

are most typically found as the only speech in their turn. It means that they are rarely found with further speech. Gardner (2005) further stated that *Yeah* and *Mm* can be used as continuers, but they are usually used as acknowledgement which will be discussed below.

2.4.2. Acknowledgement

A research of Gardner (2005) found that the most frequently used of all response tokens in ordinary conversation are *Yeah*, the archetypical acknowledgement token in English. It claims agreement or understanding of the prior turn. Gardner (2005) said that *Mm* is also very common, but it is weaker acknowledgement than *Yeah*. The research of Gardner (2005) from several situations of these tokens indicates that because of the lack of repair or of dispreference in the response, they are, like continuers, claiming 'no problem' in understanding or agreement.

The difference between acknowledgement and continuers is that acknowledgement is not handing the floor back like continuers to the prior speaker, but they make a claim to adequate talk of the prior turn (Schegloff 1982 in Gardner 2005). Gardner (2005) said that *Yeah* and another type of acknowledgement, *yes*, aligns, agrees and confirms the prior speaker's talk. They are often accompanied by further talk, which are responses to an argument by the prior speaker. Pomerantz (1984) in Gardner (2005) also said that they can be used for qualified agreements, but they can also be used for negative utterances.

said that they also provide participants with the ability to not simply display alignment to ongoing talk, but establish and negotiate that alignment through a systematic process of interaction while the talk is still in progress.

2.4.6. Brief questions

Another function of tokens, Gardner (2005) stated, is brief question used for clarification or other types of repair, and it seeks to clarify mishearings or misunderstandings. e.g. *Who?*, *Huh?* It is used as a repair token when someone has not clearly heard what someone just said. Schegloff (1982) in Gardner (2005) said that it is found in roughly the same form and function in spoken languages across the globe.

2.5. Previous Studies

The study of response tokens is one of important studies in linguistic field. There are some works considering the use of response tokens in daily life which are included in the writer's references.

The first research entitled "*Talking Back: "Small" Interactional Response Tokens in Everyday Conversation*" is written by Michael McCarthy and published in 2003. The data of research are collected from the usage of response tokens among American and British English by using corpus-analytical software. McCarthy concludes that the use of responses shows a concern on the part of listeners toward conversation as well as performing the necessary feedback functions with which listeners cocreate the discourse with speakers.

The second work is "*Identifying units in interaction: Reactive tokens in Korean and English conversations*" written by Richard F. Young and Jina Lee and published in 2004. Here, the writers use term *reactive tokens* rather than *response tokens*. However, the meaning is same. The writers conclude that reactive tokens in English are resources by which the listener declines to take the opportunity for a full turn. The same role is played by some reactive tokens in Korean. However, a Korean listener's act of placing a token is not simply to decline to take a turn at talk, but it is rather to provide overt support for the current speaker's turn.

The third research entitled "*Back-channelling: The use of yeah and mm to portray engaged listenership*" is written by Kathrin Lambertz and published in 2011. The conversation analysis approach was applied because it is important to transcribe every single utterance of a conversation to detect significant features such as pitch, stress, overlapping, loudness and intonation. The research proves that there are three different functions of yeah and mm as a back-channel utterance to signal engaged listenership: continuers, alignment tokens and agreement tokens.

The writer of this study chooses those three studies as parts of his references because their studies talk about response tokens and their practical use. Thus, the studies' topics are compatible with this study. One of the differences between the previous study and this study is the data source. While the previous researches use corpus as data source, the writer of the study uses a literature work. McCarthy examined "small" interactional response tokens among American and

