*J*ournal for *E*uro*Li*nguisti*X* 5 (2008): 1-12

Joachim Grzega ▪ Marion Schöner

Introduction:
ELiX's Contribution to the European Year of Intercultural Dialogue*

Abstract

The introductory article of this *JELiX* volume gives a state of the art of cross-cultural and intercultural studies related to Europe. It then gives a forecast on the communicative aspects and European nations/countries discussed for this volume and presents the new method for data collection in most of the volume's contributions, namely the "semi-expert interview on communicative strategies" (SICS). This volume is the first to analyze the communicative behavior of all sorts of European languages with a uniform method.

Sommaire

L'article introductoire de ce volume de *JELiX* donne d'abord un aperçu de la recherche actuelle concernant les études culturelles et interculturelles sur l'Europe. Ensuite, il annonce les aspects communicatifs et les nations/ les pays européens qui seront abordés dans le cadre de ce livre et présente la nouvelle méthode pour l'obtention de données qui est à la base de la plupart des contributions de ce volume, à savoir le « semi-expert interview on communicative strategies » (SICS). Ce livre est le premier à analyser le comportement communicatif dans toutes sortes de langues européennes de manière uniforme.

Zusammenfassung

Der Einführungsartikel zu diesem *JELiX*-Band gibt einen Forschungsüberblick zu kulturübergreifenden und interkulturellen Studien zu Europa. Er gibt anschließend eine Vorschau auf die kommunikativen Aspekte und die europäischen Nationen/Länder, die in diesem Band diskutiert werden, und stellt die neue Methode zur Datengewinnung vor, die den meisten Beiträgen dieses Bandes zu Grunde liegt, nämlich das "semi-expert interview on communicative strategies" (SICS). Dieser Band ist der erste, der kommunikatives Verhalten in allen Arten europäischer Sprachen nach einer einheitlichen Methode analysiert.

1. Introductory Remarks

2008 was announced the EU's European Year of Intercultural Dialogue and the UNESCO's International Year of Languages. The editors of the *Journal for EuroLinguistiX (JELiX)* see this as a perfect opportunity to have a closer look at similarities and differences between the conversational behavior of Europeans and to offer a basis for suggestions to improve intercultural communication among Europeans.

Europe and *European* can be defined in different ways: in a political way (i.e. the EU countries), in a geographical way (i.e. the countries from the Atlantic to the Ural), or—and this is the definition that this volume of *JELiX* shall be based on—in a cultural way. In this latter sense[1] the features of language, religion, history and ethnic descent are the most basic criteria to define and characterize a civilization. *Europe* thus refers to those nations that are characterized by a minor Greek and a major Latin heritage (including the rules of law) and a tertiary Germanic heritage (from the 6th c.), the (West) Roman variant of Christian religion

* For the composition of the French as well as some German abstracts and the revision of all other abstracts we would like to thank Jasmin Germann. For proof-reading and correcting an earlier draft of this volume, we would like to thank Sandra Stenzenberger.

1 Cf., e.g., Huntington (1996: 45ff.) and Schmidt (2000: 207ff.).

(and its developments during the Reformation and Counter Reformation), the use of the Latin alphabet, the separation of spiritual and secular power, societal pluralism and individualism, a common history of the arts (in their broadest sense) as well as a common history of education and formation (see, for example, the development of the universities in the Middle Ages or the relatively recent introduction of compulsory education). European civilization can thus be contrasted with Slavic-Orthodox, North American, Latin American, Islamic, Hinduistic, Japanese and Sinic civilization (possibly also African and Oceanic civilization).

For Europe, language means multitude of languages (whereas other civilizations seem to have one or two strong bracketing language(s), e.g. Arabic [which is also religious symbol], or believe that their languages are all dialects of one big language, e.g. Sinic civilization). Since linguistic diversity is an elementary feature of European civilization, it may be argued that homogeneity may on the one hand facilitate communication, but on the other hand may destroy an important identity factor (and maybe also a chance) for Europe. Most of the European languages belong to the Indo-European language family (with the Romance, Germanic, Celtic and (West) Slavic branches), but there are also Hungarian, Finnish and Estonian (Finno-Ugric language family) and Basque (an isolated language).

The articles of this volume of *JELiX* can be divided into three groups:
(a) eleven articles on speech acts and other pragmatic elements in European languages plus one synoptical article
(b) two articles on pragmatic components of a lingua franca for intercultural dialogues
(c) an article on language teaching policies for developing intercultural competences

The editors hope that with this volume they will advance cross-cultural and intercultural pragmatics in the realm of Eurolinguistics as they believe that this corroborates also to the development of Applied Eurolinguistics in the sense of Socioeconomic Linguistics (cf. Grzega 2005). Communicative behavior is part of culture, and cultural values and patterns have been proven to have impact on a community's economic performance (cf., e.g., Harrison/Huntington 2000).

2. Cross-Cultural Pragmatics

2.1. State of the Art

So far, most Eurolinguistic studies have dwelled on grammar and vocabulary; it is time that linguists also plough through the field of "euro-pragmatics" (cf. Grzega 2006: 193ff., Hinrichs 2006: 24, Hinrichs [in print]), especially since pragmatic differences and failures are less easy to detect than grammatical, phonetic or lexical mistakes. This was the trigger for starting the project ECSTRA (*European Communicative Strategies*). ECSTRA captures and analyzes the communicative style(s) of European nations/states/speech communities—especially as far as face[2]-threatening speech acts are concerned—and their role in acquiring "Euro-competence". There is quite a series of studies on cross-cultural pragmatics and cross-cultural communication. The University of Minnesota's Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition offers an annotated select bibliography of speech acts at http://www.carla.umn./speechacts/bibliography/index.html (with particular focus in the acquisition of pragmatic competence in foreign language learning and teaching). An MLA search for "speech acts" even yields 562 hits for European languages (the vast majority of which are on requests), but each of these studies discusses just a small number of languages (cf. Grzega 2006: 196). Even the *CCSARP*, the *Cross-Cultural speech Act Realization Project*

[2] The notion of face in the sense of 'image of oneself delineated in terms of approved social attributes' goes back to Goffman (1955). Brown/Levinson (1987) have more thoroughly expanded on face-threatening acts.

(cf. Blum-Kulka/House/Kasper 1989), collected data for merely eight—mostly non-European—cultures (American English, Australian English, Canadian French, Argentinian Spanish, Danish, [German] German, Hebrew). What we still need are comprehensive or parallelly designed individual studies that aim at an encompassing comparison of European speech communities[3]. This lack of studies may originate in the lack of adequate corpora of spoken language. But an intersection of communicative patterns over Europe also seems elementary for seeing a European identity (as communities define themselves also through language) and for developing a European communicative competence[4]. As a consequence, useful alternatives to natural data corpora have to be suggested.

It should be underscored that ECSTRA compares nations/states, not languages: after all, German communicative strategies are not the same as Austrian communicative strategies, French not the same as Walloon strategies etc. On this topic—conversational differences between nations of the same language—linguists have still left a lot to be desired[5].

2.2. Pragmatic Elements Analyzed in This Volume

ECSTRA's ultimate goal is to collect components for a European "language guide", with respect to a number of communicative situations. This shall allow readers to see contrasts and similarities between Europeans. Tied up to existing research results, the communicative tasks or speech acts that are analyzed in this volume of *JELiX* with the help of a questionnaire (cf. sample in the appendix and the explanation of the method in section 2.3) are:

(1) greeting, including greetings on the telephone
(The classical studies on telephone openings are those by Schegloff [1979] and Hopper [1992], but they just play a minor role for our study, which is only interested in the very first turn of a telephone conversation and in the question whether private and business phone openings differ.)

(2) addressing
(The method used here and explained further down takes into account the state of the art, vaguely reflecting the most important ideas since the fundamental work by Brown/Gilman [1960] and the approach by Ervin-Tripp [1974]. The aim is not to draw a full table of address term usage, but of comparing addressing behavior in selected speaker-hearer constellations. Mention should be made of the nowadays outdated, but diachronically useful bibliography by Braun/Schubert/Kohz [1986]. For the period after 1986, the MLA bibliography lists over 450 entries. However, there are no studies on the rules of pronoun use dealing with a great deal of the European languages—the books by Besch [1998], Spillner [2001] and Helmbrecht [2005] are very helpful, though.)

(3) small talk
(The phenomenon of small talk was for the first time delved into by Malinowski [1923], who calls it *phatic communion*—just like Jakobson [1960] a few decades later. The relationship between the interlocutors of phatic communion is normally not very close, it is frequently rather one of maximal distance. There are numerous studies on small talk; oft-quoted ones are those by Laver [1975] and Ventola [1979]. According to Laver, small talk has (a) initiatory function, or the function of avoiding silence, or (b) exploratory function (for getting able to categorize the interlocutor). Friends and relatives can small-talk rather freely, while strangers have to respect certain conventions

---

[3] Unfortunately, the interesting papers collected and edited by Hickey/Stewart (2005) are not based on the same data collection method and are not accompanied by any attempt of a synopsis either.

[4] The term *communicative competence* was first introduced by Hymes (1972b).

[5] Klaus P. Schneider and Anne Barron have begun to set up a bibliography of variational pragmatics, accessible at http://www.linguistics.uni-bonn.de/research/variational-pragmatics.html. However, some relevant entries are still missing, e.g. Ammon (1995), Muhr (1995), Brück (2002), Grzega (2003) for German national varieties and Saari (1999) for the Swedish national varieties.

in order to appear polite. Ventola distinguishes between (a) direct/personal topics (e.g. health, looks) and (b) indirect/situational topics (e.g. the weather, the latest news, the conditions of the communicative situation. Others see small talk as the most exclusive form of the politeness principle, which was first mentioned by Grice [1975] and then elaborated by Lakoff [1973]. Lakoff differentiates two maxims, viz. (a) the "politesse" maxim [which roughly equals Ventola's indirect topics] and (b) the "friendliness" maxim [which roughly equals Ventola's direct topics]. In addition to the issue of which topics are typical and which are tabooed in small talk, the questionnaire also asks for situations in which small talk is typical and in which it is tabooed.)

(4) giving, or making, arguments
(Some of the items incorporated here go back to descriptions by Kaplan [1972] and Kachru [1987].)

(5) inviting
(This part shall test the existence of ostensible invitations as described for the US by Isaacs/Clark [1990].)

(6) turning down an offer
(For turning down an offer, or refusing, we can resort to a study by Beebe/Takahashi/Uliss-Weltz [1990], who divide refusal strategies into (a) direct refusals, including both performatives like 'I refuse' and non-performatives like 'No', 'I can't', 'I don't like to'; 'I don't think so', (b) indirect refusals, such as statements of regret ('I'm sorry'), avoidance strategies (e.g. a postponement 'I'll think about it'), excuses, explanations ('I have a headache'), and (c) adjuncts to refusals, such as a statement of positive opinion or feeling ('I'd love to'), a statement of empathy, an expression of gratitude or appreciation and pause fillers ('well', 'uhm'), which was not included in the list as it is not the refusal *per se*.)

(7) ending a conversation
(The first work on the initiation of a talk was carried out by Schegloff/Sacks [1973]. There is also a study by Otterstedt [1993], but it is regrettably full of factual mistakes and can only be quoted with utter care. Another recent, but unpublished study is Kinnison [2001].)

These various speech acts are presented for nations from all parts of Europe by various linguists who are known as experts for these nations.

2.3. Methodology: State of the Art and This Volume

For speech act analysis, the discourse completion test (DCT) has become a frequent and accepted method for gathering data (first presented by Blum-Kulka/House/Kasper [1989]). In a DCT, informants, after being confronted with the description of a dialogic situation, have to complete a dialog.

> Example:
> You get off the train with a man you have just met on the train. He offers you a car-ride home, but you don't want to accept his offer as you are not sure about his intentions or expectations.
> You: .....
> The man: *OK, so have a nice day.*

However, this way the researcher only gets the most typical answer that comes to an individual's mind. The disadvantage, in my view, is that natural data is not necessarily stimulated if the test already provides a reaction by the interlocutor. A dialog construction questionnaire (DCQ), which has no rejoinder, seems therefore more adequate for eliciting natural dialog-sections. Another point of criticism, valid for both tests, is that we may get (proto)typical answers, but certainly not the whole spectrum of answers, and thus come to wrong conclusions about culture-specificity. Therefore, the meta-linguistic judgement test

(MLJT), or meta-pragmatic judgement test, was suggested by Olshtain/Blum-Kulka (1984), Chen (1996) and Hinkel (1997) as a supplementary method. In a MLJT, the most salient answers gathered in a preceding DCT are listed, and informants are asked to rank the adequateness of the answers.

Example:
You get off the train with a man you have just met on the train. He offers you a car-ride home, but you don't want to accept his offer as you are not sure about his intentions or expectations; so you prefer to walk home. Judge the appropriateness of the following utterances for this situation.
You: .....
The man: *OK, so have a nice day*.

Utterance	very appropriate	rather appropriate	rather inappropriate	very inappropriate
No, thanks.				
No, thanks. I'd like to take a walk now.				
No, thanks, my neighbor is going to pick me up.				
: :				

Here the main disadvantage is that the informant only has to judge a limited set of linguistic forms. Furthermore, the quantity and quality of informants will decide on how valuable general conclusions drawn from the results are.

Since criticism against production and multiple-choice tasks was also raised by others (cf., e.g., Geluykens 2007: 35f.) and since ECSTRA's aim is a more general and more abstract one, we have looked for a method that can reveal all acceptable answers and their "status" and their connotations in specific given situations. Reflecting the idea of ethnography (cf. Hymes 1972a) we came up with the idea of asking those people to serve as informants, or ethnographic assistants, who have to do with language professionally and consequently possess a certain "monitor" for communicative behavior (such as students of language, linguists, journalists). These ethnographic laypersons, better: ethnographic-linguistic semi-experts, have to give, with the help of a questionnaire, their introspective view of conversational aspects typical for their speech groups, as told from the perspective of someone who has to describe this to a foreigner. Informants are regarded as semi-experts due to their experience within, and observation of, the community. We would like to call the method that we have finally come up with a semi-expert interview on communicative strategies (SICS). This questionnaire can be filled out through a face-to-face interview or by informants on their own. While a discourse completion task (DCT) gives a situation and asks for one's typical behavior; a SICS gives typical situations and asks for possible and impossible behavior. The informant can both select from a list of communicative patterns and convey additional patterns. This way a SICS resembles more a metalinguistic judgment task (MLJT), but it requires from the informants reflection on a more abstracting and generalizing level. Tests with the first types of a SICS[6] have shown that it is necessary to respect the following points when creating a SICS:

(1) Informants have to be told very clearly that it is not their task to give their personal communicative preferences, but to give what they think their community would expect or do.
(2) Situations to be commented on have to be given in a way that there is the least possible chance that informants just answer "it depends", e.g. with wordings like "what do people typically say in this case if they don't know each other?".

[6] Cf., e.g., the student projects by Tom Constapel, Julia Haupt, Eva Ollenschläger and Tanja Roik, by Philipp Heinrich, and by Michael Kern (all available at http://www1.ku-eichstaett.de/SLF/EngluVglSW/schule.htm).

(3) It should be made clear to informants that they are to describe things as if corresponding with someone who is not a member of the speech community in question.
(4) It must be clear to informants and the researcher that this method cannot lead to simple yes-or-no categories. There is not only one single answer to a question. Questions ask for all possibilities in a certain context that the informants have observed. The SICS should be looked on rather as a notebook or diary than as a table with boxes to check; this is also why informants are encouraged to give additional information on the use of certain conversational structures.
(5) The main points of the directions for filling out the SICS should be repeated in due intervals, e.g. using the following form:

> [.... Again, we'd like to remind you that you may directly add your comments, pluses and minuses, *yes*'s and *no*'s above or next to the corresponding examples that are given in many of the questions, or you may answer on the line after the question. In order to distinguish between very typical, quite typical and not so typical, but possible answers, you should double-underline very typical answers and put not so typical answers into brackets. Try to answer the questions from the perspective of somebody who has to describe to a foreigner the typical linguistic behavior in his or her nation. Please indicate also when certain forms and features are especially typical of a certain social group, e.g. the elderly/people over 60, women, teenagers. Additional information is highly welcome.]

(6) This type of empirical research is qualitative rather than quantitative. The researcher must therefore interpret the answers in a cautious way, e.g. that a given linguistic pattern can be considered as accepted, normal or "polite" in a speech community if at least 50% of the informants classify it as at least "occasional". If the informants have to give answers that are not selected from a given list, then the researcher may consider them as common if at least 10% of the informants have come up with this same answer independently.

2.4. Nations/Countries Analyzed in This Volume

The SICS served as a tool to get information on the following countries, which were brought into articles by various authors. Unfortunately, during the project (which started in April 2008), several colleagues dropped out, which meant that some countries are now not represented (Portugal, Denmark, Sweden). Luckily, a vast range of European countries is still represented in our articles:
• Austria and Germany (by Joachim Grzega [p. 13ff.])
• Belgium and the Netherlands (by Annebeth Demaeght and Celine Depuydt [p. 23ff.])
• Italy (by Joachim Grzega [p. 35ff.])
• Spain (Castilian by Joachim Grzega [p. 41ff.], Catalan by Miren Urteaga Aldalur [p. 47ff.])
• Hungary (by Małgorzata Suszczyńska [p. 59ff.])
• Estonia (by Leelo Keevallik and Joachim Grzega [p. 80ff.])
• Finland (by Joachim Grzega and Jenni Turunen [p. 88ff.])
• Slovakia (by Joachim Grzega and Pavol Štekauer [p. 94ff.])
• Ireland (by Antoinette Regan [p. 101ff.])
• Romania (by Flavia Butu [p. 109ff.]).
Thus, we could gather information on rather "central" European countries (Germany, Austria, Belgium, the Netherlands, Italy) and on rather "peripheral" European countries (Spain, Estonia, Hungary, Slovakia, Ireland) as well as on a "borderline" European country (Romania). We could gather information on northern Europe (Finland), southern Europe (Spain, Italy), western Europe (Ireland), and eastern Europe (Estonia, Hungary, Slovakia, Romania). We could gather information on countries speaking languages from all European language groups[7]: Germanic (German, English, Dutch, Swedish), Romance (Catalan, Spanish,

[7] Except for the Celtic group.

Italian, Romanian), Slavic (Slovak), and non-Indo-European (Finnish, Estonian, Hungarian).

Each article will try to relate the communicative picture of a nation to classical terminologies, such as Grice (1975), Hall (1976) and Brown/Levinson (1987). A synopsis article, "Elements of a Basic European Language Guide" is provided by Joachim Grzega [p. 118ff.].

3. Intercultural Pragmatics

With the synoptical article by Joachim Grzega, which includes characterizing Europe as a whole, we also get advice for intercultural communication within Europe. In addition, Joachim Grzega sheds light on the pragmatic side of the concept Basic Global English (BGE) [p. 134ff.], Rudolf-Josef Fischer presents Esperanto as a means of intercultural communication (and illustrates that Esperanto definitely goes beyond being "just" a language system) [p. 162ff.], and finally, Leonie Müßig discusses multilingualism concepts, which should also help to develop specific as well as general skills for intercultural communication [p. 180ff.].

Joachim Grzega
Sprach- und Literaturwiss. Fakultät
Katholische Univ. Eichstätt-Ingolstadt
Universitätsallee 1
85072 Eichstätt, Germany
joachim.grzega@ku-eichstaett.de
www.grzega.de

Marion Schöner
Sprach- und Literaturwiss. Fakultät
Katholische Univ. Eichstätt-Ingolstadt
Universitätsallee 1
85072 Eichstätt, Germany
marion_schoener@yahoo.de
www.marionmatschi.de

References

Ammon, Ulrich (1995), *Die deutsche Sprache in Deutschland, Österreich und der Schweiz: Das Problem der nationalen Varietäten*, Berlin / New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Besch, Werner (1998), *Duzen, Siezen, Titulieren: Zur Anrede im Deutschen heute und gestern*, 2nd, rev. ed., Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Blum-Kulka, Shoshana / House, Juliane / Kasper, Gabriele (eds.) (1989), *Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: Requests and Apologies*, Norwood (N.J.): Ablex.

Braun, Friederike / Kohz, Armin / Schubert, Klaus (1986), *Anredeforschung: Kommentierte Bibliographie zur Soziolinguistik der Anrede*, [Ars Linguistica 16], Tübingen: Narr.

Brown, Roger / Gilman, Albert (1960), "The Pronouns of Power and Solidarity", in: Sebeok, Thomas A. (ed.), *Style in Language*, 253-276, Cambridge (Mass.): Technology Press of M.I.T.

Brown, Penelope / Levinson, Stephen (1987), *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brück, Frank (2002), *Interkulturelles Management: Kulturvergleich Österreich – Deutschland – Schweiz*, Frankfurt (Main): IKO.

Chen, Hongyin Julie (1996), *Cross-Cultural Comparison of English and Chinese Metapragmatics in Refusal*, Ph.D. thesis, Indiana: Indiana University. (http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICDocs/data/ericdocs2sql/content_storage_01/0000019b/80/16/ad/e0.pdf).

Ervin-Tripp, Susan (1974), "Sociolinguistic Rules of Address", in: Pride, John B. / Holmes, Janet (eds.), *Sociolinguistics*, 225-240, Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Geluykens, Ronald (2007), "On Methodology in Cross-Cultural Pragmatics", in: Kraft, Bettina / Geluykens, Ronald (eds.), *Cross-Cultural Pragmatics and Interlanguage English*, [LINCOM Studies in English Linguistics 11], 21-72, München: LINCOM.

Goffman, Erving (1955), "On Face-Work: An Analysis of Ritual Elements in Social Interaction", *Psychiatry* 18: 213-231.

Grice, H. Paul (1975), "Logic and Conversation", Cole, Peter / Morgan, Jerry L. (eds.), *Syntax and Semantics*, vol. 3: *Speech Acts*, 41-58, New York etc.: Academic Press.

Grzega, Joachim (2003), "Nonchalance als Merkmal des Österreichischen Deutsch", *Muttersprache*, 113, 242-254.

Grzega, Joachim (2005), "Socioeconomic Linguistics (or Linguistic Socioeconomics): A New Field of European and Global Research and Training", *Journal for EuroLinguistics* 2: 19-43.
Grzega, Joachim (2006), *EuroLinguistischer Parcours*, Frankfurt (Main): IKO.
Grzega, Joachim (in prep.), "Kulturpragmatische Gemeinsamkeiten in den Sprachen Europas", in: Hinrichs, Uwe (ed.), *Handbuch der Eurolinguistik*, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. (publication planned for 2009)
Hall, Edward T. (1976), *Beyond Culture*, Garden City (N.Y.): Doubleday.
Harrison, Lawrence E. / Huntington, Samuel P. (eds.) (2000), *Culture Matters: How Values Shape Human Progress*, New York: Basic Books.
Helmbrecht, Johannes (2005), "Typologie und Diffusion von Höflichkeitspronomina in Europa", *Folia Linguistica* 39: 417-452.
Hickey, Leo / Stewart, Miranda (eds.) (2005), *Politeness in Europe*, [Multilingual Matters 127], Clevedon etc.: Multilingual Matters.
Hinkel, Eli (1997), "Appropriateness of Advice: DCT and Multiple Choice Data", *Applied Linguistics* 18.1: 1-26.
Hinrichs, Uwe (2006), "Doppelrezension: *EuroLinguistischer Parcours* (von Joachim Grzega) und *The Changing Languages of Europe* (von Bernd Heine und Tania Kuteva)," *Journal for EuroLinguistiX* 3: 20-30.
Hinrichs, Uwe (in print), "Geschichte, Stand und Perspektiven der Eurolinguistik", in: Hinrichs, Uwe / Reiter, Norbert / Tornow, Siegfried (eds.), *Eurolinguistik: Entwicklung und Perspektiven*, 1-49, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz (to be published in 2008).
Hopper, Robert (1992), *Telephone Conversation*, Bloomington: University of Indiana Press.
Huntington, Samuel (1996), *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*, New York: Simon & Schuster.
Hymes, Dell H. (1972a), "The Ethnography of Speaking", in: Fishman, Joshua A. (Hg.), *Readings in the Sociology of Language*, 99-138, The Hague: Mouton.
Hymes, Dell H. (1972b), "On Communicative Competence", in: Pride, J.B. / Holmes, J. (Hg.), *Sociolinguistics*, 269-293, Harmondsworth: Penguin.
Isaacs, Ellen A. / Clark, Herbert H. (1990), "Ostensible Invitations", *Language in Society* 19: 493-509.
Jakobson, Roman (1960), "Linguistics and Poetics", in: Sebeok, Thomas A. (ed.), *Style in Language*, 350-373, New York etc.: Wiley.
Kachru, Yamuna (1987), "Cross-Cultural Texts, Discourse Strategies and Discourse Interpretation", in: Smith, Larry E. (ed.), *Discourse Across Cultures: Strategies in World Englishes*, 87-100, New York/London: Prentice Hall.
Kaplan, Robert (1972), *Anatomy of Rhetoric*, Philadelphia: Center for Curriculum Development.
Kinnison, Li Qing (2001), "Good-Bye, You or I? A Study of Linguistic Patterns in American and Chinese Leave-Taking after Dinner", *Dissertation Abstracts International, Section A: The Humanities and Social Sciences* 62.1: 145. (Diss. Michigan State University 2000)
Lakoff, Robin (1973), "The Logic of Politeness, or: Mind Your P's and Q's", in: Corum, Claudia / Smith Stark, T. Cedric / Weiser, Ann (eds.), *Papers from the Ninth Regional Meeting, Chicago Linguistic Society*, 292-305, Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
Laver, John (1975), "Communicative Functions of Phatic Communion", in: Kendon, Adam / Harris, Richard M. / Key, Mary Ritchie (eds.), *The Organisation of Behaviour in Face-to-Face Interaction*, 215-238, The Hague: Mouton.
Malinowski, Bronisław (1923), "The Problem of Meaing in Primitive Languages", in: Ogden, Charles K. / Richards Ian A. (eds.), *The Meaning of Meaning*, 146-152, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
Muhr, Rudolf (1995), "Grammatische und pragmatische Merkmale des österreichischen Deutsch", in: Muhr, Rudolf / Schrodt, Richard / Wiesinger, Peter (eds.), *Österreichisches Deutsch: Linguistische, sozialpsychologische und sprachpolitische Aspekte einer nationalen Variante des Deutschen*, 208-234, Wien: Hölder-Pichler-Tempsky.
Olshtain, Elite / Blum-Kulka, Shoshana (1984), "Cross-Linguistic Speech Act Studies: Theoretical and Empirical Issues", in: MacMathuna, Liam / Singleton, David / Svartvik, Jan (eds.), *Language Across Culture*, 235-248, Dublin: IRALL.
Otterstedt, Carola (1993), *Abschied im Alltag: Grußformen und Abschiedsgestaltung im interkulturellen Vergleich*, München: iudicium.
Saari, Mirja (1999), "Schwedisch in Finnland in soziokulturellem Licht", in: Lehtimäki, Pekka (ed.), *Sprachen in Finnland und Estland*, 125-135, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
Schegloff, Emanuel A. (1979), "Identification and Recognition in Telephone Conversation Openings", in: Psathas, George (ed.), *Everyday Language: Studies in Ethnomethodology*, 23-78, New York: Irvington.
Schegloff, Emanuel A. / Sacks, Harvey (1973), "Opening Up Closings", *Semiotica* 8: 289-327.
Schmidt, Helmut (2000), *Die Selbstbehauptung Europas: Perspektiven für das 21. Jahrhundert*, München: Deutsche Verlagsanstalt.
Ventola, Eija (1979), "The Structure of Casual Conversation in English", *Journal of Pragmatics* 3: 267-298.

version received 30 November 2008

Appendix

Language Use Portrait

Dear Reader:

We need your help for the composition of a European language guide. Our question is: what are common communicative, or conversational, strategies in your nation? They are part of a project whose results will be available on http://www.eurolinguistix.com. Your information will help to find out how we can make communication among Europeans easier.

Filling out the entire questionnaire will take 20 min. roughly. You may directly add your comments, pluses and minuses, *yes*'s and *no*'s above or next to the corresponding examples that are given in many of the questions, or you may answer on the line after the question—especially if you have something new to add. In order to distinguish between very typical, quite typical and not so typical, but possible answers, you should double-underline very typical answers and put not so typical answers into brackets.

Try to answer the questions from the perspective of someone who has to describe to a foreigner the typical linguistic behavior in his/her nation.

Please indicate also when certain forms and features are especially typical of a certain social group, e.g. the elderly/people over 60, women, teenagers.

If you can add literal translations into English, whenever you have to note down phrases/expressions, we would be very grateful.

Additional information is also highly welcome.

Some personal data

Your Language ..... Your Sex.....Your Age.....
Your Nation .....
Region/City in Which You've Grown Up .....
Occupation: .....

Section A: Starting a Conversation

[We'd like to remind you that you may directly add your comments, pluses and minuses, *yes*'s and *no*'s above or next to the corresponding examples that are given in many of the questions, or you may answer on the line after the question. In order to distinguish between very typical, quite typical and not so typical, but possible answers, you should double-underline very typical answers and put not so typical answers into brackets. Try to answer the questions from the perspective of somebody who has to describe to a foreigner the typical linguistic behavior in his or her nation. Please indicate also when certain forms and features are especially typical of a certain social group, e.g. the elderly/people over 60, women, teenagers. Additional information is highly welcome.]

1. Most European languages distinguish between an informal address pronoun (e.g. G. *du*,

Fr. *tu*, Cz. *ty*) and a formal address pronoun (e.g. G. *Sie*, Fr. *vous*, Cz. *vy*).

(a) What are the address pronouns in your language? .....

(b) Say which address pronoun people typically use in your country with the following people:

- children to parents .....
- children to older relatives .....
- colleagues at work among each other .....
- employees to employer .....
- employer to employees .....
- pupils to teacher .....
- teacher to pupils .....
- people to administration officials .....
- business partners among each other .....
- clerks to customers in a store .....
- customers to clerks in a store .....
- people to strangers in the street .....

2. (a) How do people in your nation answer the telephone at home (e.g. *Hello*, "last name", "number")? .....

   (b) How do people in your nation answer the telephone at work (e.g. "name of company" + "your last name" + phrase such as *How can I help you?*) ....

Section B: Keeping Up a Conversation

[Again, we'd like to remind you that you may directly add your comments, pluses and minuses, *yes*'s and *no*'s above or next to the corresponding examples that are given in many of the questions or you may answer after the question. Try to answer the questions from someone's perspective who has to describe the linguistic behavior in his or her nation to a foreigner. Please indicate also when certain forms and features are especially typical of a certain social group. Additional information is highly welcome.]

3. (a) In what situations is small talk common, or even required, in your nation (e.g. on public transportation means, in stores, in waiting rooms, in waiting lines, during a meal ...)? .....

   (b) In what situations is it not common to start small talk, but to remain silent (e.g. in elevators, in the toilet ...)? .....

4. What are common small talk topics in your nation if you're not talking to a close friend or relative (e.g. (1) sports, hobbies, (2) traveling experiences, (3) American entertainment industry, (4) the weather, (5) recent scientific news, (6) recent political events, (7) general praise of domestic politics/politicians, (8) general complaint about politics/politicians, (9) a foreign interlocutor's language competence, ...)? .....

5. Especially if you compare your nation to other nations: what are taboo topics (= forbidden topics) in your nation if you're not talking to a close friend or relative (e.g. (1) religion, (2) politics, (3) money, (4) hobbies, ...)? .....

6. Are people in your country, before they start to say what they really want (e.g. a request, an offer), expected to

   □ (1) do more small talk in a private conversation than in a business conversation
   □ (2) do less small talk in a private conversation than in a business conversation
   □ (3) do as much small talk in a private conversation as in a business conversation

Section C: Being Nice in a Conversation

[Again, we'd like to remind you that you may directly add your comments, pluses and minuses, *yes*'s and *no*'s above or next to the corresponding examples that are given in many of the questions, or you may answer on the line after the question. In order to distinguish between very typical, quite typical and not so typical, but possible answers, you should double-underline very typical answers and put not so typical answers into brackets. Try to answer the questions from the perspective of somebody who has to describe to a foreigner the typical linguistic behavior in his or her nation. Please indicate also when certain forms and features are especially typical of a certain social group. Additional information is highly welcome.]

7. How do you, in your nation, typically present your opinion on a topic?
   □ (1) 1: you say your opinion – 2: you give reasons, citing other persons
   □ (2) 1: you say your opinion – 2: you give reasons related to the issue itself
   □ (3) 1: you give background information, citing others – 2: you say your opinion
   □ (4) 1: you give issue-related background information – 2: you say your opinion
   □ (5) bit by bit: 1: you say your opinion on aspect A – 2: you give reasons for this, citing others – 3: you say your opinion on aspect B – 2: you give reasons for this, citing others
   □ (6) bit by bit: 1: you say your opinion on aspect A – 2: you give issue-related reasons for this – 3: you say your opinion on aspect B – 2: you give issue-related reasons for this
   □ (7) 1: you present diverse opinions and argumentations – 2: you say your own opinion
   □ (8) other strategies: .....
8. If you get an invitation (e.g. to someone's home, to visiting an event) or an offer (e.g. when you need help), you can reasonably assume that this is
   □ (1) an honest offer
   □ (2) just a politeness phrase
   □ (3) .....

Section D: Getting Around Very Uncomfortable Topics

[Again, we'd like to remind you that you may directly add your comments, pluses and minuses, *yes*'s and *no*'s above or next to the corresponding examples that are given in many of the questions, or you may answer on the line after the question. In order to distinguish between very typical, quite typical and not so typical, but possible answers, you should double-underline very typical answers and put not so typical answers into brackets. Try to answer the questions from the perspective of somebody who has to describe to a foreigner the typical linguistic behavior in his or her nation. Please indicate also when certain forms and features are especially typical of a certain social group, e.g. the elderly/people over 60, women, teenagers. Additional information is highly welcome.]

9. If people want to turn down an offer or an invitation, what kinds of linguistic means are used to say "no" in a polite way in your nation? (You may add labels like "(rarely)", "(very frequently)", "(informally)" etc.)
   □ (1) a direct phrase that means "No, I don't feel like going there/doing X."
   □ (2) a vague excuse like "No, I don't have time." or "No, I have something else to do."
   □ (3) a phrase like "(I don't know yet) I'll let you know", though you will surely not contact the person again
   □ (4) a phrase like "I will have to think about it", though you won't surely contact the person again

□ (5) a concrete brief and true excuse (if there is one)
□ (6) a concrete brief and invented excuse (if there is no concrete true excuse)
□ (7) a concrete long and true excuse (if there is one)
□ (8) a concrete long and invented excuse (if there is no concrete true excuse)
□ (9) other means: .....

10. If people disagree with somebody else's opinion, what kinds of linguistic (and non-linguistic) means are used to say "no" in a polite way in your nation? (You may add labels like "(rarely)", "(very frequently)", "(informally)" etc.)
□ (1) a direct "No"
□ (2) never the word "No"
□ (3) a phrase like "(No), I disagree.", "(No), I have a different opinion."
□ (4) a phrase like "I think you have to think about this again."
□ (5) a phrase like "I think we have to think about this again."
□ (6) a phrase like "Yes, I see what you mean, but I think that ..."
□ (7) a phrase like "Yes, I see what you mean, but wouldn't you also think that ..."
□ (8) people just say nothing at all and remain silent
□ (9) people just shake their heads
□ (10) people just smile
□ (11) people just make a disapproving look
□ (12) other means: .....

Section E: Ending a Conversation

[In order to distinguish between very typical, quite typical and not so typical, but possible answers, you should double-underline very typical answers and put not so typical answers into brackets. Try to answer the questions from the perspective of somebody who has to describe to a foreigner the typical linguistic behavior in his or her nation. Please indicate also when certain forms and features are especially typical of a certain social group, e.g. the elderly/people over 60, women, teenagers. Additional information is highly welcome.]

11. (a) What do people say to show that they want to end a conversation?
□ (1) a simple "Ok, good-bye now"
□ (2) a phrase like "I want to go now"
□ (3) a phrase like "I have to go now, I have something else to do"
□ (4) a phrase like "It's already late now"
□ (5) a phrase like "I don't want to bother you any longer"
□ (6) a phrase like "We've already talked for too long"
□ (7) say what they have to do now (if there really is something)
□ (8) invent a reason
□ (9) other means: .....

(b) Does the other person...
□ (1) immediately let you go
□ (2) first try to persuade you to stay?

We thank you very much for your help!