The Syntactic and Functional Structures of Intonation Unit in Thai*

Shoichi Iwasaki

University of California, Los Angeles

1. Introduction.
    In natural speech, utterances are produced in chunks. This utterance
chunk is often accompanied by characteristic prosodic features, such as initial
pitch reset, final vowel lengthening, initial (or post) pauses, and steady declination
in pitch over time. This chunk, though fuzzy at times in naturalistic data, is more
often than not salient perceptually and has been identified variously as "tone unit",
"breath group," "intonation group," and "intonation unit." We adopt the term,
"intonation unit" (IU henceforth) here, because it has been most strongly
associated with the research tradition that analyzes naturally occurring discourse
rather than made up data in the literature (Chafe 1987; Chafe 1994, Du Bois
1993).
    IUs have both syntactic and functional structures. Syntactically, IUs may
correspond to a clause, phrase, or lexical item. Functionally, they expresses
ideational content, textural coherence, interpersonal concerns, and other aspects of
communication. One theoretical issue that has arisen in IU research is the
relationship between the syntactic and functional structures of IU. For example, it
has been found that Japanese speakers use phrasal IUs more often than English
speakers (Iwasaki 1993). A typical phrasal Japanese IU contains both an
ideational component and interpersonal component, the latter of which is
expressed by an array of pragmatic particles. It is interesting from a typological
point of view, then, to examine if Thai speakers resort to the phrasal IU strategy
since Thai also has a mechanism to encode the interpersonal function through
similar pragmatic particles. This is the first question I ask in this paper.
    The second question I pose is whether both syntactic and functional
structures of Thai IUs are constant across discourse genres. This question is
important since such an inter-genre comparison will discriminate the influence of
the cognitive pressure from social pressure in the formation of IUs. In this study,
I compare three sets of oral discourse, which are different in terms of setting
(experimental or casual) and purpose (informing or sharing information, or
chatting), as well as content. Features that appear differently across the three data
sets, are something language users control according to genre difference, while
those that do not change may reflect something that a speaker does not have
conscious control of, and may reflect cognitive constraint imposed on the
language user.

2. The Data
    The three sets of data used for this research represent three different genres
of spoken discourse. The first data set, "Pear Story" narratives, were solicited in
an experimental setting from speakers who have seen a short silent film "Pear
Story" (Chafe 1980). In this story a young boy on a bicycle steals a basketfull of

pears from a man who is picking pears from a pear tree. The boy falls off the bike when he sees a girl on another bike coming from the opposite direction. Three boys show up and help the little boy, who gives pears to them in return. The three boys walk past the pear picker, who looks at them suspiciously. After having seen the film, a subject is asked to retell the story in front of the interviewer, who is supposed to have not seen the film.

The second data set, "Earthquake," is a conversation between two young female students, who talk about their experiences in and after the earthquake which hit Los Angeles in January of 1994. The two participants met for the first time at the time of conversation. The setting is not formal and the goal is to share their experiences. In the segment analyzed in the present paper, they talk about the damage, first impression, and friends who suffered various sorts of damage, and give a description of Americans' reaction to the disaster. They not only report what has happened but also evaluate what they have experienced.

The third data set, "Students," is an informal conversation between two close college students. The setting is extremely casual, and as such there is no clear goal of conversation except to maintain the friendship. In the portion analyzed here, they talk about how they missed each other right before the conversation, indicating where they have been, who they have seen, and what they have done, and also what happened to them the previous night after they parted.

In order to make a reasonable comparison, I analyzed a similar number of IUs in each data set as shown below. Since one "Pear Story" narrative is short, four different narratives were combined. Also in Earthquake and Students, there are more IUs which are non-substantial (e.g., backchannels and laughter tokens), so the initial number of IUs taken from these data sets are larger than that from "Pear Story" narratives.

Three "Pear Story" narratives (Pear)	255 IUs
Earthquake (EQ)	300 IUs
Students (ST)	300 IUs

3. Analysis of Syntactic Structure

For syntactic analysis, I used the following five categories: Simplex clause, Complex clause, Part of clause, Isolated word and phrase, and Others. The result of this analysis will follow the explanations of each syntactic type.

3.1. Definitions of different syntactic structures

Simplex clauses (SC) contain minimally an overt predicate. One or more argument(s) or adjunct(s) without clausal modification may appear. Intransitive verbs[1] are likely to appear with their subject noun phrase (often with an inanimate referent) as in (1).

---

[1] Though it is not our major concern in the present paper, it should be noted that SCs may be classified according to the type of predicate. No a priori classification of a predicate is given, but its categorization is determined by the context in which a predicate appears. This sensitivity is necessary for Thai, in which many verbs take the same form for both transitive and intransitive senses. For example, hàw 'bark' is an intransitive verb in man hàw "It barked," but structurally is a transitive verb in man hàw khon "It barked (at) people." Actual situations are more complex than this since non-overt arguments abound in Thai. Thus, hàw in man hàw in some cases should be considered as a transitive verb if the situation clearly demands that the direct object be associated with the verb.

(1) khɔ̌ɔŋ loŋ maa lέεw (EQ 13)[2]
    thing down come ASP   "Things fell off already."

Transitive verbs, on the other hand, are usually accompanied by the overt direct object noun phrase but not the subject noun phrase (Du Bois). Thus (2) is a typical transitive clause, while (3) is unusual. However, both are SCs.

(2) kamlang kèp   pǒnlamáay (PS #14:3)
    ASP   collect fruits   "(He) is collecting fruits."

(3) phɵ̂an kawlii kɔ̌ sɵ̀ɵ sterio maa (EQ 173)
    friend Korean HP buy stereo ASP
    "(My) Korean friend had bought a stereo."

Complex clauses (CC) are of four types. Classification into subtypes requires a theory which is based on a careful analysis of clause structure. The following classification should be regarded as tentative.

    CC1: Paratactic construction: This construction combines two (or more) simple clauses paratactically. The two (or more) events depicted in this construction are relatively independent of each other, as evidenced by different subjects, aspectual markings, polarities associated with different clauses, and/or an intervening conjunction. The following two serve as examples.

(4) yang nɔɔŋ mây lúu lɵ̀aŋ (EQ:4)
     still sleep NEG know thing
     "(I) was still sleeping (and) didn't know (about the earthquake)."

(5) mây chây nâŋ tó rὲεk tὲ ʔûm pay khâw hɔ̂ŋ náam ŋay (ST:25)
     NEG right sit desk first but I go enter bathroom PP
     "No, I was sitting on the first desk, but I went into the restroom."

    CC2: Serial construction: The serial construction is similar to paratactic construction, but what is expressed in this construction is conceived as one event. From a structural point of view, this means that the two serialized verbs are not independently marked with aspectual and other verbal information. Causative, passive and purpose constructions are considered as serial constructions. However, other highly grammaticalized serialization which indicates, for example, directional, aspectual and other information is not considered as serial construction.

(6) dəən kin maa kan (Pear #16:60)
     walk eat come together
     "(They) were walking towards (him) together eating (pears)."

(7) ʔέ dəən klàp pay phìt mòt lέεw (ST:263)
     oh walk return go turn-off all ASP
     "Oh, (they) returned and turned off everything."

(CC3) Hypotactic construction: This construction consists of a dependent (adverbial) clause and the main clause. In some cases a dependent clause is marked with an overt subordinator such as *welaa* 'when' or *thâa* 'if.' In others, the main clause is introduced by the particle *kɔ̂*.

(8) thâa ʔalay kɔ̀ət khùn   níi kháw lápphĭt chɔ̀ɔp tùa ʔeeŋ níi bɛ̀p (EQ 130)
    if   something happen PP they   be responsible self   PP like
    "If something happens, they would be responsible themselves."

(9) kháw kɔ̂ maa tùat kɔ̂ mây mii ʔalay   (EQ 94)
    they   HP come investigate HP NEG have something
    "Though they came to check, there was nothing."

(CC4) Complement and relative constructions: Complement construction is a construction with a verb which takes the complement, often marked by a complementizer *wâa* or *thíi*.

(10) kháw saŋkèet hĕn wâa man hăay pay (Pear #16:67)
     he   notice see C it   disappear go
     "He notices that it has disappeared."

(11) kɔ̂ bɔ̀ɔk wâa hǐw náam (ST 112)
     HP tell   C thirsty   "So (I) told (her) that I was thirsty."

Sometimes a complementizer does not appear as in (12) below.[3]

(12) kháw bɔ̀ɔk ʔùm yùu rooŋ ʔahăan nɛ̀   (ST 106)
     he   say   Um stay dining hall PP
     "He said Um was at the dining hall."

A relative clause is marked with *thíi*. This construction appears often as part of a simplex or complex clause. The next example shows a case where the subject noun phrase is relativized in a simplex clause.

(13) khon thíi kamlaŋ kèp phonlamáay yaŋ yùu bon tônmáay (Pear #14:17)
     person C ASP   collect fruits   still stay up tree
     "The man who is collecting fruits is still up in the tree."

Part of a clause: An IU is recognized as part of a clause when it combines with the next IU to create a complete clause. If the second IU in this case can be considered independent, then it is coded as SC or CC.

(14) (EQ)
 57 mây hĕn
     NEG see

 58 mii ʔalay .. nâa ca: tòkcay ʔalay lǝǝy
     have something induce ASP surprise something EMPH

     "I don't see

---

[3] There is a rather frequent appearance of IUs which end with *wâa*. Such IUs are classified as a simplex clause.

anything that are surprising at all."

An IU is also considered as part of a clause when it is the second part of a serial construction following the first part, or when it is a prepositional phrase which accompanies a verb in the preceding IU. The next is of the second type.

(15) (EQ)
97 chây khǎw bὲp ʔaw khon ʔɔɔk maa
yes they like take thing out come

98 nɔɔk tὺk mὸt lǝǝy
outside building all EMPH

"Yes, they took out everything
from the building."

Words and phrases: Isolated words and phrases which are not part of a clause are classified as one category.

Others: In this category are included backchannel expressions, reactive tokens, fragmental IUs, laughter tokens and other miscellaneous tokens.

3.2. Result of syntactic analysis

The result of syntactic analysis is shown in Table 1. The total number of IUs is greater than the actual number of IUs in each data set because some IUs are coded for two different categories (e.g., it is coded as SC and C4 if an IU is a simplex clause containing a relative clause.)

	SC	CC1	CC2	CC3	CC4	PC	W	Oth	Ttl
Pear	150	9	37	20	7	18	7	23	271
	55.3%	3.3%	13.6%	7.3%*	2.5%	5.9%	2.5%	8.4%	100%
EQ	142	12	17	12	7	23	18	72	303
	48.8%	3.9%	5.6%	3.9%	2.3%	7.5%	5.9%	23.7%	100%
ST	155	12	15	18	8	9	5	81	303
	51.5%	3.9%	4.9%	5.9%	2.6%	2.9%	1.4%	26.7%	100%
Total	447	33	69	50	22	50	30	176	877
	50.9%	3.7%	7.8%	5.7%	2.8%	5.7%	3.4%	20.0%	100%

[Table 1] Syntactic structure of IUs in the three data sets

One noticeable trend in Table 1 is the higher frequency of serial construction (CC2) in Pear compared to the other two data sets. This is perhaps due to the object of description in Pear, which consists of many temporally sequenced actions by the people in the story. Another point of interest is the higher frequency of the "Other" category in EQ and ST compared to Pear. This is because EQ and ST are interactive conversations and are comprised of many tokens of backchannel expressions, reactive tokens, and laughter tokens. Pear, on the other hand, being a monologue, does not contain many such IUs.

In the following discussion, I will examine only SC, CC and PC (i.e., substantive IUs). Table 2 shows the frequency of these substantive IUs. In this table, different types of CCs are combined as one.

	SC	CC	PC	Total
Pear	150 (61.4 %)	73 (29.9 %)	21 (8.7 %)	244 (100%)
EQ	142 (66.6 %)	48 (22.5 %)	23 (10.9 %)	213 (100%)
ST	155 (71.4 %)	53 (24.4 %)	9 (4.2 %)	217 (100%)

[Table 2] Distribution of SC, CC and PC in the three data sets

The pattern of distribution is very similar among the three data sets with SC being the most favored type of IU. We will come back to this point later.

4. Analysis on Functional Components
    For functional component analysis, I used the following four categories: Ideational component (ID), Text-coherence component (CO), Interpersonal component (IT), and regulatory component (RG). The first three categories have been identified as metafunctions of language by Halliday (1985). Though Halliday maintains that these functions do not have direct correlation to forms, it is to some extent possible to identify the function of different linguistic expressions (Iwasaki 1993). The last functional component (RG) corresponds partially to Chafe (1994)'s notion of regulatory IU. Explanations of each functional component type is in order.

Ideational component (ID): The ideational functional component sketches out the image of realities and ideas as perceived by the speaker.

Text-coherence component (CO): This function connects one part of a discourse to another (anaphoric and cataphoric functions) or points to an item in the speech context (exophoric function). (See Halliday and Hasan 1976.) I identify as lexical items of cohesion in Thai the highlighting particle, $k\hat{o}$, and conjunctives, such as $phr\acute{o}$ 'because' and $th\hat{a}a$ 'if.'

Interpersonal component (IT): Some lexical items indicate sensitivity towards the addressee in the communication process. In English, such phrases as "y'know" or "let me tell you" serve this function. In Thai specialized lexical items and expressions attached to utterances carry out this task, which include speech level markers (e.g., $kh\hat{a}$, $khr\acute{a}p$), pragmatic particles (e.g., $n\acute{a}$, $n\hat{a}$, ηay), and other expressions such as $r\acute{o}\vartheta$ 'really?' $ch\hat{a}y$ $m\acute{a}y$ 'right?' Also included in this category are backchannel expressions and reactive tokens (e.g., $ci\eta$ $r\acute{o}\vartheta$ 'Is that so?')

Regulatory component (RG): This component shows a speaker's orientation towards what he is expressing. Some tokens express speaker's validation, hedges, exclamation, and emphasis on the message. Some examples of RG are as follows.

    Validation: - $m\acute{a}\eta$ ('maybe'), $l\grave{o}k$ ('on the contrary'), $m\acute{a}y$ $l\acute{u}u$ ('not sure')
    Hedges: $b\grave{e}\varepsilon p$ ('like'), $ya\eta\eta\acute{i}a$ ('like this')
    Exclamation: $?\acute{o}oy$, $?\acute{u}y$, $?\acute{a}aw$, $?\acute{e}$, $h\acute{o}y$

Emphasis: *lǝǝy*

Though boundaries between the above mentioned items, especially between [IT] and [RG], are not always straightforward (Chafe 1994:61), and tokens listed as examples in each category may cross boundaries, discourse environments are often helpful to sort out tokens according to the categories proposed here.

The result of Functional Component analysis is summarized in Table 3. Since the IUs under consideration are substantive IUs (i.e., SC, CC or PC), they all contain by definition the component [ID].

	Pear	EQ	ST	Total
ID	80	88	78	246
ID CO	92	45	30	167
ID IT	18	17	51	86
ID RG	7	38	24	69
ID CO IT	19	4	21	44
ID CO RG	6	15	2	23
ID IT RG	6	1	8	15
ID CO IT RG	-	2	-	2
Total	228	210	214	652

[Table 3] Functional component analysis

Table 3 shows a skewed distribution of IU types according to the number of functions coded. In order to see this trend more clearly, IUs were categorized according to the number of functional components coded in one IU. See Table 4 below.

	Pear	EQ	ST	Total
1 Component	80	88	78	246 (37.7%)
2 Components	117	100	105	322 (49.3%)
3 Components	31	20	31	82 (12.5%)
4 Components	0	2	0	2 (0.5%)
Total	228	210	214	652 (100%)

[Table 4] The number of Functional components coded in one IU

Tables 3 and 4 show that the favored number of functional components expressed in one IU in all three data sets is two (i.e., [ID CO], [ID IT] or [ID RG]). The second most favored number is one, which is always [ID]. That is, a speaker either produces [ID] or adds one additional message to [ID] in each IU. These two types of IU comprise 87.0 % of all IUs under consideration. IUs containing three components are rare, and those containing all four are almost non-existent.

5. Discussion

With the findings shown above, we are ready to answer the two questions posed at the outset of the paper. Concerning the syntactic structure of IU, we learned that Thai IUs tend to be Simplex clauses like English. According to Table 2 we saw earlier Simplex clauses occupy 61.4% (Pear), 66.6% (EQ) and 71.4%

(ST). Chafe (1994:63) reports that about 60% of substantive IUs in his English *data are single-clauses, or our Simplex clauses.* Since this simplex clausal tendency is not influenced by different discourse types, it may suggest that the tendency is a result of the cognitively induced principle of language. Chafe Chafe (1987:36-7) suggests that there is a constraint which may be called "one new concept at a time" constraint, which restricts the amount of new information coded in one IU. Furthermore, *typically new information expressed in the predicate is anchored to given information (or active concept) expressed in the subject of a clause.* It will be interesting how this system applies to Thai, which does not require the overt subject in a clause. We will not, however, pursue this point any further in this paper.

The question about the syntactic structure of IU was proposed because of the relatively large inventory of pragmatic particles both in Thai and Japanese. However, the results show that Thai IUs are not similar to Japanese IUs in this respect. It is instructive at this point to compare the structure of Thai IU with that of Japanese IU.

(16) (from *BOMBING*)[4]
1 *atashi wa   nee**   ♩ I, y'know.
    I   TOP PP
2 *uchi-de   kiita   no ne?*   heard at home, y'know.
    home-LOC hear:PAST SE PP
3 *sono are   wa   ne?*   that thing, y'know.
    that that one TOP PP
4 *hoosoo wa   ne?*   that broadcast, y'know.
    broadcast TOP PP
5 *kazoku-de.*   with my family.
    family-with

   "I heard that broadcast at home with my family."

In the above excerpt, the speaker adds a pragmatic particle, *ne* or *nee*, to IUs 1 through 4. The function of these particles is to solicit involvement of the addressee in the communication process. Like Japanese, Thai has many pragmatic particles and *ná* seems very close functionally to *ne/nee* in the above Japanese data. Thus it was suspected that Thai speakers would produce many phrasal IUs. In fact, there are some instances in which Thai IUs present a similar pattern to (16) above. Consider (17) and (18) below.

(17) Pear #14
31 ... ʔây takrâa phǒnlamáay náa   the fruit basket, y'know,
    oh basket fruits   PP
32 ... man kɔ́ ... lòn mòt lǝǝy   it fell down completely.
    it HP   fall all EMPH

(18) Pear #14
64 dèk sǎam khon nía   the three boys, y'know,
    child three person PP

---

4 Glosses used in the Japanese sample are: LOC (locative), PP (pragmatic particle), SE (sentence extension), and TOP (topic). Intonations are indicated by /*/ (falling intonation), /?/ (rising intonation) and /./ (lowering intonation).

65   thǔu phǒnlamáay kin yùu   were eating the fruits.
      carry fruits   eat ASP

However, this type of IU production is extremely rare in the present data. While one study shows that over 30% of Japanese IUs are of phrasal type (Iwasaki 1993), Table 2 earlier shows that only 4.2% (ST) to 10.9% (EQ) are such type of IU. Moreover, even when an IU takes the form of PC (Part of a clause), it usually does not contain the [IT] component as the following Table shows.

	Pear	EQ	ST	Total
# of PC	21	23	9	53
# of PC containing [IT]	6	1	0	7

[Table 5] The number of PC and the number of PC containing [IT]

Only 7 out of 53 of phrasal IUs contain the interactional component. More typical patterns surrounding PC are shown in examples below. (Some examples were shown earlier.)

(19)   (ST)
270   piin khâw bâan   I climbed to enter the house
      climb enter house
271   sɔ̌ɔŋ rɔ̂ɔp   twice.
      twice

(20)   (EQ)
97   chây kháw bɛ̀p ʔaw khɔ̌ɔŋ ʔɔ̌ɔk maa   "Right, they took out everything
      yes they like take thing out come
98   nɔ̂ɔk tɛ̀k mòt lə̀əy   *   out of the building."
      outside building all EMPH

In (19) and (20) above, information is incrementally added to the information expressed in the previous IU. Quantifiers as in (19) and prepositional phrases as in (20) are often found in this type of IU sequence. In (21) and (22) below, the motivation of PC seems to reflect the cognitive process of word search.

(21)   (Pear #14)
37   man kɔ̂ɔ chûay kan kɛ̀p   "They helped (the boy) to collect
      they HP help together collect
38   ... phǒnlamáay sày takraa hây   fruits into the basket for (him)."
      fruits   put basket BEN

(22)   (EQ)
111   ... pen .. mǔan pen tɛ̀k bɛ̀p
      be similar be building like
112   ... khɔ̌ŋ ʔɔfís phûak mɔ̌ɔ ʔalay   yàŋŋía
      of office group doctor something like that

      "(It')s like, (it')s like a building
      of doctors' offices, something like that."

When a speaker uses a pragmatic particle, he usually put it at the end of a clause. (See earlier examples (5) and (12).)

The fact that Thai speakers do not employ many phrasal IUs suggests that the mere presence of pragmatic particles in a language does not induce the phrasal IU strategy. What influences the different patterns of IU in Japanese and Thai seems to reside in the way in which grammatical relation are expressed in a clause. In Japanese, grammatical relations are marked on the noun by means of grammatical and semantic particles (Shibatani personal communication), whereas in Thai they are expressed mainly through word order. In the latter type of language, separation of arguments and adjuncts from the predicate may produce confusion. Since in English grammatical relations are expressed through word order as well as the subject-verb agreement, the unity of clause may be even stronger.[5]

The second question I posed at the outset of the paper was whether or not both syntactic and functional structures of Thai IUs are constant through discourse genres. Syntactically, as we have already discussed, Simplex clause is the most favored in all the data sets. Functionally, as we briefly mentioned, the number of functions coded in one IU is similar (2 or 1). However, though the bi-component IU is the most favorite type across the three data sets, the composition of the two component, is very different among them. Tables 6 (part taken from Table 1) below shows this point.

	Pear	EQ	ST	Total
ID CO	92 ←	45 ←	30	167
ID IT	18	17	51 ←	86
ID RG	7	38 ←	24	69

[Table 6] The number of different bi-component IUs

Among the three types of bi-component IU, [ID CO] is most favored in Pear, [ID CO] and [ID RG] are favored in EQ, and [ID IT] is favored in ST. The same point is repeated in Table 7, which compares the number of IUs which contain each of the three functional components regardless of the total number of components in an IU.

	Pear (228 IUs)	EQ (210 IUs)	ST (214 IUs)
CO +	117 (51.3%)	66 (31.4%)	53 (24.7%)
IT +	43 (18.8%)	24 (11.4%)	80 (37.3%)
RG +	19 (8.3%)	56 (26.6%)	34 (15.8%)

[Table 7] The number of IUs containing CO, IT or RG

---

5 Primacy of grammatical coding influencing the phrasal IU strategy is supported in Korean, another language which codes grammatical relations on the noun phrase with particles. Even though Korean does not have equivalents to Japanese pragmatic particles, phrasal strategies are employed (Sung-ock Sohn, personal communication). Politeness particle *yo* in Korean is not considered a pragmatic particle, but it works in a similar way to Japanese pragmatic particle, *ne* in the production of IU. This suggests that the presence of grammatical and semantic particles is a stronger factor than pragmatic particles in inducing phrasal structure. However, more rigorous investigation in this language is needed to confirm this hypothesis.

This discrepancy may be understood if we consider the nature of each data set carefully. Recall that Pear is a retelling of a story presented visually. Many actions and events happen one after another in the story. The speaker's task is to relate these actions and events with each other. Thus, the [CO] component is extremely important. However, the [RG] component, which includes hedges and exclamations, should be avoided in this type of discourse because it downplays the objective accuracy in the report. (This attitude of reporting may be culturally different. See Tannen (1980).) Also, Pear is basically a monologue, and there is no need to use an interpersonal component, thereby involving an addressee.

Like Pear, EQ also contains many IUs with [CO] component since this discourse consists of a series of events and actions that took place during and after the earthquake. The difference, however, is observable in the frequency of [RG] in EQ. This is because unlike the objective report demanded for Pear, with tokens of exclamation (ʔóoy, ʔúy, ʔáaw, ʔeˇ, háy) and emphasis (ləəy), EQ reveals personal feelings and an evaluation of events reported. Also noticeable in EQ is frequent uses of the so-called hedges (bɛ̀ɛp 'like,' yaŋŋía 'like this'), which mark the informal nature of the conversation. The following is one example.

(23) (EQ 46)
      kháw bɛ̀p tʉʉntên mâak   "They were like really nervous."
      they like nervous a lot

It is [IT] that is most frequent among the three components in ST because the two friends are allowed to freely display their interactive stances in this very casual conversation.

(24) kɔ̌ .. nâŋ ʔàʔ (ST 95)   "So I was sitting (there)!"
      HP sit PP

(25)... hɔ̌ŋ núun   nàʔ (ST 44)   "That room over there!"
      room over there PP

Some tokens of [IT] mark mutual sharedness of information. A speaker can openly demand the addressee who is close to him to accept his reasoning or recall specific information in casual conversation, which may not be appropriate if the addressee is not a close friend

(26) phɔ̌   pân khâw pay nay hɔ̌ŋ chây plàw làʔ (ST 42)
      because Apple enter go in room right not   PP
      "Because Apple went into the room, isn't that right?"

(27) mây nʉ́k wâa cà klàp yɛn ŋay (ST 267)
      NEG think C ASP return late PP
      "(I) didn't think that (I) would return late, right?"

6. Conclusion
      A typical IU in Thai is a Simplex clause with two functional components. These tendencies may be general across languages since Simplex clausal tendency is observed in English, and the tendency of bi-functional component is observed in Japanese. Moreover, these tendencies are common across the discourse types we examined. It is possible then that these tendencies reflect fundamental human

linguistic activities. Further cross-language, cross-genre comparisons will reveal more about the cognitive and social pressures that shape IUs in human language. A specific typological suggestion was made regarding the frequency of Simplex clause over Part of a clause in Thai as compared to in Japanese. Thai speakers put pragmatic particles at the end of a clause and do not readily break up a clause to put in pragmatic particle, while Japanese speakers insert a pragmatic particle after a phrase and put a juncture after such an IU. The different strategies found between Thai and Japanese are related to how grammatical relations are coded in the two languages. Since noun phrases are marked for grammatical relations in Japanese, they are more independent than noun phrases in Thai, whose grammatical relation is coded through word order. This suggests a strong connection between grammar of a language and the shape of the IU in that language. I hope that the research presented here has opened an opportunity to explore the relationship between grammar and language use from a cross-linguistic perspective.

References

Chafe, Wallace, Ed. 1980. *The pear stories! Cognitive, cultural, and linguistic aspects of narrative production*. Advances in Discourse Processes. Norwood, Ablex Publishing Company.
Chafe, Wallace. 1987. Cognitive constraints on information flow. *Coherence and Grounding in Discourse*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia, John Benjamins.
Chafe, Wallace. 1994. *Discourse, consciousness, and time: The flow and displacement of conscious experience in speaking and writing*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
Du Bois, John. 1987. The discourse basis o ergativity. *Language* 63(4): 805-855.
Du Bois, John J, Stephan Schuetze-Coburn, Susanna Cumming and Danae Paolino. 1993. Outline of discourse transcription. *Talking data: Transcription and coding in discourse research*. Hillsdale, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. 45-89.
Halliday, M. A. K., and Ruqaiya Hasan. 1976. Cohesion in English. London: Longman.
Halliday, M.A.k. 1985. *An introduction to functional grammar*. London, Edward Arnold.
Iwasaki, Shoichi. 1993. The structure of intonation unit in Japanese. *Japanese/Korean Linguistics*. Stanford: CSLI.
Iwasaki, Shoichi and Hongyin Tao. 1993. *A comparative study of the structure of intonation unit in English, Japanese and Mandarin Chinese*. LSA Annual Meeting, Los Angeles,
Tannen, Deborah. 1980. A comparative analysis of oral narrative strategies: Athenian Greek and American English. *The pear stories: Cognitive, cultural, and linguistic aspects of narrative production*. Norwood, NJ, Ablex. 51-87.