



universität
wien

DIPLOMARBEIT

Titel der Diplomarbeit

**“English as Lingua Franca in Military Meetings
within
a Multinational Peacekeeping Mission“**

Verfasser

Peter Sintler

angestrebter akademischer Grad

Magister der Philosophie (Mag.phil.)

Wien, 2011

Studienkennzahl lt. Studienblatt:

A 343

Studienrichtung lt. Studienblatt:

Diplomstudium Anglistik und Amerikanistik

Betreuer:

Hon. Prof. Dr. Dr. h.c. Henry G. Widdowson

Declaration of Authenticity

I confirm to have conceived and written this M.A. thesis in English all by myself. Quotations from other authors are all clearly marked and acknowledged in the bibliographical references, either in the footnotes or within the text. Any ideas borrowed and/or passages paraphrased from the works of other authors have been truthfully acknowledged and identified in the footnotes.

Peter Sintler

Hinweis

Diese Diplomarbeit hat nachgewiesen, dass die betreffende Kandidatin oder der betreffende Kandidat befähigt ist, wissenschaftliche Themen selbstständig sowie inhaltlich und methodisch vertretbar zu bearbeiten. Da die Korrekturen der/des Beurteilenden nicht eingetragen sind und das Gutachten nicht beiliegt, ist daher nicht erkenntlich mit welcher Note diese Arbeit abgeschlossen wurde. Das Spektrum reicht von sehr gut bis genügend. Die Habilitierten des Instituts für Anglistik und Amerikanistik bitten diesen Hinweis bei der Lektüre zu beachten.

The material provided in this project has been collected on the understanding that confidentiality will be observed in relation to identities of and details about individual participants. The author respectfully requests that those reading this project maintain this confidentiality code. Thank you.¹

¹ cf. Wray & Bloomer (2006: 174-175)

Acknowledgements

My utmost gratitude goes to Professor Dr. Henry G. Widdowson for his guidance, professional supervision, continuous assistance and encouragement throughout my writing process. His patience, advice and constructive criticism were of invaluable help to me.

This research project would not have been possible without the support of many people at the Ministry of Defence, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and the Permanent Mission of Austria to the United Nations, the UN Department of Peacekeeping Operations and the military staff of a UN Peacekeeping Mission. I would like to thank everyone who contributed to my research.

My thanks also go to the staff members of the English and American Studies Library of Vienna University.

Moreover, I very much appreciate the assistance of Evelyne and my British friend and colleague Tony for proofreading my thesis. Thank you both.

To my grandsons Jake and Luke

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	1
2. English as Lingua Franca	4
2.1. The Role of ELF	4
2.2. ELF in the Military	9
2.3. The Native Speaker as a Point of Reference	11
2.3.1. A Native Speaker Norm	12
2.3.2. The Question of Conformity to Native Speaker Norms	16
3. Communicative Efficiency	18
3.1. The Importance of Context	18
3.2. Mutual Intelligibility	20
3.3. Ethnography of Communication	20
3.4. Ethnomethodology	22
3.5. Conversation Analysis	25
3.6. Discourse Strategies	29
3.6.1. Turn-taking Procedures	30
3.6.2. Interruptions and Overlaps	32
3.6.3. Repetitions	35
3.6.4. Pauses during Speech	37
3.6.5. Miscommunication and Problematic Talk	37
3.6.6. The Notion of Repair in Communicative Interaction	39
4. Power Strategies in Verbal Interaction	42
4.1. Introduction	42
4.2. Power and Speech	42
4.2.1. Giving Instructions and Decision-making	44
4.3. Politeness	45
4.3.1. Keeping Face	46
4.3.2. Mitigation	46
4.3.3. Humour	48

5.	Meetings	50
5.1.	Introduction	50
5.2.	Types and Features of Meetings	51
5.2.1.	Formal and Informal Meetings	53
5.2.2.	Goals and Meeting Objectives	55
5.2.3.	Participant Roles and Relationships	55
5.2.4.	The Chairperson	56
5.2.5.	Setting an Agenda	57
5.3.	Military Meetings	58
5.3.1.	Types and Purpose of Military Briefings	59
5.3.2.	The Main Properties of Military Meetings	60
5.3.3.	The Formality of Military Meetings	62
5.3.4.	Institutional versus Ordinary Talk	63
6.	The Data	67
6.1.	Introduction	67
6.2.	Information on the Data	68
6.3.	The Methodology of Data Collection	69
6.3.1.	The Ethical Question of Informed Consent	71
6.3.2.	Anonymization	73
6.3.3.	The Naturalness of the Data	74
6.3.4.	The Role of the Observer	75
6.3.5.	The ‘Observer’s Paradox’	76
6.4.	Quantitative and Qualitative Aspects	78
6.5.	The Transcription of Recorded Data	79
7.	Analysis and Aspects of Interactions	84
7.1.	Introduction	84
7.2.	On Exerting Power	85
7.2.1.	Power Relations	85
7.2.2.	On Agenda Setting	93

7.2.3.	On the Chairperson	96
7.2.4.	On Participants	101
7.2.5.	On Informed Consent	103
7.2.6.	On Opening a Meeting	105
7.2.7.	On Instructions and Decision-making	107
7.3.	On Politeness/Impoliteness	109
7.3.1.	On Mitigation	113
7.3.2.	The Function of Laughter and Joking	116
7.4.	On Discourse Strategies	123
7.4.1.	The Notion of Turn-taking in Interaction	123
7.4.2.	On Overlapping Talk	125
7.4.3.	On Pauses and Disfluency in Speech Events	126
7.4.4.	On Repairs during Discourse	128
7.4.5.	On Repetitions	129
7.5.	On Miscommunication	136
7.6.	Summary	139
8.	Conclusions	142
9.	Bibliography	146
9.1.	Electronic Ressources	153
DATA A:	Meetings A	155
DATA B:	Meetings B	180
DATA C:	Meetings C	197
APPENDIX I:	Abbreviations	209
APPENDIX II:	List of Speakers	211
ABSTRACT	213
GERMAN SUMMARY (Zusammenfassung in deutscher Sprache)	215
CURRICULUM VITAE	219

1. Introduction

The use of English as the world's primary language for international as well as intra-national communication is now a reality. Millions of people, in an effort to overcome language barriers, are using English to interact with each other for all kinds of purposes, simply because English is the language that is currently most widely understood. It is the lingua franca for many "who do not share a common language" (Knapp 2002: 217), or as Firth (1996: 240) puts it more precisely, it is

a 'contact language' between persons who share neither a common native tongue nor a common (national) culture, and for whom English is the chosen *foreign* language of communication (original emphasis).

Moreover, "the supremacy of English is [...] being established step by step in European politics and various European and international organizations" (Seidlhofer et al. 2006: 5), such as the EU, NATO [North Atlantic Treaty Organization], or UN [United Nations]. English plays now an official as well as a working role in the proceedings of major international political gatherings in all parts of the world (Crystal 2003: 87). Besides being the most important language in "international organisations and conferences", English has a widely recognised communicative function in trade and commerce, science, diplomacy, education, international banking, internet communication, publications, film, or tourism (Graddol 1997 [2000]: 8). Likewise English adopted a major role in technology transfer, advertising, international safety, for instance in air traffic control, or as relay language in translation as well as interpretation. These are just some of the most important domains in which English is used in our time. Broadly speaking, as Vollstedt (2002: 103) sums up,

[English] is used in most contacts between employees speaking different mother tongues: in conferences and meetings, internal training events, or [a] company's information and communication system.

One specific and noteworthy field of using English for communicative purposes is the military where issues relating to conflict resolution, peacekeeping, politics,

and numerous other subjects clearly need to be discussed in some shared language particularly where they concern operations involving multinational forces. The military is definitely a key area for lingua franca interaction, because in the military field the requirement to achieve and maintain effective communication standards is always acute. For example, some of NATO's first Standardization Agreements (STANAGs) were aimed at establishing common standards for English language proficiency levels.² Consequently, English has become an official lingua franca of NATO, along with French (NATO 2006: 3). English also plays a crucial, if not decisive communicative role in several other contemporary military alliances. The necessity to communicate in a common language clearly also exists in international peace missions where linguistic misunderstandings may well lead up to making severe operational mistakes, which, in a worst-case scenario, can result in casualties (Crossey, 2005).³ Therefore, English is now the lingua franca of many ongoing multinational peace operations.

The aim of this study is to investigate the role of English as lingua franca (ELF) in military meetings within a specific peacekeeping mission. In other words, this paper will examine the communicative effectiveness of ELF in the interactions of decision-making international military personnel and at the same time provide insights of how non-native speakers use English in military meetings. Research in this field is relevant because of the relatively large number of currently ongoing peace operations. I want to characterise and describe what is going on in these kinds of meeting by the use of a common means of communication.

The following research process was adopted for this study: Chapter 2 discusses the role of ELF as well as its role in a military environment. The chapter also questions the need of conformity to native speaker (NS) norms by ELF users in order to be communicatively effective. The following chapters will discuss matters that are needed as a background to the description of what is happening in military meetings of a particular kind. Therefore chapter 3 concentrates on

² NATO defines language proficiency as an individual's unrehearsed, general language communication ability. (NATO 2010b.: 1).

³ Exact page reference could not be verified; article read online.

communication issues, particularly on communicative efficiency with ELF. It discusses the role of context and mutual intelligibility. It also provides introductions to ethnography, ethnomethodology, and Conversation Analysis (CA), because these are important factors in approaching the research investigation. Chapter 3 also focuses on discourse strategies. It explains and discusses features of turn-taking, interruptions, overlapping talk, pauses, repair, repetitions, and miscommunication in verbal interaction. Chapter 4 elaborates on issues of power and politeness, including the aspect of mitigation but also the function of humour in negotiation activities. These terms are discussed and clarified. Emphasis is on expressing power in verbal interactions. Chapter 5 is on meetings and how they are organised. It provides a general overview of meetings and then focuses on military meetings and their properties, such as structure, agenda setting, goals, objectives, participants and chairperson roles, as well as genre and formality. Chapter 6 concentrates on the issue of data. It presents the methodology and strategies for collecting data and discusses how the data for the study were collected and the problems and restrictions associated with this, as well as various aspects on data transcription. Chapter 7 provides an analysis of research findings. It demonstrates how military meetings exemplify specific aspects of lingua franca interaction, the role of ELF in this matter and describes how people actually communicate. The analytic process discusses the particular forms or significance power, politeness, discourse strategies, and communication in general take on in military meetings. It identifies various phenomena and features, groups the cases, and outlines the dynamics of certain phenomena. Each object of the analysis is discussed with the help of references to empirical data. The chapter then closes with a summary and discussion of findings and is followed by conclusions.

2. English as Lingua Franca

As Crystal (2003: 12) recalls, “[t]he prospect that a lingua franca might be needed for the whole world [...] emerged strongly only in the twentieth century, and since the 1950s in particular”. However, the prime reason for English having spread worldwide is that “Britain had established the pre-conditions for English as a global language by settling communities of English speakers around the world” (Graddol 1997 [2000]: 8). The “American influence was extended around the world” after World War Two (ibid.), when many international organisations and bodies have been and are still being founded. These developments can be summarised as follows:

The present-day world status of English is primarily the result of two factors: the expansion of British colonial power, which peaked towards the end of the nineteenth century, and the emergence of the United States as the leading economic power of the twentieth century (Crystal 2003: 59).

On the whole, a language traditionally becomes an international language for one main reason: “the power of its people - especially their political and military power” (ibid.: 9). As Crystal points out, “[t]he pressure to adopt a single lingua franca, to facilitate communication in such contexts, is considerable” (ibid.: 12). In the early 2000s around 1.5 billion people or “about a quarter of the world’s population [were] already fluent or competent in English” and this figure is continuously growing (ibid.: 6). It is clear that ELF plays a very important role in the modern world. This raises the question of what this role involves and what its implications are. I shall consider this in the next section.

2.1. The Role of ELF

By now, “English has become a global lingua franca with non-native speakers of the language outnumbering its native speakers” (Hülmbauer et al. 2008: 25), or as House (1999: 73) summarises the current situation by pointing out that

[i]t is a fact that a very large part of international communication is today conducted in a lingua franca, and that the majority of lingua franca interactions worldwide take place in English.

Moreover, according to House, “ELF interactions are defined as interactions between members of two or more different linguacultures in English, for none of whom English is the mother tongue” (ibid.: 74). In fact, as Seidlhofer (2005b: 339) says, “the term ‘English as a lingua franca’ (ELF) has emerged as a way of referring to communication in English between speakers with different first languages”. The important aspect is that communication occurs through a language which is not the native tongue. However, a multitude of conferences are taking place every day where English is used to communicate by many participants as a non-native language, i.e. ELF, but where also “‘true’ native” English speakers are present (Knapp 2002: 221). In other words, meeting constellations are possible where NSs interact with ELF speakers of different language proficiency levels. According to Knapp, such constellations surely are “not in line with the generally accepted definition of lingua franca, but not to consider them would simply mean ignoring the reality” (ibid.). On the whole, the participation of NSs in ELF interactions cannot be categorically excluded and is therefore possible.

Although ELF is the preferred expression, the terms “Englisch als Medium der interkulturellen Kommunikation” [English as a medium of intercultural communication] (Meierkord 1996: 19), or “English as an international language” (EIL) by Jenkins (2000: 2), are also used. On the whole, according to Hülmbauer et al. (2008: 33), “in ELF situations ‘English’ is viewed as being appropriated, and made appropriate, as a means of intercultural communication”. For Seidlhofer (2005b: 339), ELF is in most cases a ‘contact language’. That implies that ELF speakers draw extensively on their “awareness of the intercultural and bi- or multi-lingual nature of the communication they are engaged in”, and therefore they “employ very effective strategies in order to successfully communicate across cultures” (Seidlhofer 2006: 42).

The spreading of English can be shown by three concentric circles representing the types of spread, as well as “the patterns of acquisition and the functional domains in which English is used across cultures and languages” (Kachru 1985: 12). Kachru calls these three circles the: inner, outer and expanding circles. As Crystal (2003: 68) explains, the “inner circle” represents the NSs, the “outer circle” consists of second-language speakers and the “expanding circle” includes the growing number of people learning English as a foreign language (EFL). However, “because English in the Expanding Circle is usually learnt as a foreign language, it has been expected to conform to Inner Circle norms” (Seidlhofer & Jenkins 2003: 142). This particular aspect “has resulted in numerous performance (or EFL) varieties of English” (Kachru 1985: 12-13).

Graddol (2006: 110) argues that Kachru’s model fails to capture the degree to which ‘foreign language’ learners in some countries “were becoming more like second language users”. He also makes the point that the “traditional definition of ‘second-language user’ [...] no longer makes sense” and there is now an increasing “need to distinguish between proficiencies in English, rather than a speaker’s bilingual status” (ibid.) Likewise, Seidlhofer & Jenkins (2003: 152) suggest that “the legitimacy which has already been accorded to Outer Circle Englishes should be extended to the Expanding Circle”. Graddol (2006: 110) therefore suggests that Kachru’s inner circle should be “conceived of as the group of highly proficient speakers of English”, namely of “those who have ‘functional nativeness’ regardless of how they learned or use the language”. However, Seidlhofer & Jenkins (2003: 142) are of the opinion that

for Expanding Circle consumption, the main effort remains, as it has always been, to describe English as it is used among its British and American native speakers and then to “distribute” (Widdowson 1997: 139) the resulting descriptions to those who speak English in non-native contexts around the world.

Most ELF interactions are now taking place among non-native speakers (NNSs) of English. Firth (1996: 255) characterises this state of affairs as follows:

[i]n a world where international travel and cross-national communications are everyday occurrences, the English language is overridingly the *modus operandi* for communicators. In a great number of instances English is used as a *lingua franca*, in which case none of the interactants involved has the language as their mother tongue.

At this point the question of “ownership of English” (Widdowson 2003: 35) requires some clarification. Nelson (1992: 337) says that “[f]or one body to claim “ownership” of English on some basis of historical antecedence is pragmatically unsound thinking”. On the one hand, “English is now so widely established that it can no longer be thought of as ‘owned’ by a single nation” (Crystal 2003: 26). On the other hand, as Graddol (1997 [2000]: 10) argues, the

[n]ative speakers may feel the language ‘belongs’ to them, but it will be those who speak English as a second or foreign language who will determine its world future.

As Widdowson (1994: 385) sees it, “[t]he very fact that English is an international language means that no nation can have custody over it”. As an international language “it serves a whole range of different communities and their institutional purposes and these transcend traditional communal and cultural boundaries (ibid.: 382). For Widdowson, “standard English, unlike other dialects, is essentially a written variety and mainly designed for institutional purposes” (ibid.: 380). As soon as it is accepted, that “English serves the communicative and communal needs of different communities, it follows logically that it must be diverse” (ibid.: 385). The point is that “[a]n international language has to be an independent language” (ibid.). What is more, “everyone who has learned it now owns it - ‘has a share in it’ [...] and has the right to use it in the way they want” (Crystal 2003: 2-3).

The important question is whether English will essentially disperse into mutually unintelligible varieties. McKay (2002: 53) suggests that English will “naturally stabilize into standard form to the extent required to meet the needs of the communities concerned”. As McKay says, “an international language is one that

is no longer linked to a single culture or nation but serves both global and local needs as a language of wider communication” (ibid.: 24). With English being an international language, “the use of English is no longer connected to the culture of Inner Circle countries” (ibid.: 12). Only very few people would suggest that there were just one single standard of English in our modern world (Quirk 1985: 2, 30). In the past “[w]hen there was only ENL, and that for only seven million people, it was possible [...] to recommend a single model or standard” (ibid.).

ELF is now a means of achieving worldwide communication, neither depending on Inner Circle norms nor ENL proficiency.⁴ It is basically a ‘mode of communication’. In other words, ELF is “an umbrella term that encompasses all types of communication among bilingual users of English in the Expanding Circle” (Cogo 2008: 58). Moreover, “it allows for local realisations as well as extensive use of accommodation strategies and code switching” (ibid.). Seidlhofer & Jenkins describe the current situation of English which has reached global dimensions and functions, as follows:

[t]he naïve notion of a monolithic, uniform, unadaptable linguistic medium owned by its original speakers and forever linked to their rule(s) has been recognized as simply contrary to the facts, and has therefore given way to the realization that indigenized varieties of English are legitimate Englishes in their own right (Seidlhofer & Jenkins 2003: 142).

Seidlhofer (2006: 44) insists that “there cannot even be any native speaker intuitions about ELF because, by definition, nobody speaks ELF natively”. The global socio-political development of our time appears to be the true reason for English having turned into a lingua franca. English is the language in which “most lingua franca communication worldwide is now taking place” (Seidlhofer 2002: 269). The point to be made is that “ELF users operate in international settings in which native speakers of English may or may not figure” (Seidlhofer 2005a: 168). It is therefore necessary to separate ELF from English as a foreign language (EFL), because “EFL and ELF are functionally and conceptually different” (ibid.).

⁴ EFL and ELF speakers frequently produce similar linguistic outputs. The difference, however, lies in the fact that EFL aims at a standard ENL variety (and culture) as a target norm, whereas ELF has mutual intelligibility among NNSs as its defined goal (Hülmbauer 2007: 15).

Indeed, as Seidlhofer et al. (2006: 6) remark, ELF “declares itself independent of the norms of English as a native language (ENL)”.

The importance of English as a global lingua franca has so far been widely recognised. English is in many instances a vehicle for wider communication between individuals of one country as well as among individuals from different countries. As McKay (2002: 5) remarks, “[i]n this way, English is an international language in both a global and local sense”. On the whole, “in ELF situations ‘English’ is viewed as being appropriated, and made appropriate, as a means of intercultural communication” (Hülmbauer et al. 2008: 33). It is the “geographical-historical” as well as the “socio-cultural” developments that turned English into a global language (Crystal 2003: 29). People worldwide “have come to depend on English for their economic and social well-being” (ibid.: 29-30). What is more, “[t]he language has penetrated deeply into the international domains of political life, business, safety, communication, entertainment, the media and education” (ibid.: 30). No wonder that ELF is also playing an important communicative role in the military field, a matter that will receive more attention and will be discussed in the following section.

2.2. ELF in the Military

The use of ELF in the military field has become widespread by now. In general, ‘Military English’⁵ communicates ways of thinking and procedures for action in a way that can be understood particularly by military personnel. Therefore, military language, just like any other language, fulfils communicative requirements for a “specific purpose” (Widdowson 2003: 61). On the whole, “[a] specific purpose is directly matched up with a specific variety of English” (ibid.: 62). Specificity in this context is to be seen in terms of encoded linguistic features.

⁵ cf. *NATO Glossary of terms and definitions (English and French)*. Listing terms of military significance and their definitions for use in NATO. AAP-6(2010).

Military language, and for the purpose of this paper, 'Military English', belongs to the large group of technical Englishes. It is essentially a "professional register" with a specialised lexicon (ibid.: 55). It is, so to say, 'another English', not a variant but a different virtual language, a different code. Moreover, it emphasises the expertise of those who use it. For that reason, according to Widdowson,

[t]he varieties of English used for international communication in science, finance, commerce, and so on, are mutually unintelligible. As far as lexis is concerned, their communicative viability depends on there not being a unified standard lexis, but on the development of separate standards appropriate to different domains of use (Widdowson 2003: 41).

The important point is that "a code which declares independence is no longer a dialect but a language in its own right" (ibid.: 52). Registers do change over time, but "the change is naturally and endonormatively controlled from within" (Widdowson 1997: 143). Such changes occur in line with "the requirements of communication across the international community of its specialist users" (ibid.: 143).

For Crystal (2003: 109) it is extremely important that "[e]ven within a single language, terminology and phrasing need to be standardized, to avoid ambiguity". Therefore, great efforts have been made so far, specifically by NATO, to develop a standardised system for 'Military English'. The introduction and use of a rather limited vocabulary and fixed sentence patterns are considered an option to express military situations unambiguously. Nevertheless, the development of separate standards results in the communication of specialist groups being "largely closed off from the world outside" (Widdowson 1994: 383). In brief, "professional and academic registers are, for the most part, essentially written varieties, and tend to retain a written mode even when spoken" (Widdowson 1997: 143). For Widdowson, "writing exerts a stabilizing and indeed standardizing influence". In effect, "it will be standard language which will be favoured by endonormative control" (ibid.). Therefore, regulation and control from the Inner Circle should not be necessary. As Graddol (1997 [2000]: 33) summarises,

[r]ather than a process which leads to uniformity and homogeneity, globalization seems to create new, hybrid forms of culture, language and political organisation: the results of global influences meeting local traditions, values and social contexts.

This globalization process requires “a rethinking of the way in which activities are carried out and the way they are managed” (ibid.: 42). Generally, two types of ‘working English’ which can be distinguished in workplace settings exist. The first type “is the communication between [...] professionals and workers within the same line of work” which “is sometimes portrayed [as] a single, monolithic variety like a special dialect of English” (ibid.: 43). The second type of ‘working English’ “relates to communication with people who are not members of the trade or profession themselves” (ibid.). This would then apply to communication outside the workplace setting. Military language belongs to the first type, and therefore military ELF, too. The question is whether ELF used in a multinational peacekeeping mission is at all a NS controlled communication medium or not. Therefore the next section will look into the role and possible normative effects of the NS vis-à-vis ELF.

2.3. The Native Speaker as a Point of Reference

Graddol (2006: 110) insists that the “distinctions between ‘native speaker’, ‘second-language speaker’, and ‘foreign-language user’ have become blurred”. Speakers use language to create a relationship between themselves and their listeners by adopting a communicative role such as informing, questioning, persuading and the like. Davies (2003: 213) points out that as far as the identification of NNSs is concerned, one “cannot distinguish the non-native speaker from the native speaker except from autobiography”. In contrast, Graddol remarks that it has to be elucidated that NNSs

may acquire communicative skills which are different from those of native speakers, reflecting the more hazardous contexts of communication in which they routinely find themselves (Graddol 1997 [2000]: 13).

In practice, no nation has custody over global English. In other words, in view of the global development of English, NSs, wherever they are, have, as Widdowson (1994: 385) insists, “no say in the matter, no right to intervene or pass judgement”. In that context, NSs are “irrelevant” (ibid.). This means that NSs have already lost the exclusive prerogative to control the standardisation of this so-called global English. As a result, any further ELF development seems non-restricted. International varieties of English are not dialects; they are something else, something less dependent on NS norms. However, what is seen as the NS norm? The following sub-section will look into this.

2.3.1. A Native Speaker Norm

In most instances ELF interactions involve non-native speakers (NNSs). Nevertheless, “a considerable number of learners of English still regard the NS as a model that they strive to emulate to some degree” (Adolphs 2005: 119). Such tendencies and attitudes rest “on an undefined notion of the native speaker that has become associated with successful language use” (ibid.). The kind of English representing a native language model is based on the belief that

[t]he strict Chomskian line on this issue is that native speakers (NSs) do and cannot commit errors (of competence) since they know their language perfectly and comprehensively (James 1998: 83).

Despite their absence in the majority of ELF interactions English NSs exert a kind of normative effect and oblige ELF users to comply with their dictates. As a result, the non-native speaker “usually is associated with the expectation ‘less competent than a native speaker’” (Knapp 2002: 220).

If errors⁶ are thought to be deviations from the codified English as native language norm, it is quite clear that NSs also produce errors. Kachru (1992a: 62)

⁶ Linguistic forms which deviate from the ENL code but which convey meaning effectively, then, cannot simply be regarded as ‘errors’. They also constitute a part of English, of the “virtual language” (Widdowson 1997: 138) English. (Hülmbauer 2007: 9).

characterises linguistic deviations as being different from the norm in the sense that they are the “result of the new ‘un-English’ linguistic and cultural setting in which the English language is used”. However, Cook (1999: 186) makes the point that “[m]any native speakers are unaware how their speech differs from the status form”. For James (1998: 83), there is “a discrepancy between what learners tend to say” and “what the collective entity of NSs (or ideal NS) tend to say”. In fact, NSs do not represent a collective identity or linguistically homogenous group simply because of the many variations that exist in their native tongue. According to Adolphs (2005: 119),

the diversity of linguistic patterns found in naturally occurring language makes any attempt to create a label for this supposedly unified notion questionable.

Linguistic diversity among NSs is primarily created by social, cultural as well as geographical differences. As a result, NSs are split into subgroups and because of this they cannot be considered an entity.

All in all, on many occasions ELF forms are thought to be incorrect or to contain errors⁷ when compared with native English. Widdowson (2003: 40) makes the point that “Standard English is generally defined by its lexis and grammar”. However, what is often considered Standard English “is a variety, a kind of superposed dialect which is socially sanctioned for institutional use” (Widdowson 1994: 380). It is important to be aware that Standard English, just like any other language variety, develops endonormatively through an ongoing process of self-regulation, as required and appropriate to different conditions of use (ibid.: 386).

NSs exhibit a wide range of communicative competence; nevertheless they are still subject to variation. Above all, NSs do not speak their native tongue homogeneously. Moreover, “the majority of those who are to the language born speak nonstandard English and have themselves to be instructed in the standard”

⁷ cf. James (1998: 78): “If [...] the learner is unable or in any way disinclined to make the correction [of a fault in his or her output], we assume that the form the learner used was the one intended, and that it is an **error**” (original emphasis). Strictly speaking, James’ definition is not relevant for this study because the ELF interactants are to be considered language users.

(ibid.: 379). As Cameron (2001: 55) says, “[l]inguistic competence is about rules of grammar; communicative competence is about rules of speaking”. Variation between NSs and NNSs “cannot simply be subsumed as a special case of the variation among NS’s” (Coppieters (1987: 565). In fact, “NNS’s have been found to lie OUTSIDE the boundaries of NS variation” (ibid.; original emphasis). As far as variation is concerned, Coppieters claims that

NS’s do vary as regards language use and linguistic intuitions, and any study pretending to compare and contrast NS’s and NNS’s will have to face the problem of NS variability (ibid.: 548).

The NS norm apparently raises some concern and seems to be mainly applicable to second and foreign language users because it serves as a basis for error evaluation. The point to be made is that it seems unclear on which foundations this norm is based. This, as Adolphs (2005: 119-120) states,

leaves some learners of English in the awkward position of striving to conform to the undefined concept of the native speaker and at the same time studying a language that has little in common with this concept.

Cook (1999: 194) presents the argument that “[p]eople cannot be expected to conform to the norm of a group to which they do not belong, whether groups are defined by race, class, sex, or any other feature”. Or as Firth (1996: 241) puts it,

the term ‘lingua franca’ attempts to conceptualize the participant simply as a *language user* whose real-world interactions are deserving of unprejudiced *description*, rather [...] than as a person conceived *a priori* to be the possessor of incomplete or deficient communicative competence, putatively striving for the ‘target’ competence of an idealized ‘native speaker’ (original emphasis).

Regardless of these group definitions and categories of users of English, it is obvious that a permanently growing number of people are speaking English for an ever increasing number of reasons and purposes. The non-native users of English are thereby acting “as *agents* in the development of English: they [...] contribute

to the shaping of the language and the functions it fulfils” (Seidlhofer 2005a: 164; original emphasis).

Seidlhofer (2002: 271) remarks that rather little thought seems to have gone into “in what respects English as a lingua franca (ELF) differs from ‘English as a native language’ (ENL)”. Widdowson (2003: 50) points out that

we might think of English as an international language not in terms of the distribution of a stable and unitary set of encoded forms, but as the spread of a virtual language which is exploited in different ways for different purposes.

Moreover, “English as an international language is not *distributed*” into different domains of use as a set of established encoded forms and essentially unchanged, “but it is *spread* as a virtual language” (Widdowson 1997: 139; original emphasis). It must also be accepted that “what we today call *non-native* English is being used in response to new cultural and linguistic settings” (Nelson 1992: 329; original emphasis). Graddol (2006: 87) hints that

[p]roponents of teaching English as a lingua franca (ELF) suggest that the way English is taught and assessed should reflect the needs and aspirations of the ever-growing number of non-native speakers who use English to communicate with other non-natives.

Using ELF means “to appropriate the language according to communicative needs, which often implies that traditional norms are not adhered to” (Hülmbauer et al. 2008: 31). When a language gradually diversifies into various facets, so does its norm. Therefore other norms will be needed which represent the ELF speakers and describe the qualities of their language usage. The assumption that English as a native language can serve as norm and linguistic model, would require all NSs to use their language in an identical way, i.e., faultlessly, without making any errors. This cannot be achieved and also is not the case. The question therefore remains as to what degree non-native ELF speakers still conform to NS norms. The next sub-section will try to find an answer.

2.3.2. The Question of Conformity to Native Speaker Norms

Relatively few researchers have been exploring areas of ELF discourse in an attempt to understand how and according to which principles NNSs use English among themselves. Seidlhofer (2005a: 170) makes the point that “the control over the norms of how [ELF] ‘should be used’ is still assumed to rest with the minority of its speakers, namely English native speakers”. However, for the majority of its users English is a foreign language simply because the majority of verbal interactions in English do not involve NSs. As Seidlhofer (2002: 274) says, “[s]ince ELF is [...] not the native language of its users, an ELF model for learners should accordingly not be dictated by any native-speaker”. Nevertheless, a tendency still exists to regard NSs “as custodians over what is acceptable usage” (Seidlhofer 2005b: 339). Yet, with English now being used internationally, it is being shaped at least as much by its NNSs as it is by NSs (*ibid.*).

The point is whether NSs will be needed to regulate English as an international language (EIL) or prevent it from diversifying. According to McKay (2002: 18), “one of the primary reasons for the spread of English today is [that] it has such a variety of specific purposes”. Otherwise English most likely would not have spread and would not regulate itself as an effective means of global communication (Widdowson 1997: 144). People talking about English as global language are obliged and bound to think about “the specific use that is made of it for [...] professional and academic purposes” (*ibid.*: 143). Therefore, members of the global community are acquiring registers which are language varieties that “developed to serve uses *for* language rather than users *of* it” (Widdowson 2003: 54; original emphasis). These registers define different

global communities, which we have to qualify to belong to through the secondary socialization of education and training, involving a heavy investment in the written language. They are defined not so much by experience as by expertise (*ibid.*).

For example, different groups of specialist users develop specific vocabularies that are suited for their needs but are quite incomprehensible to others (Widdowson 1994: 382). The question is “whether ELF users should be accorded the right to be norm-developing rather than simply [be] norm-dependent” (Seidlhofer (2005a: 169). Considering the large number of ELF users, there seems to be “a *prima facie* case for so doing” (ibid.; original emphasis).

Conformity to NS norms is a rather important issue for consideration. However, ELF communication happens without such conformity. When ELF is used within the Expanding Circle in non-conformity with native language norms, it is using ELF “precisely in forms that serve ‘to perform specific tasks in specific communicative situations’” (Seidlhofer 2006: 43). It can then be argued that “the effectiveness of ELF depends to a considerable degree on non-conformity with established norms of Inner Circle (or Outer Circle) Englishes” (Hülmbauer et al. 2008: 28). In the long run ELF users would have to identify norms for their own benefit.

On the whole, there is no immediate need for ELF speakers to comply with native-speaker norms and conform to native-speaker cultural standards. It seems that there is a growing trend towards what is called ‘Global English’ with less and less interference by native-speakers. Apparently, “ELF users are not dependent on native-speaker norms but are capable of cooperatively developing norms of their own” (Hülmbauer et al. 2008: 28). The question is whether non-native ELF users are communicatively efficient. The following chapter will therefore try to provide an answer to this.

3. Communicative Efficiency

3.1. The Importance of Context

The immediate context of a speech situation determines the appropriate linguistic constructions. Therefore, “information can be readily extracted from the context, and does not need to be explicitly expressed through grammatical means” (Coppieters 1987: 567). For the construction of meaning context is just as important as grammar. Quirk (1995: 14), who displays a critical attitude towards deviations in the English language, remarks that the appropriateness of a linguistic form firmly depends on the context:

A correct form is one that is felt to be acceptable at the relevant period, in the relevant place, and on the relevant occasion. This means that there cannot be a single standard by which an expression must be correct in all places, on all occasions, and at all periods of history.

ELF has been spreading to such an extent that NSs are no longer a determining part of ELF communication. As a result, “ELF speakers are language users in their own right” (Seidlhofer 2001: 137). In terms of acculturation of English beyond the inner circle, there seem to be two processes at work: “[o]ne results in the *deculturation* of English, and another in its *acculturation* in the new context” (Kachru 1992b: 305; original emphasis). Thus, English separated from the inner circle context and adapted to the new areas where it is being used, is turning into “new language types” (ibid.: 306). Moreover, as Gnutzmann (2005: 117) puts it, “detaching communication in an international context entirely from the standard variety of English and its associated cultures seems problematic”. In ELF communication “mutual accommodation is found to have greater importance for communicative effectiveness than ‘correctness’ or idiomaticity in ENL terms” (Seidlhofer 2001: 147). There is always the question of how much language knowledge is needed to achieve and maintain an efficient and effective lingua franca communicative ability. For ELF users it might be reasonable to adopt a similar maxim as Nelson (1992: 336), who, as an Indian English speaker, writes:

I do not aspire to be indistinguishable from a British or American speaker. English as I know it and use it serves my needs, fulfils its functions as a communicative system for me.

Many consider English as native language to be the right and “real thing”. However, this does not mean that English is the ‘real thing’ when it is used communicatively on a global level, because several kinds of English exist, even though these are not considered proper or real English (Widdowson 1994: 378). When its users accept that the form of language which they use is appropriate, then it becomes ‘right’. English as native language, regardless of the form which is being used, would then be ‘right’ and ‘real’. In other words, “authenticity is nontransferable” (ibid.: 386). It has been suggested that the appropriateness of a linguistic form within a certain context can make the form of language becoming acceptable or ‘real’. According to Seidlhofer (2002: 283-284), this means that

in a global context, where the number of ELF users now exceeds the numbers of ENL speakers, native-speaker authenticity is becoming increasingly irrelevant for and incompatible with the realities of lingua franca communication.

Interactants generally engage in ELF talk to achieve common goals. However, it may happen that they have no common background, be it linguistic, social, cultural, or otherwise, to facilitate the achievement of these goals (Jenkins 2000: 75), i.e., no contextual features exist, at least in the sense of shared socio-cultural knowledge. Widdowson (1990: 102) remarks that

[p]eople who have particular knowledge and experience in common, whose contextual realities, so to speak, are closely congruent, will manage to communicate by engaging relevant aspects of contexts with only sparing use of the linguistic resources at their disposal. Conversely, of course, those who have little in common have to place greater reliance on the language.

The point to be made is that culture-specific norms and conventions, whether foreign or own, are often covered up during lingua franca interactions “for the

benefit of achieving a conversational goal” (Bae (2002: 214). All of this raises the question of how the use of ELF as a common language is to achieve mutual intelligibility among the interactants. This matter will be considered in the next section.

3.2. Mutual Intelligibility

In multinational communicative events, such as conferences and meetings, the need for mutual intelligibility is always present. Mutual intelligibility therefore is to be seen as a key issue in ELF communication. The aim of the participants clearly must be being successful in their lingua franca interactions. Crystal (2003: 22) makes the point that above all, there is a need for preserving the participants’ identity. Therefore, the co-existence of mutual intelligibility and identity is a special feature of meetings and creates a situation where a common language, such as ELF, effectively unites the linguistic diversity among the participants.

Interestingly enough, non-native ELF speakers apparently have difficulty with understanding NSs whilst understanding other NNSs seems less problematic. Non-native ELF speakers “often find it easier to communicate on an international NNS level than with prominent NS participation” (Hülmbauer 2007: 4).

3.3. Ethnography of Communication

Ethnography of communication engages in the study of language in relation to social and cultural factors that may affect and influence communication. It refers to the use of language, e.g., the way speakers associate modes and rules of speaking, codes and registers with socio-cultural settings. In essence, ethnography is a form of research that focuses on the sociology of meaning through close field observation of socio-cultural phenomena. The researcher or ethnographer focuses on a community, for example a military organisation, as this is the case in this

study, and selects informants who have an overview of the activities of that community. The interest of the linguistic researcher may relate to the investigation of a particular speech activity, or a social institution, or a social (speech) community (Auer 1995: 420). These three fields of research are in fact interrelated: “communities usually have institutions and communities have characteristic speech activities” (ibid.). According to Cameron (2001: 7), those who primarily engage in the analysis of spoken discourse include linguists, anthropologists, philosophers, psychologists and sociologists, students of the media, education, or the law. Moreover, conversation analysis which is “working with spoken discourse, is an interdisciplinary enterprise” (ibid.).

Cameron (2001: 55) remarks that “[t]he ethnography of speaking developed as a way of investigating the rules of speaking that are operative in particular language-using communities”. Ethnography “refers to the investigation of culture(s) using a particular methodology, that of *participant observation*” (ibid.; original emphasis). It therefore “refers to the description/analysis an ethnographer produces on the basis of having done participant observation in a particular culture” (ibid.: 67). The ethnography of communication tries to describe the forms and functions of verbal and non-verbal communicative events in specific cultural or social settings. The present study focuses on a community of military personnel, who are using English as a common language, and at the same time investigates how the use of ELF succeeds in a military culture that is embedded in a peacekeeping operation. In other words, the “ways of using and understanding language are analysed in relation to the wider culture in which they occur” (ibid.: 53), i.e., the ethnography of communication is based on the assumption that the meaning of an utterance can be understood only in context of the specific communicative event in which it is embedded. However, the term ethnography of communication or ethnography of speaking “does not presuppose that the medium of communication is exclusively spoken language” (ibid.). In essence, “[t]he ethnographic approach is one in which attention is paid to the interdependence of language-using and other activities” (ibid.).

In short, ethnography of communication is concerned with the analysis of language use in its respective cultural setting. Moreover,

[w]hen linguists and other social scientists analyse spoken discourse, their aim is to make explicit what normally gets taken for granted; it is also to show what talking accomplishes in people's lives and in society at large (Cameron 2001:7; original emphasis).

Thus, language use is analysed as part of a whole social situation. The ethnographic approach is naturalistic in the sense of non-intentionally affecting the ongoing social-linguistic events under investigation (Auer 1995: 427).

This study examines the communicative effectiveness and efficiency of non-native ELF speakers in military discourse who establish a conversational situation in which mutually known conversational structures help to understand speech contents. Therefore, the following section is essentially on ethnomethodology.

3.4. Ethnomethodology

Ethnomethodology is a descriptive discipline and does not engage in explanation or evaluation of a particular social order as the topic of study. It is generally used in ethnographic studies to describe the methods people use to achieve the orderly character of everyday social situations. Moreover, it is a method for understanding the social order people use and make sense of the world through analysing the accounts and descriptions of their day-to-day activities.

The sociologist and theorist Harold Garfinkel coined the term ethnomethodology already in the mid-1950s (Heritage 1984 [1992]: 4). It was him, who developed a specific research policy to provide answers to the mainly sociological question, calling it ethnomethodology (ten Have 2007: 6). However, the beginnings of linguistic ethnomethodology go back to Harvey Sacks whose lectures at a number of universities, were recorded, transcribed and then published (Sacks 1984 [1992]:

ix). Johnson & Johnson (1998: 118-119), describe ethnomethodology in their “Encyclopedic Dictionary of Applied Linguistics” as:

[a] branch of sociology, which deals with the questions of social order, organization and (inter)action. Since most of these processes are mediated through language, ethnomethodologists use transcripts of naturally occurring conversations to arrive at descriptions of the interactants’ knowledge about the social structure in which they operate. While DISCOURSE ANALYSIS is largely interested in the structure of conversation (e.g. the organization of TURN-TAKING), in its inductive, data-driven approach, ethnomethodology is primarily concerned with the question of how individuals constitute their shared knowledge about the world through talk (original emphasis).

Clayman & Maynard (1995: 2) in turn offer the following characterisation of the ethnomethodological programme of theory and research:

Ethnomethodology offers a distinctive perspective on the nature and origins of social order. It rejects “top-down” theories that seek to explain social order in terms of cultural or social structural phenomena which are conceived as standing outside of the flow of events of everyday life. Adopting a thoroughly “bottom-up” approach, ethnomethodology seeks to recover social organization as an emergent achievement that results from the concerted efforts of societal members acting within local situations.

Ethnomethodology proposes “that everyday interaction constitutes a legitimate domain of sociological study” (Hutchby & Wooffitt 2008: 26). For one thing, the ethnomethodological approach initially developed as an oppositional movement to functionalism. Functionalism was interested in finding “explanations for how societies manifest order and stability over time”. Societal norms and values are internalised through a process of socialisation and subsequently unconsciously reproduced in human actions (ibid.: 27). At last, “the main issue for functionalism became the explanation of deviance” (ibid.).

Cameron (2001: 88) remarks that for the ethnomethodologist “social order is created not by abstract structures, but by the concrete actions of people going about their everyday business”. Cameron concludes that

sociologists should concentrate on studying people's actions on their own terms, rather than trying to fit them into an abstract theoretical framework which may have no relevance for the actors themselves (ibid.).

For Leech (1983: 46), “formalists study language as an autonomous system”, and “tend to regard language primarily as a mental phenomenon”. Functionalists, however, study language “in relation to its social function” (ibid.). In principle, ethnomethodology opposes formalism. Ten Have (1990 [2004]: 29) suggests a total of four strategies in ethnomethodological typology. The fourth of these strategies is the one that ten Have describes as the way conversation analysis takes place. This strategy essentially involves the study of ordinary practices by recording some of their output, using audio or video equipment (ibid.). The recordings are then transcribed in such a way which “limits the use of common sense procedures to hearing what is being said and noting how it has been said”. The transcripts are then used to point out some of the “orderly products” of the mentioned ordinary practices. As ten Have remarks, “[i]t is the analyst's task, then, to formulate a ‘device’ which may have been used to produce that ‘product’ and phenomena like it” (ibid.).

The following quotation by Hutchby & Wooffitt (2008: 27) sums up the basic idea of ethnomethodology:

[T]he aim of sociology is not to understand how norms are internalized, such that people end up either reproducing these norms or deviating from them; but rather to describe the methods that people use for accounting for their own actions and those of others. These are the ‘ethno-methods’ which are the subject of ethnomethodological inquiry.

Ethnomethodological ideas provide the basis for the concept of speakers and listeners who jointly establish a conversational situation in which mutually known conversational structures aid the understanding of speech contents. Therefore it is quite important how content is formulated and understood through an underlying conversational structure. One general point to be made is that this paper can only give an outline of the subject because “[e]thnomethodology raises complex

theoretical and philosophical issues”, and these would be rather difficult to deal with in the present study (Cameron 2001: 88).

Conversation Analysis (CA) developed out of ethnomethodology. As Heritage (1995: 391) remarks, “[i]t emerged not as an attempt to come to terms with language, meaning or communication but rather as an approach to the study of social action”. Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis (CA) are concerned with the use of natural language in everyday life (Clayman & Maynard 1995: 10), or as Stubbs (1983: 10) says, CA is a term which implies an ethnomethodological approach. CA must be seen as a specific style of social analysis. The following section is to provide an insight into CA.

3.5. Conversation Analysis

The term conversation refers to any interactive talk. However, as that term in place of talk could be misleading, the term ‘talk-in-interaction’ was introduced (Schegloff 1987), indicating that CA research “is not restricted to ‘casual’ or ‘mundane’ conversation” (Firth 1996: 237-238). Non-conversational interactions which take place within institutional or workplace settings, are also considered suitable fields of CA study (ibid.: 238). As Cameron (2001: 87) remarks,

Conversation Analysis does not deal only with conversation: the approach has also been applied to talk in professional and workplace settings (Drew & Heritage 1992), to political speeches (Atkinson 1984) and to media genres such as radio phone-in programmes (Hutchby 1996).

In fact, “[t]he central focus of CA is to describe the conversational practices that are the conditions of intelligible, coordinated action in the social world” (Heritage 1995: 406). Once it was realised that language is ordered and linguistic behaviour is following certain rules, data collection began to concentrate on “natural” conversation, collecting material and information as authentic as possible. It was then possible to trace and discover the actual behaviour and performance of

interactants which normally would not be found in hypothetical constructions. Sacks (1984 [1992]: 22) says, “whatever humans do can be examined to discover some way they do it, and that way will be stably describable”. He proposes to examine some piece of data even without having a particular interest or question in mind and still be rewarded with solutions and discoveries (ibid.: 27). This approach led “to the way of analysing talk that is now known as **Conversation Analysis**” (Cameron (2001: 48; original emphasis).

CA tries to determine the practical meaning of utterances and aims at least in part at uncovering the “organized reasoning procedures which inform the production of naturally occurring talk” (Hutchby & Wooffitt 2008: 1). In other words, “CA is the study of talk” (ibid.: 11). Ordinary conversation “is the predominant form of human interaction in the social world” and it is also “the primary medium of communication” (Heritage 1995: 394). On the whole, CA stands for “the systematic analysis of the talk produced in everyday situations of human interaction: talk-in-interaction”, which occurs naturally and may be recorded (Hutchby & Wooffitt 2008: 11). CA tries “to explicate the reasoning principles that guide and are displayed within interactional conduct” (Clayman & Maynard 1995: 7), or as Heritage & Atkinson (1984 [1992]: 1) remark,

[t]he central goal of conversation analytic research is the description and explication of the competences that ordinary speakers use and rely on in participating in intelligible, socially organized interaction. At its most basic, this objective is one of describing the procedures by which conversationalists produce their own behavior and understand and deal with the behavior of others. A basic assumption throughout is Garfinkel’s (1967: 1) proposal that these activities – producing conduct and understanding and dealing with it – are accomplished as the accountable products of common sets of procedures.

CA does not “rest on methodological guidelines which can be packaged in the straightforward fashion that is often thought desirable in social science” (Heritage 1995: 410). CA characteristically includes comparisons between “ordinary conversation” and “institutional interactional practices” (Arminen 2005: 235). Its analytic purpose is “not to explain *why* people act as they do, but rather to

explicate *how* they do it” (ten Have 2007: 9; original emphasis). Therefore, CA tries to answer questions such as how ordinary talk is organised, how participants coordinate their talk, i.e., how they “display for one another their understanding of ‘what is going on’” (Hutchby & Wooffitt 2008: 13).

CA relies on an unconventional yet intense intellectual interest in the details of talk-in-interaction. Talk-in-interaction is particularly important in social life, not just at the level of everyday concern but also at the level of society at large. Many practitioners insist that casual talk is “the ‘basic’, ‘primordial’ form or ‘bedrock’, of all forms of talk” (Firth 1996: 238). The concept of “bedrock” status in relation to other institutionalized forms of interpersonal conduct was first suggested by Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson in 1974 (Heritage & Atkinson 1984 [1992]: 12).

CA is relevant for three specific areas in linguistics which are the ethnography of communication, pragmatics, and discourse analysis (Hutchby & Wooffitt 2008: 4). Researchers use audio- or video recordings of non-experimental, naturally occurring interactions as their basic data,⁸ because “recordings as a resource can be analyzed and re-analyzed” (Heritage 1995: 395). The advantage of such recordings is that they can be studied “again and again” (Sacks 1984 [1992]: 26). In fact, as Heritage & Atkinson (1984 [1992]: 4) say:

[t]he availability of taped record enables *repeated* and *detailed* examination of particular events in interaction and hence greatly enhances the range and precision of the observations that can be made. The use of such materials has the additional advantage of providing hearers and, to a lesser extent, readers of research reports with direct access to the data about which analytic claims are being made (original emphasis).

The data can also be made available to other researchers who then can draw their conclusions on an existing analysis. Indeed, “the influence of the analyst’s individual preconception is minimised” by subjecting the data to public scrutiny (ten Have 1990 [2004]: 25).

⁸ see section 6.3. for details on the ‘methodology of data collection’.

Recorded data have to be transcribed,⁹ because CA is done through the use of transcripts. When analysing the transcripts, a conversation analyst will establish “how talk is sequentially structured and interactively managed” (Firth 1996: 238). It may be argued that a researcher “is already interpreting, analysing and making choices about what to record and what to miss out” just by taking field notes (Stubbs 1983: 230).

The point to be made is that the aspects provided in characterising CA are rather general and mainly touch the theoretical framework for monolingual talk. The crucial question is whether the criteria describing CA can also be applied to ELF interactions. Firth (1996: 240) concludes that

[a]lthough foreign language, or lingua-franca, interactions are an extremely common, even quotidian, occurrence in manifold settings throughout the world – and particularly *English* lingua franca inter-actions – such interactions have been overlooked by conversation analysts (original emphasis).

More and more linguists seem to adapt CA principles in ELF talk to demonstrate that they are also applicable to lingua franca interactions. CA provides a basic methodology for describing “how lingua franca interactions are sequentially and thus socially constructed” (ibid.). The methodological approach toward analysis is perhaps the most important contribution of CA insofar as “CA emphasizes that analysis should be based entirely on closely transcribed examples of actual talk recorded in naturally occurring settings” (Hutchby & Wooffitt 2008: 4). Firth (1996: 240) suggests that addressing lingua franca interactions from a conversation analytic point of view will promote and improve the general understanding of

(1) the nature of conversational competence, and (2) the linguistic and interactional resources deployed and required in order to conduct meaningful, orderly and indeed ‘ordinary’ discursive practices.

⁹ see section 6.5. for a discussion on the ‘transcription of recorded data’.

CA is distinctive because of its emphasis on recording talk “in naturally occurring settings”, and secondly, in terms of its approach to analysing “naturally occurring data” (Hutchby & Wooffitt 2003: 229-230). For Johnson & Johnson, CA is

an approach to discourse dealing with the linguistic analysis of conversation, and strongly associated with ETHNOMETHODOLOGY. It is concerned with the structure of conversations, dealing with such matters as TURN-TAKING (using the ADJACENCY PAIRS concept), topic change and conversational structure - rules governing the opening and closing of conversations [...] and communication breakdown (Johnson & Johnson 1998: 89; original emphasis).

A noticeable feature of verbal exchanges is the cooperative attitude of the participants. Discourse strategies are the most significant contribution to talk-in-interaction. Without these conversation is unlike to function. The following section will therefore discuss discourse strategies.

3.6. Discourse Strategies

Discursive strategies are created in line with a cognitive representation of the context. Speakers decide what should go into a sentence whilst they are talking. In other words, discourse strategies represent cognitive processes in speaking and comprehension. Sometimes they happen unconsciously and their discursive realisation takes the form of coherent sequences, which are to accomplish interactional goals. However, there is no need to assume “that sharing at all levels of either grammatical or social rules is necessary” (Gumperz 1982 [1995]: 29-30). The communicative relevance of context models relies on their control of how speakers accommodate their utterances to a communicative situation. Moreover, “the effective employment of communicative strategies presupposes grammatical competence and knowledge of the [relevant] culture” (ibid.: 5).

Discourse strategies include the generation of texts from selected and ordered information from underlying knowledge. According to McKeown (1985: 8), text

order is not the product of underlying knowledge but the result of discourse strategies that are used at the time of text generation. Gumperz (1982 [1995]: 29) suggests that “being able to interact [...] implies some sharing”. Interactants, although speaking the same language, may display quite significant differences in background knowledge (ibid.: 6). Gumperz (ibid.: 3) makes the point that

[a] general theory of discourse strategies must therefore begin by specifying the linguistic and socio-cultural knowledge that needs to be shared if conversational involvement is to be maintained.

Nevertheless, as it seems, discourse strategies are neither a part merely of linguistic competence, nor of linguistic performance. According to Hutchby & Wooffitt (2008: 49), three very basic facts about conversation are known: (1) turn-taking occurs, (2) one speaker tends to talk at a time, and (3) turns are taken with as little gap of overlap between them as possible. The next sub-section will therefore discuss turn-taking as the most common discursive strategy in communicative interaction.

3.6.1. Turn-taking Procedures

Turn-taking is most fundamental to verbal interaction. Regardless of being “formal or informal, meetings and their agendas are achieved incrementally on a turn-by-turn basis”, in various adjustments to normal conversation (Boden 1994: 99). In most instances only one person speaks at a time. However, there seems to be a general tendency of avoiding silence between speaking turns.

Hutchby & Wooffitt (2008: 49-50) make the point that turns in interaction can essentially be identified as being “constructed out of units, called turn-construction (TCUs), which broadly correspond to linguistic categories such as sentences, clauses, single words [...] or phrases. They are pragmatically and grammatically complete units that accomplish recognisable social actions in a specific context. Moreover, turn design not only involves an action selection but also “a selection of how the action is to be realized in words” (Drew & Heritage

1992: 36). According to ten Have (2007: 103), “turns-at-talk in ordinary conversation are constructed in the actual course of speaking, using locally recognizable ‘units’ [...] as their ‘building blocks’”. During the construction of such blocks, a speaker is considered as the owner of the floor. But as soon as this kind of construction is finished, another speaker might come in, unless measures are taken to prevent this (ibid.).

The rules for turn-taking “operate in terms of locally constructed discourse statuses rather than position in a social hierarchy” (Drew & Heritage 1992: 48). Sequence organisation relates to basic conversational organisations that are used by the interactants in institutional settings “to manage particular role-specific activities” (ibid.: 38). This means that participants normally will wait until a speaker signals a completion point, i.e., the end of his or her speaking turn.¹⁰ There are several ways of doing this, for instance by pausing at the end of a sentence, or by asking a question, and so on. Most important is that the participants “must be able to distinguish between rhetorical pauses and turn relinquishing pauses” (Gumperz 1982 [1995]: 160).

Throughout a conversation speakers display in their sequentially next turn an understanding of what the prior turn was about (Hutchby & Wooffitt (2008: 13). A basic tool used in CA is known as “next-turn proof procedure” and it is “to ensure that analyses explicate the orderly properties of talk as oriented to accomplishments of participants” (ibid.). Its aim is to establish how people understand and respond to one another in their turns at talk and what role talk-in-interaction plays in social processes. The methods by which people understand each other in talk can be observed in turn-taking itself, for example through the above mentioned next-turn proof procedure (ibid.: 29). Interactants seem to be mutually collaborating and orienting in order to produce orderly and meaningful communication. Therefore, according to Sacks et al. (1974: 700), “turn-taking seems a basic form of organization for conversation”. As Boden (1994: 99) exemplifies, for instance in informal meetings “talk most approximates the

¹⁰ see sub-section 7.4.1., Example 20 (A), for a practical example and discussion of turn-taking in verbal interaction.

conversational turn-taking model, with the general exception that long turns are expectable”.

The participants in a conversation will normally avoid talking all at once, on the other hand “there will not usually be stretches of time in which no one talks at all” (Cameron 2001: 89). This does not mean that interruptions, simultaneous speech or overlaps, or silence never occur in speech interactions (ibid.). They do occur and when they occur they apparently represent something other than the normal and desirable procedure in conversation. Participants usually consider them as “problems which need to be ‘repaired’” (ibid.). This is an issue that prompts enquiry into the nature of interruptions and overlaps and this is a topic that will be dealt with in the following sub-section.

3.6.2. Interruptions and Overlaps

The phenomenon that is commonly known as “interruption”, but should be more precisely referred to as “overlap”, represents “a paradigm case of the ambiguity of power and solidarity” (Tannen 1994: 35). It might well be that interactants “assume that only one voice should be heard at a time” (ibid.). Interrupting is often considered “a hostile act, with the interrupter [as] an oppressor and the interrupted as an innocent victim” (ibid.: 55). It is also seen as “a means of social control, an exercise of power and dominance” (ibid.). Therefore, an overlap in talk-in-interaction can be considered “an interruption, an attempt to wrest the floor, a power play” (ibid.).¹¹ However, Sacks et al. (1974: 699) make the point that “overwhelmingly, one party talks at a time, though speakers change, and though the size of turns and ordering of turns vary”.

An interruption is seen “as violation of speakers’ turns at talk” (West & Zimmermann 1983: 103). While a transition onset may be a perfectly legitimate place for an overlap to occur, “it may also systematically be open to being treated

¹¹ see sub-section 7.4.2., Example 21 (B), for a discussion of ‘overlaps’ and ‘interruptions’ in a practical example of verbal interaction during a military meeting.

as ‘interruptive’ by the current speaker” (Hutchby & Wooffitt 2008: 57). Interruptions normally accompany a topic or turn change, and take place at non-transition relevance places. As such, they often take the form of overlapping, but interruptions “can also take place without actual overlapping” (Murata 1994: 386).

An interruption results in “a ‘deeper intrusion into the internal structure of a speaker’s utterance’ than an overlap”, i.e., it “penetrates well within the syntactic boundaries of a current speaker’s utterance” (West & Zimmermann 1983: 104). In many instances interruptions are seen “as *violations* of turn-taking rules” (ibid.). However, interruptions are only those “deep incursions that have the potential to disrupt a speaker’s turn, although actual disruption [...] is a product of further interaction” between speaker and interrupter (ibid.). As Hutchby & Wooffitt (2008: 110) remark, “interruptions can be treated as an indicator of interpersonal factors such as dominance, power, or control”. However, interruptions can also “signal ‘high involvement’” (Cameron 2001: 74). For example, a listener “expresses enthusiasm and support for the speaker by jumping in before the end of the speaker’s turn” (ibid.). To put it more simply, “some speakers consider talking along with another to be a show of enthusiastic participation in the conversation”, expressing solidarity and creating connections (Tannen 1994: 35).

In general, the term ‘interruption’ “superficially carries negative meaning”, while ‘overlap’ “does not necessarily do so” (Murata 1994: 385). Interruptions are seen as “intentional actions of interrupting” a speaker’s utterances at non-transition-relevance places, whereas “overlaps are regarded as unintentional infringements” (ibid.: 386). People commonly perform overlaps when competing for a next turn, i.e., when each interactant projects his/her start to be the “earliest possible start at some possible transition-relevance place, producing simultaneous starts” (ibid.). Consequently, interruptions can be classified into two types, i.e. “co-operative and intrusive”. Intrusive interruptions include “three subcategories: topic-changing, floor-taking, and disagreement interruptions” (ibid.: 399).

In overlapping speech a speaker wins “the right to talk and be attended to by co-participants while the other speaker falls silent” (Cameron 2001: 89). This means in practice that the floor basically is not given just to one speaker. The structures and patterns of talk-in-interaction essentially result from “what people do as they go along rather than from their being compelled to follow a course of action that has been determined in advance” (ibid.).

Jefferson (1986: 154; quoted in Hutchby & Wooffitt 2008: 110-111) shows that simultaneous speech acts which look like interruptions “occur in the environment of legitimate transition-relevance places”. They do not seem to be proper interruptions, but rather attempts to gain the floor. As Jefferson puts it,

[t]he overlap could [...] be seen as a byproduct of two activities: (1) A recipient reasonably, warrantably treat some current utterance as complete [...] and starts to talk, while (2) the current speaker, perfectly within his rights, keeps going (ibid.).

As a matter of fact, during the occurrence of overlap participants who engage in talk-in-interaction are “orienting to the rules of turn-taking” (Hutchby & Wooffitt 2008: 54). Phenomena of overlapping speech are significant in terms of speaker transition. In essence, what West & Zimmermann (1983: 105) call ‘overlaps’ are

(1) events occurring in the immediate vicinity of possible turn-transition places, and (2) those brief utterances (e.g., “yeah”, “right”) or longer incursions (e.g., “saying the same thing at the same time” which have some facilitative warrant.

Nevertheless, with overlap being an integral part of verbal interaction, “conversational cooperation requires that interactional synchrony be maintained so that speakers cannot be interrupted at random” (Gumperz 1982 [1995]: 160). As already indicated the communicative feature of repetitions is linked to turn-taking and overlapping strategies. The next sub-section will therefore discuss that particular feature.

3.6.3. Repetitions

Repetitions mostly relate to incidents of unplanned talk. According to Tannen (1987a: 584), the repeating of words, sentences, or phrases of other speakers

- (a) accomplishes a conversation;
- (b) shows one's response to another's utterance;
- (c) shows acceptance of other's utterances and their participation; and
- (d) gives evidence of one's own participation.

Tannen suggests that “[r]epetition enables a speaker to produce in a more efficient, less-energy-draining way” (ibid.: 581). Murata (1995: 345) differentiates between two types of repetitions as far as the number of people who produce them is concerned. In self-repetition the speaker repeats him/herself. By contrast, two-party repetition is produced as cooperative work between a speaker and a conversational partner (ibid.). Moreover, the use of immediate repetitions appears to be a salient feature “of communicative behavior observed at topic and subtopic boundaries, others being pause/ silence, interruption, and overlapping” (ibid.: 343).

Speakers produce their utterances in real time and mostly with very little planning. This leads to speakers making false starts and repeating themselves. However, a reasonable amount of repetition or even pausing will assist listeners in absorbing the information that is provided through talk before it finally disappears (Cameron 2001: 34). Altogether it seems that “if certain features recur in spoken language data, they must serve some purpose, however obscure we find it” (ibid.: 33). As a matter of fact, irregularities are likely to play an important role when analysing ELF speech.¹²

As far as the use of repetitions is concerned, Murata (1995: 346-353) identifies five functions of repetition at topic and subtopic boundaries. *Interruption-oriented repetitions* happen when “a conversationalist interrupts the current speaker and

¹² see sub-section 7.4.5., Example 31 (A), for a discussion of repetitions and overlaps occurring in non-native ELF speaker interaction during a military meeting.

takes turns” or intends to change the topic (ibid.: 346). Such interruptions can be used “to aid turn-taking and floor-taking” and essentially create overlaps whereby words or syllables can be “obscured by the overlap” and are then repeated by the person causing the interruption (ibid.). *Solidarity repetitions* are cooperatively produced two-party repetitions (ibid.). Solidarity is shown when conversational partners “seem to demonstrate their cooperation or involvement in conversation” by almost immediately “repeating the preceding speaker’s words and phrases”. By doing so, conversational partners are “showing their listenership, participation, agreement, and solidarity with the speaker” (ibid.). *Silence-avoidance repetitions* allow a speaker to continue talking while searching for a next topic or utterance. Speakers demonstrate their participation and involvement in a conversation “[b]y avoiding silence in between turns” (ibid.: 350). When they are unable to introduce a new topic quickly enough, they tend to repeat what their conversational partner says to avoid any pause or silence (ibid.). *Hesitation repetitions* usually take place “in the beginning phase of an utterance or, most frequently, where a speaker changes topics” (ibid.: 351). These repetitions seem to occur automatically and most likely unconsciously. In essence, hesitation repetitions seem to fulfil “a kind of downplaying function in order to increase the indirectness” of a statement or a question and help to formulate the change of topic in a less “face-threatening” and offensive way “to the conversational partner” (ibid.).

A speaker normally utilises *reformulation repetitions* to change an utterance into a desired shape “by repeating the words or phrases she or he mentioned earlier” (ibid.: 352). These repetitions may also be used to make an utterance “more understandable or correct”. Speakers tend to use reformulation repetitions in relation to the cooperative nature of conversational interaction. Furthermore, such repetitions appear to reflect “a mental processing (Chafe, 1979), where a speaker tries to find appropriate words or phrases in the process of interaction” (Murata 1995: 353).

3.6.4. Pauses during Speech

A further phenomenon during speech events is pausing. Speakers use pausing and intonation (pitch and stress) to subdivide utterances into units, which may “coincide with grammatical constructs, such as a clause, but they do not have to” (Cameron 1991: 35). A speaker sets boundaries to signal the structure of speech s/he wishes “to impose on the information s/he is giving” (ibid.). Pauses are useful to the listeners who have to process utterances in real time. A certain amount of pausing and repetition increases their chance of taking in the information provided by the speaker before it disappears (ibid.: 34). Moreover, it may help to reduce incidents of miscommunication and this is what the next section is all about.

3.6.5. Miscommunication and Problematic Talk

Miscommunication can happen under many different aspects. For example, listeners might create their own ideas or insights about a matter that is under discussion. This could cause other assumptions to be reached than originally intended. Moreover, miscommunication may occur because requested information is not communicated or is misinterpreted. It may also take place, particularly in ELF interactions, because of different “L1-based cultural knowledge frames and interactional norms” (House 1999: 75). Miscommunication can be caused by gaps in an interactants’ “knowledge of the world, in particular knowledge of the subject on hand” (ibid.). Moreover, disturbances and outside influences can be the reasons of both miscommunication and misinterpretations. According to Holmes & Stubbe (2003: 137), “[m]iscommunication and problematic talk could be described as occupational hazards of organizational life”. Ineffective or problematic communication can have highly visible “negative outcomes, both for the individuals concerned and for [an] organisation as a whole” (ibid.: 138).

On the whole, there are two basic types of miscommunication, i.e., ‘misunderstanding’ and ‘non-understanding’.¹³ The distinguishing factor between these two phenomena is the interaction participants’ degree of awareness (Pitzl 2010: 31). Immediate awareness of an understanding problem by at least one of the participants points towards a ‘non-understanding’ (ibid.). However, “an instance of ‘miscommunication’ of which neither participant is aware at the time of its occurrence represents a ‘misunderstanding’” (ibid.). Misunderstandings may occur on a global discourse level, but such “‘misunderstandings’ are not realized by participants for a considerable span of time and only through some instance or other surface in the conversation” (ibid.: 58).

House (1999: 76) suggests that “[m]isunderstandings may also result from uncooperativeness on the part of one interlocutor or both interlocutors”. According to House, four types of misunderstanding have been identified: operational (processual), language-based, strategic and conceptual (ibid.: 82). Misunderstandings generally form part of the linguacultural practice of talk, and occur in everyday communicative interactions between members of one and the same linguaculture (ibid.: 76). There is a strong likelihood that they occur when members of different linguacultures meet as this is the case in ELF interactions (ibid.). As House remarks, misunderstandings in ELF interactions do not stem from deep cultural differences between the participants’ native culture-conditioned norms and values, but can be traced to the participants’ failure to employ discourse strategies and a lack of pragmatic fluency (ibid.: 85).

Misunderstandings are very complex phenomena and “may be the result of inadequate perception, inappropriate comprehension at the syntactic, semantic, pragmatic and discourse levels of language” (ibid.: 75). For Vollstedt (2002: 100),

[a] common language is not always a guarantee for perfect communication, simply for the fact that speakers are confronted with different levels of language knowledge, intercultural differentiation, and comprehension problems.

¹³ The notion of ‘non-understanding’ as a form of miscommunication is exemplified in subsection 7.2.3. through Example 5 (B).

Misunderstandings might cause communication breakdowns, particularly in instances when participants are unable to exchange their views or intentions. It may be argued that participants are likely to make every reasonable effort to avoid such situations. In cases where action, words, or utterances are unknown or unclear, listeners let them ‘pass’ on the common-sense assumption that the matter will either become clear or redundant as interaction progresses (Firth 1999: 243). However, “[t]he ‘let it pass’ concept [...] is an ‘interpretative procedure’ (Cicourel, 1973) that hearers adopt when faced with problems in understanding the speaker’s utterance” (ibid.). This is something I will return to in section 7.5.¹⁴

Even though ELF interactions mostly happen in multilingual and multicultural settings, there is no reason why one should not expect various types of miscommunication in ELF (Seidlhofer et al. 2006: 17). These include operational, language-based, conceptually-based or strategic misunderstandings (House 1999: 78). All in all, it seems that “many interactants from different cultures successfully establish, maintain, or enhance their business relationships” despite existing differences in their cultures and competence in using ELF (Poncini 2004: 21). In ELF talk, like in any other interactions, misunderstandings and communication troubles can be rectified by repair as this is demonstrated in my data. My next section will deal with the topic of repair of problems or troubles in communicative interaction.

3.6.6. The Notion of Repair in Communicative Interaction

Repair basically refers to how interactants deal with problems in speaking, hearing, or understanding. It can be initiated by “the speaker who produced the trouble source”, or by others, i.e., the listeners (Hutchby & Wooffitt 2008: 60). A clear distinction is also to be made between “marking something as a source of trouble” and “the actual repair” as such (ibid.). In other words, repair is classified

¹⁴ see section 7.5., Example 33 (A), for a practical demonstration and discussion of the ‘let-it-pass’ principle.

according to who initiates the repair and who resolves the problem as well as in what way it unfolds within a turn or a sequence of turns.

Repair relates to several phenomena, such as apparent errors in turn-taking, for example those “involved in much overlapping talk, to any of the forms that are commonly called correction, i.e., faults in the contents of utterances” (ibid.: 57). In the first sense, the term repair is used because “one way of seeing what is going on is in terms of a ‘repair of the turn-taking system’”. In the second sense, the term repair is used instead of “correction” (ibid.).

Trouble in talk-in-interaction not just refers to errors of fact, logic, or correctness, it goes far beyond. In many instances repair “involves the temporary suspension of a turn or a sequence in progress to attend to an emergent trouble of some kind” (ibid.: 59). Four varieties of repair have been identified (Hutchby & Wooffitt 2008: 60, after Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks, 1977):

- Self-initiated self-repair: repair is initiated and carried out by the speaker of the trouble source;
- Other-initiated self-repair: repair is carried out by the speaker of the trouble source but initiated by a recipient,
- Self-initiated other-repair: the speaker of a trouble source may try and get the recipient to repair the trouble,
- Other-initiated other-repair: the recipient of the trouble-source turn both initiates and carries out the repair. This is closest to what is conventionally understood as ‘correction’.

On the whole, the positions in which repair tends to occur are essentially very near to the source of trouble (Hutchby & Wooffitt 2008: 64). Self-repair¹⁵ occurs when a speaker becomes aware of a marked utterance and tries more or less immediately to correct it.

¹⁵ see sub-section 7.4.4., Example 23 (C), demonstrating instances of ‘self-repair’ by a non-native ELF speaker.

Other-repair is to be understood as correcting a specific part of another speaker's marked utterance. Listeners perform other-repair primarily to correct grammatical 'infelicities'.¹⁶ Despite lingua franca interactions evincing "linguistic infelicities and abnormalities, the parties nevertheless *do interactional work* to imbue talk with orderly and normal characteristics" (Firth 1996: 256; original emphasis). However, when pronunciation variants take place listeners also display a tendency to perform other-repair. The initiative to repair can be with the speaker or "others can take such an initiative", which is called 'other-initiated repair' (ten Have 2007: 133).

To establish the true reasons for conversation participants performing other-repair seems rather difficult. It seems that several factors come into play, such as the feeling of having to correct mistakes, views on language proficiency, orientation towards ENL standards, or automatic response. It might also happen that an interactant wants to make sure that "mistakes are corrected in order to avoid possible misunderstandings" (Strasser 2004: 99).

Particularly in conference or business talk the use of other-repair could prove to be rather controversial. Some participants might become offended when others correct them several times. As a result, an otherwise good atmosphere or relationship between individuals could be spoiled (ibid.: 100). In addition, other-repair sequences might disturb an entire conversation.

¹⁶ Lexicogrammatical 'infelicities' are to be understood as 'non-conformities' to ENL norms. In lingua franca interaction, participants have different ways of dealing with their status as nonnative speakers, and with what may be perceived as linguistic (foreign-language) incompetence. [...] most often participants 'do work' to divert attention from the 'surface' features of talk, and are differentially able to disattend to encoding difficulties and linguistic infelicities (Firth 1996: 253).

4. Power strategies in Verbal Interaction

4.1. Introduction

Power can be defined in many ways. As Holmes & Stubbe (2003: 3) put it, power is treated as a relative concept from a sociological or psychological perspective. This concept includes the ability to control others as well as the ability to accomplish one's goals (ibid.). Language is one of the primary and crucial means of enacting and exercising power. Thus, power can be exerted in many different ways in talk-in-interaction. As Holmes, Stubbe & Vine (1999: 357) put it, an obvious means by which people make their power in relation to others quite explicit is "by using on 'record strategies'". Moreover, Tannen (1987b: 5) makes the point that "[i]t is misleading [...] to reify power as if there is one source of it and somebody has it and someone else doesn't". The following section is intended to describe the interrelation between power and speech.

4.2. Power and Speech

Power of speech contributes to the constructing of social reality. Above all, the interrelationship between power and communication is very close. Language is an important means of enacting and exercising power over people. Holmes & Stubbe (2003: 3) make the point that every interaction relates to

people enacting, reproducing and sometimes resisting institutional power relationships in their use of discourse by means of a range of coercive and collaborative strategies.

In practice, according to Wray & Bloomer (2006: 85), "[l]anguage is often used to exercise power over people in subtle ways". Öberg (1995: 143) remarks that institutional talk is "task-related [and] performed within a specific setting". Moreover, it includes "elements of conscious planning" (ibid.). This leads to the

question of how power can be expressed during communicative interactions, such as professional discourse.

Some of the strategies for asserting power and control involve making decisions or giving instructions, setting an agenda, or opening and closing a discussion. These strategies are necessary simply in order to get things done. Accordingly, numerous linguistic devices are used to this end and it is clear that these are playing an important role in achieving effective communication. Tannen (1987b: 5) suggests that “[p]ower may be there in different forms and in different ways – all constantly changing in dynamic response to the behaviour of others”. Requests, for example, are made using a wide range of subtle linguistic resources. When addressing their audience speakers in a higher position of authority and rank generally rely on a finely tuned understanding of the scale of directness to indirectness or politeness strategies. They also rely on supportive moves that precede or follow requests to mitigate the impact and the linguistic modifiers that are used to soften messages. Nevertheless, generalisations have to be treated with caution. According to Holmes, Stubbe & Vine (1999: 378),

[t]he discourse which characterises any interaction will reflect not only the particular relationships involved, in terms of social distance or solidarity, and relative power or potential influence in the organisation; it will also reflect the particular goals of the interaction, and the relative roles of each participant in relation to those goals. Moreover, features of the discourse will reflect the dynamic and responsive nature of interaction. In the course of a single interaction, participants may orient to a number of different identities and goals, either simultaneously or at different points in time.

Within a speech event or interaction, speech acts may be realised by relatively direct discourse strategies at one point, but by rather indirect strategies at others (ibid.: 379). All of this raises the question of how direct discourse strategies work in asserting power and therefore the next sub-section will discuss two topics and these are ‘giving instructions’ and ‘making decisions’.

4.2.1. Giving Instructions and Decision-making

Holmes & Stubbe (2003: 32-33) remark that “[g]iving directives and making requests are the most obvious means by which one person can get another to do as they wish”. In practice, this means to exercise power over others. Labov (1972: 125) provides the following rule for requests in order to perceive a request as a valid command:

B [the hearer] must believe that A [the speaker] believes that

1. X needs to be done.
2. B has the ability to do X.
3. B has the obligation to do X.
4. A has the right to tell B to do X.

Imperative directives are often “delivered to subordinates, and typically [concern] routine tasks” (Holmes & Stubbe 2003: 33). Likewise, “the addressee’s obligations are clear; i.e., the required action is a routine part of their responsibilities” (ibid.: 33-34). Moreover,

[d]ecision making is a vital component of meeting management and directing the decision-making process is an important and complex aspect of workplace interaction (ibid.: 75).

One possibility to reach a decision is “to simply state the desired decision” (ibid.).¹⁷ Another strategy is for “speakers [to] boost the strength of a directive” or “turning up the heat” (ibid.: 34). However, in multi-party conversations to reach a decision is often more problematic. Generally, there are two main strategies in the process of decision making: one person either “made a unilateral declaration or [...] the decision was negotiated, often at great length” (ibid.: 76). However, as politeness can be used to exert power, this strategy will be discussed in the following section.

¹⁷ see sub-section 7.2.1. on ‘Power Relations’, Example 8 (C), discussing imperative directives and direct instruction.

4.3. Politeness

As Holmes & Stubbe (2003: 5) point out, “[p]oliteness is one important reason for modifying the blatant imposition of one’s wishes on others”. Politeness is commonly interpreted as a means as well as a linguistic strategy of avoiding problems and friction in communicative interactions. Thus, politeness and politeness strategies play an important role in any workplace and often serve institutional rather than personal interests.

Workplace interactions are seldom neutral in terms of power. Therefore, politeness can also play a very important role in such interactions. According to Holmes, Stubbe & Vine (1999: 355), the use of particular politeness strategies “may serve institutional rather than personal goals”, for instance, where the surface forms are designed “to express solidarity or positive politeness, but the underlying interactional goal is a manipulative or transactional one”. Positive politeness involves the expression of solidarity or friendliness (ibid.: 354). For that reason it seems quite important to consider the ways in which power and solidarity are enacted through discourse. According to Fraser (1980: 349), politeness nevertheless remains a “property of an utterance which is determined by the hearer”. In principle, “[i]ssues with regard to politeness are relevant to anyone’s getting a chance to talk in another way” (Sacks 1992: 705).

Cameron (2001: 80) differentiates between positive and negative politeness. “Positive politeness’ involves using language to signal liking and approval”, whilst “[n]egative politeness’ involves using language to minimize imposition”. Politeness can also represent a strategy for *mitigating* threats to face in verbal interaction (ibid.: 79; original emphasis). Politeness basically means showing awareness of another person’s face. Therefore, the following sub-section will briefly discuss points related to the issue of keeping face.

4.3.1. Keeping Face

People have an attribute which they call “face” and is considered “a kind of social standing or esteem” that every individual claims to have and wants other people to respect (Cameron 2001: 79). In other words, a person’s face is that particular person’s public self-image in an emotional and social sense. So called “face threatening acts” represent a threat to another individual’s self-image and have the potential to cause damage to the face of, for instance, a speaker (ibid.).

As Cameron says, two kinds of face exist: the “positive face” and the “negative face” (ibid.). The positive face relates to “the wish to be liked and approved of by others”, whereas the negative face, as already mentioned earlier on, refers to “the wish to be allowed to go about your business without others imposing unduly on you” (ibid.). In other words, the negative face relates to the need to be independent and to have freedom of action and the positive face relates to the need to be accepted and to be treated as group member.

Holmes & Stubbe (2003: 5) remark that “most workplace interactions provide evidence of mutual respect and concern for the feelings or face needs of others”. Politeness mainly relates to “all the linguistic devices people may use to minimize threats to face” (Cameron 2001: 80). However, it must be realised that it is also possible to use humour “to mitigate face threats, both to self and others” (Pullin Stark 2009: 170). As Fraser (1980: 342) suggests, “the harshness or hostility of the force of one’s actions” can generally be reduced by mitigation. Mitigation is seen as an attempt at reducing the force of an utterance. The question of what is mitigation and how is it practised will therefore be discussed next.

4.3.2. Mitigation

When expressing power, for example within a workplace or some other framework, both superiors and subordinates tend to use mitigation strategies to

reduce the force of their utterances, and, more importantly, to comply with the face needs of other people. During interactions it is quite often possible to observe the building of teams or the formation of alliances that employ mitigation devices, particularly when it comes to multi-party interactions. As Fraser puts it, “[m]itigation is defined not as a particular type of speech act”; instead it is defined as “the modification of a speech act” intended to reduce “certain unwelcome effects which a speech act has on the hearer” (ibid.: 341).

According to Fraser, mitigation strategies of speakers normally include “the use of indirectness in performing a speech act, the use of distancing techniques, disclaimers, tag questions, and hedges” (ibid.). A “very important aspect of mitigation is that it is *not* the same as politeness” although a high degree of politeness and mitigation are often found together (ibid.: 343-344). On the whole, mitigation is aimed at reducing “the unwelcome effect of what is done”, but politeness “depends on the extent to which the speaker has acted appropriately in that context” (ibid.: 343).

A quite common indirect method of mitigating consists of “providing as part of the utterance a justification for why the hearer should (or should not) be performing some specific activity” (ibid.: 346). However, if speakers are not aware of the function of indirectness that is intentionally created through using mitigation strategies, they frequently respond just to the form of the utterances and miss their true intent. Thus, the potential for misunderstanding or miscommunication by the interactants involved can be rather high. It was found that humour can be a useful device that helps to practice politeness by mitigating or softening less welcome messages, for instance, directives or criticism. The next sub-section will discuss the role humour can play in workplace interaction.

4.3.3. Humour

Humour plays a key role in constructing and maintaining good relations and social cohesion. It generally releases tension, but it can also be very helpful in mediating and mitigating power, managing power relations, thereby fostering solidarity (Pullin Stark 2009: 155). Holmes (2000: 163) defines humour as

utterances which are identified by the analyst, on the basis of paralinguistic, prosodic and discursal clues, as intended by the speaker(s) to be amusing and perceived to be amusing by at least some participants.

Humour creates and maintains collegiality. Furthermore, it is a very useful and effective means of exerting power less explicitly. It can be used to achieve a “speaker’s instrumental goal while apparently de-emphasizing the power differential” (ibid.: 165). It can also be used by a subordinate “in an unequal power relationship to subvert the overt power structure” (ibid.).

Where the participants in talk-in-interaction have known each other for some time, small talk and humorous remarks may surface on occasions. Just like small talk, humour is a multifunctional and valuable resource in workplace interaction. Particularly in the workplace humour becomes a resource in the construction and maintenance of power relationships or as Holmes & Stubbe (2003: 117) put it,

humour is used to construct and preserve good workplace relations, to indicate positive intent and concern for the feelings of addressees and to mitigate overt realisations of power – in other words, to express politeness.

On the whole, humour is “a highly flexible discourse strategy which typically builds and maintains good relationships at work” (ibid.: 134), and this is why it is rather important that it should occur in interactions. Moreover, it is a multifunctional and valuable resource and feature in a workplace environment. It also serves as “a subtle device for getting things done in a socially and professionally acceptable manner” (ibid.: 122). What is more, it “can serve a number of functions simultaneously and hence its power as a management tool”

(Pullin Stark 2009: 156). Nevertheless, laughter may not always express amusement. It can also signal embarrassment or surprise (ibid.: 154). To put it more simply, laughter as it takes place in talk-in-interaction, is “a finely coordinated interactional phenomenon” (Hutchby & Wooffitt 2008: 79). Consequently, the question arises: What is the function of laughter and humour in talk-in-interaction?

According to Öberg (1995: 40), “[...] laughter works as a discourse boundary device”. Moreover, it is interesting to note “[*w*]hen did the participants laugh, *what* did the participants laugh at and *how* did the participants laugh - jointly or unilaterally?” (ibid.: 39; original emphasis). Or, as Holmes (2000: 180) very appropriately remarks, “[t]he power of humour lies in its flexibility [...] - it can function as a bouquet, a shield, and a cloak, as well as an incisive weapon in the armoury of the oppressed”.

5. Meetings

5.1. Introduction

After having discussed various factors of communication in general, the study will now concentrate on a general description of meetings, how meetings generally are organised. This will be followed by a section on how military meetings are organised, including a description of particular features of military meetings and how factors of communicative interaction can be of particular importance and significance and how these factors work out in this particular kind of meetings. Moreover, there is always the question to be considered of how much language is needed to achieve and maintain an efficient and effective communication, especially in the military field.

Meetings, as Boden (1994: 82) says, “are, by their very nature, talk”. Yet, there is a difference between meeting talk and ordinary conversation insofar as meeting talk “is both situation specific and transsituational, operating within the enforced priorities of the organization and its environment” (ibid.). Meetings “derive their very existence from a perceived need to hold a specific gathering at a specific time” (ibid.: 83). As far as meetings in general are concerned, Boden remarks that “organizations come together” in meetings which

may be preceded, arranged, complemented, augmented and cancelled by other forms of organizational communication such as telephone calls, memoranda and reports (Boden 1994: 81).

Moreover, “meetings remain the essential mechanism through which organizations create and maintain the practical activity of organizing” (ibid.). An important factor is how meetings fit into the overall culture of the organisation in which they take place (Pan, Wong Scollon & Scollon 2002: 107). According to Boden (1994: 81), meetings are

the interaction order of management, the occasional expression of management-in-action, that very social action through which institutions produce and reproduce themselves (original emphasis).

Meeting talk, just like any naturally occurring conversation, cannot be interpreted and adequately understood without proper regard for the context of its occurrence. In a very broad sense, an interaction between two people, which normally would be called a conversation, can already be described as a kind of meeting. To be more specific, Holmes & Stubbe (2003: 59) quote Bargiela-Chiappini & Harris (1997: 208), who “define meetings as ‘task-oriented and decision-making encounters’ involving ‘the cooperative effort of two parties, the Chair and the Group’”. In other words, a meeting is a rather formal encounter with a minimum of three persons participating and yielding reportable outcomes or results. However, none of these factors is really crucial. This certainly requires taking a closer look at the nature of meetings. The following section will therefore discuss the types and features of meetings.

5.2. Types and Features of Meetings

What appears to be important for the purpose of distinguishing meetings from other kinds of encounters is “the *function* of the interaction” between people, or, as Holmes & Stubbe (2003: 59) “use the term ‘meeting’ to refer to *interactions which focus, whether indirectly or directly, on workplace business*” (original emphasis). Holmes & Stubbe distinguish between three distinct types of meetings taking into account their overt primary goals and expected outcomes:

- planning or prospective/forward-oriented meetings;
- reporting or retrospective/backward-oriented meetings; and
- task-oriented or problem-solving/present-oriented meetings (ibid.: 63)

A planning and prospective/forward-oriented meeting is a meeting for “assigning tasks, requesting permission or action, strategising [and] making decisions” (ibid.: 64). A reporting or retrospective backward-oriented meeting relates to “reporting,

clarifying, giving feedback, requesting information [and] updating”, and a task-oriented or problem-solving/present-oriented meeting concerns “problem-solving, collaborative task completion [and] information exchange” (ibid.). Meetings quite often contain “elements of all three functions” (ibid.: 63). Their main goals nevertheless must be clear to all participants.

Cuff & Sharrock (1985: 154) make the point that meetings essentially constitute themselves through various kinds of activities to achieve an ‘episodic ordering’ through which the structuring of proceedings is achieved. In general, meetings consist of three phases or sections:

- an opening or introductory section;
- a central development section; and
- a closing section. (Holmes & Stubbe 2003: 65).

“Prebeginning activities” may take place before the actual opening of a meeting. These “are done in anticipation of, even in preparation for the start of the meeting” (Cuff & Sharrock 1985: 155). Opening sections typically include an agreement on an agenda, the identification of tasks or “problems to be solved” (Holmes & Stubbe 2003: 65), but also small talk. Therefore it can be difficult to differentiate an opening section from “prebeginning activities”.

Following the initial phase or opening section, a meeting generally moves to the central development section or central activity, which appears to be “the main reason for the interaction, which itself has a preliminary phase, a centre and a closing phase” (Mulholland 1991: 46). The final phase of a meeting or closing section is again bound to conventions. It appears that “a speech event cannot be ended unilaterally” (ibid.: 47). Therefore joint agreement must exist to close a meeting. The signal for closing quite often is very brief. It may even be given non-verbally. As a general rule, “[t]he less formal the interaction, the less signalling is needed” (ibid.).

Holmes & Stubbe (2003: 59-60) list a number of features which might “influence the relative formality of a meeting”, but might also be useful when comparing different types of meetings:

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
Formal procedures	Informal style
Explicit structured agenda	‘Rolling’ agenda
Tightly integrated group	Loosely connected
Mixed gender group	Same-gender group

Meetings quite often show features from both columns. Some meetings have what Holmes & Stubbe call a “much more flexible and fluid agenda, with topics emerging gradually and ‘naturally’ and with no explicit, formal control over topics or procedures” (ibid.: 61). Meeting features depend on “the roles and relative experience of different participants, the range of topics to be covered” and on the “relationship between the participants” (ibid.). There are of course many other features than those listed above, “which differ from one meeting to another and which bear a less direct relationship to the formality of the meeting” (ibid.). Having said that, there is a need to look into the formality of meetings and therefore the next sub-section will discuss this matter.

5.2.1. Formal and Informal Meetings

The nature of a meeting, i.e., formal or informal, logically determines its features. For one thing, as Boden (1994: 84) suggests, “large [formal] meetings [...] are primarily information oriented, whereas smaller, informal meetings are, at least in spirit, decision focussed”. The “*process* of decision-making [...] is the observable feature of so many organizational settings” whereas “‘decisions’ [...] are frequently invisible” (ibid.; original emphasis). Pan, Wong Scollon & Scollon (2002: 108) emphasise that “organizational decision making takes place both

within formal business meetings and in pre- and post-meeting events and activities”.

Characteristic for formal meetings is that they are “officially convened by written summonses or fixed arrangements” (Boden 1994: 85). The composition of participants is usually organisationally defined. Such meetings generally “follow a prepublished or relatively fixed agenda”, and are chaired by a designated official (ibid.). In other words, the main features of a formal meeting are its fixed agenda and its presiding chair. Formal meetings very often take place not only “at regular time intervals but also at regular preset times in the day and week” (ibid.).

Formal meetings which belong to the category ‘conference-room’-type meetings may be easier to identify because of their pre-planned character, but they are usually “much more difficult to document for reasons of confidentiality” (Pan, Wong Scollon & Scollon 2002: 108). In general, ‘conference-room’ meetings are clearly structured. This can normally be recognised and uncovered without much difficulty. It may be useful to look into the structural characteristics such meetings display, but there is the “danger of falling into structural descriptions” (ibid.). In other words, two meetings might appear very similar to each other in structures and procedures, but they can be functioning in very different ways. They even may follow similar patterns, but in practice there could still be many variations behind what seems to be an obvious meeting procedure (ibid.: 109). To illustrate this point, the passing of information is considered to be of great importance in some organisations or societies, whereas in others the emphasis rests more on social relationship (ibid.: 110).

Informal meetings, as Boden (1994: 87) points out, rarely have a designated chairperson, “although the highest ranked member of the assembled hierarchy usually opens and closes the meeting” and may also provide “initial position statements, occasional summaries and topic refocusing”. Furthermore, “informal meetings rarely have a fixed or written agenda” (ibid.). However, “in definitional terms”, informal meetings “embody the essence of ‘big’ meetings and are

understood to do so, yet they are also streamlined and conversational in both conception and organization” (ibid.). The following sub-section will enquire about meeting objectives and goals.

5.2.2. Goals and Meeting Objectives

Objectives and goals of meetings are usually linked to thematic and content concerns. The important factors for the effective running of a meeting are “a common understanding of the purpose of a meeting, and agreement about the role of different individuals attending” (Holmes & Stubbe 2003: 61-62). A number of implicit objectives generally exist that “relate to [an] organisation’s business, for instance, making the required decisions, achieving [a] meeting’s goals within the allotted time”, or ensuring that relevant decisions are implemented (ibid.: 62). In complex international organisations, “negotiations are done to a large extent through meetings”, and policies and decisions “are made through a consultative and feedback process” adopted within the framework of such meetings (Pan, Wong Scollon & Scollon 2002: 109).

It seems that the function of a business meeting “always goes beyond a mere business deal” (ibid.). A meeting can be a place for members from various groups “to air their own views regarding the issues of their concern”, but “[i]t can also be a place for group members to develop group cohesion and build team spirit” (ibid.). What are the roles of the participants and what is their relationship? This is to be discussed next.

5.2.3. Participant Roles and Relationships

The participant roles as well as their relationships have considerable influence not only on the conduct and development of meetings but also on their success. Negotiators generally have to define the issues they are concerned about and also

have to search for appropriate solutions. As Öberg (1995: 13) says, interactions can be used for observing and analysing ongoing negotiation processes. Moreover, “interaction analysis is concerned how talk is organised in actual practice” (ibid.). For example, core topics are discussed during the central development section of a meeting when the roles and engagement of participants with an issue are commonly “signalled by the fact that they speak more quickly” during this section “with shorter turns, overlapping speech and a great deal of [...] feedback” (Holmes & Stubbe 2003: 67). During the closing section of a meeting, all proceedings come to an end, actions to be taken are agreed on, and decisions reached normally are summarised (ibid.).

Boden (1994: 88) makes the point that “[m]embership is a vital feature of all meetings” and “particular people *make* a meeting, and making (or missing) a meeting is a noticeable affair” (original emphasis). Moreover, “[m]eetings cannot start, do not exist in some sense, without a perceived critical mass of members present” (ibid.). Normally, “the essence of membership is marked by some kind of listing display [...] or by noting the presence of a quorum” (ibid.: 89). With membership being a calculated affair, it “*elaborates* the actual activity of the meeting by including and excluding various potential members or subunits of the organization” (ibid.; original emphasis). Nevertheless, “[m]eetings are, in effect, infinitely variable but, like talk itself, routinely structured” (ibid.: 83). Perhaps, the most important participant in a meeting is the chairperson. The role of the chairperson will therefore be discussed in the following sub-section.

5.2.4. The Chairperson

In any meeting the chairperson takes up a very important role. Senior staff members of organisations usually manage meetings “quite explicitly by means of speech acts”, for instance by “setting the agenda, summarising decisions, and closing the meeting, thus taking responsibility for keeping the discussion on track and bringing it to a close” (Holmes, Stubbe & Vine 1999: 358). The function of a

chairperson can be briefly characterised as follows: “[o]ne party, that is, has responsibility for the conduct of talk, while the others have less control over it” (Cameron 2001: 162).

The chairperson has rights and obligations in relation to the participants and the purpose of a meeting (ibid.). A chairperson may use “strategies which emphasis[e] his or her authority, such as very formally marking the opening and closing of the meeting” (Holmes & Stubbe 2003: 64-65).

Chairpersons very often make it clear at the beginning of a meeting what they expect to cover and in what order. Meeting management is considered a dynamic process in which all participants play an active part. Seniority is an important factor in this. Those with a higher status and more authority have the largest influence on the content, structure and in the discussion (ibid.: 71). The selection of the speakers “depends on the chairperson, who has both rights and obligations in relation to the assembled members and the purpose of the meeting” (Boden 1994: 86). It is the chairperson who “attends to the agenda, taking points of order and information, guiding both discussion and speaker order, and [is] generally maintaining order and temporal pacing” (Boden 1994: 86). The following subsection is therefore on agenda setting in general.

5.2.5. Setting an Agenda

Agenda organisation implies a particular type of “topic structure”, and is often supported by a “participation framework”, and is managed by “meta-talk” (Öberg 1995: 148). Topic structure refers to agenda items or points “which are at least mentioned but often more extensively treated over a sequence” (ibid.). In other words, each point is usually introduced, discussed and elaborated during the meeting. The term participation framework refers to the meeting participants. Under normal circumstances “one individual [...] acts as chairperson, even if he has not been explicitly elected as such” (ibid.). Meta-talk, also known as agenda

talk, refers to talk “about the actual or aimed-at agenda” (ibid.). The person who is in control of the agenda

monitors the information exchange. When he [/she] selects the agenda items, he [/she] establishes what is relevant from the available information. [...] Who sets the agenda and how this is done also demonstrates and determines the relationships between the participants, as it is a criterion of the power balance as well as of the amount of familiarity and rapport between the participants (Öberg 1995: 157).

An agenda “can be conceived of as a **mental plan**” or “**a written list**” (ibid.: 143-144; original emphasis). The notion of ‘mental plan’ relates to ideas in the minds of the participants in the meeting and refers to the proceedings. The term ‘written list’ refers to an auxiliary checklist of points to be discussed. The participants may be given the option to choose between a mental and a written agenda. However, it can happen that the participants are not aware of their plans as to how they will want to move on in their meeting (ibid.: 144).

5.3. Military Meetings

Military meetings, often called briefings, are conducted when military staff need information quickly, when staff members can get together conveniently, and when they need to decide how to act on that information. The point is that the briefing is a particular kind of military meeting. Military meetings have particular goals which may not always be explicitly stated or acknowledged.

When compared to other forms of professional discourse, military discourse shows two particular features. For a start, military discourse does not involve “lay people”. This already distinguishes it from institutional discourse which itself is a form of professional discourse. Secondly, the existence of a pure military objective, for instance situational developments, violations of the status quo, operations and the like, distinguishes the military discourse from other forms of professional discourse (Poncini 2004: 51).

Military meetings represent a specific type of communicative interaction with distinctive features because there is always the presence of power as officially sanctioned by rank. These meetings essentially make up a kind of genre of their own. As to their conduct, one main concern is the effective enactment of that particular genre through the use of ELF. As Brown (1995: 26) says, “[t]he spoken language is used to show the hierarchy of rank”. In military discourse power relationships are fundamental and they are more clearly perceived in military talk than in other kinds of interaction. Participants in such meetings tend to use a “functionable language system” and disregard the cultural specific norms of the particular lingua franca they use (Bae 2002: 214). All in all, military meetings follow distinct norms and are formally regulated by standing operation procedures. All this affects the kind of institutional nature the genre of these meetings has.

Military meetings are used at every level to keep the respective commander and his staff on developments in the field and elsewhere informed (U.S. Army Field Manual 101-5 1997: 27). However, in many cases military briefings are preferred. The military briefing has certain features which make it very much different from meetings in general. The following sub-section discusses the most common types of military briefings and their purpose.

5.3.1. Types and Purpose of Military Briefings

There are four basic types of military briefings: the information briefing, the decision briefing, the mission briefing, and the “staff briefing” or meeting (ibid.: 115). The goal of military meetings and briefings is to present information to commanders, staff officers, or other designated audiences. The techniques employed for this are determined by the purpose of the briefing, the desired response, and the role of the briefer (ibid.).

The majority of meetings are situation-oriented to a particular audience. The purpose and goals are to facilitate and produce a rapid and coordinated response

to ongoing or developing situations and, furthermore, to obtain a quite thorough understanding of prevailing operational conditions that could influence and affect the successful execution of a mission or an individual operation.¹⁸ On the whole, a unified effort among commanders and staffers by informing all attendees on an ongoing military situation is to be secured and coordinated.

The purpose of military meetings is to present information on ongoing operations and matters of general interest requiring staff action. The exchange of information, the presentation of guidance, the issuance of directives, and the announcement of decisions also take place. In peacekeeping missions staff meetings are held on a regular basis. In combat, staff briefings “are held when required by the situation” (ibid.). Attendance in staff meetings depends on the type of operation, operational rules, standing operational procedures, and the size of the mission headquarters. (ibid.: 115-116).

Normally, the force commander, the chief of staff,¹⁹ certain staff officers and commanding officers of major subordinate commands participate. The person who convenes the meeting sets the agenda. Setting an agenda in the first place and keeping the discussion on track are ways and means of explicitly expressing power. It is the chief of staff (executive officer) of a mission who “presides over a staff briefing” (ibid.: 116).

5.3.2. The Main Properties of Military Meetings

The majority of meetings dealt with in this paper basically follow a tripartite structure. In principle they are routine meetings and therefore they do not have

¹⁸ cf. “Oral Communication Skills for Staff Officers“. *English Skills for Staff Officers (ESSO), Unit 2*. National Defense University (2009).

¹⁹ The chief of staff is the senior or principal member or head of a staff, or the principal assistant in a staff capacity to a person in a command capacity; the head or controlling member of a staff, for purposes of the coordination of its work; a position that in itself is without inherent power of command by reason of assignment, except that which is invested in such a position by delegation to exercise command in another’s name (U.S. Department of Defense 2005: 85).

elaborate introductory phases. There is also no real need for setting agendas because the turn-taking of the participants follows an established routine.

As far as language is concerned, set patterns exist, specifically for 'Military English'. Military meetings are speech events which differ considerably from civilian interactions. Above all, they are subject to situational constraints simply because of their mission-oriented character. Most principles and techniques of effective speaking apply to military meetings just like to any other type of speech or interaction. However, a military briefing is more concise and as a rule restricts itself to the basic facts that are needed for comprehension. For that reason, essentials are delivered in a purely objective manner. According to Holmes & Stubbe (2003: 11), workplace interactions "are embedded in the business and social context of a work group, as well as in a wider social and institutional order".

The kind of engagement interaction I am interested in is the military meeting with its particular features. Therefore, for this study it will be necessary to identify 'macro-contextual' characteristics relevant to military meetings, i.e., formality, ranks, participant positions, structure, objectives, appointments and relations. These 'macro-contextual' features are not exactly the same for every type of military meeting and therefore it is not possible to take them for granted. It may be necessary to point out the relevance of situational constraints and 'macro-contextual' features for participants.

In the military the relationship of speech and power is of significance, mainly because of the delineation of the rank and power structure. Being superior or subordinate in a military system is prescribed by appointment and rank both of which are indicated by symbols and insignia as well as a regulated dress code. All military personnel are expected to comply with what might be seen as elements of decorum. Failure to respect a superior's rank and position results in punishment under military regulations. Power relations reflect legitimate, expert, reward or coercive power exercised by superiors. However, respect is not just paid from subordinates to superiors. Superiors show their respect to lower ranks because

these not only possess expertise in certain skills but also years of experience. Another important aspect is that career structures of obtaining rank and position are clearly delineated. Rank is achieved through job progression, performance, schooling, testing, evaluation, and several other criteria. Rank achievement is not completely objective. The rank and power structure contributes to and forms part of the genre of military meetings, particularly the formality of these, and this matter is to be discussed in the next sub-section.

5.3.3. The Formality of Military Meetings

The formality of military meetings can vary to some degree. In general, meetings are held on a regular basis and take place in assigned conference rooms. The chairpersons who are of senior military rank “state the agenda and monitor the progress of the discussion by summarising, reformulating and confirming understanding” (Holmes & Stubbe 2003: 73).

In a military meeting the chairperson, who normally is the highest ranking officer, emphasises power and authority as well as the hierarchical relationship between all participants who hold various appointments and positions within the organisation. Along the requirement to wear uniform including rank insignia very clearly demarcates the military status, divisions and responsibilities. These situational characteristics quite automatically result in a display of formality. Moreover, it maintains or increases social distance between individuals.

Despite their formal traditions and settings, military meetings can still hold a number of informal aspects. For example, chairpersons may downplay their authority and encourage a “collegial nature of the decision-making process” (ibid.: 65). Another factor that quite often influences a meeting’s formality is its size. As Cuff & Sharrock (1985: 151) suggest, “a meeting might be viewed in terms of size or composition, and it might be expected that other organisational features might depend on them”. In general, smaller meetings tend “to concentrate at the

less formal end of the scale in terms of interaction style” (Holmes & Stubbe (2003: 60). From my own observation, meetings with five participants were less formal than larger ones because the participants in these smaller meetings were well acquainted with each other and this automatically helped to reduce formality. Moreover, these meetings were held in the chairperson’s office whereas the larger meetings were convened in proper conference rooms with the participants sitting around a large conference table according to a predetermined seating order. This had the immediate effect of increasing the formality of the meetings. However, this raises the question of what are the differences between ordinary and institutional talk and how are they manifested. This question is discussed in the next sub-section.

5.3.4. Institutional versus Ordinary Talk

A distinction can generally be made between ordinary interaction and formally distinct speech events. As Arminen (2005: 58) says, “turn size, order and context are crucial for the distinction between ordinary and institutional talk”. However, ordinary talk is commonly seen as a system of speech exchange in which turn size, order or content are not predetermined. In CA research ordinary conversation is seen as “the predominant medium of interaction in the social world” (Drew & Heritage 1992: 19). In practice, conversation is referred to as “casual”, “normal”, “trivial”, “commonplace”, and “ordinary” (ibid.).

Institutional talk contrasts prototypical forms of ordinary, everyday talk. In respect of CA, Hutchby & Wooffitt (2008: 139) argue that “what characterizes interaction as institutional is to do [...] with the special character of speech-exchange systems that participants can be found to orient to”. Drew & Heritage (1992: 22) suggest that participants in institutional talk “generally show an orientation to institutional tasks or functions in the design of their conduct”. They shape their conduct by reference to constraints which are “goal-oriented or functional in character” and “impart a distinctly ‘formal’ character to the

interaction” (ibid.: 23). For Heritage (2004: 106), institutional talk embodies three basic elements:

1. The interaction normally involves the participants in specific goal orientations that are tied to their institution-relevant identities.
2. The interaction involves special constraints on what will be treated as allowable contributions to the business at hand.
3. The interaction is associated with inferential frameworks and procedures that are particular to specific institutional contexts.

Drew & Heritage (1992: 28-29) outline five major dimensions of interactional conduct: these are (1) lexical choice; (2) turn design; (3) sequence organisation; (4) overall structural organisation; and (5) social epistemology and social relations. There is also the point to be made that “comparatively ‘innocuous’ conversational remarks may be interpreted as threatening in an institutional context” (ibid.: 24).

Despite all these definitions, “a hard and fast distinction” between institutional and ordinary talk cannot be made (ibid.: 21). If it is accepted that all talk is shaped by its context, “then arguably it does not make sense to take one context as more ‘basic’ than another, nor to consider some kinds of talk as more ‘ordinary’ than others” (Cameron 2001: 21). In other words, talk permeates each particular institutional practice. Even if a distinction between institutional and ordinary talk according to formal characteristics could be made, this would only be one aspect of formal institutional interactions. The relevance of the institutional context must be shown “as the aim [...] to shed light on the institutional interaction” (Arminen 2005: 47). Institutional interactions, whether formal or quasi-formal, make use of a large number of generic talk-in-interaction properties. Speakers normally “evoke and orient to the institutional context of their talk through their lexical choice” (Drew & Heritage 1992: 29). Therefore, lexical choice is an important factor in institutional talk. The use of technical vocabularies is an indicator of a particular group membership and “can embody definite claims to specialized knowledge and institutional identities” (ibid.).

Altogether, conversation is not as self-evidently coherent as one might think. To begin with, as Stubbs (1983: 228) puts it, “[c]oherence is achieved through interpretation”. The complexities and features which distinguish spoken from written language, as well as numerous paralinguistic elements and inputs that also turn up, are quite often the most significant and important phenomena which should be subjected to analysis. Such phenomena will have to be transformed into a written form (Cameron 2001: 33-35). Since CA explicitly concentrates on the organisation of talk-in-interaction, it might happen that “gesture, body movement and facial expression are not studied in their own right” (Hutchby & Wooffitt 2008: 70). This occurs, as Cameron (2001: 55) remarks, mainly because “[t]he highest-level unit is the *speech situation*, the social context in which speaking takes place” (original emphasis). Speech situations are occasions for using language, nevertheless it must be appreciated that “they are not purely linguistic” (ibid.).

The distinctiveness of formal types of institutional settings rests on the relationship between “the participants’ social roles and the forms of talk in which they engage” (Hutchby & Wooffitt 2008: 141). In general, its overall structural organisation usually manifests how an interaction is institutionalised. However, as Drew & Heritage (1992: 43) point out, “no ‘standard pattern’ for the overall organization of conversations” exists. Various types of institutional interaction are “organized into a standard ‘shape’ or order of phases” (ibid.). As far as social epistemology and social relations are concerned, Drew & Heritage suggest that professional participants in institutional interactions design their talk in such manner “as to maintain a cautiousness, or even a position of neutrality with respect to their co-participants” (ibid.: 46-47). Therefore, when it comes to the analysis of talk in institutional settings, the aim must be “to disclose and specify the verbal practices and interactional arrangements through which the institutional practice is talked into being” (Arminen 2005: 16).

While relationships between speakers in ordinary conversation appear to be symmetrical, “institutional interactions are characteristically asymmetrical” (Drew

& Heritage 1992: 47). Asymmetrical talk is defined as “talk in which the participants do not have equal power, status, responsibility or control” (Cameron 2001: 102). For example, this is the case in military talk because of the inherent hierarchy. What is more, as Drew & Heritage (1992: 49) point out, in institutional discourse there is not only a “direct relationship between status and role” of the participants but also between their “discursive rights and obligations”. Therefore,

institutional interactions may be characterized by role-structured, institutionalized, and omnirelevant asymmetries between participants in terms of such matters as differential distribution of knowledge, rights to knowledge, access to conversational resources, and to participation in the interaction (Drew & Heritage 1992: 49).

It seems quite clear “that the rules of conversation operate in ways that are, in principle at least, independent of the extradiscursive identities of the participants” (ibid.: 48).

6. The Data

6.1. Introduction

This chapter will discuss the question of the data used in this study and also give an insight into their characteristics. At first, it seems easy to find and collect data. The simplest way appears to be just to take one's own audio and perhaps also video recordings of naturally occurring talk. However, all data recording must be performed in a very proper way mainly because subsequent transcription and analysis will have to be carried out in great detail. Involuntary recorded background noise, for instance, can create serious problems (Wray & Bloomer 2006: 140).

As far as the policy for collecting data is concerned, Hutchby & Wooffitt (2008: 89) suggest that "data are not necessarily approached with a particular question in mind". In contrast, Davey & Gramkow Andersen (1996; quoted in ten Have 2007: 78) are of the opinion that

[i]t is of paramount importance that the analyst goes about his everyday life like a photographer. Just as the photographer looks at the world through an imaginary camera lens assessing potential shots, so the analyst must look for potential data sources in the world around him.

According to ten Have (2007: 79), "any option for procuring data should be considered, but practical, ethical and legal considerations should also play a part". Therefore, in any research study a discussion of the authenticity and naturalness of the data, the role of the observer, as well as the description of the data collection method are essential. The following section is to provide information on the data that are used in my research.

6.2. Information on the Data

For the purpose of my study the recordings of a total of ten military meetings are divided into three datasets, i.e., three types of recorded military staff meetings. These meetings were attended by non-native English speakers who used English as lingua franca (ELF). However, native English speakers were also present and participated in the interactions during eight of the meetings. The recordings took place within a multinational peacekeeping mission over a period of three weeks. Each meeting lasted between twenty-five and fifty-five minutes. The lowest number of participants was five and the highest twelve. One set of recordings was taken during headquarters-level meetings. A second set was recorded during meetings held at staff officers' level, and a third set of recordings was made during meetings at liaison officer level without any native speakers (NSs) participating. All recordings have been transcribed for analysis purposes.

The majority of the seventeen participants in the five headquarters-level meetings are non-native speakers (NNSs) of English except for S1, S5, S6, S10 and S11. Participants S2, S3, S12, S13, and S15 are from Argentina and have Spanish as their mother tongue. S7, S14, and S17 have Hungarian as L1. S4, S9, and S16 are from Slovakia with Slovak as their L1. And S8 is from Austria with German as L1. However, there were never more than three NSs in any one of these five meetings.²⁰

A total number of twelve officers participated in the three staff officers meetings. The maximum number of NSs in these meetings did not exceed three. O1, O3, O8, O11, and O12 are from Argentina with Spanish as their mother tongue. O6 and O7 have Hungarian as their L1. O5 and O9 are from Slovakia with Slovak as their L1.

And finally, all participants in the two liaison officer meetings were NNSs of English. The mother tongue of M2, M3, M9, M11, and M12 is Hungarian. M1,

²⁰ See APPENDIX II 'List of Speakers'.

M5, M7 and M8 are from Slovakia and have Slovak as their L1. The native tongue of M4, M6, and M10 is Croatian. M14 is from Austria with German as L1.

All meetings were pre-scheduled, taking place on a weekly basis. Their main object was the exchange of information relating to the execution of various tasks in line with the peace-operation's mission.

6.3. The Methodology of Data Collection

The idea to collect and investigate ELF data during military meetings within a multinational peacekeeping operation and to analyse features of effective ELF communication was prompted by repeated personal involvement in such missions during the past. As far as I am aware of, the use of ELF in military meetings has so far been subject to little linguistic enquiry. For this study I was looking for conversations and group interactions by international military staff in which, so to say, something was at stake for the participants involved, that is, where speakers had to present and exchange information, draw conclusions, make decisions, and accomplish certain goals using English as their common language.

Multinational peacekeeping is a field where English as official working language is of high importance. For obvious reasons, I wanted to record my data inside a peacekeeping rather than a peace enforcement mission. Generally speaking, peacekeeping missions are quite delicate operations of restricted access. First of all, visiting permits and clearance for filming or recording must be obtained from UN New York. As it is quite unusual for outsiders to attend military meetings, special permission has to be locally granted well in advance. Such permits depend a great deal on the good will of the officers-in-charge on site. I got in touch with the local Defence Ministry, the Austrian Mission in New York and people in the mission area where my recordings took place. After explaining the purpose of my research interest, I was cleared and arrangements were made for me to attend the ten military meetings with ELF as communication medium.

The meetings were rather formal routine meetings and complied with mission routine orders. The larger meetings appeared to be more formal than those with up to five participants, because larger meetings tend “to be more formal according to a number of criteria” and features (Holmes & Stubbe 2003: 60). All participants knew the meeting goals and objectives. The chairpersons set and/or maintained the agendas, got the meetings underway, and, if necessary, introduced newly arrived officers.

A very fruitful research relationship with the participants developed right from the start based on mutual trust but also shared interest in my research project. As Poncini (2004: 69-70) says, negotiating contact and developing a kind of working relationship with the participants represents a rather important factor in a research process. Thus, I was able to openly record discursive interactions of military key personnel representing various roles and levels within the organisation and, above all, was communicating in ELF. Interestingly, my recording equipment was always rather quickly ignored. My impression was that the participants did not seem to pay attention to that device. In other words, they apparently forgot about it. They were quite intensely focussing on their discourse and rarely on their status as objects of observation despite my presence and the presence of the recorder. I also took down some field notes to supplement the recordings.

Concerning my presence, I was very briefly introduced at the first meeting of each set of meetings. For the recordings I used a H2 Zoom professional recorder which looks similar to an oversized mobile phone. I always set it up clearly visible after the arrival of the participants at the conference venue. Therefore the recordings can be classed overt recordings. My data base includes about four hours of recorded material. I selected particular parts from this for further analysis in order to exemplify and demonstrate the communication efficiency and discourse strategies of military non-native ELF speakers. I chose the VOICE “Mark-up conventions” for transcribing the recorded material.²¹

²¹ cf. VOICE Project 2007. “Mark-up conventions”. *VOICE Transcription Conventions [2.1]*. <http://www.univie.ac.at/voice/documents/VOICE_mark-up_conventions_v2-1.pdf> (20 April 2011).

When it comes to recording talk-in-interaction “important ethical considerations” may arise (Wray & Bloomer (2006: 139). There is always the question of the participants’ consent to being recorded. This question will therefore be discussed in the following section.

6.3.1. The Ethical Question of Informed Consent

Whatever the data source, the researcher should always consider issues of consent. Either the interactants are asked for permission to be recorded first or, if the recorded data are thought to be “less ‘genuine’” if people were to know that they are being recorded, they should be asked afterwards (ibid.). The key term describing the desired status of participants when recording speech is “*informed consent*” (Cameron 2001: 23; original emphasis). This term indicates that speakers, who are going to be recorded, should not only be informed about it but also instructed on its purpose.

From an ethical point of view, hidden recording would inevitably amount to deceiving people (ibid.: 22). As a rule, people should be given the opportunity to decide for themselves if they wish to be recorded or not. On the other hand, ten Have (1999: 61; 2007: 79) lists “three basic, often mixed, but distinguishable rights to refuse” which should be granted to every participant in a potential recording. For ten Have, these rights include:

- to be recorded or to give access to the situation for recording purposes;
- to grant permission to use the recording for research purposes;
- public display or publication of the recordings in one form or another (ibid.).

Labov (1972 [1978]: 207) believes that there is always “a great deal of interest in the first steps to be taken” and the situation that subsequently develops. Moreover, Labov tries to formulate an answer to the question: “What do you say to people?” (ibid.). For Labov this is not a trivial question and for him “[t]he elementary steps

of locating and contacting informants, and getting them to talk freely in a recorded interview, are formidable problems” (ibid.).

People, who are to be recorded, are entitled to be informed about the intended recordings and their purpose. However, the provision of too many details and explanations concerning the research and analysis will more than likely have an influence on the interactants’ behaviour. So, how much should they be told? As Cameron (2001: 22) suggests, “[t]here may be a case for vagueness”. In practice, ‘informed consent’ can mean informing speakers just sufficiently enough on how the data they are about to produce will be used. Nevertheless, it must be borne in mind that detailed information on the intended study may affect the naturalness of the data aimed at. Cameron also makes the point that

if you tell people, for instance, ‘I’m interested in how much you swear’, there is a chance that the knowledge will affect their behaviour in such a way as to frustrate your goals (ibid.).

Hence, there is a need to balance both the nature and the amount of information to be given to interactants. As a rule, as far as the intended research questions and the handling of data are concerned, there should just be enough said to keep people sufficiently at ease when they engage in a conversation which is about to be recorded. All in all, there is, as already mentioned, no real need to inform people about every detail. It seems reasonable to keep information vague simply because too much of it might result in manipulating and influencing the interactants (ibid.).

In my case the participants were informed about the purpose of my visit and agreed to both my presence and recording their discursive interactions, possibly because they had no other choice. They had also agreed on the use of the data for linguistic analysis. The participants were given the opportunity to edit and delete my recordings. I also told them that any identifying features, i.e., names, locations, organisations, etc. would be changed to maintain confidentiality. This leads to the topic of anonymization of data which is to be discussed in the next sub-section.

6.3.2. Anonymization

The most important implication of recorded talk clearly is “that ‘private’ conversations [...] become to some extent ‘public’, accessible to people other than the original participants” (ibid.: 23). Hence, it could become rather difficult and complicated at times to obtain consent for making and subsequently using recordings. Concerning the use of data and their transcriptions, anonymization of specific details, such as the names of persons, addresses, organisations, and locations should be taken as a general principle. For that reason it is quite common to give people pseudonyms in transcripts and analytic comments. Moreover, ten Have (1999: 62; 2007: 80) recommends that

making transcripts unrecognizable by a process of anonymization should be a routine procedure, which can be explained as part of the consent-gaining process.

Anonymization often seems to be conducive for being given consent for recording talk (Wray & Bloomer 2006: 174). Anonymization also gives the interactants the opportunity to delete certain portions of the recordings, or to simply leave them untranscribed (Cameron 2001: 23). Furthermore, the promise or guarantee that the data will be confined and presented only to a very limited audience of professionals might remove objections to being recorded (ibid.: 23-24). In other words, anonymization is for any analyst a very good opportunity of exercising discretion. At the same time it is of great importance to preserve the naturalness of data, i.e., interactions should take place in a natural manner. The question of the naturalness of data is to be discussed next.

6.3.3. The Naturalness of the Data

The naturalness of data is extremely important in any linguistic research project. Recorded interactions “should be ‘naturally occurring’, that is, ‘non-experimental’, not co-produced with or provoked by the researcher” (ten Have 2007: 68). The

most natural data usually stem from conversations that would happen anyway and are taking place in a natural environment, regardless whether a researcher wants to record them or not. However, in any natural environment it is more than likely that background noises occur. This means that natural data will hardly ever be obtained under, what is considered, ideal recording conditions. As soon as so-called ideal recording conditions are created, for instance, inside a laboratory, the recorded data will no longer be natural (Labov 1972 [1978]: 190). Such recordings and the matching kind of talk are considered to be ‘experimental’. Still, in most cases the boundaries between experimental and natural data remain fuzzy. For ten Have (1999: 48; 2007: 68), recordings “should catch ‘natural interaction’ as fully and faithfully as is practically possible”. Obviously, the act of recording in itself will make the data less naturalistic and a recorded conversation will most likely never be a perfectly faithful representation of what would have been said under what is generally thought to be normal circumstances. Cameron (2001: 20) claims that

it is widely acknowledged that the act of recording talk, whether in a lab or somewhere else, has the potential to affect participants’ behaviour and make the talk something different from what it would have been otherwise.

A recording process that speakers are aware of can be interpreted as part of the overall context and therefore it will affect the talk as any other contextual element does. However, the inhibitions associated with interactants, who know “that they are being recorded, are usually fairly short-lived” (Wray & Bloomer 2006: 139). It seems that the majority of people “will soon forget about the recording as they become involved in the activities” (ibid.). Labov (1972 [1978]: 209) insists that the “only way to obtain sufficient good data on the speech of any one person is through an individual, tape-recorded interview”. He further adds that “we can only obtain these data by systematic observation” (ibid.). Still, researchers should always be aware of how the act of recording might make the data less naturalistic.

6.3.4. The Role of the Observer

Generally speaking, the presence of observers during meetings has, up to a certain degree, an impact both on the ongoing communicative interactions and the interactants' behaviour. Or as Cameron (2001: 20) puts it, there is "the question of how a researcher's presence may affect other people's behaviour".

Unobtrusive techniques, for instance, are those which an observer can use "without affecting the linguistic behaviour to be observed and analyzed by his or her presence" (Auer 1995: 429). An observer is often called a „complete observer“, i.e. "reiner Beobachter" (Atteslander 2003: 102). Clearly, some problems are nearly always associated with participant observation. But, as Milroy (1987: 60) remarks, the problem, which is particularly relevant and has to be taken into account, is "the effect of the observer's presence on the behaviour (including the linguistic behaviour) of the persons studied". For Auer (1995: 433), "[i]n participant observation, the observer enters some social field [...] as an active participant who becomes engaged in interaction". After the observer becomes an accepted interactant his or her observation of the interactions begins (ibid.). However, individuals, who are observing and recording meetings, seem to be getting involved in these at least to a certain degree. Hence, there is a need to reflect on observers and the roles they play during recording work.

Observers take on particular roles and seemingly participate in meetings to considerably varying degrees. Atteslander (2003: 103) distinguishes between three major observer roles: the "complete participant", i.e. "völlige Identifikation mit dem Feld", the "participant-as-observer", i.e. "Teilnehmer als Beobachter", and the role of "observer-as-participant", i.e. "Beobachter als Teilnehmer".²² These roles are not at all fixed and can interchange during an observation and recording process. In line with the specific recording situation, the observers have

²² Passiv teilnehmend bedeutet, dass sich der Beobachter ganz auf seine Rolle als forschender Beobachter beschränken kann und wenig bis nicht an den zu untersuchenden Interaktionen bzw. sozialen Konstellationen teilnimmt (Atteslander 2003: 102).

to judge for themselves which is the most useful and appropriate role for the purpose of their studies (ibid.).

According to ten Have (2007: 69), recording in workplaces can be difficult simply because the observer has to try to keep recording activities unobtrusive in order to obtain data that are as far as possible natural and spontaneous. Thus, I purposely and intentionally refrained from participating in any of the ongoing interactions. I made every effort to remain an outsider and not to become an involuntary interactant. I was a ‘passive participant’ or passive observer. Labov (1972: 206) insists that “the aim of linguistic research must be to find out how people talk when they are not being systematically observed”. He calls the phenomenon referring to the relationship between natural talk and the recording process “observer’s paradox” (ibid.), and this will be explored in the next sub-section.

6.3.5. The ‘Observer’s Paradox’

The problem that Labov (1972 [1978]: 209) describes as ‘observer paradox’ apparently comes into play as soon as people realise and acknowledge that they are the objects of investigation. Moreover, as Milroy (1987: 59) puts it, “the very act of recording is likely to distort the object of observation”. Cameron (2001: 24) even suggests that “[t]he absence of a human observer may reduce the distorting effects of observation, but it does not entirely circumvent the Observer’s Paradox”. Therefore, Labov’s ‘observer paradox’ can never be completely excluded. It may well be that awareness of this fact will provoke a more natural approach to a recording process.

Labov (1972 [1978]: 209) is of the opinion that the paradox can be overcome by breaking “through the constraints of the interview situation by various devices which divert [the speakers’] attention away from the speech” in order to lessen the effects of the recording activities. In other words, instead of concentrating on how the interactants express something, they should be encouraged to pay more

attention to the contents of their talk (ibid.). As Labov (1972: 256) suggests, the best possible solution to the ‘observer’s paradox’ seems to be focussing upon natural groups. Furthermore,

[t]he effects of the recording situation are of course never absent, but they can be overridden by more powerful social controls exerted by peer-group members in excited and rapid interaction (Labov 1972: 66).

It is thought that peer-groups with strong social powers can create a kind of dynamic interaction which might reduce the ‘observer’s paradox’. Focussing on peer-groups, however, is rather restricted and is not suitable for every research purpose (ibid.: 66, 256-257). In their efforts of coming to terms and to deal with the ‘observer’s paradox’, “many researchers try to make the observations, including recording activities, as unobtrusive as possible” (ten Have 2007: 69). Furthermore, as ten Have suggests, the use of small, unobtrusive recorders as well as discreetly operating these may reduce the effects of the paradox (ibid.). Atteslander (2003: 101) remarks that the interactants in a meeting usually adapt fairly quickly to a prevailing situation. In other words, they quickly get used to the recording equipment and hardly get distracted as long as the device is not moved, relocated or otherwise handled.²³

It appears that “observation itself may generate artificial behaviour” (Stubbs 1983: 227). However, I do not feel that this happened during any of my recorded meetings. According to my own judgement and observation, all recorded communicative interactions occurred practically without being influenced or affected by Labov’s ‘observer paradox’. Later, the officers-in-charge confirmed that the meetings were conducted the same way as usual, i.e., they took place in their usual and normal operational context and environment and were not specifically set up for the purpose of my study. The data I obtained can therefore without hesitation be considered ‘natural data’. The question is now of how much

²³ Meist haben sich die Untersuchungspersonen schon nach kurzer Zeit an den/die Beobachter oder die technischen Aufzeichnungsgeräte gewöhnt und lassen sich im Ablauf ihrer alltäglichen Handlungen nur mehr wenig bzw. nicht stören, solange nicht demonstratives Aufzeichnen die Beobachtung immer wieder ins Gedächtnis ruft (Atteslander 2003: 101).

data is needed for conducting a research study. This question is difficult to answer. Most certainly the answer will depend on the kind of research. However, there will always be quantitative and qualitative aspects and these will be discussed in the following section.

6.4. Quantitative and Qualitative Aspects

Right from the beginning of any research it has to be clear what amount of data will be required to answer the research question. Therefore, it has to be decided whether the appropriate approach is to be of a qualitative or quantitative nature. As Arminen (2005: 53) puts it, in empirical analyses, the researchers have to seek demonstrable features of “institutionality” in interaction. In other words, they have to select a representative amount of data instances so that their points essentially can be demonstrated supported by a number of data extracts. From a CA point of view only empirically demonstrated points are valid. Moreover, the presentation of data must be accompanied by convincing analysis.

For Arminen, “comparative studies are another step towards applied conversation analysis” (ibid.: 229). In this case an aspect of the data will have to be presented in numerical form in order “to build a strict comparative dimension” (ibid.). CA studies “what this-and-that is composed of”, whereas “quantitative analysis is about how this-and-that is distributed” (ibid.: 26). CA and quantitative analysis therefore address different orders of things, i.e., they are asymmetrically alternate (ibid.).

Qualitative research tries for interpretative results and not so much for representative findings. However, mere qualitative comparative studies do not permit rigorous comparisons. On the whole, they are rather unsatisfactory because they are promiscuous in terms of potential comparative dimensions. As they do not provide representative examples for analysis, they can only be used to illustrate specific points that are made or to exemplify tendencies. Quantification

would essentially be the answer to solve these shortcomings; however the point was already made that this requires a large number of data in order to obtain representative research results.

For this study, which examines the communicative performance and effectiveness of non-native ELF speakers in the military field, the collected data cannot be analysed in line with fixed formulae mainly because the interactants quite often use unconventional methods to achieve their communicative objectives. Therefore a qualitative analysis of the data seems to be the appropriate method for achieving the goal of this study. Nevertheless, it must be borne in mind that a qualitative research which is supported by a rather small set of data cannot provide representative findings, but it can be used to highlight points made and to illustrate potential tendencies. An important step in preparing the collected data for analysis is to transcribe the voice recordings. The next section therefore discusses the question of data transcription.

6.5. The Transcription of Recorded Data

Before any recorded data can be systematically analysed they must essentially be transcribed (Cameron (2001: 31). Transcribing recorded data is an important and necessary initial step in the process of analysing recorded interactions in the way that CA requires (Hutchby & Wooffitt 2008: 69). The production of a transcript represents a distinctive stage for the data analysis itself (ibid.). Yet, transcriptions remain more or less selective renderings of available data, focusing primarily on the text of recorded utterances. Details as to the particular ways in which words are spoken, are usually added later. The issue of irregularities will largely depend on the research question.

For any analysis to be reasonably valid the transcription has to be as accurate as far as ever possible. Transcribing is a time-consuming task and must not be underestimated. Ten Have (2007: 93-94) describes transcription work as follows:

[t]ranscribing recorded talk might be seen by some as a relatively simple matter, a secretarial task. One 'just' writes down what is said by the parties to the interaction. In fact, this is only the starting point for a transcription adequate for a detailed analysis.

Transcriptions are “always and necessarily selective” (ibid.: 96). What is more, transcriptions cannot represent the recordings in their full detail. Therefore, when dealing with transcripts, it must be kept in mind that every written version is already in itself a subjective interpretation of spoken discourse.

In CA great emphasis is placed on using extracts from transcriptions of recorded, naturally occurring talk (Hutchby & Wooffitt 2008: 69). This is because CA “studies the social organization of [...] 'talk-in-interaction', by a detailed inspection of tape recordings and transcriptions made from such recordings” (ten Have 1990 [2004]: 23). Certain characteristics as well as irregularities in verbal interaction can be of particular interest to an analyst. Therefore, they should be shown and appropriately marked in the transcripts. As ten Have (1990 [2004]: 25-26) sees it, transcriptions can be considered representations of the data, but they are no real substitutes because

[b]y making a transcription, the researcher is forced to attend to details of the interaction that would escape the ordinary listener. Once being made, transcripts provide the researcher with a quick access to a wide range of interactional episodes, that can be inspected for comparative purposes. Furthermore, as noted, transcripts are being provided with their analysis as an essential part of CA's research reports, giving the reader a way of checking the analysis presented, that is not available with other methods.

For the purpose of CA “transcripts are not thought of as ‘data’. The data consist of tape-recordings of naturally occurring interaction” (Hutchby & Wooffitt 2008: 69). Cameron (2001: 66) insists that “discourse data have to be treated as *discourse* as well as just *data*” (original emphasis).

In using transcripts a researcher has access to interactional data for comparative purposes. There is no standard way or form to transcribe recorded talk. However,

there are established conventions from which analysts can choose one variety that fits best their purpose. Transcription systems used in ‘Discourse Analysis’

tend to offer a practical *compromise* between the interests of faithfulness to the original, recorded sounds, and of readability of the final transcribed product (ten Have 2007: 94; original emphasis).

Transcripts are usually annotated to help the reader to examine and understand the subsequent analysis (ten Have 1990 [2004]: 50). Unfortunately “[n]o transcription system exists which is able, or even lays claim to being able, to capture all the possible features of talk that may be observable” (Hutchby & Wooffitt 2008: 71). On the one hand transcripts are to highlight irregularities; on the other hand they have to be written in a way that can be readily understood by people who never participated in the speech event under study.

The most suitable way to document irregularities is, as suggested, to adhere to existing transcription conventions. When doing transcription work, the first step is trying to understand the transcription conventions that will be used, for instance the VOICE conventions.²⁴ There are other transcription systems. However, it must be remembered that “[n]o transcription system is perfect”, mainly because any such system may be “the result of a series of compromises between heterogeneous considerations” (ten Have 2007: 94). Therefore, researchers must be aware that transcriptions will always remain incomplete. No transcription is absolutely accurate. Nevertheless, transcriptions should comply with one of the standardised representation formats.

When listening to recordings, a sense and feeling are needed “of which features of talk to concentrate on” (ibid.: 73). The process of transcribing gives the analyst a basic feeling for whatever has been recorded. It is also helpful in pointing out and highlighting characteristic phenomena that might then be studied in detail. They can be transcribed in varying levels of detail to provide a limited nevertheless

²⁴ VOICE Project 2007. “Mark-up conventions”. *VOICE Transcription Conventions [2.1]*. <http://www.univie.ac.at/voice/documents/VOICE_mark-up_conventions_v2-1.pdf> (20 April 2011).

useful access to what will be discussed in an analysis. In other words, transcripts are a “convenient way to capture and present the phenomena of interest in written form” that occur in interactions and are of research interest (ten Have 2007: 95). Furthermore, “[f]or analysing talk-in-interaction [...] one not only wants to write down *what* has been said, but also *how* it has been said” (ibid.: 94; original emphasis). Transcripts have to be adjusted to enable analysts to decide what to get out of them. For one thing, “[t]ranscribing is a way to bring into focus the characteristics of spoken discourse” (Cameron 2001: 33).

There is always a divergence between the recorded data and their transcription. Therefore “transcriptions should not be taken as a substitute for the recordings”, but rather as one of possible representations created for analytical purposes (ten Have 2007: 95). An important aspect is that

a transcription might be best seen as a *translation*, made for various practical purposes, of the actually produced *speech* into a version of the standardized *language* [...], with some selective indication of the actual speech production (ten Have 2007: 94; original emphasis).

Analysis is not performed merely on the transcripts alone. Transcription is an integral part of analysis, because by repeatedly listening to the audio-recordings an analyst “begins to hear and to focus on phenomena that may subsequently form part of an analytic account” (Hutchby & Wooffitt 2008: 71). However, it takes great effort “*not to hear spoken language in terms of the written model*” (Cameron 2001: 33; original emphasis). Typical features of written texts, such as punctuation marks and the like, have to be done away with as they do not actually represent elements of the talk that is transcribed. Indeed, “if punctuation marks are used in the normal way [...] there is a danger of imposing on spoken discourse a kind of structure it does not actually have” (ibid.: 34).

Sometimes it may be difficult to complete transcripts in a satisfactory manner because of recurring overlaps in interactions or involuntarily recorded background noise. All in all, though rather tiresome, transcribing recorded data is a highly

important work process that requires a large degree of precision and fidelity. The important point is “that much of the complexity of spoken conversation is evident only in close *written* transcriptions” (Stubbs 1983: 228; original emphasis). This refers to frequently occurring conversational complexities and features, such as false starts, hesitations, self-corrections, ungrammatical and unfinished sentences, pauses, repetitions, intonation, fillers, pitch, stress, or overlapping utterances (ibid.). In short, transcripts are considered “as a ‘representation’ of the data”, while the recordings themselves represent “a ‘reproduction’ of a determinate social event” (Hutchby & Wooffitt 2008: 70).

7. Analysis and Aspects of Interactions

7.1. Introduction

After having pointed out what is distinctive about military meetings in general, e.g., their particular genre because of the question of rank and power, the hierarchical system, or the particular importance that has been attached to them mainly over different types of briefings, this chapter will examine to what extent such meetings, according to my data, are successfully conducted. The military meetings which are forming the backbone of this study show all these specific features that I have discussed earlier on. Moreover, they are conducted by people who have different native tongues and nationalities and cannot speak English as a native language. These meetings are therefore conducted through ELF.

The typical features of the meetings that are discussed will be pointed out first because these features play an important role for the analysis of the data. Furthermore, the situational features of participant talk which, whether or not, contribute or cause problems to interactions will be examined. Aspects, such as formality, power, politeness, the roles of chairpersons and participants, or structure, have already been discussed in this paper.

Military meetings represent speech events which differ considerably from ordinary, unplanned talk because they are regulated by formality, objectives and goals, as well as their participants' status and rank. For that reason, it will be necessary to examine how far situational features affect the interactants and their communicative effectiveness as ELF speakers. Moreover, the study will have to show that normal processes of communication are operating even though the interactants are not conforming to NS norms. Being aware of these processes being ELF encounters of a particular kind, I want to characterise and describe what is going on in these military meetings. The analysis of interaction samples is subject to detecting potentially interesting and possibly orderly phenomena.

Emphasis however must be on communicative efficiency. Thus, characteristic discursive phenomena will be discussed.

The recorded data are authentic and natural. They are in no way manipulated or invented and refer to non-experimental interactions. The transcripts range from short, just a few lines long exchanges to elaborate and complex stretches of talk. The interactants, most of them non-native ELF speakers, execute routine business such as informing, reporting, discussing and decision-making. No instructions whatsoever were issued as to the length, the level of formality, or the content of their talk.

The interactants were aware of being recorded. This might pose a problem vis-à-vis the data's authenticity. I was present at every meeting as an observer. It could be argued that this might have influenced the interactants' language. In my opinion the interactants acted in a completely natural way despite what might be seen as outsider interference. Nevertheless, from what I have witnessed, at all times the interactants conducted their discussions freely as if there were no observer and recording equipment present at all.

The following sections are to examine how far military meetings, according to the available data, are successfully conducted and communicatively effective even though these meeting are conducted through English as a lingua franca.

7.2. On exerting Power

7.2.1. Power Relations

Holmes & Stubbe (2003: 61) make the point that one aspect of meetings refers to "the ongoing process of constructing, developing and maintaining workplace power and rapport". Open manifestations of power and authority can easily be observed in more formal, structured meetings. In small and informal meetings

such manifestations are rather less explicit and overt (ibid.). Furthermore, Tannen (1987b: 5) suggests that “[w]hen people are taking different roles, it may not be the case that one has power and one doesn’t”. It may well be that people have different kinds of power which they are exercising in different ways (ibid.). Moreover, “there are many different kinds of power and influence that are interrelated and have varied manifestations” (ibid.). Power can be overtly expressed by summarising the progress or outcome of an interaction, regardless whether of a military or other nature. These measures are also essential strategies for getting things done. In interactions between members of a peacekeeping mission, it may happen that power is sometimes equally shared despite different ranks and appointments simply to preserve collegiality and cooperation.

The following extract represents a typical example of direct instruction, perhaps one of the most significant communicative features of military verbal interaction.²⁵ Chairperson M2 instructs speaker M5 that some kind of screen, which, M2 as non-native ELF speaker, calls a “*fence*” (in line 558), obstructs independent observation in a certain location and therefore will have to be dismantled. The functionality of that particular screen is exceptionally important for M2 and therefore he intensifies the force of his directive during the ongoing discourse. Speaker M5 replies that he will take appropriate action (in lines 559 and 560). M2 insists to be kept informed of further developments. M2’s instructions are given directly and unmitigated, without regards to English NS language standards. This course of action complies with Cogo’s (2008: 60) view that “[s]peakers of ELF are less concerned about adhering to NS standards and more concerned about their communicative skills”.

Example 1 (C)

555 M2: no **no** (.) but (.) e:r you know very well if somebody try cover
 556 something (.) he try to do something under the shadow (2)
 557 for the remain of the **the** er er (.) right COOPeration (.) in the
 558 future (1) we WANT (2) to destroy this <3> fence </3>
 559 M5: <3> okay this </3> probably (.) but if possible i’ll arrange it
 560 step by step because the incident is not as serious (.)

²⁵ see sub-section 4.2.1. for a discussion of ‘Giving Instructions and Decision-making’.

561 they <4>have </4> new liaison officer and i don't want to give
 562 them immediately a lot of **(un) xx (/un)**
 563 M2: <4> okay okay </4> (.) i agree with you (2) you are right (.)
 564 firstly please try to explain them this is er opposite of
 565 the <5> status quo </5>
 566 M5: <5> of course </5> (1) **of course** i will
 567 M2: this (.) thank you (.) continue please inform me (.) okay

Above all, a number of idiosyncrasies occur during the above interaction, such as **if somebody try cover something* (in line 555), or **he try to do something under the shadow* (in line 556), or **for the remain of the right cooperation* (line 557), or **they have new liaison officer* (line 561), or **try to explain them* (line 564), or **this is opposite of the status quo* (in lines 564-565).

In **try to explain them* the preposition 'to' is missing before 'them'. The statement **this is opposite of the status quo* which represents an idiomatic 'infelicity' should really be "*in violation of the status quo*", and **to do something under the shadow* should be "*to do something under cover*" or "*to do something secretly*".²⁶ Moreover, **try cover something* is an 'incomplete infinitive form' (line 555); or **they have new liaison officer* (line 561) is 'missing' an indefinite article before "*new liaison officer*". These linguistic 'mistakes'²⁷ are not too serious, insofar as it seems perfectly clear from the context what the two speakers mean. Sometimes, a mistake will not even be noticed by anyone, especially in the rush of conversation (Crystal 2000: 33).

Several grammatical 'infelicities' or 'non-conformities' to ENL norms can also be found in the rather short stretch of verbal exchange, such as missing the third-person '-s' in **somebody try cover* (line 555), or **he try to do something* (line 556). Although non-native ELF speakers quite often do not use the third person singular present tense '-s' marking in their verbs, this apparently does

²⁶ "In ELF talk 'marked' or 'deviant' (according to standard English models) language does not impede the communication process but can influence it positively" (Hülmbauer 2007: 15).

²⁷ If the learner is inclined and able to correct a fault in his or her output, it is assumed that the form he or she selected was not the one intended, and we shall say that the fault is a **mistake**. A mistake is either intentionally or unintentionally deviant and self-correctible (James 1998: 78; original emphasis). Strictly speaking, James' definition is not relevant for the current study because the ELF interactants are seen as language users and not learners.

not result in misunderstandings or communication problems (Seidlhofer 2005b: 340). The communicative effectiveness of the ELF interaction is not affected, nor cause these features problems in the above exchange. On the whole, the above identified grammatical ‘infelicities’ or non-conformities to ENL norms neither affect communication nor comprehension. Moreover, ELF users seem to be taking advantage of the built-in redundancy of Standard English grammar. As Seidlhofer et al. (2006: 20) remark, they do not hesitate to do away with an idiosyncrasy such as the third person ‘-s’, when conveying their message is more important than adhering to grammatical norms. Even though interactants have diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds, these participants in talk-in-interaction “overridingly adopt the (‘default’) position that their talk is understandable and ‘normal’ – even in the face of misunderstandings and abnormalities” (Firth 1996: 256).

The statement “*we want to destroy this fence*” in line 558 is an example for an imperative directive. Further examples of instructions uttered by speaker M2 are the following:

- **firstly please try to explain them this is opposite of the status quo*
- *please inform me*

On the whole, M2 and M5 seem quite satisfied with their discussion. They essentially share their power and agree on their criteria which refer to a change in the situation on the ground and ways to handle the pending problem. They negotiate a consensus on how to resolve the subject issue. In that sense their exchange can be regarded as successful communication between two non-native ELF interactants, who are performing as responsive recipient and initiator. Despite the repeated non-compliance with English NS norms by both speakers their communicative success is nevertheless achieved.

The main point here is that non-native ELF speakers can be very effective during discourse. Their English can be good enough for the purposes for which they are discussing matters. During the meeting M2 and M5 seem to focus primarily on

their joint communicative enterprises. They use ELF as a transactional means for the successful exchange of information and, more importantly, they “direct their attention not to the language, but rather to the content of their discussions” (Seidlhofer et al. 2006: 20).

What should also be considered is that M2 and M5 come from different nations. They are not NSs who speak the same first language. They do not need to be, because they have enough English in common and are using it functionally effectively as *lingua franca* without strict adherence to the norms of English. Moreover, in their interaction several of the communicative features discussed earlier on can also be found. Assuming their English is such that it essentially leads to a breakdown in communication, in other words, so that the meeting consequently fails, or that it results in grave misunderstanding, or if it was the case that non-conformity to standard norms had disastrous consequences or serious negative results, then the English of the two speakers is simply not good enough. But in the above example it is good enough for both interactants to be effective. As the result, they are in effect communicating, expressing their views, negotiating, turn taking, and essentially exerting power.

The above interaction relies very much on shared context and this in turn reduces the potential for misunderstanding. Context fosters communication because it makes it possible to recognise the meaning of an utterance rather independently of its grammatical constructions. Communication is always a shared responsibility between speaker and listener and a listener’s preparedness to understand, which is “triggered by personal qualities in the speaker, can be an important component in communicative success” (McNamara 2004: 767).

In conclusion, it can be said that the kind of English that is used, works and it serves the interlocutors adequately for resolving an issue they have to deal with. In this extract ELF communication is taking place at comparable proficiency levels and as it can be seen features such as the third-person ‘-s’, articles, or the use of idioms are not absolutely necessary for mutual intelligibility. As Cogo

(2008: 60) puts it, “[i]n ELF contexts it is not English NS norms that are attended to”; it is rather that “ELF users from different first language backgrounds orient to communicative success”.

The following excerpt which is from a liaison officers meeting made up by non-native ELF speakers, is to show that both the efficiency and effectiveness of military talk-in-interaction are not affected by any sort of deficiency when using ELF to communicate with each other. Moreover, the effective use of power and establishing power relations as well as following the meeting agenda and conducting the meeting satisfactorily, are taking place. Speaker M2 is the chairperson and comments on the subject of observing and reporting incidents as follows:

Example 2 (C)

- 421 M2: i don't understand HOW the patrol (1) NEVER recognised
 422 anything and never report anything (1) HOW (.) there the line is
 423 BROken (.) what is the the- (.) somebody has ANY of ideas? (1)
 424 because MANY of times (.) i'm visiting in this area (.) i
 425 recognise some pleasure boat (.) some fishing boats (.) some
 426 divers (.) and any any e:r (.) inCIDENTS (.) and next day i (.)
 427 M3: sir it's a matter of luck (.) it's a matter of luck (.) to
 428 to see something
 429 M2: but you know (.) erm last time (.) erm last time we spoke about
 430 this question (.) e:r MAYbe not enough (.) the patrol (.) and we
 431 er reconstructed second and the first platoon the power (.) and
 432 we increased the number of the patrols (2) after that (.) we i
 433 ordered the standing patrol also (1) but the incidents report (.)
 434 number didn't increased (.) am i RIGHT gentlemen?
 435 MM: we don't know
 436 MX-m: yes you are
 437 M2: okay (5) because we are (.) this is OUR responsibility NOT
 438 **[org4]** (.) recognised the incidents and report that (.) NOT
 439 **[org4]** (.) please continue

M2 essentially maintains a hierarchical relationship, however, shows a tendency to mitigate his complaints in respect of the apparently low number of incident reports. He believes that this is caused by slack observation discipline and therefore he asks the other participants whether they believe that his assumption is correct. The majority indicate that they simply do not know (in line 435). Only

one person agrees with M2 (in line 436). There are no pauses between speech acts and this keeps the dynamics of the meeting alive. The power relationship between speaker M2 and the others is demonstrated by their addressing M2 formally as ‘*sir*’ which is the conventional format in a meeting of this kind. Nevertheless, the point to be made is that when people take on different roles, “it may not be the case that one has power and the other doesn’t”; it is rather the case, as illustrated by the above interaction, “that they have different kinds of power, and they are exercising it in different ways” (Tannen 1987b: 5).

The entire discourse appears to be communicatively successful. Nevertheless, by looking more closely at the features of the spoken ELF, a number of grammatical and lexical ‘infelicities’²⁸ can be found in this extract. In lines 421 and 422, speaker M2 uses “*how*” instead of “*why*”. In line 422, he says **[the patrol] never report anything* omitting the third-person ‘-s’. In lines 423 and 424, he says **any of ideas* and **many of times* respectively. However, the use of the additional preposition “*of*” does not bring about a distraction on the other participants. In line 424 the phrase **I’m visiting in this area* includes the supplementary preposition “*in*”. More grammatical ‘infelicities’ or non-conformities to ENL norms are in line 425, i.e., “*I recognise some pleasure boat*” where the simple past “*recognised*” and the plural form of “*boat*” should be used. In line 426 **and next day* is missing the definite article ‘*the*’.

In line 423, M2 repeats “*the*”, in line 426 “*any*”, and in 429 “*last time*” as ‘hesitation repetitions’.²⁹ Speaker M3 repeats in lines 427 and 428 “*it’s a matter of luck*” and “*to*”, as self-repetitions to emphasise his statement. Idiomatic and grammatical ‘infelicities’ are in lines 430 and 431 in **we reconstructed second and the first platoon the power* which should be “*we reorganised and strengthened the second and the first platoon*”. In 433 and 434 the utterance **the incidents report number didn’t increased* contains two grammatical ‘infelicities’,

²⁸ Grammar and lexis are often differentiated when discussing errors. Grammar as a relatively clearly structured system is predictable. Lexis, however, is an open system with less inbuilt redundancy. From a linguistic point of view, grammatical mistakes are considered less severe than lexical ones (Hülmbauer 2007: 8).

²⁹ see sub-section 3.6.3. for an explanation of the notion of ‘hesitation repetition’.

i.e., a supplementary plural ‘-s’ marker and the use of a past participle instead of an infinitive. The statement should be “*the incident report number didn’t increase*”. Furthermore, M2 overuses the plural marking instead of omitting it. In line 438 the past participle “*recognised*” is used instead of the infinitive “*recognise*”. It should also be noted that only one repair takes place, i.e., M2 changes “*we*” to “*I*” in line 432.³⁰

Despite all these deviations from English NS norms M2 is communicatively effective. The errors he makes are not serious enough to distort the meaning of what he is trying to express.³¹ He is able to establish with the other participants successful communication which is based on an overall cooperative behaviour. The ELF being used is not in conformity with standard norms but nevertheless communication is effective. The interactants clearly display a ‘let-it-pass’³² attitude because no one instigates any ‘other-repair’ or asks questions referring to M2’s grammatically deficient sentences.

The main features of the excerpt however are power relations, the maintenance of the hierarchic order, the dynamics of the meeting, and most importantly, all participants are non-native ELF speakers. As it turns out, the use of ELF does not change the dynamics of the communicative interaction. Several communicative features figure in the interaction even though the actual language used is not always in conformity with standard forms. Discourse can be achieved despite incorrect English at times. Moreover, talk-in-interaction seems to be affected by the respective mother tongue. In this context, Crystal (2003: 145) remarks that

[i]nternational varieties thus express national identities, and are a way of reducing the conflict between intelligibility and identity. Because a speaker from country A is using English, there is an intelligibility bond with an English speaker of country B – and this is reinforced by the existence of a common written language. On the other hand, because speaker A is not using exactly the same way of speaking as speaker B,

³⁰ see sub-section 3.6.6. for an explanation of ‘Repair’ (self-repair and other-repair).

³¹ Some of the language features may be considered deficient ‘interlanguage’ that is in need of correcting, because deviant language is thought to be distorting the meaning of a message.

³² see sub-section 3.6.5. for a discussion of the concept of ‘let-it-pass’.

both parties retain their identities. It is another way of ‘having your cake and eating it’.

In using ELF, errors and mistakes are to be seen as relating less to language rules and more to how seriously they affect ELF inter-communication. For that reason most ELF speakers appear to use only as much grammar as absolutely necessary to modify the lexis. On the whole, if the participants in these military meetings are familiar with the basic concepts of military terminology as well as the military concepts behind, or, in other words, if they have got the concept of the lexis to go with the concepts that are being discussed, then the so-called grammatical imperfections in the utterances of the interactants become less important.

7.2.2. On Agenda Setting

In contrast to casual conversations institutional talk is usually characterised by an agenda. The meetings under review in this paper are ‘conference-room’ meetings.³³ The participants engage in institutional talk and are familiar with the agenda organisation. They know most of the topics to be discussed and therefore, as Öberg (1995: 144) puts it, they “approach the meeting[s] with partially shared mental agendas”.

In the following example the chairperson S1 sets the meeting agenda by handing the floor to the other participants in a predetermined order. In compliance, first speaker S2, then speaker S3, and finally speaker S5 submit their reports. Brown (1995: 26) makes the point that the military, when on duty or performing duty related tasks, follow a strict hierarchy of rank, also in form of appropriate address. In other words, “[t]he spoken language is used to show the hierarchy of rank” in military talk (ibid.). In my data this is achieved by using ‘*sir*’ (in lines 610 and 615) instead of the rank specific address for a senior officer. However, this kind of address is rather specific to English when addressing a male commanding officer. The interaction therefore shows at least some typical feature of military discourse.

³³ see sub-section 5.2.1. for an explanation of ‘formal and informal meetings’, including ‘conference-room’ meetings.

The strategy S1 employs to indicate that it is he, who is in power, is by following a standard agenda and taking on the responsibility of “keeping the discussion on track” (Holmes & Stubbe 2003: 73):

Example 3 (A)

- 50 S1: <clears throat (2)> (3) <to S2> anything else </to S2>
 51 S2: from the fourteenth to eighteen of august we are having the BELL
 52 on inspection (.) so we can't use for night flights (.) and (1) only
 53 for four days (.) that's all i have from <spel> u n </spel> flight?
 54 and (.) <to S1> nothing else sir </to S1>
 55 S1: <to S2> good thank you. </to S2> (.) <to S3> [nameA] </to S3>
 56 S3: in [nameA] we don't have any special problem (.) for **for** us
 57 S1: <to S3> thank you </to S3> (.) <soft> okay **okay** </soft>
 58 <to S5> [S5] </to S5>
 59 S5: <to S1> sir </to S1> three points? erm (.) **sim-** similar change-
 60 over key personnel within [nameB]

In this excerpt the agenda topics are delivered by the participants by making the following statements:

- *we are having the BELL on inspection...*
- *we don't have any special problem...*
- *sir three points...*

Furthermore, the example highlights how S1 exerts power explicitly. He does this by asking S2 “*anything else*” or addressing speaker S5 by name. Power is here exerted “by controlling the development of the interaction” (Holmes & Stubbe 2003: 73).

Speaker S2 states in line 51 in the above example: “*to eighteen of August*”. This formulation is permissible in military talk however it does not comply with NS norms where it should be “*to the eighteenth of August*”. In line 52, speaker S2 utters **we can't use for night flights* omitting the pronoun ‘it’ before ‘*for night flights*’ which is standing for Bell (helicopter). Communication in fact remains effective in this interaction without the speakers’ conformity to the norms of Standard English.

In multi-party conversations the discussion can move to topics which are not relevant for all participants. It is then up to the chairperson to put the discussion back on track. This is illustrated in the next example. The chairperson O2 talks with speaker O3 about some technical private matter (in lines 761 and 763) which should actually not be part of the meeting. Following this, he hands the floor to speaker O4 (in line 765), who then starts discussing a forthcoming event, i.e. “*the forthcoming world peace day*” (line 767), as one of the agenda topics.

Example 4 (B)

758 O2: <58> okay </58> <to O3> anything else? </to O3>
 759 O3: no (1) it’s all coordinated with the (.) [org12] in [nameA]
 760 O2: good (.) <to O3> i was going to come down to your medals
 761 parade tonight (1) but my daughter has chickenpox </to O3>
 762 O3: <soft> oh okay </soft>
 763 O2: so i have a problem (.) unfortunately (.) i can’t make it
 764 O3: okay
 765 O2: <to O4> [nameB] </to O4>
 766 O4: it’s all quiet (.) erm (1) the only thing on horizon is
 767 the world peace day on the first
 768 O2: right
 769 O4: erm (.) no problems with that (.) this this email has been
 770 thrown out at the moment (.) questioning who is taking
 771 (un) xx (/un) on the entire <59> thing </59>
 772 O2: <59> okay </59>
 773 O4: my understanding is (.) it is an [org12] or [org6] lead (.) and
 774 we’ll be there if you require us and provide the back of it
 775 if something went wrong (.) but the paper i’ve got (1) from (1)
 776 states categorically (1) erm overall operation responsibility rest
 777 with the <spel> u n </spel> military (.) for the duration
 778 of the event

It is “the chair’s role [...] to take responsibility for ensuring the agenda³⁴ is fully covered in the time available“ (Holmes & Stubbe 2003: 73). O2 exerts power by controlling the interaction and handing the floor to speaker O4 (in line 765) in order to proceed with the agenda. During the interaction, O4 as NNS utters in line 766, **the only thing on horizon is* omitting the definitive article ‘*the*’ before the word ‘*horizon*’. In line 769, speaker O4 repeats the word ‘*this*’ as hesitation

³⁴ see sub-section 5.2.5. for a discussion of ‘setting an agenda’.

repetition.³⁵ In lines 776 and 777, he says **responsibility rest with*, this time leaving off the third person singular ‘-s’ marking. Non-native ELF speakers quite often do not use the third-person present tense ‘-s’ marker. They also show a tendency to omit definite and indefinite articles where these are required in Standard English. However, these omissions normally have no serious effect on their communicative efficiency.

7.2.3. On the Chairperson

Chairpersons “do power” by explicitly controlling the development of the ongoing discussion, setting and stating the agenda of a meeting, monitoring the progress of the interaction “by summarising, reformulating and confirming understanding”, and finally close the meeting with “pre-closing sequences and terminal exchanges” (Holmes, Stubbe & Vine 1999: 360).

The following extract of the opening sequence of a staff meeting gives some insight and illustrates a strategy of emphasising authority by a chairperson. O2, who is chairing the meeting, is the person holding the highest organisational authority in this particular setting. The short interaction that takes place right at the beginning of a meeting also exemplifies miscommunication³⁶ between ELF speakers. To be more precise, it is ‘non-understanding’, because speaker O2 almost at once becomes aware of an understanding problem that participant O5 has. Speaker O2 therefore reformulates his utterance in such manner that it can be understood by O5. This quickly leads to the production of the requested response.

Example 5 (B)

710 OO: good morning
 711 O2: why (.) **WHY** do i get the plastic chair?
 712 OO: @@@@
 713 O2: <@> who did that? </@> (.) alright (.) erm through all three
 714 sector (1) that’s all for me (.) anyone from <spel> **m f r** </spel>

³⁵ see sub-section 3.6.3. for an explanation of the notion of ‘hesitation repetition’.

³⁶ see sub-section 3.6.5. for a discussion of the notion of ‘miscommunication’.

- 715 O5: two <spel> i c </spel> is on er leave
 716 O2: <spel> u n </spel> flight (.) officer <spel> m p i o </spel>?
 717 O5: he's on a leave as far i know
 718 O2: what does it stand for?
 719 O5: name?
 720 O2: what does it stand for?
 721 O5: he is on a leave
 722 O2: what does it mean (.) <spel> m p i o </spel>?
 723 O5: press information officer
 724 O2: press information (.) eh yeah
 725 OX-m:public information officer

The first thing that has to be pointed out is a hesitation repetition³⁷ that occurs in line 711, when speaker O2 utters the word “*why*” twice. In lines 713 and 714 he omits the plural marker ‘-s’ in saying **all three sector*. When speaker O2 asks for “*M.P.I.O.*” in line 717, O5 answers **he's on a leave as far I know* omitting ‘*as*’ after ‘*far*’. O2 wants to get to know the meaning of the abbreviation. He therefore asks the question “*what does it stand for*” (line 718). From then on miscommunication begins to take its course, because speaker O5’s answer is “*name*” in line 719. Clearly, speaker O5 misinterprets O2’s question and promptly comes up with a wrong answer. When O2 repeats his question in line 720, O5 answers “*he is on leave*”. Meanwhile O2 realises that his question requires reformulation and in line 722 he therefore asks “*what does it mean M.P.I.O*” to receive the correct answer. Speakers tend to use reformulation repetitions³⁸ in relation to the cooperative nature of conversational interaction. Speaker O5 is unable to cope with O2’s first question which he obviously does not understand. Therefore it is reformulated and thereafter communication between speakers O2 and O5 is successful.

In this short stretch of conversation several aspects concerning the role of the chairperson can be observed.³⁹ Above all, the chairperson O2 does not formally open the meeting. He rather asks those present why should he get the plastic chair (line 710). This complaint clearly deemphasises his authority and is met by general laughter.

³⁷ see sub-section 3.6.3. for an explanation of ‘hesitation repetition’.

³⁸ see sub-section 3.6.3. for an explanation of ‘reformulation repetition’.

³⁹ see sub-section 5.2.4. for a discussion of the role of the chairperson.

In this particular case, as Öberg (1995: 40) says, “[n]ot only was laughter used as a phase or topic shift signal, but also as a meta-comment when something unexpected happened” (ibid.). At this moment of laughter there is clearly the danger that the whole situation is getting out of hand and the subject meeting is turning informal and no longer remains a ‘conference-room’ meeting.⁴⁰ Moreover, the overall situation that develops, exemplifies the way in which humour and laughter can mitigate the formality of an interaction and how, in particular in the interests of agreement, the division between ranks can in some sense also be modified. Nevertheless, the discourse shows particular hierarchical features of military meetings.

It should also be noted that speaker O2 instead of declaring the meeting open as one would expect, is starting to check who is present (in lines 714 and 716). By staging this activity it becomes more and more obvious that O2 is tightening his grip on the overall situation. He continues to chair the meeting as foreseen and consequently regains the authority to start it. However, at the very beginning he fails to make explicit what points he expects to cover and in what order this procedure should take place. The audience, who initially bursts into laughter, immediately begins to provide the answers to O2’s questions (line 715). In the above excerpt O2 quickly adopts a strategy that indirectly calls the participants to order and by doing so he is increasing the social distance between him and them. The example demonstrates that various features can be emplaced in a short stretch of interaction. However, it also shows that participants can achieve their objectives by using ELF.

The following example illustrates the turn-taking back to the chairperson during the introduction of participants. In accordance with the level of formality as well as the overall purpose of a meeting, “turns may revolve regularly back to the Chair, may be taken in order and merely monitored by the Chair” (Boden 1994: 85). In this example chairperson O2 controls the floor as expected, and takes charge of the agenda.

⁴⁰ see sub-section 5.2.1. for an explanation of ‘formal and informal meetings’, including ‘conference-room’ meetings.

In formal meetings, the speakers are obliged to give their name and appointment in the organisation they are working for. Therefore all participants introduce themselves or are introduced by other speakers. In this example the chairperson and a few other staffers are new and only recently arrived in the mission area and had not officially met. Therefore O2 asks the interactants to introduce themselves one by one and, at the same time, to state their position within the organisation. However, a non-explicit agenda setting is characteristic for a rather informal atmosphere a meeting sometimes adopts. It is also exemplary for the occasionally deemphasised authority of the chairperson, as demonstrated below.

Example 6 (B)

- 384 O12: my name is captain [O12] [O12/last] (.) e:r (.) here in [org10]
 385 mission i'm on position of military public information officer
 386 at <spel> p i o </spel> office (.) so concerning my military
 387 background (.) i was promoted e:r (.) in the year two thousand
 388 in the branch of nuclear biological and chemical defence
 389 O2: right
 390 O12: so i served several positions (.) the platoon company e:r
 391 at <spel> n b c </spel> battalion in [place49] (.) and after that (.)
 392 i served at er (.) e:r the staff er of land forces in [place49] and
 393 after that at verification centre
 394 O2: right

Speaker O12 is a non-native ELF user. His utterances illustrate an ELF speaker's tendency to omit articles and prepositions respectively. In lines 384 and 385 he says **here in [...] mission* and **I'm on position*. In both events he omits the definitive article. Moreover, the preposition 'on' should be 'in'. In line 390, speaker O12 utters **I served several positions* missing out the preposition 'in' and in line 391 he states **at N.B.C. battalion* omitting the definitive article before 'N.B.C.' Finally, in line 393, he says **at verification centre* without a determiner after the preposition 'at'. The omission of articles is sometimes influenced by native tongue standards. O12's native tongue is Spanish. However, despite his non-compliance with English NS norms communication is effective and stays on track. Some of the communicative features that were already described earlier on can be traced in his speech.

The following excerpt is to illustrate how informality can easily develop during formal interaction. Moreover, what becomes clear during this spell of informality is that the chairperson O2 has a planned agenda which in fact he is trying to maintain:

Example 7 (B)

581 O12: so i like to ask you to take a picture from (.) the detail portrait (.)
 582 and to <39> mail </39>
 583 O2: <fast> <39> for me </39> </fast>
 584 O12: for <40> you </40>
 585 O2: <40> okay </40>
 586 O12: and to write a very short (.) personal background
 587 O2: very short?
 588 O12: no it's up <41> to you </41>
 589 O2: <41> how </41> many WORDS do you want?
 590 O12: nobody knows it
 591 O2: COME and SEE me later
 592 O12: five hundred
 593 OO: <@> copy </@> @@@@
 594 O12: it's half page maybe half <42> page </42>
 595 O2: <42> come </42> and see me later
 596 O12: yeah
 597 O2: or send me an email (.) tell me (.) **tell me** what you want

When speaker O12 asks O2 for a photograph and some background information in writing (lines 580 and 584), he is likely to steer the meeting into an informal spell and a direction that O2 currently sees as unfit as far as the agenda he apparently has in mind is concerned. Therefore O2 avoids a detailed discussion of the biographical matter at this point by saying that O12 should come and see him later (line 590). As Holmes & Stubbe (2003: 66) point out, it is quite common in meetings that “agenda setting [...] [is] strongly influenced by those in position of power or authority”. The above extract shows that the agenda setting is done by O2 who maintains his authority by suggesting to speaker O12 to contact him later which O12 openly acknowledges (line 595). There are a few grammatical imperfections in O12's utterances. i.e., **a picture from the detail portrait* which should possibly be *“a portrait photograph”* or **it's half page* which should be *“half a page”* but these are of minor importance. O2 repeats *“tell me”* in line 597

to emphasise his request. The use of ELF between the interactants in no way changes the dynamics of their talk. Communicative effectiveness is achieved.

7.2.4. On Participants

As a rule and as laid down in standing orders, meetings in a peacekeeping mission normally take place at timetabled pre-arranged intervals. They are attended by the same number of predetermined participants. The question of achieving a quorum does not arise, because military discipline requires listed members to participate. Should a member not be able to attend then quite automatically a deputy will be dispatched. In practice, participants are well acquainted with each other. Newcomers to the mission usually integrate rather quickly and are absorbed by the existing system. The officers who act as chairpersons rotate once a year or, in some cases, every second year. Therefore a degree of continuity is in place which also expresses itself in a degree of familiarity which appears to be higher than one would expect it to be. Moreover, the majority of participants are quite aware and conscious of their own as well as the roles of others.

In the following example speaker S8 declares that a certain party is likely to give the peacekeepers a hard time and that no agreements exist on the use of certain flight routes. The matter is discussed and proposals are submitted. Subsequently, the chairperson S1 provides a possible solution to the problem. In doing so, S1 moves the discussion back on track. The discourse displays typical features of military interaction, e.g., it reflects the military hierarchical order.

Example 8 (A)

293 S8: that's just my idea again (.) e:r maybe they try to give us a hard
 294 time in the future because (.) **because** of this two one five
 295 business (1) it goes on and on and on (.) they may not allow us
 296 to use this corridor anymore (1) because it's very close to
 297 their airport their air- airfield there (.) in [**place35**] (1) because
 298 you remember the poem we heard a few weeks ago (.) during
 299 this night flight (1) so maybe (.) i don't know. (.) and i'm afraid
 300 (.) we don't have any agreements (.) you know (.) because in the

- 301 past there were no agreements signed
 302 S1: well we'll check that
 303 S8: i do never **(un) xx (/un)** agreement maybe=
 304 S1: =actually if we don't have that agreement we can't go
 305 to **[place26]**
 306 S10: we can always use the (.) **[place19]** of course
 307 S1: yeah
 308 S10: the **[place19]** stops that's why we use the corridor road
 309 S8: no **no no** (.) we use the **[place19]** (.) and then we use the
 310 **the <spel> s b a </spel>** road going to **[place23]**
 311 S1: yeah (.) we can use the **<spel> s b a </spel>** road

In this example non-native ELF speaker S8 displays a few lexico-grammatical 'infelicities'.⁴¹ In lines 293 and 294, he uses the phrase **maybe they try to give us a hard time* whereas it should be "*maybe they are trying to give us a hard time*" because it is an ongoing activity. In lines 300 and 301, he says "*in the past there were no agreements signed*". This phrase is possible and feasible; however the word order should really be "*no agreements were signed in the past*". Furthermore, in line 297 self-repair⁴² occurs by changing the noun phrase "*their airport*" to "*their airfield*".

The above excerpt illustrates how the speakers are using ELF talk effectively in order to maintain the genre of their interaction. This is not achieved just by any means. In fact, the interactants operate exhibiting various features of military meetings I have already discussed. They do this successfully. A common view would be, if interactants cannot speak enough English, they most likely cannot be effective when talking about complex military matters. However, in this kind of meeting they are effective. They know enough English and it is up to the task. Teaching them more English at this stage, in a sense would probably be meaningless and perhaps even be unnecessary. One would immediately ask two questions: what kind of English should they be taught, and secondly, what are they going to use it for. If these interactants are able to effectively use ELF for their communication purposes, then that would be all that is needed at this level of

⁴¹ "[P]articipants [in ELF talk] typically make unidiomatic and non-collocating lexical selections, and [...] the talk throughout its duration is commonly 'marked' by dysfluencies, and by syntactic, morphological [...] anomalies and infelicities" (Firth 1996: 239).

⁴² see sub-section 3.6.6. for an explanation of the notion of 'self-repair'.

military discourse. Remarkably, lexico-grammatical rules seem to play a secondary role in their interaction.

7.2.5. On Informed Consent

The following extract from one of the top level meetings will help to understand and at the same time illustrate the policy of ‘informed consent’ I have already described.⁴³ The short discussion demonstrates how ‘informed consent’ can be achieved by informing the participants just sufficiently enough on how the data they are about to produce will be used. It is important to remember that too much information on the planned research might affect the naturalness of these data.

In this example chairperson S1 introduces the observer to the participants, and very briefly refers to the observer’s status and the purpose of the intended recordings (in lines 7 and 8, 11 to 14, and 17 to 18). After this short introduction the meeting proceeds as per standing procedures and a well established routine:

Example 9 (A)

- 6 S1: there is a comfortable seat (.) hm i think you all know (.)
 7 you have all met (.) the colonel? (.) and do you all know
 8 what he is doing here?
 9 S5: a thesis that’s as much as i just know
 10 SX-m:a thesis yes
 11 S1: yeah on the (.) <clears throat (2)> english as the lingua franca of
 12 international organisations i think. (3) and looking at HOW
 13 non-native english speakers communicate with
 14 each other? primarily (.) so <1> hm </1>
 15 S2: <1> unfortunately </1> [first name6] is not here
 16 SS: @@@@
 17 S1: <clears throat (2)> so we are going to be reCORded (.) if
 18 everybody does not mind? (1) and hm that will be used then for
 19 the study (.) <soft> so. <soft> (2) GOOD
 20 S2: only (.) to confirm that on sunday we are sending one platoon
 21 to [nameC] (.) the same thing that we did last sunday? e:r (1)
 22 the same opportunity (.)

⁴³ see sub-section 6.3.1. for an explanation of the notion ‘informed consent’.

The very act of recording, which S1 mentions (in line 17), has apparently no particular influence on the objects of observation. Moreover, the information provided by S1 is vague; nevertheless it contributes to the achievement of ‘informed consent’. As it turned out to be, the effect of what is known as the ‘observer’s paradox’ seems to have been practically non-existent among the interactants. While observation itself may generate artificial behaviour, my impression was that this did not occur at all.

Significant in this interaction is the use of ‘*yeah*’, ‘*yes*’ and ‘*hm*’. Jefferson (1984: 206) found out that among speakers who use regularly “*yeah*” or “*yes*” and “*hm*” or “*mm*” a regular distinction exists. According to Jefferson, “*mm*” or “*hm*” indicates “passive reciprocity” (ibid.). This is exemplified by S1 in lines 6, 14 and 18, proposing that the co-participant is the current speaker and shall go on talking. In this example, however, this is the silent observer who remains ‘silent’. As Jefferson says, “‘*Yeah*’ is used as a recipient-so-far is moving into speakership”, i.e., S2. (ibid.).

In the following extract the chairperson S1 indicates that the meeting will be recorded (lines 866 and 867) and if anyone would object to being recorded they might as well leave the room (line 868). The meeting then continues as per established routine:

Example 10 (A)

- 862 S1: that is interesting er (.) he is doing a study into english (.) as
 863 the lingua franca of international organisations (.) and
 864 is particularly interested in (.) non-native english speakers
 865 speaking to each other using english as a common language (.)
 866 so please speak UP this afternoon because we are
 867 being recorded (1) if anybody objects to being recorded (.)
 868 then they can leave now
 869 SS: @@@@
 870 S1: hm good (.) did you see [first name31]
 871 S9: no sir
 872 S2: we er we have prepared the (.) operation branch (.)
 873 the operation branch have prepared the briefing for force
 874 commander tomorrow (.) so then i will show you (.) er
 875 to see what is written there (.) [...]

In the above excerpt S1 very briefly interacts with speaker S9 before handing the floor to speaker S2. However, prior to this, S1's announcement that objectors to being recorded can leave, results in an outbreak of general laughter. S2, who is a non-native ELF speaker, starts to provide his input as foreseen (in line 871). He starts off with two hesitation repetitions⁴⁴ in lines 872 and 873, i.e., "we" and "the operation branch". In line 873, he utters "the briefing for force commander", which is a formulation that is possible in military talk but does not comply with NS norms. According to NS norms a definite article should be before the words 'force commander'. The statement **I will show you to see* is tautological, because 'I will show you' already signifies that something can be visually inspected. These rather minor 'infelicities' or non-conformities to ENL norms have no influence on the communicative effectiveness of the interaction. People can achieve their objectives even though their English is in some people's eyes defective and erroneous.

7.2.6. On Opening a Meeting

The recorded meetings generally follow a formal routine. Yet, a few of them include some informal moments. Generally, all meetings take place at specific starting times in predetermined locations, i.e., the meetings are scheduled and planned beforehand. However, quite often no particular finishing time is set. Most meetings come quite naturally to an end after the discussion of important agenda issues.

In the following example S1, who is a NS, acts as the chairperson. It is only logical that he should be the one to initiate the opening section. In this particular meeting the opening section could be classed as 'prebeginning section', because S1 is just making some general remarks before handing over to speaker S2. As the meeting itinerary follows standard routine procedures, no specific formalities are required to proceed with the agenda:

⁴⁴ see sub-section 3.6.3. for an explanation of the notion of 'hesitation repetition'.

Example 11 (A)

- 1207 S1: it's the english speakers
 1208 S2: @@@
 1209 S1: damned britishers (3) are we on?
 1210 SX-m:on
 1211 S1: <soft> good </soft>
 1212 SX-m:thank you
 1213 S1: erm erm <clears throat (2)>
 1214 S2: okay sir (.) er with **[nameB]** (.) e:r (.) on the fifth of august
 1215 i received a observed alfa report from the <spel> o p </spel>
 1216 eighty-four (.) the helipad you have there (.) on the eleventh of
 1217 august i sent you (.) the observed alfa report asking you to take
 1218 permission to improve the situation (.) of this helipad (.)

In the above excerpt speaker S2 is taking his turn by routinely providing information on matters to be discussed (in line 1211) after S1 completes his contribution. This turn-taking in fact marks the definite beginning of the subject meeting and basically initiates an introductory phase or what may be called a second opening.

Concerning S2's utterance, two 'infelicities' or 'non-conformities' to ENL norms can be observed. In line 1217, speaker S2 says **asking you to take permission* instead of "*asking you to grant permission*" or "*asking you to give permission*", or "*asking you for permission*". This comes down to using the wrong word. Furthermore, in line 1218, S2 talks about **to improve the situation of this helipad* meaning "*to improve the state of this helipad*". Again, S2's utterance is the result of choosing the wrong vocabulary. However, deviant language use in ELF does not necessarily affect communicative effectiveness. In this particular exchange speaker S2's reference to 'observed alfa report' makes it clear what he means. Therefore S1 ignores the marked expressions. He simply 'lets them pass'.⁴⁵ The use of 'sir' in line 1214 exemplifies one of the special features of military discourse and expresses the existing power relationship.

Similar to the above discussed meeting, one of the liaison officer meetings starts with an 'opening phase' followed by a 'sub-opening phase' which includes small

⁴⁵ see sub-section 3.6.5. for a discussion of the concept of 'let-it-pass'.

talk and personal introductory remarks. Both these phases are brief and in the main informal:

Example 12 (C)

- 1 M1: so good morning to everyone (1) i welcome you again on (.)
 2 regular [org4] meeting and specially i like to welcome
 3 our our so (1) special tasker (.) please shortly introduce (.)
 4 yourself
 5 M14: right (.) my name is [M14] [M14/last] (.) i am a retired
 6 army officer (.) i used to serve in [place22] some thirty years ago
 7 (.) also in this camp (1)
 [...]

 9 i completed four years (.)
 10 at the university and i'm now in the process of writing my thesis
 [...]

 28 M1: so i wish you pleasant stay (.) and foremost pleasant stay here (.)
 29 so we can now start
 30 M3: sir (.) lady gentlemen let me inform you about the latest issues
 31 connection with my [org4] team and the sixty-third regiment
 32 and [nameE] mainland army (.) next please (1)

In this excerpt, M1 is the chairperson. The opening phase of the meeting consists of welcoming the participants (in line 1). M1 then refers to speaker M14 (line 3). This is followed by some introductory remarks. After this, M1 formally opens the meeting (line 29) and speaker M3 is taking over. This turn-taking marks the definite beginning of the subject meeting (line 30). M1's hesitation repetition in line 3, or the omission of the indefinite article in **I wish you pleasant stay* (in line 28), and **foremost pleasant stay*, or the word order in **we can now start* (in line 29) do not affect his communicative efficiency and cause no problems in the above interaction.

7.2.7. On Instructions and Decision-Making

In the following extract, speaker S1 refers to riot controlling. Some of his points are relevant for an envisaged action plan that is under consideration during the ongoing meeting. The main issue nevertheless is to achieve S1's goals:

Example 13 (A)

- 745 S1: hm because i DON'T think [org12] could HOLD until
 746 the <spel> m f r </spel> turned up in [nameA] and [nameC]
 747 S2: yes
 748 S1: so
 749 S2: so to use at the first instance the local reserve
 750 S1: yeah
 751 S2: and then to wait until <spel> m f r </spel> is coming to (.)
 752 yes we are going to
 753 S1: yeah i think so (.) but (1) you're the ONLY one with (1)
 754 riot control equipment. (.) YOU HAVE IT (.)
 755 <to S5> you don't have it [S5] </to S5>
 756 S5: yeah
 757 S2: [nameA] have (1) the riot control <6> equipment </6>
 758 S1: <6> oh really </6>
 759 S2: it's not the same that [nameC] has
 760 S1: no but they have some (.) and <to S5> you have none </to S5>
 761 S5: no we have got some few small shields but
 762 not to make (.) a decent capability sir
 763 S1: okay (.) so we need to look at THAT

In line 757, S1 is talking about riot control equipment. He makes the point that not everyone has got that kind of equipment. S2 and S5 remark on the subject. As one can see from line 761, S5 is concerned about not having a decent capability with regards to riot gear. In this short excerpt S1 is aware of the digression and decides to cover the issue at some other time and occasion. As expected, S1 who is the chairperson briefly summarises the most important points of that short discussion (in lines 757 and 760) and leaves things at that. In line 749, S2 utters **at the first instance* which should really be “*in the first place*” or “*at first*”. Still, S2's statement does not greatly differ from NS language in its communicative quality. In S2's ELF talk words simply are inappropriately applied but do not cause misunderstanding in the interaction. Therefore, communication remains effective.

It seems rather interesting that during the short interaction the expressions ‘*yeah*’ and ‘*yes*’ are used rather frequently. Jefferson (1984: 199) calls these pre-shift objects ‘acknowledgement tokens’. As Jefferson points out, ‘*yeah*’ or ‘*yes*’ are “‘acknowledgement tokens’ [that are] massively associated with topical shift”

(ibid.). The point is that intrusions such as ‘yeah’ or ‘yes’ “display active listening or intense involvement in the conversation” (West & Zimmermann 1983: 105).

7.3. On Politeness/Impoliteness

Whereas in a military environment power, which is based on position, appointment and rank structure, may invite and encourage the use of relatively open coercive discourse strategies, meeting interactions particularly within the framework of multinational peacekeeping normally show evidence of mutual respect and concern for the feelings and face needs of participants. All this is politeness. In multinational peace operations, politeness towards subordinates can be an indication that a rather powerful superior is earnestly concerned with creating and establishing good working relations, developing rapport and maintaining a degree of collegiality. However, subordinates may also be determined “to express themselves politely or with deference to a superior” (Holmes & Stubbe 2003: 6).

In the following example taken from one of the liaison officers meetings, speaker M2 acts as the chairperson. As the deputy commanding officer he is also in the position of authority. During the course of the meeting he reminds the audience of an ongoing violation of the operational status quo. In his opinion this matter should be resolved as quickly as possible. Moreover, speaker M5, who is a participant, is to deal with the matter according to M2’s instructions. It is to be noted how the power relationship is expressed in this particular exchange. In this context and in accordance with military standards M2 does not necessarily need to be polite. Nevertheless, when giving his instructions he decides to use the word ‘*please*’ twice (in lines 544 and 546). Speaker M5, in turn, reflecting on M2’s resolution strategy raises some argument and proposes to resolve the whole issue in a different way:

Example 14 (C)

542 M2: from the green net (.) i think so (.) we CANNOT (1)
 543 we cannot er (1) CONTinue this very PEACEful (.) e:r way (.)
 544 er in my opinion (1) please prepare a letter (.) a protest letter
 545 to the <spel> n g </spel> commander (2) <2> er before </2>
 546 this time please get a connection with your COLLeague (.)
 547 the liaison officer
 548 M5: <2> sir </2> (2) but there is no time for it (.) firstly tomorrow
 549 we will have a meeting (.) we will explain to new
 550 <spel> L o </spel> the situation (.) and (.) firstly (.) i will protest
 551 this strongly VERbally (.) and (.) they will get the (un) xx (/un)
 552 to remove it (.) must remove it (.) before change anything will
 553 happen to it (.) i will arrange it step by step (.) because this
 554 this incident was (.) i think is not as serious

There are some lexical, grammatical and idiomatic ‘infelicities’ or ‘non-conformities’ to ENL norms. Speaker M2 in lines 545 and 546 says **before this time* where he adds an extra noun, i.e., ‘time’ which is not needed. In line 546, he says **get a connection with your colleague* meaning ‘get in touch’. Speaker M5 states in line 549 **we will explain to new L.O.* omitting the definite article before ‘new L.O.’. In line 552, M5 says **before change anything* meaning ‘before anything changes’. There are also two hesitation repetitions,⁴⁶ in line 542 “we cannot”, and in line 553 “this”. The two speakers are using grammar as much as actually necessary to ‘commodify’ the lexis. Nevertheless, their interaction is very effective in spite of so called grammatical imperfections.

In the above example, politeness as an outstanding feature of the talk apparently covers more than just fixed formulae such as ‘please’ or ‘thank you’ and so on. M2 asks M5 to take some actions in compliance with standing operational procedures of the organisation, and in this particular case, to prepare a letter of protest and to contact a specific liaison officer. Therefore M2 is to some extent imposing on M5, which can be seen as threat to M5’s “negative face”. The “negative face” commonly refers to one’s wish to be allowed to go about one’s own business without others imposing unduly upon oneself (Cameron 2001:79). Therefore, M5 as the hearer typically challenges M2’s authority not with a direct

⁴⁶ see sub-section 3.6.3. for an explanation of the notion ‘hesitation repetition’.

and confrontational strategy, but rather in a socially acceptable or polite way, such as reasoning and proposing a policy of persuasion.

It is rather difficult for a superior to react negatively to a sound proposition without losing face. In situations in which power and politeness are played out careful attention to context is required. An interaction, in which one participant is trying to persuade another to approve a particular course of action, displays a very different significance from a quick ‘yes’ in a series indicating routine approval. The relationship between those contributing to the interaction is of particular importance. The question that arises is how M2 and M5 do fit into the organisational hierarchy. M2 is ‘exerting power’⁴⁷ because of his position, but uses linguistic features and discourse devices which underscore his power and emphasise collegiality. The setting in which interaction is taking place is a routine meeting following established standards. Both interactants have sufficient background knowledge for discussing the issue that has to be resolved. As Tannen (1987b: 5-6) says, when studying an interaction and asking “what is going on”, one is “necessarily applying interpretations from other coherence systems”. Moreover, “[t]his is necessarily so because without a lot of background knowledge, interaction is incomprehensible” (ibid.: 6).

Speaker M5, as it seems, considers M2’s request and action as face-threatening. Therefore the initial choice that he has to make is whether he is to perform this request or not. Given the suggested shortage of personnel as well as M5’s argument that there is not enough time to prepare a written protest, a mutually acceptable course of action is worked out in a polite manner.

The interesting point as far as the above ELF dialogue is concerned, is that the interaction is rather free despite possibly being affected by first languages. This suggests that non-native ELF speakers with different first languages who engage in a process of negotiating meaning, have somehow to compensate for the situation they are in. In the military, if there would be no opportunity for

⁴⁷ see section 4.2. for a discussion of ‘power and speech’.

compensation over rank, position and authority then perhaps the speakers would keep to their own forms of military interaction.

On the whole, communication and decision taking are not affected insofar as it involves NNSs whose English does not comply with the standard. One must remember that these ELF speakers are inter-language users with different language skills and proficiency levels. It might be useful to distinguish between language learners and language users because of this. Learners, by definition, are not in control of the language (Widdowson 2003: 49). However, a deviation from NS norms by non-native ELF speakers would not necessarily imply a learner status. In fact, “ELF speakers are not considered merely *learners* striving to conform to NS norms but primarily *users* of the language”, and this implies that “the main consideration is not formal correctness but functional effectiveness” (Hülmbauer et al. 2008: 28; original emphasis). Therefore, non-native ELF speakers should not be treated as learners aiming at more native-like competence, but as expert users of English for whom that language is the chosen lingua franca. Such speakers normally construct their medium of communication to best suit their needs.

The following extract suggests impoliteness on behalf of S1, because it can be considered impolite to point out that someone is not speaking, i.e., to announce it. Speaker S3’s utterances primarily consist of single words and not sentences. S1, as the chairperson, announces that he is trying to get S3 to speak (in line 1257):

Example 15 (A)

1255 S2: seventeen fifty
 1256 S3: seventeen fifty
 1257 S1: i’m trying to get HIM to speak (.) so that we have some
 1258 recording of him (.) when he becomes the prime minister (.)
 1259 president of **ar-** (.) [**place12**] then we can record his voice from
 1260 S2: @@@@
 1261 S3: seventeen fifty
 1262 S1: seventeen fifty (.) force commander arrives at eighteen hundred
 1263 S3: eighteenth yes
 1264 S1: and then?
 1265 S3: e:r

1266 S2: the parade
 1267 S3: the paRADE

S3 continues with his strategy of just saying odd words. On the other hand, him saying “*eighteenth*” (line 1263) instead of “*eighteen*” would suggest that his English is not good enough to engage in meaningful talk-in-interaction at this particular moment. Therefore the listeners let this unclear statement “‘pass’ on the (common-sense) assumption that it will either become clear or redundant as talk progresses” (Firth 1996: 243).⁴⁸ Moreover, S1 is trying to provoke S3 to contribute to the ongoing discourse. However, speaker S3 is either unwilling or unable to do so. He is being assisted by S2 in producing adequate answers to S1’s questions. All of this points to S3 having a language problem, i.e. his English proficiency seems inadequate.

During conferences one ought not to complain about the current actions of parties who are actually attending the meeting. Although doing this in a somewhat humorous manner, S1 is communicating his plan with regard to speaker S3 to the other participants (lines 1257 to 1259). On the whole, one should not make too much of the availability of a technique for getting a person to talk simply by announcing that he has not talked enough (Sacks 1992: 705-706).

7.3.1. On Mitigation

In the following excerpt M1, who is in charge of military personnel from several nations, acts as chairperson. He reduces the harshness of the force of one of his statements through mitigation.

Example 16 (C)

304 M8: i have nothing special now (1) er i am looking forward for this
 305 last part of the of the locstats (.) and i just remind (.) don’t forget
 306 report your roads to the joc (.) that’s all

⁴⁸ see sub-section 3.6.5. for a discussion of the concept of ‘let-it-pass’.

- 307 M1: specially during the weekend (.) saturday and sunday (.) because
 308 (.) lastly i check leaving book and it was (.) very strange to me
 309 why you don't (.) **why you don't** adhere e:r regulation and
 310 we set up (un) xxx (/un) (.) so thanks (.)
 311 any points <2> [org4]s </2>
 312 M8: <2> no point </2> sir

As far as grammatically incorrect utterances are concerned, in lines 308 and 309, speaker M8 states **don't forget report your roads*. Here, he omits 'to' before the infinitive 'report', and he uses 'roads' instead of 'movements'. In line 305, M8 repeats "of the" representing a hesitation repetition.⁴⁹ Speaker M1 states in line 308 **lastly I check leaving book* probably meaning "[the] last time I checked the leave book". M1 uses wrong words: 'last' he turns into an adjective, and **leaving book* should be 'leave book' as indicated. In line 309, he repeats "why you don't" as hesitation, and he utters **why you don't adhere regulation* omitting the preposition and the determiner 'to the' before 'regulation'. Nevertheless, despite these incorrect forms the utterances can be understood, they make sense, and therefore they are communicatively effective. The errors are not serious enough to distort the meaning of M1's utterances.

As already pointed out, speaker M8 reminds those present not to forget to report their location status and movements during weekends (lines 305 and 306). M1 seems concerned about his subordinates' whereabouts and the non-compliance with his order. He could threaten to punish offenders in order to rectify the current state of affairs. He is left with how to put this unwelcome news to his soldiers. He chooses a way of speaking so as to reduce as far as possible the harsh facts on the listeners by mitigating the force of his utterance.⁵⁰ Therefore, he says that he had been checking the leave book (line 308) and found that people were not entering their names. He then asks why people do not adhere to his orders and regulations (line 309) and finally leaves matters at that.

In this example of self-serving mitigation M1 indicates the desire to be excused for having to perform unpleasant acts, such as punishing people. He defuses some

⁴⁹ see sub-section 3.6.3. for an explanation of the notion 'hesitation repetition'.

⁵⁰ see sub-section 4.3.2. for a discussion of 'mitigation' and 'mitigation strategies'.

unwelcome listener response. Acting the other way round, M1 might create a lot of aggravation by opting to put his audience down. He would quite overtly intrude into his listeners' space and into their peace of mind. He would also be rude because he would want to create, to dominate and bluntly impose his will on others. He would invade his subordinates' minds by way of reducing them.

M1 is obliged to check on the whereabouts of his subordinates. Therefore he is trying to find ways and means to be relieved of this duty, for instance, forcing his men to report to the unit's operation centre. In the end, he opts to cooperate with his subordinates to discuss the matter. Cooperating means M1 has to give up some of his own territory. He cannot cooperate unless he is doing so. His wish to cooperate and to protect his own space at the same time creates tension which leads to the creation of the phenomenon of politeness, or, as it happens, mitigation. It would be much clearer to say what he wants in order to communicate his message in a straight forward manner and to make it more accessible. To M1, this seems too direct, abrupt, or a threat. He tries to avoid direct confrontation and to save face. Therefore he opts to mitigate what he wants to say. He makes his message less clear by saying **it was very strange to me why you don't adhere regulation*. M1 is trying to soften the "unwelcome effect" which his utterance might have on the participants in the meeting, in this case their anger, which they would hold towards him because of what he was doing (Fraser 1980: 344-345). It could be that his audience fail to understand what he is trying to get across. So why does not he say directly what he means. This might be more cooperative in the sense of getting his message across. However, he opts to mitigate his message in such a way that he does not cause offence. He seems to be worried about his relationship with the soldiers and that is really what mitigation is all about.

As a non-native ELF speaker M1 makes in his utterance some errors which deserve to be considered deviations from the codified English as a NS language norm. Nevertheless, he displays considerable communicative competence and effectiveness. The use of ELF actually enhances the possibilities of interaction which is relatively neutral in terms of people offending each other. If all meeting

participants were to speak the same language it could be that M1 would abstain from mitigation. Therefore, ELF actually provides for cooperation without aggravation. The use of a common language which belongs to neither side provides for reconciliation of the cooperative and the territorial forces.

As Fraser (1980: 341) remarks, “mitigation is not a type of speech act”. The illocutionary force of M1 in the chosen example is that of trying to stop the listeners’ non-compliance with standing rules. M1’s endeavour to reduce the harshness of his available retaliatory action amounts to mitigation which is designed to modify the effects of his complaint which are most likely “unwelcome to the hearer” (ibid.: 342). Furthermore, M1’s goal seems to be to soften these effects in order to make his “criticism more palatable” (ibid.). Nevertheless, according to Fraser, to mitigate is not designed “to reduce an *existing* unhappy state on the part of the hearer” (ibid.). The fact that the interaction in this kind of military discourse involves the use of a language, which is not a first language for several of the interactants, does not inhibit their communicative success.

7.3.2. The Function of Laughter and Joking

In this section the use of humour, joking, and laughter by non-native ELF speakers as particular discursive strategy to release tension in military meetings will be analysed. Humour serves a wide range of functions.⁵¹ It helps to maintain good relations among fellow workers and to construct collegiality. Humour not just entertains and amuses; “it may also be used to enact other aspects of workers’ identities in particular contexts” (Holmes 2006: 27).

My data show that even non-native ELF speakers manage to joke and produce humour in talk-in-interaction. In the following example the chairperson O2 and military policeman O9 talk about drink-driving and an ongoing hunting season, whereby that term is used in an ambiguous way. The ambiguity consists in the

⁵¹ see sub-section 4.3.3. for a discussion of the notion of ‘humour’.

police hunting and tracking down traffic offenders whilst the civilian hunters are after fowl. O9's statement that the military police have started their hunting season causes general laughter (line 560). Whilst humour is primarily intended to amuse, it also contributes to creating and maintaining solidarity among fellow workers. Moreover, it serves "to hedge face threatening acts, such as directives, criticisms, and insults" (ibid.: 29):

Example 17 (B)

- 559 O9: so there is hunting season (.) so we've started to advise peoples
 560 O2: civilians?
 561 O9: no **no** military (.) it's hunting season for us you <36> know </36>
 562 OO: <36> @@@@ </36>
 563 O9: <@> okay (.) no **no no** </@> i'm joking (.) but it's mug out time
 564 so (.) people are all having parties
 565 O2: yeah **yeah**
 566 O9: just remind people that drink driving is illegal
 567 O2: yeah (.) do you have any campaign for that (1) posters?
 568 O9: hm it's on the table of our (.) **ha-** having unofficial here
 569 somewhere (.) we are chasing it (1) we hope so
 570 O2: okay

After O9's statement in lines 559 and 561 to the effect that the current season is also a hunting season, namely for the military police, there is general laughter. At this point a humorous atmosphere is created by rather simple means. The grammatical 'infelicities' in line 559 do not affect speaker O9's communicative effectiveness. He says **there is hunting season*, using an indicative pronoun, instead of saying "*it is hunting season*". O9 pluralizes "*people*" which is a noun that normally does not have a plural form. However, no one seems to be irritated by this 'marking'. In line 564, speaker O9 utters **people are all having parties* including a superfluous '*all*'.

Remarkably, O9 exploits ambiguity and once the audience interpret the second meaning of his statement "*it's hunting season for us*" (in line 561) in a way that is intelligible and understood, they see the funny side and begin to laugh. This in turn provokes O9 to break into unilateral laughter (in line 563), realising that his joke is working and has the desired and intended effect on the other participants.

O9, who is a non-native ELF speaker, is able to encourage group membership in his endeavour to prevent drink-driving. He explains that it is ‘mug-out-time’⁵² and people are having (farewell) parties (lines 563 and 564). This ELF interaction, which does not rely on standard language usage, makes it clear that systematic reference to NS models is in practice not necessary to achieve communicative effectiveness.

Interestingly, the repeated use of *‘yeah’* in the above excerpt seems to indicate a preparedness by O2 to shift from reciprocity to speakership, which then happens in line 566, while *‘hm’*, uttered by O9 in line 568, seems to exhibit “passive reciprocity”. Jefferson (1984: 200) means by “passive reciprocity” that the user of *‘hm’* “is proposing that his co-participant is still in the midst of some course of talk, and shall go on talking”.

According to Cogo (2008: 60), “ELF users accommodate to each other both to ensure intelligibility and to display group membership”. In the above excerpt ELF serves as form and function. By performing the function of informing the meeting about the danger of drink driving ELF is appropriated by speaker O9 and changed in form. O9 initially refers to the ongoing hunting season. In other words, as Cogo puts it, “form seems to follow function and start a circular phenomenon of variation and change” (ibid.). The participants in the meeting see the funny side of O9’s statement which is meant to be a warning to everyone present.

Humour and joking play significant roles also in the following example. O2, as the chairperson, enquires whether speaker O9 has always been with the military police (in line 369). As it turns out, O9 became a military policeman after serving initially with an anti-aircraft unit. After making this particular announcement he jokingly adds that he is now doing bad things to other people (line 381). Following this statement, the audience surprisingly bursts into laughter.

⁵² ‘Mug-out-time’ refers to a farewell function where people are presented with a silver-plated tankard as a farewell gift at the end of their tour of duty with the peacekeeping mission.

Example 18 (B)

- 369 O2: you have always been military police
 370 O9: no (.) i have been with the military police since nineteen
 371 ninety-six (.) and since then i went through all the positions from
 372 the crime scene technician staff (.) basically as <spel> i b </spel>
 373 (.) section so (.) before that i was graduated from (.) anti-aircraft
 374 defence missile system (.) so i served with anti-aircraft defence
 375 <24> brigade </24>
 376 O2: <24> yeah </24>
 377 O9: as a technician staff radar stations tuning repairs (.) everything
 378 and activity like that
 379 O2: good
 380 O9: so i changed my mind (.) and i'm a policeman now (.)
 381 i do bad things <25> to peoples </25>
 382 OX: <25> @@@@ @ </25>
 383 O2: <25> @@ </25> <@> don't say </@> that here (.) so

There are some 'infelicities' or non-conformities to ENL norms in O9's utterances. In line 371 he states **since then I went through all the positions* when he should have used the progressive form "*since then I have been passing through all positions*". O9's utterance includes an indication of time in the form of '*since then*'. Therefore, the meaning of his statement is clear. In line 373, he omits the definite article before '*anti-aircraft*'. The determiner is also omitted in line 374, where O9 says **I served with anti-aircraft defence brigade*. In line 378, the plural form of '*activity*' should be used, and in line 381 speaker O9 pluralizes "*people*", a noun that normally does not have a plural form.

Humour serves in this example the strategic function of "disarming criticism" in relation to positive face threats (Pullin Stark 2009: 165). Moreover, as Holmes & Stubbe (2003: 117) remark,

[t]he requirement of institutional roles at work often make face-threatening acts unavoidable, in such contexts, humour provides an acceptable attenuation strategy. It is coopted as a strategy for mediating between competing discourses – those of politeness and power.

Speaker O9 on the one hand wishes to maintain a good relationship with the other participants, on the other hand, as a policeman he exercises power and opens himself up to the criticism by his colleagues. As a non-native ELF speaker he uses

humour as a multifunctional device “in managing relations in the workplace” (Pullin Stark 2009: 153) and to mitigate power in order to nurture solidarity. The above example nevertheless illustrates that diversity exists in the manner people use humour in a workplace (Holmes 2006: 27). On the whole, humour can function as “a positive politeness strategy expressing solidarity”, but it can also function as a hedging strategy, i.e., “a means of modifying illocutionary force, [...] expressing negative politeness” (Holmes 2000: 167).

Spontaneous and collaborative humour as demonstrated in lines 380 through 383 illustrates the way participants in a workplace interaction are using discourse “to construct different aspects of their identity”, and particularly their social relationship with their colleagues (Holmes 2006: 27). Speaker O9 clearly demonstrates that joking as well as ambiguous humorous statements are possible in ELF interactions.

In the military, where there are given ranks, power is limited by the rank of a particular interactant. Moreover, power is also limited with regard to an individual’s position and appointment within the organisation. If the participants in talk-in-interaction are speaking ELF in such situations and circumstances, the main question refers to the way in which they use ELF to mitigate or to maintain their power relationship. It should be borne in mind that all utterances and statements very often are multifunctional. Therefore, “a humorous utterance may, and typically does, serve several functions at once” (Holmes 2000: 166).

Given the power relationship that exists in military meetings, ways can be observed in which individual interactants mitigate the hierarchical distance in some kind or another for effective purpose, or quite often in order to manage the interaction in a more friendly, humorous or informal fashion or whatever it may be.⁵³ This phenomenon can be traced in the following extract from a headquarters-level meeting. After all, similar phenomena could presumably be observed in any kind of interaction. S1 is the chairperson, but he is also a NS of English:

⁵³ see sub-section 4.3.2. for an explanation of the notion ‘mitigation strategies’.

Example 19 (A)

- 571 S1: <to S8> i want to know where you get your TAN from </to S8>
 572 S8: because i'm always out in the [place19]
 573 S1: <to S8> i don't believe you </to S8>=
 574 S8: =of course (1) that's why
 575 S1: <to S8> you are not going to get tanned through a TIN roof of
 576 a driver vehicle (.) i don't believe er </to S8> =
 577 S8: =my job is outside? the office you know (.) at least more than
 578 half of it (.) so (.) that's where i get my sun tan from
 579 S1: hands up who <@> believes it </@>
 580 SS: <loud> @@@@@ </loud>
 581 S1: <@> good </@> okay well (.) have a nice weekend

In initiating humour⁵⁴ and choosing this kind of talk, speaker S1 is participating as an equal, drawing on common ground in a topic that, strictly speaking, is not immediately work-related. However, “the most general or basic function of humour is to amuse” (ibid.). S1 jokingly remarks on the sun tan of speaker S8 (in line 571), who says that his job involves spending a lot of time in the open (line 572).

It should be noted that humour may be used by the powerful not only to maintain authority and control, but also to give the impression of being collegial (Holmes 2006: 29). S1 asks the other participants whether they believe S8's statement (line 579), which in turn provokes laughter. Through his action S1 is mitigating his power, whilst building solidarity with the participants thereby reducing hierarchical distance. Moreover, S1 reduces his power distinction not only by his remarks but also by displaying a degree of familiarity. Firstly, he remarks on the sun tan, secondly, he inquires how this sun tan came about, and thirdly, he puts S8's answer into question (line 573). In this example, “[h]umour typically constructs participants as equals, emphasising what they have in common and playing down power differences” (Holmes & Stubbe 2003: 109-110). The basic social function of humour is “that it serves to create and maintain solidarity, a sense of belonging to a group” (Holmes 2000: 159).

⁵⁴ see sub-section 4.3.3. for a discussion of the notion of ‘humour’.

The entire interaction in this excerpt is taking place in a lingua franca situation. The humorous phase occurs during the closing part of a meeting in form of collaborative humour deriving from small talk. S1's mitigation strategy⁵⁵ could just as well be employed outside the military. In this respect there is no difference between military and civilian ways of conversation. Whenever military personnel talk about anything not strictly pertaining to the military they often switch to a different register (Brown 1995: 27). This is demonstrated by employing private talk. Although the meeting is formal, familiarity, as far as membership is concerned, plays here an important role. Pullin Stark (2009: 170) makes the point that humour "tends to be based on common ground, which is particularly important for speakers of English as a lingua franca", because quite often it fosters "a feeling of belonging or bonding amongst people whose identities reflect more differences than areas of similarities". All in all, the fact that S8 is a non-native ELF speaker does not inhibit the occurrence of this specific feature at all, neither communicative efficiency.

According to Holmes & Stubbe (2003: 109), both "[t]he opening and closing phases of meetings are obvious sites for humour". The verbal exchange in the above example typically takes place at the end of a meeting, just before S1 releases the participants wishing them a nice weekend (in line 580). Pullin Stark (2009: 158) remarks that humour releases tension particularly at the end of a stressful meeting and it helps the participants "to return to normal and collegial relations". However, what is more important, jointly constructed humour usually develops among people who know each other rather well and "are familiar with each other's sense of humour" (Holmes 2006: 33). What has to be pointed out and is noteworthy is that this multifunctional resource within the military meeting under discussion is available not only to NSs but also to NNSs. In other words, it is possible to enact this kind of humorous function by using ELF, i.e., non-native ELF speakers are able to produce humour.

⁵⁵ see sub-section 4.3.2. for a discussion of 'mitigation'.

7.4. On Discourse Strategies

7.4.1. The Notion of Turn-taking in Interaction

As Boden (1994: 100) says, “the relative formality of a given meeting is an unavoidably local affair” and thus, “[m]eetings do not all proceed at the same level of formality and, therefore, turn-taking procedures vary”.⁵⁶ In formal meetings “turn allocation, transition, and even duration are overtly managed by the chairperson”, who acts “as a kind of central switching station for the meeting” (ibid.: 99). If regular speaker changes are to take place, discourse participants must have the capability “to scan phrases to predict when an utterance is about to end” (Gumperz 1982 [1995]: 160).

The following example is taken from a headquarters-level meeting and illustrates the rather restrictive form and nature of turn-taking. S1 is the chairperson and discusses with non-native ELF speaker S8 the use of a certain flight corridor (in line 311). It should be noted that both speakers take their turns in orderly fashion. There are no overlaps during their interaction and all statements are clearly separated from each other.

Example 20 (A)

- 311 S1: yeah (.) we can use the <spel> **s b a** </spel> road
 312 S8: so we always can use that corridor (.) but not THIS one
 313 near [**place35**] anymore (.) MAYBE
 314 S1: i don't think that they'll do that. (.) i mean if they do do that (.)
 315 i go and see the chief of staff again.
 316 S8: yeah (.) but the situation talking about two one five (.) you know
 317 (.) is very tense now (.) you know.
 318 S1: TENSE?
 319 S8: yes
 320 S1: well (.) for a situation to be TENSE (.) you have to have two
 321 sides that are feeling tense and i'm NOT feeling tense
 322 SS: @@@@
 323 S8: well there are two sides (.) you know (.) that is [**first name19**]
 324 and myself (.) you see
 325 SS: @@@@

⁵⁶ see sub-section 3.6.1. for an explanation of ‘turn-taking’ and ‘turn-taking procedures’.

- 326 S10: **[first name19]** is feeling tense
 327 S1: when DOES **[first name19]** go?
 328 S8: er at the end of this month
 329 S1: GOOD (.) well
 330 S10: problem <6> solved </6>

This relatively short conversation suggests that the efficient running of a meeting, the maintenance of the structure of the interaction, arriving at its outcomes and finally the decision making, are not affected by a NNS being involved whose English does not completely conform with NSs' standards and norms.

The repeated use of the phrase “*you know*” by speaker S8 is noteworthy. In fact, people insert also several other, apparently unnecessary words and phrases into their speech, such as “*you see*”, “*mind you*”, or “*I mean*”. Such phrases “are held to be signs of unclear thinking or lack of confidence” (Crystal 2000: 12). Using ‘*you know*’ primarily occurs in sentences that are referred to as ‘statements’ (ibid.: 16). However, there are many other types of sentences which are not statements and where “the use of *you know* would sound quite bizarre” (ibid.). Still, it has to be accepted that any moderate use of these phrases might be a valuable instrument for expressing subtle nuances and stylistic effects (ibid.: 17). Moreover, “[w]hen *you know* is over-used, it draws attention to itself, and gets in the way of communication” (ibid.).

In the above excerpt, the phrase “*you know*” which speaker S8 uses in lines 316, 317 and 323, presumably serves to reassert himself that S1 is following his concerns. Most likely it serves to express the question ‘*Are you with me?*’ In other words, S8 wants to make sure that S1 follows his expressed opinion on an ongoing situation. It could well be that S8 uses the phrase “*you see*” in line 324 to achieve a similar effect. The fact that S8 is a non-native ELF speaker in no way inhibits his use of typical nonsensical phrases or the occurrence of these specific features in his speech. On the whole, it is possible to make use of such a particular kind of phrases when using ELF.

7.4.2. On Overlapping Talk

In meetings, where the participants know each other, interruptions and overlaps occur rather frequently. In other words, the turns do not necessarily go back to the chairperson and turn-taking may resemble ordinary conversation. In the following example the chairperson O1 raises a particular question with speakers O3 and O4. Almost at once other participants join the interaction (line 81). All interactants know each other from previous meetings. As it turns out, the turn-taking is no longer strictly observed and therefore both overlaps and interruptions occur (in lines 78 and 83):

Example 21 (B)

- 69 O1: two days ago (.) yes
 70 O4: <to O1> in [nameB] no </to O1>
 71 O1: yes (.) <@> but one of </@> the sectors (.) it was almost
 72 on the boundary=
 73 O3: =is in the er (.) **is in the** front the
 74 <spel> u n o p </spel> forty five
 75 O1: mhm (.) it was was outside the [place19]=
 76 O3: = <fast> OUTside (.) yes yes </fast>
 77 O1: yes <@> yes of course </@> @@@
 78 O3: i was thinking the last (.) **the** <8> **last** </8>
 79 O1: <8> <fast> <@> it was </8> surprise </@> </fast>
 80 O3: event was the demolition (.) of the mines
 81 OX-m: [nameB] joc com has sent this information
 82 O4: [nameB] sent information (2) i've heard nothing about
 83 O1: so nothing special (.) <9> so </9>
 84 O4: <9> no </9> (.) nothing special

The relatively large number of repetitions in the above interaction is remarkable. In line 73, speaker O3 repeats “*is in the [front]*” as a hesitation repetition,⁵⁷ whilst in line 76 the repeating of “*yes*” represents a solidarity repetition,⁵⁸ just like O1’s repetition of “*yes*” one line further on. Another solidarity repetition occurs when speaker O4 says **sent information* in response to an unknown speaker’s statement “*sent this information*”. Furthermore, in line 83, speaker O1 utters “*nothing special*”, and speaker O4 repeats this out of solidarity in line 84. In line 78,

⁵⁷ see sub-section 3.6.3. for an explanation of ‘hesitation repetition’.

⁵⁸ see sub-section 3.6.3. for an explanation of the notion of ‘solidarity repetition’.

speaker O3 repeats “*the last*” and this can be seen as silence-avoidance repetition. In line 79, speaker O1 omits the determiner in **it was surprise* when he should have said “*it was a surprise*”. On the whole, the discursive interaction is communicatively effective despite these ‘infelicities’ or non-conformities to ENL norms.

It should be noted that some laughter occurs (in lines 71, 77, and 79) during the discussion, which is about some explosions that had taken place in or near an area under observation. According to Öberg (1995: 40), “[l]aughter and joking [are] frequently used in connection with the pre and post-phases and entering or leaving a phase of the negotiation”. In the above example laughter assists in resolving an embarrassing situation for speaker O4 who lacks information on events that had taken place close to his area of operational responsibility.⁵⁹ The example clearly shows that humorous interaction can be generated by non-native ELF speakers.

7.4.3. On Pauses and Disfluency in Speech Events

In the following example speaker M2 uses pausing after most of his statements. He also uses intonation in trying to highlight and bring home to the audience the important points of his utterance:

Example 22 (C)

637 M2: i understood you but i explain WHY we are do that earlier (.)
 638 because of (.) LAter SOMEthing happening with the civilians
 639 in the [**place19**] (2) the media will (.) er inform
 640 the (**un**) **xx** (**/un**) [**org11**] responsibility (.) to blocking (1)
 641 the roads er in front of the civilians (1) this is OUR responsibility
 642 (.) this is OUR task (1) we will continue this procedure in the
 643 future also (.) as i mentioned (.) e:r the sign of the [**org11**] is er
 644 visible (.) this is our task also (.) inform the civilians (.) this is
 645 **<spel> u n </spel>** restricted area (.) and that’s all (.)
 646 we NEED to show them (.) they are in a WRONG PLACE (.)
 647 this is our task (.) we NEED to continue in the future

⁵⁹ see sub-section 4.3.3. for a discussion of the notion of ‘humour’.

It should be noted that M2 pauses for lengths between half-a-second and two seconds in every line. His pausing, however, rarely coincides with grammatical constructs. Would this be the case, then other participants might interpret this as an indication of readiness for turn-taking. M2 also uses fillers such as “*er*” in lines 639, 641, and 643. These fillers basically represent pauses however add considerably to the disfluency of M2’s speech. Nevertheless, for M2, ELF clearly fulfils the intended conversational purpose. There are also several ‘infelicities’ or irregularities in M2’s utterance that need discussing. To begin with, in line 637 he says **why we are do that earlier*. Here, the auxiliary ‘*are*’ is superfluous as well as the adverb ‘*earlier*’. The statement **of later something happening* in line 638 should be reformulated to “*if something happens later on*”. The utterance **responsibility to blocking the roads* (in line 640) should be “*responsibility to block the roads*” or “*responsibility for blocking the roads*”. In line 644, M2’s statement **this is our task inform the civilians* is missing ‘*to*’ before the infinitive ‘*inform*’.

The communicative function of English always stands in the foreground. Successful communication between the participants in the meeting as speakers of different native tongues must be guaranteed. When looking at the linguistic features in the norm of Standard English, there is the argument whether these features are incorrect or whether they are deviant or errors⁶⁰. As it turns out they are not functionally ineffective. One could after all still investigate how far the participants in this particular meeting are formally conforming to English NS norms, but this is here not really the main question. On the contrary, the crucial question in the matter is whether such ELF speakers are actually enacting the discourse. If they do, then there would in fact be no need for them to speak correct English simply because their English is effective enough without it being NS language.

⁶⁰ Error is defined “as ‘a linguistic form [...] which, in the same context [...] would in all likelihood not be produced by the learner’s *native speaker counterparts*’” (James 1998: 64, after Lennon 1991: 182; original emphasis). However, James’ definition is not relevant for this study because the interactants are considered language users and not learners.

7.4.4. On Repairs during Discourse

Self-repair⁶¹ occurs when a speaker becomes aware of lexical, grammatical, or idiomatic ‘infelicities’ in his or her speech and immediately tries to rectify these. Especially in ELF interactions participants make grammatical, lexical or idiomatic errors, and show a tendency to self-correct almost at once. Grammatical and lexical errors often appear to be “within, or immediately after, the turn construction unit containing the trouble source” (Hutchby & Wooffitt 2008: 62). However, repair initiation may also occur at structural positions.

In the following example ‘self-repair’ takes place when speaker M8 becomes aware of errors in his speech. In lines 681 and 682 he performs ‘self-repair’ by correcting his statement “[org12] that organised (the meeting)” to “[org D] organising the meeting”. This is a factual repair because the meeting in question has not yet taken place and still needs to be arranged. Therefore the auxiliary ‘be’ should have been inserted before ‘organising’. In line 682, speaker M8 also omits the definite article before ‘mukhtar’. His statement should really be “[org D] to be organising the meeting with the mukhtar”. Furthermore, in line 685 speaker M2 corrects his initial statement of “we haven’t”, to the simple past “we didn’t get anything”, most likely because he is trying to express that this ‘non-receiving’ occurred at a particular time in the past, for example, at a recent meeting. Speaker M9 in line 691 repairs his statement of “we saw” to “we got this weekly report”:

Example 23 (C)

- 681 M8: er about (un) xx (/un) [org12] that organised (.) to
 682 organising the meeting with mukthar of [place23] after
 683 <spel> t k </spel> forty alfa position
 684 M7: we will ask it (.) we will ask it (.) him or her
 685 M2: we will check because we HAVEN’T (.) we didn’t get (.)
 686 anything
 687 M7: okay
 688 MX-m: thank you
 689 M8: no point sir
 690 M2: any additional (1) please

⁶¹ see sub-section 3.6.6. for an explanation of ‘repair’ (self-repair and other-repair).

691 M9: i have only one question sir (.) yesterday we saw (.) **got this**
 692 weekly report from scat in **[place47]** they will start to build this
 693 road from **[place51]** (.) we need er MORE information about
 694 this activity (.) EACH road (.) <7> **because** </7>
 695 there are three roads

It should also be noted that the ‘self-repairs’ in the above excerpt are always preceded by a short pause. There is also a repetition of **we will ask it* to be observed, and the omission of the preposition *‘for’* before the word *‘it’*, by speaker M7 in line 684. M7 also performs a reformulation repetition⁶² by uttering *“we will ask [for] it”*. Still, despite several ‘infelicities’ or ‘non-conformities’ to ENL norms the discourse remains on track and is communicatively effective. The military hierarchical order is reflected by the repeated use of the word *‘sir’* which at the same time represents one of the typical features of military meetings.

In non-native ELF interactions ‘other-repairs’ apparently are relatively rare. It seems that the participants are not always absolutely sure about linguistic ‘infelicities’ and therefore prefer to ‘let them pass’.⁶³ This kind of behaviour seems to happen quite frequently. Nevertheless, the discourse of the meeting whereby the participants effectively carry out their activities is not inhibited by the fact that they are using a language which for them is a lingua franca.

7.4.5. On Repetitions

In this sub-section different types of repetitions are exemplified by short extracts from my data base to show that repetition phenomena also occur in ELF interaction.

The following example highlights an *interruption-oriented repetition*. In the short interaction between three ELF speakers, S11 interrupts speaker S1 (in line 554) in response to S1’s announcement that *“the force commander is back on twenty-*

⁶² see sub-section 3.6.3. for an explanation of ‘reformulation repetition’.

⁶³ see sub-section 3.6.5. for a discussion of the notion of ‘let-it-pass’.

sixth in office” (in line 551) and S1’s additional remark “*which is a Wednesday*” (in line 553) and takes the floor by repeating “*Wednesday*” and then stating that “*he [the force commander] arrives on the twenty-fifth*” (in line 554).

Example 24 (B)

551 S1 the force commander is back on twenty sixth in office=
 552 S10: =in office on the twenty sixth=
 553 S1: =which is a <18> wednesday </18>
 554 S11: <18> wednesday </18> morning he ARRIVES on the twenty fifth
 555 (.) that’s he will be not involved
 556 S1: and i think [**last name27**] is AWAY just before he comes=

In line 552, speaker S10 already repeats part of S1’s initial statement. However, speaker S10 is not interrupting to take the floor. S10’s repetition is what is known as ‘solidarity repetition’⁶⁴ to be discussed next.

The following two examples of ELF interactions refer to *solidarity repetitions*:

Example 25 (A)

826 S1: no (.) you have your MEDAL parade <11> on </11>
 827 S3: <11> friday </11> six <spel> p m </spel>
 828 S1: FRIDAY (.) six <spel> p m </spel> good (.) force commander
 829 is BACK (.) so that’s no problem

Example 26 (A)

171 S1 i think his first day in office is the twenty sixth
 172 S2: twenty sixth (.) yes
 173 S1: twenty sixth
 174 S2: yes monday
 175 S1: wednesday=
 176 S2: =wednesday yes
 177 S1: the twenty sixth is a wednesday

These repetitions not only illustrate involvement and participation in the respective conversation but also agreement and solidarity with the respective interactant. The repetition of “*twenty-six*” and “*Wednesday*” in the above

⁶⁴ see sub-section 3.6.3. for an explanation of the notion of ‘solidarity repetition’.

examples is used to ensure that the listener has understood and reflects cooperation. The same goes for repeating “*Friday six p.m.*”.

Repetitions can serve a number of purposes and often have several functions. However, their prime function is to confirm involvement, comprehension, agreement, and solidarity with conversational partners as shown in the above ELF exchanges. The following example can be seen as *silence-avoidance repetition*, but also as repetition to demonstrate solidarity with speaker S2’s suggestion of relocating headquarters to ‘sector three’:

Example 27 (A)

560 S2: i can propose to change the (1) **the** position of the
 561 <spel> h q </spel> (.) we can go to the (.) sector three (.)
 562 **[place16]**
 563 SS: <loud> @@@ </loud>
 564 SX: sector three
 565 S11: sector three **[place16]**
 566 S1: <@> sector three **[place16]** </@> that will be nice i think
 567 **[S8]** spends quite a lot of time in sector three

In the above ELF interaction three different speakers independently repeat the words “*sector three*” before S1 comes in referring to the topic of the discussion.

According to my data, the majority of repetition occurrences seem to relate to *hesitation repetitions*.⁶⁵ In the following example S7, who is a non-native ELF speaker, reports that he has cancelled a month old order. However, to avoid silence whilst searching for words S7 refers to repeating statements, mostly as hesitation repetitions. Moreover, speaker S7 also performs ‘self-repair’⁶⁶ during his utterances. These features will be discussed below.

Example 28 (A)

1517 S7: last but not least (.) e:r (.) against the <spel> h 1 n 1 </spel> e:r (.)
 1518 influenza (.) i as i reported (.) er **i ordered some** (.) **i made some**
 1519 regulations (.) er which were given by myself er at fifteenth of

⁶⁵ see sub-section 3.6.3. for a discussion of the notion ‘hesitation repetition’.

⁶⁶ see sub-section 3.6.6. for an explanation of ‘repair’ (‘self-repair’ and ‘other-repair’).

1520 july (.) and i have (.) i would like to inform (.) i had cancelled
 1521 this regulations **fifteen of august** (1) er it was restricted the
 1522 [nameK] soldiers to visiting in the [place16] [place44] and
 1523 [place46] er nightclubs and discos and so (.) and so (.) er i
 1524 cancelled this (.) er regulation er **fifteenth of <10> august </10>**
 1525 (.) thank you sir (.) i finished
 1526 S1: <10> okay </10> (2) night clubs?
 1527 S7: night clubs

In line 1518, speaker S7 corrects his statement **I ordered some [regulations] to *I made some [regulations]* whereas he should have said “*I issued some [regulations]*”. In line 1519, he uses the wrong preposition, i.e., ‘at’ instead of ‘on’, and omits the definite article in **at fifteenth of July*, which should really be “*on the fifteenth of July*”. In line 1520 he starts off by saying “*I have (cancelled)*” but later self-corrects to **I had cancelled this regulation fifteen of August*. There is a missing preposition ‘on’ (in line 1521). Also in line 1521, a grammatical error occurs; instead of “*it was restricted*” there should be the past continuous “*it was restricting*”. In line 1522, speaker S7 puts a superfluous ‘to’ in front of “*visiting*”. In line 1523, a further hesitation repetition⁶⁷ “*and so*” can be found. S7 repeats his earlier announcement in lines 1523 and 1524 by saying “*I cancelled this regulation fifteenth of August*”. In military jargon the preposition ‘on’ before ‘*fifteenth*’ can be omitted.

As Cameron (2001: 34) suggests, “[r]epetition can be a way of ‘buying time’ to plan the next chunk”. The above extract demonstrates S7’s attempts to buy time in between his statements. Moreover, it should be noted that S7 refers to immediate ‘self-repair’ when he realises having committed an error in his speech.

In the next excerpt O2 hesitantly asks speaker O6 the question “*what what does that involve*” (in line 979). He repeats that question in line 981.

⁶⁷ see sub-section 3.6.3. for an explanation of ‘hesitation repetition’.

Example 29 (B)

- 979 O2: what **what** does that involve?
 980 O6: excuse me
 981 O2: what does that involve?
 982 O4: it's the leaders' meeting with the <spel> m f r </spel>

The following extract demonstrates self-repetition which in fact represents a hesitation repetition and is taking place at the beginning of a new topic. In this particular case O4 refers to a manpower reduction by saying “*in our in our mounting order*” and “*we're we're eligible*” (in line 177):

Example 30 (B)

- 177 O4: in our **in our** mounting order (.) we're **we're** eligible for
 178 two hundred and forty places (1) that was reduced from
 179 two hundred and forty two from (.) the previous regiment (1)
 180 so two hundred forty is what we have got

In the next example S2 and S4, who are non-native ELF speakers, engage in talk-in-interaction whereby several repetitions and overlaps⁶⁸ occur. Moreover, their interaction not only demonstrates the effects of unplanned talk but also the effects of interrupting speech:

Example 31 (A)

- 28 S4: i was (.) in the morning **i was** discussing the with (.) e:r
 29 commander <1> of </1>
 30 S2: <1> <to S4> so you </1> DON'T you don't <2> need the </2>
 31 S4: <2> we don't </2> need=
 32 S2: =the platoon </to S4>
 33 S4: because this demonstration so far has not <pvc> **confirmed** <ipa>
 34 /kɒnfɪrmd/ <ipa> </pvc> (.) but for sure we will (.) we will (.)
 35 stand there. (.) for sure **for sure**
 36 S2: i think this **this** demonstration is more quiet than the **the** last one
 37 on <3> sunday </3>
 38 S4: <3> yeah yes </3> of course

A number of ‘infelicities’ or ‘non-conformities’ to ENL norms stand out in the above exchange. These refer not just to repetitions but also to grammatical and

⁶⁸ see sub-section 3.6.2. for a discussion of the concept of ‘interruptions and overlaps’.

pronunciation deviations from NS norms. In lines 28 and 35, for example, speaker S4 repeats “*I was*” and “*for sure*”. These repetitions can be interpreted as *hesitation repetitions*⁶⁹ because in line 28 speaker S4 starts the sentence “*I was in the morning*” and then suddenly repeats “*I was*”, most likely because he changes the topic of his utterance “*to discussing*”. S4’s repetitions in lines 34 and 35, i.e., “*we will*” and “*for sure*”, can be classed reformulation repetitions,⁷⁰ because S4’s intention seems to be making his utterance more understandable.

Furthermore, in line 33, speaker S4 mispronounces the word “*confirmed*” which however does not make it less communicatively effective. There is also a grammatically incorrect statement by S4 in line 33. He says **so far has not confirmed* omitting the past participle of the auxiliary ‘*to be*’, i.e., ‘*been*’. Again, this has no influence on communicative effectiveness. In line 30, S2 repeats “*you don’t*” as reformulation, and in line 36 he repeats the determiners “*this*” and “*the*” as hesitations. Furthermore, speaker S2 makes a grammatical error in line 36 by uttering **this demonstration is more quiet* when referring to a future event. He should rather say “*this event will be quieter*” or “*this event is expected to be quieter*”.

The repetitions by speaker S2 in lines 30 and 36 could have been caused by S4 not agreeing to S2’s plan of supplying one platoon for reinforcement. It seems that S2 is rather astonished about S4’s reaction. Therefore, quite unforeseen, he is forced to engage in unplanned talk. For speaker S2 the change in this discursive situation comes quite unexpectedly. However, S4 is also engaging in unplanned talk because for him it seems clear from the start that there is no need for an extra platoon and so he does not expect one. In this example, the utterance “*so you DON’T*” (in line 30) also overlaps with “*of*” (in line 29). S2 repeats “*you don’t*” and briefly gains the floor. S4 quickly confirms that there is no need for the platoon (line 31). The overlaps in speech⁷¹ (in lines 30 to 32) seem to be the result of both speakers being rather surprised by each others statements.

⁶⁹ see sub-section 3.6.3. for an explanation of ‘hesitation repetition’.

⁷⁰ see sub-section 3.6.3. for an explanation and discussion of ‘reformulation repetition’.

⁷¹ see sub-section 3.6.2. for a discussion of ‘interruptions and overlaps’.

The fact that the speakers use a language, which is not their first language, does not inhibit their ultimate communicative success. Furthermore, there are no pauses between the speech acts and this keeps the dynamics of the interaction very much alive. On the whole, this kind of verbal exchange confirms Firth's (1996: 237) conclusion that participants in lingua franca talk

do interactional and discursive work to imbue talk with an orderly and 'normal' appearance, in the face of extraordinary, deviant, and sometimes 'abnormal' linguistic behaviour (original emphasis).

The example also demonstrates what typically happens in ELF talk, namely that a significant influence from each participant's first language can be traced insofar as the English spoken by each of the speakers is not exactly the same; nevertheless their utterances remain quite intelligible. Differences in the pronunciation of words, in the vocabulary, intonation, and the grammar used may occur. All serve to distinguish one type of ELF from another, or ELF from a NS form of English. As already discussed, S4's pronunciation of the word "confirmed" (in line 34) differs considerably from standard pronunciation.

In the next extract S2, who is a non-native ELF speaker, corrects his utterance in line 1407 by stating "because they" to "if they", and again in line 1410 by changing "not to avoid" to "to avoid". However, this kind of *reformulation repetition* can also be classed as self-repetition.

Example 32 (A)

1406 S2: they do not have to or they don't need to enter to HUNT inside the
 1407 **[place19]** (.) but they CAN enter (.) because they (.) if they
 1408 follow the direction from THEIR government they will see that
 1409 the areas are INSIDE the **[place19]** (.) that's why they operating
 1410 the green (.) **the greens** to point (.) not to avoid (.) to avoid (.)
 1411 sorry (.) the entrance of the people to hunt inside the **[place19]** (.)

S2 is trying to find a correct sentence and he even apologises for having made a wrong statement (in line 1411). Here, the reformulation repetitions serve to find a suitable way to express what S2 is actually trying to convey. On the whole, reformulation repetitions are production-oriented, because they are to assist

speakers in producing correct sentences, and they are comprehension-oriented, because utterances may become better understandable.

7.5. On Miscommunication

In the following excerpt of a headquarters-level meeting one specific aspect is noticeable almost immediately. Chairperson S1 asks S7, a non-native ELF speaker, three times within a few seconds (in lines 1373, 1376 and 1378) about the originator of a particular policy. However, speaker S7 continues with his report of what seems to be a new hunting policy:

Example 33 (A)

- 1368 S7: er (.) the second one (1) i would like **i would like** to report you (.)
 1369 e:r the hunting policy had been changed totally (.) e:r er
 1370 for the previous time (.) and er from e:r (.) this small hunting
 1371 season until er game er time we are (.) we have a NEW policy
 1372 (.) ABSOLutely brand new policy
 1373 S1: WHO from?
 1374 S7: e:r (.) i was informed by the <spel> c o </spel> (.) er i hope
 1375 so everybody knows it but i would like to er er=
 1376 S1: =no (.) but WHOSE whose policy
 1377 S7: the policy is=
 1378 S1: =no (.) but whose policy (.) the policy of the government of
 1379 **[place22]** (.) the policy of the <spel> u n </spel>
 1380 S7: the government the government of **[place22]**
 1381 S1: the government of [place22] policy (.) is NEW is <8> new </8>
 1382 S7: <8> new </8> (.) they regulated the hunting policy (.) NOBODY
 1383 nobody can entering the <pvc> hed- </pvc> hunting activity to
 1384 the **[place19]** (.) only OUTside (1) of the **[place19]** they can
 1385 hunting BUT er (.) the south part (.) the **[nameD]** side (.)
 1386 could be approaching er not more than THREE hundred metres
 1387 (.) er distance

The above example displays several communicative features that should be noted because they do not conform to NS norms. This leads to the question of whether and how they affect the communicative efficiency in the interaction between speakers S1 and S7. For example, in line 1368, speaker S7 repeats “*I would like*”

which can be interpreted as silence-avoidance repetition⁷². In line 1370, S7's statement **for the previous time* suggests the use of a wrong preposition and should rather be "*from the previous time*" or even better, "*since then*". In line 1371, speaker S7 performs self-repair⁷³ by changing "*we are*" to "*we have*". In line 1376, S1 repeats the words "*whose*" and "*whose policy*" which he uses again in line 1378 to emphasise his question.

When S1 suggests the "*policy of the government*" in line 1378, speaker S7 repeats the words "*the government*" in line 1380. This statement is then taken up by S1 in line 1381 and repeated most likely as 'solidarity repetition'⁷⁴. S1 also repeats the words "*is new*" and speaker S7 repeats "*nobody*" in lines 1382 and 1383. These repetitions apparently stress the importance of the utterances and should be seen as 'reformulations'.⁷⁵ Furthermore, in lines 1384 and 1385, speaker S7 says **nobody can entering* instead of saying "*nobody can enter*", or **they can hunting* instead of "*they can hunt*", and in line 1386, **[they] could be approaching* when it should be "*[they] can approach*". S7's use of the progressive form produces errors⁷⁶ that apparently are not self-correctible.

The problem that arises during the interaction is 'miscommunication', a subject already discussed in this paper.⁷⁷ Miscommunication apparently is caused by S7 who is not paying full attention when S1 asks him the subject question (in line 1387) for the first time. S7's 'non-understanding', which is known as 'over-riding', might be interpreted as uncooperative or impolite behaviour (Pitzl 2010: 40). 'Over-riding' is defined as

a particular interactional phenomenon in which [participants] apparently ignore the others' utterance and carry on with their topic they have already introduced or stay with the schema which they have brought to the

⁷² see sub-section 3.6.3. for a discussion of 'silence-avoidance repetition'.

⁷³ see sub-section 3.6.6. for an explanation of 'repair' (self-repair and other-repair).

⁷⁴ see sub-section 3.6.3. for a discussion of the notion 'solidarity repetition'.

⁷⁵ see sub-section 3.6.3. for an explanation of 'reformulations'.

⁷⁶ "If [...] the learner is unable or in any way disinclined to make the correction [of a fault in his or her output], we assume that the form the learner used was the one intended, and that it is an **error**" (James 1998: 78; original emphasis). Strictly speaking, James' definition is not relevant for this study because the interactants are to be considered language users and not learners.

⁷⁷ see sub-section 3.6.5. for a discussion on 'miscommunication'.

encounter (Vasseur, Broeder & Roberts 1996: 77; quoted in Pitzl 2010: 40).

S1 not only ranks highest, he is also the chairperson. He is constantly attentive and has an active part throughout the proceedings. It is only proper for him to ask questions to clarify reported issues to be able to make appropriate decisions. Considering the goal-oriented nature of the interaction, speaker S7 fails in the first place to provide the expected information and therefore S1 is asking for specific details.

The main point, however, is how far ELF influences the way in which military meetings are conducted. How far does the use of ELF change the dynamics of the discourse? It is also interesting to observe how far the fact that S7 is a non-native ELF speaker, influences the interaction with a NS. Another point is whether this affects speaker S7's role as a briefer. On the whole, the linguistic diversity of ELF speakers, as it seems, has no influence on their potential to communicate or miscommunicate. As long as ELF interactants achieve a certain threshold of understanding that is sufficient for their conversational purpose, they seem "to adopt a 'Let-it-Pass' principle" (House 1999: 75).⁷⁸ Moreover, Poncini (2004: 22) suggests that "participants in NNS-NNS interactions are able to achieve their practical goals through assumed mutual understanding". Firth (1996: 244) makes the point that as far as errors in utterances are concerned, quite often the "interactants pretend to understand one another - even when they in fact do not".

This 'Let-it-Pass' procedure, which belongs to the main characteristics of ELF interactions, can also prove vulnerable. The "robustness" of an ongoing talk might become more "fragile" and "the myth of mutual intelligibility in ELF interactions may break down" (ibid.). This is what happens in the above discussion: speaker S7 briefs on an "*absolutely brand new [hunting] policy*" (in line 1372). When S1 repeatedly enquires about who had issued that policy he causes an instance of miscommunication by following House's definition of "operational (processual) misunderstandings" (House 1999: 78). These misunderstandings occur when

⁷⁸ see sub-section 3.6.5. for a discussion of the concept of 'let-it-pass'.

habitual expectation patterns are stronger than the reality of verbal input. In such instances “interlocutors ‘don’t listen’, because scripts and schemas are automatically activated, or, as is often the case with NNSs, because of over-rehearsal” (ibid.). In the above example, it is more than likely that speaker S7 got carried away by his reporting of the “*brand new [hunting] policy*”. Following S1’s questions, S7’s talk turns fragile and is briefly diverged because S7 is obliged to respond to S1’s request. Only in line 1380, S7 eventually provides an answer. The true reason for S7’s misunderstanding however could be a lack of “knowledge of the subject on hand” (ibid.: 75) and not deficiencies in using ELF.

The most important point is that the communicative features produced by S7 do not seem to cause distractions on S1. As a matter of fact, an efficient and effective communication is maintained throughout their interaction. The above data show how communication between ELF speakers operates, i.e., revealing and exhibiting a number of communicative features which have been discussed earlier on in this paper. In conclusion, the speakers are able to achieve communicative efficiency without strictly adhering to NS norms.

7.6. Summary

Investigating how non-native ELF speakers communicate can be done through an “endonormative” approach (Seidlhofer et al. 2006: 8). Moreover, to determine which and how many mistakes such ELF speakers make requires an “exonormative” approach. The first type of approach focuses more on a qualitative analysis of forms, whilst the second, being interested in the difference between ELF and ENL, focuses more on a quantitative understanding of processes. Above all, it is necessary to establish which ELF features are “to be judged as ‘errors’ rather than variety-defining characteristics” (ibid.: 11). It must be borne in mind that ELF cannot be regarded as being “bad or deficient English - it is just *different in form* from NS English and *serves different functions*” (Hülmbauer et al. 2008: 32; original emphasis).

Concerning the communicative ELF functions in non-native contexts, Seidlhofer et al. (2006: 8) distinguish between two different groups. The first, is “typically manifested in ‘prestigious’ writing”, such as staff-work and where NS control is “difficult to ascertain” (ibid.). However, this is not applicable in this study. ELF users in that group often consider themselves as still learning English and they apparently aim for the achievement of extensive intelligibility across languages (ibid.). The second group “is typically manifested in spontaneous spoken interaction” (ibid.: 9), i.e., discourse at an international level in this case, for the purpose of my paper, the distinctive genre of military meetings. ELF speakers in this second group “see themselves either as learners or users of English” (ibid.). They communicate irrespective of whether or not they defer to NS norms (ibid.). Non-native ELF speakers or ‘language users’ display something like a discernable characteristic ELF. Some of their language features may be considered deficient ‘interlanguage’ that is in need of correcting, because deviant language is thought to be distorting the meaning of a message.

The ability to communicate in a common language is a prime tool and prerequisite for working together at multinational military levels. According to my data, military meetings within a peacekeeping mission can be successfully conducted by non-native ELF speakers. These speakers are communicatively effective even though their ELF is not in conformity with NS norms. They establish successful communication particularly because of their cooperative behaviour. Moreover, the features of military meetings that have been discussed in this paper are emplaced and effectively carried out in ELF speaker discourse. The participants achieve their objectives. They interact with each other even though their English is in some people’s eyes defective and erroneous.

My findings show that the communication of non-native ELF speakers participating in military meetings can be effective without strictly conforming to NS norms of English and that it is not necessary to reach that high level sort of NS ability. The data demonstrate language competence in conducting particular military meetings by using ELF. Errors occur but in relatively low frequency.

There are occasional ‘errors’ in pronunciation, grammar and vocabulary, but they are not serious enough to distort meaning and rarely seem to disturb NSs. The non-native ELF speakers establish relationships within a hierarchical environment; they get their messages across and achieve their objectives. They are reasoning and they are coming to their conclusions; they are also interacting humour. They are effectively communicative without being accurate in terms of NS norms or conforming that way. Therefore, the assumptions that have been made not only with NATO but also others, including the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR),⁷⁹ namely that everything depends upon linguistic accuracy and how accurately NS norms are reflected, obviously do not hold. At least it might be worth thinking about what the relationship is between linguistic accuracy, conformity and effective communication.

⁷⁹ The CEFR is a document which describes in a comprehensive manner i) the competences necessary for communication, ii) the related knowledge and skills and iii) the situations and domains of communication. The CEFR defines levels of attainment in different aspects of its descriptive scheme with illustrative descriptors scale. The illustrative descriptor scales, plus other descriptors related to the CEFR, are available in a Data bank of descriptors.

8. Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to investigate the role of ELF as inter-communicative tool for military staff in a multinational peacekeeping mission. The study tried to determine the degree of communicative efficiency that can be reached in military meetings where the majority of the interactants are non-native ELF speakers with different native tongues. A further question was whether English as common language was by any means NS controlled.

The opinion that successful ELF communication depends on using NS norms is still widespread. But do NS norms really affect lingua franca inter-communication abilities? My data show how ELF speakers are operating. Clearly, they operate revealing and exhibiting all of the various features of communication that I have discussed in this paper. They do this successfully. I would say ELF speakers communicate very competently without strict adherence to NS norms. My study demonstrates that the notion that NNS communication is meeting NS norms simply does not hold.

The ELF speakers participating in the military meetings under investigation use English that is good enough and communicatively effective enough for them to be fully fledged participants in talk-in-interaction at those meetings. The very fact that they do not speak what is generally considered Standard English does not prevent or restrict the working relationship between them and the enacting of a discourse which is effective for their joint purposes. Moreover, the interactants display a sense of community and togetherness if not familiarity that is not inhibited or non-existent by the absence of a common language. They achieve this sense of community through the use of ELF. In effect, “the communication process is based on collaboration in which all the interlocutors are continuously and actively involved” (Hülmbauer et al. 2008: 32).

What the study shows is that the English which international military staff members within a certain peacekeeping mission speak is apparently good enough

for the particular type of conversation they are conducting and the kind of talk they are displaying during their meetings. One aspect of their performance skill is their “ability to cope communicatively” when their “linguistic resources are not fully adequate” with native speech and this apparently is “a familiar problem for those communicating in their second language” (McNamara 2004: 766). This outlook nevertheless does not really mean or even suggest that NNSs should not further improve their English. On the contrary, for instance, when some of these speakers get promoted and have to take up a much higher level position or a higher appointment in the military line or if these interactants for some reason want to be for example missile experts or, for argument’s sake, Information Technology specialists, then it could well be that their current ELF proficiency would probably no longer be good enough. They will then have to develop their English in such a way that it is effective at the new, higher level appointment. However, the general measure still remains overall communicative effectiveness and not so much formal correctness. In other words, dealing with other discourses than the said military basically requires learning a lot more language. Indeed, this would also apply to NSs when they move to other spheres of activity than they are used to and trained at.

One is proficient in a language to the extent that one possesses it, makes it one’s own, bends it to one’s will, asserts oneself through it rather than simply submits to the dictates of its form (Widdowson 1994: 384). In essence, real language proficiency is when one is able to take possession of a language (*ibid.*). Therefore there is no immediate need to insist on the kind of rigorous measure of confidence against NSs, because that is not relevant for the purposes in question. In fact, NNSs generally concentrate more on the content and less on formalistic aspects of their utterances.

NNSs seem to shape ELF to make it effective. Their ELF appears to be simplified, and its form made more transparent and adapted to its function. Such features put NS control into question. The study highlights that ELF in a multinational military environment is only to a minor degree NS controlled and this primarily concerns

military terms and agreed proficiency levels. It must be remembered that ELF is commonly used in two ways, “with two forces at work” (Seidlhofer et al. 2006: 6). One force tries for conservation of existing norms, i.e., NS norms. This force “is particularly powerful because it is sustained by the received wisdom” and the experience that “effective communication depends on adhering to established native-speaker norms of correctness” (ibid.). However, my findings show that ELF communication can be effective without strict conformity to NS norms. The second is “a force for innovation” that is trying to change existing norms; it is “norm-developing” (ibid.).

Crossey (2005)⁸⁰ warns that little research has been carried out into actual language used on military missions and particularly on linguistic shortfalls that might occur. To overcome this problem, NATO, for instance, issues from time to time descriptors of English language proficiency levels to lay down the language requirements for international staff appointments.⁸¹ Moreover, every military appointment requiring certain language skills carries a Standardized Language Proficiency (SLP) tag which relates directly to STANAG 6001 and is based on NS norms, demanding conformity to these norms. In other words, the level of proficiency refers to the degree of accuracy a NNS reflects NS norms.

The results of my investigation would seem to suggest that one might want to think again about the standards which are applied, for instance, those regulated in NATO documents. For NATO, undoubtedly it is the question of interoperability that receives major attention. Interoperability requires multinational forces to share common doctrines and procedures as well as the ability to communicate effectively with each other (NATO 2006: 1). In short, interoperability is “the ability to act together coherently, effectively and efficiently” (NATO 2010a: 124). This ability is of particular interest and significance in multinational military forces. As far as communicative interoperability is concerned, it is widely believed that the latter can only be achieved if a language is learned fully.

⁸⁰ Exact page reference could not be verified; article read online.

⁸¹ cf. NATO. 2010b. *Language Proficiency Levels*. STANAG 6001 NTG (Edition 4). Brussels: NATO Standardization Agency (NSA).

In conclusion, military meetings as such have certain conventional features, thus enabling participants who speak ELF to communicate effectively. Therefore, motivated by communicative needs, ENL is appropriated and efficiently and successfully employed by non-native ELF speakers with rather little reference to ENL norms. Since this is borne out in my data one should really think again about assuming that correct NS English is the only way which can talk about effective communication.

9. Bibliography

- Adolphs, Svenja. 2005. "I don't think I should learn all this" – A Longitudinal View of Attitudes Towards 'Native Speaker' English". In Gnutzmann, Claus; Intemann, Frauke (eds.). *The Globalisation of English and the English Language Classroom*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag. 119-131.
- Atkinson, Maxwell J.; Heritage, John (eds.). 1984 [1992]. *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Atteslander, Peter. 2003. *Methoden der empirischen Sozialforschung*. (10. Aufl.). Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Auer, Peter. 1995. "Ethnographic Methods in the Analysis of Oral Communication: Some Suggestions for Linguists". In Quasthoff, Uta M. (ed.). *Aspects of Oral Communication*. Berlin, New York: de Gruyter Verlag. 419-440.
- Bae, Jung Hee. 2002. "discourse strategies solving trouble in German lingua franca communication". In Knapp, Karlfried; Meierkord, Christiane (eds.). *Lingua Franca Communication*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 195-216.
- Boden, Deidre. 1994. *The business of talk: organisations in action*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Brown, Virginia. 1995. *Leveling of irregular past participles in military English*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang GmbH.
- Cameron, Deborah. 2001. *Working with spoken discourse*. London: Sage Publications.
- Chafe, Wallace L. 1995. "Some Reasons for Hesitating". In Tannen, Deborah; Saville-Troike, Muriel (eds.). *Perspectives on Science*. Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Corporation, 77-89.
- Cicourel, Aaron V. 1973. *Cognitive sociology: Language and meaning in social interaction*. London: Macmillan.
- Clayman, Steven E.; Maynard, Douglas W. 1995. "Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis". In ten Have, Paul; Psathas, George (eds.). *Situated Order: Studies in the Social Organization of Talk and Embodied Activities*. Washington D.C.: International Institute for Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis, University Press of America Inc., 1-30.
- Cogo, Alessia. 2008. "English as a Lingua Franca: form follows function". *English Today* 95, Vol.24, No. 3 (September 2008), 58-61.

- Cook, Vivian. 1999. "Going Beyond the Native Speaker in Language Teaching". *TESOL Quarterly* 33, Number 1, Spring 1999, 185-209.
- Coppieters, Rene. 1987. "Competence differences between native and near-native speakers". *Language, Journal of the Linguistic Society of America*. Volume 63, 1987, 544-573.
- Crystal, David. 2000. *Who Cares About English Usage?* (2nd ed.). London: Penguin Books Ltd.
- Crystal, David. 2003. *English as a global language*. (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cuff, E.C.; Sharrock, W.W. 1985. "Meetings". In van Dijk, Teun A. (ed.). *Handbook of discourse analysis. Vol. 3. Discourse and dialogue*. London: Academic Press Inc. Ltd.
- Davey, Bill; Gramkow Andersen, Karsten. 1996. "Some practical and legal aspects concerning the collection of empirical data". In Jensen, K.A.; Steensig, J. (eds.). *Datadag*. Aarhus: Danish Association for Applied Linguistics.
- Davies, Alan. 2003. *The native speaker: myth and reality*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Drew, Paul; Heritage John. 1992. "Analyzing talk at work: an introduction". In Drew, Paul; Heritage, John (eds.). *Talk at work: interaction in institutional settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 3-65.
- Firth, Alan. 1996. "The discursive accomplishment of normality: On 'lingua franca' English and conversation analysis". *Journal of Pragmatics* 26 (1996), 237-259.
- Fraser, Bruce. 1980. "Conversational mitigation". Mey, Jacob L. & Haberland, Hartmut (eds.). *Journal of Pragmatics*. Vol. 4 (1980). Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company, 341-350.
- Gnutzmann, Claus. 2005. "'Standard English' and 'World Standard English', Linguistic and Pedagogical Considerations". In Gnutzmann, Claus; Intemann Frauke (eds.). *The globalisation of English and the English Language Classroom*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag, 107-118.
- Gumperz, John Joseph. 1982 [1995]. *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Have, Paul ten. 1990 [2004]. "Methodological Issues in Conversation Analysis". Electronic version of a paper published originally in the *Bulletin de*

- Méthodologie Sociologique*, Vol. 27, 1 (June 1990): 23-51. Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam.
 Online <<http://www2.fmg.uva.nl/emca/mica.htm>> (12 September 2010)
- Have, Paul ten. 2007. *Doing Conversation Analysis: a Practical Guide*. (2nd ed.). London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Heritage, John. 1984 [1992]. *Garfinkel and Ethnomethodology*. (Reprint 1992). Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Heritage, John. 1995. "Conversation Analysis: Methodological Aspects". In Quasthoff, Uta M. (ed.). *Aspects of Oral Communication*. Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 391-418.
- Heritage, John. 2004. "Conversation analysis and institutional talk". In Fitch, Kristine; Sanders, Robert E. (eds.). *Handbook of language and social interaction*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Assoc. Inc. 103-147.
- Heritage, John; Atkinson, J. Maxwell. 1984 [1992]. "Introduction". In Atkinson, John M. (ed.). *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*. 1992 Reprint. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1-15.
- Holmes, Janet. 2000. "Politeness, power and provocation: how humour functions in the workplace". *Discourse Studies*, Vol. 2 (2), 159-185.
- Holmes, Janet. 2006. "Sharing a laugh: Pragmatic aspects of humor and gender in the workplace". *Journal of Pragmatics*. Vol 38, Issue 1 (2006), 26-50.
- Holmes, Janet; Stubbe, Maria. 2003. *Power and politeness in the workplace: a sociolinguistic analysis of talk at work*. Harlow: Pearson Education Ltd.
- Holmes, Janet; Stubbe, Maria; Vine, Bernadette. 1999. "Constructing professional identity: "Doing power" in policy units". In Sarangi, Srikant ; Roberts, Celia (eds.). *Talk, Work and Institutional Order: Discourse in Medical, Mediation and Management Settings*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 351 – 385.
- House, Juliane. 1999. "Misunderstanding in intercultural communication: interactions in English as a lingua franca and the myth of mutual intelligibility". In Gnutzmann, Claus (ed.). *Teaching and Learning English as a Global Language: Native and Non-Native Perspectives*. Tübingen; Stauffenburg Verlag, 73-89.
- Hülmbauer, Cornelia. 2007. "'You moved, aren't?' - The relationship between lexicogrammatical correctness and communicative effectiveness in English as a lingua franca". *VIEWS*. Vol 16/2, (2007), 3-35.

- Hülmbauer, Cornelia; Böhringer, Heike; Seidlhofer, Barbara. 2008. "Introducing English as a lingua franca (ELF): Precursor and partner in intercultural communication". *Synergies Europe*, No.3, 25-36.
- Hutchby, Ian; Wooffitt, Robin. 2008. *Conversation analysis*. (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Polity Press.
- James, Carl. 1998. *Errors in Language Learning and Use*. London, Harlow: Addison Wesley Longman Ltd.
- Jefferson, Gail. 1984. "Notes on the systematic deployment of the acknowledgement tokens 'yeah' and 'hm mm'". In *Papers in Linguistics*, 17, 197-206.
- Jenkins, Jennifer. 2000. *The Phonology of English as an International Language: New Models, New Norms, New Goals*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Johnson, Keith; Johnson, Helen (eds.). 1998. *Encyclopedic Dictionary of Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Kachru, Braj B. 1985. "Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: The English language in the outer circle". In Quirk, Randolph; Widdowson, Henry G. (eds.). *English in the world: Teaching and learning the languages and literatures*. Cambridge : CUP, 11-30.
- Kachru, Braj B. 1992a. "Models for Non-Native Englishes". In Kachru, Braj B. (ed.). *The Other Tongue: English across Cultures*. (2nd ed.). Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 48-74.
- Kachru, Braj B. 1992b. "Meaning in Deviation: Toward Understanding Non-Native English Texts". In Kachru, Braj B. (ed.). *The Other Tongue: English across Cultures*. (2nd ed.). Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 301-326.
- Knapp, Karlfried. 2002. "The fading out of the non-native speaker. Native speaker dominance in lingua-franca-situations". In Knapp, Karlfried; Meierkord, Christiane (eds.). *Lingua Franca Communication*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 217-244.
- Knapp, Karlfried; Meierkord, Christiane (eds.). 2002. *Lingua franca communication*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Labov, William. 1972. *Language in the inner city*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Labov, William. 1972 [1978]. *Sociolinguistic patterns*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Leech, Geoffrey N. 1983. *Principles of pragmatics*. London: Longman.

- Mauranen, Anna; Ranta, Elina (eds.). 2009. *English as a Lingua Franca: Studies and Findings*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- McKay, Sandra Lee. 2002. *Teaching English as an International Language: Rethinking Goals and Approaches*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- McNamara, Tim. 2004. „Language Testing“. In Davies, Alan; Elder, Catherine (eds.). *The handbook of applied linguistics*. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell, 763-783.
- Meierkord, Christiane. 1996. *Englisch als Medium der interkulturellen Kommunikation. Untersuchungen zum non-native-/non-native-speaker-Diskurs*. Frankfurt/Main: Peter Lang GmbH.
- Milroy, Lesley. 1987. *Observing and analysing natural language*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Mufwene, Salikoko S. 1998. „Native speaker, proficient speaker and norms“. In Singh, Rajendra (ed.). *The Native Speaker: Multilingual Perspectives*. London, New Delhi: Sage Publications, 111-123.
- Mulholland, Joan. 1991. *The language of negotiation: a handbook of practical strategies for improving communication*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Murata, Kumiko. 1994. „Intrusive or co-operative? A cross-cultural study of interruption“. *Journal of Pragmatics* (Apr 1994), Vol 21, Issue 4, 385-400.
- Murata, Kumiko. 1995. „Repetitions: a cross-cultural study“. *World Englishes* (1995), Vol 14, No 3, 343-356.
- Nelson, Cecil L. 1992. „My language, your culture: whose communicative competence?“ In Kachru, Braj B. (ed.). *The Other Tongue: English across Cultures*. (2nd ed.). Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 327-339.
- Öberg, Britt-Marie. 1995. *Negotiation processes as talk and interaction: Interaction analyses of informal negotiations*. Linköping, Sweden: Linköping University.
- Pan, Yuling; Wong Scollon, Suzanne; Scollon, Ron. 2002. *Professional communication in international settings*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Pitzl, Marie-Luise. 2010. *English as a lingua franca in international business: Resolving miscommunication and reaching shared understanding*. Saarbrücken: VDM Verlag Dr. Müller AG&Co.KG.
- Poncini, Gina. 2004. *Discursive Strategies in Multicultural Business Meetings*. Berlin: Peter Lang.

- Pullin Stark, Patricia. 2009. "No joke - this is serious! Power, solidarity and humour in business English as a lingua franca (BELF)". In Mauranen, Anna; Ranta, Elina (eds.). *English as a Lingua Franca: Studies and Findings*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 154-177.
- Sacks, Harvey. 1984 [1992]. "Notes on Methodology". In Atkinson, Maxwell J.; Heritage, John (eds.). *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 21-27.
- Sacks, Harvey. 1992. *Lectures on Conversation. Volume I*. Jefferson, Gail (ed.). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Sacks, Harvey; Schegloff, Emanuel; Jefferson, Gail. 1974. "A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation". *Language*, 50, Dec 1974, Vol 50, No 4, Part I, 696-735.
- Seidlhofer, Barbara. 2001. "Closing a conceptual gap: the case for a description of English as a lingua franca". *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*. Volume 11, No. 2, 2001, 133-158.
- Seidlhofer, Barbara. 2002. "The shape of things to come? Some basic questions about English as a lingua franca". In Knapp, Karlfried; Meierkord, Christiane (eds.). *Lingua franca communication*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 269-302.
- Seidlhofer, Barbara. 2005a. "Standard Future or Half-Baked Quackery? Descriptive and Pedagogic Bearings on the Globalisation of English". In Gnutzmann, Claus; Intemann, Frauke (eds.). *The Globalisation of English and the English Language Classroom*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag, 159-173.
- Seidlhofer, Barbara. 2005b. "English as a lingua franca". *ELT Journal*, Volume 59/4, October 2005.
- Seidlhofer, Barbara. 2006. "English as a Lingua Franca in the Expanding Circle: What it Isn't". In Rubdi, Rani; Saraceni, Mario (eds.). *English in the World: Global Rules, Global Roles*. London, New York: Continuum, 40-50.
- Seidlhofer, Barbara; Breiteneder, Angelika; Pitzl, Marie-Luise. 2006. „English as a Lingua Franca in Europe: Challenges for Applied Linguistics“. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*. (2006) 26, 3-34.
- Seidlhofer, Barbara; Jenkins, Jennifer. 2003. "English as a Lingua Franca and the Politics of Property". In Mair, Christian (ed.). *The Politics of English as a World Language: New Horizons in Postcolonial Cultural Studies*. Amsterdam, New York: Rodopi B.V., 139-154.

- Strasser, Thomas. 2004. *The Use of English as a lingua franca in a large Austrian Company*. Vienna: Unpublished M.A. thesis.
- Stubbs, Michael. 1983. *Discourse analysis: The sociolinguistic analysis of natural language*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Tannen, Deborah. 1987a. "Repetition in conversation toward a poetics of talk". *Language* (1987) 63/3, 574-605.
- Tannen, Deborah. 1987b. "Remarks on Discourse and Power". In Kedar, Leah (ed.). *Power through Discourse*. Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Corporation, 3-11.
- Tannen, Deborah. 1994. *Gender and Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Vasseur, Marie-Thérèse; Broeder, Peter; Roberts, Celia. 1996. "Managing understanding from a minority perspective". In Bremer, Katharina; Roberts, Celia; Vasseur, Marie; Simonot, Margaret; Broeder, Peter (eds.). *Achieving understanding: discourse in intercultural encounters*. London: Longman, 65-108.
- Vollstedt, Marina. 2002. "English as lingua for internal company communications". In Knapp, Karlfried; Meierkord, Christiane (eds.). *Lingua franca communication*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 87-107.
- West, Candace; Zimmermann, Don H. 1983. "Small insults: a study of interruptions in cross-sex conversations between unacquainted persons". In Thorne, Barrie; Kramarae, Cheris; Henley, Nancy (eds.). *Language, Gender and Society*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Newsbury House Publishers, 102-117.
- Widdowson, Henry G. 1990. *Aspects of Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Widdowson, Henry G. 1994. "The Ownership of English". *TESOL Quarterly* Volume 28, Spring 1994, 377-389.
- Widdowson, Henry G. 1997. "EIL, ESL, EFL: global issues and local interests". In *World Englishes*. Vol. 16, No. 1, March 1997, 135-148.
- Widdowson, Henry G. 2003. *Defining Issues in English language teaching*. Oxford: OUP.
- Wray, Alison; Bloomer, Aileen. 2006. *Projects in linguistics: a practical guide to researching language*. (2nd ed.). London: Hodder Education

9.1. Electronic Resources

- Arminen, Ilkka. 2005. "Institutional Interaction: Studies of Talk at Work". Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Limited. *Online* <<http://www.uta.fi/~ilkka.arminen/doc/ArminenInstitutionalJuly25th05.pdf>> (14 Jan 2011).
- Crossey, Mark. 2005. "Improving linguistic interoperability". In *NATO and peace-building. NATO Review. Summer 2005*. Brussels: NATO Headquarters. *Online* <<http://www.nato.int/docu/review/2005/issue2/english/contents.html>> (26 Jan 2011).
- Department of Defense. 2005. *Dictionary of military and associated terms*. Joint Publication 1-02. Washington: U.S. Department of Defense. *Online* <[http://www.bits.de/NRANEU/others/jp-doctrine/jp1_02\(05\).pdf](http://www.bits.de/NRANEU/others/jp-doctrine/jp1_02(05).pdf)> (12 Feb 2011).
- 2008. "Effective Army Briefing". In *Military Science II Textbook*. Cincinnati, Ohio: University of Cincinnati. *Online* <http://www.uc.edu/armyrotc/ms2text/MSL_201_L08a_Effective_Army_Briefing.pdf> (30 Jan 2011)
- Graddol, David. 1997 [2000]. *The future of English? A guide to forecasting the popularity of the English language in the 21st century*. London: The British Council. The English Company (UK) Ltd. *Online* <<http://www.britcoun.org/english/enge2000.htm>> (12 Feb 2011)
- Graddol, David. 2006. *English Next: Why global English may mean the end of 'English as a Foreign Language'*. London: The British Council. The English Company (UK) Ltd. *Online* <<http://www.britishcouncil.org/learning-research-english-next.pdf>> (12 Jan 2011)
- Jefferson, Gail. 1986. "Notes on latency in overlap onset". *Human Studies*, 9 (1986), 153-183. *Online* <<http://www.liso.ucsb.edu/Jefferson/Latency.pdf>> (24 January 2011).
- McKeown, Kathleen R. 1984. "Discourse Strategies for Generating Natural-Language Text". New York: Columbia University, *Online* <<http://www.mendeley.com/research/discourse-strategies-for-generating-naturallanguage-text>> (14 Jan 2011)
- NATO. 2006. "Interoperability for joint operations". *NATO Backgrounder*, July 2006. Brussels: NATO Public Diplomacy Division. *Online* <<http://www.nato.int/docu/interoperability/interoperability.pdf>> (04 Jan 2011).

- NATO. 2010a. *NATO Glossary of terms and definitions (English and French)*. AAP-6(2010). Brussels: Office of NATO Terminology Coordination, NATO Standardization Agency (NSA). Online <<http://www.nato.int/docu/stanag/aap006/aap-6-2010.pdf>> (22 Feb 2010).
- NATO. 2010b. *Language Proficiency Levels*. STANAG 6001 NTG (Edition 4). Brussels: NATO Standardization Agency (NSA). Online <<http://www.bilc.forces.gc.ca/stanag/index-eng.asp>> (10 Feb 2010).
- 2009. "Oral Communication Skills for Staff Officers". *English Skills for Staff Officers in Multinational Operations (ESSO)*, Unit 2. National Defense University. Online <<http://www.crmra.ro/ESSO/index.htm>> (25 Jan 2011).
- Seidlhofer, Barbara. 2007. *VOICE (Vienna Oxford International Corpus of English: Mark-up conventions)*. Version 2.1, June 2007. Online <<http://www.univie.ac.at/Anglistik/voice>> (12 Jan 2011).
- U.S. Army Field Manual 101-5. 1997. *Staff Organization and Operations*. Washington DC: HQ Department of the Army. Online <http://www.dtic.mil/doctrine/jel/service_pubs/101_5.pdf> (20 Jan 2011).

DATA A: Meetings A

1 SX-f: does anybody want something to drink (.) water?
2 S5: no thank you
3 S2: no
4 S1: i turn that off. (.) good SO (.) <clears throat (2)> i think (.) please?
5 SX-m:<fast> thank you very much </fast>
6 S1: there is a comfortable seat (.) hm i think you all know (.)
7 you have all met (.) the colonel? (.) and do you all know
8 what he is doing here?
9 S5: a thesis that's as much as i just know
10 SX-m:a thesis yes
11 S1: yeah on the (.) <clears throat (2)> english as the lingua franca of
12 international organisations i think. (3) and looking at HOW
13 non-native english speakers communicate with
14 each other? primarily (.) so <1> hm </1>
15 S2: <1> unfortunately </1> [first name6] is not here
16 SS: @@@@
17 S1: <clears throat (2)> so we are going to be reCORded (.) if everybody
18 does not mind? (1) and hm that will be used then for the study (.)
19 <soft> so. <soft> (2) GOOD
20 S2: only (.) to confirm that on sunday we are sending one platoon
21 to [nameC] (.) the same thing that we did last sunday? e:r (1)
22 the same opportunity (.) erm <to S4> and you have to direct them
23 (.) what else you **you** want or what you NEED from them
24 there </to S4>
25 S4: no need to know (.) it's only my responsibility
26 S2: <to S4> yes but e:r [P7] asked us to send our platoon last sunday
27 (.) and this sunday also </to S4>
28 S4: i was (.) in the morning i was discussing the with (.) e:r
29 commander <1> of </1>
30 S2: <1> <to S4> so you </1> DON'T **you don't** <2> need the </2>
31 <2> we don't </2> need=
32 S2: =the platoon </to S4>
33 S4: because this demonstration so far has not <pvc> confirmed <ipa>
34 /kɒnfɪrmd/ <ipa> </pvc> (.) but for sure we will (.) **we will** (.)
35 stand there. (.) for sure **for sure**
36 S2: i think this **this** demonstration is more quiet than the **the** last one
37 on <3> sunday </3>
38 S4: <3> yeah yes </3> of course
39 S2: the mukthar will be present here?
40 S4: yeah
41 S2: <to S4> so yes (.) how much? people is expected to be
42 there </to S4>
43 S4: mhm so far (.) we have not had <pvc> confirmed <ipa>
44 /kɒnfɪrmd/ <ipa> </pvc> (.) but maybe fifty (1) what police
45 S2: e:r so we are not sending a platoon
46 S4: we are expecting only small.
47 S2: okay (.) **okay**
48 S1: <clears throat (2)> they're on STANDby anyway <4> so erm </4>
49 S2: <4> yes </4> yes yes
50 S1: <clears throat (2)> (3) <to S2> anything else </to S2>
51 S2: from the fourteenth to eighteen of august we are having the BELL
52 on inspection (.) so we can't use for night flights (.) and (1) only
53 for four days (.) that's all i have from <spel> u n </spel> flight?
54 and (.) <to S1> nothing else sir </to S1>
55 S1: <to S2> good thank you. </to S2> (.) <to S3> [nameA] </to S3>
56 S3: in [nameA] we don't have any special problem (.) for **for** us
57 S1: <to S3> thank you </to S3> (.) <soft> okay **okay** </soft>
58 <to S5> [S5] </to S5>
59 S5: <to S1> sir </to S1> three points? erm (.) **sim-** similar change-
60 over key personnel within [nameB] you are referring as the

61 chief of staff from **<spel> t f </spel>** erm in the last three weeks
 62 ALL of the regimental commanders of the **<spel> t f </spel>** and
 63 **<spel> n g </spel>** have changed over within my sector erm (.)
 64 in order to try to influence them (.) er we had a coffee morning
 65 with the **<spel> n g </spel>** commanders on wednesday which
 66 went really well (.) INTERestingly (.) erm (.) the er one of the
 67 commanders used it as an opportunity to talk about two one five?
 68 (.) the isos erm may have come up with which should not have
 69 moved any **(un) xxx (/un)** of getting them removed they are
 70 clearly back in (.) erm (.) but there was an accusation that we
 71 have changed the goal posts in as much that they've repaired the
 72 front of the WALL (.) FILLED IN with what could be FIRE? slits
 73 erm (.) now we? the **<spel> u n </spel>** have changed the goal
 74 posts in terms of demanding the contractor to raise the floor level
 75 (.) i used your name in VAIN to say that this HAS been
 76 communicated quite clearly with the **<spel> n g </spel>** chief
 77 of staff and (.) er that he's aWARE of it (1) we got to the end of it
 78 (.) erm effectively with them admitting that they have made
 79 the mistake in the very first instance several years ago when
 80 they went to the building (.) erm by NOT asking the
 81 **<spel> u n </spel>** if they COULD replace (.) the BUNKer which
 82 was (.) the sand bag bunker which was taken down to another
 83 building to go up (.) so they have lost a position and they
 84 admitted that's their fault (.) they think we're very close to a
 85 solution (.) the contractor comes back in a week's time and WILL
 86 fill in the floor (.) so we are nearly there sir (.) so er we are trying
 87 to influence **<spel> n g </spel>** and **<spel> t f </spel>** coffeering
 88 coming up in about a week's time (.) the FIRE practice sir (.)
 89 second point that you refer to (.) we HAVE (.) my
 90 **<spel> r s m </spel>** has been a complete pain (.) we have done
 91 lots of fire evacuation drills you recall sir (.) in **in** my first
 92 thought of three weeks in **in** tenure i said (.) that my number ONE
 93 concern in **[place37]** was the fire alarm systems within **[place37]**
 94 palace as in FIFTY per cent of the building STILL (.) cannot (.)
 95 you CANNOT hear the fire alarm erm (1) there HAVE been
 96 improvements since we took over so (.) there are now the
 97 over-simplistic stand alone erm smoke detectors (.) and there are
 98 some improvements to the fire alarm SYstem but (.) we still
 99 cant hear it (.) that remains a concern and i put down with **with**
 100 **[last name5]** (.) but is that a **<spel> u n </spel>** thing or not?
 101 (.) or is it a comm thing?
 102 S1: **<to S5>** what? (.) the FIRE alarm? **</to S5>**
 103 S5: WELL it's **it's** investment? that's required sir
 104 to MODernise the fire alarm system
 105 S1: so a **<spel> u n </spel>** responsibility
 106 S5: so i'll continue to **to to** monitor that (.) and i know there is
 107 a meeting next week to look at that. (.) but the point i would like
 108 to make to **to** the other sector commanders sir (.) that (2)
 109 it has been an opportunity for us to REALise that we need
 110 to improve our own drills (.) ODD STANDARD FIRE
 111 EVACUATION drills every one goes out (.) it's dry (.)
 112 as it is a dry run (.) there is no real fire and? (.) tick that one off
 113 erm what we (.) had NOT practiced in the past? (.) was going
 114 back into the building to **to** absolutely hundred per cent verify
 115 there is no one in the building (.) and it happened (.) i think about
 116 three minutes to midnight **<fast>** i was not here (.)
 117 i was on leave **</fast>** erm (.) i've just recommended
 118 a few things (.) if you think it's appropriate that you practice
 119 your drills (1) and you practice how long it takes before
 120 the fire brigade come (.) we couldn't even ring the **the** fire erm (1)
 121 the civilian fire service on the telephones that we had (.)
 122 we couldn't ring on the (.) locking office telephone (.)
 123 we needed the mobile phone to ring one one two or whatever
 124 the number is (.) so we hadn't actually practiced that (.)

125 so on AIRING some dirty laundry in public (.) i think
 126 it's worth saying that (.) it really is worth having a- another look
 127 at your fire procedures (.) so we have improved those (.) and
 128 we improved them SIGNIficantly from **from** the package
 129 we took over from my **pre-** predecessors (.) i thought we were
 130 good (.) we are not as good as i thought (.) we were (.)
 131 we are certainly not as good as we should be (.) so
 132 we are getting better (.) erm a concern sir
 133 S1: the problem on FIRE (.) the POINT that [S5] is making is that on
 134 <spel> u n </spel> internal phones? you cannot ring one one two.
 135 (.) you can ONLY ring one one two on the civilian line. (.)
 136 so you have to have the ACCess number (.) and then
 137 <soft> ring one one two </soft> (.) the SECOND thing is (.)
 138 i don't know whether it was you who told me (.) something that
 139 your junior commanders should check on. (.) people were found
 140 going to BED (.) wearing their IPOD (.) and if they go to bed
 141 wearing their ipod? (.) they cant hear anything
 142 S2: <fast> any alarm </fast>
 143 S1: any alarm (.) that's **that's** so <soft> that's another point. (.)
 144 okay </soft>
 145 S5: <to S1> third one sir (.) not important (.) the INTER-sector (.)
 146 it's a knock out competition that we had on wednesday (.)
 147 it went very well clearly you came along to it (.) so thank you
 148 for that (.) and [nameA] won conVINCINGgly (1) but i think
 149 it was a good fun-day at [nameA] (.)
 150 that's it from me sir </to S1>
 151 S1: <to S5> okay thank you. </to S5>
 152 S4: <to S5> thank you for the nice (.) competition </to S5>
 153 S1: good (.) thank you
 154 S4: thank for the nice day
 155 S1: they enjoyed? it (.) did they?
 156 S4: yeah **yeah** of course yeah it was
 157 S2: good competition
 158 S1: i was SURprised how FEW people there were (.) <soft>
 159 i suppose we can't <5> release </5> too many people. </soft>
 160 to go and watch <soft> that's the problem </soft> (.)
 161 <to S4> do you have anything </to S4>
 162 S2: <5> yeah </5>
 163 S4: <to S1> nothing special sir </to S1>
 164 S1: <to S4> there was quite a lot of ACTivity while you were away?
 165 (.) i'm sure that you have been BRIEFed </to S4> (.) er
 166 the good news yesterday was about the helicopter overflight (.)
 167 you know (.) i actually had an aPOLOgy from the chief of staff (.)
 168 erm (.) he said it was a miSTAKE (.) e:r a procedural mistake. (.)
 169 e:r he said it went up when it got closer. (.) but erm. (1)
 170 FORce commander is still away (.) he's going to be away until (.)
 171 i think his first day in office is the twenty sixth
 172 S2: twenty sixth (.) yes
 173 S1: twenty sixth
 174 S2: yes monday
 175 S1: wednesday=
 176 S2: =wednesday yes
 177 S1: the twenty sixth is a wednesday
 178 S2: on the twenty forth he's flying from [place18] (.)
 179 that is twenty sixth
 180 S1: the chief of mission goes away today? (.) or late tonight
 181 early hours of tomorrow morning. (.) and then
 182 i THINK [last name7] goes away who will be acting
 183 chief of mission <soft> because the (.) erm (.)
 184 </soft> the CHIEF of mission has to be somebody that
 185 is on <spel> u n </spel> contract (.) so when they (1)
 186 that's WHY the force commander is on <spel> u n </spel>
 187 contract not on secondment (.) erm from his government (.)
 188 he is actually <spel> u n </spel> staff member (.) because

189 he is also designated official. (1) so i think there is a GAP of
 190 a couple of days between the time that **[last name7]** goes away
 191 and the force commander comes back. (.) but if you could just
 192 make sure to let me know what's going on. (.) erm <soft> if (.)
 193 you know (.) we have a serious (.) obviously </soft> contact
 194 with chief operations. officer first (1) the (.) erm **[nameE]** forces
 195 are PARTICULARly keen on us (.) erm (.) not allowing people
 196 into the **[place19]** because of the commemorations of the deaths
 197 of **[first name1]** and (1) erm **[first name2]** (.) erm and
 198 general **[first name3]** spoke to **[last name4]** down there about
 199 that. (.) so if you can (.) <soft> you know </soft> (.)
 200 make sure that you have er (.) just over this two week period. (.)
 201 you know (.) more patrols perhaps than you would normally have
 202 in that area (.) spending a little bit more time there (.) erm because
 203 the VANDALism (.) erm by the youth has been (.) i think (.)
 204 has been on increase (.) there has been an increasing activity also
 205 by people on motorbikes and (1) you know (.) general
 206 MISBEHAViour in that area from **[nameD]** and **[nameD]** youths.
 207 (.) so (.)<soft> so </soft> good (.) anything else?
 208 S2: no sir
 209 S4: no sir
 210 S1: good (.) thank you very much gentlemen (.) have a nice weekend

211 S1: this is **[org11]**
 212 SX-m: it's switched on
 213 S1: it's that low
 214 S10: it wont service broadcast
 215 S1: café news
 216 S10: @@@@
 217 SX-m: may i sit
 218 S1: of course (.) <soft> yeah
 219 S2: i think we need both letter that the <spel> o c u n </spel> flight
 220 was receiving in front of letters of protest (.) about(.) er (1)
 221 one overflight (1) over <spel> t k </spel> fifteen (.) in one of
 222 them they refer that there were (.) fourTEEN rounds up
 223 <spel> t k </spel> fifteen (.) with a hughe (1) in another letter
 224 they are saying the same (.) with about (un) xxx (/un)
 225 announcing if they can't recognise the kind of (.) helicopter that
 226 was overflying <spel> t k </spel> fifteen (.) we can help them
 227 with that (.) we are not sure what they are complaining about (.)
 228 but on the other hand i sent a mail <1> to</1>
 229 S1: <1> but </1> we don't fly FOURteen ti <2> mes? </2>
 230 S2: <2> NO </2> NO no sir no that's
 231 S1: <soft> okay </soft>
 232 S2: good it had been reality (.) and i sent i sent a mail to
 233 the three sectors (.) **[first name20]** sent the mail (.) informing
 234 them that in the period of the next two or three weeks
 235 we are not going to fly (.) to overfly <spel> t k </spel> fifteen or
 236 the area of **[place47]** (.) trying to minimise the protest letter that
 237 they are writing EVERY day **EVERY day** in that area only to (.)
 238 to SEE if we have good results or <3> not </3>
 239 S1: <3> mhm </3> <soft> okay thanks </soft>
 240 S2: erm they (.) as i (1) briefed this morning (.) e:r the exercise that
 241 we are having next week (1) we will include one patrol of
 242 **[org12]** (1) to (.) let them work with us (.) and to help them
 243 with some procedures that are not very clear for them
 244 to work with <4> us </4>
 245 S1: <soft> <4> mhm</4>
 246 S2: and to help avoid e:r (1) things happening like on last saturday (1)
 247 because it's unacceptable that they are **are** saying that
 248 they began to check from the last BUS to the first bus (.)
 249 given that you have to allow the first baker to cross (1)

250 at the beginning (.) so (1) that was there was a confusion about
251 that (1) and we are going to SOLve them (.) INTEgrating them (.)
252 in our exer <5> cises </5>
253 S1: <5> good thank </5> you
254 S2: next week. (.) to show them that we can work in joint operations.
255 S1: okay
256 S2: that's all
257 S1: <soft> thank you </soft>
258 S8: today i had a discussion again about two one five (2)
259 **[first name19]** called me on the phone. (.) and er (1)
260 he asked me why we are not removing these containers. (.) and
261 i told him again to the about twentieth time (.) we will remove
262 the containers when the job is done as we have requested. (1)
263 which what is we agreed to close these windows in the wall (.)
264 and it has been done (.) as we asked you to close all holes
265 we can see er (.) this includes those holes in the ground as well (.)
266 so if we have time there (.) you know (.) and it is the same level
267 as the ground level there no problem (.) the **the** whole case is
268 solved for us. (1) er (.) and then he started again (.) it's like
269 **like** talking in a circle (.) it always starts from the beginning
270 again (.) and i said stop (.) i'm not going to talk to you anymore
271 about this (.) it it's supposed to be solved on the lowest **on the**
272 **lowest** level (1) and that's it (1) and later on (.) i met by **by** luck
273 (.) the camels (.) the camel of **[nameB]** (.) captain whatever=
274 S10: **[last name25]**
275 S8: yes and they ask him (.) and he said (.) they were talking to the
276 owner (.) and the owner agreed (1) to fill up those holes (1)
277 **when-** whenever he comes back from his leave (.) you know (.)
278 so he is on holiday for three weeks which means two more weeks
279 now (.) and then will be resolved (1) hopefully.
280 S1: <soft> okay </soft>
281 S8: okay (.) the second point i have is the <spel> u n </spel> flight
282 (1) about half-an-hour later (.) **[first name19]** called me again.
283 (1) and asked me if there is an agreement between
284 <spel> u n </spel> and the republic of **[place22]** about using
285 the corridor (.) er near **[place35]** (.) which is used by our
286 <spel> u n </spel> flight when they go to **[nameC]** (1) and
287 i said i have no idea <fast> i don't know </fast>
288 i have to look into it (.) maybe we find something (.)
289 we have something. (.) i don't know yet (.) so i asked
290 colonel **[first name21]** about it (.) and (1) he does not do either (.)
291 so he will call the <spel> c o u n </spel> flight and
292 they'll find some. (.) and MAYBE (.) i don't know. (.)
293 that's just my idea again (.) e:r maybe they try to give us a hard
294 time in the future because (.) **because** of this two one five
295 business (1) it goes on and on and on (.) they may not allow us
296 to use this corridor anymore (1) because it's very close to
297 their airport their **air-** airfield there (.) in **[place35]** (1) because
298 you remember the poem we heard a few weeks ago (.) during
299 this night flight (1) so maybe (.) i don't know. (.) and i'm afraid
300 (.) we don't have any agreements (.) you know (.) because in the
301 past there were no agreements signed
302 S1: well we'll check that
303 S8: i do never **(un) xx (/un)** agreement maybe=
304 S1: =actually if we don't have that agreement we can't go
305 to **[place26]**
306 S10: we can always use the (.) **[place19]** of course
307 S1: yeah
308 S10: the **[place19]** stops that's why we use the corridor road
309 S8: no **no no** (.) we use the **[place19]** (.) and then we use the
310 **the <spel> s b a </spel>** road going to **[place23]**
311 S1: yeah (.) we can use the <spel> s b a </spel> road
312 S8: so we always can use that corridor (.) but not THIS one
313 near **[place35]** anymore (.) MAYBE

314 S1: i don't think that they'll do that. (.) i mean if they do do that (.)
315 i go and see the chief of staff again.
316 S8: yeah (.) but the situation talking about two one five (.) you know
317 (.) is very tense now (.) you know.
318 S1: TENSE?
319 S8: yes
320 S1: well (.) for a situation to be TENSE (.) you have to have
321 two sides that are feeling tense and i'm NOT feeling tense
322 SS: @@@
323 S8: well there are two sides (.) you know (.) that is **[first name19]**
324 and myself (.) you see
325 SS: @@@@
326 S10: **[first name19]** is feeling tense
327 S1: when DOES **[first name19]** go?
328 S8: er at the end of this month
329 S1: GOOD (.) well
330 S10: problem <6> solved </6>
331 S1: <6> this has </6> been running for a year (.) two weeks will not
332 hurt you (.) is it
333 S2: @@@@
334 S8: no problems
335 S1: you know (.) if you don't have one two five to talk about
336 with **[first name19]** (.) what would you be talking
337 <7> about </7>
338 S8: <7> exactly </7> i fully agree sir with that
339 S2: yes <@> yes maybe history lesson </@>
340 SS: @@@
341 SX: again
342 S1: has he told? you yet what happened between nineteen sixty and
343 nineteen seventy- <8> four </8>
344 S8: <8> not yet </8> not yet
345 S1: history still starts at seventy-four
346 S2: ah yes
347 S8: he's refusing to tell me that (.) he always starts at seventy-four
348 S2: @@@@
349 S1: okay (.) </soft> well we just (.) WHO was it that said erm (.)
350 didn't you report that the **[org5]** said that this is the first time that
351 they stepped down or capitulated in twenty five years.
352 S8: they did (.) i didn't
353 S1: who was it that actually said that
354 S8: **[first name19]**
355 S1: ah he was (.) so this is a **[first name19]**nism
356 S8: well i asked **[first name19]** why did they do that (.)
357 why did he do it (.) you know (.) because of me he said (.)
358 i did it (.) i made them do it
359 S1: he made them do it (.) <soft> okay </soft>
360 S10: general **[first name19]**
361 S1: where is he posted to
362 S8: i don't know (.) he didn't tell me
363 S1: **[place25]** (.) probably
364 S8: <@> e:r </@> (.) i was going to say **[place43]** (.) but
365 he has a different posting whatever it is
366 S1: maybe we'll find him in the ministry of defence
367 S8: intelligence maybe
368 S1: mhm okay (.) SO we are letting **[nameB]** (.) handle it
369 S8: <fast> yes **yes** </fast>
370 S1: and we'll wait until they come back to us <9> and </9>
371 S8: <9> yes </9>
372 S1: <soft> okay </soft>
373 S8: well the OWNER (.) has come and has told me today (.)
374 the owner agreed to it he would have done it (.) already
375 but they went on holidays and september is too short (.)
376 he couldn't do it (.) when he comes back he'll do it
377 S1: <soft> okay that's good </soft>

378 S2: but he has to do this job (.) personally
379 S8: the owner
380 S2: WHY we have to wait three weeks to fill (.) with concretes (.)
381 three holes
382 S8: because the owner is not here
383 S1: but he **he** hasn't got employees?
384 S10: they are all on <10> holiday </10>
385 S8: <10> yes this </10> (.) it's holiday season (.) it's **it's** august (.)
386 it's like (.) **like** the month of HOLIDay in [place22] (.)
387 nobody works (.) you know
388 S2: yes (.) the same here (.) yes i can't understand that the
389 <spel> p i o </spel> is one leave (.) and
390 the <spel> m p i o </spel> is on leave too (.) this
391 S8: gas stations are closed here (.) everything is closed here=
392 S2: =but
393 S1: i can't understand <11> that </11>
394 S2: <11> no </11>
395 S1: the <spel> p i o </spel> (.) is on local LEAVE and
396 didn't come in for the [place39] business
397 S10: yeah (.) the BIGgest press event of the <12> year </12>
398 S1: <12> the biggest </12> press event since [place37]
399 S2: yeah
400 S1: he could have taken another day at the end of the (.) period. (.)
401 <soft> you know </soft> (.) anyway that's (.)
402 there is obviously a reason (.) so (.) GOOD (.) nothing else?
403 S2: no sir
404 S1: erm (.) i had the visit from (.) the chief of staff of (2) the [org9]
405 yesterday (1) erm i invited him to come for an hour (.)
406 we had an office call in here (.) with some coffee (1) and (.)
407 then we went (.) i took him round the airport (1) and then
408 he left. (1) erm during the office call we had the normal chit chat
409 at the beginning (.) he wanted to know where the sword
410 came from (.) you know (.) whose pictures these were. and so (.)
411 much more INFORMal than when we go there (.) but
412 it wasn't me that was informal (.) HE <13>was </13>
413 S2: <13> yeah </13>
414 S1: so it's INTEResting because you take them out of their (.)
415 environment and they become different (.) you know (.)
416 completely different people (.) erm (1) out of the constraints of
417 their (.) you know (.) their military culture (.) SO the
418 relevant things that he said (.) when he was here (.)
419 first of all he said as i said this morning (.) it was a miSTAKE
420 the helicopters flying over our camp in [place26] (.)
421 he said it was people that did not know the procedure that
422 came in for the air sea rescue exercise and (1) you know (.)
423 the staff let him down. basically (.) erm because
424 the people were not briefed that they could not use this airspace
425 (1) he APOLOGised and said it wont happen again (1)
426 as he is leaving (.) erm (.) he said that he wasn't going
427 to answer my letters on (.) as i reported this morning (.)
428 at the (un) xxx (/un) meeting (.) he is not going to answer my
429 letters on restriction of movement (1) erm (.) but he says that he
430 thinks that it wont happen again (.) so i think this is the normal (1)
431 their way of doing business. (.) when they (.) er do what we want
432 (.) they don't reply that they are doing it (.) so they don't
433 use lose FACE (.) you know (.) so he said i'm not replying to
434 your letters but you don't think you find (.) unless it's a mistake
435 (.) there will be no other restriction (1) erm
436 he sent a message from general [last name26] (.) or
437 general [last name26] sent a message (.) erm again reiterating
438 what he said when [first name22] [last name22] and i went to
439 visit him (.) and that was that general [last name26] and
440 the [org9] in the north will NOT be obSTRUCTive (.) towards
441 the peace process (.) while the current peace process is ongoing

442 (1) so (.) i mean it's interesting that he should send the MESsage
443 (.) erm as well as having said the same thing to (.)
444 **to [last name22]** (.) we talked about **[place39]** (.) and i asked
445 him to (.) have a look at the (.) **the** diversion road (.) erm with
446 his engineers and he said he would (.) erm (.) make sure by
447 the time the winter came. (1) that the (.) road had been resurfaced
448 (.) and because of amenities primarily tasked=
449 S2: =<fast> yes </fast>
450 S1: erm (1) he said that erm (1) he had enjoyed working with
451 **[org10]** (.) he thought that our cooperation was GOOD (1) er
452 he LIKed the mature way that we didn't allow things at
453 sector level to be raised to (.) headquarters level (.) and
454 whenever we ever raised an issue to headquarters level (.)
455 it was important enough to do something (.) and
456 we have solved all the problems (.) and (.) you know (.)
457 although they've taken time (.) if you LOOK BACK (.)
458 there almost isn't ANYthing that we haven't solved over
459 the last year (.) i suppose. (1) e:r <spel> c p ms </spel> erm (.)
460 he said that they were looking at them (.) but i don't think
461 they are really interested in <spel> c p ms </spel> (.)
462 you know (.) for all the reasons that we discussed. (.) erm (1)
463 this is not a (.) an arrangement between the (.) you know (.)
464 the **[nameH]** and **[nameG]** (.) it's the **[org9]** and
465 they have their orders and (.) something. (1) erm
466 he also said that in the military zone ones (.) which are (.)
467 you know (.) the **[place19]** er (.) area and er any access area
468 basically to the north (.) he said there wont be any problems
469 with (.) erm (1) cooperation with the peace process. (.) so
470 the military are not going to block what civilians want to do (.)
471 as far as ACcess is concerned in military zone ones (.)
472 and he is obviously referring to **[place33]** <soft> and
473 **[place39]** as well </soft>
474 S2: not (.) he **he** was not referring about **[place37]** palace er (.)
475 **[place37]** palace phase two
476 S1: i didn't talk to him specifically about **[place37]** palace phase two (.)
477 but i DON'T think (.) when we COME to it (.) i don't think
478 <soft> we'll have a big problem for that phase (.)
479 i may be wrong </soft> (.) erm he wanted to (.)
480 the reason i wanted to show him the airport was because
481 i wanted to see what his REACTIon was to various things. (1)
482 erm (.) he WANTED to see the good offices (.) and
483 he wanted to (1) have er (.) you know (.) a photo (.) because
484 he said this might be (.) where the (.) you know (.)
485 the decision was made to have a (.) a solution (.) so
486 he wanted to be (.) you know (.) he obviously wants to be able
487 to show in future that he was part of (.) you know
488 S2: <@> yeah </@>
489 S1: and of course they WILL claim that they are part of
490 the peace process (.) and i think why they are being cooperative
491 at the moment (.) and i think that's why they have left
492 general **[last name26]** here for another year (.) because
493 if it does come off (1) erm then they'll be able to claim that
494 the **[nameE]** peace forces initiative in **[place22]** was (1) you know (.)
495 (.) although having taken a long time (.) was a success (.) erm (.)
496 AND (1) he was interested in the state of the runway as well (.)
497 so they obviously DON'T have the information (.) in their g two
498 whether or not you can land something (.) on the runway and
499 (.) so he was interested in the condition of the **the** runway (.)
500 which i thought was interesting (1) that was it? really (.)
501 i mean it was (.) you know (.) he is very friendly (.)
502 you know him well (.) he is a nice person (.)
503 he served in the <spel> u n </spel> before (.)
504 he knows the (.) er the constraints that we have (.) and
505 the system that we are operating in. (.) you know (.)

506 i don't think FRANKly (.) i don't think they have been HARD
507 on us (1) erm you know (.) we could have had a lot more
508 LETters at the headquarter level (.) you know (.) they could have
509 given us more hassle (.) i mean (.) i think they has very much
510 been (.) erm (.) restricted to sector level **sector level** with all this
511 NOise goes on (.) we have had very little (.) you know (.)
512 troubled relationship apart from <@> **[last name24]** </@>
513 SS: <loud> @@@@ </loud> yes
514 S1: our relationship has been nice you know (.)
515 very amica <14> ble </14>
516 S2: <14> yes yes </14>
517 S1: SO I told him the big message to give his (.) erm successor in his
518 one day handover today (.) was that (.) er they have friends here.
519 (1) you know (.) so and i expect to be able to deal with his
520 successor in the same manner (1) i solve our problems in a (.)
521 you know (.) friendly and professional manner (.) <soft> that
522 was it really </soft>
523 S2: okay sir
524 S1: erm
525 S2: <to S1> so **[last name26]** will be in his position
526 one year more </to S1>
527 S1: yes
528 S2: <to S1> and what about **[last name23]** </to S1>
529 S1: **[last name23]** is er <15> also </15> here for another year.
530 S2: <15> okay </15> okay
531 S1: i DON'T BELIEVE that **[last name23]** is (.) erm all the time
532 quite understanding what **[last name26]** wants
533 S2: maybe
534 S1: yeah i think **[last name26]** is er (.) a different. (2) so (.) i thought
535 it was good really (1) erm we now have a PRETty good
536 relationship with the **[org5]** and the **[org9]** at headquarter level
537 and i think we should do our best to MAINTain it because (.)
538 you know (.) if if we start arguing about something with them (.)
539 we wont get anywhere (.) we will need just to be friendly
540 but firm (.) <16> continue </16> as we are
541 S2: <16> yes </16>
542 S1: let the sectors do <17> that </17>
543 S2: <17> yes </17>
544 S1: with their people along the line and we stay above it (.)
545 the PAREnts looking after the children
546 S2: <@> yes <@>
547 S1: @@ <@> so </@> (.) good (.) chief of mission goes away
548 TODAY (.) or tonight (.) just after midnight (.)
549 **[last name27]** will be in the chair? (.) so don't expect
550 very long <@> working hours. </@> (.) AND
551 the force commander is back on twenty sixth in office=
552 S10: =in office on the twenty sixth=
553 S1: =which is a <18> wednesday </18>
554 S11: <18> wednesday </18> morning he ARRives on the twenty fifth
555 (.) that's he will be not involved
556 S1: and i think **[last name27]** is AWAY just before he comes=
557 S11: =there is a DAY where you have the helms
558 S1: good we see what we can do that day then
559 SS: <loud> @@@@ </loud>
560 S2: i can propose to change the (1) the position of the
561 <spel> h q </spel> (.) we can go to the (.) sector three (.)
562 **[place16]**
563 SS: <loud> @@@@ </loud>
564 SX: sector three
565 S11: sector three **[place16]**
566 S1: <@> sector three **[place16]** </@> that will be nice i think
567 **[S8]** spends quite a lot of time in sector three
568 SS: <loud> @@@@ </loud>
569 S8: NEVER

570 S2: <@ @ @ @ @ sorry </@>
 571 S1: <to S8> i want to know where you get your TAN from </to S8>
 572 S8: because i'm always out in the [place19]
 573 S1: <to S8> i don't believe you </to S8>=
 574 S8: =of course (1) that's why
 575 S1: <to S8> you are not going to get tanned through a TIN roof of
 576 a driver vehicle (.) i don't believe er </to S8> =
 577 S8: =my job is outside? the office you know (.) at least more than
 578 half of it (.) so (.) that's where i get my sun tan from
 579 S1: hands up who <@> believes it </@>
 580 SS: <loud> @ @ @ @ @ </loud>
 581 S1: <@> good </@> okay well (.) have a nice weekend
 582 SX: thank you sir
 583 S1: i don't think we don't have anything major happening so
 584 S2: @ @ <@> yes </@>
 585 S8: i have one question sir (.) before we leave in the afternoon when
 586 you have your city tour [place43] city tour with your guests (.)
 587 do you need the photographer or
 588 S1: mhm (3) <to S8> WHY you're asking me that </to S8>
 589 S8: <to S1> because if you don't need him (.) i will
 590 need him </to S1>
 591 S1: is he at the moment supposed to be coming for the [name9] visit
 592 S8: no (.) he wasn't asked to
 593 S1: he was not asked to
 594 S8: no
 595 S1: i think he should don't you
 596 S2: i don't know if [nameB] handling
 597 S1: the [nameB] have their own photographer
 598 SX: okay
 599 S1: do they?
 600 SX: i don't know
 601 S2: i don't know
 602 S1: <to S8> what do you want to use him for </to S8>
 603 S8: i have to go down to this monument (.) where these three [name3]
 604 were killed (1) because it's it was exactly TODAY (.) exactly
 605 thirty five years ago
 606 S1: on the <19> [place36] </19>
 607 S8: <19> yes </19>
 608 S1: [place36] [place43] road
 609 S8: yes yes
 610 S1: <to S8> er and you are going down? to take a photograph (.) or
 611 you are having a ceremony </to S8>
 612 S8: a small ceremony yes
 613 S1: mhm
 614 S8: so if you don't need him (.) i would ask you to (.) to allow me
 615 to take him
 616 S1: i think we can get [nameB] to take some photographs (.)
 617 you take him
 618 S8: okay thank you
 619 S1: <to S8> and you WRITE this after the [name1] </to S8>
 620 S11: it's already WRITten
 621 S8: it's already written sir
 622 S1: it's already written (1) how do you know that
 623 S11: yes he has written the article that will accompany the photographs
 624 S1: oh REALLY (.) you are just going down to do the photographs
 625 S11: yes i have the orders
 626 S1: ah
 627 S8: he's is doing it for me. (1) he is writing it in a proper english
 628 S1: he's editing
 629 S11: i am the editor and translator
 630 S1: it is interesting for you (.) that's it why i am asking this question
 631 S11: yes
 632 S1: so it's going through the SIEVE
 633 S11: it's getting translated from [name3] english to

634 northern irish english
 635 SS: <loud> @@@@</loud>
 636 S1: @@ <@> okay </@> (.) good (.) yeah that's fine
 637 S8: thank you
 638 S1: i'll ask [**nameB**] to have a photographer (.) good (.)
 639 thank you very much
 640 SX: thank you sir
 641 S8: </to S1> have a nice weekend </to S1>
 642 S1: yeah you too

643 SX-m:it's already on
 644 S1: <soft> okay </soft>
 645 SX-m:yeah
 646 S2: okay sir (.) during the operations meeting (.) er (.) we gave
 647 the operation officer (.) the operational order for the hunting
 648 season that began LAST SUNDAY (.) unfortunately eh [**org12**]
 649 failed to inform in advance us (.) the map with the areas and
 650 the dates for both hunting season the manual major one (.)
 651 e:r this hunting season will last until nineteen of october (.)
 652 that's all the information that we have now
 653 S1: <soft> okay >/SOFT> (.) HOW did [**org12**] FAIL to inform us
 654 S2: because **they they** had give not to us the maps with the different
 655 area that they have received from [**org3**] and (.) er (1) in advance
 656 (.) not AFter the hunting season began
 657 S1: mhm (.) when was **when was** the official start of the
 658 hunting season?
 659 S2: the last SUNDAY
 660 S1: LAST sunday?
 661 S2: yes
 662 S1: so the sixTEENTH
 663 S2: the sixteenth yes
 664 S1: <soft> okay </soft>
 665 S2: mhm (.) something to think of (.) we receive the sound of the
 666 shots very close to the camp so (.) we realised that
 667 the hunting season had begun
 668 S1: mhm (.) were you surPRISED
 669 S2: <@> mhm </@> (.) i woke up early (1) very early er (.)
 670 they began drinking on saturday at five o'clock (.) until
 671 they began shooting at on sunday at five o'clock
 672 or six <1> o'clock</1>
 673 S1: <1> mhm </1>
 674 S2: yeah (.) for that SMALL birds?
 675 S1: but it's not about the birds
 676 S2: <fast> no **no no** </fast>
 677 S1: they like to get dressed up in combat kit (.) get up very early
 678 in the morning (.) go and have coffee (.) then go shooting and
 679 then have a long LUNCH (.) drink lots of ALCOHOL (.) and
 680 then drive home (3) yeah
 681 S2: yes (.) okay sir (.) that's all sir
 682 S1: okay thanks okay <to S3> [**S3**] </to S3>
 683 S3: sir from monday to wednesday we are having a visit from CHILE
 684 (.) one colonel and lieutenant colonel (.) er monday er (.)
 685 fifty thirty we have a meeting with you
 686 S1: mhm good (.) yeah that's fine (.) i've seen that in my diary
 687 S3: yes
 688 S1: is there ANYthing i need? (.) <to S3> could you just SEND ME
 689 erm (.) just the NAMES <2> of </2> </to S3>
 690 S3: <to S1> <2> yeah i </2> will send you </to S1>
 691 S1: and NUMbers of the chileans that you have in sector one or
 692 WHAT their job is (.) so when they come in i'm (.) you know (.)
 693 i can talk about (.) SENSIBly about it
 694 S3: that's all sir

695 S1: <to S3> and the exercise with the <spel> m f r </spel>
696 was alright? </to S3>
697 S3: yes (.) agreed it was (.) very good (.) it was (1) very good for us
698 S1: yeah (.) there was some interesting points that came out of it
699 S3: yes
700 S1: i think (.) [org12] erm (.) have recognised that they need to do
701 more on their (.) personal administration side (.) they turned up
702 for example with no water (.) nothing to EAT
703 S2: no fuel sir
704 S1: no?
705 S2: no fuel
706 S1: no FUEL?
707 S2: one van with no FUEL so (.) almost they had to (.) to PUSH
708 the van (.) because they were in the exercise withOUT fuel
709 S1: <soft> yeah really </soft>
710 S2: yes yes (.) we have to (.) to prepare more exercise to join them (.)
711 i think in that way we will improve all the force not only the
712 military one but (.) we are in a very good standard but (.)
713 we have to join them (.) to avoid the FAILures like in [place33]
714 (.) or that kind of things
715 S1: my for MY (.) my own view is that the problem that we have is (.)
716 that [org12] wants to be the first contact with everybody (.)
717 but [org12] are the SLOWest to <3> react </3>
718 S2: <3> yes </3>
719 S1: and the least prepared (.) so the FACE of [org10] however good
720 the military is (.) is always (1) e:r you know (.) POTENTIALlly
721 damaged by [org12] <4> actions </4>
722 S2: <4> yes </4>
723 S1: so we have to try an- an- and help them improve
724 their (.) standards.
725 S2: the only problem yesterday was the (1) e:r (.) the language barrier
726 (.) with [nameC] mainly (.) and (.) the the comMUNications
727 that we have to improve the system that we use the (.) not only (.)
728 er channel fifteen that is a channel for <5> prime </5>
729 S4: <5> that is </5> a local
730 S2: but this local [place21] we can't use it for ALL the [place19] (.)
731 we need to to find out different options to be communicated
732 during all the exercise
733 S1: WAS IT erm (.) YOU that came to do the <spel> u n p a </spel>
734 duties (2) was it [nameC] that replaced the <spel> m f r </spel>
735 in the <spel> u n p a </spel>
736 S4: mhm (.) no
737 S5: it was us sir
738 S1: it was YOU [nameB] (.) was it (.) okay (.) because i think erm
739 <spel> m f r </spel> could have got away EARLier (.) erm (1)
740 you know we need to look at (.) we need to look probably at (.)
741 an INTERim between [org12] and the <spel> m f r </spel> (.)
742 we probably need to look at the (.) erm (.) the operations of
743 the SECTOR RESERVE
744 S2: <fast> yes </fast>
745 S1: hm because i DON'T think [org12] could HOLD until
746 the <spel> m f r </spel> turned up in [nameA] and [nameC]
747 S2: yes
748 S1: so
749 S2: so to use at the first instance the local reserve
750 S1: yeah
751 S2: and then to wait until <spel> m f r </spel> is coming to (.)
752 yes we are going to
753 S1: yeah i think so (.) but (1) you're the ONLY one with (1)
754 riot control equipment. (.) YOU HAVE IT (.)
755 <to S5> you don't have it [S5] </to S5>
756 S5: yeah
757 S2: [nameA] have (1) the riot control <6> equipment </6>
758 S1: <6> oh really </6>

759 S2: it's not the same that [nameC] has
760 S1: no but they have some (.) and <to S5> you have none </to S5>
761 S5: no we have got some few small shields but
762 not to make (.) a decent capability sir
763 S1: okay (.) so we need to look at THAT
764 S5: yeah
765 S1: i'm thinking particularly with a view to (.) implementation of
766 a settlement (.) you know (.) so we need to look at what
767 **what** we should have (.) even if we don't use that (.) er (.) but
768 we need to look at our capability for that (.) i i THINK also
769 we need to look at (1) erm (.) the (1) whether or not
770 we need helicopter lift (.) for reserve (1) e:r it may be that when
771 we do the implementation planning (.) we need to look at
772 some troop carrying helicopters (.) maybe two or three
773 <spel> m i </spel> eight or (2) what's the big one. (1)
774 <spel> m i </spel> twenty six
775 S2: no **no** but it wont be (.) <spel> m i </spel> eight is for
776 twenty persons so <7> it's enough </7>
777 S1: <7> it's </7> enough=
778 S2: =to deploy one platoon (.) the **situa-** the problem with the
779 <spel> m i </spel> eight is er (.) they can't use the actual helipad
780 that we have (.) they need fifty-five square metres (.) to land this
781 kind of helicopter and there are many places where we CAN'T
782 **we CAN'T** (.) obtain this space in the terrain in the situation
783 on the (.) like is now er (.) for <8> example </8>
784 S1: <8> mhm </8>
785 S2: for example <spel> o p </spel> three <spel> o p </spel> eight (.)
786 we CAN'T <9> make bigger </9> helipad there (.) to **to to**
787 manage with the <spel> m i </spel> eight so
788 S1: <9> yeah </9> but if we are looking at erm (.) LIFTING a reserve
789 (.) we may be looking at different parts of the <9> island </9>
790 S2: <9> yes </9>
791 S1: rather than just the [place19]
792 S2: we have to find firstly and then
793 S1: <soft> okay (.) good (.) </soft> <toS5> [S5] </to S5>
794 S5: no point sir
795 S1: <soft> no okay (.) good </soft>
796 S4: no point sir
797 S1: nothing (.) okay (.) erm what i'm INTENDING doing first the
798 plannings (.) the IMPLementation plannings concerned (.) the
799 erm (1) the coo is working on looking at the moment a reTREAT
800 (.) for the headquarters planning staff to go AWAY (.) for
801 two days (.) erm (1) to complete a planning for (1) erm (.)
802 the implementation of a settlement or no settlement or status quo
803 (.) or (.) so we found that it's not very satisfactory (.) doing our
804 planning HERE (1) because we are DISTURBED the whole time
805 S2: yes (.) er today we have (.) we begin with e:r both
806 <spel> s o </spel> two to think different option (.) i think that (.)
807 er in next wednesday we are having or interrupt the draft (.)
808 to be (.) unless by you sir
809 S1: okay (.) thank you very much
810 S2: because the different points (.) because the different place
811 we can FIND to work (.) may have er facilities that we need (.)
812 computers and (.) connection with the system (.) so
813 we are thinking of two or three different options
814 S1: okay
815 S2: maybe not only one e:r (.) opportunity but (.) er every opportunity
816 that we going now to PLAN (.) er (.) not overcome
817 twenty forty eight hours (.) so we are trying to find the places
818 S1: good okay (.) thank you
819 S2: so we need support for that
820 S1: we do
821 S2: we are going to be in a tent in the middle of the camp (.)
822 we need different support that (.) <10> are </10> necessary

823 for the plannings
824 S1: <10> mhm </10> mhm (.) okay thank you (.) good anything else?
825 S2: no
826 S1: no (.) you have your MEDAL parade <11> on </11>
827 S3: <11> friday </11> six <spel> p m </spel>
828 S1: FRIDAY (.) six <spel> p m </spel> good (.) force commander
829 is BACK (.) so that's no problem
830 S2: eh (.) the senior adviser will be present er on friday or
831 he is on leave
832 S1: he is on leave.
833 S2: and the chief of mission also
834 S1: on leave.
835 S2: so
836 S1: so the force commander IS ACTING chief of mission. (1) yeah (1)
837 yeah (.) so (2) erm what about the **par-** the pool **party** today (.)
838 do you all have TEAMS in (1) water sports or
839 S5: we have got some individuals coming up sir
840 S1: have you
841 S5: i THINK (.) we have not got (.) we have not been asked to provide
842 a SPECIFIC team as such
843 S2: no **no no** <12> i </12>
844 S1: <12> no </12>
845 S2: think it's only individuals i think (.) only individuals
846 they can show up there
847 S1: it's not only for sector
848 S2: <fast> no **no no** </fast>
849 S1: it's just individuals (.) okay (.) but there is TRANSPORT
850 if people want to come is there (3) no
851 S4: they come alone
852 S1: private arrangement
853 S4: yeah
854 S1: okay (.) i think it's mainly for FAMILlies anyway (.) isn't it
855 S2: yes
856 S1: okay good (.) GOOD (.) thank you very much? (.)
857 have a nice weekend?

858 S1: they took the population from [place36] back to the north
859 after the island had been divided (.) i think
860 it was called operation mayflower
861 SX-m: mayflower it was indeed (.) yes
862 S1: that is interesting er (.) he is doing a study into english (.) as
863 the lingua franca of international organisations (.) and
864 is particularly interested in (.) non-native english speakers
865 speaking to each other using english as a common language (.)
866 so please speak UP this afternoon because we are
867 being recorded (1) if anybody objects to being recorded (.)
868 then they can leave now
869 SS: @@@@ @@@@
870 S1: hm good (.) did you see [first name31]
871 S9: no sir
872 S2: we er we have prepared the (.) operation branch (.)
873 **the operation branch** have prepared the briefing for force
874 commander tomorrow (.) so then i will show you (.) er
875 to see what is written there (.) er i will ask [first name32] to (.)
876 give me his presentation before being put in the whole
877 presentation tomorrow for you to see (.) AND well
878 we are working with [first name33] in one of (un) xxx (/un) in
879 [nameB] <spel> o p </spel> eighty-four in the helipad
880 they have there (.) there are some improvement that have to be
881 made and they have (.) have not done since the eleventh of
882 august (.) so now we have the picture i send the picture to
883 the <spel> c o </spel> (.) it is real bad condition the only one

884 that is being operated in **[nameB]** (.) so we are asking er
885 the force engineer to help them but we need the request
886 from **[nameB]** that's all
887 S1: is this farmer actually planting across the top <1> side </1>
888 S9: <1> it looks </1> like so we have to be aware of this and
889 i want to say that it has to be solved by **[org1]** but for sure
890 **[nameB]** has to start to think about it (.) we can improve
891 the helipad (.) if it is for operational reason i think
892 we have to do something too
893 S1: i think we might also have a (.) problem with the farmer
894 S2: yes (.) that's why we need to talk with **[org1]** but
895 we need to discuss with **[nameB]** before (.) that's all sir
896 S8: ah yesterday afternoon i received the expected phone call from
897 the **[org5]** about our <spel> u n </spel> flights (.) and it was
898 quite a serious talk to be honest (.) and it took quite some time (.)
899 he was insisting that we are not allowed to have night flights
900 anymore (.) and i told him we will not agree to that (.) because
901 we have a an existing agreement between <spel> u n </spel>
902 and **[org5]** and we have freedom of movement all over **[place22]**
903 (.) and (.) well went on and on to for almost half an hour (.)
904 he said okay that's enough now he does not talk to me any more
905 (.) he is going to (.) see his chief of staff and tell him what i told
906 (.) that's it why you get paid for that (.) he is talking (1) but
907 two hours later he called me again (.) and he was very calm (.)
908 you know (.) sir he said (.) i was talking to my chief of staff now
909 (.) and you will receive a letter (.) either today in the afternoon
910 or tomorrow early in the morning before this night flight (.)
911 ah (.) and it will be recommended not to fly at night (.) because
912 they are going to have a meeting (.) with different ministers (.)
913 and (1) they will try to coordinate all flights (.) and
914 once everything is coordinated they will tell us (.) and then
915 we can keep on flying but they have not decided yet
916 they have not received the letter from **(un) xx (/un)** so (.) but
917 luckily we do not have to dislike them (.) anyway
918 i will **(un) xx (/un)** so i know about it
919 S1: okay
920 S2: we have to (.) with the proposal with the <spel> u n </spel>
921 flight we have to cancel the flight we can fly (.) we have to
922 cancel the flight that was scheduled for tomorrow night because
923 one problem with the hanger
924 S12: we **we** come to remind some fly hours with us (.) in order to
925 expect a spare part they call this hanger that is a (.) end of the
926 power element erm maybe wait maybe one week or ten day more
927 S1: okay
928 S2: but this hanger is coming from the united state probably
929 next week or the week before after
930 S1: so this part is called the hanger
931 S12: er sorry
932 S1: this part is called the hanger
933 S2: hanger
934 S12: hanger (.) the name of the spare parts
935 S1: the name of the spare part
936 S12: is hanger the name of the spare parts (.) it is a very (.) is
937 a special bearing that connects
938 S1: not to be confused with the hangar
939 S9: no **no** sir (.) is a small part @@
940 S1: good (.) so what about erm should we not get somebody to check
941 with the civil aviation authority what their understanding
942 is separate to the liaison with the **[org5]**
943 S8: we are already talking to the <spell> c o u n </spell> flight and
944 he knows the guy **[last name35]**
945 S1: civil aviation
946 S8: tomorrow he is back and then we'll have a talk to him about this
947 S1: okay good

948 S8: no further point sir
949 S1: okay (.) thank you very much
950 S9: there is one question regarding this invitation from [nameE] side
951 (.) are we going to participate?
952 S1: we are but ONLY the military (.) i asked the senior adviser (.)
953 for his advice (.) and this invitation i have to tell you this (.)
954 is an invitation which has been sent to (.) not everybody
955 but i think we have <2> got </2>
956 S9: <2> all </2> the <spel> v i p's </spel> sir twenty one invitations
957 S1: please don't say that in public (.) the senior adviser has decided
958 that only the military will go (.) so we don't want to advertise
959 this (.) otherwise we have problems (.) but listen to this (2) ah
960 commander of [org8] (.) lieutenant general and missis
961 [first name28] [last name28] request the pleasure of your
962 company at a reception to be held on the occasion of
963 the eighty-seventh anniversary of the victory day and
964 the [nameE] armed forces day on sunday the thirteenth
965 of august between nineteen thirty and twenty one thirty
966 at [place27] officers club (.) <spel> r s v p </spel>
967 by the twenty sixth of august
968 S2: tomorrow
969 S9: tomorrow
970 S1: yes (.) but did you hear on the date of the celebration when
971 S2: thirtieth
972 S1: thirteenth
973 S14: thirteenth (.) it was
974 S1: it is the thirtieth actually
975 SX-m: okay
976 S1: so erm we don't know what the anniversary is but erm
977 S10: <fast> another [nameE] victory </fast>
978 S1: another [nameE] victory so (.) the answer is we can go (.) but
979 only the military (1) i think we went last year
980 S9: yes (.) it was combined with the general's handover
981 for the function
982 S1: yes it was
983 S9: you do remember
984 S1: yes i do so (.) but last year it was not (.) erm the invitation was
985 not erm **the invitation was not** from the general and
986 his wife (1) was it?
987 S9: i think so (.) i think he was the same
988 S1: no i don't think so i have it at home you know (.) i thought
989 that was interesting (.) i may have it wrong (.) in which case
990 it is not so interesting
991 SS: @@
992 S1: okay (.) anything else
993 S10: sir nothing from me thank you
994 S11: sir erm if i can expand a little bit (.) possibly on the context of
995 the invitation there (.) the twenty sixth of august is the [nameE]
996 armed forces day (.) that's the anniversary of the [org9]
997 themselves and victory day which is the thirtieth of august
998 celebrates [nameR]'s victory over [place29] at the end of
999 world war one (.) and the two are traditionally combined
1000 annually into a single parade in north [place43] and (.) which is
1001 on the thirtieth (.) so it will be following from that day of
1002 celebrations (.) also the coo has just asked me at this forum to
1003 expand a little on the forthcoming saint nanus day (.) the
1004 pilgrimage to **to** [place41] just to give you and everyone else here
1005 a little bit of background on the event itself (.) and the event erm
1006 has only erm been taking place now for five years (.) and this
1007 year will be the sixth year which the event will have happened (.)
1008 it's the annual and [nameH] pilgrimage to [place41] and it's
1009 the reciprocal pilgrimage if you like (.) for the erm [nameG]
1010 pilgrimage to the area of the [place33] pocket (.) erm (.)
1011 now erm in two thousand and seven (.) erm the erm

1012 <spel> t r n c </spel> denied a request by the community
1013 of [place32] to access (.) ah the north (.) by the [place39]
1014 crossing for this pilgrimage even though that pilgrimage
1015 had been opened to [nameG] to go to [place33] that year and
1016 therefore (.) erm the erm (.) people who were involved in
1017 the pilgrimage going the long way round and went via [place14]
1018 in their private cars erm to the event (.) last year aGAIN the
1019 [place33] pilgrimage took place and where the [nameE]
1020 <pvc> cypsos </pvc> cypriots were allowed through the
1021 [place39] [place32] crossing and and aGAIN the reciprocal trip
1022 was denied and erm to the [nameH] by the [nameG] side (.)
1023 the main issue that they have erm is (.) er they claim security
1024 concerns (.) because the [place33] pilgrimage when the
1025 [nameG] come there they are contained within a a small pocket
1026 surrounded by <spel> u n </spel> [place19] and
1027 they can't really go anywhere and they're escorted into the
1028 pocket and back again (.) and it's the issue the [nameG] have is
1029 when they say (.) [nameH] go to [place41] they are not contained
1030 or constrained in any way (.) erm but the argument is flawed
1031 because erm they can cross anyway via a different crossing point
1032 so er it is a (.) it is a void argument but that that is their position
1033 er last year (.) the [nameH] were so outraged that the reciprocal
1034 trip had been cancelled (.) they actually cancelled the whole
1035 pilgrimage as an official event and this was right up to er (.)
1036 the this this the representatives the two leaders of both sides sort
1037 of having words at at that level about it (.) this year clearly
1038 we have a diff- different situation with the (.) [place39]
1039 [place32] crossing in that the context of it erm being agreed to
1040 be opened as a crossing point (.) an official crossing point
1041 in the future er may or not be seen to change the (.) the context of
1042 this or (.) so the pressure would be greater on the [org9] to
1043 accept (.) erm this year (.) however they have declined for the
1044 past two years (.) so it would be quite interesting
1045 to see what happens
1046 S1: the reason they have declined last year (.) erm i was told by their
1047 chief of staff (.) was because i am surprised that it's not written (.)
1048 erm when they had the [place33] pilgrimage last year (.)
1049 they did not allow the parents of the servicemen who were
1050 serving in [place33] to cross into [place33] (.) so although
1051 the servicemen who were born in [place22] and doing national
1052 service in [place22] could be considered to be [nameG] (.)
1053 their parents were settlers (.) so they actually took the settlers off
1054 the buses last year (.) and it was an a reprisal for this action that
1055 the [nameE] military did not allow the [place41] pilgrimage go
1056 ahead through the that crossing (.) so as this year they did not
1057 stop anybody going to [place33] including the parents of the
1058 servicemen there (.) er in theory we should not have any problem
1059 with the [place41] pilgrimage
1060 S2: okay
1061 S1: but they did specifically say last year (.) they had done this erm
1062 in you <3> know </3>
1063 S10: <3> right </3> there is no record of that in the re <4> ports </4>
1064 S1: <4> isn't </4> there
1065 S11: from last year (.) but i'll make sure that it goes in for
1066 S1: can you make sure it does
1067 S10: yes
1068 S1: i was actually sat down by colonel [last name29] (.) and
1069 the way they did it (.) they told the civilian administration in
1070 the north that under their **under their** own rules (.) under
1071 the <spel> t r n c's </spel> own rules or laws (.) that
1072 the people were not allowed to pass through military area (.) and
1073 that's how they stopped the civilian side of the house persuading
1074 to allow to go in (1) so (.) it was a direct reprisal of what
1075 they had done

- 1076 S11: okay (.) that's **that's** all i've got sir
1077 S1: good (.) thank you
1078 S2: no **no** more extra point sir
1079 S1: no (.) just waiting for the hanger
1080 S2: hanger?
1081 SS: @@@
1082 S1: this is for the bell (.) because the bell flies at night
1083 S14: so mhm (.) yesterday a patient with light symptoms was
1084 transported from **[place37]** palace to **<spel> u n p </spel>**
1085 S1: why are you smiling
1086 SS: @@
1087 S14: wrong patient (.) and he was isolated in the appointed building
1088 one six one (.) he's getting better (.) so maybe in two three days
1089 he can leave the isolation room (.) and the other point is that
1090 the force medical officer next week will be real busy (.)
1091 we have a training for the medical officers from
1092 various missions military
1093 S1: okay (.) the **the** serviceman that has been isolated (.)
1094 he is not being tested (.) is he?
1095 S14: no not because (.) er **er** following the **recommend-**
1096 **recommendations** of the **<spel> w h o </spel>** the **(un) xx (/un)**
1097 don't test anybody who has **(un) xx (/un)** syndroms (.) except
1098 those who have various **(un) xx (/un)** in their life (.)
1099 **adolec-** small children or those who have chronic disease
1100 S1: so we'll never know if he has
1101 S14: no **no** (.) we only know that in **in** this time of the year usually
1102 people don't get sick because of the flue (.) so he has a good
1103 chance that he was infected by **<spel> h </spel>** one
1104 S1: where did he come from
1105 S14: he is a **a [nameS]** member (.) he is serving in the **[place37]** palace
1106 hotel (.) and he was (.) two or three days ago in **[place16]** (.) but
1107 maybe he was infected in **[place16]** (.) we dont know it
1108 S1: okay **<to S14>** thank you **</S14>**
1109 S14: you're welcome (.) that's all
1110 S13: no point sir
1111 S1: come on
1112 S16: good afternoon (.) we start in **[place33]** pocket (.)
1113 we are doing well (.) actually we have done something like
1114 five hundred metres of the patrol track
1115 S1: how many metres
1116 S16: it's around one thousand two hundred metres (.) but
1117 further we have to make it wider (.) and after this
1118 we have to bring the gravel to (.) **to** make it passable for all
1119 the vehicles (.) not like (.) close to the **[nameE]** camp (1)
1120 we had a restriction of our man yesterday (.) it was (.)
1121 **it was** reported during the morning brief today (.)
1122 they have been trying to go look at this accident and
1123 to provide the baby sitter (.) in uniform
1124 S1: through the same crossing
1125 S16: no **no** (.) they've been going through **[place14]** to
1126 **<spel> o p </spel>** in uniform (.) to **[place26]** (.) actually
1127 my replacement is coming twenty third of september
1128 S1: twenty third of september
1129 S10: can i have his name
1130 S16: it's lieutenant colonel **[last name30]** (.)
1131 **<spel> [last name30] </spel>**
1132 S1: does he have a sense of humour
1133 SS: @@@
1134 S16: you mean like (.) me
1135 SS: @@@
1136 S16: actually i don't know
1137 S1: you don't know
1138 S16: but major **[last name34]** (.) they've been serving together (.)
1139 i mean for a while (.) he was mainly aimed to the maintenance of

1140 the airflots (.) so he's a engineer but he is from the different
1141 S1: <fast> don't tell the [place22] </fast> (.) mail that we have
1142 an aircraft (.) i mean a runway specialist coming
1143 S16: okay
1144 S1: otherwise they will front page news for a week
1145 S16: oh he'll be hidden (.) in our office (.) that's all sir
1146 S1: thank you
1147 SX-m: no point sir
1148 S1: so who is representing the <spel> c p l o </spel> this afternoon
1149 SX-m: no point sir
1150 S11: just be aware the force commander is landing in approximately
1151 thirty five minutes (.) er he will not be in the office
1152 in this afternoon (.) but will be in first thing in the morning (.)
1153 those required to contribute to expanse of brief tomorrow
1154 morning (.) in the morning briefing (.) be aware
1155 the force commander had asked that tomorrow morning's
1156 briefing is an expanded brief to cover the activities of the past
1157 three weeks whilst he has been away (.) i understand to provide
1158 information to the coo and the ops branch do so but just (.) for
1159 everyone else (.) just be prepared when the chief of staff goes
1160 around the room to ask (.) have something that was not included
1161 in the morning brief (.) and you think the **the** force commander
1162 should be made aware of (.) but departments (**un**) **xx** (**un**) (.)
1163 please do so at tomorrow morning's briefing so that he does not
1164 get to hear about it through a third hand source (.)
1165 thank you very much
1166 S1: are you still providing a written agenda
1167 S11: he has a written agenda
1168 S1: erm (.) so tomorrow morning are we going to have the morning
1169 brief (.) and then his return to work brief or (.) we are going
1170 to have one brief
1171 S2: no (.) i think that first the morning briefing (.) and then
1172 the return brief (.) back to work brief
1173 S1: okay (.) and who is presenting
1174 S2: i'll be presenting the operation branch briefing (.) then i think that
1175 er [first name32] and the last one is coming
1176 S1: so <spel> c p l o </spel> and then
1177 SX-m: i talk to <spel> c p l o </spel> after
1178 S1: okay i'll start of (.) and give him an update on the peace process
1179 the so-called (.) and i'll hand over to and so it will be a verbal
1180 S11: <fast> yes (.) that's what is expected </fast>
1181 S1: good (.) any other business
1182 S2: no sir
1183 S8: no further point sir
1184 S12: no point sir
1185 S15: no point sir
1186 S1: i don't have anything from the <spel> s m g's </spel> because
1187 i was not there (.) is there anything that you want to say?
1188 S2: no **no** only what i wrote the other day about our restriction of
1189 movement (.) not to write er protest letters now (.) we have to
1190 wait one or two weeks more (.) then eh something in relation
1191 **in relation** with good offices (.) but they're waiting for
1192 (**un**) **xx** (**un**) to go there to integrate the forecast of events (.) and
1193 they expected er people that is to (**un**) **xx** (**un**) after sorry (.) the
1194 <pvc> pilgrimage {pilgrimage} </pvc> to **ayia**- instead of
1195 being hundred and fifty (.) will be four hundred or five hundred
1196 this year (.) er almost twenty five er mini buses are expected to
1197 go there (.) i (.) told the senior adviser that the military company
1198 is going to escort them through the [place19] (.) that is always the
1199 rule (.) and then [org12] can control or can do what they are
1200 expected to do (.) after the crossing points in [place11] erm (.)
1201 then i think that they will be escorted by <spel> t c p </spel> (.)
1202 we have no information **an**- also we don't have the information
1203 about the exact date of the this event (.) maybe on the first or

1204 second september
 1205 SX-m: no oh nothing
 1206 S1: okay (.) thank you very much

1207 S1: it's the english speakers
 1208 S2: @@@@
 1209 S1: damned britishers (3) are we on?
 1210 SX-m:on
 1211 S1: <soft> good </soft>
 1212 SX-m:thank you
 1213 S1: erm **erm** <clears throat (2)>
 1214 S2: okay sir (.) er with **[nameB]** (.) e:r (.) on the fifth of august
 1215 i received a observed alfa report from the <spel> o p </spel>
 1216 eighty-four (.) the helipad you have there (.) on the eleventh of
 1217 august i sent you (.) the observed alfa report asking you to take
 1218 permission to improve the situation (.) of this helipad (.)
 1219 i am concerned (.) i am inSISTing on the same issue because (.)
 1220 next week we are having a air council (1) security council (1) or
 1221 something like this (.) a meeting where POSSibly
 1222 they will decide to **to** close this helipad <1> and</1>
 1223 S1: <soft> <1> okay </1> </soft>
 1224 S2: and the <spel> o p </spel> eighty-four is the only one helipad
 1225 that is useful in **[nameB]** (1) that's why i'm insisting on the
 1226 <pvc> mainTENance <ipa> ma'teɪnəns <ipa> </pvc> of this
 1227 helipad and i request (.) that this to be made (.) through one
 1228 <spel> i s s </spel> to force engineer to put grade on it and
 1229 to sign dates on that (.) that's only the problem that we are having
 1230 S1: okay
 1231 S2: if **[nameB]** have any kind of problem with (.) the (.) **[org1]**
 1232 branch (.) you have to say yes
 1233 S1: <fast> okay </fast>
 1234 S2: in order to go and speak directly with **[first name8]** or (1)
 1235 **sh-** (.) er **[first name9]**
 1236 S1: okay
 1237 S2: yes but i need (.) the solution of this situation
 1238 S1: okay
 1239 S6: i tell about (1) and answer
 1240 S2: sorry about er i sent twice the request (.) and (.) it's a concern (.)
 1241 it's the only one helipad we can use
 1242 S1: no (.) we MUST retain it (.) we need it
 1243 S6: of course yes (.) on site
 1244 S1: don't worry we don't hold you personally responsible it's just
 1245 S6: <fast> no is not </fast> (1) but i will lend **(un) xx (/un)** (.)
 1246 S1: i will chase that good (.) okay (.) **[nameA]** no points
 1247 S3: no (.) in sector <pvc> nUn <ipa> nUn </ipa> </pvc>
 1248 we have the medal parade
 1249 S1: yeah (1) so the force commander (.) can you just tell us
 1250 what the programme is?
 1251 S3: eh (1) erm
 1252 S2: i think will be
 1253 S1: everybody is seated by what time?
 1254 S3: er (.) quarter to six
 1255 S2: seventeen fifty
 1256 S3: seventeen fifty
 1257 S1: i'm trying to get HIM to speak (.) so that we have some
 1258 recording of him (.) when he becomes the prime minister (.)
 1259 president of **ar-** (.) **[place12]** then we can record his voice from
 1260 S2: @@@@
 1261 S3: seventeen fifty
 1262 S1: seventeen fifty (.) force commander arrives at eighteen hundred
 1263 S3: eighteenth yes
 1264 S1: and then?

1265 S3: e:r
1266 S2: the parade
1267 S3: the paRADE
1268 S2: yeah
1269 S1: and then?
1270 S3: the parade
1271 S1: okay (.) nothing after the parade?
1272 S2: @@<@> yes </@> something to eat and just a little to drink
1273 S3: a little (.) **a little** drink
1274 S1: a little one (.) yeah okay
1275 S3: coke and **and** juice
1276 S2: and water (.) **water** (.) cold <2> water </2>
1277 S3: <2>mineral water </2>
1278 S1: mineral water and bread (.) bread and water (.) okay good (.)
1279 good (.) <to P6> [nameB] </to P6>
1280 S6: erm sir (1) [place21] asked me to mention one thing erm (.)
1281 <spel> c c t v </spel> (.) er the <spel> c t (.) c c t v </spel> is not
1282 working across the sector (.) and it's been flagged up as fault sir
1283 (.) the problem is (.) that the money that is set aside to correct it (.)
1284 well there is two issues (.) first the contract that is in place is
1285 not suitable for doing work that need to be done (.) but
1286 the money required for that to be done has been put into hotel
1287 ten eleven at the moment we believe (.) however the fact is that
1288 we have not **that we have not** got that capability (.) and
1289 we have been reactive regarding the ground (.) to dominate
1290 the ground and (.) **and** we are (.) i think (.) about twenty five
1291 per cent off capability at the moment er (.) it is a significant (.)
1292 concern which er i have been asked to relate
1293 S1: <soft> okay </soft>
1294 S2: twenty five per cent of your capability?
1295 S3: yeah i mean there is (.) **there is** a <3> lot </3>
1296 S1: <3> of >/3> your <spel> c c t v </spel>
1297 S6: of the <spel> c c t v </spel>
1298 S2: now i understand (.) huh
1299 S6: will be back (.) that as an asset it is excellent
1300 S2: <soft> yeah </soft>
1301 S6: and allows us to do a lot more but with it being down (.)
1302 we now replace that with soldiers (.) that's not a problem (.) but
1303 the problem is (1) my guys are having not been reactive to
1304 anything rather than be proactive
1305 S2: yeah
1306 S6: where it's there to assist
1307 S2: yeah
1308 S6: i think it is a (1) previous (**un**) **xx** (/un) it is a (.) **it is a** resource
1309 issue (.) and **and** the priorities have been set
1310 S2: have you sent an <spel> i s s </spel> request?
1311 S6: yes (.) this is (.) **this is** a yes (.) this is a day business (.) but i think
1312 it's actually the best way to (.) have been investigating
1313 (**un**) **xxx** (/un) to adapt
1314 S1: this is a very long-term problem
1315 S6: <fast> agreed sir (.) </fast> agreed
1316 S1: aha (.) you know the contract wasn't SATISfactorily written
1317 S6: agreed
1318 S1: and (.) as you say (.) we get the wrong people (.) there is also
1319 no funding (.) erm also (.) erm when we asked the controller (.)
1320 in [place42] for more <4> money </4>
1321 S6: <4> yeah </4>
1322 S1: erm (.) he said what for? (1) and when we said for the
1323 <spel> c c (.) c c t v </spel> (.) for the over-watch (1)
1324 he said where is your <pvc> compensating {compensatory}
1325 <ipa> kəm'pensətəri </ipa> </pvc> **reduct-** compensatory
1326 reduction in the number of troops
1327 S6: yeah
1328 S1: <@> so </@> @ (.) but anyway (.) can you **can you** have a look

- 1329 (.) at <5> this? </5>
1330 S2: <5> yes </5> of course sir (.) now it's the first notice
1331 about the situation
1332 S1: yeah (.) but we need to <6> press </6> mission support on it
1333 S2: <6> of course </6>
1334 S6: erm **erm** (.) there is a software element to it to be aware of (.)
1335 it's all primed and can be done (.) it's just **it's just** going that
1336 particular (.) i think (.) force is **is** very well=
1337 S1: =either (.) you know from an operation point of view (.) either
1338 we have the capability and it works (.) or we decide not to have
1339 the capability (.) but i don't think we can have the current
1340 <7> situation </7> where it's not working
1341 S2: <7> yes </7> (.) yes of course (.) yes **yes of course**
1342 S6: that's all sir
1343 S1: okay **okay** (.) thank you <to P7> [nameC] </to P7>
1344 S7: sir er today (.) at the morning briefing the (.) [org12]
1345 representative mentioned the road block of [nameC] (.) e:r
1346 first platoon area of responsibility
1347 S1: <soft> mhm </soft>
1348 S7: and she mentioned (.) she (.) had no any information about why (.)
1349 the civilians put the big stones on into the (.) e:r main track (.)
1350 the patrol track (.) i think so this is the reaction (.) this is
1351 the answer (.) step for our decision (.) because of (1) maybe
1352 three approximately three weeks ago (.) the molotov cocktails
1353 issue happened in this area
1354 S1: oh really
1355 S2: <fast> yeah </fast>
1356 S7: and i ordered (1) e:r to control to check all of er information (.)
1357 that's (.) er nearby the patrol track (.) this is the [org11] restricted
1358 area (.) and no entry (.) it was the first er secondly (.) e:r (.)
1359 this that road er which er (.) are er (.) permitted for using er
1360 to the civilians (.) it's okay (.) they are open (.) but ALL OF
1361 OTHER roads we are blocked (.) with barbed wires and some
1362 technical materials (1) because the civilians entering e:r to
1363 the [place19] and er (.) approaching to the other er posts (.)
1364 other side (.) other old **post-** posts (.) and i closed that road (1)
1365 of course (.) our patrols opening (1) and behind them (.) closing
1366 back (.) er that barbed wires (.) er road blocking system (.) and
1367 maybe it was the answer for our e:r (.) step it was a reaction (1)
1368 er (.) the second one (1) i would like **i would like** to report you (.)
1369 e:r the hunting policy had been changed totally (.) e:r er
1370 for the previous time (.) and er from e:r (.) this small hunting
1371 season until er game er time we are (.) we have a NEW policy
1372 (.) ABSOLutely brand new policy
1373 S1: WHO from?
1374 S7: e:r (.) i was informed by the <spel> c o </spel> (.) er i hope
1375 so everybody knows it but i would like to er er=
1376 S1: =no (.) but WHOSE **whose** policy
1377 S7: the policy is=
1378 S1: =no (.) but whose policy (.) the policy of the government of
1379 [place22] (.) the policy of the <spel> u n </spel>
1380 S7: the government **the government** of [place22]
1381 S1: the government of [place22] policy (.) is NEW **is** <8> new </8>
1382 S7: <8> new </8> (.) they regulated the hunting policy (.) NOBODY
1383 **nobody** can entering the <pvc> hed- </pvc> hunting activity to
1384 the [place19] (.) only OUTside (1) of the [place19] they can
1385 hunting BUT er (.) the south part (.) the [nameD] side (.)
1386 could be approaching er not more than THREE hundred metres
1387 (.) er distance
1388 S1: erm
1389 S7: for the ceasefire line and from the north side (.) it's two hundred
1390 metres (.) but INSIDE the [place19] it's ABSOLutely restricted
1391 from this time e:r
1392 S2: <fast> the problem with this is </fast> (.) that the

1393 government has provided a map (.) where are e:r (2) highlighted
1394 the different areas where the people can go to **sh-** (.) go to hunt (.)
1395 S1: mhm
1396 S2: and some of the areas are inside the **[place19]** (.) we know that the
1397 regulation is (.) NO ONE can **sh-** hunt inside the **[place19]** (.) but
1398 the MAPS that we gave to each sector (1) and er with the
1399 operational (.) well (.) last week if you see some of the area
1400 ARE inside the **[place19]** (.) so the people is confused
1401 S1: confused?
1402 S2: they have NO CLEAR policy (.) they are receiving information
1403 from TWO sides that is DIFFERent (.) completely different (1)
1404 that's why we have to be aware that people can enter
1405 S7: erm
1406 S2: they do not have to or they don't need to enter to HUNT inside the
1407 **[place19]** (.) but they CAN enter (.) because **they** (.) **if they** follow
1408 the direction from THEIR government they will see that the areas
1409 are INSIDE the **[place19]** (.) that's why they operating **the green**
1410 (.) **the greens** to point (.) **not to avoid** (.) **to avoid** (.) sorry (.)
1411 the entrance of the people to hunt inside the **[place19]** (.) that is
1412 the situation (.) we know that (1) but is TWO different er
1413 information that the people received (.) we CANT ALLOW
1414 people (.) **enter- entering** the **[place19]** to hunt (1) but is not
1415 what the government is really saying (.) that is the situation sir
1416 S7: this is the SMALL game season (.) e:r approximately twenty
1417 per cent of the hunters (.) twenty twenty five per cent of the
1418 hunters (.) are hunting in this period (.) but the MAIN hunting
1419 season in autumn (.) every day maybe hunting of hunters (.) in the
1420 **[nameC]** area (.) it's TOO MUCH (.) and we cannot (.) er
1421 controlling everybody (.)
1422 S1: erm
1423 S7: and we NEED an ABSolutely CLEAN resolution (.) or **or or** er (.)
1424 information inside (.) is it possible or not?
1425 S2: NO
1426 S1: but you know
1427 S7: and (.) sorry (.) and my suggestion is (1) because we KNOW
1428 it very well (.) and we **we** are in the **[place19]** (.) we can't control
1429 every hunters wearing camouflage er uniform and the weapons (1)
1430 if somebody hunting or shooting in the **[place19]** (.)
1431 MAYBE (1) they are soldiers
1432 S2: yes (.) that's why
1433 S7: and (.) in my opinion we can help US (1) in next step er (1) to
1434 inform er the local people and the municipality via the media (1)
1435 er the newspapers (.) or **or or** some other er way we can find (.)
1436 we need to find to inform the hunters and everybody (.)
1437 the policy was changed (.) and INSIDE the **[place19]** is restricted
1438 (.) and after that we can
1439 S2: the **the** information (.) was er passed through **[org1]** to the
1440 <pvc> **ministry** {**ministry**} <ipa> /mɪnɪstri/ </ipa> </pvc> foreign
1441 affairs in the south (1) everyone in the government knows that
1442 the people is not allowed to go inside **[place19]** to HUNT (.) but
1443 they produce a MAP (.) and again they put the places (.) inside
1444 the **[place19]** (1) they will change
1445 S1: did we ask WHY?
1446 S2: no
1447 S1: did we ask them WHY?
1448 S2: <fast> no **no** </fast>
1449 S1: but we MUST
1450 S2: yes
1451 S1: the problem that they have of course is that (.) i mean (.) in places
1452 where the **[place19]** is seven kilometres wide and have
1453 people living and having all their economic and farming activity
1454 (.) they don't see why (1) you know (.) if you ask people
1455 they can understand why you are not allowing (.) you know (.)
1456 **{S1 gets up and points at a [place22] map on the wall}** hunting

- 1457 here where the opposing forces are close to each other (.) but **but**
 1458 they wont understand why <spel> u n </spel> wont allow
 1459 hunting (.) you know (.) in the middle of a seven kilometre by
 1460 five kilometre area
- 1461 S7: because they have NO ANY information that this is the **[place19]**
 1462 S1: yeah (.) they don't know
 1463 S2: they don't know (.) and we can inform them via the media
 1464 S1: but that's what we have been saying (.) but we have to get the map
 1465 correct first (.) because if they are getting maps saying they can
 1466 hunt in that area (.) then (.) you know (.) they will hunt in that
 1467 area (.) and if they have maps saying they can hunt in that area (.)
 1468 the police are not going to stop them and it should be the police (.)
 1469 it should be a **[org3]** task this
- 1470 S7: have we any chance er for increase the cooperation level (.)
 1471 with the er (.) **the [org1]** for example (.) and IMMEDIAately and
 1472 DIRECTtly we can inform them (.) about the issue (.) and every
 1473 er weekly briefing we can inform and we can (.) of course
 1474 we WANT to get back any of feedback (.) because we have
 1475 no any information about **the the react- reaction** (.)
 1476 what happened after that report?
- 1477 S2: today **[org1]** referred with a map (.) and i'll ask er **[first name10]**
 1478 to (.) inform the authorities in the south (.) if they can do
 1479 something to change that (.) but i was informed that last year (1)
 1480 my <pvc> **pridisisor {predecessor}** <ipa> pridisisər </ipa>
 1481 </pvc> did the same (1) he got in touch with **[org1]** ASKING
 1482 **[org1]** to contact the government (.) to ask them not to include
 1483 places to hunt inside the **[place19]**
- 1484 S1: erm
 1485 S2: this year they produced **almo- almost** the same map (.) because
 1486 in the area of (.) <9> sorry </9> **in the area of [place33]** (.)
 1487 and er **[place32]** (.) they e:r (2) **they** take off places that were
 1488 er previously in that area allowed to hunt **to hunt** (1) yes
 1489 in that area (.) they CHANGE the policy (.) but not in the other
 1490 parts of the **[place19]** (.) so i have to ask there again
- 1491 S1: <9> **mhm** </9> (4) okay (.) we need to FOLLow that
 1492 S2: yeah
 1493 S1: okay
 1494 S2: thank you
- 1495 S7: sir (.) the other one information (.) e:r we got er (.) report about
 1496 the **[place51]** road construction er
 1497 S2: <fast> **[place51]**? </fast>
 1498 S7: **[place51]** road er construction is continuing (.) and as the former
 1499 <spel> c o </spel> of **[nameC]** (.) **pre-** pre-indicated er this road
 1500 er will cover by asphalt at the autumn of this year (.) maybe
 1501 at the end of september october and the this road is er e:r (.)
 1502 half part of this road is inside the **[place19]**
- 1503 S2: <fast> okay </fast>
 1504 S7: and of course it will be used by the civilians (.) e:r and (.) er
 1505 this is just an information now
- 1506 S2: but **but** you know (.) if they have the authorisation by the
 1507 <spel> u n </spel> to make this road (.) the improvement
 1508 this road
- 1509 S7: er (.) no i have no
 1510 S2: <soft> okay i will ask </soft>
 1511 S7: er i have no information (.) and last but not least
 1512 S1: so (.) WHERE does your information come from?
 1513 S7: erm also er the operational officer (.) captain **[last name11]**
 1514 informed me (.) er i don't know where this information came from
 1515 S2: i will ask er **[first name12]** (.) and then i will ask **[org1]**
 1516 S1: okay **okay**
- 1517 S7: last but not least (.) e:r (.) against the <spel> h 1 n 1 </spel> e:r (.)
 1518 influenza (.) i as **i** reported (.) er i ordered **some** (.) i made **some**
 1519 regulations (.) er which were given by myself er at fifteenth of
 1520 july (.) and i have (.) i would like to inform (.) i had cancelled

1521 this regulations fifteen of august (1) er it was restricted the
1522 **[nameK]** soldiers to visiting in the **[place16]** **[place44]** and
1523 **[place46]** er nightclubs and discos and so and so (.) er i
1524 cancelled this (.) er regulation er fifteenth of <10> august </10>
1525 (.) thank you sir (.) i finished
1526 S1: <10> okay </10> (2) night clubs?
1527 S7: night clubs
1528 S2: @@@
1529 S7: discos
1530 S1: right (.) because cabarets are off limits (.) out of bounds to
1531 <spel> u n </spel> personnel (.) you know this
1532 S7: yes of course **of course** (.) we are never visiting (.) just some
1533 times for the control
1534 S2: @@@@
1535 S1: yes (.) you are being <@> recorded here **[P7]** </@>
1536 S7: yeah
1537 S1: @@@
1538 S17: nothing else sir
1539 S1: good okay (1) <to S17> well we look forward to seeing you back
1540 here in September? </to S17>
1541 S17: thank you very much sir
1542 S1: originally one of <11> your </11>
1543 S2: <11> duty officers </11>
1544 S1: duty officers
1545 S2: yes i was telling him that i read his efficiency report (.)
1546 that i have in my computer
1547 S1: oh really
1548 S2: yes of course
1549 S1: and it said NOT RECOMmended for further
1550 <spel> u n </spel> <@> service </@> @@
1551 S7: not exactly
1552 S2: <fast> no **no no** </fast>
1553 S1: okay (.) good (.) anything else any (1) good (.)
1554 have a good week end (.)
1555 i hope your parade goes well tonight
1556 S3: okay
1557 S1: thank you very much

DATA B: Meetings B

1 O1: good morning (.) <1> everybody</1>
2 O5: <1> good morning </1> sir
3 O6: good morning sir
4 OX-m:good morning sir
5 O1: we starts the ops meeting as USUally? (.) first of all
6 i would like to (1) express my thanks to the [nameA] for the
7 pilgrimage which <soft> one was </soft> (1) last saturday
8 and [nameC] demonstration (.) the chief of staff mentioned
9 something about er (.) the public (.) **the public media <to O5>**
10 <2> have you </2>
11 O5: <2> yes </2>
12 O1: you underSTAND </to O5>
13 O5: <fast> yes **yes yes** </fast>
14 O1: <to O5> are you familiar with this article (.) which was
15 <3> in the</3> </to O5>
16 O5: <fast> <3> **yes i read** </3> </fast> about this thousand bikers
17 in the [place23] which was surprise for US (.) yes (.) because
18 <4> we </4>
19 O1: <4> **which** </4> was not THIS sunday but the sunday before (.)
20 and it was a publication from [nameE] <5> **side**</5> that
21 O5: <5> **only** </5>
22 O1: that sunday (.) and they mentioned that about the [place22] tour
23 through this battle into the [place19] it was (.) the <6> **reason** </6>
24 O5: <fast> <6> **on the fire** </6> </fast>
25 O1: of the fire so they put together (.) the EVENTS (.) but this events
26 were in the different sundays (1) but anyway they find out
27 something for their newspaper
28 O5: that's the problem of media (.) you know
29 O1: yes **yes** (.) <soft> interesting </soft> (1)
30 okay let's start with the sectors (1) and we have=
31 O3: =in [nameA] it's all quiet <clears throat (2)> (.) next week we have a (1)
32 visit from [nameL] officers i can see the (.) send them here
33 to part of our [nameL] contingent (.) and i think it's on the (.)
34 THURSDay er twenty first (.) and **wha-** (.) we have the (.)
35 **the** exercise with the (.) <spel> **m f r** </spel> and the
36 <spel> **f m c** </spel> (.) eh and (1) i think we are going
37 to make it <7> **on**</7>
38 OX-m:<7> **wednesday** </7>
39 O3: wednesday (.) but there is nothing more on [nameA]
40 it's all QUIET (3) <soft> nothing else </soft>
41 O1: <to O4> [nameB] </to O4>
42 O4: [nameB] erm (.) the isok containers are back
43 at <spel> **n g** </spel> two one five (1) erm (.) next week we have
44 a (.) visit from our general officer commanding theatre troops
45 which is a three star (1) er that will be for two days (1)
46 apart from that it's all quiet in [nameB]
47 O1: and <to O4> this **this** afternoon you have a visitor (.)
48 **[first nameD] [last nameD]** </to O4>
49 O4: yeah **yeah** (.) <soft> that's right </soft> (1)
50 three star equivalent (.) yeah
51 O1: <to O4> anything else </to O4>
52 O4: no [nameB] is quiet (.) thank you
53 O1: and there it was there demolitions?
54 O4: <to O1> demolitions? </to O1>
55 O1: by <spel> **t f** </spel> not (.) it was maybe in [nameA] (1)
56 next to the [nameB]
57 O4: the demolitions?
58 O1: i think that (.) when was it (.) it was a (1)
59 the [org9] blew up (.) the old ammunition
60 O4: <soft> no </soft>
61 O1: no?

62 O4: <soft> no </soft>
63 O1: it was this week
64 O4: it wasn't
65 O3: two
66 O4: <fast> it wasn't in [nameB] </fast>
67 O3: two days (.) two days ago
68 O4: it wasn't in [nameB]
69 O1: two days ago (.) yes
70 O4: <to O1> in [nameB] no </to O1>
71 O1: yes (.) <@> but one of </@> the sectors (.) it was almost
72 on the boundary=
73 O3: =is in the er (.) is in the front the
74 <spel> u n o p </spel> forty five
75 O1: mhm (.) it was was outside the [place19]=
76 O3: = <fast> OUTside (.) yes yes </fast>
77 O1: yes <@> yes of course </@> @@@
78 O3: i was thinking the last (.) the <8> last </8>
79 O1: <8> <fast> <@> it was </8> surprise </@> </fast>
80 O3: event was the demolition (.) of the mines
81 OX-m:[nameB] joc com has sent this information
82 O4: [nameB] sent information (2) i've heard nothing about
83 O1: so nothing special (.) <9> so </9>
84 O4: <9> no </9> (.) nothing special
85 O1: okay (1) thank you (.) <to O6> [O6] </to O6>
86 O6: [nameC] (.) last sunday demonstration next sunday
87 let's say (1) peace protest (.) so is <10> a sunday </10> as
88 it was reported previous it was the biggest er demonstration
89 in the [place23] (.) but e:r last two years (.) the biggest one
90 is postponed for the september maybe due to the weather
91 conditions as well (1) and so for sunday we don't need assistance
92 <spel> m f r </spel> will be just there (.) covering by the (.)
93 obser- standing patrols in the area and if something (.)
94 i don't believe something will happen (.) but we'll have there
95 full reserve platoon in the twenty minutes ready to move (1)
96 so (2) tell you before and (.) as other sectors we are going
97 to participate on the (.) combine exercise yeap
98 O1: <to O6> <10> next sunday </10> (8) oh i see </to O6>
99 O6: and er (.) demining activities close to <spel> o p </spel> niner
100 one continued (.) continue (.) and e:r (2) er (.)
101 there is no impact on our tasks (.) that's all
102 O1: <soft> okay </soft> <to O6> thank you
103 </to O6> (.) <11> no FLIGHT? </11>
104 O8: <11> just </11> just to remind you sure but for the next week (.)
105 we'll be out of service about two days due to technical inspection (.)
106 we'll start the MONday (.) and i think it's a will be better (.)
107 THURSDay i think is finished technical inspection (.) maybe the
108 (1) maybe FRIday (.) e:r (.) we'll be okay for for flights (1)
109 we have just two hughes for the next week
110 O1: <soft> okay (.) i hope </soft> that we don't need (.) bell
111 but (1) you know then visitors are <12> coming @@ </12>
112 O8: <12> @@@ </12> @@ it's okay
113 O1: they (.) they would like to fly with that
114 OX-m:<soft> get a bicycle </soft>
115 O1: we don't have any scheduled (.) visitors by this time
116 O8: <soft> okay </soft>
117 O1: okay
118 O8: okay <to O1> no point sir </to O1>
119 OX-m:no point sir
120 O1: no point? (.) thanks
121 O3: erm last night around one <spel> a m </spel> i receive a phone
122 call from [org3] liaison officer (.) that in [nameA] near [place45]
123 village (1) e:r (1) there were illegal immigrations transferred from
124 one side to the another (.) and they just inform us that
125 they will enter [place19] (.) with with civilian car (1) and trying

126 to catch third person who was involved (.) and they succeed
127 to do that (1) that means that they arrest three people (.) and
128 er also they found in one of the cars two iraqi children (1)
129 and they'll send all the information to us during the morning (1)
130 that's all (2) and they didn't need our assistance (.) because
131 they wanted to react promptly and (1) didn't have time to wait
132 O1: <soft> okay </soft>
133 O9: from <spel> u n m p </spel> no points
134 O1: <to O9> no flight or else </to O9>
135 O9: we were busy last week just ordinary duties (.) and shifts (.) so (.)
136 we are dealing with accidents and stuff like that nothing important
137 O1: <to O9> you had any accident extraordinary
138 checking speed checks </to O9>
139 O9: well (.) several speed checks but (1) yeah (.) we were advised (.)
140 we have to be friendly SO (.) we are trying to be (.)
141 one never knows (.) there are SIGNS speed check everywhere (.)
142 so (.) we have to be careful (.) one never knows
143 OO: @@@@
144 O1: <to O9> thank you </to O9> (.) <to O11> duty officer </to O11>
145 O11: duty officer (.) always is <@> alert </@> <13> @@@@ </13>
146 O1: <soft> yes </soft>
147 O11: <13> @@@@ </13>
148 O7: the overall programme next week will be a quiet week in sector (.)
149 er three and [nameC] there won't be programme at all (.)
150 [nameA] two days one (.) one area each day (1) and (1)
151 this monday there was a (.) short delay in the programme in
152 [nameB] (1) the patrol was not on the meeting point er
153 at the meeting time (.) so the [nameE] inspector called me (.)
154 called the joc and <clears throat (2)> (.) with a short delay they started (.)
155 the programme so everything was okay (.) i would like to
156 to ask the assistance of the (.) of the [org12] because
157 we would like to fumigate [place38] station on monday (1)
158 monday nine o'clock (.) about nine o'clock (.) and (1)
159 it would be great that the patrol would be there at the station
160 O3: <to O7> what station </to O7>
161 O7: [place38] station in [place31] (.) [place31] area (.) nine o'clock
162 monday (.) monday nine o'clock (1) the fumigation takes (.)
163 THIRty minutes one hour
164 O3: <soft> okay </soft>
165 O7: thank you (2) that's all
166 O1: that's all (1) i receive the sectors orbat (1) yesterday (.) thank you
167 (.) but the [nameM] <spel> s o </spel> personal ask me about this
168 the total number of (1) in [nameB] because if he in his OPInion
169 [nameB] has one hundred and ninety six
170 O4: no we don't
171 O1: yes (1) no
172 O4: we have two hundred and forty
173 O1: <14> maybe </14>
174 O4: <14> it was </14> two hundred forty two
175 O1: maybe he will inform you (.) but this is something (.)
176 misinformation in that (.) manpower
177 O4: in our in our mounting order (.) we're we're eligible for
178 two hundred and forty places (1) that was reduced from
179 two hundred and forty two from (.) the previous regiment (1)
180 so two hundred forty is what we have got
181 O1: mhm
182 O4: i don't know
183 O1: and the next rotation also (.) two hundred ten maybe he was (1)
184 he cut it from the budget er the <@> budget is </@> @@
185 O4: if he wants to send us home (.) we go HOME @@@ (.)
186 i volunTEER (.) we go <15> <@> home </@> @@ </15>
187 O1: <15> @@@ </15> @@ i don't know it is his his business (1)
188 so flying flying hours we have (.) a little bit shortage
189 in the flying hours because of the (.) training in the last month and

190 i would like to ask the <spel> m f r </spel> to keep one flight
191 per week (.) because you know (.) but we can provide for you
192 the bell with just six for six passengers (1) because
193 we have thirty five hours extra (1) from july (1) and
194 we have to reduce it (.) but not the last TWO weeks (1) but
195 step by step (.) and [nameA] also you have eight hours extra but
196 (1) i don't think that we must cut overflights but maybe
197 TWO three hours per month and by the end of the day (1)
198 we'll reach (.) the same

199 O3: okay

200 O1: okay (.) have you received the letter from (.) coo (.) coo's letter
201 about <spel> t k </spel> fifteen and

202 OO: <fast> yes **yes** </fast>

203 O1: because [nameA] and [nameB] is involved in the photograph (.)
204 taking photos (.) it must be considered most sector (.) because (1)
205 to be honest it was [org12] patrols who use the **photo-**
206 photo-cameras twice or three times in [nameC] (.) and
207 we had protest against it from the <spel> n g </spel> side and
208 from the <spel> t f </spel> side as well (.) so (1)
209 the <spel> u n </spel> flight must be more careful (.)
210 and passengers also

211 O4: <to O1> are we still allowed to give authority to our guys
212 to take photos </to O1>

213 O8: yes (.) if ordered it's no PROblem (.) but it was not ordered
214 O1: but they

215 O4: <to O1> as a sector we can give the orders
216 we want our guys to take photos (.) or does it have to come
217 from <spel> h q </spel> </to O1>

218 O1: <to O4> no (.) in the pax manifest **the pax manifest** i think
219 [nameB] has twice per week air photo task
220 that is no <16> **problem** </16> </to O4>

221 O4: <16> **i'm happy** </16>

222 O1: but these guys didn't have permission for this (.) and
223 the biggest problem was that they took some photographs
224 next to the <spel> t k </spel> fifteen (.) which is now
225 very hot point (.) and [nameE] forces protested
226 four five <17> **times** </17>

227 O5: <17> **maybe** </17> SIX (.) er by the way on the (.) tuesday
228 i made a flight in the [nameC] and specially we tried to (.)
229 recognise with the [org9] what is the OVERflight what they
230 SUPpose is the overflight (.) so we made (.) excuse me (.) e:r (1)
231 the <spel> t k </spel> fifteen is round here so we made a big
232 circle over the one two six (.) over the [place47] (.) and then back
233 in this e:r route (.) and after they protested again (.) so it looks
234 like <@> everybody </@> is the [nameE] territory yes
235 so what is the next step (.) er yesterday there was a meeting
236 between <spel> l os </spel> and molos (1) and they decided
237 to make a <spel> c o </spel> level meeting in the [nameC] to
238 clarify this (1) by the way they still state on the coo letter that
239 this is the <spel> u n </spel> area and we're using it like
240 the <spel> u n </spel> territory (1) but to avoid this tension and
241 the provocation (.) we had a meeting (.) with the (1) er
242 commanding officer of er [nameG] security forces and after (.)
243 there is a suggestion for the (.) three <spel> c os </spel> meeting
244 (.) and (.) the [org9] (.) [nameC] commanding officer and unified
245 commanding officer sometime in september so (.) and
246 i believe we'll (1) clear (.) but in any time when we NEED to
247 confirm (.) there is a violation of something over the
248 <spel> t k </spel> fifteen (.) **over the <spel> t k </spel> fifteen**

249 O1: yes (.) because we consider (.) <18> **that** </18> this
250 **this** letter from nineteen eighty-seven yes

251 O5: <18> **yes** </18> yes yeah **yeah**

252 O1: but they show all this (.) [org9] consider (.) yes (.) but we don't
253 use the ground (.) but we can use the airspace next to this

254 <spel> t k </spel> fifteen so (.) this is our opinion (1)
255 they have different (.) but that's THEIR <@> problem yes </@>
256 O5: it's very impolite
257 OX-m:<soft> fair firm and friendly </soft>
258 O1: okay (.) first (.) next week [first nameB] starts (.) is starting
259 his handover takeover because [first nameC] is here (.)
260 he arrived (1) but the official day start handover takeover on
261 monday and [first nameB] is leaving the next friday (.) i think
262 that his last (.) last working day last friday (.) LAST ops meeting
263 should be chaired by him (1) <@> or maybe </@>
264 it will be chaired by [first nameC] (.) because
265 i'm going home tomorrow so (.) for three weeks
266 OX-m:injury time
267 O1: if something happens you can call [first nameC] or [first nameB]
268 (.) or maybe (.) <@> the coo </@> (1) okay any other questions?
269 OX-m:no
270 O1: nothing thank you (.) have a nice weekend
271 OX-m:you too
272 O4: can i have a look where this demo is supposed to happen

273 O2: i'll spend NEXT week with [nameB] (.) if it's alright with you
274 the week after that (.) i'll spend with [nameA] not all week but (.)
275 i'll focus on [nameA] and the week after that (.) which begins
276 the seventh of september i'll visit [nameC] (.) if it takes me
277 LONGER (.) then i'm not going to rush it (.) so
278 we might slip the timings (.) i don't think i'll need too much from
279 the flight (.) apart of getting out to the edge of [nameA] and
280 maybe to the edge of [nameC] (.) but i don't want to go up in too
281 many more helicopters if i can avoid it (1) unless i'm allowed to
282 sit in the front (.) that should be fine (.) can i ask you all to
283 introduce YOURSELVES (.) and an- then state what
284 the regular agenda is (.) because as i said i don't have one
285 O3: major [O3] [O3/last] from [nameA] i'm the operations officer er
286 it's (.) my FIRST (.) time in the <spel> u n </spel> (.) also
287 my first mission abroad e:r (2) i'm staff officer (1) and i came
288 from [place12] (.) there i'm two <spel> i c </spel> of a (.) infantry
289 mechanised regiment (.) i was the trainings <18> officer </18>
290 O2: <18> second in </18> command
291 O3: the second in command of my regiment (.) i be here for
292 five MONTHS e:r and twenty eight days i'm <19> leaving </19>
293 OX: <19> @@@@ </19>
294 O2: six months still
295 O3: it was a great experience and surely different (1) i don't know
296 O2: thank you that was fine (.) that's good enough (.)
297 i've got to know you all anyway [first nameE]
298 i know you already [O10] (.) do you know [first nameE]
299 O10: no
300 O4: i'm the ops officer from [nameB]
301 O10: oh okay yeah
302 O4: <to O10> i speak to you
303 after this <20> chat round </20> </to O10>
304 OX: <20> @@@@ </20>
305 O5: i'm captain [O5] [O5/last] [nameC]
306 O2: right
307 O5: from [place49] in [org11] er (.) i at home (.) i'm surely (.)
308 i'm working (.) i work in the air traffic control cent-
309 right
310 O5: yes previous i spent eleven years in special forces regiment
311 as company and a staff officer
312 O2: right
313 O5: and this is my second mission (.) i before i was in [place28] height
314 in [place50] and [place30] and (.) i'll finish in september

315 <21> i believe </21>
316 OX: <21> @@@@ </21>
317 O2: okay (.) ONE how long have you been here for
318 O5: this is my eleventh month
319 O2: eleventh month (.) okay you are ready to go home (.) and
320 WHEN were you in [place28]
321 O5: er i was in two thousand two thousand three
322 O2: it was quiet?
323 O5: this was quiet time yes **yes**
324 O2: okay erm (.) i know
325 O8: i am air operation officer of <spel> u n </spel> flight (.)
326 i'm captain [O8] [O8/last] is my name (.) i'm er pilot of medicaid
327 pilots e:r (.) i'm stay here since january (.) from the next january is
328 one year (.) e:r i was before that (.) in antarctic er
329 O2: do you have family (.) do you have FAMILY
330 O8: yeah (.) more things
331 O2: they like the <22> antarctic </22>
332 OX: <22> @@@ </22>
333 O8: but er
334 O2: is your family here
335 O8: yeah
336 O2: in [place43]?
337 O8: is leaving the next week from [place12]
338 O2: right (.) good (.) happy?
339 O11: my name is captain [O11] [O11/last] (.) i am from [name3] navy
340 (.) i'm naval officer er of [nameI] navy (.) er this is my second
341 month in the mission (.) my first er time in <spel> u n </spel>
342 operations (.) er i will be here for one year (.) so (.) er i am
343 duty officer number three on the <spel> j a q </spel> (.) and i (.)
344 i'm in the navy since nineteen ninety-three
345 O2: good (1) thank you [O10]
346 O10: i'm [O10] [O10/last] (.) i've taken over the unmo position from
347 the mad irishman (.) and who finished last week (.) and erm (.)
348 i've been here since may (.) and i am here to following may (.)
349 i've been a police officer since nineteen ninety-five (.) and
350 i'm part of the [nameJ] federal police (.) erm and back home (.)
351 this is basically what i do (.) we are part of an international
352 deployment group (.) so we're just deployed in different missions
353 around the world
354 O2: keeps the family on its toes (.) good what RANK (.)
355 **what RANK** are you
356 O10: mhm (.) here staff sergeant (.) but back home we don't have rank
357 (.) we are federal agents
358 O2: okay (.) do you actually wear civilian clothes normally
359 O10: yeah **yeah**
360 O9: i am major [O9] [O9/last] (.) i'm two <spel> i c </spel>
361 <spel> f m p o </spel> er this is my first mission here (.) and
362 i'm just finishing first year (.) which is the last month
363 for <23> me</23>
364 O2: <23> yeah </23>
365 O9: so i hope (.) <@> maybe next time </@> i'll (.) be deployed
366 maybe (.) somewhere else i don't know
367 O2: good
368 O9: so
369 O2: you have always been military police
370 O9: no (.) i have been with the military police since nineteen
371 ninety-six (.) and since then i went through all the positions from
372 the crime scene technician staff (.) basically as <spel> i b </spel>
373 (.) section so (.) before that i was graduated from (.) anti-aircraft
374 defence missile system (.) so i served with anti-aircraft defence
375 <24> brigade </24>
376 O2: <24> yeah </24>
377 O9: as a technician staff radar stations tuning repairs (.) everything
378 and activity like that

379 O2: good
380 O9: so i changed my mind (.) and i'm a policeman now (.)
381 i do bad things <25> to peoples </25>
382 OX: <25> @@@@ </25>
383 O2: <25> @@ </25> <@> don't say </@> that here (.) so
384 O12: my name is captain [O12] [O12/last] (.) e:r (.) here in [org10]
385 mission i'm on position of military public information officer
386 at <spel> p i o </spel> office (.) so concerning my military
387 background (.) i was promoted e:r (.) in the year two thousand
388 in the branch of nuclear biological and chemical defence
389 O2: right
390 O12: so i served several positions (.) the platoon company e:r
391 at <spel> n b c </spel> battalion in [place49] (.) and after that (.)
392 i served at er (.) e: r the staff er of land forces in [place49] and
393 after that at verification centre
394 O2: right
395 O12: so it is very interesting job for <26> me </26>
396 O2: <26> yeah </26> (.) for HOW long have you been here?
397 O12: er three and half year years (.) er HERE (.) sorry my position
398 is two years
399 O2: two years and you have FAMILY with you?
400 O12: of <27> course </27>
401 OO: <27> @@@@ </27>
402 O2: and you live in [place43]
403 O12: yeah i'm living close to <spel> u n p a </spel> [place17] area
404 if you know it (.) it's maybe the half journey between [place37]
405 and <spel> u n p a </spel>
406 O2: any problems?
407 OX-m: give us the address
408 O12: no problems i enjoy it yeah
409 OO: when is the PARTY any PARTY barbeque
410 O12: not yet (.) because my family (.) actually i have er almost two
411 years old daughter (.) and they are now in [place49] during
412 this hottest period
413 O2: very good idea (.) my little baby is very hot at the moment
414 O12: how old is it
415 O2: eight months
416 O12: @ <@> so enjoy it </@> @@ i know what
417 <@> about i'm </@> talking
418 O2: yeah (.) i think you better fill him in
419 O12: no no no (.) not bad thing
420 O2: sorry
421 O7: i am captain [O7] [O7/last] force hygiene officer (.) i serve
422 in the [nameK] defence forces since two thousand two (.)
423 i'm physician (.) er this is my second mission (.) first mission was
424 in in [place48] peninsula [place24] (.) multinational forces
425 and <28> observers </28>
426 O2: <28> right </28> (.) with the <spel> u n </spel>?
427 O7: no this is a separate mission
428 O2: right
429 O7: this is not <spel> u n </spel> nato not the <spel> e u </spel> (.)
430 i'm here since last year <29> september </29>
431 O2: <29> yeah </29>
432 O7: and i'll stay until next year march
433 O2: so that's eighteen months
434 O7: yeah eighteen months
435 O2: and you have FAMILY here in [place43]
436 O7: yes in [place17] area not far from here
437 O2: what do you spend most of your time doing?
438 O7: sorry
439 O2: what do you spend most of your time doing
440 O7: my my most important tasks are water and food safety
441 O2: right
442 O7: so this task coordinating the anti malaria control programme is just

443 one of my tasks
 444 O2: you test the BOREHOLES (.) the water
 445 O7: er mainly potable water (.) **potable water**
 446 all the camps <spel> o p's </spel>and the kitchens
 447 plus the overflue
 448 O2: and the WASHing facilities and everything else
 449 O7: the **washin-** washing facilities not very (.) and the kitchens
 450 O2: <fast> the kitchens and the water </fast>
 451 O7: yeah the kitchens and water
 452 O2: keeps you very busy or is it quite quiet
 453 O7: yeah **yeah**
 454 O2: honestly?
 455 O7: <30> really </30>
 456 OX: <30> @@@@ </30>
 457 O2: what's the FIRST thing that normally happens on the agenda (.)
 458 do we normally go round on some of last week whatever=
 459 O5: =we've got
 460 O2: and then for the week ahead (.) okay (.) anything from last week
 461 O3: no (.) this week was really quiet just in the exercises yesterday (.)
 462 and (1) last sunday started the hunting season
 463 O2: <fast> yeah </fast>
 464 O3: **(un) xxx (/un)** notice (.) we weren't aware then (.) because we (.)
 465 hunting season frago (.) i talked with lieutenant colonel and
 466 he told me he is going to send one
 467 O2: yeah
 468 O3: er (.) well (.) this is the most **most** important thing (.)
 469 it's really quiet <31> in </31>
 470 O2: <31> okay </31>
 471 O3: this time of the year
 472 O2: on the HUNTING season the **[org12]** erm have ownership for
 473 the frago for that (.) which just gives some very lose directions to
 474 what to do when you come across (.) what we expect everybody
 475 to do (.) i have a copy of a map because we're dealing with some
 476 translations on it (.) which shows the dates if the ops officers or
 477 anyone else is interested (.) and want to have a look at that later (.)
 478 you issued to the game wardens
 479 OX-m:yeah
 480 O2: game wardens
 481 O10: the game wardens in the different sectors should have copies of
 482 those maps if they have any trouble
 483 O2: yes
 484 O3: the same places that the previous year
 485 O2: so if you have any problems with the MAPS get back to us

 486 O4: it will be about construction with erm sunshades
 487 but that is it <32> this </32>
 488 O2: <fast> <32> which </32> side civilian </fast>
 489 O4: er no <spel> n g </spel> (.) eh both sides <spel> n g </spel> and
 490 <spel> t f </spel> put up sunshades
 491 O2: alright
 492 O4: erm there is new recruits from both sides (.) in and around
 493 the battalions (.) so they are finding their feet (.)
 494 there is nothing (.) it's quiet
 495 O2: <fast> okay </fast>
 496 O5: in **[nameC]** this sunday it has been announced (.) erm
 497 peaceful protest of meeting in the **[place23]** cultural centre
 498 O2: yeah
 499 O5: we deployed one (.) sector reserve platoon just for case
 500 if some intruders (.) but there were no incidents there and
 501 the whole thing was quiet and we heard today more renounced
 502 meetings during the <@> weekends </@>
 503 O2: okay
 504 O5: that's all
 505 O2: anything from the flight?

506 O8: NOTHING (.) just the normal scale for the next week
507 O2: how's the flight (.) is there much light this morning
508 O8: yeah (.) it's fine
509 O2: there was lots of smoke last night
510 O8: i think it's finished
511 O2: there was a BIG FIRE last night (.) north of (.)
512 between [place43] <33> and </33>
513 OO: <fast> <33> [place34] </33> </fast>
514 O2: just this side **this side** of the mountains (.) which we didn't help
515 in the end (.) but we might (.) **we might** have done
516 O11: nothing sir (.) nothing from the duty officer
517 O2: no (.) okay [10]
518 O10: nothing further other than with the (.) **the** hunting i believe
519 [first nameF] is (.) working on a frago (.) you know
520 O2: yes he's got a frago (.) he has got the military input (.) i think
521 he's just fringing off for signature (.) erm if you have any
522 questions in the meantime (.) get in touch with us or **get in**
523 **touch with** me (.) the bottom line is (.) that if you avoid
524 confrontation but be going careful about by the way we do it (.)
525 make sure we get [org12] in but i'm glad that [org12] aren't armed
526 (.) but they don't have any body armour or helmet (.) so
527 they may get in touch with the [nameD] police (.) so
528 if there is any approach (.) **if there is any approach** to hunters (.)
529 i would rather it was from the military side rather than
530 the police side (.) with the police in the background erm
531 O3: no (.) the point is (.) last saturday
532 O2: <fast> yeah </fast>
533 O3: i went to the village and (1) about twenty <spel> p m </spel> (1)
534 we saw some guys (.) with some military clothes
535 O2: yeah
536 O3: yeah hunters (.) big belly drops (.) drinking beer and but (.) er
537 firing (.) some start shooting but it was surprise shooting
538 so (.) i think the problem is that they are possibly drunk
539 O2: yeah
540 O3: they spend their nights drinking beer (.) and
541 are with shotguns and <34> so </34>
542 O2: <34> okay </34>
543 O3: it's not easy to go to them and tell (.) okay let's go (.)
544 **let's go** out with us
545 O2: if it's not safe (.) don't do
546 O3: they were very **very** polite (.) but didn't know what did happen
547 O2: you balance between the risk <35> and </35>
548 O3: <35> yes </35>
549 O2: what's going to happen (.) we can always back off (.)
550 anything else from the last week
551 O9: from the <spel> f m p </spel> point of view it was quiet
552 **quiet** week for us (.) a lot traffic collisions (.) just one escort
553 for tacticals in sector
554 O2: yeah was that a collision
555 O9: no be tactical just several collisions before (.) you know (.) small
556 **small** things just dents and scratches nothing serious (.)
557 nobody got injured (.) i hope so
558 O2: alright
559 O9: so there is hunting season (.) so we've started to advise peoples
560 civilians?
561 O9: no **no** military (.) it's hunting season for us you <36> know </36>
562 OO: <36> @@@@ </36>
563 O9: <@> okay (.) no **no** </@> i'm joking (.) but it's mug out time
564 so (.) people are all having parties
565 O2: yeah **yeah**
566 O9: just remind people that drink driving is illegal
567 O2: yeah (.) do you have any campaign for that (1) posters?
568 O9: hm it's on the table of our (.) **ha-** having unofficial here
569 somewhere (.) we are chasing it (1) we hope so

570 O2: okay
571 O9: we are not very <37> popular thanks </37>
572 OO: <37> @@@@ </37>
573 O2: do you work out of the office (.) the same information office (.)
574 as the (.) **the** civilian
575 O12: public information office actually (.) there are only two military
576 persons (.) me and force photographer (.) and from
577 <spel> p i o </spel> side i have only one point (.) er one request
578 (.) we are working on preparation of next two months issue of
579 blue beret magazine (.) maybe you've heard about <38> it </38>
580 O2: <38> yeah </38>
581 O12: so i like to ask you to take a picture from (.) the detail portrait (.)
582 and to <39> mail </39>
583 O2: <fast> <39> for me </39> </fast>
584 O12: for <40> you </40>
585 O2: <40> okay </40>
586 O12: and to write a very short (.) personal background
587 O2: very short?
588 O12: no it's up <41> to you </41>
589 O2: <41> how </41> many WORDS do you want?
590 O12: nobody knows it
591 O2: COME and SEE me later
592 O12: five hundred
593 OO: <@> copy </@> @@@
594 O12: it's half page maybe half <42> page </42>
595 O2: <42> come </42> and see me later
596 O12: yeah
597 O2: or send me an email (.) tell me (.) **tell me** what you want
598 O7: okay (.) so the programme (.) the anti malarial programme is
599 actually a civilian programme which is coordinated
600 by the <spel> u n </spel> in the <43> [place19] </43>
601 O2: <43> yeah </43>
602 O7: and that means that <spel> u n </spel> provide the escort patrols
603 (.) to the treated areas (.) and both sides provide the workers (.)
604 the manpower (.) so they are civilian workers (.) going to
605 the [place19] (.) and they also provide the chemicals (.)
606 which they use for <44> treatment </44>
607 O2: <44> yeah </44> okay
608 O7: **treatment** of the areas (.) the programme starts usually april and
609 it finishes in **in** october (.) when the temperature is warm enough
610 for the mosquitoes to breed and (.) **and** the <45> areas </45>
611 O2: <45> can i ask </45> quiet please (.) can i ask QUIET PLEASE
612 O7: some areas stay dry as usual in the summer period and (.)
613 in six weeks periods (.) because of the two sides use
614 different kind of chemicals (.) every six weeks
615 a new period start <46> again </46>
616 O2: <46> okay </46>
617 O7: next week will be the first week of the six week
618 <47> period </47>
619 O2: <47> yeah </47> okay so you keep re-treating the same places
620 O7: yeah
621 O2: every six weeks
622 O7: yeah every two weeks (.) **every two weeks** or three weeks (.)
623 sometime two weeks sometime three weeks (.) the next week
624 will be a busy week after (.) **after** that (.) this week which is
625 a quiet week (.) **next week will be a busy week everywhere**
626 O2: do you have any problems getting the escorts that you need
627 O7: yeah (.) they arrive sometimes late (.) from the <spel> u n </spel>
628 side sometimes (.) there is some delay (.) going to
629 the meeting points (.) then they contact <48> me </48>
630 O2: <48> alright </48> okay
631 O7: the [nameE] or the [nameH] inspectors (.) **inspectors** erm (.)
632 but on the north side (.) er the problem is that in [nameA]
633 they don't have suitable cars to go into the mountains and

634 they would like to use <spel> u n </spel> cars
635 which is not allo <49> wed </49>
636 O2: <fast> <49> okay yeah </49> yeah </fast>
637 O7: we are not allowed this issue because of injuries like that (.)
638 in [nameC] usually (un) xx (/un)
639 O2: can you let me know next week
640 O7: <fast> yes </fast>
641 O2: WHEN and WHERE you have problems with the escorts
642 O7: okay
643 O2: there is no problems with the escorts (.) otherwise we'll find out
644 O7: actually we have programme for the whole <50> season </50>
645 O2: <50> yeah </50>
646 O7: but every week on on a thursday (.) i send everybody the next
647 week programme **the next week programme** of the areas
648 with the meeting points (.) with the meeting times
649 O2: okay (.) i'm sure there is problems with the [nameN] and
650 the [nameO] turning up late or turning early as well erm (.) but
651 O7: <fast> mhm usually </fast> usual- we only have programme
652 problem in [nameA] (.) usually [nameB] and [nameC] are okay
653 O2: okay
654 O7: <51> sometimes </51>
655 O2: <51> just for </51> the hills it's difficult to get around
656 O7: yeah (.) sometimes they are not waiting for the patrol (.)
657 they are just going to the [place19] (.) they do the treatment and
658 then they leave <52> which is </52>
659 O2: <52> okay </52> that's okay (.) no problem
660 O3: no (.) just is the normal thing
661 O2: it's the way it is
662 O3: we send a patrol (.) they are waiting and waiting
663 prepare and <53> going </53>
664 O2: <53> they </53> are going a different way
665 O3: yes **yes** they are going to spray
666 O2: if the spraying is done (.) that's fine
667 O3: yes <54> and </54>
668 O2: <54> if the </54> spraying does not get done because
669 we've made a mistake then (.) we try to avoid that
670 O3: and also on our escort (.) because they (.) **they** working
671 the fire breakers from <spel> o p </spel> twenty five to (.)
672 and erm [place14]
673 O2: are they clearing the fire breaks?
674 O3: yes (.) we are conducting two kinds of escorts
675 O2: yeah
676 O3: i think the difference is (.) that the (.) in the case of the fire
677 breakers (.) they started at <spel> o p </spel> twenty FIVE (.)
678 they are leading fire break with the (.)
679 O2: yeah
680 O3: heavy machine in some place and start from there (.)
681 so there is no problem to find them (.) not really (.)
682 anti malaria is (.) it's most compli <55> cated </55>
683 OX: <55> @@@ </55> @@
684 O2: okay no problem (.) er in the next week erm next SUNDAY
685 there should be a **a** parade in north [place43] (.) for armed forces
686 day and (.) VICTORY day in [place22] which should be next
687 sunday erm should not affect anyone really (.) but there will be
688 roads closed in north [place43] (.) and we've got world peace day
689 (.) erm we are not sure what we are going to do for that (.) but
690 you're aware about [first nameE] is it (.) and
691 then is the saint nanas day pilgrimage (.) we are not sure where
692 that's going to BE (.) were you on the brief this morning?
693 O3: yes
694 O2: so usually on the first or the second of september (.) but
695 this year the first and the second is in the middle of the week (.) so
696 it might be one of the weekends either side (.) they TRIED
697 to use the [place39] crossing last year (.) erm i think

698 they were allowed to use it eventually (.) but they had to take
699 a roundabout route to get there (.) what's going to happen this year
700 (.) i don't know (.) and they go to **[place41]** (1) and i'm sure
701 **[org1]** will be in touch (.) when they **when they** find out (.)
702 we'll see **(un) xx (/un)** be aware about (.) but has
703 anyone got anything else for the coming week or any other point
704 OX-m:no **no**
705 O2: no (.) no operations coming up?
706 OX-m:no (.) no points sir
707 O2: no LOVELY (.) thank you very MUCH for coming in? (.)
708 thank you for introducing yourselves (.)
709 i hope you have everything

710 OO: good morning
711 O2: why (.) WHY do i get the plastic chair?
712 OO: @@@@
713 O2: </@> who did that? </@> (.) alright (.) erm through all three
714 sector (1) that's all for me (.) anyone from <spel> m f r </spel>
715 O5: two <spel> i c </spel> is on er leave
716 O2: <spel> u n </spel> flight (.) officer <spel> m p i o </spel>?
717 O5: he's on a leave as far i know
718 O2: what does it stand for?
719 O5: name?
720 O2: what does it stand for?
721 O5: he is on a leave
722 O2: what does it mean (.) <spel> m p i o </spel>?
723 O5: press information officer
724 O2: press information (.) eh yeah
725 OX-m:public information officer
726 O2: the camelot
727 OO: the camelot is on leave
728 O2: on leave
729 O5: the (.) austrian guy
730 OO: yes
731 O5: sorry i have to go
732 OO: @@@@
733 O2: two <spel> i c f m p </spel> (.) <spel> s o </spel> two pol plans
734 **[org12]** <spel> l o </spel> yes the force hygiene officer (1) yes (.)
735 right without any further ado we go round the room anything
736 from this week (1) <to O3> apart from preparing for
737 your medals parade </to O3>
738 O3: yes (1) medal parade this afterNOON (1) for next week e:r (.)
739 most important is the (.) pilgrimage to **[place41]**
740 O2: yeah
741 O3: our duty is to (.) provide escort and ensure the crossing (1)
742 will proceed from the south to **(un) xx (/un)** point (.) e:r
743 O2: <to O3> they are saying that there are two MASses (.)
744 in **[place41]** </to O3>
745 O3: yes (.) one in the morning and the other in the evening (.) but
746 we don't know (1) if people (1) will stay to both (1)
747 just only one morning <56> so </56>
748 O2: <56> right </56>
749 O3: we don't KNOW when this (1) task (.) will finish
750 O2: will **[org12]** (.) will **[org12]** tell you what is required (.)
751 how this is going to work
752 O10: erm the escort (.) will be ar <57> ranged </57>
753 O2: <57> right </57> (.) okay but it could start quite early
754 (.) i understand
755 O3: yes (.) at six o'clock (.) because the mass starts on (1)
756 seven thirty (.) so (2) <58> it's </58> likely to **(un) xx (/un)**
757 six <spel> p m </spel>
758 O2: <58> okay </58> <to O3> anything else? </to O3>

759 O3: no (1) it's all coordinated with the (.) [org12] in [nameA]
760 O2: good (.) <to O3> i was going to come down to your medals
761 parade tonight (1) but my daughter has chickenpox </to O3>
762 O3: <soft> oh okay </soft>
763 O2: so i have a problem (.) unfortunately (.) i can't make it
764 O3: okay
765 O2: <to O4> [nameB] </to O4>
766 O4: it's all quiet (.) erm (1) the only thing on horizon is
767 the world peace day on the first
768 O2: right
769 O4: erm (.) no problems with that (.) this **this** email has been
770 thrown out at the moment (.) questioning who is
771 taking (**un**) **xx** (**/un**) on the entire <59> thing </59>
772 O2: <59> okay </59>
773 O4: my understanding is (.) it is an [org12] or [org6] lead (.) and
774 we'll be there if you require us and provide the back of it
775 if something went wrong (.) but the paper i've got (1) from (1)
776 states categorically (1) erm overall operation responsibility rest
777 with the <spel> **u n** </spel> military (.) for the duration
778 of the event
779 O2: where did that come from?
780 O4: this is from a (.) e:r the chief of [org1] officer (.) i've seen
781 an email from [first nameA] [last nameA] saying why
782 we haven't been involved (.) so we haven't been involved either
783 (.) this just jumped <60>on </60> dropped on our face
784 O2: <60> okay </60> (2) [org1] has not dropped on us either
785 (.) alright
786 O3: so for the moment my understanding is we'll do as we normally
787 do (.) which is provide the (.) er (1) the <spel> **q r f** </spel> and
788 the medical facility if things should go wrong and
789 we keep a low profile and stay out completely if we could (1)
790 and let them (**un**) **xx** (**/un**) [org6]
791 O2: so that will be in the [place19]
792 O4: <soft> yeah </soft> (.) i guess is going to be erm (.)
793 by [last nameG] (.) but nothing has come by my desk with
794 any details or planning (.) so (1) if we can
795 O2: the FIRST question will be (.) why (.) it's on **on** this side of
796 the **buf-** (.) of the ceasefire line isn't it?
797 O4: you see (.) it's the same as [nameE] and [nameD]
798 <61> speakers </61>
799 O2: <61> [nameE] </61> and [nameD] speakers are going to be there
800 O4: so (.) to me that's going to be in the [place19]
801 O2: yeah
802 O4: and there is talk of (.) erm (.) a platform being set up
803 for a small concert
804 O2: right
805 O4: that could be on the [nameD] side (.) or it could be in [place20] (.)
806 on the football pitch (.) or it could be on the crossing (.) so
807 at the moment i don't know (1) nothing **nothing** has come passed
808 me at all (.) and this is the first i've seen of it
809 O2: right (.) is the football pitch on the north?
810 O4: no it's in the [place19]
811 O10: no it's in the [place19]
812 O2: it's in the [place19]
813 O4: yeah it's is a (.) local green (.) the local football team use it (.)
814 civil use area
815 O2: so what privacy have the [org3] in the [place19]
816 O4: none
817 O10: none
818 O2: <to O10> so it's YOUR privacy </to O10>
819 O10: yeah we've been (.) **we've been** bypassed in the planning
820 for this as well
821 O2: okay (.) HOW are we going to find more information about it
822 O4: i was hoping to find a [org7] guy today i'll speak to the [org7]

823 O2: you're going to speak to your **[org7]**
824 O4: and er find out (.) but (.) this is the situation at the moment (.)
825 it seems that both of us have been completely bypassed
826 O2: right
827 O4: its plan's been hatched
828 O10: and **[org3]** don't know anything about either
829 O4: yeah (.) so <soft> but so </soft> (.) if you (.) you know
830 could speak the erm <spel> h q's </spel> **[org7]** (.) and
831 find out what's going off
832 O2: i speak to **[org7]** about it next time i see him
833 O4: and (.) er
834 O2: do you think it's going to be a problem (.) probably not (.)
835 we get the information from the ground
836 O4: <soft> it's just </soft>
837 O10: it's basically a candlelight feature i think (1)
838 they're expecting it to be erm
839 O2: but obviously it could also interfere with traffic across
840 the call sign
841 O4: it's **it's** just me planning for (.) if there was an answer
842 O2: there is not going to be an answer
843 O4: no something medical (.) i don't know (.) an accident
844 something like that
845 O2: okay
846 O4: stage collapse (.) and we can come in provide the people
847 to pull it out (.) it's just a case i like to know where it's going on
848 O2: yeah that's the first priority where
849 O4: <fast> so then we can </fast> (.) come ourselves can come up
850 with some contingent
851 O2: presumably it's best not going back to **to [org1]** (.)
852 <to O4> it's probably best just going to your guys </O4>
853 O4: **[org1]** are people
854 O2: yeah (.) the yeah
855 O4: so they have all the contacts of this
856 O10: **[org6]** know about it (.) don't they?
857 O4: honestly i've to speak to him
858 O10: i thought **[first nameG]** knew something about
859 O4: i'll grab **[first nameG]**
860 O2: <to O4> if you have a problem come back to me (.) and
861 perhaps you can send me an email or some note how
862 we can do this a little bit </to O4>
863 O4: <soft> yeah </soft> (.) erm apart from that (.)
864 all quiet on er (.) **[nameB]** front
865 O2: i'm going out (.) this morning into
866 O4: <spel> h q </spel> (.) again so much (.) similar to west
867 just the rural area
868 O2: okay (.) i'm going out on the streets on MONday
869 O4: <soft> on monday (.) yeah (2) okay </soft>
870 O2: and i think the only day that i can come to **[nameA]** (.) next week
871 (.) is TUESday
872 O3: <soft> okay </soft>
873 O2: <to O8> do you know what the flights are looking like on tuesday
874 (.) at the moment </to O8>
875 O8: tuesday?
876 O2: tuesday
877 O8: <soft> next week </soft> (8) we have four flight on tuesday
878 next week
879 O2: right
880 O8: **[nameA]** two **two** flight (.) **[nameC]** (.) one **[nameA]** (.)
881 one **[nameB]**
882 O2: okay (.) will i be able to get to <spel> o p </spel> eight (.)
883 that's what i need to get <62>to </62> (.) will i be able to go
884 in the morning on tuesday
885 O8: <62>yes </62>
886 O2: <to O8> okay (.) do i have to book it (1) or

887 do i need talk to you? </to O8>
888 O8: just me
889 O2: okay (.)<to O3> so [O3/last] </to O3>
890 O3: ah (.) in the morning (.) because i think the best option is
891 to fly to <spel> o p </spel> eight and
892 <63>then </63> go by truck through the
893 O2: <63> yeah </63> (2) and then if you give me (.)
894 drop me off back here (.) afterwards
895 O3: yes (.) or (.) we can go to [nameF] and then (.) from
896 the helipad of <spel> o p </spel> twenty two (1)
897 go to the <spel> u n p </spel> but i don't know (.)
898 if we can do this
899 O8: yes
900 O3: because (.) the BEST part with the track is (.)
901 this (1) it is the most INteresting
902 O2: right (.) okay
903 O3: because of the train
904 O2: <to O3> so HOW long will it take from <spel> o p </spel> eight
905 to [nameF] camp </to O3>
906 O3: yes <sighs> how much (1) it could be one and a half hour
907 O2: is that all? (1) that's okay
908 O3: yes because it's very difficult terrain
909 O2: right (.) and then will drive up (.) is it alright if i get a lift
910 back here (.) with the same vehicle
911 O3: yes (.) is no problem
912 O2: i'll go for that (.) because i've to see all of it (.)
913 i've got to see ALL of it (.) even if it is boring
914 O3: if you want you can lunch there
915 O2: erm
916 O3: <to O2> if you want (.) if you want to come back FASTER (.)
917 it's no problem </to O2>
918 OX-m:<soft> yeah they have wonderful lunches </soft>
919 O2: if i fly if i fly EIGHT THIRTY (1) and i land (.)
920 land at <spel> o p </spel> eight about nine o'clock (.)
921 about thirty minutes to get out there
922 O3: <soft> mhm </soft>
923 O2: maybe a bit less
924 O3: nine o'clock (.) yes (.) at eleven we can be at (.) [nameF] camp
925 O2: yeah (.) maybe we just DRIVE straight through (.) i come
926 back to [nameF] camp for lunch (.) some other time
927 O3: <fast> okay okay </fast>
928 O2: okay i need time in the office as well
929 O3: <to O2> as you wish (.) that's no problem </to O2>
930 O2: i need some time in the office as <64> well </64>
931 OO: <64> @@ </64> @@@
932 O2: so that's the plan for tuesday
933 OO: there's a pool
934 O2: they have a POOL as <65> well </65>
935 OO: <65> @@ </65> @@
936 O2: okay (.) that's good (.) and who do you think will meet me there?
937 O3: <to O2> yes i (.) <soft> i can give you help </soft> </to O2>
938 O2: okay
939 O3: i need to run away from my <66> office </66>
940 OO: <66> @ </66> @@@
941 O2: okay this (.) we take a morning out on tuesday (.) [nameC]
942 O6: we had a very peaceful and calm week (.) and hopefully
943 will be the next week the same
944 O2: yeah
945 O6: we have only operational (.) almost operational issue (.)
946 er er small game (.) but according to (.) our (.) information (.)
947 that is no permission for [place19]
948 O2: <soft> okay </soft>
949 O6: if the hunters (un) xx (/un) they come er any problem
950 O2: QUIET week is a good week (.) and next week

951 anything coming up (.) for you? (.) no
 952 O6: no (.) <soft> **no** </soft>
 953 O2: okay (.) <to O8> how's the FLIGHT? </to O8>
 954 O8: eh (.) all **all** the flights this week was normal (.) eh (.) today
 955 we finish with the second (.) the technical inspection
 956 of the second hughes
 957 O2: yeah
 958 O8: one hughes is normal services and the second one finish
 959 <67> **today** </67> the inspection (.) and e:r (1) the next week (.)
 960 we have the normal schedule and nothing
 961 O2: <67> **right**</67> (5) is the bell aligned now
 962 O8: yeah
 963 O2: it has the HANger? (.) much confusion
 964 O8: <@> much confusion </@> @@
 965 O2: because they said we're waiting for a hangar to be delivered
 966 from the united states (.) and everybody here thinks
 967 OX-m:well
 968 O2: it's a big hangar (1) it's a bearing or something (.) about that big
 969 O8: this is nothing **nothing (un) xx (/un)** for the next week
 970 O2: okay (.) lovely (.) <to O11> [O11] anything </to O11>
 971 O11: nothing for the next week
 972 O9: we'd a quiet week (1) we hope the same will be the next one
 973 but (.) except the information you tell us there is a optragon
 974 next week (1) as it was scheduled for third
 975 O2: er what?
 976 O9: something about third of september
 977 O4: <soft> is it (.) yeah okay </soft>
 978 O9: okay
 979 O2: what **what** does that involve?
 980 O6: excuse me
 981 O2: what does that involve?
 982 O4: it's the leaders meeting with the <spel> **m f r** </spel>
 983 O2: okay (.) what do you (.) **what do you** have to do for that?
 984 O9: we have to confirm if it is on third or not (.) there will be
 985 distribution of the frago as usual (.) from
 986 <spel> **m f r** </spel> meeting
 987 O2: <to O9> the <spel> **m f r** </spel> write it for you </to O9>
 988 O9: yeah
 989 O2: right (.) what (.) **what** do the military police do?
 990 O9: escorts from the gates to the <spel> **u n d p** </spel> and
 991 then from the <spel> **u n d p** </spel> to the gates again
 992 O2: with the <spel> **m f r** </spel>?
 993 O9: no <spel> **m f r** </spel> and we are taking care of the security (.)
 994 car parking media military public information officer and
 995 camp commander
 996 O2: okay (.) that will take place on (.) thursday
 997 O9: so is it on sir?
 998 O4: i've got it down as being on
 999 O2: do we need to confirm that?
 1000 O9: we need to confirm that
 1001 O2: <to O9> do you want me to confirm that? (.)
 1002 is it always at the same time? </to O9>
 1003 O9: e:r (.) well no some time it is at ten o'clock and then
 1004 maybe in the afternoon (.) it depends
 1005 O6: it's the first after the (.) **the** break
 1006 O2: so you need confirmation of the day and the time
 1007 OO: <soft> yes (.) please </soft>
 1008 O2: okay (.) fine (.) thank you (1) anything from the police?
 1009 O9: nothing
 1010 O2: nothing (.) quiet week?
 1011 O9: yeah
 1012 O2: <to O7> hygiene </to O7>
 1013 O7: the next week programme to everybody (.) but today morning
 1014 [nameB] joc contacted me (.) that the [nameD] forecasted (.)

1015 at the meeting time (.) so i contacted the chief inspector who said
 1016 that their **their** car has broken down (.) so they are not able to
 1017 come to go today (.) so they would like to go on <68> **monday**
 1018 </68> (.) same time same meeting point seven thirty
 1019 O2: <68>**okay** </68> (3) it will be nice if next time they can phone us
 1020 (.) to (.) when their car breaks down
 1021 O7: that's **that's** the standard procedure **procedure** but sometime
 1022 it does not work
 1023 O2: do their cars break down very often?
 1024 O7: no (.) in this area (1) because in this area the municipality is
 1025 responsible for the spraying (.) this has never happened
 1026 O2: okay
 1027 O7: this is the first time it ever happened
 1028 O2: it is normally quiet (.) it's a hick-up now and again
 1029 <soft> but this </soft>
 1030 O7: next week there wont be any programme but on monday
 1031 O2: just one day
 1032 O7: <soft> just one day </soft>
 1033 O2: the only thing i've got (.) from me was the saint nanus day (.)
 1034 the peace day (.) erm (2) and the armed forces day is on sunday (.)
 1035 in north **[place43]**
 1036 O4: yeah
 1037 O2: which everybody should be aware of (.) and i'm on the ground
 1038 in **[nameB]** on monday and in (1) **[nameA]** as we've discussed (.)
 1039 on tuesday and then i'll be in the office wednesday thursday and
 1040 friday next week (.) the week after that i need to try to get out
 1041 into **[nameC]** (1) so next friday (.) we can have a talk (1) about
 1042 what we can do (.) in **[nameC]** (.) if that is okay
 1043 O6: <soft> yes </soft>
 1044 O2: good (.) erm (.) is there anything else you want to ask me (1)
 1045 everybody HAPPY? (2) i'll be able to give you a little bit of
 1046 direction as i get my head into the job (.) but at the moment
 1047 i'm still (1) trying **trying** to swim a little bit (.) okay (.) thank you
 1048 all very much for coming in (.) and i'll see you all next friday

DATA C: Meetings C

- 1 M1: so good morning to everyone (1) i welcome you again on (.
 2 regular **[org4]** meeting and specially i like to welcome
 3 our **our** so (1) special tasker (.) please shortly introduce (.
 4 yourself
- 5 M14: right (.) my name is **[M14]** **[M14/last]** (.) i am a retired
 6 army officer (.) i used to serve in **[place22]** some thirty years ago
 7 (.) also in this camp (1) after retirement in two-thousand-and-four
 8 (1) i felt very bored and enrolled at (.) **[place53]** university
 9 studying anglistics (.) and linguistics (.) i completed four years (.
 10 at the university and i'm now in the process of writing my thesis
 11 (1) and the topic of the thesis is english as a lingua franca in
 12 multinational military forces (.) with an emphasis on
 13 peacekeeping missions (1) now (.) for this study VOICE
 14 recordings of NON-native english speakers are required for
 15 analysis and research (1) and what i hope (.) to prove eventually
 16 (.) will be that the lexis you are using is professional (1) that is
 17 pretty clear because military english is one of the technical
 18 englishes (1) and the second question will be the grammar (1)
 19 so in other words the syntax (.) how you form your sentences (1)
 20 in **[place53]** we have study programmes (.) the VOICE
 21 programme (.) you can look this up on the internet (.) and within
 22 the european union at this time the so-called DYLAN project is
 23 running till two-thousand-and-eleven with more than ten nations
 24 taking part (.) they do a similar thing what i'm doing (.) but all
 25 restricted to CIVILian speech not to professional military (.
 26 so that is it (.) in brief (.) thank you very much for allowing me
 27 to take some recordings (1) thank you
- 28 M1: so i wish you pleasant stay (.) and foremost pleasant stay here (.)
 29 so we can now start
- 30 M3: sir (.) lady gentlemen let me inform you about the latest issues
 31 connection with my **[org4]** team and the sixty-third regiment and
 32 **[nameE]** mainland army (.) next please (1) i was in duty in last
 33 week and we have some day off for captain **[last nameH]** and
 34 captain **[last nameI]** and (.) i started this week with a day off too
 35 (.) during this time captain **[last nameH]** er hold the duty (.
 36 i had four car patrol **car patrol** during the week and we don't
 37 make any heli patrol (.) next please (1) we had a pretty calm week
 38 (.) it was calm and peaceful fortunately (.) er the north side does
 39 not (1) did not have too much activity (.) only this terrain briefing
 40 was er **(un) xx (/un)** (.) they have visitors er from **from** the
 41 motherland (.) from **[place52]** (.) and **and** they made big terrain
 42 briefing activity (.) er they announced it for all position but of
 43 course they didn't did it (.) but it was huge terrain briefing
 44 between thirty and one-hundred person er in the positions (.
 45 they had some maintenance activity in corridor road (.) and
 46 the usual flag changing activity (.) now they seem **(un) xxx (/un)**
 47 area as you can see in the slide (1) there was some maintenance
 48 announced from the south side too (1) and er
 49 the **<spel> t m a </spel>** has not got too much complaint (.) only
 50 the blue point issue (.) that is a little bit er new thing (.)because
 51 they used to send letters at connection blue point but they never
 52 (.) **never** complained verbally against our activity in **in** that
 53 territory (1) e:r they had (.) **they had** average provocative er er
 54 reflector activity against **<spel> t f </spel>** fifty-five in the
 55 middle of the night (.) er fortunately er the **[nameD]** liaison
 56 officer was available that time (.) er the responsible **[org4]** er
 57 called him and (.) **and** they start the activity (.) BUT
 58 unfortunately according to the **[nameE]** side er **af-** after
 59 our patrol (.) **patrol** leave the scene (.) and **and** after some
 60 **some** hour rest they (.) **they** start doing again (.) this childish
 61 game (.) i think it's never finished (1) **<1> and </1>**

62 M1: <1> mhm </1>
63 M3: we had a fire near <spel> n g </spel> one-one-six as you can
64 learn in the morning in the briefing (.) and there was a short
65 (un) xx (/un) at <spel> t f </spel> thirteen (.) it was not too big
66 thing er it was only reported (.) there was announced some
67 activity in the position (.) and and (.) only **only** the number er of
68 people was there who was announced (.) but the patrol reported
69 because the patrol see some weapon (.) and the activity was
70 announced as **as** (.) a weapon-less activity (.) but after some
71 investigation er (.) er (.) the weapon wasn't a weapon (.) just a
72 holder of the weapon (.) so they **they** carry pistol holder but **but**
73 without pistols (.) that's all (1) next please (1) we have three
74 letters in last week but we decided only yesterday (.) so we did
75 not answer not yet (.) next please (1) i will continue in the duty (.)
76 because captain [**last nameI**] ha- has a holiday next week until
77 the third of september (.) and captain [**last nameH**] has some day
78 off (1) er in the next days (.) we continuing our regular
79 observation and patrols (.) and we continuing er (.) the locstat
80 update (.) i hope the next week will be finished this **this** big work
81 of the first platoon area (.) next please (1) any questions sir
82 M1: any question? (.) nobody thanks
83 M4: sir lady gentlemen (1) short brief about (2) last week activities (3)
84 we have done total of three patrol (2) we have announced from
85 four three [**nameE**] regiment about flag replacing activity on
86 <spel> t k </spel> twenty seven (1) have been done with
87 no problem (.) on eighteenth (.) we got announcement about
88 cleaning activities (1) and for [**place23**] line with (.) eight
89 unarmed soldiers and one pick-up (1) next please (1) next (3)
90 okay (.) from the <spel> n g </spel> side because this repair
91 maintenance activity announced at the <spel> n g </spel>
92 one one eight and one one nine position (1) there was some kind
93 of pipe (.) water pipeline malfunction (2) and (.) from the
94 [**nameC**] we announce these activities (1) this protest gathering at
95 [**place23**] cultural centre (1) and e:r cleaning and maintenance
96 activities within this ten <spel> u n </spel> soldiers and four
97 vehicles (.) in the all <spel> u n </spel> position (.) to [**place23**]
98 line (2) other phone contacts (.) it is to be **no-** noted (.) that (.) this
99 even done on sixteenth (1) zero-one-thirty <spel> a m </spel> (.)
100 when they noted those (.) unpolite letter written on this wall of
101 the church nearby the <spel> s b a </spel> boundary in [**place47**]
102 village (1) and of course they reported (.)the [**nameE**] reported
103 the same date about six-thirty <spel> a m </spel>
104 two civilian went on the spot and they repaint the wall (.) this
105 wall (.) and now that those letter are not visible (1) but (.)
106 they protested (1) in written complaint at <spel> c o </spel> level
107 meeting events are discuss and the outcome time date and place
108 of meeting between today fifteen hundred hours at
109 the compound in [**place26**]
110 M1: excuse me (.) how far it is the compound from the camp
111 M4: six hundred metres quite definitely and (.) if you are going
112 to go across the street it's very close
113 M1: <soft> very close </soft>
114 MM: @@@@
115 M4: anyway to the main gate it is about (.) five minutes of driving
116 in this crowdy street
117 M1: that's fine
118 M4: so we have received two protest letter (1) and (1) we got er
119 minor (.) car accident (.) minor damage as well (1)
120 the <spel> f m p o </spel> made report (.) we made our
121 statement (1) myself (.) the driver and three other colleagues as a
122 witness (.) passengers in the car nothing to report about this (2)
123 and again about meeting (1) we got (.) we have meeting on the
124 liaison **liaison** officer level here in <spel> c g s </spel> officer
125 club on thirteen august (.) e:r (1) minute of meeting report has

126 been prepared and sent to the (.) relevant addresses (1) and for
 127 the next week as [org4] framework we got another two issue (.)
 128 two task (.) vehicle maintenance at [place43] and heli patrol
 129 over the <spel> t k </spel> fifteen (un) xxx (/un) on twenty six
 130 (.) we have some information about about some container (.) so
 131 we'll check it (.) that's all (.) <soft> thank you </soft>
 132 M1: thanks (.) any question (1) so next
 133 M5: sir lady gentlemens let me inform you about [org4] activity (.)
 134 first [org4] team activity in [place15] (.) our area of responsibility
 135 is first regiment [org5] (.) e:r last week i was on duty (.) we
 136 provided five day patrol and one night patrol (1) next one please
 137 (1) we had (.) nine phone contacts with liaison officer (.) four of
 138 them was about the our protest (.) er some of them was about
 139 the announced maintenance activity (.) first one was about
 140 a move forward in [place15] (.) one <spel> n g </spel> military
 141 pickup e:r stop in front of the shop and two <spel> n g </spel>
 142 unarmed soldiers was shopping (1) according to status quo
 143 it is forbidden to stop <spel> n g </spel> military car in
 144 [place15] (.) excepted on the <spel> n g </spel> position (1)
 145 e:r on fourteen he had (.) we received two pre-announced
 146 maintenance activity (.) one of them was about the repairing
 147 water system (.) er in the <spel> n g </spel> one-one-eight
 148 position (.) and second one was the (.) prolonged this (.)
 149 repainting and maintenance activity <spel> c o </spel> and
 150 (un) xx (/un) have announced (.) next one please (1) e:r
 151 we strongly protest to liaison officer about <spel> n g </spel>
 152 one-five-six alfa sentry box spotlight was directed to
 153 <spel> t f </spel> fifty-five position (1) er liaison officer spoke
 154 with <spel> c o </spel> from this camp (.) and after (.) er
 155 half past two the <spel> n g </spel> soldiers switched off the
 156 spotlight (.) we strong verbal protest about the <spel> n g </spel>
 157 soldiers from one-zero-four position build up one new wall which
 158 consist of bricks (1) but i will speak about this later (.) this was
 159 solved (.)and (.) last protest was about the <spel> n g </spel>
 160 soldiers from one zero six position stopped our car during our
 161 regular patrol (.) e:r and was er (.) very unpolite behaviour this
 162 soldier er (.) liaison officer apologised for this incident and he
 163 explained the soldier about the manners and the rules in the
 164 [place19] (1) pre-announced three times opposite (.)
 165 pre-announce activity opposite side (1) activity from opposite
 166 side as i said (.) it was terrain briefing and changing flag (1)
 167 complained it was about the one-five-six alfa spotlight (1)
 168 correspondence (.) er we receive one er social letter from
 169 (un) xxxx (/un) (.) we wrote er three patrol report (.) one of them
 170 was about the one-zero-four position (.) and additional was about
 171 remove it the new wall (.) i will mention later (.)and the
 172 inspection of the mobile team to one-zero-six position in [place15]
 173 (.) other (.) still this time we (.) without (.) <spel> g p s </spel>
 174 (.) next one please
 175 M1: you have any information?
 176 M6: yes i have information about this (.) the chief of the
 177 <spel> i t </spel> technologies in the <spel> u n p a </spel> (.)
 178 he has a long holiday (.) he will not here before the nine of
 179 september (.) so this moment this cause is CLOSeD (.) so
 180 they can do after (1) and (.) after they resolved this problem
 181 they replace (.) i think
 182 M5: okay (.) and on this slide is visible on <spel> n g </spel>
 183 one-one-two position which was one military pickup and one
 184 civilian pickup (.) this was pre-announced activity for
 185 repainting activity (.) next one please (1) this is observe (.) this is
 186 (.)we observe on one-one-five position some theoretical
 187 preparation because on this time is changing soldier on the
 188 position (un) xxx (/un) pre-announced maintenance activity (.)
 189 one civilian worker (.)next one please (1) this is about

190 <spel> n g </spel> one-one-eight position report announced
 191 repairing activity **repairing activity** (.) er they observe on this
 192 spot some (.) er unarmed soldier and civilian workers (.) after
 193 that er (.) we protest about this activity to liaison officer and
 194 this time (.) they announced this activity because
 195 the water tube was cut (.) and this was repairing this one (1)
 196 next one please (1) e:r on seventeen august on <spel> n g </spel>
 197 one zero six position they observe one (.) e:r military helicopters
 198 (.) this military helicopter was one-thousand metre from the
 199 ceasefire line without announcement (.) we ask about this the e:r
 200 liaison officer and he said it was (.) in this time was a handover
 201 takeover <spel> c o </spel> position (.) <spel> c o </spel> first
 202 regiment and the new <spel> c o </spel> check the territory
 203 M1: so <spel> c o </spel> was inside
 204 M5: yes (.) <spel> c o </spel> was inside (.) next one please (1)
 205 this is about the one-five-six position (.) the spotlight was directed
 206 to <spel> t f </spel> fifty-five (.) i mentioned before (.)
 207 next one please (1) this is about the <spel> n g </spel> soldier
 208 build up the new wall which consist of the bricks (.) e:r is visible
 209 on the **on the right** (.) the exact location of this new walls was in
 210 front of them main building and behind the **(un) xx (/un)** position
 211 (.) we strongly protested and asked about the explanation from
 212 liaison officer (.) he promise that this new wall will be removed
 213 (.)and next day during our patrol we observe it that this wall
 214 was removed (.) in this case we solved this problem (1)
 215 e:r this is about the new gate (.) a new fence at one-five-six
 216 position (.) this is very famous position this time (.) during the
 217 previous week <spel> n g </spel> soldiers explained er the iron
 218 fence around the one-five-six which was enclosed by fence (.)
 219 only partly in the past liaison officer promise us he will check it
 220 personally and he will **(un) xx (/un)** the commander of the
 221 mentioned camp to arrest them this original fence (.) but this
 222 week we observe (.) they continued this activity and put there
 223 new gate (.) despite our strong verbal protest (.) this new gate is
 224 visible (.) is red (.) is very visible
 225 M1: so our action will be protest letter
 226 M5: yes (.) we will write a protest letter about this (.) next one please
 227 (1) this is er about the fire inside the <spel> u n </spel> **[place19]**
 228 (.) e:r firstly during other regular patrol we observe (.) in front
 229 the main gate e:r (.) one-one-six position one **one** fire er **fire**
 230 engine (.) we immediately we called the liaison officer ask about
 231 this activity (1) he ask us about the permission to cross the (.)
 232 e:r enter to the **[place19]** er (.) it was emergency situation (.)
 233 because in the **[place19]** was some fire (.) e:r after that we
 234 monitored the situation (.) also on the spot was other patrol and
 235 **[org12]** (.) we observed there four firemens (.) two fire engine and
 236 (.) two **[org12]** guys (1) next one please (1) about oncoming week
 237 **[org4]** framework monitoring our area of responsibility
 238 patrolling being duty officer **(un) xxx (/un)** (.) any question?
 239 M1: thanks (.) any question
 240 SX: beautiful sunset i see
 241 M5: sorry i did not get a chance to see
 242 M1: so thanks
 243 M6: good morning sir good morning gentlemen (.) this my weekly
 244 summary report for last week till today (1) i was duty officer (1)
 245 i have four car patrol and one heli patrol (.) please next one (1)
 246 activity (.) we still we have the demining activity on the main
 247 **(un) xx (/un)**to <spel> u n </spel> four-four-two-six (.) next one
 248 (.) in my area we ongoing activity for cleaning from
 249 two-thousand-nine and we have yesterday one not announced
 250 preparation for er <spel> c o </spel> visit (.) it was inspection for
 251 <spel> n g </spel> one-four-four (1) as can you see on this slide
 252 (.) it was not announced preparation for these visitors (.) but later
 253 i spoke with liaison officer point of contact and apologised (.)

254 they forget to tell me what going on (.) on next slide
255 we can see some cars and some soldiers (1) on this slide
256 it's from may two thousand nine (.) it's e:r construction sandbags
257 (1) and next one you can see they remove the sandbags from
258 the wall of the sentry box (.) and we can say we close
259 this ongoing incident
260 MX-m: they have quite big (.) concrete building in front of the sandbags
261 M1: probably
262 M6: it is closed (.) opposite side has big terrain briefing (2)
263 for next week duty team officer will be captain (un) xxx (/un) (.)
264 we have planned observation and patrolling (.) [org4] team work
265 and office work (2) questions?
266 M1: thanks
267 M6: thank you for listening to my presentation (.) thank you
268 very much
269 M7: sir (.) lady (.) gentlemen (.) let me to brief you about weekly
270 summary of [org4] team five (1) in activities i have four recce
271 patrols (.)(un) xx (/un) area of (un) xx (/un) on fifteenth of
272 august (.) there is nothing to report (.) e:r meetings nothing to
273 report (.) phone contacts (.) i had a very calm week because i had
274 no announcement from any side (.) contacts (.) and during my
275 whole patrols last week (1) i saw <spel> n g </spel> soldiers only
276 at seven positions (.) we have a sixteen main positions without
277 staff positions and only seven positions there soldiers saw (1) so
278 so maybe demilitarisation (1) announcement from other [org4]
279 teams (1) two terrain briefings and some cleaning activities (1)
280 next one (1) oh (.) i phoned to our liaison officer (.) about work
281 in the [place19] from our <spel> u n </spel> soldiers (1)
282 yesterday (.) they put barbed wires (.) it's not good visible
283 M8: it's around here (.) this is the fence in the plan here
284 M7: they put barbed wire all in main patrol track on [place23] line (.)
285 so it is good information for [org4] too (1) because
286 there is no possibility to get (.) from the main patrol track (.) to
287 to the <spel> u n </spel> position maybe one three five and (1)
288 one is located at <spel> o p t </spel> one two six (.) if you want
289 to cross (.) you have to get out of the car and remove wire
290 M1: but this barbed wire is (.) e:r clearly er marked (.) by night
291 M7: <1> no </1>
292 M8: <1> no </1> no no
293 M1: i know
294 M8: it is **it is** in the path where no civilian movement is allowed (1)
295 and our patrols they know
296 M1: so brief our soldiers (1) thanks
297 M7: for coming week (.) office work (.) [org4] on duty will be me
298 and captain (un) xx (/un) according to duty roster (1)
299 next (.) that's all
300 M1: thanks (3) so we had a (1) a quiet (.) er week (.) so i am glad (1)
301 and thanks for the work you have done in the previous week (1)
302 and er (1) and i wish you in the same (.) **in the same** level for
303 next week (.) so captain (un) xx (/un)
304 M8: i have nothing special now (1) er i am looking forward for this
305 last part of the **of the** locstats (.) and i just remind (.) don't forget
306 report your roads to the joc (.) that's all
307 M1: specially during the weekend (.) saturday and sunday (.) because
308 (.) lastly i check leaving book and it was (.) very strange to me
309 why you don't (.) **why you don't** adhere e:r regulation and
310 we set up (un) xxx (/un) (.) so thanks (.)
311 any points <2> [org4]s </2>
312 M8: <2> no point </2> sir
313 M1: [org4] (3) so i hope that we have passed examination (.) english
314 examination so (1) after five minutes break we will continue (.)
315 in the same (.) **the same** presence (.) thanks

316 M2: good morning lady and gentlemen
317 MM: good morning sir
318 M2: take your seat please (5) thank you okay so much please
319 M3: sir lady gentlemen let me inform you about the latest issues and
320 action in our area of responsibility (.) next please (1) i was in duty
321 on last week er (.) captain **[last nameI]** (.) er (.) has on his leave
322 in the island (1) and captain **[last nameH]** has three day offs (.)
323 during the last week er (.) we had four car patrol in our area of
324 responsibility (2) and we had a very **very** calm week like the
325 previous one (1) er (.) it's **it's** very interesting as i **as i** see the
326 incidents in **in the the [place19]**connection with the civilians and
327 connection with the~~spel~~ **n g** ~~spel~~regiments (.) it's looks like
328 almost as the same level like before (.) BUT the **[nameE]** er
329 complaints er **AB**solutely reduced (.) so it looks like the new
330 commander has a new policy (.) i hope he will continuing (1) this
331 (.) **<clears throat (2)>** (1) next please (1)there was only one time
332 briefing activity er in the second platoon area of responsibility (.)
333 and (.) we had some announcement from the~~spel~~ **n g** ~~spel~~
334 side (.) sometime briefing also (.) almost all territory of first and
335 seventh regiment (1) and we had only two small complaint (1) er
336 **FIR**st for some over**FLIGHT** in the corridor road area (.) it was an
337 unknown helicopter (.) the **[nameE]** side blamed US about that
338 flight but we haven't got any **any** flight at night (.)it was three
339 o'clock in the morning (.) and the other one was also in corridor
340 road (.) it was some strange (.) but (1) e:r er unproved issue (1)
341 the **[nameE]** side see er (.) **see** (.) er (.) a **milita-** civilian pickups
342 and some people er put some boards into the van according to
343 them and (.) but **but** our patrol doesn't find anything and in the
344 next day because it was at night (.) the next day (.) the **[nameE]**
345 side also does not see any change in the area so it was some
346 invisible process **<1> or something </1>**
347 MM: **<1> @@@@ </1>**
348 M3: (.) so that was all the incidents during the last week (1) the next
349 please (1) we had er three protest letters (.) er in the last week (.)
350 er it was some small issues one of them was a blueprint issue (.)
351 and some civilian intrusion reflection and (.) **and** (1) er the last
352 one er that we received just yesterday (.) and this is **is** the only
353 one that is announced one it was also civilian intrusion (.) er (.) in
354 the blueprint area (.) and **and** the interesting er part of that issue
355 (.) that (.) it is on the **LET**ters that the **[nameE]** side send us (.)
356 that they **SEE** our patrol (.) er that check the guy who want to go
357 through (.) and they see that our patrol send them back (.) to the
358 **[place13]** (.) i don't understand why they send the protest letter
359 (1) but we have a proof we doing our job our patrol doing well
360 our job **WELL** (.) next please (1) the next duty officer is
361 captain **[last nameH]** (.) and i will have one day off (.) er
362 tomorrow (.) and captain **[last nameI]** continuing (.) er his
363 holiday (.)we continue our regular observation **PATROLS** and er
364 the locstat update (1) that is our next story (1) but i hope we will
365 finish next week but (.) i have only some small computer work
366 on it (1) and we have to (.) brief back the lesson learning in
367 the next week (1) er until the end of the month (.) that's all sir
368 M2: **<soft>thank you so much </soft>**
369 M3: any question?
370 M4: lady (.) gentlemen (.) good morning everybody (.)
371 **SIR** let me inform you about the all last week (1) about the first
372 regiment (.) i was in duty (.) next time e:r that time **(un) xx (/un)**
373 should be in duty this week er mini recreation nothing to report (.)
374 we made one heli patrol and three **[place31]** run (.) next one (1) er
375 from the~~spel~~ **n g** ~~spel~~ side there was a cleaning activity (.)
376 e:r (.) on the **[place23]** line (1) er in the ~~spel~~ **t k** ~~spel~~ er
377 fifteen camp (1) and a flag changing on the **[place23]** line (.)
378 next one please (1) from the~~spel~~ **n g** ~~spel~~ side

379 we got two terrain briefing announcement (1) e:r (.) at all (.)
 380 it was all on the responsible area (.) next one (.) er i announced
 381 the [nameE] er today (.) exercise in the [place23] area (.) next one
 382 (1) e:r (.) there **wer- ver- very very very** (.)er (.) big
 383 <@> issues </@> (.) as usual (.) from the [nameE] side e:r (.)
 384 the [nameE] er find e:r three soldier <spel> n g </spel> soldier
 385 digging at [place47] (1) our patrol er find them but (.) e:r (.)
 386 they was (1) on walking (1)er nothing special (1) er the [nameE]
 387 complaint is about all **all** the day (.) because it's unannounced
 388 activity and we have a protest letter about this i need a answer (.)
 389 you can sign it after briefing (.) er on the same day it was a
 390 saturday there was a fire in [place47] area (1) er the time told you
 391 there was a terrain briefing (.) announced terrain briefing by
 392 the <spel> n g </spel> but on the [place23] line (.) they arrived
 393 with weapons (.) more than fifty soldier with weapon (.) so the
 394 [nameE] complain about this (1) er (2) and in the [place23] area
 395 lot of civilian people (.) civilian cars as usual (.) but the patrol
 396 never find anybody because (.) e:r usually more than one hour (.)
 397 to the patrol to arrived to [place23] (.) it's too big area to control
 398 for us (.) and the <spel> m s l </spel> the same (.) ships (.)
 399 divings (.) swimmers but the patrol never find anyone anything
 400 (1) e:r **(un) xx (/un)** the <spel> t k </spel> thirty one (1) and
 401 during the flag changing activity the (.) er [nameE] report (.) that
 402 the <spel> n g </spel> taking take took picture about the (.) er
 403 [nameE] activity (1) er the same day we got the information
 404 about a helicopter that er **(un) xx (/un)** (.) the information
 405 the helicopter leave the corridor road (.) and i got the information
 406 of the [place23] line from the <spel> m s l </spel> to [place47] (1)
 407 the [nameE] saw a helicopter (.) er the first regiment inform me
 408 that it was an <spel> n g </spel> helicopter (.) but the patrol and
 409 any <spel> u n </spel> person did not find the helicopter (.)
 410 did not saw it (.) and we have a <spel> c o </spel> meeting in
 411 the last week (.) next one please (1) you can see the e:r
 412 the [nameE] colonel and **(un) xx (/un)** commander (.)
 413 next one please (1) we got one protest letter that i told you (.) and
 414 i need the answer (.) you can sign it (.) we need a car servicing
 415 this week (.) next one (1) and er next time normal [org4] and
 416 we try to organise the next liaison level and <spel> c o </spel>
 417 level meeting (.) next one (1) thank you very much (.)
 418 sir any question?
 419 M2: no question just **just** notice (1) if the [org4] officer recognise
 420 something in the <spel> m s l </spel> (.) for example (2)
 421 i don't understand HOW the patrol (1) NEVER recognised
 422 anything and never report anything (1) HOW (.) there the line is
 423 BROken (.) what is the **the** (.) somebody has ANY of ideas? (1)
 424 because MANY of times (.) i'm visiting in this area (.) i recognise
 425 some pleasure boat (.) some fishing boats (.) some divers (.) and
 426 any **any** e:r (.) inCIDENTS (.) and next day i (.)
 427 M3: sir it's a matter of luck (.) **it's a matter of luck** (.) to
 428 to see something
 429 M2: but you know (.) erm last time (.) erm **last time** we spoke about
 430 this question (.) e:r MAYbe not enough (.) the patrol (.) and we er
 431 reconstructed second and the first platoon the power (.) and
 432 we increased the number of the patrols (2) after that (.) we i
 433 ordered the standing patrol also (1) but the incidents report (.)
 434 number didn't increased (.) am i RIGHT gentlemen?
 435 MM: we don't know
 436 MX-m: yes you are
 437 M2: okay (5) because we are (.) this is OUR responsibility NOT
 438 [org4] (.) recognised the incidents and report that (.) NOT
 439 [org4] (.) please continue
 440 M5: good morning everybody (.)**(un) xxx (/un)** last time
 441 when i was on duty (.) first i would like to inform our guest
 442 my <spel> l o </spel> responsibility **(un) xxx (un) [org5]** (.)

443 during last i was on duty we carried out five car patrol and
 444 we tried to organise <spel> c o </spel> level meeting with
 445 the new <spel> c o </spel> first <spel> n g </spel> regiment but
 446 it will be held on the october because our <spel> c o </spel> is
 447 on holiday now (.) next one please (1) contacts
 448 we tried to organise the <spel> c o </spel> level meeting that
 449 it will be POSTponed and hopefully tomorrow we have
 450 a <spel> l o </spel> meeting with our liaison officer because
 451 from september he will go to school (1) and
 452 we got the information that terrain briefing of all area of
 453 first <spel> n g </spel> regiment on twenty four of august (.)
 454 without any problem (.) and i had to protest firstly verbally
 455 protest against additional equipment and fence in iron in front
 456 side of <spel> n g </spel> one zero four position (.) this day
 457 we observed one civilian worker put this green net to the fence (.)
 458 i know what's the background because last week we observed
 459 this position a new concrete wall (.) after our complaint
 460 they remove it (.) now they want **conce-** conceal this position
 461 after that it is not so easy to observe anything inside the camp (.)
 462 but i have (.) but can we do in the future probably every second
 463 week we'll organise heliflight and we will check this fence from
 464 the air (.) any solution for the future (.)**(un) xx (/un)** yesterday
 465 i had to protest against **(un) xxx (/un) <spel> n g </spel>**
 466 one one five position is **[place40]** area (.) then
 467 we got this military position (.) we observe three military trucks
 468 and at least sixty soldiers (.) it wasn't announced in advance (.)
 469 but (.) when we (.) called our liaison officer he announced this
 470 activity for **[place40]** area (.) and we also received
 471 announcement our patrol went at <spel> n g </spel> one five five
 472 position (.) and in the evening yesterday i got information from
 473 first patrol leader (.) there was one military car in **[place15]**
 474 they used **(un) xx (/un)** all day **(un) xx (/un)** to stop in front
 475 of the betting shop there were two soldiers **(un) xx (/un)**
 476 inform (.) about this incidents my liaison officer informed his
 477 new <spel> c o </spel> about this incident (.) i think it happened
 478 in the future and (.) it will be happened (.) it happened in the past
 479 and it will happen in the future also (.) it's normal (.)
 480 sorry about this **(un) xx (/un)** (.) update is from opposite side
 481 we got announcement terrain briefing between <spel> t f </spel>
 482 zero eight charlie and <spel> t f </spel> one zero (.)
 483 it happened yesterday and it will happen **tomorr-** e:r tomorrow (.)
 484 and we got one complaint from **[nameE]** side (.) **[nameE]**
 485 soldiers observed one civilian person at <spel> n g </spel> one
 486 one nine position who was playing on guitar (.) protest against
 487 this activity (.) this soldier was **(un) xx (/un)** of all soldiers and
 488 sorry **sorry** he will leave the army (.) is very **(un) xx (/un)**
 489 this is the information we got and i have to pass this information
 490 MX-m: maybe he is a not a very qualified <@> guitar player </@> (.)
 491 he disturbed <@> the others </@> @
 492 M5: yes (.) it's funny but it's true (.) okay (.) **(un) xx (/un)**
 493 two protest letter (.) one of them is answer letter for
 494 firing position at <spel> n g </spel> one one eight position (.)
 495 i tried to (.) er explain them politely (.) what will be
 496 the solution to solve this problem (.) we will see
 497 what will happen and (.) last during **during last [org4]** briefing
 498 (.) protest against additional iron fence around <spel> n g </spel>
 499 one five six position after this **(un) xxx (/un)** (.) and
 500 we got one **com-** protest letter from **[nameE]** side
 501 **(un) xx (/un)** civilian construction at <spel> n g </spel>
 502 one zero one position **(un) xx (/un)** they can write us because
 503 it's their task and not our task (.) and other issue
 504 we haven't got now <spel> g p s </spel>
 505 and yesterday (.) er i have extra patrol with next
 506 <spel> d c o </spel> (.) we inform (.)him about last incidents in

507 our area (1) next slide please (1) and last thursday
 508 we **(un) xxx (/un)** this routine task at <spel> n g </spel>
 509 one one two position (.) it was without problem and one more and
 510 last thursday we **(un) xxx (/un)** <spel> n g </spel>
 511 one one five position next to the main gate also this green net (.)
 512 it was not there in the past (.) er i'm sure they put this green net
 513 (.) to the fence because behind this green net there is a firing
 514 position a bit further (.) and i think they are going reinforce
 515 this firing position in the future (.) we will discuss about this issue
 516 when we have meeting with our liaison officer and
 517 they will check it from the (2) next slide please (1)
 518 monday was this terrain briefing all area (.) they also had
 519 this **(un) xx (/un)** only at <spel> n g </spel> one zero eight
 520 abandoned position (.) on the spot there were approximately forty
 521 soldiers without personal weapon (.) this activity was without any
 522 incidents (1) <soft> next please </soft> (1)
 523 i mentioned before we also saw this green nets in front side of
 524 <spel> n g </spel> one zero four position (.) for us
 525 they put it there to **dis-** disguise this position because last week
 526 we had this incidents (1) why they made this game with us (.)
 527 but our liaison officer explain was very simple (.)
 528 they want to protect this camp from inhabitants and from
 529 any **(un) xx (/un)** et cetera **et cetera** (.)
 530 i don't know (.) **(un) xxx (/un)** but we do (.) and our
 531 two incidents which happened yesterday (.) we were on
 532 regular patrol this **(un) xxx (/un)** <spel> n g </spel> one five five
 533 position (.) immediately i called liaison officer (.) and
 534 he announced terrain briefing for this part of our area (.)
 535 our other being from the **[nameE]** side without complaint from
 536 **[nameE]** side (.) fortunately (.) and plan for oncoming week (.)
 537 we will do more on normal framework (.) er and tomorrow
 538 we have this meeting with our liaison officer (.) maybe
 539 interviews with his replacement and end of this month
 540 we should prepare **(un) xxx (/un)** (.) that's all from my side (.)
 541 do you have any question
 542 M2: from the green net (.) i think so (.) we CANNOT (1)
 543 **we cannot** er (1) CONTinue this very PEACEful (.) e:r way (.)
 544 er in my opinion (1) please prepare a letter (.) a protest letter
 545 to the <spel> n g </spel> commander (2) <2> er before </2>
 546 this time please get a connection with your COLLeague (.)
 547 the liaison officer
 548 M5: <2> sir </2> (2) but there is no time for it (.) firstly tomorrow
 549 we will have a meeting (.) we will explain to new
 550 <spel> l o </spel> the situation (.) and (.) firstly (.) i will protest
 551 this strongly VERbally (.) and (.) they will get the **(un) xx (/un)**
 552 to remove it (.) must remove it (.) before change anything will
 553 happen to it (.) i will arrange it step by step (.) because this
 554 **this** incident was (.) i think is not as serious
 555 M2: no **no** (.) but (.) e:r you know very well if somebody try cover
 556 something (.) he try to do something under the shadow (2)
 557 for the remain of the **the** er **er** (.) right COOPeration (.) in the
 558 future (1) we WANT (2) to destroy this <3> fence </3>
 559 M5: <3> okay this </3> probably (.) but if possible i'll arrange it
 560 step by step because the incident is not as serious (.)
 561 they <4>have </4> new liaison officer and i don't want to give
 562 them immediately a lot of **(un) xx (/un)**
 563 M2: <4> okay okay </4> (.) i agree with you (2) you are right (.)
 564 firstly please try to explain them this is er opposite of
 565 the <5> status quo </5>
 566 M5: <5> of course </5> (1) **of course** i will
 567 M2: this (.) thank you (.) continue please inform me (.) okay
 568 M12: good morning sir good morning gentlemen (.) allow me to tell
 569 you about the last week (.) the activities in our area of
 570 responsibility (.) i was duty officer (1) there is nothing to report

571 (.) we conducted three car patrols (.) no heli patrols (.) no
572 meetings (.) next one please (1) other (.) there is just the demining
573 activity of the minefield near <spel> o p </spel>niner one (.) next
574 one please (1) main position activities (.) there is just one
575 announcement for the **for the** friday (.) and the preparation for the
576 <spel> c o </spel> inspection (1) next one please (1) i conducted
577 three car patrols and i i observed er two constructions (.) i
578 reported that to the duty officer (.) er this construction is
579 <spel> n g </spel> one three nine bunker (.) they (.) recently
580 camouflaged their position (.) and now they put one row of bricks
581 er about so (1) i strongly protested to liaison officer (1) er (.) and
582 he told me that er (.) he is now busy with inspection (.) and after
583 inspection they will organise the meeting and we will talk about
584 this issue and will try to solve it (1) next one please (1) this is
585 another construction activity (.) this is <spel> n g </spel> five
586 one bravo (1) again i protested to liaison officer (1) and er (.) they
587 also told me that he is very busy (1) and they will discuss this
588 during the meeting (1) other (.) there are missing stones **stones**
589 because there was **there was** a writing in stones (.) second patrol
590 or something like that (1) focal task (.) i strongly verbally
591 protested against this constructions and i tried to arrange the
592 meeting for that (.) negotiations (1) <spel> u n </spel> response
593 there is nothing to report (1) duty officer is going to be major
594 **[last nameJ]** (.) and our planned activities are observation
595 patrolling preparation for rotation office work and preparing the
596 lessons now (1) that concludes my briefing sir
597 M2: thank you <soft> so much </soft>
598 M7: sir lady gentlemen (.) weekly summary of **[org4]** one two five (.)
599 i was on duty (1) i conducted four vehicle patrol some office
600 work correspondence (.) nothing to report (1) contacts (.) on
601 twenty first of august **[nameE]** announced cleaning activities all
602 on **[place23]** line (.)i informed my liaison offer and on
603 twenty forth of august it was very busy day (.) liaison officer
604 announced terrain briefing on twenty fifth and twenty sixth of
605 august on **[place23]** line and corridor road at all
606 <spel> n g </spel> position approximately one hundred unarmed
607 soldiers and six military cars (.) and the **[nameE]** side announced
608 flag changing on **[place23]** line at **[nameE]** positions (1) i
609 informed liaison officer about exercise near the ayia marina
610 church today (.) is a **(un) xx (/un)** accident about
611 platoon **(un) xx (/un)** **[place23]** line (.) other day **[nameE]** side
612 complain about armed soldiers during the terrain briefing because
613 <spel> n g </spel> sides side announced this terrain briefing
614 without weapons (.) but **the-** they had their weapons (.)
615 so i verbally protested this activity and
616 the next day it was without problem (.) and next complain from
617 **[nameE]** side (.) concerning taking photos from
618 <spel> n g </spel> one three two (.) this is er **[place23]**
619 checkpoint (.) they took pictures of (.) this activity of
620 changing flags at the <spel> t k </spel> thirty two thirty four (1)
621 so i verbally protested (.) and then after this verbal protest (.)
622 liaison promised (.) that he will speak with erm the soldiers (.)
623 and it's then forbidden (1) others (.) our landline is working (.)
624 our extension is er four eight five one (.) after six months we
625 working (.) so if you have a need (.) just call us (1) these
626 few pictures e:r from terrain briefing (1) these soldiers were
627 divided into small groups (.) and er (.) i observed (.) this e:r
628 soldiers at some positions (3) <soft> okay </soft> (.)
629 <clears throat (2)> (.) few words about the (.) new obstacles along
630 **[place23]** line (.) <spel> u n </spel> put these barbed wires on
631 all entrances on er (1) **[place23]** line (.) so <clears throat (2)> (1) in
632 my opinion it makes harder to do other job because we can **can** (.)
633 approach our <spel> n g </spel> positions (.) and this a lot of
634 people have already started to make new roads or by-passes

635 nearby these obstacles (.) in my opinion this is useless and
636 makes only troubles for <spel> u n </spel> personnel
637 M2: i understood you but i explain WHY we are do that earlier (.)
638 because of (.) LAter SOMeThing happening with the civilians
639 in the [place19] (2) the media will (.) er inform
640 the (un) xx (/un) [org11] responsibility (.) to blocking (1)
641 the roads er in front of the civilians (1) this is OUR responsibility
642 (.) this is OUR task (1) we will continue this procedure in the
643 future also (.) as i mentioned (.) e:r the sign of the [org11] is er
644 visible (.) this is our task also (.) inform the civilians (.) this is
645 <spel> u n </spel> restricted area (.) and that's all (.)
646 we NEED to show them (.) they are in a WRONG PLACE (.)
647 this is our task (.) we NEED to continue in the future
648 M12: okay (.) next time i will show the reaction of local people (.) so
649 this is the first reaction on the wires (.) the locals put some small
650 stones on the side patrol track (.) this is near one four zero (.)
651 we can expect the most of the activities from [named] side (.)
652 i think (.) in the future we can find something similar on main
653 patrol track (1) this problem from yesterday
654 M2: mhm we will see
655 M7: we will see (.) only for information
656 M2: yeah thank you
657 MM: @@@@
658 M2: this is a (.) you know (.) a the [org2] task in the future (.)
659 i told this
660 M7: okay yes patrol (.) non serving (.) office work (.) i've been
661 prepared for you to handle this task (.) and (.) <clears throat (2)> (1)
662 i'm on leave from twenty eight to thirty first of august (.)
663 do you have any question
664 M2: it was very simple earlier (.) then the [org11] mission was only
665 one pillar (.) the military (1) it was very simple (.) nobody
666 entering (2) and if somebody entered <6> er </6>
667 MX-m: <6> shoot him </6>
668 M2: we caught him (1) now we have three pillars (2) the situation is
669 total different unfortunately (.) and we NEED to cooperate (.)
670 with the [org2] and the [org12] also (.) we NEED (2) e:r that
671 aspect is easier for us (.) because we are only recognise the
672 situation (.) and we give the situation to the [org12] and the [org2]
673 (.) and they continue the er procedure (1) the other aspect is much
674 more difficult (.) because we haven't ANY of feedback (1) but
675 they do (.) and ANY of result (.) last briefing inform the FIRST
676 issue when we got e:r an information about the illegal hunters got
677 two hundred liras penalty (.) it was the FIRST under the
678 thirty five years (1) but the game is continuing (.) i'm sure (.)
679 we have an absolutely CLEAN task (1) we will do that (2) and the
680 final solution is not our task (.) <soft> okay (.) please </soft>
681 M8: er about (un) xx (/un) [org12] that organised (.) to
682 organising the meeting with mukthar of [place23] after
683 <spel> t k </spel> forty alfa position
684 M7: we will ask it (.) we will ask it (.) him or her
685 M2: we will check because we HAVEN'T (.) we didn't get (.)
686 anything
687 M7: okay
688 MX-m: thank you
689 M8: no point sir
690 M2: any additional (1) please
691 M9: i have only one question sir (.) yesterday we saw got this
692 weekly report from scat in [place47] they will start to build this
693 road from [place51] (.) we need er MORE information about
694 this activity (.) EACH road (.) <7> because </7>
695 there are three roads
696 M2: <7> mhm </7> a forecast approximately SIX er months ago
697 M9: but from first of september they will start
698 M2: mhm (.) our forecast cast was (2) they are repairing **repairing**

699 this road (.) and suddenly (1) one day will cover by asphalt
700 M10: one question (.) minute of meeting (.) draft report we sent to
701 the duty to the charlie oscar (.) to authorise (1) now
702 we can go back this week to this report (.) i will have to send it
703 M2: i will check it (.) and i will inform you (.) er (.) unfortunately
704 i didn't get any of information about (2) but i can promised you
705 M10: we have meeting on last thursday (.) and minutes of meeting
706 report draft version we sent to the liaison officer on friday last
707 friday (.) i think in the same day (.) but if not the latest on friday
708 M2: i can promised i will check it and give you a feedback
709 M10: still not send it (.) sure
710 M2: just ONE general information for US (.) as i mentioned er
711 last [org4] briefing (.) the er small game the hunting season has
712 started (.) and the the POLICY of the HUNters (.) er is
713 ABSOLUTely new (.) and it was changed er (.) some sentence
714 please inform everybody again what is the NEW
715 of the er hunting activity
716 M11: so according that NEWS the hunters does not allowed to go into
717 the [place19] (.) so the the [nameD] government give a new (.)
718 a new map to the hunters (.) er because in previous times (.) that
719 was given a map that contains er the [place19] territory as a
720 as a possible territory for hunting (.) but nowaDAYS
721 they are absolutely restricted to go to the [place19] to hunting (.)
722 this is the official (.) er (.) point (.) of the (.) of the [nameD] side
723 M2: in the (un) xxx (/un) (.) outside they can hunting <8> but</8>
724 M11: <8> four </8> hundred metres (.) three hundred metres
725 from the [place19]
726 M2: three hundred metres and the north two hundred (.)
727 NOBODY can entering by weapon into the [place19] (.)
728 any of hunters (.) so (.) if somebody in the [place19] (.) especially
729 the CAMOUflage clothes with weapon (.) he is soldier (1)
730 and WE can PROTEST against (.) the whole process
731 M11: are the public leaders aware of this?
732 M2: i don't know
733 M11: i'm just asking because i would like to inform them
734 M2: yes i hope so (.) everybody knows that because
735 it was the business
736 M8: no the public does not knows it
737 M11: will we be back on this
738 M8: yes we will back will be back on this
739 M2: the senior operational officer is preparing (.) it's very
740 very IMPORtant ABSOLUTELY opposite procedure
741 than the last hunting season was
742 M8: maybe er because of the [place19] is a restricted area for hunting
743 (.) the <spel> h q </spel> didn't send to us the the op order (1) er
744 the order for the small game (.) they sent only the [org12] (1)
745 the orders (2) we will (.) we are preparing the
746 the (.) er sector op op order
747 M2: okay (.) any additional comment? (.) thank you (.)
748 i have finished (1) have a nice day (.) dismiss
749 MM: dismissed

APPENDIX I

Abbreviations

AAP	Allied Administrative Publication
BELF	Business English as Lingua Franca
BILC	Bureau for International Language Cooperation
CA	Conversation Analysis
EFL	English as Foreign Language
EIL	English as International Language
ELF	English as Lingua Franca
ENL	English as Native Language
ESL	English as Second Language
EU	European Union
EUMM	EU Monitoring Mission in Former Yugoslavia
FYROM	Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
L1	Native Language
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NNS	Non-native Speaker
NS	Native Speaker
NSA	NATO Standardization Agency
OSGAP	Office of the Secretary General in Afghanistan and Pakistan
PfP	Partnership for Peace
STANAG	Standardization Agreement
TCU	Turn-Construction Unit
UN	United Nations
UNAFHIR	UN Austrian Field Hospital in Iran
UNDOF	UN Disengagement Observer Force
UNFICYP	UN Peace-Keeping Force in Cyprus
UNGOMAP	UN Good Offices Mission in Afghanistan and Pakistan
UNIT-B	UN Inspection Team in Iran and Iraq - Baghdad
UNTAC	UN Transitional Authority in Cambodia
UNTSO	UN Truce Supervision Organization

APPENDIX II

List of Speakers

Speaker	L1	Gender
S1	English	M
S2	Spanish	M
S3	Spanish	M
S4	Slovak	M
S5	English	M
S6	English	M
S7	Hungarian	M
S8	German	M
S9	Slovak	M
S10	English	M
S11	English	M
S12	Spanish	M
S13	Spanish	M
S14	Hungarian	M
S15	Spanish	M
S16	Slovak	M
S17	Hungarian	M

Speaker	L1	Gender
M1	Slovak	M
M2	Hungarian	M
M3	Hungarian	M
M4	Croatian	M
M5	Slovak	M
M6	Croatian	F
M7	Slovak	M
M8	Slovak	M
M9	Hungarian	M
M10	Croatian	M
M11	Hungarian	M
M12	Hungarian	M
M14	German	M

Speaker	L1	Gender
O1	Spanish	M
O2	English	M
O3	Spanish	M
O4	English	M
O5	Slovak	M
O6	Hungarian	M
O7	Hungarian	M
O8	Spanish	M
O9	Slovak	M
O10	English	F
O11	Spanish	M
O12	Spanish	M

Abstract

There is always the question of how much language is needed to achieve and maintain an efficient and effective communication in the military field. This study examines how communications are operating in specifically military meetings within an international peacekeeping mission by the use of English as lingua franca (ELF).

The paper describes what is going on in such meetings. In order to do that it is necessary to talk first about how communication takes place, how meetings generally and military meetings in particular are organised, and how the necessary data are collected. The study looks into the question of what constitutes efficient communication, i.e., factors involving discourse, negotiation of meaning, turn taking procedures and several others. It examines how the various features of communication, operation of power, opening of a meeting, mitigation, repair, politeness, etc., are satisfactorily performed in military meetings.

The meetings being investigated belong to a particular genre and therefore display distinctive characteristics. One is that they are military and because of this they possess particular features. A second is that they are conducted by people who cannot speak English as a native language. The study therefore looks at aspects of communication in such meetings where the majority of participants are non-native ELF users. Research reveals that actually they do not need to be native speakers, because they know enough English and they are using it functionally efficiently as a common language. These people are in effect communicating, turn-taking, negotiating, expressing themselves, exerting power, and being polite in their verbal interactions. Normal processes of communication are operating even though the interactants are not conforming to the norms of Standard English.

According to my data, these participants in the military meetings operate by successfully revealing and exhibiting various features of communication. Moreover, the study shows that the notion that communication must meet with

accuracy native speaker norms simply does not hold. Therefore, one must think again about assuming that correct native speaker English is the only way which can talk about effective communication.

German Summary

(Zusammenfassung in deutscher Sprache)

Im militärischen Bereich stellt sich immer wieder die Frage welches Maß an Sprachfertigkeiten ist für eine effiziente und effektive Kommunikation erforderlich bzw. ausreichend. Die Studie untersucht daher die allgemeine Kommunikationsfähigkeit der Teilnehmer an Besprechungen, die bei der Verwendung von Englisch als Lingua Franca innerhalb einer internationalen Friedenstruppe stattfinden.

Die vorliegende Arbeit beschreibt die kommunikativen Merkmale derartiger Besprechungen. Hierzu werden zunächst das kommunikative Verhalten der Teilnehmer und die organisatorischen Merkmale von Besprechungen allgemeiner und militärischer Art untersucht, und danach wird die Methodik der Sammlung der erforderlichen Daten, beschrieben. Die Studie untersucht die für eine erfolgreiche Kommunikation maßgeblichen Faktoren, vor allem jene, die den Diskurs, Meinungsäußerungen oder die Diskussion von Ansichten betreffen. Weiters untersucht sie wie die verschiedenen Arten der Kommunikation, Machtdemonstration, Formalität, Sprachpräzisierung, Fehlerkorrektur oder Austausch von verbalen Höflichkeiten, im Rahmen militärischer Besprechungen mit Erfolg ausgeführt werden.

Die untersuchten Besprechungen gehören zu einem bestimmten Genre und besitzen deshalb besondere Eigenschaften. Eine davon sind ihre militärischen Wurzeln und damit verbunden eine Reihe spezieller Merkmale. Eine zweite bezieht sich auf die Tatsache, dass an diesen Besprechungen Personen teilnehmen, die Englisch nicht als Muttersprache haben. Die Studie untersucht deshalb kommunikative Aspekte von Besprechungen in denen die Mehrheit der Teilnehmer nicht englische Muttersprachler sind. Das Ergebnis dieser Untersuchung zeigt, dass diese Teilnehmer auch nicht englische Muttersprachler sein müssen, schon deshalb nicht weil sie ausreichende Englischkenntnisse besitzen und diese funktionell effizient als gemeinsame Arbeitssprache einsetzen.

Diese Personen kommunizieren erfolgreich, wechseln sich im Vortrag ab, verhandeln, artikulieren sich, üben Macht aus und wickeln ihre Gespräche in höflicher Form ab. Das übliche Diskussionsverhalten findet statt, obwohl die Gesprächspartner die englischen Sprachnormen vernachlässigen.

Den vorliegenden Daten ist zu entnehmen, dass die Teilnehmer an den militärischen Besprechungen unterschiedliches Kommunikationsverhalten zeigen und erfolgreich einsetzen. Darüber hinaus zeigt die Studie, dass die bislang vertretene Ansicht, dass sich die Kommunikation in englischer Sprache dezidiert an den Normen der Muttersprachler zu orientieren habe, nicht hält. Daher ist ein Umdenken erforderlich und zwar hinsichtlich der Meinung, dass nur muttersprachig korrektes Englisch den einzig möglichen Weg zu effizienter Kommunikation darstellt.

Curriculum Vitae

Persönliche Daten:

Name: Peter SINTLER
 Geburtsdatum: 19. Dezember 1939
 Geburtsort: Wien
 Nationalität: österreichisch
 Kontakt: petersintler@hotmail.com

Ausbildung:

2005 - 2011 Universität Wien, Diplomstudium Anglistik und Amerikanistik
 1997 Universität Cambridge (Summer School)
 1994 Landesverteidigungsakademie, TrpKdtKurs
 1969 - 1970 Doncaster College of Technology, Higher National Certificate
 in Engineering
 1961 - 1966 TU WIEN, Maschinenbau, Erste Staatsprüfung
 1957 - 1959 Hotelfachschule Wien
 1957 Matura (BRS XII, Wien)

Berufliche Tätigkeiten:

2005 Ruhestand
 1994 - 2004 Landesverteidigungsakademie, Sprachinstitut des
 Bundesheeres:
 Hauptlehtroffizier, Sprachmittler, Übersetzer,
 Terminologie, Prüfer, Referent und Kursleiter
 „Taktisches Englisch“
 2001 – 2002: Teilnahme an der EU Beobachtermission
 EUMM in: Albanien, FYROM (Mazedonien) und
 Montenegro
 1996: Ernennung zum Oberst
 1975 - 1993 Teilnahme an folgenden UN Friedensmissionen:
 UNTAC (Kambodscha)
 UNAFHIR (Iran)
 OSGAP (Afghanistan, Pakistan)
 UNGOMAP (Afghanistan, Pakistan)
 UNIT-B (Irak)
 UNTSO (Israel, Libanon)
 UNDOF (Syrien)
 UNFICYP (Zypern)
 1975 Bundesheer
 1966 - 1975 selbständig erwerbstätig (Großbritannien, Doncaster)
 1965 - 1966 Tourismus (Schweiz, Zermatt)
 1962 - 1965 Aushilfskraft (Schweiz, Adelboden; Wien)

1960 - 1961	Südbahnhotel Semmering (NÖ)
1959 - 1960	Wehrdienst (Artillerie)
1957 - 1959	Aushilfskraft (Wien, NÖ, Salzburg, Kärnten)

Publikationen:

2004	Wörterbuch Alpiner Begriffe, Englisch-Deutsch/Deutsch-Englisch, Eigenverlag, ISBN 9783950181609
------	---

Teilnahme an internationalen Seminaren als Vortragender:

10/2003	Helsinki: PfP Seminar: "The Management of Innovation during the Production of Language Training Programmes"
10/2002	Bratislava: BILC Seminar: "Classroom Instruction focused on Military Needs"
11/1999	Brno: BILC Seminar: "Management of Language Programs"
10/1998	Wien: PfP Seminar: "Language Training for Multinational Peace Support Operations and Testing Issues"

Auslandsaufenthalte:

2001 - 2002	Albanien, FYROM (Mazedonien) und Montenegro
Sommer 1997	Großbritannien
1975 - 1993	Zypern, Syrien, Israel, Libanon, Irak, Iran, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Kambodscha
1966 - 1975	Großbritannien (South Yorkshire)
1965 - 1966	Schweiz
Sommer 1962	Schweiz

Sprachkenntnisse:

Deutsch	Muttersprache
Englisch	kompetent
Französisch	selbständig
Italienisch	elementar