviewed in the theoretical background.

The analysis has been done by contemplating them manually. To display the data in an uncomplicated way, this section elaborates their purposes in bands. Starting with the phrase *why not*, each band of the target phrase is counted for the frequency of the identical purpose as shown in Figure 4 on the next page. The complete analysis is provided in Appendix A.
As shown in Figure 4, the results indicate that *why not* is mostly used as a spoken device of demanding for explanation, according to the highest frequency reaching to 56%. In this band, *why not* is used as a question to seek not only affirmation or negation from the interlocutor but also for more information. The pattern of employing them tends to occur without any context. In other words, *why not* for this purpose is used as an isolated question as displayed in the examples below:

**Character A1:** That's very kind of you, Marcus, but no.

**Character B1:** Why not?

**Character A1:** For Christ’s sake! She’s got a rare disease and if she believes something that’s not right...then hears the truth, her brain will boil in her head and she’ll die, okay? [About a Boy, 2002]

**Character A2:** Bianca Stratford. Sophomore. Don’t even think about it.

**Character B2:** Why not?

**Character A2:** I could start with your haircut, but it doesn’t matter. She’s not allowed to date until her older sister does. And that’s an impossibility. [10 Things I Hate about You, 1999]
The examples above show that *why not* can reach the goal of its purpose by being answered with more details or information from the interlocutor. However, it can also be used to serve other purposes that occur in a small minority. The purposes are clarification, explanation, and directive, all of which are used at almost the same frequency – 12%, 12%, and 11%, respectively. For the purpose of clarification, *why not* is used as an answer for affirming or negating and, at the same time, assigns the opportunity for more explanation from the interlocutor. The purpose of this case is shown in the example below:

Character C: Look. I'm happy to entertain you, as always, but I have a question for you. Are we really "friends?"

Character D: *Why not?*

Character C: Well, friends can tell each other anything, right? If we have our "friends" hats on... [Jerry Maguire, 1996]

According to the example above, instead of replying to a question with *yes* or *no* and raising the question afterward, *why not* can be employed in the close extent of such an utterance. Following with the purposes of explanation and directive, the noticeable remark is that the purposes in this band are used with the amount of contexts that provide sufficient information to clarify the thought or command for serving the needs of the speaker. The examples of these purposes are provided as follows:

Explanation:

*Character E1:* *Kathleen Kelly of the bookstore.*

*Character F1:* *Why not?* You said you thought she was attractive.

*Character E1:* So what? Who cares about Kathleen Kelly? [You’ve Got Mail, 1998]

Directive:

*Character E2:* I've got goose-bumps all over me.

*Character F2:* *Why not* just go to... Nome for supplies and a wife? Isn't that closer?
**Character E2:** Yeah, right! That's where you'd go to find girls! Nome. He's gay, by the way. [Blast from the Past, 1999]

Apart from the purposes elaborated so far, there are some rare cases that show the purposes of the phrase *why not* in conversation. The first case at 6% of using *why not* in this band is used for the purposes of clarifying and signaling the requirement for explanation as shown in the example below:

*Character G:* Do you want to stay?

*Character H:* Why not...all that awaits me at home is a masturbating Welshman. [Notting Hill, 1999]

The rest of the cases, the second and third, the purpose of irony and statement exist at the same rate which is 1.5%. Otherwise, these purposes are unlikely to be used in film dialogue. The examples provided below display the purposes of these cases:

**Irony:**

*Character I:* I already made an appointment for later today.

*Character J:* See? You want custody of my job? ... *Why not* just consider my wrist slapped and call me when you feel I've served my time?

*Character I:* I'm sorry, Ike. This is permanent. [Runaway Bride, 1999]

**Statement:**

*Character K:* Cleary family tradition.

*Character L:* A little pigskin, *why not?*

*Character K:* Great. [The Wedding Crashers, 2005]

In the example of irony, evidently, the context produced by Character J shows the attitude of sarcasm towards Character I. Afterward, the phrase *why not* in this situation is used to serve the negative judgement of the character. For the case of purpose of statement, as provided in the example above, *why not* in this case is equally used as general phrases, such as, *o.k.*, *fine*, *all right*. For this reason, the phrase *why not* in this case is used with a decreasing of the specific spoken device.
unlike the other bands. To fill the gap of remaining doubtfulness, the co-examined phrase *go ahead* is scrutinized at the same pattern. The results are also transformed into a graphic of bar charts as shown in Figure 5 below. The complete analysis is provided in Appendix B.

**Figure 5**: Purposes of using the target phrase *go ahead* in the film dialogue corpus

![Bar chart showing purposes of using *go ahead*](chart.png)

The results of examining the purpose of the phrase *go ahead*, according to Figure 5, reveal that, starting from the most popular band reaching to 39% of use *go ahead* in the first band is used for directive as shown in the following examples:

*Character M1*: Wanna pet her, sweetheart? *Go ahead*. She won't bite. You got this raging scoop disease, my friend.

*Character N1*: Which is what you love about me. [*One Fine Day*, 1996]

*Character M2*: Does she have a lady friend for me?

*Character N2*: *Go ahead*. Ask her.

*Character M2*: I'll go ask her. [*Mrs. Doubtfire*, 1993]

The examples above show the evidence that *go ahead* in this band tends to be used as a device to encourage the interlocutor to accomplish the task. In this form of use, it is likely to be attached with explaining information that support the idea. The next band with the frequency at 29% is that *go ahead* is used with the purpose of
statement. In general, *go ahead* in this band is used in the same area of general affirming phrases, such as, *yes, fine, all course*. The examples below show how it works with such phrases.

*Character O1:* I'll bet you can.
*Character P1:* Go ahead. And you
*Character O1:* Yes? [*10 Things I Hate about You*, 1999]

*Character O2:* Fiona, I've got to talk to you.
*Character P2:* Go ahead.
*Character O2:* No, you know, properly talk to you, privately. No, this is a circle of truth. [*About a Boy*, 2002]

The band that is also used in average frequency at 21%, is *go ahead* which in this band is used to affirm a question. Similar to the previous band, *go ahead* in this band holds the same purpose of a general affirming spoken device, however, the distinctive remark is that it is usually used to reply to a question as in the following example:

*Character Q1:* Let me handle this, okay?
*Character R1:* Go ahead. [*Forgetting Sara Marshall*, 2008]

*Character Q2:* Can I take a minute?
*Character R2:* Go ahead. [*Sleepless in Seattle*, 1993]

According to Figure 5, the last two bands that are obviously used in few cases are the bands of clarification/irony and statement/irony. The data expose that these two purposes present at 7% and 4%, respectively, in the film dialogue corpus. In detail, apart from the purpose of clarification and statement, both purposes are noticed by their contexts that distinctly show the attitude of resentfulness in the utterance. The examples in the next page provide the idea of using *go ahead* for such purposes.
Clarification/irony:

*Character S:* You want to go to the game?

*Character T:* Well, go ahead, 'cause I’m not going.

*Character S:* Seventh and final game of what has been a classic series between... Sweetie, I wouldn't have gone, either. [*How to Lose a Guy in 10 Days*, 2003]

Statement/irony:

*Character U:* It's not "love me." It's not "trust my handshake." It's make the sale. Get it signed. There shouldn't be "confusion" about that.

*Character V:* Go ahead. Jump right on into my nightmare. The water’s warm.

*Character U:* So honesty is outlawed here, I can't be honest? [*Jerry Maguire*, 1996]

The analysis to find out the purposes of the target phrases *why not* and *go ahead* brings out dramatic aspects. One major perspective is that whereas the phrase *why not* is decisively noticed, judging by frequency of employment, as being used with a demand for explanation, the phrase *go ahead* cannot be completely labeled as being used with directive since the frequency of use in the highest band cannot stand out from the subordinate band – the purpose with statement. Another aspect, the common purposes that exist in both phrases – directive, clarification, and statement – are not completely claimed that they are co-purposes of the target phrases since they are not used in high frequency of both phrases. Nevertheless, to acquire more perspective of the study, the next section provides the content that is to be aware together with this sections.
4.4 THE POSITION IN TALKING TURN OF THE TARGET PHRASES

Another interesting aspect to find out the characters of *why not* and *go ahead* is the position of emerging in talking turn. Undoubtedly, the contexts of the two target phrases are significant to extract the actual purposes. On the other hand, the occurrence without context of the two target phrases exhibits another aspect that is inevitable to focus on. Since the out-of-the-blue occurrence of the target phrases possibly serve various functions, the appearance of the target phrases in isolation is worth taking into account. In other words, without any context, the target phrases hold the unique functions that are utilized to serve the exact purposes. To discuss the occurrence of each type, the results are presented by Table 3 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th><em>why not</em></th>
<th><em>go ahead</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Isolated</td>
<td>34 (51%)</td>
<td>7 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>17 (26%)</td>
<td>7 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medial</td>
<td>12 (18%)</td>
<td>7 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final</td>
<td>3 (5%)</td>
<td>7 (25%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 3, in the case of the phrase *why not*, the data illustrate that the most popular form of emerging *why not* in talking turn is being isolated. Reaching to 51%, the result reveal that *why not* tends to be used as a spoken device to signal the switching turn in conversation as in the following examples:

*Character W1:* But I have realized in these past few days...you can't just turn back time.

*Character X1:* Why not?

*Character W1:* I moved on. [13 Going on 30, 2004]
Character W2: No, the point is I'm not gonna start out assuming the guy's a liar.
Character X2: Why not?
Character W2: Because that's how you wind up... [Hitch, 2005]

The above examples represent the distinctive function and purpose of *why not* that is mostly used as a continuer response token of RTs and turn-dealing function of DMs which demands for an explanation. In the case of emerging with context, although there is evidence that *why not* randomly appears in any position in context, the far gap of frequency can reveal that *why not* represents the character of being preferably used as isolated phrase. In case of the phrase *go ahead*, as shown in Table 3, while the phrase *why not* is noticeable for the distinction of frequency, the phrase *go ahead* is unclear in terms of appearing in talking turn. This exposes the pattern of emerging that is unpredictable in talking turn. Comparing with *why not*, the phrase *go ahead* is more randomly used in conversation, meaning that this produces the property of hard-to-predict phrase including its functions and purposes.

In a nutshell, the sections in this chapter reveal various aspects that are useful to reach the summit of the present study. The results in this chapter decrease the vagueness of the two target phrases and expose the evidence to describe the functions, forms, and purposes of *why not* and *go ahead* and are interpreted for creating more perspectives in the next chapter.
CHAPTER 5
CONCLUSION, DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter presents the aspects gained from the results of the previous chapter. The summary perspectives are described in five sections in the following way. Sections 5.1 and 5.2 display the summary of the study and findings, respectively. To expand knowledge of studying in spoken language, the findings of the present study are speculated on in Section 5.3; the discussion of the findings. This is followed by Section 5.4, which provides the conclusion of the study. Lastly, with the intention of paving the way for further study, Section 5.5 discusses the recommendations for further research.

5.1 SUMMARY OF THE STUDY

To remind of the main purposes of the present study and provide substantial content for further discussion, this section summarizes the objectives, the target phrases, materials, and procedures of the study.

5.1.1 Objectives of the Study

The present study concentrated on examining the pragmatic functions of the two phrases why not and go ahead. At the same time, the study investigated the significance of the position in talking turn of the two phrases.

5.1.2 Target Phrases, Materials, and Procedures

The target phrases why not and go ahead are distinctive spoken devices that can be memorable in informal conversation. In addition, they are representative of phrases in the word band that occur in low frequency of spoken corpora but it is worth investigating their characters.

The self-invented corpus of film dialogue was the material for data collection, and the 66 occurrences of the phrase why not and 28 occurrences of the phrase go ahead including their contexts were the samples of the study. Additionally, the British National Corpus (BNC) and the Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA).
were added to examine the prevalence of use between the film dialogue corpus and real conversation.

In the process of examination, after extracting all of the phrases *why not* and *go ahead* from the film dialogue corpus, the target phrases including their contexts were laid into an Excel spreadsheet in order to categorize their functions and analyze their real purposes. Finally, the target phrases were recognized for the position in talking turn to find out the significance.

5.2 SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS

The results of examining the target phrases can be summarized as follows:

5.2.1 The target phrases *why not* and *go ahead* can hold more than one function and purpose at a time.

5.2.2 The most popular use of the two target phrases *why not* and *go ahead* is to serve the function of maintaining the continuance and signaling the switching-turn in conversation. Whereas they converge in functional aspect, they possess the discrepancy in terms of purposes. That is to say, the phrase *why not* is preferable in use to serve the purpose of demanding for explanation while the phrase *go ahead* tends to be used as a phrase of directive and statement.

5.2.3 The pattern emerging of the two target phrases *why not* and *go ahead* in conversations is that the phrase *why not* is likely to occur in isolation with predictable purposes. This is opposed to the phrase *go ahead* that shows randomness of occurring in talking turn.

5.3 DISCUSSION

According to the results of the study, this section discusses the aspects concerning the research questions that have been raised. At the same time, with regard to expand the useful perspectives of the study, there are interesting aspects added in this section. The contents are presented as follows:

5.3.1 Pragmatic Functions of the Phrases *why not* and *go ahead*

As the results of the study pointed out, the pragmatic functions can be elaborated into two issues separated by the target phrases *why not* and *go ahead*. Starting from the phrase *why not*, it can be described that *why not* possesses the ability
to hold various functions at a time. Among these functions, there are two being preferable from the others, namely, continuer response token of response tokens and turn-dealing function of discourse markers. Together with these functions, the phrase why not is mostly used as a device to request for more explanation from the interlocutor. In this point, the present study approaches the identical feature of why not from the study of Bednarek (2008) based on the theory of speech acts. In the aspect of usage form, why not tends to be used without adjacent words. That is to say, it is preferably employed in isolation.

The same as the essential characteristic of why not, the co-examined phrase go ahead can also contain diversified functions in itself. Remarkably, the two notable functions are the same as the phrase why not, which are continuer response token of response tokens and turn-dealing function of discourse markers. In the purpose of use, there is evidence that shows the directive by employing the phrase go ahead. Nevertheless, the frequency of using go ahead in the purpose of statement is in the close range of directive. In other words, the phrase go ahead can often be used for the purpose of commanding or declaring against the interlocutor. Lastly, as opposed to the phrase why not, go ahead possesses the tendency to be used randomly in talking turn including being used in isolated word.

5.3.2 The Significance of Position in Talking Turn

Apart of being isolated in conversations, the difference of the position in talking turn of the target phrases is that the phrase why not tends to lead information that declare the intention as in the example below:

Kathleen: You know this is never gonna work.
Joe: Why not? Because clearly you're gonna fall in love with me. Oh, really?
Well, then we just do this until one of us feels something more, and then we stop.
Kathleen: Well, it won't be me. [You’ve Got Mail, 1998]

The example above is representative the intention of using why not at the initial position of talking turn. The results in the study reveal the role of the phrase why not placed at the beginning of the saying that is mostly used in the same way as
the example above. In the opposite way, the phrase *go ahead* can be used to initiate, link, or finalize the motive. This aspect of the present study is slightly different from the previous study, especially, the study of Forchini (2010). Whereas the phrases *you know* and *I mean* tend to occur in the middle position of conversation, *why not* seems to appear in isolation and *go ahead* can occur in all position in talking turn including being an isolated phrase.

### 5.3.3 The Invisible Purpose of the Target Phrases

The results of the study reveal that the majority purpose of using the target phrases *why not* and *go ahead* is different, namely, the phrase *why not* tends to be used for demanding more explanation whereas the phrase *go ahead* is favorable to be used for directive and statement. In the opposite way, the minority purpose of employing the two target phrases belongs to irony. Clearly, the sense of irony can be drawn from the contexts of both target phrases as in the following examples:

Maggie: *I already made an appointment for later today.*
Ike: *See? You want custody of my job? ... Why not just consider my wrist slapped and call me when you feel I've served my time?*
Maggie: *I'm sorry, Ike. This is permanent.* [Runaway Bride, 1999]

Avery: *It's not "love me." It's not "trust my handshake." It's make the sale. Get it signed. There shouldn't be "confusion" about that.*
Jerry: *Go ahead. Jump right on into my nightmare. The water's warm.*
Avery: *So honesty is outlawed here, I can't be honest?* [Jerry Maguire, 1996]

As the examples above show, the significant factor that exhibits the purpose of the character is the context. Both characters in the examples show the emotion of resentfulness through their words surrounding the target phrases. This suggests that, without any contexts, the target phrases cannot be recognized whether they are used for the purpose of irony or other negative judgment. Unlike positive judgment or neutral, to extract the purpose of negative judgment from the target phrases, it seems to rely on semantic tools beyond general spoken corpora.

However, comparing with the study of Bednarek (2008) that analyzed the dialogue of the television comedy-series *Gilmore Girls*, the results reveal that the
majority of speech acts in the present study involves neutral judgment while the previous study involves speech acts of negative judgment, namely, accusation and disqualification.

5.3.4 The Spontaneous Function of the Target Phrases

In the process of categorizing the target phrases why not and go ahead in the area of response tokens and discourse markers, by observing the results, it can be elucidated that both hold the characteristic of engagement and emphasizing function in some degree. At the same time, they can combine with diverse functions which depend on the purposes of the speakers. The distinctive function of the target phrases is provided in the following examples:

Kid: Marcus, we don’t really want you hanging around with us anymore.

Marcus: Why not?

Kid: Well, it’s because of them. [About a Boy, 2002]

Julainne: Do you smoke, Richard?

Bellman: Yes, ma’am, I do, but it’s...


According to the above example, the conversation exposes that the target phrase why not is used as a spoken device to arouse the interlocutor more than the usual phrase such as why. The same as the above example, instead of using normal phrases, such as, yes or of cause, the phrase go ahead in the conversation is used to encourage the listener in the greater degree of fulfilling the desire. This leads to the assumption that instead of using simple stance markers such as why, yeah, of cause, o.k., the two target phrases why not and go ahead are employed to signal the stimulation which is the nature of engagement tokens in response tokens and emphasizing function in discourse markers.
5.3.5 The Popularity of Using the Target Phrases by Period

The additionally interesting aspect found in the study is the prevalence of using the phrases *why not* and *go ahead* by period. Figure 3 has displayed that *why not* in the film dialogue corpus is decreasingly employed from the period of 1990 - 1999 to the recent years. By closer checking of the data, the band of the movies from 1990 - 1999 demonstrates the era of teenage movies; in the data there are 12 out of 20 feature films. Comparing with the band of the movies from 2000 – 2015, there are only 6 out of 20 movies. This can be interpreted to mean that *why not* seems to be an utterance for representing teenage portrayal or showing fashionable style. On the one hand, *why not* belongs to teenagers as a spoken device that is used to announce modernism. On the other, it is the phrase of adults who desire to show a semantically stylistic device in conversations. However, the significant changes by periods do not occur in *go ahead*. This probably refers to the more general usage as a spoken device in conversation.

5.4 CONCLUSION

The discussion from the previous section can be summarized to the following conclusions:

5.4.1 At some point, the phrases *why not* and *go ahead* can be used interchangeably, especially, in cases where they are used in isolated phrase as in the following example:

*Marshall: Let me handle this, okay?*

*Bretter: Go ahead. [Forgetting Sara Marshall, 2008]*

According to the example above, *Bretter* could reply to *Marshall* by using *why not* and the meaning is in the close frame. However, exchangeable usage is unlikely to occur due to the fact that both *why not* and *go ahead* possess salient characteristics that are not identical.
5.4.2 The position in talking turn of the phrase *why not* can predict the functions and the purposes of itself. Unfortunately, this property does not exist in the phrase *go ahead* except the cases in which it appears in isolation and is easy to be examined.

5.4.3 Among the various tools to investigate spoken language, a corpus is a convenient one in terms of self-directed study. The self-invented film dialogue corpus in the study is evidence to gain more confidence on employing corpora in English studies. The adjustable attribute is the dominant aspect that can be considered to conduct a study with this handy tool. Still, there are some defects that learners should consider for improvement, such as finding a suitable point to analyze target samples within a corpus to claim the generalization.

5.5 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

With the intention of providing convenience for future research, the following recommendations are presented based on the findings and conclusions of the study.

5.5.1 In the present study, there are 28 occurrences of the phrase *go ahead*. This can be considered a low frequency and causes the narrow scope of *go ahead* in various contexts. By considering increasing the possibility of occurring samples from sources which are film dialogue, to gain more uses of *go ahead* in a corpus, movie scripts could be more added into a film dialogue corpus in a further study.

5.5.2 As the discussion pointed out, spoken corpora cannot always deliver the whole scenario of interaction, especially of the missing paralanguage. Consequently, future research may include factors such as, stress and intonation, pausing and rhythm, and include paralinguistic features to extract the genuine characters of the samples.
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## APPENDIX A

### SPEECH ACT APPRAISAL OF THE PHRASE WHY NOT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extracted Phrase</th>
<th>Appraisal of speech act</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. C1: No, I won't go with you  
D1: Why not?  
C1: Because I don't want to. It's a stupid tradition | Demand for explanation |
| 2. C1: No, I won't go with you  
D1: Why not?  
C1: Because I don't want to. It's a stupid tradition | Demand for explanation |
| 3. E1: Me? I can't do that.  
F1: Why not?  
E1: I don't know anything about you, all right? I haven't seen you since high school. | Demand for explanation |
| 4. G1: Why are you talking to me?  
H1: Why not? We are neighbors, right?  
G1: But you usually ignore me. | Clarification / Explanation |
| 5. I1: Should I go to his place alone?  
| 6. K1: But I have realized in these past few days... you can't just turn back time.  
L1: Why not?  
K1: I moved on. | Demand for explanation |
| 7. M1: Marcus, we don't really want you hanging around with us anymore.  
N1: Why not?  
M1: Well, it's because of them. | Demand for explanation |
| 8. But then I thought, "Why not?" Why shouldn't I take the poor little sod out for a meal? I could be Uncle Will. Cool Uncle Will, King of the Kids. Okay, Marcus. You're on. (monologue) | Clarification |
| 9. O1: No, we can't. It's not a discussion, it's an argument, and you always win.  
P1: Why not just tell me what to do?  
O1: I want you to think for yourself! | Demand for explanation |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Dialogue</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Q1: No. Can't do that. R1: Why not? Q1: We're really going around in circles here. Just accept the facts, okay?</td>
<td>Demand for explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>S1: That's very kind of you, Marcus, but no. T1: Why not? S1: For Christ's sake! She's got a rare disease and if she believes something that's not right...then hears the truth, her brain will boil in her head and she'll die, okay?</td>
<td>Demand for explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>U1: Well, you don't go to New Year's alone either. V1: Why not? I'm going alone. U1: Well, that's you.</td>
<td>Explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>W1: It never works out because I'm into legs and butts and hair myself! That's why! So I wind up with guys who are very good looking, but even more shallow than I am, if you can picture that. Now, if you'll excuse me, I have to go find another low-paying, demeaning job where some guy named Jerry keeps telling me how lousy his marriage is. X1: Why not go to work for me? W1: Doing what?</td>
<td>Directive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Y1: Why not buy them milk or something...instead of Dr. Pepper? Z1: They like Dr. Pepper.</td>
<td>Directive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>A2: I've got goose-bumps all over me. B2: Why not just go to... Nome for supplies and a wife? Isn't that closer? A2: Yeah, right! That's where you'd go to find girls! Nome. He's gay, by the way.</td>
<td>Directive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>C2: I'm not wearing his pants. D2: Why not? He has great pants. C2: I just don't want to.</td>
<td>Explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>E2: I told you Becca I can't wear strapless! F2: Why not?! Annie and Helen come out to see all the bridesmaids arguing. E2: Because, I...</td>
<td>Explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 19 | I2: Oh, no, don't.  
J2: **Why not?**  
I2: Well, 'cause if girls did it, what would guys do to impress them? | Demand for explanation |   |   |
| 20 | K2: Tai?! Why would I go with Tai?  
L2: **Why not?**  
K2: Don't you even know who my father is? | Clarification |   |   |
| 21 | M2: I don't know.  
N2: **Why not?**  
M2: You got your whole social world going on, I don't want to get in the way. | Demand for explanation |   |   |
| 22 | **So if you're in a situation where you're with a woman, why not do the most interesting thing...that you can do in that situation? And by which, I don't mean have a conversation, have a chin-wag, a bit of a chat. (monologue)** | Directive |   |   |
| 23 | O2: No. Afraid not.  
P2: **Why not?**  
O2: Don't know. | Demand for explanation |   |   |
| 24 | Q2: Dude, no.  
R2: **Why not?** I washed my hands. With soap this time.  
Q2: Are you serious? | Explanation |   |   |
| 25 | S2: She's not coming.  
T2: **Why not?** She doesn't live with you any more, Pop. You're not married.  
S2: What? | Explanation |   |   |
| 26 | U2: No, the point is I'm not gonna start out assuming the guy's a liar.  
V2: **Why not?**  
U2: Because that's how you wind up... | Demand for explanation |   |   |
| 27 | W2: I can't tell you that.  
X2: **Why not?**  
W2: Because you're a stranger. | Demand for explanation |   |   |
| 28 | Y2: My son said the same. We haven't seen each other since.  
Z2: If you miss him, **why not** call him?  
Y2: Afraid. | Directive |   |   |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>A3: Look, I have to think of something before tomorrow.</td>
<td>Demand for explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B3: Wait, <strong>why not</strong> tonight?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A3: Poker night. Boys' night out.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>C3: You are not allowed to act this way.</td>
<td>Demand for explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D3: <strong>Why not?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>E3: Look. I'm happy to entertain you, as always, but I have a question for you. Are we really &quot;friends?&quot;</td>
<td>Clarification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F3: <strong>Why not…</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E3: Well, friends can tell each other anything, right? If we have our &quot;friends&quot; hats on…</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>G3: Let's meet up maybe tomorrow night? You wanna just grab some dinner?</td>
<td>Clarification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H3: Yeah. <strong>Why not?</strong> Meeting of minds sounds good.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G3: What do you say Geisha House, Hollywood, 9:00?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>I3: I wasn't.</td>
<td>Demand for explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J3: <strong>Why not?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I3: Because you told me not to.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>K3: Yeah.</td>
<td>Demand for explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L3: <strong>Why not?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K3: Get up.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>M3: Right, I'll get my things and then let's fix the country, shall we?</td>
<td>Clarification / Explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N3: Yeah, I can't see <strong>why not.</strong> …That is so inconvenient.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>O3: Yeah, Mommy. We're fine.</td>
<td>Directive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P3: Miranda, <strong>why not</strong> let me take care of the kids?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O3: I'll pick 'em up after school, be with them, then drop them off at your house after work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Q3: I can't get rid of Mrs Doubtfire. She's terrific.</td>
<td>Demand for explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R3: <strong>Why not?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q3: She's the best thing that ever happened to us.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>S3: You sure about that?</td>
<td>Clarification / Explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T3: No. Yeah. I don't know. <strong>Why not?</strong> I can take it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S3: Ok. Well, in high school, there was Markus.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>U3: Do you want to stay?</td>
<td>Clarification / Explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V3: <strong>Why not…</strong> all that awaits me at home is a masturbating Welshman.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 40 | W3: I wouldn't go outside.  
X3: Why not?  
W3: Just take my work for it. | Demand for explanation |
| 41 | Y3: Please don't do that now.  
Z3: Why not?  
Y3: Because I want you to practice being super quiet. | Demand for explanation |
| 42 | A4: The price just went up to ten.  
B4: Why don't you just do it out of the kindness of your heart?...Alright... why not? | Demand for explanation |
| 43 | C4: I wasn't as much fun as I thought it was going to be.  
D4: Why not?  
C4: Well, you know those cold bitches that work in those stores and try to intimidate you? It works. | Demand for explanation |
| 45 | G4: Do you want a bite of this?  
H4: Why not?  
G4: Well, here goes. | Clarification |
| 46 | I4: Troy, I can't. I can't.  
J4: Why not? You never thought about it?  
I4: Well, yes, of course I have, but I... | Demand for explanation |
| 47 | K4: I can't evolve right now.  
L4: Why not? Because of Michael?  
K4: No. | Demand for explanation |
| 48 | M4: I already made an appointment for later today.  
N4: See? You want custody of my job?... Why not just consider my wrist slapped and call me when you feel I've served my time?  
M4: I'm sorry, Ike. This is permanent. | Irony |
| 49 | O4: Have you talked to your dad about this?  
P4: No.  
O4: Why not?  
P4: It's very hard for him to talk about this stuff. It's like it makes him sadder. | Demand for explanation |
| 50 | Q4: No. Sam is very uncomfortable about this…  
R4: Why not?  
Q4: Look, Doctor, I don't want to be rude, but… | Demand for explanation |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Dialogue</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 51   | S4: I don't think I could really describe it.  
T4: Why not?  
S4: And if I could describe it, it probably wouldn't be on a radio show. | Demand for explanation |
| 52   | U4: Well why don't you look her up?  
V4: Yeah, right.  
U4: Why not?  
V4: Because I guarantee she's married and has a couple kids. Girls like Mary don't stay single. | Demand for explanation |
| 53   | W4: and light up a couple of cigars?  
X4: Stogies?  
W4: Yeah.  
X4: Why not?  
W4: It's just that we lost a lot of really good men out there. | Demand for explanation |
| 54   | Y4: Cleary family tradition.  
Z4: A little pigskin, **why not?**  
Y4: Great. | Statement |
| 55   | A5: Robbie is so amazingly cute. I think I should go out with him.  
B5: Yeah, **why not?** You're single, and he's single. It makes sense. | Explanation |
| 56   | C5: No, I don’t think it should bum you out.  
D5: **Why not?**  
C5: I think it should bum you out when you stop trying. | Demand for explanation |
| 57   | E5: Kathleen Kelly of the bookstore.  
F5: **Why not?** You said you thought she was attractive.  
E5: So what? Who cares about Kathleen Kelly? | Explanation |
| 58   | G5: Well, if you don't like Kathleen Kelly, I can tell you right now you ain't gonna like this girl.  
H5: **Why not?**  
G5: Because it is Kathleen Kelly. | Demand for explanation |
| 59   | I5: You're going to let her just wait there?  
J5: Yes. Yes I am. That's exactly what I'm going to do. **Why not?**  
I5: But she wrote the letters. | Clarification |
| 60   | K5: But it wasn't meant to be.  
L5: **Why not?**  
K5: He ran Spain. | Demand for explanation |
M5: So you're going to offer her a job?
N5: Why not? What else has she got to do?
M5: Now that she's destitute…

Clarification

O5: Well, I can't imagine her working for you.
P5: Why not?
O5: She has a horrible personality.

Demand for explanation

Q5: You know this is never gonna work.
R5: Why not? Because clearly you're gonna fall in love with me. Oh, really? Well, then we just do this until one of us feels something more, and then we stop.
Q5: Well, it won't be me.

Demand for explanation

S5: You wanna know what I think?
T5: Why not?
S5: You're better off without him. You know, you guys are the best.

Demand for explanation

U5: Me? No.
V5: Why not?
U5: Don't really want one.

Demand for explanation

W5: There's no way.
X5: Why not?
W5: "Octopus's Garden?" You may as well just say "Piggies?"

Demand for explanation
## APPENDIX B

**SPEECH ACT APPRAISAL OF THE PHRASE GO AHEAD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extracted phrase <em>go ahead</em> including context</th>
<th>Type of speech act</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. C1: God, what is up with her lately, anyway? I mean, she seems so lost. I have no idea. I'm getting so sick of having her around...with this crazy new act she has going on. You know how she stole Charlotte's idea and then fired her? I say we <em>go ahead</em> with our own presentation...and let her fall on her ass. Oh, God, yeah. Okay, you're not Cajun. D1: Wanna go for a walk? C1: Sure.</td>
<td>Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. E1: Goody. Hang in there. Why does nobody listen to a word I say? Arlene, aren't you coming? Oh, you're invited, are you? Okay, bye-bye. Oh, no, excuse me. <em>Go ahead.</em> You know, what am I? I'm just the...editor in chief. Whatever. We've gotta go to rd, please, between th and th. F1: It's West rd. E1: You got it I don't know anything about you, all right? I haven't seen you since high school.</td>
<td>Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. G1: Can I ask him a question? H1: <em>Go ahead.</em></td>
<td>Clarification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I1: Fiona, I've got to talk to you. J1: <em>Go ahead.</em> I1: No, you know, properly talk to you, privately. No, this is a circle of truth.</td>
<td>Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1: Uh...dad...</td>
<td>R1: Go ahead son, there's more.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1: Cher, I'm really sorry. Oh, shit. Now I'm going to go ahead and cry.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1: Let's never fight again, OK?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U1: Could you take a look at my penis?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1: Go ahead. Let me see it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U1: Sorry.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1: Let me handle this, okay?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X1: Go ahead.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y1: What's your advice?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z1: You've got three choices: one - go ahead with it. Two - go outside and say 'Sorry, folks, it's all off!'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y1: Not tempting. Next?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2: You want to go to the game?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2: Well, go ahead, 'cause I'm not going.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2: Seventh and final game of what has been a classic series between... Sweetie, I wouldn't have gone, either.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2: It's not &quot;love me.&quot; It's not &quot;trust my handshake.&quot; It's make the sale. Get it signed. There shouldn't be &quot;confusion&quot; about that.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2: Go ahead. Jump right on into my nightmare. The water's warm.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2: So honesty is outlawed here, I can't be honest?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2: Does she have a lady friend for me?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2: Go ahead. Ask her.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2: I'll go ask her.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2: Wait a minute, honey. I want to show you something.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2: It's okay. Go ahead.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2: Now, this is Lois Lane. She lives here in the newsroom.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I2: Wow...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J2: Wanna pet her, sweetheart? Go ahead. She won't bite. You got this raging scoop disease, my friend.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I2: Which is what you love about me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 19 | K2: I think they're Costa Rican or something.  
L2: Uh, sure.  
K2: **Go ahead.**  
L2: Well, gracias, papi.  
K2: Oh, my God, I'm so glad you came. | Statement |
| 20 | M2: How do you know that?  
N2: I can hear you walking around sometimes. At first I thought it was a robber. **Go ahead,** tell her, Dad.  
M2: I don't think I have to now. | Directive |
| 21 | O2: Can I take a minute?  
P2: **Go ahead.** | Clarification |
| 22 | Q2: Do you smoke, Richard?  
R2: Yes, ma'am, I do, but it's...  
Q2: ... a non-smoking floor, yeah. Well, you know what? **Go ahead.** | Directive |
| 23 | S2: Do you mind if I get married now?  
T2: No, **go ahead.**  
S2: Hi, Todd. Although we may choose whom we marry. | Clarification / Irony |
| 24 | U2: Can I say something about the cat?  
V2: Well sure. **Go ahead.**  
U2: This here is, and Rhoda, you know I mean no disrespect... but this...this is total shit. | Clarification |
| 25 | W2: You're probably here to gloat over the anchor position. **Go ahead,** I'm sure I deserve it.  
X2: You know, Evan. I've been a real prick. | Statement |
| 26 | Y2: So I'm dead... Okay. If this is what you want. Okay, okay...  
Z2: **Go ahead,** use 'em.  
Y2: Alright... I've learned that I don't know as much I thought I did... | Directive |
| 27 | A3: David, just do it.  
B3: What?  
A3: **Go ahead,** be with her. It's what you both want. | Directive |
| 28 | C3: I want that money right now, or I'll hand you over to the police.  
D3: **Go ahead!**  
C3: They'll be pretty rough with you....with your record | Statement |
APPENDIX C
LIST OF MOVIES USED IN THE FILM DIALOGUE CORPUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Release Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13 Going on 30</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Dresses</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About a Boy</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Along Came Polly</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Lot like Love</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Pie</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blast from the Past</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brides Maids</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridget Jones’s Diary</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clueless</td>
<td>1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy A</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgetting Sarah Marshall</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Weddings and a Funeral</td>
<td>1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends with Benefits</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hitch</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Alone</td>
<td>1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to Lose a Guy in 10 Days</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry Maguire</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knocked Up</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love Actually</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Doubtfire</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My Best Friend’s Wedding</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never been Kissed</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nine Months</td>
<td>1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notting Hill</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Fine Day</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretty Woman</td>
<td>1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Princess Diaries</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reality Bites</td>
<td>1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runaway Bride</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movie</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sleepless in Seattle</em></td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sweet Home Alabama</em></td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ten Things I hate about You</em></td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The Holiday</em></td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>There’s Something about Mary</em></td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The Wedding Singer</em></td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Train Wreck</em></td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Valentine’s Day</em></td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Wedding Crashers</em></td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>You’ve Got Mail</em></td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>