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#### Abstract

My interest in the complexities of real English interactions among people who use English as a lingua franca and the practical applications arising from that led my attention to casual ELF talk. According to Eggins and Slade (1997: 8), there is still a lack of description of casual talk and above all "of adequate materials for teaching casual conversation to learners of English as a second or foreign language". Therefore, this thesis aims at making a contribution to the description of casual ELF talk.

Thus, the spoken mini-corpus presented in this thesis is an example of casual ELF talk. In the course of my work for this thesis an explicit transcription and analysis of this naturally occurring discourse with focusing the attention on almost all linguistic phenomena that became 'visible' in my data finally made me aware of a striking feature which has been discussed in discourse analysis for a long time, namely the fact that casual talk can display several degrees of formality.

In this respect, the theoretical part in this thesis at first sets out to throw some light on the linguistic nature of both casual and what is supposed to be the more formal kind of conversation, namely institutional or professional talk, in order to illustrate the differences between these types of spoken discourse and to finally present the basic conditions within which casual talk takes place. In this respect, I will also present some approaches to analysing conversation I find most relevant for the description of casual talk. Furthermore, the introductory part of this thesis also aims at elucidating how everyday talk shows certain degrees of formality. Thus, the theoretical part will provide an in-depth insight into the linguistic theory that provides the basis for a detailed analysis and description of formality in casual ELF talk. As opposed to some researchers (cf. Gelas (1988), Heylighen and Dewaele (1999) or Fielding and Fraser (1978)), who claim that "[the] noun versus verb distinction, together with its related word classes", represents an effective technique in distinguishing between a more and a less formal style of speech, this thesis primarily considers the degree to which a segment of talk possesses a detectable generic structure to be an indication of formality. In other words, the analysis of generically structured and non-generically structured segments of talk will reveal that casual conversation need not necessarily be restricted to informality.


The major part of this thesis is then concerned with the presentation and analysis of selected data extracts illustrating different degrees of formality in casual talk. In this respect, an empirical investigation of several examples will show that only text types which can be described as having a generic structure are amenable to an analysis in terms of formality.

The final part is then devoted to a brief presentation of my findings. I will summarize the results I gained from the analysis of my data by again showing the reader how an analysis in terms of formality based on generically structured and non-structured parts of talk can be an effective technique in showing different degrees of formality in casual ELF talk.

## Zusammenfassung

Mein Interesse an der Komplexität von Interaktionen zwischen Sprechern, die Englisch als ein globales Sprachmedium nutzen und an dem daraus resultierenden tatsächlichen Sprachgebrauch, richtete mein Augenmerk auf so genannte „alltägliche", „zwanglose" oder oft auch als „informell" titulierte Gespräche (casual talk) in Englisch als einer Lingua Franca (ELF). Gemäß Eggins und Slade (1997: 8) mangelt es aber noch immer an einer genauen Beschreibung dieses Phänomens und vor allem an adäquaten Unterrichtsmaterialien, die darauf im Unterricht von Englisch als Zweit- oder Fremdsprache näher eingehen. Die vorliegende Diplomarbeit versucht daher einen Beitrag zur Beschreibung des oben erwähnten Sprachphänomens zu leisten.

Die gesammelten Daten in dieser Arbeit verstehen sich daher als ein repräsentatives Beispiel für alltägliche, zwanglose Interaktionen in ELF (casual ELF talk). Im Zuge meiner Arbeit wurde ich dann mittels einer detaillierten und umfangreichen Transkription und Analyse meiner Daten auf einen wichtigen Aspekt, welcher in der Sprachwissenschaft schon seit langem behandelt wird, aufmerksam, nämlich, dass die oft als alltäglich und daher als informell bezeichneten Gespräche in ELF durchaus verschiedene Formalitätsebenen aufweisen können.

Der Theorieteil dieser Diplomarbeit beschäftigt sich daher zuerst mit dem Erscheinungsbild des bereits zitierten Sprachphänomens und beleuchtet aber auch Eigenschaften von so genannten formellen Gesprächen, in der Folge auch „institutionelle" oder „berufsmäßige" Interaktionen genannt, um letztendlich auf Unterschiede hinzuweisen bzw. die Rahmenbedingungen für casual ELF talk festzulegen. Hierbei wird auch auf wichtige Vorgangsweisen in der Beschreibung und Analyse von casual talk eingegangen. Da in dieser Arbeit verschiedene Ebenen von Formalität in zwangslosen Gesprächen nachgewiesen werden sollen, werden im Theorieteil detailliert die Kriterien für Formalität bzw. Informalität beleuchtet. Im Gegensatz zu Linguisten, welche die sprachlichen Erscheinungsformen von Formalität oft anhand der Dominanz einzelner Wortkategorien in Interaktionen messen, versucht diese wissenschaftliche Arbeit zu zeigen, dass das Vorhandensein bzw. Nichtvorhandensein einer nachweisbaren Struktur einzelner Sprachsegmente Aufschluss über Formalität in Gesprächen geben kann.

Im Hauptteil dieser Arbeit werden dann ausgewählte Beispiele, anhand deren unterschiedliche Grade an Formalität in casual ELF talk nachgewiesen werden sollen, präsentiert. Hierbei wird eine Untersuchung zeigen, dass nur Textarten, welche eine gattungsmäßig erfassbare Struktur aufweisen, einer Formalitätsmessung zugeführt werden können.

Der Schlussteil widmet sich einer kurzen Präsentation der gewonnenen Erkenntnisse und Ergebnisse. Dabei wird nochmals auf die Relevanz und Effektivität einer Analyse, welche sich auf die Strukturiertheit von Sprachsegmenten und deren Nutzen für das Bestimmen von Formalität in Interaktionen stützt, hingewiesen.

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1. Why this topic?

More research effort has been directed to the compilation of written corpora in the past, due no doubt to the paucity of good recording facilities [...]. Therefore publicly available written corpora are more numerous and more extensive than are publicly available speech corpora. (Knowles 1996b: 6)

Nevertheless, there has been an ongoing interest in the study of conversation ${ }^{1}$ for the past fifty years. Due to the invention of the tape recorder and other recording machines, linguists have finally been able to "capture [...] conversation and [make] it accessible to systematic study" (Halliday 1994: xxiii). As a result of this technical development, modern language research has been based more and more on spoken interactive discourse. (Cheepen 1988: 1).

In this respect, Seidlhofer (2004: 215) emphasizes the significance of research effort directed to interactive spoken discourse by arguing that
[...] research is being undertaken [...] on spoken data [for two main reasons]: first, the language is at one remove from the stabilizing and standardizing influence of writing, and second, spoken interactions are overtly reciprocal, allowing studies to capture the online negotiation of meaning in the production and reception of utterances, thus facilitating observations regarding mutual intelligibility among interlocutors.
[original emphasis]

If we now pause to consider the fact that the mother tongue English speakers are heavily outnumbered by non-native speakers of English (cf. Seidlhofer (2003b: 7), Graddol (2006: 57-66)) this leads a new urgency to the linguistic interest in this kind of spoken discourse, i.e. interactions in English among people who do not have English as their mother tongue, and a full description of this speech style. Even so, such interactions "have been overlooked by conversation analysts [...]" (Firth 1996: 240). Therefore, a comprehensive and reliable description of a speech corpus of English as a lingua franca (ELF) is currently compiled at the Department of English Studies at the University of Vienna. The Vienna-Oxford International Corpus of English (VOICE ${ }^{2}$ ) focuses its attention on spoken ELF interactions and is described as follows:

[^0]VOICE is a structured collection of language data - a computer-readable corpus of recordings and transcriptions - of spoken interactions in English as a lingua franca. The focus is on unscripted, largely face-to-face communication among competent speakers from a wide range of first language backgrounds whose primary and secondary education and socialization did not take place in English. The speech events being captured include private and public dialogues, private and public group discussions and casual conversations, and one-to-one interviews. (Seidlhofer 2004c)

In sum, VOICE focuses on spoken ELF discourse on all levels, including institutional and casual speech situations. Particularly the second point, i.e. casual ELF talk, awakened my interest in this fascinating research field and encouraged me to make a small contribution to spoken ELF research.

Many MA theses written on English as a lingua franca at the University of Vienna are based on institutional interactions (cf. Breiteneder 2005, Böhringer 2007, Faseth 2007, Walenta 2007). Certainly, the status of English as a global language and its rise above all in domains such as business, research, industry or politics (cf. Kramsch 1998: 23) highlight the necessity of elaborate analyses and descriptions of formal ELF discourse.

Nevertheless, I also agree with Myers (1994: 108), who points out that
everyday life is not institutional - not politics, or church services, or courts [...] talk in everyday life is man to man, or woman to woman, or woman to man or whatever [...]

Cameron (2000: 27) shares this view by stating that conversation "does not refer solely or primarily to [...] highly ritualized types of public speaking, [such as] political and legal oratory". In addition to this, she claims that talk does not only take place in an institutional context (meetings, classrooms) but also happens at private social gatherings among friends or family members (ibid).

In the same vein, Cheepen (1988: 2) even goes further by arguing that a rigorous description of casual talk is a significant precondition in order to study all kinds of conversation, as natural or informal and spontaneous conversations are 'the stuff from which the more formal,
stereotyped ([...]) kinds of conversation are built' (Cheepen 1988: 3) ${ }^{3}$. In this respect, Singleton (1984: 115) also emphasizes that
an 'increasing attention has been paid to the simplified speech styles used by native speakers (NSs) to those who do not have full command of the language of the community, such as [...], foreigners, [...]. [emphasis added]

Consequently, with regard to foreign language teaching, the focus
has so far remained very much on 'cumulative' proficiency (becoming better at speaking and writing English as native speakers do) and on the goal of successful communication with native speakers (and for some levels, approximating native-like command of the language). (Seidlhofer 2003b: 12)

A number of practical findings achieved by English language research have therefore been applied to the field of $E F L$ teaching, while
[ELF research] has not had any major impact on how the subject 'English' is actually conceptualised, linguistically described and pedagogically prescribed for learning. (ibid.) [emphasis added]

For this reason, this thesis aims at contributing to the description of ELF, which is a prerequisite for teaching people who want to interact with both native and non-native speakers of English in lingua franca settings. Thus, it was decided at the beginning of this project to concentrate on the accumulation and investigation of a corpus based on casual ELF talk. Even so, this thesis also throws some light on linguistic peculiarities of institutional talk (cf. section 4.3.) in order to clarify the question whether formal and informal speech do follow a similar patterning and can both be found in casual ELF talk.

Finally, it has to be stressed that
linguistic descriptions alone cannot, of course, determine what needs to be taught and learnt for particular purposes and in particular settings - they provide necessary but

[^1]
### 1.2. Outline of a paper on different degrees of formality in casual ELF talk

The beginning of this study (cf. chapter 2) sets out to provide the reader with a brief overview of the field of English as lingua franca (ELF). The chapter also investigates the nature of English as a foreign language in order to present a framework for describing the difference between ELF and EFL.

Chapter 3 focuses on a detailed description of my data and methodological considerations. It examines issues of data collection, transcription and description. Furthermore, section 3.4.4. presents relevant characteristics of the speakers involved in the recorded data set. The final part of this chapter deals with selected approaches to discourse analysis I consider most useful for the investigation and description of my casual ELF corpus.

Chapter 4 is devoted to an in-depth description of casual ELF talk. It shows the problematic issue faced when generally applying the label casual conversation to any informal every-day interaction. Moreover, this study hypothesizes that both casual and professional conversation can display different degrees of formality. Thus, chapter 4 examines in some detail characteristics of both casual and professional talk in order to finally present essential basic conditions within which casual interaction takes place.

The purpose of chapter 5 is then to raise the question of an appropriate definition of formality in ELF conversation. Besides defining formality, the chapter also looks at approaches to both revealing and measuring formality in talk. In this respect, this thesis shows that my own approach to analysing formality in casual ELF interaction differs essentially from that of other researchers (cf. Crystal and Davy 1969, Singleton 1984 or Heylighen and Dewaele 1999) in a number of ways. While the last-mentioned linguists primarily focus on word classes as an indication of formality in talk, the paper at hand demonstrates that the existence or nonexistence of a detectable and salient generic structure of speech segments can be considered to be a resource for showing whether casual ELF talk is more or less formal. Finally, chapter

5 also provides a discussion of how crucial non-linguistic determinants are for the degree of formality in casual ELF interaction.

Following the idea that the structure of speech sheds light on different degrees of formality, chapter 6 sets out to investigate the concept of turn-taking in talk. In other words, it is argued that turn-taking displays the skeletal structure of any interaction and thus serves as an indication of formality in conversation. Furthermore, we also look at how the allocation of turns is implicated in the production of questions and answers in casual ELF talk.

Chapter 5, 7 and 8 pinpoint the focus of research of this thesis, i.e. revealing different degrees of formality in casual ELF talk by investigating its generic structure. Thus, chapter 7 first provides a definition of generic speech genres in casual ELF interaction. The major part of chapter 8 is then concerned with the analysis of different generic varieties of casual ELF talk (chunks) in my speech corpus. The examples in this paper demonstrate that speech genres in casual ELF interaction have a distinctive communication structure and thus display different degrees of formality. Even so, this thesis emphasizes that casual ELF talk does not only consist of generically structured parts of talk, it also incorporates segments of talk where a generic analysis does not succeed at all. Put differently, the examples in this thesis show that casual ELF interaction displays both generically structured (chunks) and non-generically structured (chat) segments of talk, and thus an analysis in terms of formality has to include both types of talk. Adopting this perspective, chapter 8 finally investigates the linguistic nature of so-called chat segments.

## 2. English as a lingua franca

First of all, this chapter outlines English as a lingua franca (ELF). For a deeper understanding of the nature of English as a lingua franca, this thesis also provides a short description of English as a foreign language (EFL).

### 2.1. English as a foreign language

To start with, Graddol (2001: 51) offers the following definition of a foreign language:


#### Abstract

A foreign language is one which is not your own, which represents the identity of an 'other'. One of the prime functions of learning a foreign language is to communicate with native speakers, and to learn about their culture. The model of correctness is naturally that of the native speaker [...].


In the case of EFL, people primarily study or use English in order to interact with native English speakers. Thus, EFL speakers adopt both linguistic and cultural norms of the native speakers in their language use. In contrast, ELF speakers
are not primarily concerned with emulating the way native speakers use their mother tongue within their own communities [...]. Instead, the central concerns for this domain are efficiency, relevance and economy in language learning and use.
(Seidlhofer 2000: 57)

In this respect, I would consider myself to be both an EFL and an ELF speaker. For instance, as a student of English I use English as a foreign language when I get in touch with English native speakers, or when I devote myself to Anglo-American culture or linguistics. On the other hand, in doing this thesis' research project I acted out my role as an ELF speaker when I used English to converse with non-native speakers with different mother tongues.

### 2.2. Descriptive ELF research

What is a lingua franca? According to Bußmann (1996: 281), a lingua franca can be seen as a second acquired language system that fulfils communicative purposes between people of different first languages. Similarly, Meierkord (2000: 1) describes a lingua franca as "any natural or any artificial language which is used among speakers of different mother tongues" [emphasis added]. In other words,
[w]hen speakers do not share each other's language but can resort to a third language for communicative purposes, they use a lingua franca, a language which is the mother tongue to neither of them. (Meierkord 2000: section 1)

Scholars such as Crystal (1997) or Widdowson (1994) agree that English can be labelled a lingua franca - indeed the predominant lingua franca in today's world. House (1999: 74) describes ELF discourse as "interactions between members of two or more different linguacultures in English, for none of whom English is the mother tongue".

The predominance of English can probably be traced back to its rise above all in domains such as business, research, industry and politics all over the world (cf. Kramsch 1998: 23). House (2002: 245) confirms the idea that English can be given a global status by stating that
[a] very large part of international communication today is conducted in a lingua franca, and the vast majority of lingua franca interactions worldwide take place in English.

Thus, it seems that nowadays the most frequent and widespread use of the English language has shifted away from so-called native speakers to non-natives. In other words, most English communications take place among people for whom English is a foreign language (Seidlhofer 2001: 141):
[T]he largest group of users of 'English' [are] those to whom English serves on a daily basis as a lingua franca for conducting their affairs, more often than not entirely among so-called "non-native" speakers of the language, with no native speakers present at all. These are people who have learned 'English' as an additional language and to whom it serves as the most useful instrument [...] for communication that cannot be conducted in their mother tongue, be it in business, casual conversation, science and politics [...]. (Seidlhofer 2001a: 141)

According to Seidlhofer (ibid.), non-native speakers of English outnumber mother tongue English speakers and most English interactions take place in ELF. As opposed to House's (1999: 74) description of ELF, Seidlhofer's definition of ELF discourse does not exclude English native speakers.

From a practical or linguistic perspective, however, one might raise the question to what extent ELF depends on native varieties of English. In this respect, Seidlhofer (2002: 272-273) argues that although ELF is recognizably based on native varieties of English, it is also independent of native-speaker usage and thus "a use in its own right" (Seidlhofer 2001: 137). Adopting this perspective, one could argue that ELF idiosyncratic features can no longer be described as 'mistakes' but as peculiarities of "a linguistic phenomenon in its own right" (Seidlhofer 2004: 213).

However, what hinders us from considering ELF as a language in its own right is the fact that it has not yet been thoroughly described. Put differently, although ELF interactions are "an extremely common, even quotidian, occurrence in manifold settings throughout the world" (Firth 1996: 240), there is still a lack of a clear linguistic description of this kind of conversation. In this respect, House (1999: 74) even claims that "studies of intercultural communication [...] have practically ignored ELF interactions". For this reason, among scholars such as Firth, Jenkins or House, above all Seidlhofer assertively emphasizes the lack of a descriptive linguistic reality of ELF and thus sets out to make a contribution to the pioneering ELF research, as stated in the following:
[...] English in the world finds itself in an "unstable equilibrium": On the one hand, the majority of the world's English users are not native speakers of the language, but use it as an additional language, as a convenient means for communicative interactions that cannot be conducted in their mother tongues. On the other hand, linguistic descriptions have as yet predominantly been focusing on English as it is spoken and written by its native speakers.

VOICE seeks to redress the balance by providing a sizeable, computer-readable corpus of English as it is spoken by this non-native speaking majority of users in different contexts. These speakers use English successfully on a daily basis all over the world, in their personal, professional or academic lives. We therefore see them primarily not as language learners but as language users in their own right. It is therefore clearly worth finding out just how they use the language. This is exactly what VOICE seeks to make possible. (VOICE Homepage)

In essence, Seidlhofer initiated the compilation of a large-scale corpus of English for descriptive purposes. In other words, the aim is to provide a basis for the linguistic description of English "as it is spoken by this non-native speaking majority of users" (VOICE Homepage).

This paper sets out to make a small contribution to this ELF research. It will focus its attention on ELF talk, with special regard to casual ELF speech, as "practitioners have maintained that casual conversation is the 'basic', 'primordial' form, or 'bedrock', of all forms of talk" (Firth 1996: 238).

## 3. Data and methodology

### 3.1. Preliminary considerations

To begin with, it has to be stated that I did not have a clearly defined research question before I actually started to gather my data. The only prerequisite for my data collection was that linguistic exchange had to happen in English as a lingua franca and in a setting which can be characterized as 'casual'. The main reason why I decided on compiling an ELF speech corpus based on casual interactions as the source for my empirical investigations was that I wanted to focus my attention on authentic every-day ELF conversations outside an institutionalized ${ }^{4}$ context. In other words, I was deeply interested in how speakers with different mother tongues and cultural identities make use of the English language in order to achieve certain speech goals in spontaneously and naturally occurring interactions regarded as 'informal'. Finally, both a detailed study of the secondary literature on spoken discourse in English and in ELF and a comprehensive analysis of my own small-scale ELF corpus made me aware that 'casual interactions' are not necessarily restricted to informality. In this respect, I realized that casual talk might display different degrees of formality, which ultimately led to the emergence of a concrete topic.

### 3.2. Data collection

### 3.2.1. Corpus vs. elicitation data

Since research does not necessarily have to start with working out a clearly defined research question before starting the actual process of data collection (cf. Cameron 2002: 22), I immediately devoted myself to the acquisition of appropriate speech material. However, before concentrating on the actual compilation of my casual ELF speech corpus, some theoretical considerations about data collection and the nature of a speech corpus had to be done.

[^2]allows the linguist to obtain full details of the range of a linguistic feature and its patterns of behaviour, related to the language as a whole, in objectively measured terms. [It] involves the pre-planned gathering of a coherent body of data from subjects other than the linguist.

He notes further that the compiling of such a body of data or corpus is "essentially a passive ${ }^{5}$ exercise, [...] [as] [a]ll investigation and categorisation is carried out after the compilation of the corpus" (ibid.). In this respect, Knowles (ibid.) emphasizes the basic advantage of corpus data:
it is possible to gain information on the actual frequency in the language of a given linguistic feature, its full range of behaviour, and its relations with other features.

In his study on compiling and transcribing a corpus of speech, the linguist also uncovers a second type of systematic data, which he labels 'elicitation data'. Although this study did not use this kind of data, it will briefly be discussed in the following:

As opposed to corpus data, the function of elicitation data is experimentation. This means that decisions and investigations are carried out before the actual acquisition of data. At the planning stage, the researchers do not focus their attention on the whole range of features in a language, but "on one specific feature and its limits of variation" (Knowles 1996b: 8). In other words, the linguist concentrates on a particular kind of data or on the variable of interest before he/she starts to accumulate appropriate data. The problem of elicitation data (as against corpus data) is that "in gathering this type of data, the linguist has contact with the subject, and may influence the subject's performance" (Knowles 1996b: 9). As opposed to elicitation data, "[i]n the accumulation of corpus data, the linguist may or may not have contact with the subject, but in either case does not influence the subject's performance" (ibid.).

Undoubtedly, the presence of an observer and recording devices may influence the speaking behaviour of the subjects being recorded. This leads us to a problematic issue which Labov (1972: 181) calls the "Observer's paradox". This term implies that "the aim of linguistic research in the community must be to find out how people talk when they are not being

[^3]systematically observed" (ibid.). However, Labov admits that "we can only obtain this data by systematic observation" (ibid.).

In my case, naturally occurring talk was a prerequisite for my data collection. Thus, I asked myself how I could possibly overcome or at least reduce the risk of directly influencing the natural acting of my speakers by my role as a researcher. However, first of all, I had to inform the people who joined my project about the approximate research purpose. Although I did not have a fully developed research question when I got in contact with them, I at least explained the scientific orientation of my study to them. After I had told them about the importance of English as a lingua franca for our daily life and that they were chosen to make a contribution to a small-scale ELF corpus that might reveal further interesting linguistic features within ELF research, they immediately agreed to participate in my project. As already mentioned, before it came to the actual recording process, I was afraid that my presence could influence the spoken discourse I wanted to record. Fortunately, there are several methods that might diminish the observer's impact on the recorded data. In this respect, it was above all Milroy (1987: 60ff.) who provided me with a simple but nonetheless effective strategy to avoid the risk of getting forced or even biased data: I started to establish a relationship on an equal basis with my participants in order to create a comfortable conversational situation. First of all, I tried to arrange the meeting with my speakers like a relaxed 'get-together' among friends. For this reason, the meeting was held in my girlfriend's apartment and we offered our guests coffee and snacks. Admittedly, providing food and drinks slightly complicated the recording session (a lot of side noise), but it also seemed to make the participants more careless about the fact that they were recorded by a little recording machine placed in the middle of the table. There was only one instance in about three hours of recording where a participant suddenly mentions her discomfort about being taped (cf. lines 340-341):

## EXAMPLE 1

332 Af3: um (.) i studie:d a thing like uh Gene Sciences (.) i think you shouldn't say Genetics
333 because $<4><$ SOFT $>$ it doesn't exist in: english? </SOFT> </4>
334 SX-6: <4> n- no: </4>
335 Af3: yes i'm doing my $\mathrm{PhD}($.$) at the (.) at the University of <$ COINAGE $>$ Veginary
336 </ved3InərI/> </COINAGE> Medicine in Vienna (.) yes (.) what else (1) ask me some
337 questions
338 Gf1: why did you study that?
339 Af3: because i was very interested in biology (.) at school a:nd i was interested in um in
340 diseases in genetically uh diseases (.) uh but then i started to $<1\rangle<$ FAST $>$ that makes me

341 nervous </FAST> </1>
$342<1><$ Am2 checks the microphone> </1>
343 All: <1>@@@@@</1>

However, what I found most important in establishing a researcher-participants relationship was that I also participated in the conversations in order to distract attention from my actual role as a researcher. Put differently, I attempted to become 'one of them' and as the relationship developed, my initial role as the observer gradually diminished ${ }^{6}$. Of course, such an approach to doing recordings can also lead to an objection to the reliability of the analyst's work as he or she "could, theoretically, have deliberately guided the various conversations in order to produce certain effects" (Cheepen 1988: 6-7). Although my presence certainly had at least some impact on the interactions carried out by the speakers, I dare to say that my presence and participation were relevant for both creating an atmosphere where naturally occurring talk could happen and for the subsequent transcription process. In this respect, Schneider (1988: 126) even underlines the importance of the observer's presence and participation in a recording session by arguing that
[the] danger connected with data collected by a non-participating researcher is that details of the interaction may be lost for the analysis, or else that details are misinterpreted by the analyst.

To sum up, this section distinguished between two types of systematic data: corpus and elicitation data. According to Knowles (1996b: 6), the basic function of a corpus is "the accumulation of as large a mass of data as is practicable" [original emphasis]. As opposed to corpora, "the narrower limits of elicitation data preclude such a broad conspectus, while permitting more detailed examination of a particular aspect" (ibid.).

I consider my systematic data to be a corpus, more precisely a small-scale corpus based on casual ELF talk. Obviously, my collection of data does not represent English as a lingua franca as a whole, but it reflects peculiarities of ELF use among certain non-native speakers of English who interact in so-called casual speech situations.

[^4]
### 3.3. Data transcription

It is obvious that a systematic analysis of recorded naturally occurring talk presupposes its written representation. Therefore, composing transcripts can be considered to be the first step of the analysis and investigation procedure. In this respect, Hutchby and Wooffitt (1998: 73) explicitly highlight the importance of transcriptions in the data analysis, as indicated in the following:


#### Abstract

The transcription of data is a procedure at the core of analysis, in two important respects. First, transcription is a necessary initial step in making possible the analysis of recorded interaction in the way that CA requires. Secondly, the practice of transcription and production of transcript represents a distinctive stage in the process of data analysis itself.


Furthermore, they add that
[ t ]he transcription of data is an integral part of analysis, since in repeatedly listening to the tape one begins to hear and to focus on phenomena that may subsequently form part of an analytic account". (Hutchby and Wooffitt (1998: 75)

Ten Have (1990) also underlines the importance of listening attentively to the recordings as "by making a transcription, the researcher is forced to attend to details of the interaction that would escape the ordinary listener".

However, making transcriptions does not only require an accurate hearing, or more precisely, 'rehearing' of the data, it also demands finding appropriate ways of representing them. Thus, my transcription, represented in standard orthography, corresponds to the VOICE transcription conventions". As transcriptions "need to capture the reality of spoken interactions as precisely as possible" (VOICE homepage), I attempted to transcribe both linguistic and non-linguistic events as far as possible. Fortunately, the VOICE project, which is predominantly based on an orthographic representation model, also provides the researcher with
a fairly detailed set of descriptors for pronunciation variations and coinages, for codeswitching, for onomatopoeic sounds and for laughter, not only as such but as a prosodic feature of speech. (VOICE homepage)

[^5]To sum up, besides an orthographic representation of speech, my transcription also displays speaker turns, simultaneous talk, stress, loudness, pauses and other meta-linguistic features such as laughter. Although the transcription of my small-scale ELF corpus conforms to the VOICE transcription conventions, I used a slightly modified approach to representing the individual speakers at the beginning of a turn. Instead of using the labels 'S1', 'S2', etc., distinctive forms such as Gf1, Am2, etc. were given to individual speakers. As I did not have a definite research aim in mind when I set out to transcribe my data, I found it particularly important that labels could be immediately assigned to a particular speaker. Thus, I considered facts such as speaker origin, gender and the moment when the speaker actually entered the conversation to be useful means of identifying participants at first 'sight'. Accordingly, the first capital letter of a label provides information about the individual speaker's nationality, $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{f}$ simply indicates his/her sex and the number corresponds to the order of participation.

Table 1: Speaker-specific labelling-system

| Gf1 | Greek | female | (first speaker) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Am2 | Austrian | male | (second speaker) |
| Af3 | Austrian | female | (third speaker) |
| Dm4 | Dane | male | (fourth speaker) |
| Sf5 | Serb | female | (fifth speaker) |
| Mm6 | Macedonian | male | (sixth speaker) |

After ensuring my participants that my labelling-system would sustain their absolute anonymity and personal privacy, I was granted permission to attach the transcripts to the thesis.

### 3.3.1. Issues of data transcription

Eventually, the analyst has to deal with some problems when doing the transcriptions. In my case, the orthographic representation of spoken ELF discourse sometimes proved to be a very complex and problematic task. In this respect, above all the approach to adequately representing the individual speakers' speech behaviour led me to a phenomenon which I might hence call the 'analyst's paradox'. In other words, since the transcriber was present at
the recordings, he or she might be able to 'decode' speech fragments that seem to be unintelligible for an absent person. However, this may also lead to the danger that the analyst's interpretation of the data is strongly guided by his or her subjective perception. Thus, it is most likely that what we transcribe does not always entirely reflect reality. Bublitz (1988: 146) confirms this problem by pointing out that "transcriptions [...] are only products of [the analyst's] interpretation". Indeed, it was sometimes a real challenge to decode snippets of conversation in my ELF corpus. Even so, I dare to say that my transcripts of speakerspecific peculiarities are not totally biased or subjective as I conferred with my participants while doing the transcriptions when necessary. This was particularly necessary when transcribing conversational situations where participants suddenly acted out their specific professional roles (cf. Drew and Heritage 1992: 3-4). Due to pronunciation idiosyncrasies and to the fact that speakers sometimes used technical expressions which were of course not all known to me, I had to get in touch with participants in order to clarify things. Last but not least, other difficulties also arose because of technical deficiencies in my recordings. Thus, it seems reasonable not to provide the whole transcription in this thesis but above all parts that were both technically acceptable (sound quality) and of scientific value for the overall linguistic analysis. In this respect, the transcription in the appendix represents talk of an overall length of about 180 minutes, which equals about 92 pages of transcribed speech.

Finally, although the VOICE transcription conventions have undoubtedly proved to be of value in transcribing spoken ELF discourse, it has to be stated that spoken discourse as a whole can never be adequately represented by written forms. Put differently, in spite of comprehensive and elaborate transcription systems, there are bound to be elements which are completely lost in transcriptions (e.g. gestures) or "which must remain impressionistic, elusive and subjective" (Cook 1995: 36). In this respect, Thompson (2004) points out that

> "an audio recording of a speech event is only an incomplete view of what occurred, not only because of possible technical deficiencies, but also because visual and tactile features are lost".

For this reason, my transcription displays in a few instances descriptions of non-verbal features that are of particular importance for the ongoing of talk.

### 3.4. Data description

In the previous sections we explored ways in which data can be collected and transcribed. In this section we finally turn to the description of the recorded data. According to Stubbs (1983: 220), a thorough description of the recorded data is "particularly important to keep the reader in clear view of precisely what data the analysis has been based on".

### 3.4.1. Setting

As has already been mentioned, the recording session took place in my girlfriend's flat in Vienna ${ }^{8}$. Most of the participants knew in advance why they had been invited to this "private" meeting. In other words, the academic purpose of the meeting, i.e. investigating ELF in casual speech situations, had been articulated when it was actually arranged. The data set was then gathered on $12^{\text {th }}$ March 2005. In this respect, it has to be stated that my girlfriend's flat was not chosen as the place for my data collection as I might have thought that the setting a priori labels an interaction either casual or professional. In fact, I believe that setting does not always unambiguously indicate whether talk is casual or not. Thus, I concur with Drew and Heritage (1992: 3-4) in that "interaction is institutional [or interpersonal] insofar as participants' institutional [or interpersonal] identities are somehow made relevant" in talk. In this respect, the main reason why I recorded my data in my girlfriend's flat was that I wanted to create a comfortable speech situation where spontaneous and naturally occurring talk could happen.

### 3.4.2. Topic

However, although the basic objectives were known to the participants, the talk compiled in my small-scale corpus turned out to be highly interactive and spontaneous. According to Eggins and Slade (1997), there are no professional (or institutional) motivations to casual talk and thus anything can be a topic of talk. Adopting this perspective, there was no strong focus on certain topics or speech goals, and thus the participants could feel free to talk about whatever came to their mind. In this respect, the interlocutors talked about general (e.g. problems of foreign language learners, academic writing in English as a foreign language,

[^6]travelling in Europe, politics, food, music or cultural differences) and more personal things (e.g. personal experiences as a foreigner in Austria, job-related issues or future ambitions) and predominantly used English "to establish and maintain social relationships" (Brown and Yule 1983: 3).

### 3.4.3. Casual or institutional talk?

Furthermore, I was particularly interested in how speakers would reveal their 'interpersonal meaning' in talk. Referring to Eggins and Slade (1997: 49-50), casual conversation is "'driven' by interpersonal, [...] meanings". Put differently, the "primary task of casual conversation is the negotiation of social identity and social relations" (ibid.). Although the overall recording can be defined as casual talk, occasional features of institutional talk do occur throughout the entire conversation. Thus, it remains the question whether a real distinction between these two discourse types can be drawn or even makes sense. For this reason, the subsequent chapters of this thesis will aim at investigating the linguistic nature of both casual and professional talk in order to establish a descriptive definition of these types of talk.

### 3.4.4. Participants

Having now briefly addressed problematic issues such as determining the setting of casual interaction or identifying talk as either casual or professional, a profound description of the participants is considered essential.

In this respect, it has to be stated that before I actually thought about asking certain people whether they wanted to participate in my project, some considerations of the following kinds seemed important for the present study. First of all, I wanted to investigate 'real' or so-called 'pure' ELF speech situations. According to Seidlhofer (2001a: 146), ELF is in its 'purest' form a language with "no native speakers". Similarly, House (1999: 74) describes ELF speech situations as "interactions between members of two or more different linguacultures in English, for none of whom English is the mother tongue" ${ }^{9}$. Correspondingly, I was deeply interested in recording interactions among speakers with both different social or cultural

[^7]identities and different native languages ${ }^{10}$. Furthermore, I expected to record vivid and spontaneous conversations among different ELF speakers. Thus, I had to find people who were happy to have an extended conversation in English. Fortunately, I was able to get participants that met the aforementioned conditions.

The participants of the data set have already been identified in terms of their origin, gender and the sequence in which they entered the interaction (cf. section 3.3.). Now, further information about the individual speakers is provided. Table 2 shows all speakers who participated in the recorded interaction:

Table 2: List of speakers

| Speaker | First language | Gender | Profession | Age |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Gf1 | Greek | female | Ph.D. student (Byzantine Studies) | 28 |
| Am2 $^{\text {II }}$ | German (Austria) | male | Student (English and French) | 27 |
| Af3 | German (Austria) | female | Ph.D. student (Genetics) | 25 |
| Dm4 | Danish | male | Editor and translator | 28 |
| Sf5 | Serbian | female | Student (German) | 20 |
| Mm6 | Macedonian | male | Ph.D. student (Veterinary Medicine) | 27 |

The participants differ from each other in several respects. Firstly, the degree of acquaintance between the speakers differs. There are two couples, namely Am2/Af3 and Gf1/Dm4. Besides this, speakers such as Af3 and Mm6 know each other very well as they work together and also interact socially outside work. At the other extreme are participants who were brought together for this project and then had little or no further contact. Thus, the conversation starts with an introductory round in order to 'break the ice' between the few interlocutors not acquainted with the others. Secondly, although my participants are mostly well-educated and many of them work in an international field of work and are thus accustomed to the use of English as a "foreign language of communication" (Firth 1996: 240), their language

[^8]competence slightly varies. While interlocutors such as Gf1, Af3 or Dm4 have a very good command of English, Mm6 and Sf5 reveal minor difficulties when using English. Especially Mm6, who is rather predominant in the interaction, turns out to be a very fluent but, seen from the perspective of formal correctness, nevertheless error-prone speaker concerning both pronunciation and the correct use of grammar. As opposed to Mm6, Sf3's English proficiency is quite good judged by conventional standards. However, she does not seem to be very confident when using English. In essence, all participants use English habitually and are thus competent and fluent ELF speakers. They are fluent in view of the fact that they
[have] decided they are fluent enough to conduct an interaction in English. In other words, it is the speakers themselves (and the circumstances) that decide when ELF is their chosen means of communication. (Seidlhofer 2004b: 9)

### 3.5. Methodological considerations

Having studied conversation from a variety of perspectives, ranging from philosophical, sociological and linguistic to critical semiotic ones ${ }^{12}$, I will only present a brief overview of selected approaches I found most useful and relevant to the analysis of casual spoken discourse in my data. The following section will provide the reader with a brief outline of the concepts of ethnomethodology and conversation analysis (CA), whose origin and development will be briefly described in this section.

### 3.5.1. Ethnomethodology

The ethnomethodological approach to analysing conversation was strongly influenced by the work of the sociologist Harold Garfinkel in the 1960s and 1970s. Garfinkel aimed at investigating how "social members themselves make sense of everyday life" (Eggins and Slade 1997: 25). In the course of his studies he developed an ethnomethodological approach based on the idea that we should pay "to the most commonplace activities of daily life the attention usually accorded extraordinary events" (Garfinkel 1967: 1). Garfinkel (1967) claims that members of any society possess the capability of both rational understanding and taking

[^9]responsibility for their social actions. This is why he insists that sociological aspects should also be a topic of analysis.

Ventola (2001: 982) stresses the importance of sociological factors and defines the concept of ethnomethodology as in the following:

Ethnomethodology claims that speakers have in social situations an understanding of common sense knowledge for dealing with matters at hand - interactants use this methodology for inferencing and going about the social interaction with the others involved in the same situation.

Also Hutchby and Wooffitt (1998: 31) remark that ethnomethodology deals with methods "people use for accounting for their own actions and those of others". In other words, how people make sense of their social world. However, ethnomethodology does not assume that this 'social world' is essentially orderly, but believes that social life is "potentially chaotic" (Garfinkel 1967) and "social order is constructed in the minds of social actors" (Suurmond 2005: 10). Thus, individuals themselves make sense of or bring order to their social world by establishing patterns within which new experiences can be interpreted (Garfinkel 1967). In this way, interactants construct a social reality to bring order into a haphazard situation or "to make sense of an often senseless interaction" ${ }^{13}$ (ibid).

In a nutshell, ethnomethodology investigates the participants' common sense knowledge and its realisation in everyday interaction. But how can this obviously sociological approach be linked to conversation analysis?

### 3.5.2. Conversation analysis

Early conversation analysts such as Sacks, Schegloff, Jefferson and Goffman followed an empirical methodology "with the ethnomethodological aim of finding methods for making the commonsense world visible" (Eggins and Slade 1997: 25). Relating to the study of talk, this meant that they "[insisted] on the use of materials collected from naturally occurring occasions of everyday interaction" (Atkinson and Heritage 1984: 2, quoted in Eggins and Slade 1997: 25). Thus, conversation analysis can be seen as a branch of ethnomethodology

[^10]that focuses on the investigation of natural empirical data, or as Sharrock and Anderson (1987: 299) sum it up:

Seeing the sense of ordinary activities means being able to see what people are doing and saying, and therefore one place in which one might begin to see how making sense is done in terms of the understanding of everyday talk. [emphasis added]

This means that CA describes what speakers do in socially organised interaction. In other words, CA is "at a point where linguistics and sociology (and several other disciplines [...]) meet" (Schegloff 1991: 46).

As already mentioned, the basic goal of CA is the description of everyday talk, which is "the central medium of research" (Heritage 1989: 23). Therefore, CA is based on recorded and transcribed naturally occurring speech. In this respect, Sacks (1984) underlines that in CA "nothing in talk-in-interaction should be dismissed as trivial or uninteresting before we have subjected it to analysis". Hutchby and Woofitt (1998: 116) confirm this idea by supplementing that "often the analysis of a phenomenon will grow from the careful description of one instance". Sacks (1984: 27) also advances this view by stating that
[w]hen we start out with a piece of data, the question of what we are going to end up with, what kind of findings it will give, should not be a consideration. We [...] make a bunch of observations, and see where they will go.

Using transcripts and recordings, the researcher is able to precisely investigate how interaction is socially organized. In my thesis, exactly this approach to explicitly transcribing and analysing naturally occurring or 'casual' talk with focusing the attention on almost all linguistic phenomena that became 'visible' in my data finally made me aware of the topic of this paper, i.e. Different degrees of formality in casual ELF talk.

To sum up, this thesis will demonstrate an ethnomethodological approach to doing conversation analysis. In other words, following ethnomethodologists such as Sacks (1974) or Schegloff (1968), we will primarily deal with the management of the whole interaction, "taking into account factors such as [...], placement of topics, [...], the way speakers organise 'who speaks when'" (Cheepen 1988: 10) and how talk - casual talk in particular - is structured in terms of different speech genres.

## 4. Casual vs. professional conversation

### 4.1. Introduction

"Each person's life is lived as a series of conversations."(Tannen 1990: 13)

The above statement by Tannen can best be illustrated by a brief outline of my own daily routine:

Every morning, my first attempt to successfully communicate with my girlfriend is restricted to a short and hoarsely uttered 'Good Morning' looking forward to her drowsily replied 'yeah'. Afterwards, when I dress, my partner's benevolent nodding in agreement apparently confirms that she still likes my taste in clothes. Later on, during breakfast, we talk about everything whereupon the main focus of our discussion always turns out to be on job-related affairs. We - a curious molecular biologist sharing the roof with a passionate linguist - often end in vivid discussions about topics such as 'real-time PCR ${ }^{14}$, and 'the necessity of ELF in modern daily life' respectively. In this respect, we both managed to gradually develop at least some kind of knowledge of basic technical terms used in the field of research of the significant other. Later on, at work, a nice chat with my colleagues about antithetic topics like current developments in European football or new teaching methods and learning strategies always lightens my working day. Fortunately, my profession as a teacher of German as a foreign language also allows and presupposes a lot of interesting talk in the classroom.

In every step described in the above report conversation takes place - irrespective of whether it is verbal or non-verbal ${ }^{15}$, setting or topic-bound, and independent of the actual position speakers adopt in the illustrated situations. Of course, there is a salient differentiation with regard to the type of language - 'the register' - we tend to apply in particular social situations. Halliday (1978: 31-32) confirms this interdependence of register and situation by stating that "the language we speak [...] varies according to the type of situation". For example, when I talk to my girlfriend at home I use another register than in the classroom or in my supervisor's office at the university.

[^11]So, does this mean that setting determines register and thus formality in conversational situations or is it just a post-hoc fallacy? Furthermore, do different levels of formality reveal whether talk is more or less casual or professional? What about me discussing the relevance of English as the international language of science with my partner at home while having breakfast or me talking to colleagues at work about the crucial goal that brought Manchester United into the final of the European Football Champions League?

Apparently, place (or setting) does not always unambiguously indicate whether certain conversational situations are casual or more institutional. Boden and Zimmermann (1991: 13) also mention the problematic issue of assigning (in)formality to casual and institutional talk. In other words, they argue that talk at work does not inevitably have to be formal whereas informality need not necessarily be a distinctive feature of casual conversation. Consequently, both casual and professional exchange can show different degrees of formality.

As casual talk has still not received as much attention from linguists as institutional conversation (Eggins and Slade 1997: 7), this thesis aims at describing the former. Even so, it will also throw some light on the linguistic nature of professional interaction as it is assumed that "a close and detailed analysis of [institutional talk] will ultimately provide some basis for the more daunting task of analysing casual [conversation]" (Cheepen 1988: 12). Thus, my investigation will attempt to illustrate the differences between casual conversation and the professional kind and to finally present the essential basic conditions within which casual talk takes place. Furthermore, this thesis sets out to elucidate how everyday talk ${ }^{16}$ displays certain degrees of formality by using appropriate examples from my recorded data. In this respect, an extensive and systematic analysis of the data extracts presented in the following chapters will challenge the linguistic view that casual talk is solely an informal matter.

[^12]
### 4.2. Casual conversation

First of all, why should we study casual conversation? According to Sacks (1974: 729-731), everyday "conversation is the most basic form of talk and all others, such as chaired meetings, debates, trials, or ceremonies, can be described as transformations of the basic rule set". Delin (2000: 1) remarks that discourse types such as meetings, trials or debates are concrete realisations of casual talk, as they try to evoke the everyday by using ordinary conversational devices. In other words, their features overlap with the features of every day or casual talk. Consequently, Cameron (2000: 27) labels casual conversation as the "proto-typical form of talk".

Secondly, what do we mean by casual talk? For many people it might be a taken for granted thing in our daily life. We get together with friends or family members in a relaxed atmosphere and indulge in having a nice chat about whatever comes to our mind without worrying that anything we say will be held against us. Whether this definition serves as a satisfactory reply to the question posed above or is just 'half the truth' and therefore needs to be further 'problematized' will be critically discussed and analysed in this section.

As already mentioned, Eggins and Slade (1997: 17) argue that casual talk is not determined by any specific setting. Thus, they refer to 'psychological' rather than 'physical' setting when they talk about place in casual conversation. In other words, they point out that
[we] experience casual conversation as probably the only context in which we are talking in a relaxed, spontaneous and unselfconscious way. We feel it is the only place where we are really free to be ourselves [...]. We are in fact very busy reflecting and constituting our social world. (Eggins and Slade 1997: 17) [emphasis added]

Furthermore, Eggins and Slade (1997) also state that topic does not define whether talk is casual or non-casual. This can be traced back to the idea that casual talk is not a planned or task-oriented speech activity. Speakers are not restricted to pre-given social roles. They are interested in talking "for the sake of talking" (Eggins 1997: 6) and therefore anything can be a topic of talk. They decide themselves whether things are important or not. Adopting this perspective, everything can be casual, even if we talk about so-called 'formal' things (e.g. job-related affairs). Thus, what matters in defining the criteria for calling a conversation casual or non-causal are neither setting nor topic but the functions a speech activity is
expected to fulfil. Put differently, from an emic perspective, a speech situation can be defined 'casual' as soon as conversationalists act out their desire to talk for the sake of talk.

Like in any other talk, participants in casual conversations construct and reveal their own social identity in a given speech situation. In this respect, Eggins and Slade (1997: 17) point out that casual talk is
motivated by interpersonal needs [...] to establish who we are, how we relate to others, and what we think of how the world is.

They explain further that
casual conversation is a critical linguistic site for the negotiation of [...] important dimensions of our social identity [...]. (ibid.)

Talking about revealing social identities in casual talk, Eggins and Slade (1997: 21) claim that "conversation is less interactive [when] participants' social identities represent differences [...]". Cameron (2001: 1001) concludes that "ordinary talk [...] occurs in settings between people whose relationship is close rather than distant". Eggins and Slade (ibid.) argue that less intimate relationships between casual speakers distinguish themselves by solidarity and consensus. Put differently, people who hardly know each other tend to make stronger efforts to get along with the other interactants. In contrast, disagreement and confrontation in casual conversation seem to happen above all among interlocutors who are close and familiar. Thus, we speak of 'solidarity' and 'difference motivated' casual conversations respectively (Eggins and Slade 1997: 21).

Building on the above findings, one might argue that highly interactive casual talk presupposes speakers with intimate relationships, or more precisely, participants who share the same knowledge about social realities or even the same cultural background. But what would all this mean for casual $E L F$ conversations, where people often neither share the same social identity and language nor know their interlocutors? Is it thus possible for ELF speakers to both indulge in spontaneous casual talk and to naturally reveal their social identity? The following study will therefore try to find answers to the questions posed above on the basis of the analysis of ELF conversations.

Having established that casual talk is at first defined by its function, i.e. talking for the sake of talking, we can consider its forms or linguistic peculiarities. In this respect, Myers (1994: 108) points out that casual or every day talk is a distinct discourse type and that there is a distinction between this and other text types such as professional talk or "the language of written news reporting, sports commentary, instructions, interviews, magazine features or advertising" (Delin 2000).

However, it has to be stated that the following discussion of linguistic forms of casual talk is based on observations and thus we do not regard possible linguistic peculiarities of ordinary interaction as defining features of this sort of talk. From an etic perspective, researchers discovered the following linguistic characteristics of casual talk:

According to Eggins and Slade (1997), casual talk basically distinguishes itself by rather natural, unplanned, emotional and above all simple speech acts. In this context, we often leave out things, make use of abbreviations, familiar expressions, irony or jokes and do not always care about appropriateness of our utterances.

Moreover, Sacks (1992: 44) remarks that rapid turn-taking ${ }^{17}$ and the frequent occurrence of overlaps ${ }^{18}$ can also be considered as major features of casual speech. This means that speakers often change, take turns very quickly as they contribute to the conversation whenever they are interested in it or feel the need to do so, independent of whether it is their actual turn or not.

Besides this, every day interaction also shows a high degree of topic change within a speech situation (ibid). Put differently, speakers in casual talk tend to switch from one subject matter to another, without respecting if a previous topic is still under discussion or has already been brought to an end.

Furthermore, Burton (1978: 140) emphasizes that linguistic exchanges in casual conversation are more open-ended than in institutional talk. This can be traced back to the fact that

[^13]interactants in [professional] encounters negotiate in order to achieve exchange closure, [whereas] casual conversationalists are frequently motivated to do just the opposite: to keep exchanges going as long as possible (ibid.).

This is why participants in casual talk often tend to choose challenging rather than supporting moves in order to compel further talk. In a similar vein, Kress (1987: 12-13) also maintains that speakers often construct difference in order to avoid silence:

Successful dialogues come about in the tension between (discursive) difference and the attempt to resolve that difference in some way. [...] Where there is no difference, no text comes into being.

Eggins and Slade (1997: 43) confirm this view by highlighting that casual conversation is often marked by the absence of support and therefore they consider 'difference' or 'disagreement' to be "essential to the motivation and maintenance of casual talk".

To sum up, casual talk is "despite its sometimes aimless appearance and apparently trivial content, [...] a highly structured, functionally motivated, semantic activity" (Eggins and Slade 1997: 6) [emphasis added]. This means that everyday interaction is not simple at all but a rather complex procedure.

### 4.3. Professional/institutional talk

It has already been pointed out in this thesis that setting, topic or participant relationships do not always unambiguously correspond with a particular type of talk. Thus, it is above all the function a given speech situation is expected to fulfil that categorizes conversation either as 'casual' or 'non-casual ${ }^{19}$. Although this study focuses its attention on casual ELF talk, I will devote the following section to a brief description of professional conversation in order to set the boundaries between casual talk and the more formal kind.

What distinguishes institutional conversation from casual talk? First of all, it is necessary to briefly explain the notion of 'institutions'. According to Lepper (2000: 134), the term 'institution' derives from the Latin word 'instituere' and means "to establish, arrange [or]

[^14]teach". Thus, institutions are entities "through which the collective affairs of society are conducted in the context of recognized practices, systematically inculcated through learning and adhered to through established convention" (ibid.). Adopting this perspective, Heritage and Greatbatch (1991: 94) describe institutional talk as "formal task-based or role-based ${ }^{20}$ activities" and list interactions such as courtroom trials, classroom lessons, doctor-patient interaction, job interviews, emergency calls and news interviews as unambiguous examples of this kind of talk.

Secondly,
interaction is institutional insofar as participants' institutional and professional identities are somehow made relevant to the work activities they are engaged.
(Drew and Heritage 1992: 3-4)

It is now of prior interest to detect how our so-called institutional identity influences our speech behaviour. In this context, Drew and Heritage (1992: 24) in their description of institutional interaction point out that talk in professional situations is rather objective, polite and above all oriented towards a goal that has been fixed with one's workplace in advance. Thus,
the range of possible conversational topics is extremely restricted - they must be directly related to the overall [institutional] goal - that is, speakers must perceive them as leading towards that goal. (Cheepen 1988: 122)

In other words, institutional talk is a "message" (Brown and Yule 1983: 1-2) or "goaldirected" (Lepper 2000: 138) speech action. Holmes and Stubbe (2003: 62) confirm this belief by also stating that institutional talk has goals or objectives which "relate to the organisation's business, such as making the required decisions [...] within the allotted time, ensuring the relevant decisions are implemented, and so on." Thus, participants design language in a way to make sure that "the recipient gets the informative detail correct" (Brown and Yule 1983: 12). Gumperz (1982a: 162) in this context mentions the distinctive question-answer system in professional talk: when we are asked questions by our superior, we are expected to reflect carefully on what we say and come up with a clear answer that excludes any kind of vagueness. Of course, this requires good knowledge of the topic or at least that speakers have

[^15]an idea of what will be the primary focus of the conversation in advance. Thus, professional interaction is often planned in advance.

In essence, the main criterion for calling a conversation 'professional' or 'instituional' is that it has to be goal- or task-oriented. This often presupposes a planning phase which ultimately results in organized talk among professional conversationalists. That is why Holmes and Stubbe (2003: 65) point out that professional interaction displays a distinctive structure. More precisely, professional talk shows the following three-phase structure:

> Opening or introductory section
> Central development section
> Closing section

In the opening section, problems or concerns are introduced. The central development section then is the actual debating phase where participants work on finding solutions or are assigned tasks to carry out until the next meeting. In the closing section, negotiations are rounded up and if possible, problems are resolved (Holmes and Stubbe 1997: 66). Because of these detectable structural components, professional talk is considered to be formal.

Referring to topic, institutional interlocutors stick to the actual topic and topic change often happens by mutual agreement. Consequently, this results in a rather 'controlled', highly organized and constrained turn taking behaviour among participants (Lepper 2000: 134-135). One participant "take[s] the responsibility of driving the [conversation] forward, opening and closing a string of topics" (Oeberg 1995: 48) and keeping the discussion on track. Thus, another way in which the institutional or professional nature of talk manifests itself is embodied in its form - "most notably in turn-taking systems which depart substantially from the way in which turn-taking is managed in [casual] conversation" (Heritage and Greatbatch 1991: 95). Put differently, participants in professional conversation "confine their conduct within the framework of some distinctive 'formal' institutional turn-taking system" (ibid.). In this respect, Kress (1985: 25) even claims that in professional interaction the mechanisms of turn-taking are often more important than the actual content.

Moreover, institutional talk also distinguishes itself by a lack of emotionality as everything we say can be put on the 'scale pan' and thus be of disadvantage for us. That is why Drew and Heritage (1992: 24) argue that in professional situations we should try to 'withhold expressions of surprise, sympathy, agreement, or affiliation".

Eggins and Slade (1997: 43) also argue that in professional conversations "power is not equally distributed but is in fact constantly under contestation". Cameron (2001: 102) confirms this view by mentioning an imbalance in professional conversation as its participants frequently do not have "equal power, status, responsibility or control". In other words, hierarchy among speakers exercises and distributes power in a speech situation.

In sum, this section has shown that the crucial difference between casual and professional talk is that institutional interactions are goal- or task-oriented speech activities usually embedded in the social context of workplace talk or any other form of public speaking (e.g. politics, etc.).

### 4.4. A final juxtaposition of casual and professional talk

In this section I will summarize this thesis' approach to differentiating casual from professional talk. For this reason I suggest the following table as a starting point for discussion:

Table 3: Casual vs. professional talk

## Casual talk

Synonyms interpersonal, ordinary, everyday talk

Functions talk for the sake of talk

## Professional talk

institutional, non-casual, organized talk
goal- or task-oriented speech activity
Participants' evolving social roles pre-given social roles
roles
\(\left.\begin{array}{lll}Forms \& natural, unplanned, simple speech \& goal/task-oriented->planning-> <br>

acts: \& organized talk-> distinctive\end{array}\right\}\)| structure: |
| :--- |
| overlaps |
|  |
| high degree of topic change |
| linguistic exchange is more open-ended |$\quad$| central development section |
| :--- |
|  |

First of all, we analyse the functions of any speech situation in order to decide whether it can be labelled as casual or non-casual. In this respect, goal- or task-oriented speech activities are considered to be 'non-casual' or 'professional' while talking for the sake of talking is regarded as 'casual' talk. Based on this prior distinction, one might then observe which possible forms these types of talk take. Table 3. sheds light on some linguistic peculiarities linguists (cf. Cheepen 1988, Sacks 1992, Eggins and Slade 1997, Lepper 2000, Holmes and Stubbe 2003) were able to detect when analysing casual and institutional conversations. Whether the above-mentioned linguistic forms always unambiguously fit with this study's main criteria for calling a conversation casual or non-casual, i.e. talking for the sake of talking or fulfilling goal-oriented speech activities respectively, will be focus of research in the following chapters.

Finally, it has to be emphasized that the above descriptions of casual and professional talk do not present definite or unambiguous answers to linguistic questions in the research field of interpersonal/institutional talk. Consequently, they should primarily be seen as a contribution to this field of research or as a baseline for further linguistic description.

## 5. Formality

### 5.1. Preliminary questions

What is formality? Is there an unambiguous and universally valid definition of this term which we can rely on? If yes, would it thus be legitimate to characterize, for instance, "the sentence read out by a judge at the end of a trial" (Heylighen and Dewaele 1999:2) as a prototype of formal language while considering spontaneous or relaxed conversations among family members or close friends to be prototypical informal speech?

According to linguists such as Labov (1972), there is a lack of a clear and general definition of formality. Put differently, while some researchers primarily conceive formality as "an aspect of social situations" (Irvine 1979: 775) and consequently label the main criterion for formality 'non-linguistic', "the underlying assumption of most approaches is that [formality] is characterized by some special 'attention to [linguistic] form'" (Labov 1972 quoted in Heylighen and Dewaele 1999: 3). In raising the question about an appropriate definition of formality, Irvine (1979: 786) finally comes to the conclusion that formality is only "a cover term [,] 'so general that it is not very useful as an analytic tool'".

Therefore, this chapter sets out to provide an introductory overview of some selected key ideas from different approaches to defining formality.

### 5.2. Defining formality

Most of us will be able to intuitively distinguish between formal speech and the more informal kind. When we are, for instance, among friends, our choice of linguistic expressions will obviously differ from the way we talk to our superior in the workplace. Apparently, our perception of formality in speech often depends on a certain situation or given context.

Therefore, the Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics (Richards, et al. 1997: 144) defines formal discourse as
the type of speech used in situations when the speaker is very careful about pronunciation and choice of words and sentence structure. This type of speech may be used, for example, at official functions, and in debates and ceremonies. [emphasis added]

Given the above definition, one would therefore guess that any particular situation reveals a certain degree of formality ${ }^{21}$. Therefore, many linguists use the concept of formality "as a way of describing characteristics of a social situation" (cf. Irvine 1978:6) and list formality as a non-linguistic or "situational variable" (Rubin 1968). Consequently, an analysis of speech in terms of formality has to start with an investigation of situational aspects. Having then defined how an (in)formal situation might look like, the linguist may further investigate its linguistic peculiarities. Following this approach, the next section will thus consider the situational aspect of formality by focusing its attention on non-linguistic determinants.

### 5.2.1. Non-linguistic determinants of formality

The purpose of this section is to provide an introductory overview on some selected nonlinguistic variables that may affect the degree of formality in spoken discourse, while emphasising that "the empirical evidence [for those variables] is limited, and the theoretical justification is tentative" (Heylighen and Dewaele 1999: 32).

### 5.2.1.1. Situation

Following Grice's (1975) maxims of conversation ${ }^{22}$, Heylighen and Dewaele (1999: 25) highlight the importance of formality as "avoidance of ambiguity in order to minimize the chance of misinterpretation". Thus, they conclude that "formality will be highest in those situations where accurate understanding is essential, such as contracts, laws, or international treaties" (ibid.) (emphasis added). Accordingly, any physical, mental or social situation may influence our choice of a particular style of speech. In this respect, Holmes and Stubbe (2003: 60 ) in their study on talk at work also argue that a number of situational features influence the

[^16]formality of speech. Consequently, they provide the following comparative framework for describing more and less formal interaction ${ }^{23}$ :

| More formal | Less formal |
| :--- | :--- |
| Large in size | Small in size (2-4) |
| Formal setting | Unplanned location |
| Starting time specified | Occurs by chance |
| Finishing time specified | Finishes 'naturally' |
| Participants specified | Open to anyone |
| $[\ldots]$ | $[\ldots]$ |
| Explicit structured agenda | 'Rolling' agenda |
| Tightly integrated group | Loosely connected |
| Mixed gender group | Same-gender group |

(Holmes and Stubbe 2003: 60)

In a similar manner, Levelt (1989) also states that a number of features influence the formality of speech. He distinguishes four categories of context factors that define any speech situation:
the persons involved, the space or setting of the communication, the time, and the discourse preceding the present expression.
(Levelt (1989) quoted in Heylighen and Dewaele (1999:26))

Following Levelt's (1989) categorization, Heylighen and Dewaele (1999: 25-27) hypothesize that any decrease in shared context automatically leads to an increase in formality. Consequently, they make predictions for each of the four dimensions established by Levelt (1989):

The larger the difference in psychological or cultural background (including characteristics such as age, class, nationality, or education) between [the speakers], the smaller the shared context, and therefore the higher the formality of their communication. [...] [Thus, they follow that] people who are psychologically close, [...], will tend to be minimally formal in their exchanges.

The more different the spatial setting for sender and receiver, the smaller the shared context. [Accordingly, they argue that] conversations over the telephone or another indirect medium would be expected to be more formal than conversations which take place in the same location.

The longer the time span between sending and receiving, the less will remain of the original context in which the expression was produced. [...] This may also in part

[^17]explain why spontaneous speeches, produced on the spot, have a much lower formality than speeches prepared at an earlier moment.

Finally, Heylighen and Dewaele (1999: 25-27) claim that the fourth category, the factor of discourse,
suggests that formality would be higher at the beginning of a conversation [...], because there is not any previous discourse to refer to as yet.

Although this thesis does not aim at finding any empirical evidence for the above-mentioned hypotheses, it will at least briefly comment on some of them (cf. cultural background, spatial setting and time span) by raising the following questions and considerations:

The assumption that any difference in cultural background could lead to a more formal exchange of speech between the interlocutors does not necessarily match our expectations of formality. For instance, is it really most likely that speakers with diverse cultural identities tend to approximate the norms of 'formal' speech more closely than close friends as they want to avoid misapprehensions or ambiguity? In this context, I dare to say that one could also be informally explicit and thus it is not always legitimate to consider speech addressed to an unknown person to be more formal than speech addressed to an intimate person. Apparently, the existence or lack of intimacy does not always unambiguously indicate the degree of formality in certain conversational situations. This is exactly the point where we see that besides non-linguistic variables spoken discourse is also deeply affected by linguistic factors such as topic. In this respect, the idea of 'topic' might also challenge the above hypotheses on space (or setting) and time. For instance, two business partners are energetically debating about their favourite football teams over the telephone. Although this thesis has not analysed any data yet that could refute the hypothesis that spatial setting might indicate different degrees of formality, it questions the idea that the telephone conversation in our example would be less formal when carried out in the same location. Besides space, the length of the time span between sending and receiving is also considered to be an indication of formality in speech. But what about a mother's 'prepared' welcome speech for the birthday party of her five year old son opposed to a business meeting where someone is asked to spontaneously reflect on the current development of the company's cash flow? Can we really expect spontaneous speeches to be generally less formal than prepared ones?

In sum, the above considerations have thrown some light on Heylighen and Dewaele's (1999: 25-27) interpretation of Grice's (1975) maxims of conversation and on the problematic issue of employing the concept of situation in measuring formality in spoken discourse.

### 5.2.1.2. Gender

Although there have been many studies on possible differences between the use of language of men and women (cf. Thorne, et al. (1983), Labov (1990), Tannen (1991)), most of the findings and hypotheses "remain mere speculation" (Heylighen and Dewaele's (1999)). As this thesis does not aim at contributing to the discussion whether gender-related variables actually do correlate with formality, this section will only provide a juxtaposition of two selected antithetic theories.

In their study on measuring formality in different languages such as English, French, Italian and Dutch, Heylighen and Dewaele (1999: 28) point out that while there is no significant difference in formality between men and women in written situations, women tend to use a "markedly less formal speech style".

Tannen (1991: 89) also states that there is a difference between the use of language of men and women particularly in spoken discourse. She claims that women often use a more informal style of speech. Tannen concludes that this difference in formality among male and female interactants can primarily be traced back to the fact that
men focus on the literal, informational content of the message, while women tend to focus on the implied relationship with their partner, an ill-understood difference in attitude, which creates many conflicts and misunderstandings between the sexes. (ibid.)

Consequently, she labels the stylistic speech differences between men and women 'reporttalk' and 'rapport-talk'. According to her,
[r]eport-talk [...] does not arise only in the literally public situation of formal speeches delivered to a listening audience. The more people there are in a conversation, the less well you know them, and the more status differences among them, the more a conversation is like public speaking or report-talk. The fewer the people, the more intimately you know them, and the more equal their status, the more it is like private speaking or rapport-talk. (ibid.)

This leads to the conclusion that women are supposed to feel more comfortable in so-called private situations and thus prefer to use a more intimate and informal style of language appropriate to those situations.

As opposed to Tannen (1991) or Heylighen and Dewaele (1999), Trudgill (1974) and Labov (1990: 210) claim that women often tend to approximate the norms of speech more closely than men and thus use a more formal style of speech. In this respect, Labov argues that "men use a higher frequency of non-standard forms than women" (Labov 1990: 210). Building on Labov's (ibid.) thesis, one might follow that a more refined speech is thus primarily typical of female speakers.

To sum up, whether gender might affect the degree of formality of spoken discourse can be questioned as the empirical evidence for the above hypotheses is as yet limited and there are still discussions "on whether these differences [among male and female speech] are firmly substantiated" (Heylighen and Dewaele (1999: 28).

### 5.2.1.3. Introversion/extraversion and level of education

Besides 'situation' and 'gender', researchers such as Digman (1990), Furnham (1990) or Heylighen and Dewaele (1999) also consider non-linguistic or personality variables like 'introversion/extraversion' and the speaker's 'level of education' to be factors that might correlate with formality.

Although many linguists (cf. Naiman et al. (1975), Skehan (1989)) did not implicitly believe in the existence of a significant link between introversion/extraversion and any linguistic measure until the end of the eighties, researches such as Furnham (1990) or Carell et al. (1996) estimate that a clear relationship between introversion/extraversion and formality emerges in any spoken discourse. According to them, introverted speakers tend to use a more formal style, whereas the speech of extraverts seems to be more fluent and thus less formal. Furthermore, they argue that introverts' speech might be more precise in certain conversational situations as it distinguishes itself by a higher lexical richness than the linguistic manifestations of extraverts. Building on those findings, Heylighen and Dewaele (1999: 31) conclude that "introverts would spend more time reflecting before they speak, whereas extraverts would be quicker to react, avoiding pauses in the conversation". As a
result, extraverts' speech seems characterized by a less formal language production, while the speech of introverts tends to be more formal but "less fluent and less reactive to the immediate context of the conversation" (ibid.).

In spite of that, this thesis does not support the hypothesis that introversion/extraversion might serve as a means of indicating different degrees of formality in spoken discourse. For instance, if we pause to consider the possibility of prepared speeches in certain professional situations, it is most likely that even so-called extraverted speakers might be able to produce formal speech appropriate to the immediate context of the situation.

In a similar approach to investigating formality in speech by focusing on personality variables, Heylighen and Dewaele (1999:32) hypothesize that formality might "correlate positively with the general factor of 'intellect'" or level of education. More generally, they speculate that "the higher the academic level a person has reached, the richer his or her vocabulary and the wider his or her outlook" (ibid.). Accordingly, some might conclude at this point that academically educated people tend to speak in a more precise and thus more formal way than less educated persons. Nevertheless, Heylighen and Dewaele (ibid.) also emphasize that the empirical evidence for their hypothesis is limited: they investigated the use of language - particularly on the basis of word classes - among a group of more and less educated speakers and finally came to the conclusion that the formality score ${ }^{24}$ of speakers with an academic degree only scored insignificantly higher than the one of the speakers without such a degree ${ }^{25}$.

As a consequence, Heylighen and Dewaele (1999:32) state that the effect of each separate personality variable (cf. gender, introversion/extraversion and level of education) "is not that strong [...], but it might be made more visible by combining the extreme values of the three variables". Therefore, they conclude that
the prototypical producer of formal speech would be a male, introverted academic[,] [while it is most likely that a] person [who] speak[s] in a highly informal way would be an extraverted woman without formal education. (ibid.)

[^18]In sum, formality should not be regarded as a single continuum, but as a "complex of interrelated factors concerning many facets of a speech event" (Irvine 1978: 19). Irvine (ibid.) thus concludes that


#### Abstract

all societies seem to make distinctions among speech events according to these [interrelated factors], and to have speech events that are behaviorally more formal and less formal in these various senses of the term. These aspects of 'formality' provide a possible framework for comparing speech events within a society; and in addition, societies can be usefully compared with each other according to how they connect the various aspects of formality, and what concomitant effects formalizing a speech event will have.


However, the above considerations and descriptions of non-linguistic determinants only provide the reader with a hypothesis of what a formal situation is or may look like, but they "[do] not define formal speech as such" (Heylighen and Dewaele 1999: 2). Put differently, as it was argued in this thesis that formality can be considered to be "an aspect of social situations" (Irvine 1978: 6), we are now interested in its linguistic characteristics.

### 5.2.2. Linguistic features of formality

In describing the linguistic features of formal discourse, one belief is that formality can be characterized as "an attempt to avoid ambiguity" (Heylighen and Dewaele 1999: 5). This idea can be traced back to Grice's (1975) maxims of conversation that include requirements such as informativeness or the avoidance of obscurity and ambiguity. Bildung on Grice's findings, Heylighen and Dewaele (1999: 3) follow that speakers are supposed to "pay more than the normal attention to form, if they would want to make sure that their expressions are not misunderstood ${ }^{\prime 26}$. Considering an analysis of speech at the level of the lexicon, this means that formal speakers often tend to use precise and above all context-interdependent expressions (Heylighen and Dewaele 1999: 8). In other words, formal speech based on context-interdependent words and expressions has "less chance to be misinterpreted by others who do not share the same context as the sender" (Heylighen and Dewaele 1999: 9) [original emphasis]. So, speakers try to design their utterances in a way that "the recipient gets the informative detail correct" (Brown and Yule 1983: 1-2). This is why some linguists (cf. Crystal and Davy 1969, Singleton 1984, Givón 1985, Halliday 1985, Gelas 1988, Heylighen and Dewaele 1999) have attempted to investigate the intrinsic structure of (in)formal speech

[^19]by focusing on word classes or grammatical forms that are considered to be either formal or informal. In this respect, Givón (1985) found out that the absence of context often encourages speakers to render their speech more formal by "a higher use of nouns that require more lexical searching because of their relatively infrequent use" (Heylighen and Dewaele 1999: 10). As opposed to formal discourse, informal speech is more context-dependent and thus it shows shorter and more frequent words (ibid.). Following the idea that context(in)dependence may serve as a means of assigning (in)formality to certain word classes, the words of the lexicon can be divided into two groups:

Nouns, articles, adjectives and prepositions are viewed as representatives of formal speech while verbs, adverbs, pronouns and interjections often indicate a more informal style (cf. Givón 1985, Gelas 1988, Heylighen and Dewaele 1999). Accordingly, it can be assumed that a speaker using a more formal style will tend to replace the verb by a noun ('nominalization'), while the speech of a more informal interactant might show an increase in verb proportion (Heylighen and Dewaele 1999: 12-13). The remaining category of 'conjunctions' "[does] not seem to be related to the [...] formality of an expression [and thus] has no a priori correlation with formality" (ibid.).

In a similar vein, Fielding and Fraser (1978: 223) state that "[the] noun versus verb distinction, together with its related word classes", represents a fundamental and significant technique in distinguishing between a more formal and a less formal style of speech. In other words,
the nominal style is likely to be more monotonous, less personal, and more formal. It appears to be a carefully considered and closely monitored production. The verbal style, on the other hand, is characteristic of spontaneous, unreflective speech. It is immediate, informal and varied (Fielding and Fraser 1978: 226) [emphasis added].

To sum up, in the above considerations it was argued that the words of the lexicon can be more or less formal according to the speech situation in which they are used. In this context, it has to be stressed that
no expression can be absolutely formal or absolutely informal. All linguistic expressions will be situated somewhere in between these two extremes. Where exactly on that continuum the expression will lie, depends on the choices made by the one who produces the expression, which in turn depends on the situation and the personality of the sender [...] (Heylighen and Dewaele 1999: 9)

Referring to the idea that the lexicon, nouns and verbs in particular, can be used for describing formality, this thesis argues that a measure which focuses on word classes does not seem to be the only adequate approach to revealing different degrees of formality in speech. Although verbs and nouns are often interchangeable - "by nominalization or its inverse, verbalization" (Heylighen and Dewaele 1999: 12) - speakers in this study's small-scale ELF corpus predominantly use verbs as means of expression. Thus, nominalization and the more formal noun phrases are replaced by verb phrases, including pronouns, adverbs and interjections. As opposed to Heylighen and Dewaele (1999), this thesis hypothesizes that a high verb proportion in casual ELF talk need not necessarily exclude the possibility that both a more formal and a more informal style of speech may occur in ELF conversation. Above all in ELF contexts, where English is used as a contact language between speakers, "for none of whom English is the mother tongue" (House 1999: 74), a measure which focuses on the native-based word-class-model does not seem to be a reliable measure of formality.

Analysing linguistic characteristics of formality, linguists (cf. Irvine 1978, Eggins and Slade 1997) also discovered that formal discourse frequently displays an increased structuring or linguistic organization. Similarly, Heylighen and Dewaele (1999: 10) claim that a more complex structure of speech segments is typical of formal talk while informal speech styles are structurally less complex but more interactive. According to Irvine (1978: 8), there are

> various levels of linguistic organization that may be subject to the additional or elaborated structuring, such as intonation [...], phonology, [...], fixed text sequences, and turn taking. [emphasis added]

Of course,
[i]ncreased structuring need not affect all of these aspects of linguistic organization equally or at the same time. Some speech events formalize different parts of the linguistic system, and so cannot be lined up on a simple continuum from informality to formality. (ibid.)

This is exactly the point where this thesis sets out to highlight the importance of 'structure' in analysing different degrees of formality in spoken ELF discourse. More precisely, this paper will focus its attention on peculiarities of structuring in casual talk by primarily investigating levels of linguistic organization such as turn taking (cf. chapter 6) and different text types (cf. chapter 8).

### 5.2.3. Measuring formality

Building on their hypothesis (cf. 5.2.2.), Heylighen and Dewaele (1999) ultimately propose an empirical measure of formality, the F-score, which is based on the frequencies of different word classes in a given conversation:
$\mathrm{F}=$ (noun frequency + adjective freq. + preposition freq. + article freq. - pronoun freq.

- verb freq. - adverb freq. - interjection freq. +100 )/2
(Heylighen and Dewaele 1999: 13)

According to Heylighen and Dewaele (1999: 13), the frequencies in the above formula are
expressed as percentages of the number of words belonging to a particular category with respect to the total number of words in the excerpt. F will then vary between 0 and $100 \%$ (but obviously never reach these limits). The more formal the language excerpt, the higher the value of $\mathbf{F}$ is expected to be. [emphasis added]

### 5.3. Summary

To sum up, section 5.2.1. briefly outlined some non-linguistic variables that are said to affect the degree of formality in spoken discourse. Ultimately, the situational aspect of formality is generally accepted and the prediction made that some of the non-linguistic factors discussed might at least intuitively correlate with our expectations of formality. Even so, the empirical evidence of some situational variables is still limited and therefore more work is needed before both a theoretical and a practical justification can be reached.

Having established that the main criterion for calling speech '(in)formal' is non-linguistic, chapter 5 also set its focus on investigating approaches to measuring formality in speech. In this respect, I focused my attention on Heylighen and Dewaele's (1999: 13) formality measure. They claim that the F-score "adequately distinguishes more from less formal genres of language production" (1999: 1) (emphasis added). In other words, the proportion of certain word classes in a text serves as an indication of a particular predominant level of formality. Whether the F-score unambiguously serves as a practically effective measure of formality in casual ELF interaction will be put to the test in section 8.4 . by applying it to selected data from my ELF corpus.

## 6. The concept of turn-taking

### 6.1. Introduction

During the process of conversation analytical investigation I detected a significant feature for the description of talk in general and for my data in particular, which linguists label 'turntaking'. A circumstantial study of this linguistic phenomenon resulted in the final insight that turn-taking not only sheds light on the skeletal structure of interaction but is also one of the basic indicators that display degrees of formality in conversation. Thus, this chapter aims at describing and exploring the concept of turn-taking with special regard to its relevance for casual ELF talk.

### 6.2. Turn taking

Meierkord (2000: section 3.1) stresses the importance of turn-taking as the basis of any interaction by defining the term 'turn' as "the most central unit of analysis in CA". Even so, she claims that an unambiguous technical definition of the turn-taking concept "must necessarily fail" (ibid.). Bublitz (1988: 148) confirms this view by claiming that it is almost impossible to find a satisfactory definition for it. He adds further that this difficulty of adequately describing turn-taking can be traced back to the fact that non-verbal actions ${ }^{27}$ and "utterance parts which are spoken but not spoken in turn" are often ignored by linguists (Bublitz 1988: 146).

However, referring to turn-taking, Sacks et al. (1974: 700) stipulated two crucial facts which are necessary that conversation is possible at all:
a) only one person speaks at a time.
b) speaker change recurs.

Sacks (1992: 95) labels talk that does follow the above principle 'two party' conversation. However, 'two party' talk does not necessarily have to involve only two persons. "[It] may be a basic format such that conversations having more than two persons present can take a two-

[^20]party form" (ibid.). What is important is that this kind of talk only displays one speaker talking at a period of time and therefore excludes any overlaps.

Consequently, Sacks (1974: 700) concludes that conversation itself is fundamentally a turntaking activity or a
generative mechanism, designed to fulfil two distinct functions. First, speakers have to be able to work out when it is appropriate to transfer the role of speaker. Second, there has to be a way of determining who the next speaker is to be (ibid.).

Thus, in their work on turns at talk, Sacks et al. (1974) argue that there are three basic possibilities of speaker change or turn allocation in conversation:
(1) selection of next speaker by current speaker
(2) self-selection by next speaker
(3) continuation of turn by current speaker until the next potential change-over point (Sacks et al. 1974 quoted in Cheepen 1988: 39)

### 6.2.1. Determining turn allocation

### 6.2.1.1. TCUs

Referring to speaker change, there is the question of how and above all where do we find 'appropriate points' where a smooth transition can happen? Sacks et al. (1974) thus claim that participants are able to detect points of potential speaker change in conversation as speakers talk in units, so-called Turn Constructional Units (TCUs). At the end of these TCUs, which are defined as "grammatically complete units of language, such as a sentence, clause or phrase" (ibid.), speaker change is possible. But who should be the next speaker? In this respect, Sacks et al. (1974) specify two possibilities for determining the allocation of turns. First, the current speaker selects the next speaker by using his/her name, gaze, posture or by directing questions to particular participants. In this way, turn-taking is controlled by one person, which is, according to Atkinson (1982: 103), a salient feature of formal talk.

## EXAMPLE 2

1729 Mm6: (3) what about you Am2 (.) what's your plans after graduation?
1730 Am2: <1> um: </1>

1731 Mm6: <1><@>doing interviews? </@> </1>
1732 All:@@@
1733 Am2: no intend to become a teacher.

The above extract from my transcribed data illustrates that when Mm6 asks what about you Am2 (.) what's your plans after graduation? he has selected Am2 as the next speaker by using the vocative and formulating a question. Referring to my data, it has to be stressed that the more 'formal' allocation of turns in casual interaction is primarily achieved by formulating questions whereas the use of the vocative plays an inconsiderable role.

Having briefly discussed the first possibility of turn-taking described in Sacks et al. (1974), we shed some light on the second way of allocating turns in conversation. Secondly, the next speaker self-selects without being invited or nominated to participate in the actual event.

## EXAMPLE 3

167 Gf1: you were born here?
168 Am2: i was born here
169 Af3: that's the funny thing <4> @ @@ </4>

While Gf1 selects Am2 as the next speaker by asking you were born here?, Af3 self-selects by joining the conversation "without having been invited or nominated to speak" (ibid.). Evens so, she also respects the TCU boundary and comes in at the end of the turn of the previous speaker. To sum up, both ways of changing from speaker role to listener role and vice versa have in common that the actual speaker change always immediately occurs at the end of a TCU and thus lapses are avoided (cf. Sacks et al. 1974).

However, this dual system of turn-taking evidently suggests conversation to be an "infinitely generative turn-taking machine" (ibid.) and therefore disregards the possibility of any gaps or overlaps which are above all salient features in casual talk. Therefore, Sacks et al. (1974: 729) point out that turn-taking is considerably predetermined by the nature of the social task and thus conclude that there is a difference between the allocation of turns in casual talk and other types of conversation. Consequently, Sacks (1992: 527) assumes that in casual interaction idiosyncrasies of the following sort may occur: there might be a lot of interruptions or overlaps as the next speaker often starts to talk before an utterance of the previous speaker is coming to completion. In this context, Sacks et al. (1974: 729) position casual conversation at one end of a continuum and the more professional kind at the other end of the pole. Put
simply, the degree to which turns are pre-allocated in casual talk is more informal while turntaking in institutional interaction is a more formal procedure. In this context, this thesis will illustrate that simultaneous speech or numerous overlaps are a salient feature of casual ELF interaction in my small-scale speech corpus as can be seen in the following example:

## EXAMPLE 4

261 Am2: and where did you meet (.) each other?
262 Gf1: <4> @@@</4>
263 Af3: <4> first time </4>
264 Gf1: through a Cradle of Filth concert
265 Am2: <5> uhum </5>
266 Gf1, Af3: <5>@@@@@@</5>
267 Am2: <6> so you're both </6>
268 Af3: <6> you hear Cradle of Filth? </6>=
269 Am2: =you're both into metal music?

Furthermore, it remains to be explained how the concept of turn-taking can be applied to everyday interactions where participants do not operate in their mother tongues but in English as a lingua franca. In this respect, Meierkord (2000) raises the question if the application of the unit of turn to lingua franca conversation is useful or even possible. She thus claims that it is necessary to rework or re-define the concept of turn-taking before it can be applied to crossor inter-cultural data. In a similar vein, House (2002: 255) points out that as compared to native-speakers of English, ELF speakers often have little acquaintance of "sensible points of transition from one speaker to next speaker" and thus seldom use devices for turn or topic change. Put differently, participants in ELF conversation do not always wait for places where transition can take place (TCUs) but chime in whenever they like or feel the need to do so. They speak "'on their own behalf' and take turns on their own initiative, without being directed by any one member of the group" (Kress 1985: 25). Consequently, the turn-taking procedures are "less foregrounded, allowing the content to be most salient" (ibid.).

### 6.2.1.2. Question/answer pairs

Besides TCUs, Sacks et al. (1974: 717) also highlight the importance of the 'adjacency pair' in the description of the system of turn-taking. Adjacency pairs are "conversational sequences [conducted by different speakers] where there [is] some kind of 'special relatedness' operating between adjacent utterances" (ibid.). More generally, "the occurrence of the second turn can be explained by the first" (ibid.):

Past and current work has indicated that placement considerations are general for utterances. That is: a pervasively relevant issue (for participants) about utterances in conversation is 'why that now' [...] some utterances may derive their character as actions entirely from placement considerations. For example, there do not seem to be criteria other than placement (i.e. sequential) ones that will sufficiently discriminate the status of an utterance as a 'statement', 'assertion', 'declarative', 'proposition', etc., from its status as an 'answer' [...]. Finding an utterance to be an 'answer' [can only be accomplished] by consulting its sequential placement.
(Schegloff and Sacks 1974: 241-242, quoted in Cheepen 1988: 11)

In this respect, Sacks et al. (ibid.) consider the classic 'question/answer sequence' to be the most frequent adjacency pair in spoken interaction ${ }^{28}$.

## EXAMPLE 5

Dm4: you speak more english now?
Am2: i speak more english and french a:nd sometimes sometimes i do have the problem that i'm not quite sure how to pronounce german words=

## EXAMPLE 6

1478 Mm6: $=<1>$ yeah it's not that far away $</ 1>$ in the moment Ukraine is neighbour of
1479 European Union <2> Kosovo not (.) @@@ </2>
1480 Gf1: <1> it's (great) </1>
1481 Gf1: <2> yeah of course of course $</ 2><3>$ i mean it's far away $</ 3>$ (in the)
1482 geographical (one).
1483 Mm6: <3> yeah yeah </3>
1484 Mm6: yeah but
1485 Gf1: is the sea also there? (.) what unites continents?
1486 Af3: that would be a cheap holiday.

As opposed to example 5 where there is an unambiguous relatedness between adjacent utterances, it might be more difficult to find a way of interpreting Af3's turn (line 1486) as an adequate answer to Gfl's question (line 1485) in example 6. Even so, Eggins and Slade (1997: 29) claim that "despite an [alleged] absence of any indications of cohesion [there is always an] implication that adjacent turns relate to each other".

[^21]
### 6.2.1.2.1. The management of questions and answers in casual talk

In this section we examine the interactional management of questions and answers in casual ELF conversation. Our objective is to show the ways in which turn-taking as a linguistic feature of formality is deeply implicated in the production of questions and answers in interpersonal talk. In so doing, this thesis aims at demonstrating that even casual interaction may display more or less formal linguistic characteristics by particularly investigating 'interviews' and 'casual questions' in my ELF corpus.

### 6.2.1.2.1.1. Interviews

As opposed to interpersonal talk, interviews are an institutionalized form of interaction with a "formally distinctive turn-taking procedure" (Heritage and Greatbatch 1991: 94). In this respect, Atkinson (1982: 103) adds that in formal situations, such as interviews in particular, turn-taking is often controlled by one person or a "small group of people, who have the right to 'police' the turn-taking system" ${ }^{29}$, in advance. Heritage and Greatbatch (1991: 93) also confirm this view by arguing that turn type pre-allocation is one of the basic features that set interviews and formal talk in general apart from casual interaction.

In their study on news interviews Heritage and Greatbatch (ibid.) underline that controlled turn taking is a typical linguistic feature of interviews. This means that the allocation of turns among the speakers is exclusively assigned to the interviewer (IR) who also opens and closes the interview. Put differently, interviews are "managed by the interviewer in the form of questions [...], to be answered by the interviewees (IEs)" (Greatbatch 1992 quoted in Lepper 2000: 64). From the point of view of the question/answer format, "the second part (the answer) of the $\mathrm{Q} / \mathrm{A}$ pair must tie to the first, and the first part (the question) requires a certain kind of response - an answer" (Lepper 2000: 72). This means that

IRs may not properly engage in actions other than questions, while [...] IEs should refrain from initiating actions (such as unsolicited comments on prior talk) or sequences (for example, asking questions to which the IR [...] would be obliged to respond) (Heritage and Greatbatch 1991: 97-98).

[^22]Thus, interviews are formal entities where turn-taking is "strongly constrained within [...] sharply defined procedures" (Heritage and Greatbatch 1991: 96). An example of those mentioned formal characteristics of interview settings can also be found in my corpus of casual ELF talk:

## EXAMPLE 7

555 Mm6: okay let's go on the north
556 All: @@@@@
557 Dm4: uh i don't know what to say i already introduced myself but uhm as itold you i
558 come from Denmark and uh i work here at a company called Bet and Win=
559 Mm6: $=\mathrm{mhm}=$
560 Dm4: =and i: i do translations from English and German to Danish and i also write
561 some articles in Danish (.) <SOFT> that's all </SOFT>
562 Mm6: where are you coming from where exactly from Copenhagen or?
563 Dm4: Copenhagen yeah

In this interview-like speech situation, speaker Mm6 clearly functions as the 'interviewer' and pre-allocates in line 555 the turn-taking of speaker Dm4 by directly addressing to him. Line 562 illustrates Mm6 initiating a beginning move, which opens up an exchange. Dm4 responds by linking backwards to the question of Mm6 but does not create any expectations what will be said next. According to Coulthard and Ashby (1976: 140-147), this model of initiating and responding moves ${ }^{30}$, which is typical of interviews, is a general indication of formality in spoken discourse.

### 6.2.1.2.1.2. 'Casual' question/answer pairs

In their work on question and answer pairs in casual interaction, Eggins and Slade (1997: 45) point out that casual conversationalists seldom ask questions to which they already know the answers. This means that they ask 'real ${ }^{31}$ questions and the moves which
occur after the Responding slot do not generally consist of evaluating moves but are either recycling types of moves (queries, challenges) or additional 'afterthoughts' of various kinds (ibid.).

[^23]The following example illustrates this specific feature of questioning in casual talk (cf. lines 679-680 and 687-688):

## EXAMPLE 8

679 Af3: and how do you travel to Austria?
680 Sf5: by bus (.) first time (.) so the first time so i'm not coming home for $<1>$ i don't know $681</ 1>$ till the summer so i'll be here (.) i came by the bus it was: nine or eight NO (.) TEN 682 hours or so=
[...]
687 Gf1: <2> where do you come from? </2>
688 Sf5: Pirot

A further linguistic feature which has relevance for analysing the interactional management of question/answer pairs in casual conversation is the application of "non-directed questions" (Sacks 1992: 528). This means that while, for instance, questions in interview settings
first provide the occasion for the other party to talk, and also provide what they ought to do, i.e., produce an answer, [...] with non-directed questions, it's no particular person's business to answer it [...]. Sacks (1992: 528)

Put differently, if a speaker does not direct a question to a particular participant, "i.e., leaves it open as to who should speak next, [the other] speakers can opt for who's to speak next" (Sacks 1992: 527):

## EXAMPLE 9

2739 Am2: do you like austrian food?
2740 Sf5: yes
2741 Mm6: yeah Schnitzel yeah it's okay.
2742 Sf5: Schnitzel (.) and <LN> Mohn </LN> <TRANSL=poppy> uh <LN> Knödel </LN>
2743 <TRANSL=dumpling> and <LN> Mohn </LN><TRANSL=poppy>

In the above example, Am2 (cf. line 2739) does not directly address a particular speaker when posing his question. Thus, the participants who want to speak next are waiting until the utterance is completed, and then "it's apparently the case that first starter goes" (Sacks 1992: 527). In this respect, it has already been mentioned in this thesis that casual conversationalists do not always await the actual end of a TCU. This means that they often tend to interrupt a
question of the given speaker when ever they feel the need to do so. Lines 267 and 268 of example 10 can be seen as an instance of this tendency in casual talk:

## EXAMPLE 10

261 Am2: and where did you meet (.) each other?
262 Gf1: <4> @@@</4>
263 Af3: <4> first time </4>
264 Gf1: through a Cradle of Filth concert
265 Am2: <5> uhum </5>
266 Gf1, Af3: <5>@@@@@@</5>
267 Am2: so <6> you're both </6>
268 Af3: $<6>$ you hear Cradle of Filth? $</ 6>=$
269 Am2: =you're both into metal music?

As can be seen in the above example, Af3 (cf. line 268) interrupts Am2 right in the middle of his question. Therefore, Am2 immediately repeats his question in line 269 in order to avoid being beaten out by Af3. Because if you "lose any given race [...] there's no guarantee when you will next get a chance to talk [...]" (Sacks 1992: 527).

Finally, with regard to my data, I dare to say that question/answer pairs in casual talk might also display features of the following sort: It appears that if a given speaker directs a question to a particular participant, other speakers nonetheless start to talk or even respond to the question. An illustration of this point is provided in the following examples:

## EXAMPLE 11

687 Gf1: <2> where do you come from? </2>
688 Sf5: Pirot
689 Gfl: where is it near?
690 Sf5: in the near to the (.) Macedonian and Bulgarian $<3>$ (.) border $</ 3>$
${ }_{691}$ Gf1: $<3>$ no which city is near? </3>
692 Mm6: Nis is the $<4>$ closest $</ 4>$
693 Sf5: <4> Nis Nis </4> (1) it's it's <5> a really </5>

## EXAMPLE 12

3067 Af3: <1> you cannot buy it in Billa $</ 1>$ so you cannot buy a a Listeria free salmon.
3068 Mm6: yeah but that's okay (1) <2> in every food it's (.) it's bacteria </2>
Af3: $<2><$ @ $>$ do you like Listeria? < $@></ 2>$

3070 Gf1: yeah but for me that's more bacteria @ @
3071 Af3: they're they're dangerous
3072 Mm6: yeah okay=

Although both questioners (cf. Gf1 in line 691 and Af3 in line 3069) in the above examples do not use the vocative in order to address to the next speaker, it is evident that the questions are obviously directed to specific people. In other words, as opposed to 'non-directed' questions, questions in the above speech situations provide an occasion for a particular participant to talk. Even so, other speakers take their chance to 'enter the room'.

So far, section 6.2.1.2.1. has been concerned with sketching an outline of the management of questions and answers in interpersonal talk. As opposed to the question/answer format in interviews, casual $\mathrm{Q} / \mathrm{A}$ pairs are not necessarily controlled by the questioner and do not always display a sequential order. This kind of questioning and responding is typical of informal multi-party talk where participants often do not get the chance to speak in turn.

Finally, it is argued in this thesis that the majority of Q/A pairs in my corpus of casual ELF interaction is compatible with the two types presented above, i.e. interview-like exchange and casual $\mathrm{Q} / \mathrm{A}$ pairs. Consequently, this thesis suggests the following concept of $\mathrm{Q} / \mathrm{A}$ pairs for the analysis of casual ELF talk:

| interview-like exchange: |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| displays a sequential order: <br> initiation - response - initiation, etc. <br> (interviewer may or may not know the <br> answer) | turn-taking at the end of <br> TCUs | formal |
| 'casual' question/answer pairs: |  |  |
| no sequential order, often non-directed <br> questions (overlaps, gaps, etc.) | turn-taking at the end of <br> TCUs or any given point or <br> time | informal |
| (interactants rarely ask questions to <br> which they already know the answers) |  |  |

### 6.3. Summary and conclusion

This chapter aimed at illustrating that a strict allocation of informality to turn-taking in casual talk is not always appropriate or even possible. Moreover, as a smooth turn-taking based on native English standards often cannot be directly applied to ELF interaction, this thesis proposes the following system of turn allocation, i.e. a slightly modified and complemented version of the one illustrated in Sacks et al. (1974), with special regard to degrees of formality, for the analysis of casual ELF interaction in my data:

| turn allocation | degree of formality |
| :--- | :---: |
| current speaker selects next speaker | more formal |
| next-speaker self selects at the end of a TCU | more formal |
| next-speaker self selects at any given point (overlaps, gaps) | more informal |

Having now presented some of the basic features that characterize the concept of turn-taking in casual ELF interaction, the following chapter will be devoted to the focus of research of this thesis, i.e. revealing different degrees of formality in casual ELF talk by investigating its generic structure.

## 7. The concept of speech genres

### 7.1. Introduction

While this thesis has already analysed casual conversation as a distinct speech genre of its own, this chapter is particularly interested in defining 'speech genres' within casual interaction. In other words, we aim at linguistically describing 'sub-categories' of everyday talk, or as I will hence call it, 'generic varieties of casual conversation'.

First of all, it will be necessary to compile a general description of the term speech genre with regard to casual talk in order to detect what generic varieties of everyday interaction have in common. In this context, Eggins and Slade (1997: 57) point out that although a lot of work has already been done on the analysis of written (cf. Martin 1984) and spoken genres (cf. Ventola 1987) and their sub-categories, there is still a lack of adequate studies in the field of speech genres especially within casual conversation. This is why the following considerations will attempt to gradually develop a linguistic theory that provides the basis for a further discussion of generic varieties in casual ELF talk.

### 7.2. Defining the term speech genre

To begin with, this thesis regards linguistic genres as "different ways of (inter)acting discoursally" (Fairclough 2003: 26). More precisely, as do Charaudeau and Maingueneau, (2002: 278-280), we consider a speech genre to be an entity that can be described by its linguistic function, formal features and textual organization.

Martin offers a clear definition of speech genre in the following:
[genre] is a staged, goal oriented, purposeful activity in which speakers engage as members of our culture (Martin 1984: 25 quoted in Eggins and Slade 1997: 56).

In other words, genres within talk move through different stages until they reach a point of closure, i.e. the goal of speech. Evidently, Martin's definition focuses on the idea that speech genres can primarily be described by the occurrence of different stages. This range of staging
possibilities associated with a particular genre was first mentioned by Hasan in the 1970s when she introduced the notion of generic structure in her analysis of service encounters. According to Hasan (1985: 61), each speech genre has its own generic structure which contains obligatory and optional elements. While obligatory elements or stages are a defining feature of a particular genre, "other elements which are optional may occur in some instances of the genre and may also occur in other genres" (Eggins and Slade 1997: 56). Furthermore, Hasan declares that
the appearance of all these elements in a specific order corresponds to our perception of whether the text is complete or incomplete (Halliday and Hasan, 1985: 61).

It has to be stressed that Hasan's (1985) concept of generic structure and thus resulting definition of speech genre are based on an analysis of service encounters. It might be clear to the reader that speech acts in such genres often do follow certain patterns or a generally accepted 'formula of talk'.

## TEXT $1^{32}$

Customer Can I have ten oranges and a kilo of bananas please?
Vendor Yes, anything else?

Customer
Vendor
Customer
Vendor

No thanks
That'll be dollar forty
Two dollars
Sixty, eighty, two dollars. Thank you.
(Data from Halliday and Hasan (1985: 59) quoted in Eggins and Slade (1997: 55))
The above example illustrates the obligatory stages in a service encounter: (1) sale request, (2) sale compliance, (3) sale, (4) purchase and (5) purchase closure. Thus, these five elements define the basic generic structure of service encounters. However, Hasan's (ibid.) apparently structure-based definition of speech genre proves its strengths in defining sub-categories of conversations where exchange is rather regulated or even controlled and might thus be called on for describing above all varieties of institutional talk. But what about interactions which do not always follow 'prescribed' orders of linguistic exchange and thus do occur spontaneously or naturally?

[^24]Bakhtin (1986: 52, quoted in Eggins and Slade 1997: 63)) provides a more general definition by also implying the possibility of 'casualness' in his description of speech genres:
[speech genre is] the typical form of the utterance associated with a particular sphere of communication (e.g. [the family], the workplace, [...], the military) which have therefore developed into 'relatively stable types' in terms of thematic content, style and compositional structure.

In addition to this, he highlights the importance of generic forms by arguing that
if speech genres did not exist and we had not mastered them, if we had to originate them during the speech process and construct each utterance at will for the first time, speech communication would be almost impossible.
(Bakhtin 1986: 78, quoted in Eggins and Slade 1997: 63)

He concludes that
even in the most free, the most unconstrained conversation, we cast our speech in generic forms, sometimes rigid and trite ones, sometimes more flexible, plastic and creative ones. [...] We learn to cast our speech in generic forms and when hearing others' speech, we guess its genre from the very first words; we predict a certain length and a certain compositional structure; we foresee the end; that is from the very beginning we have a sense of the speech whole (ibid.). [emphasis added]

This means that even in spontaneous or casual interactions we seem to follow generic forms in order to avoid total amorphousness in conversations. In this context, Fairclough (1995: 14) considers any segment of talk which does possess a detectable text structure to be an "institutionalized language activity". Eggins and Slade (1997: chapter 6) confirm this view by stating that even in casual talk there are text types which can be assigned a schematic structure and that generically structured talk is characteristic of institutional or formal talk.

### 7.3. Speech genre and casual ELF talk

Finally, as this chapter is concerned with establishing an approach to describing basic features of generic varieties of casual $E L F$ talk, I consider Millar's (1984) approach to defining speech genres to be an essential contribution to the compilation of this task. Millar (1984 quoted in Eggins and Slade 1997: 64) stresses the social context within interaction and therefore regards
genres as social actions occurring within particular social contexts. Drawing on this definition, Eggins and Slade (1997: 64) point out that
[genres] are looked at not only for the textual regularities they display, and therefore also the generic conventions they flout, but also for the class, gender, and ethnic biases they incorporate.

Put differently, Eggins and Slade (ibid.) consider genre as textual and social categories. In this respect, a linguistic description of genre with regard to ELF has to exceed a merely textual analysis by also considering both the cultural background of speakers and the fact that linguistic exchange happens in ELF, a language that enables its users to behave naturally in conversation and to express their thoughts and thus 'own self' through a language other than their native tongue.

Consequently, this thesis suggests the following definition of speech genre with regard to ordinary ELF interaction: speech genre is a contextually and culturally marked way of "using language in connection with a particular type of social activity" (Fairclough 1995: 14). Furthermore, it is an interpersonal-goal-oriented activity which follows generic conventions, but sometimes in a more flexible way as opposed to the more formal kind of talk. Fairclough (1975) and Kress (1987: 42) confirm this view by stating that genres should not be regarded as "fixed and rigid schema but as abstract, [...] categories open to negotiation and change". Kress (1987: 42) maintains that
[g]enres are dynamic, responding to the dynamics of other parts of social systems. Hence genres change historically; hence new genres emerge over time and hence, too, what appears as 'the same' generic form at one level has recognisable distinct forms in differing social groups.

At this point, the ideas presented by Kress (1987: 42) are maintainable in so far as English itself is indeed a dynamic language which is still undergoing a lot of change, above all with its persistent spread all over the world. Having reached the status of a global language or lingua franca, English is no longer exclusively tied to one specific culture. Thus, it becomes evident that also the concept of genre needs to be redefined in order to meet the requirements of English as a lingua franca.

## 8. Classifying text types in casual conversation: chunks vs. chat

### 8.1. Introduction

Having already presented the most important features that define speech genre within ordinary ELF interaction (cf. section 7.3.), it remains to give the reader an insight into the analysis of different generic types of casual talk. But how do we know if a segment of conversation is amenable to a generic description? According to Eggins and Slade (1997: 231), interpersonal interaction is generically structured when
[segments of talk] move through predictable stages [and] when one participant takes the floor and is allowed to dominate the conversation for an extended period. Even in highly interactive genres, there is usually one speaker who dominates the floor for that period ([...] sometimes it may be two or even more speakers [...]).

In this thesis, the work on generic varieties of casual conversation will thus include a brief linguistic description and analysis of story telling, observation/comment texts, opinion texts and gossip. In their description of genres in casual conversation, Eggins and Slade (1997: 265) also mention 'joke-telling'. As I intend to devote a chapter of its own (cf. chapter 9) to an in-depth analysis of humour in casual talk, joke-telling as one of the basic humorous devices in interpersonal interaction will be discussed within this chapter. Although a generic analysis accounts for a significant proportion of my casual ELF data, there are also segments of the data which cannot be analysed generically. Eggins and Slade (1997: 266) label segments which do not display a generic structure 'chat ${ }^{33}$. Consequently, chat is not included in the subsequent discussion of generic varieties of casual ELF talk - it will be investigated in section 8.3.

### 8.2. Chunks

In this sub-chapter we deal with 'generically structured segments of casual conversation', socalled chunks. In this respect, Eggins and Slade (1997: 270) point out that the positioning of segments of interpersonal talk as "either more or less amenable to generic analysis" depends

[^25]on two factors: "the degree of interactivity of the genre and the degree to which interpersonal or experiential meanings are foregrounded". In other words, there are types of casual talk which are less interactive but display a more 'rigid' generic structure and text types ${ }^{34}$ where interaction and the change of interpersonal meanings are more foregrounded than the actual generic structure. As opposed to segments of talk which show a clear and more defined generic structure, highly interactive talk also distinguishes itself by a dynamic development of text and a more open-ended nature. Thus, an analysis of this kind of interaction needs to capture both the schematic structure and the "dynamic unfolding" of talk (ibid.). This will be illustrated in section 8.2.4., when we investigate the nature of gossip in casual ELF talk. At first, this thesis starts with describing varieties of casual talk which are more amenable to generic analysis, so-called 'story telling' texts.

### 8.2.1. Storytelling

In the early part of the twentieth century, many linguists considered casual talk to be predominantly 'messy' and informal as it "rarely conforms to the principles of structure and form" (Lepper 2000: 100). Thus, they concentrated on studying narrative above all in relation to literary and historical texts. Consequently, they defined storytelling as a formal entity with a distinctive structure. Sacks confirms this idea by stating that "stories are told in orderly sequences, governed by embedded rules of production and turn-taking" (Sacks 1972 quoted in Lepper 2000: 99). Even so, he claims that even the more formal storytelling is ubiquitous in naturally and spontaneously occurring talk. Building on Sacks' findings, linguists such as Cheepen (1988: 15) or Eggins and Slade (1997: 15) also point out that storytelling as a more formal feature of speech is frequently occurring in casual talk. In this respect, Cheepen (ibid.) emphasizes that in casual interaction telling stories displays a more dialogic structure than in 'free narrative', an "institutionalized form of entertainment [where a story is] told by one narrator for the benefit of an audience" (Cheepen 1988: 15):
[Stories in casual talk] are collaborative stories, in which both speakers contribute to the telling, so that the form of dialogue is preserved; stories are not, therefore, instances of free narrative (although examples of free narrative can still be found in modern society), in which one speaker has the right and duty to tell the story, and the other speaker(s) has the right and duty to act as the audience.

[^26]However, Eggins and Slade (1997: 15)) underline that storytelling is a linguistic task that "requires the production of a chunk of information" and thus displays a "more monologic pattern in casual [interaction]" (ibid.) (emphasis added). In this respect, this thesis underlines the necessity of a more detailed definition of the term 'monologue' with special regard to its relevance for the analysis of storytelling texts in interpersonal conversation. As will be exemplified in this chapter, even the telling of a story can to some degree be an interactive activity. Thus, I suggest taking Vorobej’s (1997) concept of 'face-to-face persuasive monologue ${ }^{35}$ into consideration. Vorobej (1997: 3) declares that in a face-to-face persuasive monologue (limited) interaction is possible. For this reason it is argued in this thesis that in case of storytelling in casual interaction the term 'monologue' is equivalent to Vorobej's (1997) face-to-face persuasive monologue.

Concerning conversational storytelling, Plum (1998: 221-265) categorises storytelling texts into four genres: narrative, anecdote, exemplum and recount. These storytelling genres are "built up around a set of narrative clauses [...]; in addition they share basic structural elements at their beginning and ends - for example Abstract, Orientation and Coda ${ }^{36 \%}$ (Martin 1992: 564) - while they are different in the distinctive middle stages. Prince (1973) succinctly describes the typical structure of a story as in the following: a story consists of at least one event that arises out of a particular state. In other words, "the event must result in a state different from the original" (Cheepen 1988: 53). Cheepen (ibid.) supplements Prince's (1973) definition of storytelling by also considering the factors 'temporal location' and 'evaluation'. As will be shown in the subsequent examples, temporal location is not always explicitly referred to in the text (e.g. last year, etc.). Instead of that, it can either be implicit in the context or even ignored. Evaluation also seems to be a common factor in some storytelling texts as speaker comments sometimes tend to be "heavily evaluatively loaded" (Cheepen 1988: 53).

In the following sub-chapters we will thus briefly investigate examples of storytelling genres in my casual ELF corpus in order to disentangle distinct structures of generic varieties of casual ELF talk. Furthermore, this thesis will also provide an answer to the question why an

[^27]analysis of storytelling is also essential to the description of casual $E L F$ talk. In this respect, Eggins and Slade (1997: 238) point out that an analysis of stories
is not only of theoretical importance for a description of casual conversation in English but, as stories are a reflection of people's identities, such an investigation can also shed light on the construction of social identities and sociocultural worlds.

### 8.2.1.1. Narratives

Narratives are spoken texts in which protagonists have to face and resolve problematic experiences. According to Plum (1998: 246), "these texts increase in tension or excitement, culminating in a crisis followed by a resolution of that crisis". Protagonists in narratives are either powerful or powerless, acting alone or with others (ibid.). The following example, in which Mm6 reports on an incident during a passport control at the airport in London, exemplifies the specific generic structure of narratives:

## EXAMPLE 13

658 Mm6: =and it's quite funny when i have been in U.K. uh: usually when you're leaving
659 London uh any any airport or in U.K. when you're leaving it's no checking passport
660 regular passport control it's only checking for the luggage and usually the woman is
661 checking the passport (.) and i gave my passport to her and she is asking where are you
662 coming from and i said < @ > you can read it from the passport < @/> and she said what's
663 your country called $<$ SOFT $>$ you know </SOFT> and i really had no idea you know i said
664 i don't know M C D I M no idea <SOFT> you know </SOFT> and she said okay i will 665 check on the list <SOFT> you know </SOFT> and she's checking on the list and she said 666 this country is not exist you know but typical British $<$ SOFT $>$ you know </SOFT><@>
667 THIS COUNTRY IS NOT EXIST $</ @>$ hey come on $<@>$ come and enter in U.K. you
668 can see it's inside in stamps who published this passport $<$ SOFT $>$ you know $</$ SOFT $>$ and
669 she go to speak to: to with her boss and her boss come back and this took and managed the
670 problem and FINALLY on the end they managed the problem in the European Union
671 because of this problem with the name uh for country code for my country they used three
672 times $x$ you know it's no: no name it's just three times for the country code you know like
673 <@> pornography three times x </@>
674 All: @@@

In this example, Mm6 signals in line 658 that a story is about to be told when he says and it's quite funny when $i$ have been in U.K. ${ }^{37}$. The point of the text, i.e. the actual problem Mm6 has

[^28]to face, is introduced from line 661 to line 663: apparently, Mm6's passport does not clearly name his home country. The crisis gradually builds up and culminates when Mm6 is told that officially his country does not exist (cf. line 666). Finally, the complication is resolved by both the protagonist unfailingly insisting on the existence of his home country and the airport personnel simply using three 'Xs' to label the country (cf. line 672).

### 8.2.1.2. Anecdotes

Although anecdotes are closely related to narratives, they differ in the fact that they do not provide an explicit resolution to a problematic experience. Instead of resolving a crisis, protagonists react to a problem by showing expressions of amazement, frustration, embarrassment, humiliation, etc. (Plum 1998: 255-258).

## EXAMPLE 14

208 Dm4: and especially when i moved here i couldn't even pick up the phone Gf1 knows that 209 cause i couldn't understand it i couldn't read it german i could read german and ithought i 210 could understand it but $i$ found out pretty fast that it is very difficult to understand (.)
211 Af3: and=
212 Dm 4 : =cause of the austrian dialect
213 Af3: and there are several dialects in Austria
214 Gf1: <LN $>$ ja $</$ LN $><$ TRANSL=yes $>$

As opposed to example 13, in the above extract there is not a crisis that somehow gets resolved. Instead of resolving the problem, Dm4 emphasises the problematic aspect of his experience by expressing his reaction (and i thought $i$ could understand it but $i$ found out pretty fast that it is very difficult to understand) to it.

### 8.2.1.3. Exemplums

What matters in exemplums is not the representation of events as problematic, something typical of both narrative and anecdote [...], but instead it is the cultural significance of the macro-event, that is the significance of the events in the context of culture in which the text is told. (Plum 1998: 258)

Eggins and Slade (1997: 237) confirm this view by arguing that in exemplums "there is an explicit message on how the world should or should not be". Thus, the example presented below, does not represent a particular event, it is more concerned with Dm 4 making the point
that even within the European Union border controls do make sense (cf. line 1063 they should check and line 1071 you're always ALLOWED to come but they have to know about (that)).

## EXAMPLE 15

1063 Dm4: =yeah but that's okay they should (.) they SHOULD check i mean uh: the
1064 European Union shouldn't mean that the borders are open and people can come and go 1065 as they want.
1066 Gf1: <1> and smuggle </1>
1067 Dm4: <1> uh we should </1> we should STILL be keeping an eye on who comes and 1068 who goes.
1069 Mm6: <2> yeah </2>
1070 Dm 4 : $<2>$ and we didn't have other passports $</ 2>$ the difference is that now we can
1071 GO they can't say uh no we don't want you here (.) you're always ALLOWED to come
1072 but they have to know about (that).

### 8.2.1.4. Recounts

Recounts do not necessarily deal with a problem; they are concerned with retelling an event with "a prosody of evaluation running throughout to make the story worth telling" (Eggins and Slade 1997: 237). Put differently, when Mm6 retells the experiences one of his Danish friends made in Skopje in the example below, he also comments on these events by appraising them. In this respect, Mm6's evaluation of events is realized by funny remarks ${ }^{38}$ (cf. line 1217, 1218, 1220, 1221), which then results in an outburst of laughter:

## EXAMPLE 16

1216 Mm6: when the danish friend was in my place in Skopje he ca- can't believe how it's
1217 cheap in Macedonia you know and he bought $<@\rangle$ everything what is possible $<1>$ to
1218 take with him</@></1>
1219 SX-f: <1>@@@ </1>
1220 Mm6: $\leq$ @ $>$ and the most funny thing was he $<$ COINAGE $>$ cutted $<\left[\mathrm{k}^{\wedge}\right.$ tid $]>$
1221 </COINAGE> his hair in Skopie because </@> <2> @@@ @@ </2>
1222 All: <2>@@@</2>
$1223 \mathrm{Mm6}$ : <@ $>$ it is much cheaper yeah $</$ @ $>()<$. FAST $>$ he can't believe it you know
1224 because </FAST> (.) to cut hair in Skopje is maybe (.) less than two euro $<$ FAST $>$ you
1225 know </FAST> and < 3> @@@@</3> yes.
1226 All: <3>@@@</3>

[^29]So far in this section we have briefly investigated the nature of different kinds of storytelling texts in casual conversation. Of the storytelling texts in my data, anecdotes and narratives occurred most frequently across the four groups. This might be traced back to the fact that above all text types such as narratives or anecdotes are primarily concerned with 'entertaining the hearer' (Eggins and Slade 1997: 264), which is a distinctive characteristic of talk in my data ${ }^{39}$. Acknowledging that exemplums and recounts represent a natural feature of casual spoken discourse, instances of these phenomena only account for a minor part of the analysis of my ELF corpus as they were the least frequent storytelling texts in my data.

As has already been discussed in this chapter, storytelling in casual conversation displays a particular text structure. With regard to my data, storytelling can be assigned a generic structure formulation (with 'narratives' showing the clearest generic structure), but sometimes it also seems to be a highly interactive speech activity. This is not to suggest that storytelling in my collection of data displays an entire dialogic structure, nor that there is a significant deviation of the 'standard norm'. It simply means that the bulk of stories which occur in my data reveal elements of Vorobej's (1997) concept of 'face-to-face persuasive monologue' where interaction is possible. Similarly, Cheepen (1988:53) points out that stories in casual interaction are often dialogic -

> that is, they are told not through one long conversational turn taken by the 'storyteller', but through a series of short turns by both 'teller' and 'audience', often with the 'audience' providing questions to elicit more information, and sometimes even with the 'audience' PROVIDING some of the information, in the form of guesses - one part of the story frequently provided by the 'audience' being evaluation, which may be inserted at various points throughout the story. This dialogic form of story telling means that the distinction between 'story-teller' and 'audience' becomes blurred, because what is happening in such a situation is that the speakers are collaborating in a story-telling. [original emphasis]

Furthermore, while Eggins and Slade (1997: 266) claim that a high degree of interactivity primarily occurs in contexts where the interactants are more familiar with one another, at least in my data the degree of familiarity or contact between the participants paradoxically does not act as an indication of interactivity in one of the storytelling genres. In other words, despite the fact that most participants are less familiar or have less contact with one another, storytelling tends to be a highly interactive activity in my taped conversation. Accordingly, as I do believe that talk reflects our social identity and enables us to share our attitudes, this

[^30]thesis argues that the frequent occurrence of highly interactive segments of talk in my data can be traced back to the fact that the participants have discovered ELF as a powerful means of sharing their ways of seeing the world with people from all over Europe, and thus the exchange of meanings is more foregrounded than the adherence to generic structures.

While Plum (1998: 221-265) categorises storytelling texts into the four genres discussed above, Eggins and Slade (1997: 265-269) also include 'opinion texts' and 'observation/comment texts' in their generic analysis of casual talk. As these generically structured text types can also be detected in my casual ELF corpus, the next sections will briefly outline the linguistic features of opinion and observation/comment texts.

### 8.2.2. Opinion texts

What matters in opinion texts is that participants "propose, elaborate, defend and exchange opinions about people, things or events" (Eggins and Slade 1997: 266-267). Consequently,
[opinion texts] are expressions of attitude not of fact. They express an individual or a societal judgement as to the rightness or wrongness, the goodness or badness, the desirability or otherwise of a state of affairs in the real world. (ibid.)

Although opinion texts are a highly interactive genre, there are at least one or two speakers who dominate the floor for a particular period of time. In this respect, the generic structure of opinion texts focuses on two stages: firstly, an opinion is presented and secondly, an interactant is required to react to what has been said. Of course, it is most likely that in case of disagreement participants will provide evidence for their opinion and try to find a "resolution of some sort before the text is closed" (ibid.). To illustrate this point, consider example 17:

## EXAMPLE 17

837 Mm6: yeah but (.) the same characteristic for the Adriatic coast (than) the (southern)
838 Greece is that many uh a lot of islands in the sea what is typical for your region (.) i really 839 like to go there (and) especially but it's so strange YOUR transport from from Athens or 840 from Thessalonica to the islands uh: (.) doesn't matter by plane or by by: ferry boat it's SO 841 expensive and it's it's really strange $=$
842 Gf1: =by (ferry boat)? <SOFT> it's not expensive there many go (by them) now </SOFT> 843 <gaprec 00:03> (due to unintelligible speech!)
844 Mm6: i know <SOFT> i know </SOFT>
845 Gf1: i don't find it expensive PERSONALLY but but (.) to (Aegina) it's not expensive=

846 Mm6: =yeah < @ > because it's not that far from <LN> Rhodos </LN>
847 <TRANSL=Rhodes> </@>
848 Gf1:@@@
849 Mm6: yeah but fly to $<\mathrm{LN}>$ Rhodos $</ \mathrm{LN}><$ TRANSL=Rhodes $>$ (.) it's $<1>$ it's make 850 difference $</ 1>$ (.)
851 Gf1: $<1>$ of course (that's more far) $</ 1>$

In this extract, Mm6 presents his personal opinion on the Greek transportation and shipping, namely that it is strange (cf. line 839) and expensive (cf. line 841). Gf1 immediately reacts to Mm6's statement by disagreeing (cf. line 842 it's not expensive and line 845 i don't find it expensive PERSONALLY). Thus, Mm6 tries to reason his opinion by mentioning the expensive flight to Rhodes in particular. Gf1 agrees on that and thus a resolution 'of some sort' is achieved.

### 8.2.3. Observation/Comment texts

According to Martin and Rothery (1986: 10), observation/comment texts are concerned with things or events and "factuality is what matters". In other words, "an observation is made on a fact and then a comment follows" (ibid.). The following extract provides a good example of these text types:

## EXAMPLE 18

2723 Mm6: and uh: castle is really from that time you know and it's really so small (.) and it's
2724 on on the rock you know position of the castle is so so specific one but inside it's
2725 nothing specific because in the time when Romania was socialistic country (.)
2726 everything what was inside uh on some way was (.) given back to the people=
2727 Am2: =mhm=
2728 Mm6: =it's really strange after the second world war they almost destroyed all all area
2729 inside (.) and on some way castle is so damaged.
2730 Am2: mhm mhm

Mm6 factually describes a castle he once visited during his stay in Romania. Afterwards, he comments on his observation by considering the event as really strange (cf. line 2728).

### 8.2.4. Gossip

While the previous sub-chapters focused on an analysis of segments of casual conversation that display "a global structure organization" (Eggins and Slade 1997: 273), this chapter will look at gossip, a genre that shows indeed a distinctive staging structure but is above all a highly interactive activity with almost 'chat like ${ }^{, 40}$ elements. Thus, an analysis of gossip will include a description of both its generic structure and the more open-ended nature of this kind of talk.

First of all, it will be necessary to define and label gossip as a genre of its own. Secondly, we aim at describing gossip in my collection of data where English is not a native language but a lingua franca. Thirdly, this thesis will briefly outline both the basic functions and the generic structure of gossip.

What is gossip? It is widely acknowledged that gossip in the most general sense refers to any talk about daily life (Eggins and Slade 1997: 278). Tannen (1991: 97) argues that gossip characterises above all women's talk in general. More precisely, Bergmann (1993: 45) describes gossip as the passing on of any details about "the personal affairs of others".

However, the above definitions seem to be too general to classify gossip as a particular genre with a definable structure. In this thesis, the term gossip will be used more specifically and thus, as a starting point, we primarily take the definition offered by Eggins and Slade (1997) into account. According to Eggins and Slade (1997: 273), gossip is "one of the most commonly occurring and socially significant genres in English casual conversation". Moreover, gossip functions as
a form of talk through which interactants can construct solidarity as they explore shared normative judgements about culturally significant behavioural domains. [Therefore,] gossip is a culturally determined process [...]. (ibid.)

Eggins and Slade (1997: 278) conclude that gossip is a conversational genre in which participants exchange negative opinions and pejorative evaluations about an absent person

[^31]"who is known to at least one of the participants" (often a friend). Similarly, Cheepen (1988: 116) defines gossip as a
rather special kind of story [where an absent person is used as a Scapegoat and which] is characterised by substantial contributions from [more than one] speaker [...], and by the absence of any positive evaluation which may balance the negative aspect.

## EXAMPLE 19

964 Af3: um i want to go to Sweden $<3>$ (.) to a friend of mine $</ 3>$ to Babsi
$965 \mathrm{Mm6}$ : < $3>\mathrm{mhm}</ 3>$
966 Gf1: she's gonna be there in the summer?
967 Af3: for how long (.) do you know?
968 Gf1: i don't know i'm asking you is she gonna be there in the summer?
969 Af3: uh SHE said to: Bettina i think she that she will come in in June not July hh but i
970 don't know how long for how long she will stay (3) it's not a typical summer holiday.

Example 19 illustrates the only incident in my corpus where participants actually do talk about an absent person who is known to them, namely their friend Babsi. Although they do exchange details about Babsi, they definitely do not pass on any negative opinions about her. As a consequence, it would not be legitimate in the analysis of casual talk in my corpus to mark, for instance, the segment of talk illustrated in example 19 as an instance of gossip.

Why do people gossip? People 'gossip' in order to share opinions and judgements about "a person's behaviour or physical attributes, and by doing so implicitly asserting appropriate behaviour or defining a physical norm" (Eggins and Slade 1997: 276). Therefore, gossip is concerned with events that "are not experientially unusual but interpersonally unacceptable" (ibid.): the world is classified by stating "what people should or should not be doing" (ibid.). In this way, gossip enables people to establish and reinforce group membership. Put differently, gossip is "a privilege which is only extended to a person when he or she is accepted as a member of the group or set. It is the hallmark of membership" (Gluckman 1963: 313). Furthermore, gossip also functions as a form of social control. This means that gossip is a way of maintaining and controlling the morals or values of a social group by negatively judging an absent third person who failed in some way to live up to the group values (Gluckman 1963: 308).

As already mentioned in this section, gossip is a highly interactive genre. In this respect, Eggins and Slade (1997: 278) argue that gossip is "inherently dialogic [as] speakers work together collaboratively to construct the discourse". Even so, there is an underlying and distinctive linguistic structure that defines gossip as a genre of its own. As opposed to the storytelling texts presented in this thesis, in gossip texts there is no problem which culminates in a crisis. Consequently, there is neither a complication nor a resolution stage. The focus is on justifying the speaker's negative opinion of an absent person and not on an event itself. Thus, gossip has an interpersonal orientation, i.e. the pejorative evaluation of people (Eggins and Slade 1997: 276). In generically describing gossip it has to be mentioned that this thesis does not present a fixed or rigid schema, i.e. the 'ideal' type, but attempts to present an underlying structure which participants orient to. Basically, there are three obligatory elements which define the generic structure of gossip: Third Person Focus, Substantiating Behaviour and Pejorative Evaluation (Eggins and Slade 1997: 285). To start with, Third Person Focus is the initial obligatory stage of gossip and "functions to introduce the third person and to frame the deviant behaviour". Secondly, Substantial Behaviour as a further obligatory element is concerned with legitimizing the judgements by providing evidence for the negative evaluations. In other words, this stage justifies why the behaviour of a third person is considered to be inappropriate or unacceptable. Thirdly, the "events outlined in the Substantiating Behaviour are evaluated and commented on" at the Pejorative Evaluation stage (ibid.). In this respect, it has to be stressed that in gossip texts there is often a recursive cycle of Substantiating Behaviour followed by Pejorative Evaluation. Put differently,
speakers provide evidence for ways in which the behaviour of the third person is inappropriate [...], they then follow this by giving the Pejorative Evaluation, after which someone [...] provides further evidence. (Eggins and Slade 1997: 286)

The above presented recursive cycle in gossip is often supplemented by an optional element, namely so-called Probes. Probes are chat like segments and label elements in which speakers request more details. They basically consist of question-answer segments and enable the text to continue (Eggins and Slade 1997: 286). In other words, interactants co-construct the gossip by asking questions or eliciting more information. In this way, they do not only indicate interest or show that they are in accordance with the gossip, they also keep the text going on. In this respect, it has to be mentioned that Probes are not functionally specific to the gossip genre; they can occur in any particular genre of casual talk ${ }^{41}$.

[^32]
### 8.2.5. Pejorative evaluation texts

Although Eggins and Slade (1997: 273) point out that gossip is one of the most commonly occurring genres in casual talk, at least in my collection of data it does not occur at all. It is most likely that the participants in my recorded conversations refrain from gossiping as they know that they are 'on record'. However, the analysis of my data revealed one example of talk where participants indeed exchange pejorative evaluation, but instead of judging an absent familiar person, interactants share negative opinions about what I will hence label 'social reality'. For this reason, this thesis suggests adding a new text type to the discussion of generic varieties of casual talk in my data: pejorative evaluation texts. Based on the idea that pejorative evaluation texts, like any other generic varieties of casual talk, represent social identity and construct social reality, this thesis broadly defines them as 'segments of talk in casual interaction which involve pejorative judgement of social reality'. In this respect, social reality is not restricted to the behaviour or actions of an absent third person (cf. Eggins and Slade 1997: 278), it rather incorporates experiences with people, things or events that are at least known to some of the participants. Finally, talking about generic structure, the different elements or text stages of gossip (cf. 8.2.4.) can also be found in pejorative evaluation texts. This point will be illustrated by example 20 :

## EXAMPLE 20

2260 Mm 6 : i hate the voice in the public transport (.) the voice saying the next station or: (.) $2261<2>$ or go out </2> yeah it's it's really <3>@@@ </3> (i) really need to put some girl
2262 to be more you know for example in $<\mathrm{L} 1=$ MACEDONIAN $>$ Praga
2263 </L1=MACEDONIAN> <TRANSL=Prague> it's it's some girl and it's very you know
2264 like like slowly and all like (1) so so sweet you know here it's so hard and like
2265 <LOUD> <LN> BITTE ALLE AUSSTEIGEN </LN> <TRANSL=please leave/get out
2266 of the train> </LOUD>
2267 Af3: <2> yes </2>
2268 All: <3>@@@@@</3>
2269 All: <4>@@@@@@@@ </4>
2270 Af3: <4> < @ > <L1=GERMAN $>$ (zack zack) </L1=GERMAN $><$ TRANLS=hurry up
2271 hurry up></@></4>
2272 Mm6: yeah it's it's really (.) real it's EVERY DAY it's really too much ESPECIALLY when i leave in Hütteldorf and <FAST> travel all city and come to university </FAST> uh it's it's really too much you know and you EVERYWHERE the same voice you
2275 know (.) it's it's
2276 <telephone rings> <gapnrec 00:06>
2277 Am2: well i like the voice cause sometimes if you fall asleep,
2278 Mm6: it's very practical thing $<5>$ BUT $</ 5>$ (.) come on give to some girl to say that you know like@@@<SOFT> BITTE ALLE AUSSTEIGEN </SOFT> like this will be

2280 much better than (.) $<$ FAST $>$ bitte alle aussteigen $</$ FAST $>$.

The Third Person Focus in example 20 introduces the thing or event which is going to be talked (gossiped) about: the announcements in the public transport in Vienna. The evaluative, interpersonal contribution in this excerpt even starts in the Third Person Focus when Mm6 states that he hates the voice in the public transport (cf. line 2260). The Third Person Focus stage is followed by the first Substantiating Behaviour which provides evidence for the negative evaluation: Mm6 considers the announcements in the public transport in Prague to be more polite than those in Vienna (cf. line 2262 to 2264 [...] it's [...] so sweet you know here it's so hard [...]). Af3 confirms this by providing further evidence or information which enables the participants to make a negative evaluation: she stresses the abrasive tone of voice of announcements in Vienna (cf. line 2270 zack zack). In the subsequent Pejorative Evaluation stage, Mm6 makes an explicit judgement when he says, it's really too much (cf. line 2272). What is characteristic of gossip, namely that events known to the interactants are often repeated and retold (cf. Eggins and Slade 1997: 286), can also be found in the above example: Pejorative Evaluation is again followed by Substantiating Behaviour when Mm6 legitimizes his judgement by again comparing the announcements in Vienna public transport to those in Prague (cf. line 2278 to 2280).

Although this thesis labels the above excerpt pejorative evaluation text, there are parts of this text which seem similar to opinion texts in that there might be evidence of disagreement and resolution. In line 2277 , Am2 briefly mentions that he likes the voice. When Mm6 immediately reacts to Am2's utterance by showing understanding for what has been said (cf. line 2278 it's very practical thing), it seems at first sight that he tries to find a "resolution of some sort before the text is closed" (cf. Eggins and Slade 1997: 267). However, Mm6 then refrains from doing this by stating again his opposed opinion. To sum up, although there might be an indication of disagreement in the above excerpt, both the lack of a real resolution stage and above all the prevailing generic structure indicate that example 20 can be labelled 'pejorative evaluation text'.

Finally, it has to be mentioned that an unambiguous categorisation of text types into particular generic varieties of casual talk is not always possible as ordinary interaction sometimes tends to display what I will hence consider 'hybrid' forms of talk.

### 8.3. Chat

In section 8.2. we investigated the nature of generically structured types of casual conversation. Accordingly, excerpts presented were examples of segments of talk which were more (cf. storytelling texts) or less (cf. gossip) amenable to generic analysis. In this section we turn to examples of casual talk where a generic analysis does not succeed at all. These non-generically structured segments or 'chats' will be briefly discussed and exemplified in this section.

What is 'chat'? It is widely acknowledged among many linguists that 'chat' simply refers to any ordinary talk about daily life, and thus it is often used as an equivalent of casual interaction (cf. Cheepen $1988^{42}$ ). As this thesis has already subdivided casual conversation into two groups, namely types of talk which can be assigned a generic structure formulation and those which are not amenable to generic analysis, so-called chats, it would by no means be legitimate to use chat as a generic term that comprises different varieties of interpersonal talk. Therefore, the term chat has to be defined more precisely in this thesis.

Referring to Eggins and Slade (1997: 230), casual conversation consists of different kinds of talk, namely chunks ${ }^{43}$ and chat. Chunks are embedded in chat sequences and vice versa ${ }^{44}$, or chats are followed by chunks followed by more chat (ibid.). Cheepen (1988: 15) also states that casual interaction often displays elements of both more formal speech types (what he calls 'non-phatic speech') and 'phatic communion'. Phatic communion, a term originally established by Malinowski (1923: 313-315), is "the language used in free, aimless social intercourse" and it is "deprived of any context of situation". It "does not [...] have any kind of goal comparable to that of" (Cheepen 1988: 16) generically structured types of casual interaction. Instead of phatic communion, Eggins and Slade (1997) use the term 'chat' in their work on analysing casual conversation. They argue that while the structure of chunks is relatively predictable, in chat segments the structure is "managed locally that is, turn by turn" (Eggins and Slade 1997: 230). This means that chat is amenable to analysis "that models conversation in terms of the micro-interaction, describing the move by move unfolding of talk" (Eggins and Slade 1997: 230). In this respect, Eggins and Slade (1997: 67) describe chat

[^33]as a spontaneous, highly interactive, non-generically structured and thus informal activity with rapid turn-taking.

Considering the basic functions of chat, many linguists agree that this type of informal speech is neither concerned with serious information nor is it goal or task oriented (cf. Holmes and Stubbe 2003: 88). Thus, it is often considered to be "marginal and purposeless" (ibid.). However, Eggins and Slade (1997: 229) deny the idea that chat can be defined as a minor discourse mode. According to them (ibid.), it has particular conversational functions: First of all, it enables speakers "not just to kill time [or to talk for the sake of talk], but rather to clarify and extend the interpersonal ties that have brought them together". Furthermore, as talk consists of both chat and chunks, chat segments often enable or lead up to chunks, which means that participants "co-operate in setting the scene" (Eggins and Slade 1997: 229) for chunks where topics are discussed in particular ways. In other words, topic movement is not necessarily a chance affair in casual talk, as suggested by researchers such as Crystal and Davy (1969: 115)) or Sinclair and Coulthard (1975: 4), it may also arise out of the interplay of chat and chunk segments. As opposed to this view, the afore-mentioned Crystal and Davy (ibid.) point out that with regard to topic management, casual conversation is characterized by
[...] the absence of any conscious planning as conversation proceeds. [Furthermore], [c]onversation does not take place in a series of coordinated blocks, but - especially as someone searches for the beginning of a topic - in a series of jumps [...]. There is a general absence of linguistic or cultural pressures to make the conversation go in a particular direction.

However, Cheepen (1988) contradicts the view that casual interaction distinguishes itself by a lack of topical organisation by arguing that
> topics are raised and discussed in particular ways, and arise largely out of particular elements in the discourse, which form part of the interactive basis of the dialogue; and, [...] there are occasions when it is possible to predict that topic change WILL occur, and also the DIRECTION [...] which it will take. [original emphasis]

In this thesis we neither claim that speakers do prepare the succession of topics in advance nor that the occurrence of certain topics can be predicted. This paper will merely attempt to briefly exemplify that topical organisation can be achieved by chat and chunks, or in other words, that chat segments can be designed to progress the conversation towards a new or
overall topic. In essence, in this thesis the term 'chat' is to be understood in the same way as Eggins and Slade's (1997) use of the term.

## EXAMPLE 21

648 Mm6: it's it's the joke in the Balkans we still have a borders on the Balkans in opposite 649 you're not feel that you are changing countries
650 All: @@@@@
651 Af3: and your country <@> doesn’t exist </@>
652 Mm6: <@> LN> ja </LN> <TRANSL=yes> </@>
653 All: @@@
654 Af3: <SOFT> yeah </SOFT>
655 Mm 6 : not (.) not for long (1) yeah that was quite far $<$ FAST $>$ because you are from
656 Greece you understand that the problem with you know with the name of my country
657 </FAST>=
658 Gf1: $=\mathrm{mhm}=$
659 Mm : =and it's quite funny when i have been in U.K. uh: usually when you're leaving 660 London uh any any airport or in U.K. when you're leaving it's no checking passport 661 regular passport control it's only checking for the luggage and usually the woman is 662 checking the passport (.) and i gave my passport to her and she is asking where are you 663 coming from and i said < @ > you can read it from the passport < @/> and she said what's 664 your country called <SOFT>you know </SOFT> and i really had no idea you know i said 665 i don't know M C D I M no idea <SOFT> you know </SOFT> and she said okay i will 666 check on the list <SOFT> you know </SOFT> and she's checking on the list and she said 667 this country is not exist you know but typical British <SOFT> you know </SOFT> < @ > 668 THIS COUNTRY IS NOT EXIST $</ @>$ hey come on $<@>$ come and enter in U.K. you 669 can see it's inside in stamps who published this passport <SOFT> you know </SOFT> and 670 she go to speak to: to with her boss and her boss come back and this took and managed the 671 problem and FINALLY on the end they managed the problem in the European Union 672 because of this problem with the name uh for country code for my country they used three 673 times x you know it's no: no name it's just three times for the country code you know like 674 <@> pornography three times $\mathrm{x}</$ @>
675 All: @@@
676 Af3: that's genetic disease
677 Mm6: <@> yeah </@>
678 Af3: triple x syndrome
679 All: @@@@@
680 Mm6: yeah it's funny experience.
681 Af3: and how do you travel to Austria?
682 Sf5: by bus (.) first time (.) so the first time so i'm not coming home for $<1>\mathrm{i}$ don't know $683</ 1>$ till the summer so i'll be here (.) i came by the bus it was: nine or eight NO (.) TEN 684 hours or so=
685 SX-m: $<1>$ uh $</ 1>$
686 Af3: $=\mathrm{mhm}=$
687 Sf5: =i travelled from my city to Belgrade the capitol and from Belgrade to Vienna it <2>
688 (.) was only </2>
689 Gf1: <2> where do you come from? </2>
690 Sf5: Pirot
691 Gf1: where is it near?

692 Sf5: in the near to the (.) Macedonian and Bulgarian <3> (.) border </3>
693 Gf1: <3> no which city is near? </3>
694 Mm6: Nis is the $<4>$ closest $</ 4>$
695 Sf5: <4> Nis Nis $</ 4>$ (1) it's it's $<5>$ a really $</ 5>$
696 Mm6: <5> i've been only once there </5>
697 Gf1: i've been also in Nis (.) (for a) very LONG stop with the bus

Example 21 illustrates a multiparty talk where several participants are contributing at some stage to the ongoing of conversation. But at one point in this interaction, speaker Mm6 takes the floor and is allowed to dominate the interaction for a certain period of time. As has already been analysed and discussed in section 8.2.1.1. (narratives (cf. example 13)), Mm6 starts telling a story in line 659. The right to tell a story is negotiated with the other participants in the previous segments of chat (lines 648-658), where speakers co-operate in setting the scene and finally enable Mm6 to present a topic at great length. After the story has been told, there are other chat segments which are highly interactive. Firstly, participants briefly react to Mm6's story by spontaneously commenting on it. Then, especially Af3's contribution in line 681 marks a shift in the interaction when she asks Sf5 how she actually travels to Austria. This speaker change may suggest that Sf5 is likely to take the floor and proceed with her own story about travelling. However, instead of 'allowing' a possible upcoming chunk, the other interactants debar her from dominating the conversation for an extended period by asking questions and briefly mentioning their own travelling experiences. In this way, they "clarify and extend the interpersonal ties that have brought them together" (Eggins and Slade (1997: 67), which is typical of chat. To summarize, example 21 shows a storytelling text embedded within a highly interactive context, or in other words, a sequence of chat followed by a chunk followed by more chat.

As we have seen in example 21, chat is a highly interactive activity with rapid turn-taking and frequently occurring overlaps. It cannot be generically analysed and thus we aimed at describing it by particularly looking at its speech functions ${ }^{45}$. In terms of English as a lingua franca, the above excerpt has shown that the linguistic description of chat provided by Eggins and Slade (ibid.) can directly be applied to casual conversations where people operate in English as a "contact language" ${ }^{46}$ (Firth 1996: 240). In this respect, it has to be mentioned that in my collection of data chat is the predominant text type in casual conversation as this kind of 'multiparty talk' outnumbers the so-called generic varieties of interpersonal talk. In their

[^34]study on casual conversation, Eggins and Slade (1997: 269) also point out that chat segments often constitute the main part of ordinary talk. Furthermore, they declare that chat with its obvious lack of a generic structure is an informal speech activity. Consequently, in our ongoing discussion of different degrees of formality in casual ELF conversation, one might claim that chat as an obviously predominant distinctive feature of casual talk indicates that interpersonal interaction is mainly informal. Nevertheless, in this thesis it is argued that formality is not a stable thing and thus interpersonal talk displays diverse levels of formality. Therefore, as do Eggins and Slade (1997) in their approach to analysing casual conversation, we do not consider different types of talk to be 'autonomous units' within talk as we do believe in interdependency between chat segments and chunks. Put differently, chat and the more formal ${ }^{47}$ chunks co-operate in conversation and thus the resulting interplay illustrates different degrees of formality within interpersonal interaction.

### 8.4. Summary and conclusion

In this chapter we investigated an intrinsic feature of casual talk, namely that it consists of chats and chunks. In this way, the analysis of generically structured and non-generically structured segments of talk considerably underlined the assumption that interpersonal talk is, in fact, not restricted to informality and thus can be assigned different degrees of formality. In other words, we consider the degree to which a segment of talk possesses "a definite pattern of organization of its interdependent parts" (Boehm et al. 1978), i.e. a detectable structure, to be a result of formality. Thus, according to linguists such as Hasan (1985: 61), Eggins and Slade (1997: 167), Heylighen and Dewaele (1999: 10) or Lepper (2000: 100), generic varieties of casual talk are structurally more complex and thus more formal than those "moments of rapid and highly interactive turn-taking" (Eggins and Slade 1997: 270) (chats). In this respect, Fairclough (1995: 14) generally denotes types of talk with a schematic structure "institutionalized language activities". On the other hand, it is acknowledged among the aforementioned linguists that chat is not amenable to generic analysis and thus it is informal. Based on the idea that chunks are "either more or less amenable to generic analysis" (Eggins and Slade 1997: 270), I will hence label types of talk which show a clearer structure 'more formal' and those which are less generically structured 'less formal'. To illustrate this

[^35]idea, casual talk, with regard to a classification into both structuring and different degrees of formality, is represented on a line in figure 1 :
Storytelling texts

Figure 1: Different degrees of formality in casual ELF talk, illustrated by distinctive types of interpersonal interaction (a modified version of Eggins and Slade's (1997: 270) model of generically structured and non-generically structured segments of conversation, supplemented by degrees of formality).

In figure 1, the vertical cline positions segments of casual conversation which display a clear generic structure and are hence more formal at the upper section of the axis, while less generically structured and thus less formal types of casual talk are placed at the lower section of the axis. Apparently, chat as a non-generically structured and informal segment is at the ultimate bottom of the cline. In short, figure 1 shows that due to chat and chunks casual talk shows diverse levels of formality. In this respect, it is important to stress that an unambiguous classification of text types is not always possible and therefore above all the generic forms of casual talk "should not be interpreted as fixed or rigid schema" (Eggins and Slade 1997: 238). In other words, although speakers orient to an underlying generic structure in interpersonal interaction, there is hardly an 'ideal' type of generically structured talk as participants often
tend to deviate from it or simply mix different genres in their speech ${ }^{48}$. Nevertheless, the concept of genre is a "useful [tool] for describing the globally structured [and thus more formal] moments in casual conversation" (ibid.).

As this thesis has already pointed out that formality is not necessarily a stable thing in casual talk, figure 2 illustrates the interplay of chats and chunks and the resulting variation in formality in a selected excerpt of talk from my ELF corpus. The extract of conversation represented in the graph is about travelling in Southern Europe. In this respect, the numbers at the x -axis indicate the line numbers in the attached transcription part ${ }^{49}$. Furthermore, the x axis displays the chronological sequence of distinctive text types in the excerpt, which is described in the following:
chat - storytelling - chat - storytelling - chat - storytelling - chat - opinion text - chat

The $y$-axis corresponds to the classification concept presented in figure 1 and shows how the detected types of interpersonal talk can be characterized in terms of different degrees of formality. While storytelling texts are evidently more formal than opinion texts, chats as nongenerically structured and thus completely informal speech activities are positioned at the very bottom.

[^36]

In essence, figure 2 illustrates that chunks and chat segments differing in formality can be allocated to speech situations. More precisely, chunks are seen as structurally more complex and thus more formal than chats. Bearing in mind Heylighen and Dewaele's (1999) formality measure (cf. section 5.2.3.), this thesis is now interested in re-investigating some of the text types in figure 2 by applying the F-score to it. In this respect, the following diagram (Table 4) displays the F-scores of a chunk, i.e. a storytelling text (cf. lines 802-813), and a chat (cf. lines 814-836) segment embedded in a conversation about the work of a Greek animal welfare centre ${ }^{50}$.

| lines | formal categories |  |  |  | informal categories |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | nouns | adject. | prepos. | articles | verbs | adverbs | pronouns interj. | formality |  |
| Chunk 802-813 | 17,98 | 5,04 | 12,23 | 13,67 | 23,74 | 5,04 | 17,98 | 4,32 | $\mathbf{4 8 , 9 2}$ |
| Chat | $814-836$ | 21,39 | 5,78 | 9,83 | 10,98 | 21,96 | 8,09 | 15,61 | 6,36 | $\mathbf{4 7 , 9 8}$

Table 4: Frequencies in percents and resulting formality scores for chunk and chat segments in casual ELF talk (based on the model provided by Heylighen and Dewaele (1999: 19))


When we look at the F-scores in table 4 and the corresponding diagram (figure 3), we notice that the F -score of the more formal chunk segment (storytelling) ( $\mathrm{F}=48,92$ ) only scores slightly higher than the one of the chat ( $\mathrm{F}=47,98$ ). In addition to this, we neither see a considerable portion of so-called formal word categories (nouns, articles, adjectives,

[^37]prepositions) in the storytelling text, nor do we detect a peculiar portion of informal categories (verbs, adverbs, pronouns, interjections) in the chat segment. Put differently, in my example the frequency of so-called formal and informal word classes is almost equal in both chat and chunk. So, the increase or decrease of certain word categories in different types of talk need not necessarily be the only reliable approach to revealing different degrees of formality in speech.

However, this thesis neither hypothesizes that an analysis of formality based on word classes is not appropriate for investigating casual talk, nor that the relatively high F-score for the informal chat segment in my example can be seen as a result of ELF interaction: it rather proposes to consider my own results as a call for establishing a different way of revealing degrees of formality in talk among speakers who use English as a lingua franca.

As already mentioned in this paper, Heylighen and Dewaele (1999), in their study on measuring formality in different languages such as English, French, Italian and Dutch, focus their attention on revealing different degrees of formality in genres, that is to say, in oral or written texts which are generically structured. However, this approach to primarily analysing genres obviously excludes a certain type of oral language production where a generic analysis does not succeed at all - so-called 'chats'. In this respect, as do Eggins and Slade (1997), this thesis argues that speech considerably consists of chat segments and therefore an analysis in terms of formality has to incorporate both generically structured and non-structured parts of talk. Put differently, besides word classes above all the existence or non-existence of a detectable and salient generic structure of speech segments can be a pivotal factor that indicates whether talk is more or less formal. Consequently, as opposed to researchers such as Gelas (1988) or Heylighen and Dewaele (1999), it is hypothesized in this paper that attention to structure is a theoretically more fundamental approach to investigating formality than concentrating on word classes.

## 9. Humour

### 9.1. Introduction

Whilst I was busily engaged in transcribing my data, I soon came to the conclusion that humour or lightheartedness seem to be essential characteristics of casual ELF talk. This insight can be traced back to the fact that a considerably high portion of discussions in my corpus is overlayed by humorous features - laughter in particular ${ }^{51}$. As linguists such as Eggins and Slade (1997) also consider humour to be a distinctive feature of casual interaction, and as we are concerned with gradually compiling the framework for a detailed description of casual ELF talk with regard to different degrees of formality, we hence regard humour as a further significant component in the entire developing process. Thus, I will offer here a brief discussion of humour and its relevance to casual ELF talk.

### 9.2. Functions of humour

Eggins and Slade (1997: 20) consider humour to be a pervasive linguistic feature in casual conversation when they define casual talk as in the following:
[Casual conversation] refer[s] to interactions which are not motivated by a clear pragmatic purpose, and which display informality and humour [...]" (Eggins and Slade) (emphasis added).

But why do we use humour in casual talk? According to Eggins and Slade (1997: 156),
humour seems to enable interactants to speak 'off the record', to make light of what is perhaps quite serious to them, in other words to say things without strict accountability, either to themselves or to others.

Mulkay (1988) also points out that the use of humour allows speakers to simultaneously convey 'serious' and 'non-serious' meanings. In this respect, "interactants can claim either that the 'serious' meaning was not intended, or that the 'non-serious' meaning was not"

[^38](ibid.). However, humour enables participants to show ambiguity and speak without accountability.

A more profound description of humour and its functions in interaction is carried out by Holmes and Stubbe (2003). According to them (2003: 110), humour in interaction distinguishes itself by two basic functions: First of all, it may "provide an acceptable vehicle for contesting power" (ibid.) or exercising authority. Similarly, Eggins and Slade (1997: 167) also point out that although humour might be seen as a salient feature of casual talk, it also functions to negotiate power, which is usually a typical activity that describes more formal talk in the workplace:

Humour provides interactants in casual conversation with a resource for exercising discursive power, and so slipping out of the non-hierarchic relations of the casual context and into the hierarchic patterns of formal, public contexts.
(ibid.) [emphasis added]

Secondly, humour may also serve as a socially oriented means of constructing harmonious relations or solidarity among status differentiated speakers or between equals (Holmes and Stubbe 2003: 110-117). In this respect, Holmes and Stubbe (2003: 111) claim that
[s]hared humour emphasises common ground and shared norms. A humorous comment which elicits a positive response (such as a laugh or a smile), [...], indicates that the speaker shares with others a common view about what is amusing - thus creating or maintaining solidarity [...].

Accordingly, the forthcoming examples in this section will illustrate that responsive laughter from the listener frequently implies understanding of content, agreeing or support and thus the willingness to accept and create intimacy between interlocutors. As an extensive analysis of humour is not a prevailing matter of this thesis, I will only present a few but nonetheless persuasive conversational excerpts which outline both the basic types and effects of humour in my small-scale ELF corpus ${ }^{52}$.

Finally, building on their findings, Holmes and Stubbe (2003: 114) argue that humour with its function of amusing and thus constructing solidarity (or doing collegiality) typically occurs in informal speech situations, namely in socially oriented or interpersonal speech. However, in

[^39]more formal institutional speech humour pre-eminently functions as a strategic means of doing power or showing authority.

This position fits neatly with our discussion of different degrees of formality in casual conversation. Paradoxically, humour is on the one hand a distinctive feature of everyday talk (establishing solidarity and intimacy) and on the other hand it may also display identifying characteristics of institutional interaction (exercising authority or doing power). Adopting this perspective, it can be argued in our discussion on different degrees of formality in casual ELF talk that the concept of humour might challenge the idea that both a rigid conceptual separation of casual and professional talk and an unambiguous assignment of the terms 'informal' and 'formal' to the aforementioned types of conversation respectively do make sense or are even possible. It is this critical perspective which will be further developed in the subsequent section of this chapter. Furthermore, it will also be investigated whether typical humorous devices, such as 'teasing', telling 'dirty jokes' or 'funny stories' and using 'hyperbole’ (cf. Eggins and Slade 1997: 155) do occur among participants who do not use English as a native language but as a means of conversing with people with various mother tongues, i.e. as a lingua franca.

### 9.3. Humorous devices

### 9.3.1. Teasing

## EXAMPLE 22

1729 Mm6: (3) what about you Am2 (.) what's your plans after graduation?
1730 Am2: <1> um: </1>
1731 Mm6: <1><@>doing interviews? </@> </1>
1732 All: @@@
1733 Am2: no intend to become a teacher.

Example 22 shows a teasing sequence which involves a participant teasing one member. The first tease is set up by Mm6 when he asks Am2 for his future job ambitions. What appears to be an ordinary question to the uninformed reader turns out to be an initiating tease as Mm6 is a close acquaintance of Am2 and therefore already knows Am2's plans after graduation. Besides this, it has to be mentioned that while most participants were involved in the previous
discussion, Am2 abstained from participating in it. Thus, it is most likely that the first tease set up by Mm6 acts as a "strategy to fix Am2 as the centre of attention" (cf. Eggins and Slade 1997: 159). The second and more salient tease alludes to Am2's positions as both the host and initiator of the 'table talk', in line 1731 Mm 6 anticipates Am2's answer by alleging that Am2's future ambitions will not exceed doing interviews. Although teasing might sometimes be seen as a face attack that enables speakers to emphasize power or authority, it is most likely that the above teasing sequence predominantly serves as a source of entertainment or as an expression of solidarity (cf. Holmes and Stubbe 2003: 117).

### 9.3.2. Jokes

Eggins and Slade (1997: 160) define jokes as devices that "function in part as a test or puzzle for listeners, who may lose face if they are unable to 'get' the joke, [and thus] [...] jokes are membership tests". In this respect, Eggins and Slade (ibid.) primarily use the term 'dirty joke' to refer to the specifically sexual meanings which are often implied in joking. In my ELF data, jokes or dirty jokes do not occur at all. Bearing in mind the aforementioned idea that membership plays an important role in joking, I suggest the following explanation for the absence of jokes in $m y^{54}$ ELF corpus: as ELF speakers do have different cultural backgrounds, they might desist from making jokes because "what [...] is funny in one [social] context, for one [social] group of interactants, may well not be [...] for a different [social] group of interactants" (Eggins and Slade 1997: 157). For this reason I believe that jokes among ELF speakers are often created contextually and not culturally, which means that funniness arises as participants do have a common knowledge of a social context.

### 9.3.3. The funny story

## EXAMPLE 23

2031 Mm6: $=<$ FAST $>$ yeah yeah yeah </FAST> (2) but we have a competition in my country 2032 on on on one mountain and it's very nice usually they give to the winner small dog uh 2033 our native dog uh uh (xx) dog call it <L1=MACEDONIAN> xxxx
$2034</$ L1 =MACEDONIAN you know and it's so funny usually they give $<1>$ (same) $</ 1>$
2035 Af3: $<1>$ alive dog? $</ 1>=$

[^40]2036 Mm6: =yeah alive dog <2> PUPPY (.) of this (x) you know </2>
2037 SX-f: <2>@@@</2>
2038 Am2: <3> instead of what? </3>
2039 Mm6: <3> yeah it's a SHEPHERD dog and it's very nice. $</ 3>=$
2040 SX-3: $=$ a shepherd dog=
2041 Mm6: =yeah
2042 Am2, Af3: @@@@@
2043 Mm6: $<4>$ when it become </4> (.) when it become large it's almost like <LN>
2044 Bernhardiners </LN> <TRANSL=St Bernard (dogs)> it's really large dog you know it's
2045 so large @@
2046 Af3: <4> <@> (it's ) a <L1=GERMAN> Fernsehwastl </L1=GERMAN>
2047 <TRANSL=mascot of Austrian TV show Musikantenstadl> </@> <4>

The third and most frequent humorous device used in my ELF corpus is the funny story. In this excerpt, Mm6 does not only claim the right to tell a story, he also announces that he will tell a 'funny story' (cf. it's so funny in line 2034). In this regard, Eggins and Slade (1997: 161) argue that while the narrator is telling a funny story, the other participants are expected to "suspend their turn-taking rights" and to guerdon the narrator with laughter. For good or ill, what seems to be a rather structured procedure among native-speakers of English, looks different when funny stories are told among my ELF participants. Although the above extract of conversation denotes a detectable structure, the narrator is often interrupted by laughter, questions or interjections. Even so, this excerpt shows that omnipresent overlaps do not necessarily hinder successful story telling in casual ELF talk.

### 9.3.4. Funny remarks

## EXAMPLE 24

1315 Gf1: MANY tourists do that for example in in $<2>$ (x) island $</ 2>$ we have many danes
1316 there i have even found uh condoms in the ancient sights (.) on the ancient stones (.)
1317 condom stones and beers broken.
1318 Mm 6 : <2> in Greece </2>
1319 Mm6: uh there wasn't danish man <FAST> they're swedish </FAST>.
1320 All: @@@@@@

Further frequent indications of humour in my casual ELF data are what I will hence label 'funny remarks'. In my corpus, funny remarks are often ironically used either to emphasize a speaker's attitude towards a social context or to contribute to an easing of tension. In this respect, Gf1 talks about 'condom stones' (cf. line 1317) in order to call attention to the serious problem of 'brainless' waste disposal on a certain Greek island caused by Danish tourists.

Considering the fact that one member among the participants in this table talk actually is from Denmark, Mm6 tries to ease the situation by asserting that the 'wrongdoers' are of Swedish origin (cf. line 1319).

### 9.3.5. Hyperbole

## EXAMPLE 25

1127 Gf1: i had very much fun but uh: other Greeks DIDN'T (.) i mean when you come from
1128 Athens and you go to Nicosia (.) you feel like you went from New York to: $<1><@>$ i
1129 don't know $</$ @ $</ 1><2>$ to: $</ 2>$ (xx) island $<3>$ @@@ $</ 3>$ i don't know
1130 Mm6: <1> @ @ </1>
1131 Af3: <2> Unterstinkenbrunn </2>
1132 All: <3>@@@</3>

In example 25, the use of pejorative or exaggerated remarks is a further realization of the humorous devices speakers tend to use in casual conversations. In this respect, Eggins and Slade (1997: 163) consider this phenomenon to be 'hyperbolic' ways of speaking as interactants in interpersonal talk often make use of "amplification, in association with pejorative appraising items". Thus, when Gf1 refers to Nicosia, the capital of Cyprus, as a 'jerkwater town', it has to be interpreted as humorous as the more likely reading of this funny remark is that Gf1 simply accounts Nicosia much smaller than Athens. So does Af3 when she mentions the small Austrian village 'Unterstinkenbrunn' for the purpose of comparison. Although it is assumed that most participants in this ELF conversation will neither know the place which is comparatively referred to by Gf1, nor by Af3, they make sense of these exaggerated comments by interpreting them as humorous. Consequently, hyperbole as an indication of humour does not necessarily presuppose that interactants do have to posses the same mother tongue or social identity; it also functions among speakers "for whom English is [simply] the chosen foreign language of communication" (Firth 1996: 240).

### 9.4. Summary and conclusion

To sum up, the above discussion of selected examples from my data has illustrated a range of humorous devices common in casual ELF conversation. In this respect, the funny story is the most frequent type of humour used by participants in my small-scale ELF corpus. Funny
remarks are further frequent indications of humour or lightheartedness in my data. Teasing and hyperbole do sporadically appear, whereas jokes are an absolute exception.

The basic insight we gained from analysing humour in casual ELF talk reads as follows: Besides chats and chunks, we have also found humorous devices to be a possible resource for indicating degrees of formality. Referring to Eggins and Slade (1997: 167), humour often provides participants in interpersonal conversation with a resource for exercising power, which is typical of more formal talk. Accordingly, participants in casual ELF talk are supposed to establish hierarchic patterns and thus more formal contexts through the use of certain humorous devices such as teasing or funny remarks in particular. Put differently, when we tease other participants or make fun of them or things they can relate to, it is obvious that power is not equally distributed (Cameron 2001: 102). Consequently, this constraint or imbalance of power in interpersonal interaction indicates that a predominantly informal speech situation becomes more formal.

Even so, with regard to my own data, it has to be mentioned that although some participants did not know each other before, there is a certain kind of intimacy and almost amicable key tone which characterizes the way people interact in my taped conversation. Thus, no one takes other participant's comments too seriously or even feels offended by them. In this regard, laughter often seems to be a way of '(superficially) paying attention or even tribute' to humorous utterances conducted by other interactants. In other words, humorous devices in my speech corpus do neither license a challenge nor indicate a means of contesting authority or power, they are rather used to create intimacy or strengthen solidarity among people with different social identities.

However, this is exactly the point where I do see a problematic facet in using the concept of humour as a possible device for revealing different degrees of formality in casual conversation. Bearing in mind the discussion of chat and chunk segments in the previous chapter, one could raise the following question: What about, for instance, teasing embedded in chat segments? Would this mean that even chat with its absence of a schematic structure becomes a more formal speech activity? Considering the idea that only text types which can be described as having a generic structure are amenable to an analysis in terms of formality, this can by no means be answered in the affirmative. As it has still been not possible to provide definite answers to these questions, this thesis suggests that more work is needed
before a complete understanding of this phenomenon can be reached. However, in this paper the idea that humour may function as a means of establishing power and thus formality in interpersonal talk will not be further investigated. For this reason I only consider the 'funny story' to be a humorous device that may serve as an indication of formality in casual speech as the funny story "requires the production of a chunk of monologic talk unfolding in a predictable, staged way" (Eggins and Slade 1997: 160).

## 10. Conclusion and outlook

The basic aim of this thesis was to describe different degrees of formality in casual ELF talk. For this purpose, casual ELF data had to be collected, described and thoroughly analyzed. However, before I devoted myself to the acquisition of appropriate speech material, I had to clarify what kind of spoken language I was actually focusing on in this thesis. In other words, I had to define and investigate the linguistic nature of casual talk as a linguistic phenomenon of its own. In so doing, I began to realize that it is not always easy to set the boundaries between casual and professional conversation. Later on, during the analytical part of my research, I was faced with another problematic issue: I had to establish a concept of formality that would underline my initial assumption that casual talk is not totally restricted to informality but may also display different degrees of formality.

As mentioned above, the first analytical step of this thesis was to critically define casual talk. In this respect, the current work attempted to show that a distinction between interpersonal and institutional talk is sometimes difficult to draw and can thus be criticized for the following reason: Talk often displays features of both formal and informal interaction. In other words,
particularly when authentic [talk] [is] investigated there always seem to remain examples of activities that the participants orient to and label as [casual] but that only partly fit the definition of the prototypical event. (Oeberg 1995: 51)

For this reason I agree with Holmes and Stubbe (2003: 88-89) who point out that "talk is inherently multifunctional" and thus a strict and unambiguous classification in terms of casual or professional interaction is not always possible. In this context, they (2003: 89) particularly emphasize that even in professional or institutional interaction participants are "unavoidably involved in constructing, maintaining or modifying the interpersonal relationship between themselves and their addressee(s)". As a result, researchers have still not agreed on an adequate and unambiguous definition of the concept of casual talk (Oeberg 1995: 18).

However, this thesis attempted to illustrate at least the complexity of sketching the basic conditions within which casual ELF talk may take place. In so doing, it was argued that setting does neither unambiguously indicate whether talk is casual or professional, nor does it reveal different degrees of formality in conversation. Consequently, the term 'psychological
setting' was introduced in order to describe any casual interaction as "the only place where we are really free to be ourselves" (Eggins and Slade 1997: 17). This means that casual talk provides a 'space' that enables us to reveal both our social self and interpersonal needs in a given speech situation. In terms of linguistic peculiarities, the investigation in this thesis has shown that casual talk is indeed a complex discourse type. In essence, casual interaction was described as a highly interactive, spontaneous speech activity with a varying distribution of turns and a high degree of speaker and topic change. Accordingly, it displays a lot of interruptions or overlaps as interactants often speak "'on their own behalf" and take turns on their own initiative, without being directed by any one member of the group" (Kress 1985: 25). Considering this perspective, one might hence argue that casual talk distinguishes itself above all by an incoherent or even chaotic sequence of speech fragments. However, this was exactly the point where this thesis set out to demonstrate that interpersonal conversation does show structured phases. In other words, the study has shown that even interpersonal interaction can be amenable to generic analysis. Adopting Eggins and Slade's (1997) model of generic structure formulation, I detected more and less generically structured text types, socalled chunks, in my small-scale casual ELF speech corpus. Although a generic analysis accounted for a considerable proportion of my ELF data, there were also segments of talk that could not be generically described. These highly interactive 'chat' segments had no schematic structure and often co-operated with chunks by progressing the conversation towards a new or overall topic. As a consequence, an analysis of casual talk (in both ENL and ELF) has to consider both chat and chunks as the interplay of generically structured and non-generically structured segments of talk sheds light on the skeletal structure or linguistic nature of casual interaction.

The main part of this thesis was then devoted to the focus of research, i.e. describing different degrees of formality in casual ELF talk. Referring to the subject of measuring formality in speech, many linguists (cf. Crystal and Davy 1969, Singleton 1984, Halliday 1985, Heylighen and Dewaele 1999) have focused their attention on investigating above all word classes or grammatical forms. As a result, they considered nouns, articles, adjectives and prepositions to be typical representatives of formal speech, while a high portion of verbs, adverbs, pronouns and interjections was seen as an indication of informality in speech. For this purpose, Heylighen and Dewaele (1999) introduced an empirical measure of formality, the F-score ${ }^{55}$, based on the frequencies of different word classes in a spoken corpus. According to them, the

[^41]noun versus verb distinction should finally indicate whether a speaker uses a more or less formal style. However, when applying this formality measure to my own data, I did not detect a clear correlation between formal and informal word classes in certain speech situations. In other words, the concept of nominalization or verbalization did not unambiguously serve as a means of identifying different degrees of formality in selected examples of conversation. Thus, this thesis was interested in establishing a different way of revealing formality in talk. Finally, the concept of formality used in this thesis is briefly summarized in the following:

I have argued in this thesis that generic structure patterns "operate to build 'chunks' of talk, [...] within the flow of chat" (Eggins and Slade 1997: 54). In addition to this, it was stated that generic varieties of casual talk (chunks) are structurally more complex than segments of talk that do not posses a generic structure (chat) (cf. Lepper 2000: 100, Hasan 1985: 61, Eggins and Slade 1997: 270). Adopting this perspective, it was suggested that the demarcation between structured and non-structured text types is one way in which different degrees of formality in casual interaction can be explored. In other words, I attempted to demonstrate that a generic analysis provides a way of classifying talk into more and less formal speech. As a result, as do Eggins and Slade (1997: 270), I positioned chunks that show a clear structure (e.g. storytelling texts) and are thus more formal on top of a cline, while highly interactive, less structured and thus less formal generic varieties (e.g. gossip) were placed underneath at the pole. Chat as a non-generically structured type of talk was positioned at the ultimate bottom of the cline and thus considered as totally informal. Building on these findings, this thesis suggests using the following steps of generic analysis in order to detect different degrees of formality in casual ELF talk:

1. investigating whether a text type reveals a distinctive and detectable generic structure or not
2. defining and labelling the text type
3. specifying the degree of formality according to the model presented in section 8.4. (cf. figure 1)

Although none of my findings has been fully confirmed yet, I dare to say that the concept and the empirical measure of formality proposed in this thesis can be seen as a further tool in the domain of analysing degrees of formality in spoken ELF discourse.

Finally, I hope that this thesis made a contribution to the description of ELF and casual ELF talk in particular. In this respect, researchers are invited to examine or adopt my formality measure in their approach to analysing speech in English as a lingua franca. Moreover, this study is also intended to allow linguists to investigate my data and transcriptions for other aspects than different degrees of formality in casual ELF talk.
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Appendix
＜gaprec 00：04＞
Gf1：okay（then
Gfl：okay（then i will start）（．）my name is［Gf1］（．）i come from Athens（．）Greece（．）and i Studies（1）uh Byza

Gf1：（．）unfortunately＜LN＞xx＜／LN＞（．）＜LN＞also＜／LN＞＜TRANSL＝well＞（1）um（1） Byzantine Studies uh Byzantium（．）Byzantine Empire is the medieval empire that lasted from eastern middle ages（2）＜2＞so＜／2＞

Af3：＜2＞it＇s not about the antique Greece？（．）that＇s medieval（1）＜／2＞ Gf1：$\langle 3\rangle$ it＇s medieval $\langle/ 3>$ it＇s medieval it＇s after the Romans Af3：＜3＞later＜ $13>$ mhm
Gf1：it＇s medieval Greece

Gf1：it＇s medieval Greece and the whole empire was uh from：（．）as i said thousand hundred years（．）lasted thousand hundred years and was extended from：Spain to：all all REACHED Spain and on the sixth century to：（1）i would say uh um：Asia minor（．）so all Mediterranean
area till Danube（．）northern（．）so the borders were from Danube northern to North Africa （southern）＝

Af3：＝that＇s very huge（1）
Gf1：〈4＞＜＠＞yeah it was hu
Gf1：＜4＞＜＠＞yeah it was huge＜／＠＞＜／4＞then western Spain and eastern：i would say： todays：um which land is there now（．）Georgia（4）
Af3：＜4＞＠＠＠＜／4＞
Gf1：okay that＇s＜＠＞all＜／＠＞i would say eastern Middle Ages studies which means
cultural history archaeology＜FAST＞when we say archaeology in Greece＜／FAST＞（．）uh we mean also history of arts are the same things（．）archaeology and history of arts are the same departments

Am2：＜1＞and uh may i ask you why you study in Vienna＜／1＞
Af3：＜1＞mhm＜／1＞
Gf1：＜2＞i＇m not＜／2＞
Am2：＜2＞why you have chosen to study in Vienna＜／2＞
Gf1：i＇m not doing my main studies here i came here to do my master and my PhD cause here is a very famous centre of Byzantine Studies that was established uh almost hundred＜＠＞ years ago＜／＠＞（．）with a very extended library uh and the good thing is that＝

Gf1：well ghat or middle（and）ancient Greece or new Greece＝

Gf1：and there always were had very much of an interest and many of the：um boo：ks of the eighteenths uh sorry nineteenths century were written by german scholars（1）they were very into it（．）they would dig english＜3＞＠＠＠＜／3＞ SX－3：＜3＞＠＠＠＜／3＞

Gf1：anyway and uh so：the problem in Greece is that uh when you do master and Phd you have such a（．）（tense）observation like here cause there are huge universities with many many
students on the same facul－um sorry（．）um（2）on the＜4＞sa：me＜／4＞ students on the same facul－um sorry（．）um（2）on the＜4＞sa：me＜／4＞

Am2：＝institute
Gf1：（．）not institute uh faculty
Gf1：and so：＜FAST＞and the professors are kind of＜／FAST＞（xxx）（．）so：they are kind of
difficult to find difficult to：have appointments with them and uh you are kind of lost in the bureaucracy（．）so to say＝

Gf1：（1）of course uh sometimes i i would like to be：studying in Greece cau：se the things i＇m

－ ค웅 lessons cause uh have the Greek（1）the teaching the main teaching of the greek language are
at the institute＝

Gf1：＝so mostly people come（for）the greek language and then＜FAST＞i don＇t know
＜／FAST＞they easily get uh are interested in the thing of Byzantine Studies and New Greek
Gf1：＝so mostly people come（for）the greek language and then＜FAST＞i don＇t know
＜／FAST＞they easily get uh are interested in the thing of Byzantine Studies and New G this thing is good thing about this institute is uh $i$ also wanted to learn at the same time very good german（．）cause if istayed in Greece i would have forgotten even my english（1）＜1＞ $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\nabla}$

Gfl：＝cause＜LN＞ja＜／LN＞＜TRANSL＝yes＞cause you don＇t speak any english you don＇t have the chance to speak uh the language＜FAST＞a foreign language＜／FAST＞when you are in the country ALL the time（．）and we go：a bit around in the country to gather experiences （．）you grow mature（．）that（will）count very much＝
Af3．＝and your dissertation is written in german or

Af3：＝and your dissertation is written in german or in english？＝

$\mathrm{Am} 2:<2>\mathrm{mhm}</ 2>$ mentality of writing is different of course（．）＜FAST＞there is a german school as we say an english school a greek school＜／FAST＞in writing and（．）interpreting also things（1）um but
uh＜LN＞$j a<$ LLN $><$ TRANSL＝yes＞ Af3：＝and do you have to travel around a lot？

Gf1：（．）around what you mean？
Af3：（．）uh to many countries to many different countries

 when was that（is also）（．）but the good thing here is that this there is a very extensive library （．）a small institute（．）the professor is SO close to you that you can always have uh intense help from him that＇s very good and uh（．）you can have the books practically at your feet＝ Af3：$=\mathrm{mhm}=$

Gf1：＝i mean you want the book you just go grab grab the book you don＇t need bureaucracy
in between you and the book（1）that＇s the problem um um i never liked HUGE spaces in the way of the space in the way of huge uh environments where i can（get lost）betwee：n bureaucracy $\langle 2>$ a：nd uh $</ 2>$

Gf1：（1）〈LN＞$j a</ L N\rangle<T R A N S L=y e s>()$.$i like it here that＇s uh so um small and extended$ at the same time and very good work is being done
Af3：（．）and how many people uh are studying uh By

Af3：（．）and how many people uh are studying uh Byzantinistik＜［baIsantinistik］＞in Vienna？
Gf1：（．）well we actually a lot FOR Vienna meaning um（i didn＇t count）the new members uh
 Am2：＝fifty people（．）oh that＇s a lot＝
Gf1：＝and we have also many people fr

Gf1：＝and we have also many people from come that come from other institutes（．）and have
lessons cause uh have the Greek（1）the teaching the main teaching of the greek language are Af3：＝mhm＝
Gf1：＝so mos
$\infty_{\infty}^{\infty} \infty \infty \infty$
\＆の
ふのすそのかの

Gf1：（．）cause um unfortunately（it）is（handed in）by everyone in English（．）so（xxx）with English＝

Af3：$=m h m$
Gf1：$(1)<3>$ i mean i would＜／3＞
Af3：＜3＞that＇s the same with science＜／3＞＜4＞＠＠＜／4＞
Gf1：＜4＞＠＜／4＞

응
$\qquad$
Am2：i speak more english and french a：nd sometimes sometimes $i$ do have the problem that
i＇m not quite sure how to pronounce german words＝ i＇m not quite sure how to pronounce german words＝
Gf1，Af3：＝＠＠＠
Am2：if i have to pronounce the final／r／in a word cause in english＜FAST＞in british english ＜／FAST $>$ you don＇ do it $=$
SX－ $1:=\langle 3\rangle$ yeah，yeah $\langle 13\rangle$
Am2：$\langle 3\rangle$ and sometimes $i$ get quite confused $\langle/ 3\rangle=$ （8）
Am2：so i have to ask Af3＝
Gf1，Af3：＝＠＠＠＠＠＠
Am2：＜4＞yeah，yes＜／4＞
Gf1：you were born here？
Am2．i was born here
Am2：cause i studied so much uh british english pronunciation（．）and（．）yeah sometimes i get Auite confused with german＝

## Gf1：yeah cause by by An－glistik you learn a LOT about pronunciation＝

Am2：＝yeah
Gf1：a lot um
Af3：and the next thing is our our dialect
Gf1：oh yeah
Af3：and the next thing is our our dialect
Gf1：oh yeah
ff：＜1＞＜＠＞it complicates the（whole）situation＜／＠＞＜／1＞
Gf1：＜$>$ and you are（．）you talk a lot＜＠＞dialect also＜erman dialect？
Gf1：um kind of（．）german or austrian？
Am1：austrian dialect well um in the beginning i had really much of a problem＝
Gf1：（i think it anything）and but slowly yeah i figure out cause i know cause i have studied language as itself i mean（．）i am also philologist（．）so i know WHAT to pay attention to i know that the［a］is gonna be［o］sometimes＜FAST＞and stuff like that＜／FAST＞so i know what（when）to focus and to understand uh what＇s being said but when Af3 speaks＜＠＞for
example＜／＠＞it＇s not always so easy cause she speaks very fast also＝齐
Gf1：yeah：of courrse
Af3：i didn＇t know that＜2＞＠＠＠＠＠＠＠＜／2＞
Gf1：＜2＞＠＠＠＠＠＠＠＜／2＞even even Barbara told me uh you＇re telling me i speak the
austrian dialect and what uh what do you think about that（xxx）＜＠＞do you understand Af3 she then asked me＜／＠＞and i said well it depends＝
Af3：＝she has the same dialect we are from the same
Gf1：i don＇t know she just uh she doesn＇t use it so much i think 〈FAST〉 when she talks to
 Dm4：＝no i agree i don＇t think she speaks so much dialect
SX－1：mhm yeah
Dm4：cause i have troubles understanding that dialects（．）as uh if i know the people it＇s not a
problem cause at my work i speak german also and i have gotten to know the people i know

[^42]Af3：＝mhm yeah
Gfl：（1）that＇s unf
Gf1：（1）that＇s unfortunate i mean in german of course german is not a flexible language as certain place the words and＜FAST＞stuff like that so this takes TIME＜／FAST＞but uh（2）in ten in a beter in german or couse cetain terms of are incture and english now of course i have to look into dictionaries ALTHOUGH the writing of the place now or in another place＜1＞＠＠＠＠＠＜／1＞
f3：＜1＞＠＠＠＠＠＜／1＞
Af3：＜1＞＠＠＠＠＠＜／1＞
Gf1：＜2＞did i put the verb
Af3：＜2＞yeah＜／2＞
f3：＜3＞＠＠＠＠＜／3＞
Af3：＝in in Gene Sciences uh it＇s much easier to write in english because all the literature is in english and all ther terms are in english＝
Gf1：＝mhm
Af3：（．）you have to back－translate it from german to english and that＇s that＇s very
complicated
＜gaprec 00：08＞ Gf1：i＇m slowly forgetting my greek forgetting my＜4＞i don＇t know＜／4＞
Gf1：i＇m slowly having a mediocre（．）uh level of all my languages cause i＇m mixing＜FAST＞ hore i speak wih Jim in engish＜／FAST＞outside ispeak german uh at he schoolicles and
sometimes greek uh i have to write some things in greek in greece in greek uh for articles and
stuff like that $($ ）and i see that i do so much mistakes in my greek now＜5＞and that＇s so （worse）＜／5＞
Gf1：mistake when i mean mistake uh mistakes not mistakes in a way of（．）＜6＞i don＇t know
Af3：＜6＞mixing up words＜／6＞
Gf1：orthography or stuff like that uh i＇m not using scientific words＜FAST＞so to say ＜／FAST＞like i used to（．）i＇m not using u：m（．）high greek（1）high level greek（．）like i used
to and like it＇s needed in academic uh level（2）（at this）um i＇m lacking of of uh＝ to and like it＇s needed in academic uh level（2）（at this）um i＇m lacking of of uh＝ Af3：＝you＇re developing a slang language
Gf1：more more（or less）
Af3：mhm
Gf1：my vocabulary is been slowly very reduced（1）cause i＇m not um very expressive with my greek any more
Am2：i know that prot
Af3：＜1＞＠＠＠＜／1＞he has that problem with german now＜2＞＠＠＠＜／2＞ Am2：＜2＞oh yeah＠＠＜／2＞
Gf1：＜2＞＠＠＠＜／2＞yeah it＇s exactly（xx） Dm4：you speak more english now？
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Gf1: <SOFT> how long? </SOFT>
Dm4: <2> uh: </2>
Gf1: <2> three years </2> (.) <3> or something </3>
Dm4: <3> yeah three years or something </3>
Gf1: yeah=
Af3: =mhm
Am2: and where did you meet (.) each other?
Gf1: <4> @ @ @ </4>
Af3: <4> first time </4>
Gf1: through a Cradle of Filth concert
Am2: <5> uhum </5>
Gf1, Af3: <5> @ @ @ @ @ </5>
Am2: <6> so you're both </6>
Af3: <6> you hear Cradle of Filth? </6>=
Am2: =you're both into metal music?
Gf1: mhm
Dm4: <7> yeah but not so much Cradle </7> (.) <@> Cradle any more actually </@>
<7> <door bell rings> </7>
Af3: shall we interrupt?
Am2: YES
<gapnrec $00: 12><$ Sf5, Mm6 enter the room>
Am2: so we have just started to introduce ourselves
Sf5: okay (.) shall i introduce myself too?
Am2: oh yes please=
Sf5:

how to speak so it's okay but if i have to speak to someone new it can be very difficult to understand=

Am2: <3> of course </3> cause i couldn't understand it i couldn't read it german i could read german and ithought i could understand it but i found out pretty fast that it is very difficult to understand (.) Af3: and=

Dm4: =cause of the austrian dialect
Af3: and there are several dialects in Austria
Gf1: <LN> ja </LN> <TRANSL=yes>
Af3: it's it's sometimes difficult to understand someone from Vorarlberg
Dm4: mhm
Af3: they speak <@> very fast </@>
Gf1: well that's the problem in all countries=
Af3: $=\mathrm{mhm}$
Gf1: in Greece we have several dialects also i mean (.) i lived four years in Cyprus (but)
THERE i had difficulties $\langle 1\rangle$ @ @ </1> Af3: <1> @ @ @ </1>

Gf1: i mean in the beginning i: was saying to people REPEAT REPEAT < @ > because i don't understand </@> slowly and greekly <2> @ @ @ </2> so to say

Af3. and and Sf5 he doesn't have this problem because he is Macedonian and his country is
so small and he knows every town and every small village there=
Am2: $=$ every person=
Af3: $=\langle 3\rangle\langle$ @ $\rangle$ every person is good $\langle/ @\rangle$
Af3: $=\langle 3\rangle\langle @\rangle$ every person is good $\langle/ @\rangle$
Gf1: $\langle 3\rangle\langle @\rangle$ every person $\langle/ @\rangle$
Am2: <3> @ @ @ </3>
russian (.) every slavian language it's all so similar
SX-1: you
Gf1, Af3: <4> @ @ @ @ </4>
Dm4: um well i don't have so much to say um my name is Dm4 i come from Denmark i'm twenty eight and yeah i work for a company called Bet and Win (.) it's a betting company and (1) uh yeah that's basically it i have studied in Denmark i studied uh business college (.) and a little greek <5> but then i </5>

Dm4: yeah not much <6> @ </6>
Gf1, Am2, Af3: <6> @ @ </6>
Dm4: i quitted and then i moved here to: (.) get on with it also because ithought i could learn from Gf1 it was not uh what can i say the most important thing at the moment (.) it was more important to do some (.) work
Gf1: (2) yeah cause he had to co

Gf1: (2) yeah cause he had to come here i was here we had already how many years? two and
a half years (.) a distant relationship= a half years (.) a distant relationship=

Gf1: and (.) he had to come < $1>$ here </1>
Af3: <1> for how long have you been together now? </1>

Mm6: okay my name is Mm6 (.) i'm coming from Macedonia i'm twenty seven years old (.)


SX-3: = develop
Mm6: develop (.) thank you
Gf1: so you think you gonna: Af3: i don't know

Gf1: you don't want to?
Af3: uh it's it's not so good uh concerning the salary and uh the future perspectives because
you always have a contract for a few years and afterwards you are you have to start something completely new

Af3: it's very difficult to: to get a contract there (1) and there's so much selection you always have the pressure and i don't want this (3) and otherwise i do not want to have a job where i
 think of you always do the same every day
Gf1: i do the same every day also (.) (xx) books and researching (.) researching researching <gaprec $00: 08$ >
Af3: and what do

Af3: and what do you want to do with your studies?
Gf1: um i want to work in a: better room (.) okay bu:
Gf1: um i want to work in a: better room (.) okay bu:t the dream would be to teach at the
university of course but uh you can be a researcher (on) the same time <FAST> nobody university of course but uh you can be a researcher (on) the same time <FAST> nobody
prevents you to </FAST> but uh (.) first of all i would like to work at the: ancient science authorities in Greece uh every area in Greece has ancient science SCIENCE authorities (.) for ancient and prehistoric material to Byzantine and uh newer material (.) so yeah i will have to work there and this thing allows you to work at the same time on research <gaprec 00:25>
Af3: that sounds so interesting Af3: that sounds so interesting
Mm6: sorry from what part of

## Mm6: sorry from what part of Greece you're coming? Gf1: Athens

Mm6: good Gf1: but uh still i feel after so many years of studying (.) <FAST> of course i'm tired


you're researching and (bringing) yourself into it (.) the worst thing is that you have to work

 </1> to some past work or uh some uh PROOF (.) of course you need proof cause this is science (.) bu:t working on other people's works <2> @ @ </2> Am2: <2> yeah </2>
Gf1: sterilizes you i

Gf1: sterilizes you i feel steri- sterilized ever since (.) i: started working like that i mean when i see my (xx) my projects at the university (.) i was so fruitful i i was so productive i was so:
writing so much um my own ideas and everything but now NO your ideas are of of minor uh meaning cause you have to BASE your ideas and knowledge (.) <FAST> and i don't see the point $\langle$ FAST>=
Af3: =uh at school i enjoyed very much uh writing ESSAYS many many um (.) <3> uh sheets Gf1: <3> <SOFT> yeah </SOFT> </3>

Af3: but when i came to university it's not the same
Gf1: <SOFT> no </SOFT>=
Af3: =i had so many problems during my diploma thesis because you have to look everything Gf1: yeah if there would be a gap after the <LN> Seite </LN> <TRANSL=page> uh and the comma if it's gonna be a gap after the comma and the number of the page=
Af3: =mhm

Gf1: you have even to: think of uh that
Af3: you have easily forty pages of just citations which is GOOD of course cause people that read your work have to find uh the
Gf1: yeah (1) which is GOOD of course cause people that read your work have to find uh the element somewhere a cannot see </2>
<1> mhm $\langle/ 1>$
<2> and and write something freely </2>


Af3: $=\mathrm{mhm}=$ have to work.
Gf1: yeah cause my: my scholarship also <FAST> was gonna (fade) soon </FAST> so: i will
Gfl: and if you get tired when you study then (.) it is not good (in doing them) cause you have to go on (.) with this thing only if you REALLY REALLY know it.

Mm6: hh now first of all everybody of us speak the truth what exactly you want you know


Af3: <1> you do not know (.) when you start studies </1> Gf1: when you get to this it's too late

Af3: mhm i can't go back.
Mm6: when we choose uh a subject like this one uh you know uh like this one we can expect everything <SOFT> you know </SOFT> it's because you never know from before where you really large science and=
really large science and=
Af3: =yes but i think uh everywhere in science there are quite the same rules (1) in
publications. publications.

Mm6: okay um for me more socialist SOCIAL scientists are really something <@> lost in
space for me </@><2> i mean from my point of view </2><FAST> you know because that's so far from me </FAST> and i really can't can't find myself in this always ithink in a


Gf1: =it's not a good point the point is how you publish your work i mean 〈3> what rules are </3> when you work and uh <FAST> how to express of course </FAST> your TERMINOLOGY $=$ Mm6: <3> <FAST> yeah yeah yeah it's okay that </FAST> </3> Af3: $=\mathrm{mhm}=$

Gf1: = terminology (.) <SOFT> and $\langle/$ SOFT $>=$
Mm6: =what exactly is your (.) project what you
Mm6: =what exactly is your (.) project what you're doing (.) here?
Gf1: um uh i'm doing my $\langle 4\rangle \mathrm{PhD}</ 4>$ here (.) on the Byzantine Studies=

## $=$ шчш $=:$ gw．$_{W}$

Mm6：$=\mathrm{mhm}=$
Dm4：＝and i： i do translations from English and German to Danish and i also write some各各
 580 Af3：＜5＞＠＠＠＠＠＜／5＞
581 Af3：$=$ one big family＝
582
Mm6：＝yeah（．）yeah i have been uh vice president for the international veterinary students association for two years（．）and thanks on that itravelled so much（．）i meet a lot of people（．） spent a lovely week in Copenhagen it＇s really nice（．）i have seven days sunny uh time what is
really unexpected for October mid of October in Copenhagen＝ really unexpected for October mid of October in Copenhagen＝
Mm6：＝yeah yeah（．）and around twenty（．）celcius（．）that＇s really＝
Dm6：＝yeah（3）and what about you have you ever been in（．）my country or in Serbia？

Gf1： i have passed through your country＝

Gf1：＝with the bus coming to Austria．
Mm6：oh how long did you 〈＠＞trav
Gf1：with the bus？with the bus i did i went only i went to Hungary（．）FIRST uh from Athens （．）it wasn $t$（that）lonely when 1 was in the（xx）（．）it was just like uh（ 1 don＇t know）（．）too
（xxx）maybe＜FAST＞it was VERY comfortable because the bus was almost＜／FAST＞（．） EMPTY．um but when i was CO：MING（．）once i said okay i will go from Vienna to Athens with the bus（．）and（i＇ll）see the experience．
Aff，Gf1：＠＠
Gf1：＜1＞itravelled＜／1＞i travelled＜FAST＞first of all it was SUMMER（．）＜2＞（bad） with the bus（．）and（i＇ll）see the experience．
Af3，Gf1：＠＠＠
Gf1：＜1＞i travelled＜／1＞i travelled＜FAST＞first of all it was SUMMER（．）＜2＞（bad） choice＜／2＞and i travelled from Vienna to Bratislava with uh：bus＜SOFT＞which is one choice $\langle/ 2\rangle$ and i travelled from Vienna to Bratislava with uh：bus＜SOFT＞which is one
hour i think＜／SOFT＞so this means i started my trip around seven thirty in the morning
SATURDAY（．）then from Bratislava i was waiting for the other uh＜FAST＞the greek bus to SATURDAY（．）then from Bratislava i was waiting for the other uh＜FAST＞the greek bus to co：me＜／FAST＞（．）several hours around five hours or something and from Bratislava we
went through Hungary（．）＜3＞uh：＜／3＞Serbia uh：＝ went through Hungary（．）＜3＞uh：＜／3＞Serbia uh：＝
Af3：＜1＞＠＠＠＜／1＞＜2＞oh：LN＞Gott＜／LN＞＜TRANSL＝god＞＜／2＞ 607 Af3：\ll＞＠＠＠＜／1＞＜2＞oh：LN＞Gott＜／LN＞＜TRANSL＝god＞＜／2＞
608 Mm6：＜3＞Serbia＜／3＞
609 Mm6：＝Macedonia then＝ articles in Danish（．）＜SOFT＞that＇s all＜／SOFT＞
Mm6：where are you coming from where exactly f
Mm6：where are you coming from where exactly from Copenhagen or？
Af3：you＇ve been there？
Af3：＜2＞you＇ve been everywhere＜／2＞
Dm4：＜2＞but i lived in different areas in Denmark＜／2＞
Mm6：no i have never been in Athens also it＇s＝
Gf1：you have been in Copenhagen？
Mm6：yes $i$ have been in Copenhagen（．）yes $i$ have been in in Wolos（in the south）when $i$

Gf1：＜3＞＜＠＞okay＜／＠＞＜／3＞
Mm6：＜3＞＠＠＠ $13>$ but i have
Af3：＜4＞＜＠＞you have good friends everywhere（．）around the world＜／＠＞＜／4＞

Mm6：i was really lucky until now to travel so much and to meet people all over the world but
on some way not that lucky because all of people who i know are veterinarians＜5＞＜＠＞and
on some way not that lucky because all of people who iknow are veterinarians $\langle 5\rangle\langle @\rangle$ and
on that way it＇s really selfish you know（．）just in your world $\langle/$＠$\langle/ 5\rangle$ but＝
Af3．$\langle 5\rangle$＠＠＠＠＠$\langle/ 5>$
N
웅
속웅
Mm6：＜3＞Serbia＜／3＞
Mm6：＝Macedonia then＝ with the bus（．）and（i＇ll）see the experience．
Af3，Gf1：＠＠＠
Gf1：＜1＞i travelled＜／1＞i travelled＜FAST＞first of all it was SUMMER（．）＜2＞（bad）
$\begin{array}{ll}508 & \text { Mm6：}<4>\mathrm{mhm}</ 4> \\ 509 & \text { Mm6：}=\text { uhum BYZANTIA＝}\end{array}$
Mm6：＝uhum BYZANTIA＝
Gf1：＝＜LN＞ja＜／LN＞＜TRANSL＝yes＞＝
Mm6：＝that＇s so strange＜＠＞you＇re coming from Byzantia and you＇re studying here
Byzantine＜／＠＞hh
Gf1：LN＞ja：＜／LN＞＜TRANSL＝yes＞i explained it（there already）
Mm6：uhum sorry＜1＞＠＠＠＜／1＞
Gf1，Af3：＜＞＠＠＠＠＜／1＞
Gf1：anyway uh the basic uh um（．）reason for that is that i wanted to learn＜FAST＞at the
same time german＜／FAST＞＜SOFT＞very good＜／SOFT＞
Mm6：uhum
Gf1：so：（．）＜LN＞ja＜／LN＞＜TRANSL＝yes＞（2）two in one（．）＜＠＞so to say＜／＠＞．
Mm6：and what＇s your favourite part of Byzantia Byzantian culture（．）what are exactly your
specialities？
Gf1：my speciality is history of art（．）＜2＞archaeology＜／2＞（．）art＜FAST＞Byzantine art
＜／FAST＞（1）but uh my（diploma）also was history and art $=$
Mm6：＜2＞mhm＜／2＞
Gf1：my speciality is history of art（．）＜2＞archaeology＜／2＞（．）art＜FAST＞Byzantine art
＜／FAST＞（1）but uh my（diploma）also was history and art $=$
Mm6：＜2＞mhm＜／2＞
Mm6：＝no but your privately what really it＇s your challenge for you
Gf1：well（．）i：wa：s on－＜FAST＞i was really interested in art＜／FAST＞
Gf1：well（．）i：wa：s on－＜FAST＞i was really interested in art＜／FAST＞and i＇m working ＜FAST＞my PhD is art＜／FAST＞
Mm6：mhm
Gf1：＜FAST＞but ever since i came here i＇m more focused in history＜／FAST＞＝
Mm6：＝mhm＝
Mm6：$=\mathrm{mhm}=$
Gf1：$=$ here in m
Gf1：＝here in my institute（．）so i cannot（．）i don＇t know i got closer to history also＜FAST＞
and i loved it also＜／FAST＞（．）so：yeah i think that history and＜FAST＞history of art and i loved it also＜／FAST＞（．）so：yeah i think that history and＜FAST＞history of art
＜／FAST＞can do that with each other so．Some scientists to be good they have to combin equally BOTH things and（i）say（．）uh so specialize so：much this this this theorized having much history and much history of art（．）uh in my work 〈FAST〉 and being interested in that＜／FAST＞（．）i don＇t like those people that say oh i＇m an art historian and not a

## historian＝ <br> Mm6：＝what about philosophy（．）how far is it from you？

Gf1：i have studied philosophy but it＇s just $\langle 1\rangle$ uh（．）too much $\langle/ 1\rangle$（1）no well i have studied it because it＇s＜2＞it＇s＜／2＞it＇s necessary of course uh but inever had so much interest in it（．）i i＇m more from：uhm（．）more down to earth people $\langle 3\rangle\langle @\rangle$ person $\langle/ @\rangle$
$\langle/ 3\rangle$ i can＇t $\langle 4\rangle$（．）i can＇t be so theoretical $\langle/ 4\rangle$（．）speaking theoretically about an idea $\langle @\rangle$ for hours＜／＠＞ Mm6：＜1＞you don＇t like it（．）no？＜／1＞ Mm6：＜3＞mhm＜／3＞ Af3：＜4＞＠＠＠＜／4＞
Mm6：That＇s why you（going to be）a good professor i am sure．
Gf1，Af3，Mm6：＠＠＠＠＠
Mm6：＜＠＞i don＇t know how much students you like you but DEFINITELY you can be good professor＜／＠＞
Gf1：well i＇m teaching greek yet
Mm6：okay let＇s go on the north
©
Dm4：uh i don＇t know what to say i already introduced myself but uhm as i told you i come
from Denmark and uh i work here at a company called Bet and Win＝
from Denmark and uh i work here at a company called Bet and Win＝
Gf1: =wait uh we went through Bul- $\langle 4\rangle$ Bulgaria also $\langle/ 4\rangle\langle 5\rangle$ a:nd $\langle/ 5\rangle$ and then Greece so i arrived and <FAST> and of course the buses were like THAT. </FAST> okay it was
summer all the students were coming (.) down uh: packages two buses FULL (.) i mean full i summer all the students were coming (.) down uh: packages two buses FULL (.) i mean full i
couldn't even move my feet (those) like that=
Mm6: $\langle 4\rangle$ uhum uhum $\langle/ 4\rangle\langle 5\rangle$ then Greece north $\langle/ 5\rangle$
Mm6: $=\langle @\rangle$ Saturday night $\langle/ @>=$
Gf1: =yeah (.) totally and SO from seven thirty in the morning on Saturday i arrived in Athens at ninth nine thirty at night on Sunday.
Gf1: <5> being: uh: one and half day (.) like that </5> (.) <@> it was the worst trip i've ever had. </@>
Af3: and was it cheap?
Gf1: i didn't pay it
All: @ @ @ @
Gf1: and we have a travel agency my my parents in Greece $()<6>$. so $</ 6>$ so they are
partners (.) <SOFT> with the bus companies </SOFT>
Af3: <6> mhm </6>
Mm6: you done very good marketing for your company
All: @ @ @ @
All: @ @ @ @ @
Mm6: we trust you
Am2: i won't mention it
Mm6: yeah but sometimes it can be good experience (.) i have similar experience travelling from Sofia Bulgaria to Warsaw for forty four hours LN>ja</LN><TRANSL=yes> but we
Gf1: $\langle 1\rangle$ and when there's space $\langle/ 1\rangle$ in the bus at least <FAST> you can move you can sleep </FAST> then everything is FINE=
Mm6: =yeah yeah=
Gf1: =i mean i did i DID it the only reason i did it is cause when i was going to Hungary it
was very comfortable and it was very fast i didn't know that it was going to be so: long this was very comfortable and it was very fast i didn't know that it was going to be so: long this
time and so: not comfortable <SOFT> at all </SOFT> (.) yeah but what is so long at the
borders?
Mm6: yeah it's normal (.) procedure for the Balkan still
Gf1: yeah we were waiting so long uh yeah but we were $v$
Gf1: yeah we were waiting so long uh yeah but we were very waiting so long when the driver
was giving the packets of cigarettes to the $<2>$ @ @ </2> Af3: <2> @ @ @ </2>
Mm6: <2> you know that's </2>
Gf1: and whiskeys and everything i was (thinking) <3> <@> like that </@> </3>
Af3: <3> @ @ </3>
Af3: <3> @ @ @ </3>
Mm6: it's it's the joke in
648 Mm6: it's it's the joke in the Balkans we still have a borders on the Balkans in opposite
and
All: @ @ @ @
Af3: and your country <@> doesn't exist </@>
Mm6: <@> LN> ja </LN> <TRANSL=yes> </@
Mm6: <@> LN> ja </LN> <TRANSL=yes> </@>
All: @@ @
Af3: <SOFT> yeah </SOFT>
Mm6: not (.) not for long (1) y
Mm6: not (.) not for long (1) yeah that was quite far <FAST> because you are from Greece
you understand that the problem with you know with the name of my country </FAST>=
Gf1: $=m h m=$
Mm6: =and it's quite funny when i have been in U.K. uh: usually when you're leaving
London uh any any airport or in U.K. when you're leaving it's no checking passport regular
passport control it's only checking for the luggage and usually the woman is checking the

Mm6: with Scandinavian Airlines i think <SOFT> it was </SOFT> (.) yeah but it was some
(xxx) because it was uh April not really Dm4: yeah of course Mm6: yeah

Dm4: outside seasons
Mm6: yeah outside se
Mm6: yeah outside seasons and (.)
Gf1: Maersk has now um very cheap uh tickets (.) Jim is flying Copenhagen (.) when um: at
the beginning of $\langle 1\rangle$ no at the end of march no of april $\langle/ 1\rangle$ (.) during to ( xx ) Dm4: <1> twenty second </1>

Sf5: <LN> fort? </LN> <TRANSL=away?> Gf1: to go to Copenhagen

Sf5: from Vienna?
Gf1: yeah
Dm4: yeah
Dm4: =ONE way
Gf1: cause he's going uh Vienna Copenhagen <FAST> Copenhagen Athens </FAST> so he paid a ticket Vienna Copenhagen fifty euro (.) ALL IN ALL (.) and Copenhagen Athens uh:
sixty euro (.) and i'm gonna pay almost three hundred euro to just Vienna Athens companies=
Gf1: =(there) it flies. what do you mean by
Mm6: no no it's ( x ) very popular in the moment (.) very low price < $1>$ companies </1> MAERSK Airlines </l> Mm6: uhum

Dm4: um it's the second biggest (.) no actually it's (not the second biggest) we have two big companies SAS and Maersk=

Mm6: $=\mathrm{mhm}$ mhm $=$
Mm6: yeah but on this flies it's always a lot of passengers <SOFT> you know </SOFT> for Athens i'm not so sure and maybe that's the reason because sometimes this <Mm6 clears his解

Dm4: um i think there are many people to Athens because Greece is very popular in Denmark
Mm6: yeah in the way it is so strange why that is so expensive Mm6: yeah in that way it is so strange why that is so expensive. (2)

Gf1: <1> well the the problem with his ticket was that uh for example if he came to Athens on MONDAY he would pay hundred euro more $\langle/ 1>=$ Dm4: =<SOFT> mhm </SOFT>=

Gf1: =so every day=
Gf1: =it was a different price to Athens (.) so to Athens it was more expensive than to from
Vienna to Copenhagen=
Af3: =it's like on the stock market
Gf1: and i think yeah exactly <gaprec 00:13>
Mm6: maybe it's a difference in the aeroplane @ @ @ @
All: @ @ @
Af3: an old Russian aeroplane @ @ @
Mm6: sometimes <gaprec 00:17>
Mm6: when we're talking on this subject where are Greek people usually going for the holiday because <@> you have a lot of (sea and) </@>
which of course is not inhabited which is a lot better ALSO for the animals but also for the $\therefore$
0
0
0
0
0
Mm6: yeah i saw the homepage it's a lot of photos and it's only uh contact with civilisation is
that Aegina you said. that Aegina you said.
Gf1: uh actually they
Mm6: yeah it's i don't know it's (.) it's only on the photo side $\langle 1\rangle$ i have no idea $\langle/ 1\rangle$
Gf1: $\langle 1\rangle$ there is a small village nearby $($.$) only \langle/ 1\rangle=$ Mm6: =yeah but <2> they say </2>
Mm6: in the explanation how to come there it's written that they can collect you from the
Gf1: <3> yeah of course (.) from the port </3> stuff are changed (.) especially because uh i i already not not anymore vice president (.) VCP because < gapnrec 00:07> (end of recording unit 1)
Gf1: so this is (.) pretty nice also in September and even in October $\langle 1\rangle\langle$ FAST $\rangle$ my parents
</FAST $\rangle\langle/ 1\rangle$ (.) were swimming were swimming $\langle @\rangle$ till November $\langle/ @\rangle=$ </FAST> </1> (.) were swimming were swimming <@> till November </@>=
Mm6: <1> yeah i'm sure </1>
Mm6: =yeah yeah but it's normal yeah (.) people on the Adriatic Sea they swim until end of October sometimes first days in November (.) Greece is much more sou- uh southern (.) <2> in the south </2> and (.)
Gf1: <2> <SOFT> yeah </SOFT> </2>
Gf1: it doesn't matter it doesn't matter cause the northern (region) has so much waves <FAST> so much so much so many waves </FAST> so much wind even in August is the
worst time to go (.) it's really cold
Mm6: yeah but (.) the same characteristic for the Adriatic coast (than) the (southern) Greece is that many uh a lot of islands in the sea what is typical for your region (.) i really like to go there (and) especially but it's so strange YOUR transport from from Athens or from
Thessalonica to the islands uh: (.) doesn't matter by plane or by by: ferry boat it's SO
Gf1: =by (ferry boat)? <SOFT> it's not expensive there many go (by them) now </SOFT>
<gaprec 00:03> (due to unintelligible speech!) Mm6: i know <SOFT> i know </SOFT>
Gf1: i don't find it expensive PERSONALLY but but (.) to (Aegina) it's not expensive=
Mm6: =yeah <@> because it's not that far from <LN> Rhodos </LN> <TRANSL=Rhodes> Mm6: =yeah <@> because it's not that far from <LN> Rhodos </LN> <TRANSL=Rhodes>
</@>
Gf1: @ @ @ Gf1: @ @ @
Mm6: yeah b
Mm6: yeah but fly to <LN> Rhodos </LN> <TRANSL=Rhodes> (.) it's <1> it's make a
difference </1> (.)
Gf1: <1> of course (that's more far) </1>
Mm6: yeah yeah yeah. on someway do you know what people from my country are doing?
they are going to Turkey and $\langle @\rangle$ from Turkey going by boat it's much more cheaper </@> they are going to Turkey and <@> from Turkey going by boat it's much more cheaper </@>
Sf5: <2> i' ve heard that too in Serbia </2> Sf5: <2> 1 ve heard that too in Serbia </2>
Mm6: <2> yeah yeah </2>
Sf5: yes <3> <@> they do the same thing </@> from Serbia (.) from (xxx) to (.) </3> <4>
<LN>Rhodos </LN> <TRANSL=Rhodes> </4> (.) (thirty) kilometres Mm6: <3> @ @ @ </3> yeah but <4> <LN> Rhodos </LN> <TRANSL=Rhodes> </4>
Af3: and where did YOU go to holiday?
Af3: <@> also Greece? <@>


| 915 | Sf5: things (don't) even be in front of us in the European Union we will wait a bit (.) ten years or so to (take) together with Turkey (.) |
| :---: | :---: |
| 916 | Mm6: and Bosnia @ @ |
| 917 | Sf5: yes |
| 918 | Af3: mhm= |
| 919 | Sf5: =problems (.) with Kosovo and everything (1) we have s-s-s- telling one that Kosovo is |
| 920 | a part of Serbia but it's (the other one) it's not really a part of Serbia it's (.) another country |
| 921 | together with Albania and the western part of (us) then. |
| 922 | Gfl: yeah i know this (x) by the Albanians. |
| 923 | Sf5: hm? |
| 924 | Gf1: always problems <1> with the Albanians @ @ (1) yeah exactly </1> |
| 925 | Sf5: <1> YES YES the BIGGEST problem on the Balkan in the moment </1> (.) with (.) |
| 926 | Albanians <FAST> they have </FAST> too many problems with the Albanians. |
| 927 | Mm6: i'm veterinarian i'm not really interested in politics <2> @ @ </2> |
| 928 | All: <2> @ @ </2> |
| 929 | SX-5: it's (about) it's a minority |
| 930 | Mm6: yeah i'm joking (.) YEAH it's true but (.) you know it's it's i think that's the (.) in |
| 931 | general that's that's the huge problem of Europe you know we still (.) (watching) on things |
| 932 | you know which country which nationality that is still very HIGH topic hh because (.) ithink |
| 933 | the creation of this European Union the point is all fast to be European one day you know and |
| 934 | not not ask each others. |
| 935 | Gf1: yeah but that's globalizing (it has also are there uh) |
| 936 | Mm6: yeah on some way it IS (on the air) <1> but </1> |
| 937 | Gf1: <1> some </1> (.) i mean <FAST> for example America </FAST> (.) yeah i can |
| 38 | EASILY (.) for people to give ADVANTAGE of Europe it's easy for them to create to (.) |
| 939 | <FAST> not for them to feel as ONE </FAST> but for them to don't feel that they have a |
| 940 | certain different uh:= |
| 941 | SX-3: =(xx) |
| 942 | Gf1: different identity <2> yeah </2> (.) so they want to (xxx) their identity actually so they |
| 943 | can use people like that (.) Americans and people like Americans that take advantage of |
| 944 | nations (.) nowadays. |
| 945 | SX-3: <2> mhm </2> |
| 946 | Mm6: yeah but i like i like not the SAME but something similar in Europe (.) because that's |
| 947 | very important for the (.) future of Europe because usually wars in Europe start because of |
| 48 | these reasons <SOFT> you know </SOFT> different nations different religions different |
| 949 | interests different points you know. (.) i MEAN i would be really happy if in (.) one two |
| 950 | generations people says in Europe i'm European from Macedonia i'm European from Greece |
| 951 | <SOFT you know </SOFT> (.) i think (.) and no one says that you need to forgot everything |
| 952 | and to OF COURSE i i think that's not possible (.) ESPECIALLY not in the Balkans. |
| 953 | SX-3: @ @ @ |
| 954 | SX-5: <@> no really </@> |
| 955 | Mm6: we're on the best way we were five hundred years under Turkish $\langle 1\rangle$ occupation and |
| 956 | </1> |
| 957 | Sf5: <1> five five hund- yeah </1> you were five hundred and FIFTY years= |
| 958 | Mm6: =yeah okay |
| 959 | Sf5: fifty years |
| 960 | Mm6: but let's change the subject <FAST> where are Austrians going for the holiday |
| 961 | usually? </FAST> |
| 962 | Af3: <2> also very (much) to Greece </2> |
| 963 | Mm6: <2> or what's your planning for this summer? </2> |
| 964 | Af3: um i want to go to Sweden $\langle 3\rangle$ (.) to a friend of mine $\langle/ 3>$ to Babsi |

SX-4: =WELSH= Mm6: =welsh language AND the second surprise for me was in Scotland it's it's SCOTISH
pounds what you can change in in England <1> it's it's </1> Gf1: <1> really? </1>
m4: <2> and we didn't have other passports $</ 2>$ the difference is that now we can GO they

can't say uh no we don't want you here (.) you're always ALLOWED to come but they have
to know about (that).
Mm6: yeah but why that way is no control at the moment? Dm4: yeah: it's a difference of uh: every um country @ @
Dm4: yeah: it's a difference of uh: every um country @ @ i mean some people wanna check
some people don't want at all it's laciness or whatever I don't
Mm6: yeah i was really surprised i i don't see any policemen on the on the train station in the

Dm4: =no i know i know <1> i know </1>
Gf1: <1> (but when you're going) </1> for e
FEEL you go to Germany=
Gf1: i didn't see a border i didn't see anything=
造
©

Gf1: <1> (but when you're going) </1> for example here when you go to Munich you don't
FEEL you go to Germany=
Gf1: < $1>$ i went $i$ went by train </1> <2> so by train </2> it could be not so visible but uh I
didn't feel it as i was wondering now are we in Germany or in Austria <SOFT> (i thought) </SOFT> WHERE are we?
Sf5: <2> uhum </2>
Af3: the language is the same.
Gf1: i mean in the train when you're in the train when you're passing borders <FAST> i mean when we passed the borders in Italy </FAST> (.) we pretty much figured out=

Dm4: =it was also the personnel's language <SOFT> (that made the difference) </SOFT>
Gf1: policemen came to check (.) a bit like that (.) and you were seeing the flag (2) <SOFT> yeah. </SOFT>
Mm6: it's quite funny i HOPE one day someone will asking for my passport because i have a
good collection of european visas $\langle 1\rangle$ @ @ @ @ </1> maybe i will get a good money for it.
good collection of european visas <1> @ @ @ @ @ </1> maybe i will get a good money for it.
Af3: <1> @ @ @ </1> ©
Mm6: yeah but it's it's really it's really nice <SOFT> you know </SOFT> every visa is different and that's not with European Union it's very special with the visas coming from other countries it's it's really a lot of fun.
Gf1: my my old passport had so many vis
Gf1: my my old passport had so many visas (all so) different=
Mm6: =yeah $\langle 2\rangle$ for sure $</ 2\rangle$
Gf1: <2> of course I had to </2> change it and now my new passport is <3> <@> totally empty </@></3> cause in every country i've been i've been made a stamp @ @@
Gf1: i had from Serbia and Macedonia and um: where else Bulgaria Cyprus <@> all these ( xx ) countries </@> and now (.) nothing.
Gf1: well i've been four years in Cyprus and (2) <@> i didn't really like it. </@> <1> i mean $\hat{v}$

pounds what you can change in in England <1> it's it's </1>
Gf1: <1> really? </1>
Mm6: yeah (.) they don't accept it
Dm4: i don't understand that
Mm6: yeah yeah i don't know that too
All: @ @ @
Mm6: <1> and thanks to the </1>
Af3: <1> <@> there must be some black market money </@> </1> All: @ @ @
Mm6: NO: i- it's really it's really funny
Gf1: but eng lish pounds and <2> scottish
Mm6: <2> yeah </2> it's it's okay no problem BUT if you're going back with scottish i mean you can change in the bank but if you're going in the shop or something like this in in London you can't change (.) <@> would be a surprise for me too yeah </@> (.) and it's the same situation in in in (.) Nor- Northern Ireland (.) there is (.) okay but there is another problem
with and i was thinking that only in the former Yugoslavia <@> exist this kind of problems but finally in U.K. it's </@> (.) maybe (xx) than than in ex Yugoslavia. (3) but that's Europe but finally in U.K. it $s<@\rangle$ (.) maybe ( xx ) than than in ex Yugoslavia. (3) but that's Europe
everyone is proud everyone is (.) doing his culture and likes to be (xxxxx). Gf1: but they don't have uh the same um: <SOFT> what's it </SOFT> (.) currency=
Mm6: =currency yeah. Mm6: =currency yeah.
Gf1: yeah
Mm6: yeah it it was really surprising for me because on SOME way in when you're going in which one you'll see that it's written BRITISH pound
Mm6: <1> it's ENGLISH pound or SCOTTISH pound </1>
Gf1: irrelevant to that but uh: what pissed me off really with the english (.) (thing) is that
although they established the European Community they didn't accept the european the the although they established the European Community they didn't accept the european the the
european currency. european currency.
$\mathrm{Mm6}$ : <2 y yeah um
Mm6: yeah but it's not only one difference is the other difference it's still uh: passport control (.) uh: from Brit- from between Britain and France or (.) Belgium and (other) countries
<SOFT> you know. </SOFT> Gf1: they do need (protections) OF COURSE.
Mm6: for THEM borders still exist.
Gf1: HERE borders still exist.
Mm6: okay but uh: going to Germany i think it's much different than <COINAGE>
comparated <[kompareitId]> </COINAGE> () Britain and and France.
Gf1: from Italy it's the same from here (.) they check my passport (.) they check (it)=
Mm6: from HERE to Italy?
Gf1: yeah
Mm6: i'm really surprised=
Dm4: =yeah but that's okay they should (.) they SHOULD check i mean uh: the European
Union shouldn't mean that the borders are open and people can come and go as they want.
Gf1: <1> and smuggle </1>

Mm6: $\langle 1\rangle$ no people who are there $</ 1\rangle$ told me that sea is more cold there $<2>$ than on the
Mm6:
</2>
Gf1: <2
in Rhod
Gf1: <2> yes it's very cold of course $\langle/ 2\rangle$ like in $\langle\mathrm{LN}\rangle$ Rhodos $</ \mathrm{LN}\rangle<$ TRANSL=Rhodes>
in Rhodos the sea is ICE um: but uh: it doesn't have nature (.) <FAST> i mean of course on in Rhodos the sea is ICE um: but uh: it doesn't have nature (.) <FAST> i mean of course on
the mou:ntains </FAST> it is nice there are many (.) forests and mountains and snow and that's nice (.) but (.) so near the sea near the cities it's so dry (.) and you see a constant (.) dryness (.) brown uh brown environment (.) nothing (.) <FAST> I mean the streets are really nice </FAST> <SOFT> one must say </SOFT> Mm6: nightlife probably yes=
Gf1: =an:d HOW?

Gf1: =an:d HOW?
Mm6: nightlife (.) <FAST> nightlife </FAST>
Gf1: i had very much fun but uh: other Greeks DIDN'T (.) i mean when you come from Athens and you go to Nicosia (.) you feel like you went from New York to: <1><@> idon't
know </@ </1> <2> to: </2> (xx) island <3> @ @ @ </3> i don't know Mm6: <1> @ @ </1>

Af3: <2> Unterstinken
Mm6: are you feeling any difference in language there in Greek uh: <COINAGE> cypric
< [salprlk]> </COINAGE> cypric Greek I would say <4> like here </4>
Gf1: <4> when i was (there) </4> it was difficult to ( xx ) some people that had really hard accent $=$

Mm6: $=\mathrm{mhm}$ more slowly it's like the germans sometimes <FAST> they don't understand </FAST> the austrian dialects (.) <5> (when the) </5> some germans and some austrians don't understand some german dialects (1) it's you get used to that (2) but the official language of course in (xxxx) (.) normal=

Mm6: <5> yeah yeah yeah </5>
Mm6: =yeah yeah yeah (1) you graduated in Athens at the university in of Athens?
Gf1: Me? NO Nicosia.
Gf1: <6> it's a GREEK university $\langle/ 6>$ it's from the greek state.
Mm6: mhm mhm (2) sorry what's your profession?
Dm4: <7> @ @ @ </7>
Mm6: <8> i mean what you are (doing in) </8>
Dm4: <8> i don't have a (big) profession </8> uh: i only finished business school at (xx). Mm6: uhum (1) in Copenhagen?

Mm6: right you live in Copenhagen (.) what part? (.) you know where is veterinary medicine faculty together with agriculture <9> it's it's </9>

All:<9> @ @ @ </9>
Mm6: FREDERIKSBERG Frederiksberg=
Dm4: =hm?
Mm6: Frederi
1159 . 11 . never been there but YES i know where Frederiksberg is (.) it's (another) area of course (.) but i also live in different areas in Denmark.

Mm6: i'm really sorry only for ONE thing (.) it was so expensive for me to enter in uh: erotic museum in in Copenhagen it was really <@> special type of museum <FAST> i know </FAST> <2> it's it is really strange </@> </2>

Gf1: <2> have you ever been in Amsterdam? </2>



1369 Sf5: yeah they're cos- they're cosy WELCOME that's why <2> @ @ @ @ </2>


 1381 students are here in uh and there's really surprised turkish and bosnian students are (.) on the
1382 highest uh=
SX-f: $=<1>$ turkish? </1>
Mm6: after ITALIAN and GERMAN but ITALIAN and GERMAN are not feeling like uh

 </2>

[^43]Gf1：it＇s weird cause MEDICINE for example in Serbia is（．）many many greeks are going to study Medicine in Serbia or＜2＞in＜／2＞

Gf1：＜3＞Bulgaria yeah＜／3＞
Mm6：yeah but STUDY＜4＞and doing dissertation it＇s＜／4＞
Gf1：＜4＞（only）Medicine only Medicine to study to study medicine＜／4＞
Mm6：yeah yeah it＇s different
：Medicine Faculty in Serbia is very good（．）Belgrade（．）＜5＞yes．＜／5＞ ：＜5＞yeah＜／5＞
：yeah Romania H
f1：yeah Romania Hungary uh Serbia and Bulgaria．
m6：yeah because it＇s cheaper（．）$\langle 6\rangle$ a lot of maced
Mm6：yeah because it＇s cheaper（．）＜6＞a lot of macedonians study in Bulgaria＜／6＞
Gf1：＜6＞（you mean）life there yeah＜／6＞ALTHOUGH uh：the＜FAST＞in Bulgaria
＜／FAST＞（．）the：professors ask for money to to＜7＞pass you＜／7＞for the exam． Mm6：＜7＞＜FAST＞yeah yeah＜／FAST＞＜／7＞ Sf5：＜8＞we have the same case in Serbia．＜／8＞
Gf1：＜8＞（in Athens）you have to pay yeah＜／8＞
Gf1：＜8＞（in Athens）you have to pay yeah＜／8＞＜FAST＞for GREEKS at the university
＜／FAST＞＜9＞they know they can pay＜／9＞
Mm6：＜9＞＜＠＞yeah＜／＠＞＜／9＞ Mm6：＜9＞
All：＠＠＠

Gf1：＜FAST＞of course NOT＜／FAST＞
Ill：＠＠＠
Mm6：＜1＞but uh：＜／1＞
Af3：＜1＞it＇s a MAFIA thing＜／1＞
Gf1：what can the students do（．）just
Gf1：what can the students do（．）just pay or i won＇t i won＇t PASS you．
Mm6：okay if i fail at my dissertation here＜＠＞i＇m going to Bulgaria．＜／＠＞
All：＠＠＠＠
Sf5：i think you can BUY a diploma in Bulgaria you can buy a（WHOLE）faculty and（x）fifty thousand euros＝ Mm6：＝yeah＝

Sf5：＝you can buy a $<1>$ economy management（．）diploma．＜／1＞
Mm6：$\langle 1\rangle$ i don＇t study because of of $\langle/ 1\rangle=$
Sf5：＝your（ xx ）（．）you have a faculty for fifty thousand euros（．）＜SOFT＞it＇s like that． ＜／SOFT＞（．）＜FAST＞you can buy everything on the Balkan＜／FAST＞（．）EVERYTHING（．）

Mm6：＜SOFT＞yeah（．）that＇s true＜／SOFT＞i＇ve seen a documentary a very sad and uh the bulgarian borders have begun kind of black uh：（border）

Sf5：$\langle 1\rangle$ uhu yeah the bulgarians are very（mournful）＜／1＞
Mm6：＜1＞for the greeks（．）there are many greeks＜／1＞you can find of course GIRLS
＜FAST＞when i say girls i＇m talking at the age of thirteen fourteen fifteen＜／FAST＞they＇re
WHORES in in Bulgaria and their own fathers bring them to the line（2）it was so sad ＜FAST＞i was so shocked when i saw this documentary＜／FAST＞（．）the father brings the have a MARKET＜FAST＞open market＜／FAST＞also to sell things cheaper for the greeks that just go to the borders and（3）

Mm6：yeah but（．）it＇s not that rules like like in former Soviet Union＜FAST＞i mean i＇ve
Mm6：yeah but（．）it＇s not that rules like like in former Soviet Union＜FAST＞i mean i＇ve
been in Ukraine and the state what i＇ve seen there＜1＞it＇s it＇s＜／FAST＞＜／1＞ Gf1：＜1＞Ukraine is the centre of uh＜＠＞criminality in Europe now＜／＠＞＜／1＞＝
Sf5：＝yes

## Gf1：yeah everything happens there．

$\mathrm{Dm} 4:=$ also about the language in uh Greece is really difficult＝
Am2：＝mhm＝
Dm4：＝so（1）but $i$ think i can manage．$=$

Dm4：yeah yes i was i was（．）（it＇s my place）but i would prefer to stay here（i think）BUT as a
Mm6：yeah have you ever been in Greece before＜FAST＞no＜／FAST＞？
Dm4：yeah yes i was i was（．）（it＇s my place）but i would prefer to stay here



Dm4：＜2＞i work for the Danish uh＜／2＞section there but i don＇t（like）it i don＇t wanna think about it＠＠so（．）but until she goes（i know）she should finish this year actually（too）could be next year also．＝
Am2：＜2＞mhm＜／2＞

Am2：＜2＞mhm＜／2＞
Mm6：＝mhm yeah together now＠it＇s clear．＜3＞＠＠＜／3＞

のールのヘス
Af3: the Veterinary University is something like um: uh kind old fashioned. Mm6: yeah Vet University is the might be the most traditional <1> <@> austrian university @> </1> yeah look at our on our university is the uh: lowest number of of foreign.
Ans: <1> yes </1>
Afs: mhm ond count in unive fin yeah. we we done some statistic (.) ALL together i think we're less than fifty or sixty (.) students coming from from our science uh Austria i mean from Balkans on our university it's really NOTHING sorry when i was saying our university i mean not the although not not general but
Af3: that's the macedonian at the university in Vienna </FAST> and $i$ know that (.) all together from former Yugoslavia we're mainly twenty five or thirty AGAIN bosnians are dominating there are fifty or sixty.
Af3: but your country is not so large.
Mm6: yeah country of quality not quantity i said
Af3: <@> mhm </@>
All: @ @ @ @ @ @ @
Mm6: yeah it's only two million population my country it's it's really like
Sf5: <1><FAST> Serbia is bigger </FAST> (.) only Belgrade has two milli
Sf5: <1><FAST> Serbia is bigger </FAST> (.) only Belgrade has two million (1) together

Mm6: <1> yeah that's that's this (adventure) sometimes (.) but on some way it's a big
advance because you can (.) you can be everywhere in Macedonia for less than two

Am2: how many people live in Serbia (.) <FAST> approximately? </FAST>
Sf5: hh ten million.
Am2: ten million?
Am2: ten million?
Sf5: ten million yes
Sf5: ten million yes (.) together with Montenegro (.) <1> a:nd </1>
Af3: <1> it's bigger than Austria </1>= Am2: $=\mathrm{mhm}$
Am2: <2> slightly bigger than Austria. </2>
Sf5: <2> yes </2>
Mm6: yeah it's larger country
Sf5: <FAST> larger country </FAST>
Mm6: and territory is larger than Austria

 thousands (.) <1> Serbians. </1>
Gf1: <1> in VIENNA ONLY or in
f5: in Vienna only.
Sf5: @ @ and in Austria we were about half a million @ @ @ we're like home here. (1) yeah
there are many many serbians here in Austria. there are many many serbians here in Austria
Mm6: what about greeks (.) do you know?
Gf1: here in Austria?
Mm6: yeah (.) not that much.
ぶ
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Mm6: =you don't like to go back to Denmark?
Mm6: =you don't like to go back to Denmark? Dm4: yeah i'd like to BUT it's not uh: it doesn't work for Gf1 (.) so for us it's more important to be (xx)
Mm6: and what's your opinion about the difference between danish mentality and austrian (.) is: <1> what you (.) okay you're danish but </1>
Dm4: <1> well <FAST> i don't know (so many austrians personally) </FAST> </1> but uh the: austrians are more (.) yeah i don't know how to say but LESS laid back than danish (1) but they are more polite on the other hand. Am2: AUSTRIAN people are more polite?
Am2: mhm
Dm4: but the danes are not polite it's just a different kind of (.) politeness.
Mm6: it's a lot of differences (1) i MEAN FOR ME (.) i feel that all these cultures are not that far maybe because i'm coming from different parts of Europe on some way distance between Denmark and Austria is almost the same as the distance between Austria and Macedonia but i have feeling that that Austria is and austrian culture is much more closer to to to (.) danish
and to scandinavians than to to balkans although on some way Austria is connected with some of the Balkan states in the history and you have a lot of context but again TYPICAL austrian of the Bakkan states in the history and you have a lot of context but again TYPICAL austrian
what's meaning this Vienna style i think it's more closer to you <1> than (.) to us (.) yeah. Dm4: <1> mhm i agree with that i agree with that </1> (.) but maybe Europe and Northern Mm6: <2> for example (.) although </2> POLAND is your neighbour but they're much closer Mm6: <2> for example (.) although </2> POLAND is your neighbour but they're much closer
to US (.) but it's because of different reason because of the slav connections and
Af3: you once complained when you were new here THAT austrian people do not speak so much.
Mm6:

## Mm6: h yeah that's i like to say that in this this interview <3> @ @ @ @ @ </3>

Mm6: <FAST> yeah i have a huge problem because i don't speak german probably i'm the only one who don't speak german </FAST> here it's really interesting your people don't like to speak english ALTHOUGH ALL of you (.) do speak english <1> and </1> i really don't this one in Scandinavia for example. this one in Scandinavia for example.
Af3: $\langle 1\rangle$ mhm </1>
Mm6: =uhum i was really impressed when i had been in Copenhagen i i i (entered) on a german (one) lecture and professor asked me where're you from coming i said from Macedonia <FAST> do you understand danish </FAST> OF COURSE i said not= Af3: =@@ @=
Mm6: =and JUST because of ME=
Dm4: =mhm=
Mm6: =he speaks ALL his lecture in english= m4: $=\mathrm{mhm}=$
Mm6: =for fifty students=
Mm6: =i was really impressed (.) ithink that is NOT possible to happen here in in Vienna (.) ALTHOUGH on the university people (.) are different.
Af3: but at the main university they're more flexible than at the Vet Med.

## Mm6: i don't know.



1624 Gf1: no really really few i mean i KNOW them almost ALL <FAST> <@> that are here
1625 </@> </FAST> (.) um: i would say <FAST> i don't know </FAST> WITH or WITHOUT 1626 the students now? Mm6: yeah=

Gf1: =i don't know. WITH the students must be three hundred= Mm6: =that's really nothing=
Gf1: $=$ <SOFT $>$ nothing yeah $<~$

Mm6: no we we have seventy five or eighty students MACEDONIANS here on ALL universities here in Vienna (.) i don't know about all Austria (.) that's really nothing. Af3: they're all relatives of you.

All: @ @ @ @ @
Mm6: not really
Mm6: not really <FAST> if they're relatives they will be on the University of Veterinary Medicine and i'm the only one there. </FAST>
All: @@@@@

All: @ @ @ @ @
Mm6: <FAST> because in my life it's everything connected with veterinary medicine </FAST>

Mm6: <FAST> my grandfather was veterinarian my father is veterinarian and now ME
</FAST> it's third generation and <FAST> it's it's really ALL friends of my father have been and my grandfather veterinarians and </FAST>

All: @6: oh my father was against i do study veterinary medicine (.) FIRST OF ALL because he said (.) that's difficult uh and studies are so hard taking so much time a:nd uh: university in Skopje is NEW ONE we found that after independence of Macedonia and he said that there is not enough time they do make a good stuff and uh lec- uh: studies to be on good quality but i i
 like (.) but to don't (be again) i'm the same Mm6 who is always speaks 〈@> about veterinarians. </@>

Mm6: YEAH but we're like one family everywhere (1) and on some way it's it's really strange but statistically veterinarians are people who usually uh: uh: uh: in highest percent
 < All: <1> @ @ @ </1>

Mm6: yeah again.
Mm6: actually language she studies a ( x ) of ( x ) she's studying English and <FAST> uh actually she graduated </FAST> on the English and Italian Philology. Am2: mhm
Mm6: yeah but that's true. (4) okay in my case my mother is biologist it's not true.
Mm6: yeah again
1664
1665
융
-
:
웅 1670 Macedonia because a lot of foreign companies are looking for translations and i don't know it
1671 depends probably from the money but probably she can get better money like translating than 1671 depends probably from the money but probably she can get better money like translating than 1673 Gf1: <1> yeah def

| 1726 | Mm6: =it's not that easy (3) but uh <COINAGE> (finishingly) <[fInIfIqII]> </COINAGE> |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1727 | <@> you can manipulating </@> |
| 1728 | All: @ @ @ |
| 1729 | Mm6: (3) what about you Am2 (.) what's your plans after graduation? |
| 1730 | Am2: <1> um: </1> |
| 1731 | Mm6: <1> <@>doing interviews? </@> </1> |
| 1732 | All: @ @ @ |
| 1733 | Am2: no intend to become a teacher. |
| 1734 | Mm6: here in Vienna or? |
| 1735 | Am2: probably yes (.) mhm. |
| 1736 | Gf1: <2> at school or private school? </2> |
| 1737 | Mm6: <2> or in in </2> |
| 1738 | Am2: at schools yeah. |
| 1739 | Gf1: is it EASY to find a <3> to be a professor at school? </3> |
| 1740 | Am2: <3> no not really not really </3> (.) it's rather difficult. |
| 1741 | Gf1: you have some kind of EXAMS STATE exams or just apply for a job and that's it? |
| 1742 | Am2: you get uh some kind of state exam uh (xxx) exam= |
| 1743 | Gf1: =<FAST> NO NO </FAST> exams i mean like state exams that uh all people that want |
| 1744 | to teach at SCHOOL they have to pass this exam= |
| 1745 | Mm6: =mhm= |
| 1746 | Am2: =yeah yeah= |
| 1747 | Gf1: =to go to the school= |
| 1748 | Mm6: =like a licence |
| 1749 | Am2: yeah |
| 1750 | Mm6: you mean a licence on some ways <1> a state exam </1> |
| 1751 | Gf1: <1> no exams (.) real exams </1> (.) <2> like a </2> |
| 1752 | Mm6: <2> yeah but </2> you must pass these exams to get a licence with which one you can |
| 1753 | work as teacher. |
| 1754 | Am2: to apply |
| 1755 | Gf1: no not to apply to GET one for CERTAIN after you pass this exam for SURE you can |
| 1756 | get the job <FAST> in Greece it's something like that </FAST>. |
| 1757 | Mm6: uhum |
| 1758 | Am2: <3> no it doesn't exist but </3> |
| 1759 | Gf1: <3> we have it in Greece like that. </3> |
| 1760 | Am2: uhum <4> and do you know </4> |
| 1761 | Gf1: <4> but of course it's very very difficult </4> <5> cause only </5> only one or five |
| 1762 | percent pass it. |
| 1763 | Am2: <5> i can imagine yeah. </5> (end of recording unit 2) |
| 1764 | <gaprec 00:05> |
| 1765 | Mm6: what else you talk? <1> (is gonna) </1> |
| 1766 | Am2: <1> uh english </1> |
| 1767 | Mm6: english (.) <2> german </2> |
| 1768 | Am2: <2> French </2> german of course |
| 1769 | Mm6: french |
| 1770 | Am2: <@> and german dialects </@> |
| 1771 | All: @ @ @ @ |
| 1772 | Mm6: that's NOT a LANGUAGE. |
| 1773 | Am2: yeah that's it. |
| 1774 | Gf1: well i speak greek english german (.) uh ancient greek latin @ @ @ i can read i can |
| 1775 | read french < FAST> even i understand french italian </FAST> and some (spain). |
| 1776 | Am2: but you don't speak french <FAST> do you? </FAST> |


| 1827 | Mm6: <1> i'm expert for slav languages that's my speciality definitely </1> because i travel |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1828 | so much in almost every slav country (.) a:nd= |
| 1829 | Af3: <1>@@@@@ </1> |
| 1830 | Gf1: =you can speak them all <2> all of them you understand </2> |
| 1831 | Mm6: <2> yeah yeah i </2> (.) generally i can speak ALL uh the huge problem for me is |
| 1832 | sometimes i mix for example when i speak russian <FAST> i'm mixing with other russian |
| 1833 | and Ukraine </FAST> it's difficult for me to make a difference you know <3> or what is </3> |
| 1834 | Gf1: <3> (or with) (Latvia) or Estonia? </3> |
| 1835 | Mm6: <FAST> no no they're not slav languages they'are not slav countries </FAST> |
| 1836 | Gf1: but they have problems with minorities (.) i mean the Russian force= |
| 1837 | Mm6: =okay= |
| 1838 | Gf1: =is daily (intervening) there= |
| 1839 | Mm6: =almost everyone speaks there russian there is no problem but OFFICIAL language is |
| 1840 | a complete different one lithuanian and latvian languages (.) it's different kind of languages |
| 1841 | it's not german <4> it's not </4> |
| 1842 | Gf1: <4> yeah yeah i know i know </4> |
| 1843 | Mm6: <5> and from </5> |
| 1844 | Gf1: <5> but there are slight differences </5> |
| 1845 | Mm6: and from other way m: polish is not that difficult for macedonians because it's some |
| 1846 | connection between the slavs MACEDONIAN SLAVS originally comes from the Poland not |
| 1847 | from the Russia you know and is some connection and if for example for two months it was |
| 1848 | enough for me i do speak very fluent polish and polish and czech and Slovakian (.) polish and |
| 1849 | slovakian are more closer (.) and uh czech is little bit different it's not that much MAYBE for |
| 1850 | me czech is the <COINAGE> difficultst <[dIfIkultst]> </COINAGE> MOST DIFFICULT |
| 1851 | from the all slav languages <FAST> in the moment i speak </FAST> and of course southern |
| 1852 | slave languages from slovenian to to bulgarian it's no problem and i speak fluent <FAST> all |
| 1853 | of them </FAST> and of course ENGLISH i'm trying to study german but it's going so |
| 1854 | slowly because i have no time in the moment to to do course and it's really EXTRA MONEY |
| 1855 | for me in the moment $\langle 1\rangle$ because </1> generally because of the of the studies here (2) and a |
| 1856 | little bit turkish i understand (2) and few words in greek (1) like <LN> yamas </LN> |
| 1857 | <TRANSL=your health/cheers> |
| 1858 | Am2: <1> <SOFT> mhm <SOFT> </1> |
| 1859 | Gf1: <@> <L1=GREEK> yamas </L1=GREEK> <TRANSL=your health/cheers> </@> |
| 1860 | Af3: and in the labour then you can polish up your polish (.) because Mrs. Pappelbaum |
| 1861 | Mm6: she will come again? |
| 1862 | Af3: mhm |
| 1863 | Mm6: oh that would be so nice. |
| 1864 | Af3: yes we're looking forward to it she wrote. |
| 1865 | Mm6: m: super maybe we will get again some present. |
| 1866 | Af3: oh yes for sure @ @ @ |
| 1867 | Mm6: uh it's super (2) what about you? |
| 1868 | Af3: i ha:d uh english and french at school (.) but french it's very difficult to learn i only had |
| 1869 | <FAST> i only had it </FAST> for four years and that was not enough. |
| 1870 | Am2: mhm |
| 1871 | Mm6: but definitely all of us like team @ we're perfect @ @ @ @ (1) we speak all together |
| 1872 | all a:ll european languages |
| 1873 | Am2: yeah |
| 1874 | All: @ @ @ |
| 1875 | Gf1: except portuguese |
| 1876 | All: @ @ @ @ |
| 1877 | Mm6: okay |

Af3: $=\mathrm{mhm}=$
Sf5: =in two thousand six.
Sf5: =in two thousand six.
Mm6: he was doing pres- uh: training together with representation of Austria (.) < $>$ and Slovenia together $\langle/ 1\rangle=$
Am2: $\langle 1\rangle \mathrm{mhm}\langle/ 1>$
Mm6: yeah but
Am2: <2> and was his < Mmo know the problem is </2> it's it's not enough sponsors (.) in Macedonia that is huge problem because in summer is no chance (for him) to has a training in to go in New Zealand or or <3> i don't know in $\langle/ 3\rangle$ uh Latin America (.) because usually your representation you're professionally skiing are doing this you know be- all year they
their (arctic) in skiing you know and that costs so much he has no chance to to pay.
Am2: <3> mhm </3> Am2: but it's really interesting cause the croatian ski team is VERY small (.) a:nd= Mm6: $=\langle 4>$ it's so good </4>
Am2: <4> they are very successful. </4>
Mm6: uh it's AGAIN because uh Austria and Slovenia grows $\langle 5\rangle$ and $\langle/ 5\rangle$ they have a
training together with your team $\langle 6\rangle$ and $\langle/ 6\rangle$ THIS two brother and sister (shall we) they are really talented (.) and i know story about them <FAST> they're coming actually they're no REAL croatians </FAST> (.) <FAST> they're croatians but they're coming from Herzegovina </FAST>=
Am2: <5> uhum </5>
Am2: <6> uhum </6>
An6: $=$ but () <FAST> Bosnia Herzegovina you know </FAST> and there they have ALSO high mountains with lot of snow in the winters (.) and they're coming from one really deep village in the mountain you know where they have for the more than six months snow in the winter you know almost six months (.) and after that they they come to Zagreb and there they need some people from slovenian and austrian (.) team and (.) after that TALENT come on
the on the: surface. (2) i'm SURE that in future it's it's interest (1) a lot of people from the the on the: surface. (2) i'm SURE that in future it's it's interest (1) a lot of people from the aren't typical on someway skiing country can be good skier too it's not just need good
training you know and=
Af3: Body Miller also trained with the austrians and now he's SO good (.) even better than

Am2: <@>yeah </@>
Af3: @ @ @
Mm6: yeah it was the same story with with Girardelli he was skiing for Luxembourg=
II
Mm6: =i think he's Austrian (.) < $1>$ Marc Girardelli </1> yeah
Am2: <1> <FAST> he's Austrian </FAST> (.) from Vorarlberg </1>
Af3: is he active?
Mm6: <2> no not not more </2> but before he was very popular ten ten years < 3 > maybe </3>

Am2: $\langle 3><$ FAST $>$ it's funny cause we have a skier $</$ FAST $></ 3>$ who is called uh PEPI
STROBL and he starts for the slovenian uh team.
 Mm6: yeah slovenian team was the best one in in former Yugoslavia and definitely ninety
five percent from the all skiers not only in the skiing alpine discipline also in the nordic and uh ski jumping (.) were all coming from Slovenia yeah.
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1929 Mm6: $=\langle @>$ hm definitely $\langle/ @\rangle=$ Mm6: $=\langle @\rangle$ hm definitely $</ @\rangle=$
Gf1: =and uh: it's very expensive. Af3: mhm Gf1: Mm6: <1>@@@@@@@ </1>
Gf1: <@> i've broken my leg </@>= Sf5: =oh me TOO Gf1: <2> i don't </2>

Sf5: <2> no skiing just swimming @ @ </2>
Gf1: it's really expensive <FAST> i don't understand why it has to be so expensive </FAST> it's not only the: the whole uh things to buy or to rent=

Am2: =equipment $=$
Gf1: $=\langle$ FAST $>$ (you need) equipment $\langle/$ FAST $\rangle=$
Am2: =yeah
Gf1: it's not only that it's also (.) that they recharge you a lot for the um: STAYING near
where the snow is and the pistes <SOFT> (and I don't know what.) </SOFT> Mm6: i'm scared to skiing because maybe <@> i do an avalanche after me </@>

Mm6: no but i'm skiing (.) although it's my equipment is SO OLD but i'm doing that once a year when i have a chance.

Mm6: yeah of course we have a high mountains on the <L1=MACEDONIAN> (00:02)
</L1=MACEDONIAN>
Am2: Slovenia is a beautiful place for skiing.
Mm6: yeah but Slovenia is expensive.
Mm6: yeah i mean for US=

mountains and lot of greeks (tourists) at now are coming for skiing in Macedonia and we
really have uh high mountains with with good ski ski racing (stages) not (stages)uh race (.) really have uh high mountains with with good ski ski racing (stages) not (stages)uh race (.)
RACE yeah race.

Am2: mhm
Mm6: <FAST> my cousin is the best skiing in Macedonia skier in Macedonia he's skiing for the (representation). </FAST>

Mm6: he was on the Olympic Games in Nagano and (.) forever the last one (.) win the
Olympic Games
m6: okay=

Am2: <2> uh: </2>
Mm6: <2> <FAST>
Mm6: <2> <FAST> no no no </FAST> WINTER </2> (1) < 3> Nagano was </3>
Af3: <3> (i think) the winter games were in Atlanta </3>
Af3: i think so (.) <FAST>hh OH Salt Lake City </FAST>
Mm6: Salt Lake City=

Mm6: =yeah (.) he was in Nagano and then Salt Lake City.

に 슷ㅇু
Mm6: =<FAST> yeah yeah yeah </FAST> (2) but we have a competition in my country on on on one mountain and it's very nice usually they give to the winner small dog uh our native dog uh uh (xx) dog call it <L1=MACEDONIAN> xxxx </L1=MACEDONIAN you know and it's so funny usually they give <1> (same) </1>
Mm6: =yeah alive dog <2> PUPPY (.) of this (x) you know </2> SX-f: <2> @ @ @ </2>
Mm6: <3> yeah it's a SHEPHERD dog and it's very nice. $\langle/ 3\rangle=$ SX-3: =a shepherd $\operatorname{dog}=$ Mm6: =yeah
Am2, Af3: @ @ @ @ @


<TRANSL=mascot of Austrian TV show Musikantenstadl> </@> <4>
Af3: that's cool when in case uh if you have an avalanche (.) <FAST> he can search for you. </FAST>
Mm6: yeah
Mm6: <5> definitely </5>
Sf5: <5> he can find you </5>
Mm6: yeah but we have a lot of avalanches in Macedonia because mountains are really high and usually it's uh: (1) uh: (1) snow is coming you know in (.) in <COINAGE>ETAPS < $[\mathrm{o}$ 't $\Lambda \mathrm{ps}]></ C O I N A G E>$ you know=
$\mathrm{Am} 2:=\mathrm{mhm}=$
Mm6: =at ONCE (.) in etaps and after the etaps it's a lot of avalanches because when the new snow will come on the OLD snow it's coming to <COINAGE> skytings <['sk^ItIngs]> </COINAGE> s- s- slighting how to slighting yeah sliding
SX-f: =sliding $=$ <FAST> it's coming to avalanche </FAST>
Mm6: THIS WINTER we have two avalanches but not that dangerous like like here (1) no because thanks on the that region is n- not so many people (.) and is no winter EVERY winter like like this winter <FAST> because this winter is really extraordinary in the moment it's
(two) winters $\langle/$ FAST $><1\rangle$ than (one) $\langle/ 1\rangle$ (two) winters </FAST><1> than (one) </1>
Am2: <1> even in Austria </1>=
Mm6: =yeah (1) <FAST> AND for VIENNA too. </FAST> @
Sf5: when when is the s- s- uh spring coming here in Vienna?
All: @ @ @ @ @
Sf5: i must must
Sf5: i must must ask <@> this question. </@>
Gf1: <2> (yeah it's the winter) </2>
Gf1: <2> (yeah it's the winter) </2>
Am2: <2> <FAST> <@> hopefully s
Am2: <2><FAST><@> hopefully soon </@></FAST> </2>
Gf1: this YEAR it (x) being so much and last year it was
Gf1: this YEAR it ( x ) being so much and last year it was
Am2: yeah
Mm6: how long you here (.) <FAST> two years? </FAST>
Gf1: four years
Mm6: four years
Mm6: four years oh (1) you know already Vienna.
Gf1: 〈@> i think so </@> (.) i'm not sure.

Am2: <1>mhm </1>
Af3: what do you mean? Gfl: mm this thing that paying separately: normally (.) normally when we are a company in
Greece we just (2) <@> we just pay </@>SOMEONE pays and (.) next time <2> the other pays and then the other pays and $\langle/ 2\rangle$ i don't know just $\langle$ SOFT $\rangle$ it's weird $\langle/$ SOFT $\rangle$ and (2) <FAST> yeah this thing of money it makes me feel uncomfortable <3> (.) i don't know how to handle. </FAST> </3>
Sf5: <2> the other pays (.) and that's (.) that's too (.) in our country. </2>
 like here?
Am2: <4> uhum </4>
Am2. $=$ mhm mhm (4)
Mm6: yeah it's it's a huge difference in social life (1) people here are living much more isolated than than in my country <SOFT> you know </SOFT> and it's (.) BECAUSE i have

 you know it's (.) people don't speak so much they don't meet each other so much= Gf1: =and the people don't TRUST so much=
Gf1: =so easily (also) (1) u:m i feel <FAST> for example i feel when i go to supermarket </FAST> (.) that I'M OBSERVED (.) that people think FIRST that i will STEEL and THEN afterwards <FAST> they see that i'm innocent i won't do anything </FAST> (.) i think people are really scared of that a lot HERE inent to Saturn </FAST>=
Gf1: =you go they have a sensor of course (.) uh and when you go out they CHECK you
DOUBLE check your bag (1) in Saturn for example.
Gf1: really? why did it happen to ME?=
Mm6: =we're aliens.
All: @ @ @ @ @ @
Gfl: yeah i don't un
 here $()<2>$. or: </2>
Gf1: <2> <FAST> no no no </FAST> </2>
SX-5: <2> they don't look like foreigners </2>=
Am2: $=\langle 3>$ you don't look like foreigners $\langle/ 3\rangle$
Mfl: $<3>$ not at all $<$ (COME ON) i look like foreigner DEFINITELY.
Mm6: (COME ON) i look like foreigner DEFINITELY.
Gf1: i didn't mean that at all=
Am2: =yeah=
Gf1: $=\langle$ FAST $>$ no no </FAST>= Am2: $=\mathrm{mhm}=$
Gf1: =it's that people are so scared from THAT apart me=

$\odot \quad$ ®
43
Dm4: =(that's it) (.) but (.) well (.) i would say it's better than uh Vienna now= Am2: =<@ >it's better </@>
Dm4: but Gf1 told me that Vienna is actually the european (x) group=
Amum=
Dm4: =BUT of course as i we said the past years it hasn't been like that=
<gaprec 00:22> (due to parallel telephone conversation)
Am2: and uh how many residents do live in Copenhagen? (1) approximately? Vienna=
Vienna $=$
Am2: $=$ no no=

> Dm4: $=$ or most european big cities actually= $\Delta \mathrm{m}) .-\mathrm{mhm} \mathrm{mhm}$
Mm6: but it's a lot of bikes in Copenhagen i have feeling in the morning in the morning, Dm4: yeah you can compare it to: Greece actually because it's uh: as in Athens it's easier to


Mm6: okay but Athens <2> Athens is difference </2>
Mm6: yeah but i- in Greece no one doing that (.) everybody likes to go with their own car Gf1: no motorbikes=

Gf1: =motorbikes (.) i have a motorbike (.) WITH a CAR (1) you can go nowhere.
Af3: a Vespa?
Gf1: hm?
Gf1: no $(<\mathrm{LN}>($ gro $\beta)<\mathrm{LN}><$ TRANSL=big>) cross (.) Enduro
Am2: oh=

Am2, Af3: @ @ @ @ @
Af3: <@> it's very funn
Gf1: 〈@> yeah </@>
(ㄹ)
Gf1: it's MORE safe actually (.) than a Vespa (.) Vespa is really (xxx)=
Am2: =yeah=
Af1: y will wake up early tomorrow i have an appointment with my professor.

Am2: <1> uhum (.) uhum (.) uhum </1>
Gf1: a:nd (.) i have to meet him tomorrow (.) <SOFT> (go to church) </SOFT>=

Gf1: no precise they're not.
Mm6: <2> although </2>

Mm6: i hate the voice in the public transport (.) the voice saying the next station or: (.) $<2>$ or
go out $\langle/ 2\rangle$ yeah it's it's really $\langle 3>$ @ @ @ $</ 3>$ (i) really need to put some girl to be more
Th <TRANSL=Prague> it's it's some girl and it's very you know like like slowly and all </LN> <TRANSL=please leave/get out of the train> </LOUD>

Af3: <4> <@ > <L1=GERMAN> (zack zack) </L1=GERMAN> <TRANLS=hurry up hurry
Mm6: yeah it's it's really (.) real it's EVERY DAY it's really too much ESPECIALLY when i leave in Hütteldorf and <FAST> travel all city and come to university </FAST> uh it's it's really too much you know and you EVERYWHERE the same voice you know (.) it's it's
<telephone rings> <gapnrec 00:06>

Am2: well i like the voice cause sometimes if you fall asleep,
Mm6: it's very practical thing <5> BUT </5> (.) come on give to some girl to say that you
 better than (.) <FAST> bitte alle aussteigen </FAST>.

Am2: uh Dm4 what about public transport in Copenhagen? (1) <1> do you have </1> Mm6: <1> BIKES @ @ @ @ @ </1>
Dm4: bikes (.) yeah they (rent one)=
Dm4: yeah (.) but uh the public transport is pretty good. $=$

[^44]
Af3: yes i also think it's it's getting boring it's always the SAME djs the same music the same
people=

Gf1: =they have (x) now (1) the (x) and (.) <FAST> i prefer going to concerts </FAST> than
going to clubs <1> anymore </1> Am2: <1> mhm </1>=
Af3: =mhm
Gf1: i’ve (hea
Gf1: i've (heard) a lot of clubs there (1) normally i like it in Monastery because it's not like
uh: Graffiti for example it's not like a HOUSE with separate rooms.
Gf1: i the idea of clubs i (bare) in mind is like a big (.) BALL room so to say (.) and that's it a
club (.) (with a bar) $()<1>$. not separately the rooms $</ 1\rangle$
Gf1: yeah with a dance floor (2) that's why i don't like Meggiddo and Graffiti (.) <SOFT> and the rest. </SOFT>
Gf1: it's not a dance floor $()<@>$. it's hardly a dance floor $</ @>$ (1) that's a problem (1) and
the people are so drunk. the people are so drunk.
Af3: it's in all the clubs.
Sf5: you haven't been to a serbian party (.) <@> everybody is drunk. </@>
 uh: she: her $(\mathrm{xxx})$ is german and they were went to the european uh: cup last year and they
 $<1>$ (.) AT ALL AT ALL </1> people were just dancing uh singing celebrating NO ONE was drinking <FAST> (this was so) </FAST> <2> WHY he said you're not drinking </2> (.) why
 need to DRINK to have fun= Am2, Af3: <1>@@@</1>
Am2, Af3: <2>@@@ </2>
Af3: $=\mathrm{mhm}=$
Gf1: $=$ to (get) a good mood (.) but for US it's like if you ARE in a good mood mood you
drink. Am2: <3> mhm mhm </3>
Sf5: <3> yeah (.) that's true
Sf5: <3> yeah (.) that's true (.) <SOFT> the same </SOFT> </3>
Gf1: if you're not in a good mood <4> you don't drink anything. </4>


: also
Af3: it makes you aggressive
Gf1: also yeah also
Mm6: when you talking about this it's really interesting story about Montenegro the second
part of Serbia Montenegro (.) <FAST> people there are dancing without music. </FAST>
All: @ @ @ @ @
Af3: music in thei
Af3: music in their mind (.) probably.
Mm6: yeah it's true and they have a special dance they're JUMPING and drinks a lot of=


Sf5: <1> yeah the Montenegrins are (xxx) (.) they are very ( xx ) very ( xx ). $</ 1\rangle$

Am2: =mhm=
Gf1: $=\langle @\rangle$ i have to wake up early. </@>
Gf1: i don't have a drink there (.) i don't have a drink there cause they don't have many much
variety of drinks (.) in my opinion and they: (.) they are very expensive (.) with WITH the ten uro entrance expensive. $=$
Gf1: i think it's too expensive because uh Palais Eschenbach is uh: uh it belongs to the state (.) or not?
Af3: poo i don't know.
Gf1: or is it private property?
Am2: i don't think so:,
Gf1: if it belongs to the state they must pay some FEE to rent it for the night <gaprec: 00:08> <Mm6 talks to Sf5>
Gf1: i'm sure it's for that (.) because it's uh: (.) they have also renovated it (2) Palais Eschenbach (1) it's a monument (.) it's a cultural monument=
Am2: $=m h m=$
Gf1: =so:
f3: it's a very nice atmosphere
Gf1: i like it a lot
Af3: with all the p
Af3: with all the pictures on the wall (.) it's like a ball room.
Am2: do you like (.) going out in Vienna?
Gf1: in the first year i was here i was going out <SOFT> (almost everyday) </SOFT> <1>
@ @ @ @ @ </1> but uh: as slowly of course you get tired of it and=
Am2, Af3: <1>@@@@@</1>
Af3: you still go to Monastery?
Gf1: i don't go to Monastery (3) last time when there was my birthday in January beginning

Gf1: before that i haven't been there for one and a half year @ @ @
Mm6: =uh yeah (.)maybe this is HARD for me (.) <3> (raving) </3> (1) i can accept. Gf1: <3> <@> boring </@> </3>
Af3: <3> <@> @@@ </@> </3> <gaprec 00:11>
Dm4: uh: i've so many i can't mention (.) uh: i don't know (.) it's it's different also depending

Am2: =mhm (.) of COURSE
Dm4: i mean sometimes i' m in the mood for: death and black=
$\mathrm{Am} 2:=\mathrm{mhm}=-\quad$ and then i've periods when i listen mostly to power metal and=
Am2: $=\mathrm{mhm}=$
$\mathrm{Dm} 4:=\mathrm{Genesis}$ but one of my ALL time favourite bands are definitely Helloween (1) it's uh
one of the first bands $\langle 1\rangle$ i ever listened to. $\langle/ 1\rangle$
Am2: <1> they are from Germany aren't they? </1>

Dm4: and i like Gravedigger a lot and i listened to them last night i was kind of (.) bad and
ick so: yeah <gaprec 00:10>
Gf1: very much (2) but but i also like um the older i get (.) the wider broad minded i get in
music $=$ Ans
Gf1: $=\langle$ FAST $>$ i was very much into metal </FAST> (1) then gothic also and uh: (.) what i like in those musics is uh <FAST> metal and gothic </FAST> there are varieties also in in
 everything rock (.) i can't stand mainstream i can't stand (1) house (.) and (xx) and things i

Gf1: =<1> rap oh oh my GOD </1> (.) and uh (.) almost <FAST> i can't </FAST> i can't Stand : <1> oh (.) uh </1>
Af3: do you know the second project of Chris Pohl (.) Blutengel?
Gf1: of course i know almost all of them.
Af3: i like them so much @
Gf1: well (.) to ME (1) i like
1: well (.) to ME (1) i like them not so @ @ i mean there's not
f3: it's more romantic
Gf1: yeah but=
Af3: =and more electronic=
X-4: =mhm
Gf1: <FAST> electronic is it not more </FAST> (.) more MELODIC they are.
Af3: <1> m: yes </1>
Gf1: $\langle 1\rangle$ cause Terminal Choice are really: (.) heavy $\langle/ 1\rangle$ (.) i mean (.) Terminal Choice are
like also like The ( xx ) (.) but are more (.) sick <@> i would say </@> ike also like The (xx) (.) but are more (.) sick <@> i would say </@>
f3: the guy is really sick.




Gf1: have you been to Umbro at Imago show?



กิ ๗


Sf5: =the vibration=
Mm6: =yeah vibration of the stone (1) and they're really enjoying this <@> they need this.
</@>
Af3: and are they drunk when they're doing this?
Mm6: no no no no (end of recording unit 3)
<gaprec 00:08>
Mm6: what's the next topic?
Mm6: @ @ @
Am2: or music or @ @ (2) what kind of music do you like?
Sf5: rock=
f5: U2
Am2: =<SOFT> rock </SOFT>

$\stackrel{\text { ² }}{ \pm}$ Sf5: =from FORMER Yugoslavia=
Am2: =yeah=
Sf5: =from Macedonia (.) uh $()<@>.<L 1=$ SERBIAN $>x x x</ \mathrm{L} 1=$ SERBIAN $></ @>$ and
from Bosnia <L1=SERBIAN> $x x x</ \mathrm{L} 1=$ SERBIAN $>$ it's the (.) no MANY uh but i LIKE th
english music better the rock english music=
Am2: =mhm=
Sf5: =from America and from also from Europe.=
Am2: =mhm
Af3: and you Mm6?
Mm6: <1> oh it's really hard </1>
Sf5: <1> and the <LN $>$ SERBISCH </LN> <TRANSL=serbian> music </1> (.) very bad
Am2: oh @ @
Sf5: <2> all very bad (.) all awful </2>
Mm6: <2> i will not generalize (.) what exactly i want </2> (.) because i like uh rock i like
uh: (.) macedonian music i like Balkan music generally i like classical music too (.) it's
sometimes i really need some this i MAYBE i like everything let's say maybe not (.)
TECHNO music so much=
Am2: =mhm=
Mm6: =although for short period i i also=
Gf1: =<FAST> (you liked it better?) </FAST>=

Mm6: =yeah i was going on for example on some no like more like i'm not good expert in
music but let's say i like techno like house and uh=

## Gf1: =(xxx)=



## hhm=

$\mathrm{Dm} 4:=\mathrm{mhm}=$
Am2: $=$ when i was much younger i was very much into this grunge rock scene Dm4: like Nirv
Am2: and i also like uh metal but more modern metal like Fear Factory or Machine Head (.)


 m6: what about dances?
m2: dances?
Mm6: yeah what you prefer
Am2: <1> um: </1>

m2: i'm not such a good dancer but @ @ uh <3> traditional dances </3>
f3: <3> he dances a waltz </3>
Am2: a waltz i dance a waltz yeah

Mm6: what about you?

Af3: uh i went to a < $1>$ dancing school </1>
f1: <1> freestyle </1>
f3: yeah freestyle nowadays (1) i've learnt foxtrot and and boogie woogie and (1) and waltz
that's (clear) <@>but i (.) (don't) do it (.) i wish i'd do it </@> (1) no: freestyle's okay.
Mm6: okay what about you (.) greeks
Gf1: well the only thing i have learnt at school it was traditional < @ > greek dancing </@> @ @ @
Sirtaki?
$=$
Sf5: =Sirtaki=
Am2: =Sir- Sirtaki
Gf1: not really @ @ @ traditional is (lots) of (xx) we dance more modern @ @ traditional is




各

Af3: to what?
Gf1: Umbro et Imago Af3: UMBRO ET IMAGO (.) we have been (.) have you been?
Umbro et Imago 2539
2540
2541 2542
2543
2544
 2546 Gfl: <2> it's nice </2>

2547 Dm4: <2> but it's not S
2548 Af3: and it's provoking Gf1: <FAST> i like it but it's a show </FAST> at least (.) i don't like uh: when you pay so 2550 much money for a concert and there they just stand and sings. 2550 much money for a concert and there they just stand and sings.
2551 Af3: dep- depends on the music

2552 Dm4: yeah i agree with that i agree with it (1) doesn't have to be a theatre.
2553 Gf1: but i like it when it's a show a bit.
Dm4: yeah of course but it uh depends on the music and on the band members.
Af3: the the music of Umbro et Image uh i think it's not so bad but uh the show the show is really ugly.

Gf1: <FAST> i don't know the music i like i used to like a lot </FAST> (2) i think Mea
Culpa have the (1) greatest album (.) i've heard=
Gf1: =and the greatest album in the gothic scene also (1) i believe (1) but uh (1) generally m: <gaprec 00:18>

Mm6: you reminded me so much on one person born in November.
Gf1: born in November?
Mm6: yeah
Gf1: <@> <FAST> what do you mean born in November? </FAST> </@>
Af3: there's a SONG called winter born from the Crux Shadows @ @ @ @
Mm6: yeah it's it's (.) it's almost like a copy not not maybe in the face but (1) this the things
what you said about you it's it's very <COINAGE> characteristical <[ka:ra:kterIstIkl]> </COINAGE> for her too.
Gf1: @ @ okay

Mm6: i like to check it's you're born in November too?
ff1: no
All: @ @ @ @ @
Gf1: January (.) i
Gf1: January (.) in winter @ @ @ @
Mm6: okay it's November is almost winter too
All: @ @ @ @ (7)
Mm6: i have a problem when was with the mus
All: @ @ @ @ (7)
Mm6: i have a problem when was with the music when i've been the vice president of VMEC there was ONE song when everybody recognise it as my song

Mm6: and usually they're INSISTING to me always to dance and dance and because the joke
was (some) you can leave your hat on @ @ @ @ @ @ @
All: @ @ @ @
Mm6: and sometimes i really have a problem @ @ @ @ @
All: @ @ @ @ @ (5)
Dm4: what music uh do you like?
Dm4: what music uh do you like?
Am2: me?



2640 Gf1: traditional parts of Greece have different parts of traditional (.) m:usic and traditional 6642 Sf5. <1> it's the best </1>
Mm6: i like so much czardas (.) hungarian czardas $\langle 2>$ it's so nice $</ 2>$ yeah it's so nice and that's so interesting (.) and i have a really strange experience in Budapest (.) in one restaurant (.) uh: in CZARDAS (.) and i'm <FAST> i'm not so sure that it's really typical maybe because we were tourists </FAST> and they like to make it more specific (.) girls are
choosing guys (.) with which one they like to dance= choosing guys (.) with which one they like to dance=
SX-f: <2> czardas </2>
Af3: =it's $(x)=$
Mm6: =yeah
Mm6: =yeah (.) and i have been chosen for one girl and it was so funny they put you uh (trap)
on your (.) ey:es and you must be careful to not broke some bottles in the middle <FAST> on your (.) ey:es and you must be careful to not broke some bottles in the middle <FAST>
you know when you dancing </FAST> and (.) on the end usually girls they gives you a present <SOFT> you know </SOFT> and that that was really funny uh the girl said to me
please don't open the the present before you do come in the hotel (1) and maybe because of please don't open the the present before you do come in the hotel (1) and maybe because of
this (.) greek czardas become (.) so interesting game for me. (.) <1> it's really $\langle/ 1\rangle$ this (.) greek czardas become (.) so interesting game for me. (.) <1> it's really </1>
Af3: $\langle 1\rangle$ so what was the present? </1> Mm6: and the present was so funny (.) <2> that was </2> Af3: <2> a condom </2>
Mm6: condom yeah
All: @ @ @ @ @
Mm6: typical for < @ > Hungary and Budapest </@>
Mm6: yeah BUT not a regular condom condom uh:=
Gf1: =extra large
Mm6: no
All: @ @
All: @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @ @
Mm6: on the top uh of the cond
Mm6: on the top uh of the condom uh was made like a FACE you know
SX-f: $\langle 1\rangle$ oh: $</ 1>$
Mm6: $<1>$ with eyes nose $</ 1>$ and uh mouth (1) yeah but (2) not because of these definitely
the the the dance was really nice ESPECIALLY in the SPECIAL red boots in which one they're dancing and the:=
Mm6: yes something like this (1) but it's really nice (1) and also i like so much scottish and and irish dances=
Mm6: =this is really special and extraordinary when i have a chance thanks on this (IBSA) we have a TALENT show in the program of congress and symposium where everyone from his country should be presenting some typical dance <LOUD> i have some experience in greek (invite) me to stand up and then (.) maybe that's more like Sirtarki not like uh like uh= (invite) me to stand up and then (.) maybe that's more like Sirtarki not like uh like uh=
Gf1: <1> @ @ @ </1> Gf1: =uhum=
Mm6: =traditi
Mm6: =traditional one. (9) okay psychology next topic
All: @ @ @ @
Mm6: come on we're in Vienna Sigmund Freud is here born and
 (.) it's not (.) especially psychoanalysis (.) Af3 has a chance to @@ when we were in in 응
E
تु
U
Mm6: yeah Schnitzel yeah it's okay.
Sf5: Schnitzel (.) and <LN> Mohn </ Sf5: Schnitzel (.) and <LN> Mohn </LN> <TRANSL=poppy> uh <LN> Knödel </LN>

Af3: =everybody eats pizza a:nd=


## f1: yeah they are good.

 f1: yeah they areftyrian apples

Af3: we also grow apples at home (.) in our garden (1) <1> but they do not look so nice. </1> Gf1: <1> (ye
Af3: $=$ mhm
<gaprec 00:25>
Gf1: (they don't put enough) oil in the salad that's what my problem was in the beginning (.) he SALAD
둘
Gf1: no it's water (.) only uh only (a different one).
Am2: <1> but we USE oil uh: </1>
Gf1: <FAST> the green salad that normally comes with the Schnitzel for example </FAST>
Af3: <1> WHICH salad do you mean? </1>
Gf1: <FAST> the green salad that normally con SX-5: =yeah
Am2: really?
SX-5: mhm

Gf1: we don't eat mixed salad plates EITHER in Greece @ @ @ but TOURISTS want it <1>
<@> that's why we make it for them </@> </1> <@> that's why we make it for them </@> </1>
Gf1: <2> in the winter </2> (.) <FAST> in the winter we don't eat tomatoes first of all (.) or cucumbers </FAST> (.) SELDOM (.) cause they're not uh winter (.) fruits <FAST> winter vegetables </FAST> (1) so we: <FAST> in the winter </FAST> we eat uh: yeah normal (.) cauliflower of course (.) although winter cause (x) (xx) (.) cauliflower (.) and uh: (1) what else
uh: lettuce salad very much during the winter (2) (CARROTS) of course carrots salad and lettuce salad are the main salads in winter (.) but NEVER mixed (.) they're just plain (.) LETTUCE carrots (.) ONLY with the carrots we just (wrap) a bit of currant on it.
Af3: i've got the feeling that nowadays the typical meal in in Greece is uh something like a gyros a < $3>$ big peace of meat </3> with <L1=GERMAN> pommes </L1=GERMAN>
<TRANSL=chips>
Gf1: <3> yeah </3>
Gf1: <3> yeah </3>
Af3: pommes everywhere
Am2: yeah for the tourists tourists
Af3: because of the tourists @ @
Gf1: we have it the get one (1) they're wraped up uh meat either gyros and other meat=
Af3: =mhm=
Gf1: =mhm=
Gf1: =beef or whatever=
Am2: =mhm=
Gf1: =yeah
Af3: i don't like so much meat.
Gf1: they don't put so much meat in Greece like here.
Am2: no
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Am2: =mhm=
Gf1: =yeah
Af3: i don't like so much meat.
Gf1: they don't put so much meat in Greece like here.
Am2: no
ffl: <3> yeah </3>
f3: pommes everywhere
m2: yeah for the tourists tourists
f3: because of the tourists @ @
Gf1: we have it the get one (1) they're wraped up uh meat either gyros and other meat
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f1: =beef or whatever=
m2: =mhm=
f1: = yeah
f3: i don't like so much meat.
f1: they don't put so much meat in Greece like here.
m2: no
ffl: <3> yeah </3>
f3: pommes everywhere
m2: yeah for the tourists tourists
f3: because of the tourists @ @
Gf1: we have it the get one (1) they're wraped up uh meat either gyros and other meat
f3: = mhm =
Gf1: =mhm=
f1: =beef or whatever=
m2: =mhm=
f1: = yeah
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f1: they don't put so much meat in Greece like here.
m2: no
ffl: <3> yeah </3>
f3: pommes everywhere
m2: yeah for the tourists tourists
f3: because of the tourists @ @
Gf1: we have it the get one (1) they're wraped up uh meat either gyros and other meat
f3: = mhm =
Gf1: =mhm=
f1: =beef or whatever=
m2: =mhm=
f1: = yeah
f3: i don't like so much meat.
f1: they don't put so much meat in Greece like here.
m2: no
Gf1: <3> yeah </3>
Af3: pommes everywhere
Am2: yeah for the tourists tourists
Af3: because of the tourists @ @
Gf1: we have it the get one (1) they're wraped up uh meat either gyros and other meat=
Af3: =mhm=
Gf1: =mhm=
Gf1: =beef or whatever=
Am2: =mhm=
Gf1: =yeah
Af3: i don't like so much meat.
Gf1: they don't put so much meat in Greece like here.
Am2: no
Gf1: they don't put so much meat in Greece like here.
Am2: no
Gf1: (not really)
Af3: i didn't eat
Af3: i didn't eat even one gyros in in Greece (.) in two weeks.
Mm6: where have you been in Greece in what (x)?

Af3: uh Faliraki (.) at <L1=GERMAN> Rhodos </L1=GERMAN> <TRANSL=Rhodes>
Am2: me too

Am2: uhum
Am2: =uhum=
Gf1: =in Billa at least nowhere that's what i HATE (.) i can't find tomatoes from Austria <1>
or for example </1> (.) yeah always uh something else or LEMONS <FAST> excuse me
</FAST > lemons in winter uh: what ever <FAST> but why don't you have it here </FAST>
(.) in this (.) supermarket <FAST> they have to bring it from Spain </FAST> or Italy or
Cyprus or wherever.
Af3: <1> only spanish </1>
Af3: i guess they're cheaper from Spain.
Gf1: <FAST> i think so </FAST> (.) all this transport aren't isn't paid
Af3: i understand this system.
Gf1: i don't i really HATE this thing.
Af3: mhm
Gf1: even in winter (.) things winter stuff ORANGES (1) why?
Af3: oranges they need hot climate i think.
Am2: mhm
Af3: in Florida they grow oranges.=
Gf1: =yeah they do but it's in the winter (.) also mediterranean countries they grow it in
winter (.) not in the summer (.) in summer (1) we don't have oranges (2) of course they need
the the (1) mediterranean climate=
Mm6: =yeah definitely they're not producing oranges in in all Austria.
Am2: mhm=
Af3: =mhm
Gf1: if they can produce for example tomatoes they can produce also oranges (.) also um
lemon um (x) they can produce anything.
Am2: mhm
Af3: the Marchfeld is very famous for vegetables (.) peas and so on.
Gf1: yeah?
Af3: the Iglo stuff (.) it's from Marchfeld.
Gf1: really?
Af3: mhm=
Am2: =mhm
Af3: fresh and frozen
Mm6: that is what i i miss from my country fruits and vegetables=
Am2: =mhm=
Mm6: =i mean you can find everything here <1> but the taste is </1>
Sf5: < > no taste (.) so different </1>
Gf1: that's my problem also here (.) <SOFT> the taste </SOFT> although where the taste is
really good HERE (.) it's the broccoli (.) very good=
SX-6: =mhm=
Gf1: =it tastes very good=
Am2: =mhm=
Gf1: i mean not the (.) the austrian cauliflower actually not the broccoli=
Am2: =mhm=
Gf1: =yes i like it much (2) but the fruits i always have problems with the fruits <SOFT> they
have different taste </SOFT> OF COURSE there are so many days with TRANSPORT who
knows how many days (have been) also (.) BEFORE the transport
Af3: apples are very good.
Am2: yeah

Mm6: okay
Af3: everybody does was there after school= <gaprec 00:15>
Gf1: mostly our
Gf1: = vegetarian in the modern language cause (.) from the middle ages we didn't have (.) people had more uh access to vegetables <FAST> they didn't have money </FAST> meat was uh: luxury=
Am2: $\langle 1\rangle \mathrm{mhm} \mathrm{mhm}\langle/ 1\rangle=$
Gf1: =thing (1) so: meat was for the: <@> emperors and the kings </@> and the very (1) rich people also <FAST> that's why </FAST> we have so so long <COINAGE> fastening <['fa:stenI $\eta]></ C O I N A G E>$ periods (1) when i when i read the source it's for example uh
english german travellers french travellers that come to Greece in the: fifteenths sixteenths century even in the nineteenths century (.) they ALL mentioned (ad hoc) the greek diet that that meat is not at all here only in the Easter and Christmas and (.) on holidays and big uh uh saints uh days (.) and that the greeks <COINAGE> fastened <['fa:stend]> </COINAGE> so <['fa:sten] > </COINAGE></@> (1) so (1) <FAST> so when you fasten you don't eat ANY <['fa:sten]> </COINAGE> </@> (1) so (1) <FAST> so when you fasten you don't eat ANY
dairy products ANY meat products </FAST> (.) just vegetables (1) and oil. Am2: mhm
Af3: i would miss cheese.
Gf1: yeah i don't eat cheese (.) when it's fastening it's fasten (1) a:nd but cheese also yeah of course i: other ones they: they eat cheese (1) but then but they say @ it's very funny some french travellers in the seventeenths century in <LN>Kreta </LN> <TRANSL=Crete> they
see that (.) the DONKEYS (.) eat the plant (.) (from) the <COINAGE> kretans' < ['kreIta:ns] see that (.) the DONKEYS (.) eat the plant (.) (from) the <COINAGE> kretans' <['kreIta:ns]>
</COINAGE> wrist to the uh: um: to the root of the plant you know they eat the root of the plant All: @ @ @ @ @
Am2: that's love
Gf1: which is very nice of course (1) i like it (3) so: everything is eatable (.) <@> in Greece </@> (1) yeah yeah when it's now in the Easter when the: certain kind of (.) PLANTS like
<LN> (Grashalm) </LN> <TRANSL=blade of grass> they grow in the fields (4) <SOFT> <LN> (Grashalm) </LN> <TRANSL=blade of grass> they grow in the fields (4) <SOFT>
from the fields </SOFT> Af3: grass? Gf1: like uh <LN> Löwenzahn </LN> <TRANSL=dandelion> for example
Af3: uhum salad=
Gf1: =grass=
Af3: =Löwenzahn salad
Gf1: it's not salad it's a plant that's so high as grass <SOFT> (what i say like) </SOFT> (.)
and in the fields it's growing (.) EVERYWHERE=
Am2: =mhm
Gf1: it can be cultivated (.) it's just natural cut (.) (xx) <@> they're everywhere. </@>
Am2: mhm (4)
Gf1: in general (my part) for example we eat meat once a week (.) every Sunday=
Af3: =mhm
<gaprec 00:10>
Am2: in Austria people eat meat almost every day (.) or at least sausages <1> or: </1>

[^45]in
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3101
302 Aff：＠＠＠＠
3103
Gf1：＜FAST＞so you mean if we eat a lot of salmon＜／FAST＞you＇re gonna（．）have the
3104
3105
Af3：uh it risk of dying（from）bacteria？
that uh（end of risk groups（．）i mean if you＇re pregnant（．）uh there＇s a high chance
3096 Gf1，Af3，Mm6：＠＠＠＠＠＠＠
3097 Mm6：only FRESH ONE（1）yeah
3098 Af3：and we have salmon everyday in our lab i cannot see it anymore＠
3099 Am2：＠
3100 Mm6：every weekend we＇d take some cat in the lab（．）＜＠＞you can feed it＜／＠＞
3101
302 Aff：＠＠＠＠
3103
Gf1：＜FAST＞so you mean if we eat a lot of salmon＜／FAST＞you＇re gonna（．）have the
3104
3105
Af3：uh it risk of dying（from）bacteria？
that uh（end of risk groups（．）i mean if you＇re pregnant（．）uh there＇s a high chance
3045 Gf1：m：it＇s not so good（．）i：i mean
3046 Af3：it＇s getting boring
3048 Af3：it＇s always the same（．）＜1＞in every restaurant．＜／1＞
3049 Gfl：＜1＞always the same？＜／1＞（．）and they put so little one on（ xxx ）MOST of the sushi if
3050 you order a sushi plate＜FAST＞most of it will be with avocado＜／FAST＞or cucumber（．）
3051 inside＝

$\begin{array}{ll}3052 & \text { Am2：}=\text { mhm }= \\ 3053 & \text { Gf1：}=\text {（with fish })\end{array}$
（3）
3055 Af3：you have to go to a running sushi restaurant．
3056 Gf1：i don＇t like running sushi＜FAST＞running sushi＜／FAST＞
3056 Gfl：i idon’t like running sushi＜FAST＞running sushi＜／FAST＞has only a bit of sushi（1）all
3057 the other things are：（．）baked and＝
3058 Dm4：＝and＜LN＞Lachs＜／LN＞＜TRANSL＝salmon＞
3059 SX－3：Lachs
Gf1：oh yeah（．）SALMON is very good at the running sushi．
Af3：i do not eat salmon anymore．
Af3：ido not eat salmon anymore．
Gf1：＜＠＞why（．）what（do you really want？）＜／＠＞
Aff：＜＠＞since i work with Listeria＜／＠＞
Gf1，Mm6：＠＠＠＠＠
Af3：＜＠＞every salmon
Af3：〈＠＞every salmon is contaminated with
Mm6：oh yeah come on（2）＜1＞that＇s a＜／1＞
Af3：$\langle 1\rangle$ you cannot buy it in Billa $</ 1>$ so you cannot buy a a Listeria free salmon． Mm6：yeah but that＇s okay（1）＜2＞in every food it
Af3：$\langle 2\rangle\langle @\rangle$ do you like Listeria？＜｜＠＞＜｜2＞
3：＜2＞＜＠＞do you like Listeria？＜／＠＞\ll
Af3：they＇re they＇re dangerous
Mm6：yeah okay＝
Af3：＝when you are：immunocompromised．
Gf1：＜3＞i mean EVERY Salmonella also＜／3＞but you eat eggs？
f3：＜3＞＜＠＞you are（resistant）＜／＠＞＜／3＞
Af3：＜4＞eggs？＜／4＞
Mm6：＜4＞in that（wh
Mm6：＜4＞in that（where you writing）is dangerous．＜／4＞
Gf1：uh（salmon）（．）doesn＇t have
Af3：Listeria very dangerous
Af3：Listeria very dangerous
Gf1：and Salmonella is not？
Gf1：and Salmonella is not？＠＠＠（．）what＇s Salmonella is（got）or Salmonella？
Mm6：Salmonella is the same（．）yeah she＇s working Salmonella too．

Gf1：yeah
Af3：Salmonella are not so uh such a big problem like Listeria．
Gf1：uhum
Mm6：the MOST dangerous bacterium is Clostridium because they＇re producing a lot of uh toxin（．）and that toxin is is going in the blood and（．）can go through it for a very fast time＝

Gf1：＝since i＇ve been here i eat so much salmon cause it＇s the only thing i can find in Iglo（．） 0
0
0
0
0
Af3：you shouldn＇t eat salmon when you＇re pregnant．
Gf1：okay
Mm6：〈＠＞oh come on＜／＠＞

[^46]
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Führerschein Gruppe $A$ und $B$


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Throughout this thesis the term 'conversation' refers to spoken interactive discourse (cf. Eggins and Slade 1997: 23).
    ${ }^{2}$ For a more detailed description of the VOICE project see http://www.univie.ac.at/voice.

[^1]:    ${ }^{3}$ In this respect, the following anecdote reports on an incident where one of my participants casts doubt on doing an analysis of casual conversation: After the actual recording session I was met with a response of amazement from one of the participants. He was deeply concerned about the 'anticipated output' of the taped data by asking me whether a linguist could actually benefit from a conversation which he had felt was 'all over the place' as they were 'only chatting about things that came spontaneously to their mind'. A similar incident is stated in Eggins and Slade's (1997: 22) study on casual conversation.

[^2]:    ${ }^{4}$ In the forthcoming chapters, this thesis will describe what is meant by 'institutionalized'. In essence, institutionalized talk covers any professional interaction appropriate to a particular working context (e.g. meetings, etc.) or other ritualized types of public speaking (e.g. politics, classroom, etc.) (cf. Cameron (2000: 27).

[^3]:    ${ }^{5}$ As opposed to the accumulation of corpus data, Knowles (1996: 6-8) considers 'elicitation' to be a more active task.

[^4]:    ${ }^{6}$ My way of actively participating in the conversation can be contrasted with Duranti's (1997: 99) method of "passive participation observation" where the researcher primarily acts as a silent listener.

[^5]:    ${ }^{7}$ A detailed description of the VOICE project and its mark-up and spelling conventions is available at http://www.univie.ac.at/voice.

[^6]:    ${ }^{8}$ The main reason why I decided to do the recording session in my girlfriend's flat has already been discussed in section 3.2.1.

[^7]:    ${ }^{9}$ Although I was interested in investigating 'pure' ELF discourse, this thesis does not disregard the fact that of course English native speakers do take part in many ELF interactions every day and all over the world.

[^8]:    ${ }^{10}$ Table 2 shows that among the participants there are two German speakers from Austria. Even so, I do consider the recorded data to reveal distinctive features of 'real' ELF talk as both German speakers use English as "an additionally acquired language system that serves as a means of communication between speakers of different first languages" (Seidlhofer 2001a: 146).
    ${ }^{11}$ Am2 represents the author of this thesis. A description of my actual role in the recorded session has already been given in section 3.2.1.

[^9]:    ${ }^{12}$ For a full discussion of this subject (approaches to analysing casual conversation) see Eggins and Slade (1997: 23-66).

[^10]:    ${ }^{13}$ A detailed description of ethnomethodology and its main ideas can be found in Garfinkel's 'Studies in Ethnomethodology' (1967).

[^11]:    14 A technique to quantify specific DNA fragments (for a more detailed description see http://pathmicro.med.sc.edu/pcr/realtime-home.htm)
    ${ }^{15}$ According to Bublitz (1988: 59-61), a descriptive approach to analysing conversation implies the consideration of both verbal and non-verbal (e.g. nodding) manifestations.

[^12]:    ${ }^{16}$ Throughout this thesis terms such as everyday talk, interpersonal talk or ordinary conversation (or interaction) (cf. Eggins and Slade 1997) will be equated with casual conversation. Malone (1997: 3) also uses informal talk (or discourse) as the equivalent of casual talk. Of course, I will refrain from using Malone's terminology as the following study aims at illustrating that casual talk is not necessarily restricted to informality.

[^13]:    ${ }^{17}$ The concept of turn-taking in casual talk will be elaborately discussed in chapter 6 .
    ${ }^{18}$ In my data, frequently occurring enthusiastic overlaps seem to be a typical feature of spoken discourse among ELF speakers from southern European countries while this phenomenon is less prominent among participants from northern parts of Europe (cf. APPENDIX: transcription).

[^14]:    ${ }^{19}$ Besides non-casual conversation, I will equally use the terms institutional (cf. Cameron 2001), professional (cf. Halliday 1978) or organized talk (Lepper 2000: 134-135).

[^15]:    ${ }^{20}$ As opposed to casual conversationalists, participants in professional talk try to fulfil pre-given social roles.

[^16]:    ${ }^{21}$ In this respect, the previous chapter has already shown that setting in a speech situation need not necessarily indicate the degree of formality in a given speech act.
    ${ }^{22}$ Grice's (1975) maxims of conversation include requirements of "truth, informativeness, relevance and the avoidance of ambiguity" (quoted in Heylighen and Dewaele 1999:3).

[^17]:    ${ }^{23}$ A detailed description of both the dimensions identified and their supposed influence on formality can be found in Holmes and Stubbe (2003: 59-61).

[^18]:    ${ }^{24}$ Both, a detailed description and discussion of the formality score proposed by Heylighen and Dewaele (1999) will be carried out in section 5.2.3.
    ${ }^{25}$ For a more detailed description of this investigation see Heylighen and Dewaele (1999: 32).

[^19]:    ${ }^{26}$ For a full discussion of this subject (formality and the avoidance of ambiguity) see Heylighen and Dewaele (1999).

[^20]:    ${ }^{27}$ Although this thesis supports the idea that non-verbal actions (e.g. hand gesticulation and other kinds of body language (cf. Oreström 1983: 30)) also initiate turn-taking, it will be left out of account as it is not a required matter of analysis in this paper.

[^21]:    ${ }^{28}$ Other adjacency pairs include compliment/rejection, complaint/denial, challenge/rejection, request/grant, offer/accept, offer/reject and instruct/receipt (cf. Sacks et al. 1974: 717).

[^22]:    ${ }^{29}$ According to Atkinson (1982: 103), the participants' right to predetermine the turn taking system in conversations can be traced back to their social status, position in the room and even their dress.

[^23]:    ${ }^{30}$ For a detailed discussion of initiating and responding moves in interviews see Coulthard and Ashby 1976: 75.
    ${ }^{31}$ While Eggins and Slade generally label questions to which the questioner in casual talk does not know the answer 'real questions', this thesis rather uses the term 'casual' instead of 'real' in order to highlight the interpersonal context in which such questions take place.

[^24]:    ${ }^{32}$ While excerpts of my own data are referred to as EXAMPLES, extracts of conversation from secondary sources are labelled TEXTS.

[^25]:    ${ }^{33}$ Referring to Eggins and Slade (1997: 231), we speak about 'chat' in casual conversation when "the interactivity disrupts the flow of the genre" in such a way that a generic description may be impossible. In my small-scale ELF corpus chat segments constitute more than half the talk.

[^26]:    ${ }^{34}$ In this thesis, 'text' refers to spoken discourse and 'text types' are a synonym for 'segments of casual conversation'.

[^27]:    ${ }^{35}$ For a further description of 'face-to-face persuasive monologue' see Vorobej (1997).
    ${ }^{36}$ As we are particularly interested in the middle stages of storytelling genres, the description of structural elements at their beginning and ends will be left out of account. For a more detailed study on this linguistic subject see Plum (1998).

[^28]:    ${ }^{37}$ Spelling adopted from original quotation

[^29]:    ${ }^{38}$ For a description of funny remarks see section 8.3.4.

[^30]:    ${ }^{39}$ For a more detailed description of 'hearer entertainment' in my data see the analysis of humour in chapter 9 .

[^31]:    ${ }^{40}$ 'Chat like' means that both a generic structure and speakers who dominate the floor are not detectable in a segment of talk.

[^32]:    ${ }^{41}$ For a more detailed discussion of Probes see Eggins and Slade (1997: 303-305).

[^33]:    ${ }^{42}$ For many linguists, notably Cheepen (1988), the term 'chat' is equivalent to what I call 'casual conversation' in this thesis.
    ${ }^{43}$ This thesis also labels chunks 'generic varieties of casual talk'.
    ${ }^{44}$ Cf. Probes in gossip texts

[^34]:    ${ }^{45}$ In describing chat, Eggins and Slade (1997: chapter 3) also look at other micro-structural patterns, such as mood, which I will leave out of account for my study.
    ${ }^{46}$ Besides ELF, Firth also uses the term 'contact language'. For a more detailed description of Firth's approach to defining ELF see Firth 1996.

[^35]:    ${ }^{47}$ It is argued in this thesis that generically structured segments of talk are more formal than those which cannot be generically analysed (cf. Fairclough (1995: 14), Hasan (1985: 61)).

[^36]:    ${ }^{48} \mathrm{Cf}$. example 20 in the discussion of pejorative evaluation texts in section 8.2.5.
    ${ }^{49}$ The chat and chunk segments in the sample of talk will not be further described as we are particularly interested in representing their forms in a diagram. It is assumed in this thesis that the approach to analysing chat and chunks presented in the previous chapters is by now part of the readers' basic understanding of the method and therefore the readers are invited to check themselves why I labelled certain segments chat or chunks.

[^37]:    ${ }^{50}$ For a full transcription of the above extract of conversation see APPENDIX.

[^38]:    ${ }^{51}$ In my data, laughter as a typical sign of humour is illustrated by the symbol '@)' (cf. transcription in APPENDIX).

[^39]:    ${ }^{52}$ For a more detailed discussion of humour with special regard to ELF see Brkinjač's (2005) Humour in English as a lingua franca.

[^40]:    ${ }^{53}$ In this thesis, the terms 'table talk' and 'casual talk' are synonymously used.
    ${ }^{54}$ In this thesis, the analysis of jokes in casual ELF talk is restricted to my small-scale corpus and thus does not provide the reader with an extensive and detailed description of this phenomenon in ELF conversations. For further reading see Brkinjač's (2005).

[^41]:    ${ }^{55}$ For a detailed description see chapter 5.

[^42]:    Gf1：＝you write in english too？＝

[^43]:    Af3: <2> (i wonder how they've voted) </2> because you also have the problems with visa
    

    Mm6: yeah but when you study here <SOFT> it's it's no problem <3> you can </3>
    </SOFT>
    Af3. <3> you have to pay the the study fees </3>
    Mm6: yeah but in in Bosnia are also they're paying studies fees for the but it's almost the same as studies fees here in the moment=
    
    Sf5: =yeah=
    Mm6: =and it's not on all universities in the moment=
    Sf5: =yeah=
    
    Mm6: =and uh what else (.) are not EU the students pay nothing <FAST> i mean only fifteen
     < $1>$ but unlucky </1>

    Af3: <1> <FAST> until you came here </FAST> </1>
    
    Sf5: (when you came) (.) they changed=
    Mm6: =they changed opinion when they see how large i am
    All: @ @ @ @ @
    Mm6: yeah but uh (.) doing for example (.) in Bosnia they're
    Mm6: yeah but uh (.) doing for example (.) in Bosnia they're paying around two hundred fifty
    or three hundred euros per semester or three hundred euros per semester
    Af3: mhm

    Mm6: and people like to study here because here universities are much better than all
    universities on the Balkan <FAST> that's why i came here</FAST>= Sf5: =yeah (.) me too.=

    Mm6: =because on the university VETERINARY university you can you can learn a lot of stuff and you have $\langle 1\rangle$ the equipment $\langle/ 1\rangle$ what you can't find on the university on the
    Balkans (1) and there's reason because i'm here and (.)
    

[^44]:    Am2: =pretty good=

[^45]:    Gf1: like uh <LN> Löwenzahn </LN> <TRANSL=dandelion> for example
    Af3: uhum salad=
    Gf1: =grass=
    Af3: =Löwenzahn salad
    Gf1: it's not salad it's a plant that's so high as grass <SOFT> (what i say like) </SOFT> (.)
    and in the fields it's growing (.) EVERYWHERE=
    Am2: =mhm
    Gf1: it can be cultivated (.) it's just natural cut (.) (xx) <@> they're everywhere. </@>
    Am2: mhm (4)
    Gf1: in general (my part) for example we eat meat once a week (.) every Sunday=
    Af3: =mhm
    <gaprec 00:10> Gf1: like uh <LN> Löwenzahn </LN> <TRANSL=dandelion> for example
    Af3: uhum salad=
    Gf1: =grass=
    Af3: =Löwenzahn salad
    Gf1: it's not salad it's a plant that's so high as grass <SOFT> (what i say like) </SOFT> (.)
    and in the fields it's growing (.) EVERYWHERE=
    Am2: =mhm
    Gf1: it can be cultivated (.) it's just natural cut (.) (xx) <@> they're everywhere. </@>
    Am2: mhm (4)
    Gf1: in general (my part) for example we eat meat once a week (.) every Sunday=
    Af3: =mhm
    <gaprec 00:10> Gf1: like uh <LN> Löwenzahn </LN> <TRANSL=dandelion> for example
    Af3: uhum salad=
    Gf1: =grass=
    Af3: =Löwenzahn salad
    Gf1: it's not salad it's a plant that's so high as grass <SOFT> (what i say like) </SOFT> (.)
    and in the fields it's growing (.) EVERYWHERE=
    Am2: =mhm
    Gf1: it can be cultivated (.) it's just natural cut (.) (xx) <@> they're everywhere. </@>
    Am2: mhm (4)
    Gf1: in general (my part) for example we eat meat once a week (.) every Sunday=
    Af3: =mhm
    <gaprec 00:10> Gf1: like uh <LN> Löwenzahn </LN> <TRANSL=dandelion> for example
    Af3: uhum salad=
    Gf1: =grass=
    Af3: =Löwenzahn salad
    Gf1: it's not salad it's a plant that's so high as grass <SOFT> (what i say like) </SOFT> (.)
    and in the fields it's growing (.) EVERYWHERE=
    Am2: =mhm
    Gf1: it can be cultivated (.) it's just natural cut (.) (xx) <@> they're everywhere. </@>
    Am2: mhm (4)
    Gf1: in general (my part) for example we eat meat once a week (.) every Sunday=
    Af3: =mhm
    <gaprec 00:10>

[^46]:    Mm6：〈＠＞oh come on＜／＠＞

