

DIRECT DISCOURSE METHODS IN NON-NATIVE SPEAKERS'  
GERMAN LANGUAGE USE

BY

Viktória Bagi

**Submitted to the graduate degree program in German and the  
Graduate Faculty of the University of Kansas at Lawrence  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy.**

---

Dr. Carmen Taleghani-Nikazm

Chairperson

---

Dr. William Keel

---

Dr. Nina Vyatkina

---

Dr. William Comer

---

Dr. Marcellino Berardo

Date defended: October 23, 2009

The Dissertation Committee for Viktória Bagi certifies  
that this is the approved version of the following dissertation:

DIRECT DISCOURSE METHODS IN NON-NATIVE SPEAKERS'  
GERMAN LANGUAGE USE

---

Dr. Carmen Taleghani-Nikazm

Chairperson

---

Dr. William Keel

---

Dr. Nina Vyatkina

---

Dr. William Comer

---

Dr. Marcellino Berardo

Date approved: November 20, 2009

## Abstract

This dissertation investigates the methods used by intermediate, advanced and superior level learners of German when quoting formerly uttered speech in direct discourse. The study shows that there are different methods of speech reporting at different levels of language proficiency. Each level of speakers in the study used the quotative methods of the earlier level(s), but also added more. Several superior speakers used a quotative structure without a conjugated verb. This was untypical of intermediate and advanced level speakers, who tended to adhere more to the rules of standard German syntax and avoided structures without a conjugated verb. Thus, it seems and that speakers with greater grammatical competence have a more diversified skillset when it comes to varying their quotation methods, which is a sign of greater communicative competence as well. Based on these results, this investigation contributes to our understanding of communicative competence and interlanguage development in German.

## Acknowledgements

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to the members of my committee, especially Dr. Carmen Taleghani-Nikazm for her comments, encouragement and extensive help during the course of this study. I also owe an enormous debt of gratitude to Dr. William Keel for his support of my dissertation project and graduate studies at the University of Kansas. I have learned and benefited greatly from their scholarly example and professionalism, and I am immensely thankful for their helpfulness at all times, even at large geographical distances.

I extend my warmest thanks to my professors at the University of Kansas, who have conveyed a tremendous amount of knowledge about linguistics and literature as well as about the preparation for the academic profession. They have been an admirable source of inspiration.

A very special thanks to the learners of German who agreed to be video- and / or audiotaped for the purposes of this study and thus made it possible to carry out my research.

I am greatly indebted to the faculty of the Institute of Germanic Languages and Literatures at the University of Debrecen, who, in preparation for my Master's degree, paved the way for my further studies of German.

My very special thanks go out to my parents in Hungary, without whom none of this project would have been possible. Anya és Apa, köszönöm szépen a támogatást!

Brooklyn, NY, fall 2009

## Table of Contents

1. Introduction.....	7
2. Linguistic background of the study: reported speech, direct speech and quotatives....	14
2.1 Reported speech and its main types: direct vs. indirect speech.....	14
2.2 The role of quotatives.....	26
2.3 Quotatives and the enactment phenomenon in German.....	30
2.4 <i>Like</i> and <i>so</i> : remarks on their role and grammaticalization process.....	33
3. Pragmatic background of the study: Conversational implicature, pragmatic competence and pragmatic markers.....	45
3.1 General rules organizing conversation. Story telling and the organization of turns at talk.....	46
3.1.1 Conversational implicature and the Gricean principles.....	48
3.1.2 Turn-taking, politeness, and their implications for storytelling.....	49
3.2 Pragmatic competence.....	54
3.3 Non-native innovative quotatives as pragmatic markers. Deixis and code-switching.....	64
4. Data, methodology and main findings.....	72
4.1 Data and methodology of the study.....	72
4.2 General overview.....	82
5. Direct discourse methods of intermediate and advanced level speakers of German....	92
5.1 Data analysis and discussion.....	94
5.1.1 Speakers' quotatives at the intermediate level.....	94
5.1.2 Speakers' quotatives at the advanced level.....	100
5.1.3 Speakers' quotatives at the advanced-mid level.....	116
5.2 Summary / Conclusions.....	120
6. Direct discourse methods of superior level speakers of German.....	123
6.1 Superior level direct discourse methods common with lower-level speakers.....	124
6.2 Direct discourse methods typical to the superior level: quotatives with	

verbs other than typical <i>verba dicendi</i> .....	130
6.3 Direct discourse methods typical to the superior level: quotatives without a conjugated verb.....	141
6.4 General remarks on the quotatives in the study as regards to discourse markers, deixis and code-switching.....	173
6.5 Conclusions and discussion.....	178
7. Differences in the verb tense of the quotatives in native and non-native language use.....	185
8. Conclusion.....	196
References.....	204
Appendices.....	236
Appendix 1: ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines.....	236
Appendix 2: Information on the participants of the study.....	249
Appendix 3: Transcription conventions.....	250
Appendix 4: Native speakers' evaluation sheet.....	252
Appendix 5: Native speakers' evaluations of reported utterances.....	254
Appendix 6: Information sheet and approval forms provided for the study by the Human Subjects Committee Lawrence Campus (HSCL).....	255

## 1. Introduction

With the study of any foreign language, it is essential to see not only what rules govern the language, but also when and how these rules apply. With ample observations of the language in use, it is possible to draw certain conclusions that we can incorporate into our studies in order to enhance communication and understanding in the language. Similarly, it is also insightful for an instructor to see how students develop their communication skills and understanding of the foreign tongue in use. Our knowledge of the language in its currently existing form along with an understanding of students' skills and development can greatly facilitate the process of learning and teaching.

Thus, it is important to look at various functions of the language and see how they are carried out. One significant area of communication in any language is speech reporting. "News, gossip, stories, indeed the whole fabric of everyday conversation depends heavily on quoting and referring to the words of others, and it is hard to imagine a day of our lives when we do not at some point support our discourse with direct or indirect reference to someone else's words" (McCarthy, 1998, p. 150). How we decide to render someone else's words greatly influences our performance of the quote and with that, the impression we make on our audience.

Speech reporting is a staple of everyday communication and there is more than one way to produce it. Generally, the grammar rules of reported speech tend to be quite complex, including a shift in verb tenses as well as in all deictic words, that is, those referring to concrete places, times and persons. While written language tolerates such complex sentence structures fairly well, everyday spoken conversation may become

cumbersome through their extended use. This might well be a reason why spoken language demonstrates a high level of creativity when it comes to reporting. McCarthy noticed in his data corpus on several English dialects that there were many different ways for speech reporting (1998, p. 151), including verbs greater in variety than those generally used in traditional literary reporting (p. 171). He points out that “spoken data also exhibit choices which are rarely, if ever, found in written-text reports” and the striking fact that “everyday conversational resources for reporting are much richer than is suggested by sentence-based accounts of the structure of direct and indirect speech” (1998, p. 151). Accordingly, when investigating reporting methods in a language, the researcher ought to be looking out for structures that go beyond the scope of a traditional reported speech sentence in the descriptive grammar sense.

In my dissertation research project, I am looking at different reported speech methods applied by non-native speakers of German. I have narrowed down the topic “reported speech” to direct reports only, because I was more interested in the performative nature of quotations, which is common with direct quotes accompanied by enactments, than the rather narrative nature of quotes that is characteristic of indirect speech reports. Direct quotes are generally easy to distinguish from indirect ones, because the original speaker’s words are reproduced with no changes in sentence structure and deixis. In particular, this dissertation analyzes how intermediate, advanced and superior level non-native speakers make use of different direct quotation methods and how these methods are different from each other and from those used by native speakers. My study is a descriptive, empirical and qualitative project which looks at target language production in a natural setting. Overall, the findings of my research show how the



communicative competence of learners widens as their proficiency in the language grows, and they also point out differences between the usage of quotative methods on behalf of native speakers of German and the methods non-native speakers apply. The findings of my study should thus help to understand phenomena of interlanguage development and those of second language acquisition.

Andrea Golato (Vlatten) has done research on the role of reported discourse and self-quotations in German by native speakers (Vlatten, 1997; Golato, 2000, 2002a, 2002b), but there have not been exhaustive investigations on how learners of German internalize and use reported or direct speech. Golato showed how interactions can organize grammar and how this can lead to linguistic innovations (Golato, 2002a, p. 51). The focus of her research was the relatively new German quotative *und ich so / und er so*, which corresponds to American English “and I’m like / and he’s like” (2000, 2002b, p. 40-41) and is used to turn the quotation into a performance or enactment (1997, p. 52, 2002a, p. 40).

Non-native speakers are mostly exposed to the standard rules of rendering formerly uttered speech, but not to any alternatives. McCarthy observes that many language textbooks give an impoverished and inadequate coverage of what actually takes place in everyday conversation and still rely too heavily on written data when it comes to speech reporting (1998, p. 150). The textbook I was using in my German classes at the time I started my research also left much to be desired: the textbook *Deutsch: Na klar!*, when giving a summary on reported speech, stated that the subjunctive I is commonly used only in the third-person singular form, and for other verb forms, German speakers increasingly use the more common subjunctive II or *würde* + infinitive instead

(DiDonato, Clyde, & Vansant, 2004, p. 394). However, it did not draw students' attention to the pragmatic difference between these two forms, namely, that *würde* + the infinitive and the subjunctive II express a definitely more subjective view on behalf of the speaker than the subjunctive I. The book also neglected to mention that the subjunctive I is very marginal in spoken language (see Golato, 2002a, p. 30) and failed to discuss any other quotation methods or quotative options. I agree with McCarthy when he states that discourse grammars should not be concerned only with conventionally described structures, "but must also be prepared to encounter and explain structures not previously observed or discussed within the canon of grammar" (McCarthy, 1998, p. 162).

Vlatten (Golato) herself suggested at the end of her 1997 dissertation *Quotatives, Reported Speech, and Constructed Dialogue in Everyday German Conversation* that her study could be used as a springboard for further research on reported speech in conversational German (1997, p. 204). The focus of my interest for the current study was to see whether non-native speakers at any level tend to apply the same or similar methods for quotations as native speakers: is their use of the subjunctive limited or more extensive (after all, it is what they learn as the grammatical device with which to express reported speech)? If they do use it, which one occurs more: the subjunctive I or II? To what extent do non-natives rely on enactments for a more dramatic effect? What quotatives do they use to accompany enactments: *und ich so / und er so* (if at all) or something else? In their 1991 paper, Romaine and Lange cite a quotation by Martina Navratilova, a non-native speaker of English performing a self-quotation with *like* (1991, p. 253) and they note having observed other non-native speakers of English who have picked up this use of *like* (p. 272). If non-native speakers of English can produce an informal quotative, then,

possibly, so could non-native speakers of German. Would the quotations have the same format as that of native speakers? When using verbs of saying (*verba dicendi*) as quotatives, is there a dominant verb tense?

My initial hypothesis was that most non-native speakers would be likely to stick to reported speech methods taught in textbooks, that is, to the subjunctive I and II, or simply the indicative. I did not expect the quotative *und ich so / und er so* to occur very frequently; nevertheless, I was interested whether it would be used by students to whom it was taught explicitly in class.

My goal was to determine what quotation methods would be preferred by non-native speakers in comparison to native speakers of German, and how natural-sounding these would be. Would they seem “textbook-like” or could they make the impression that the speaker had mastered the language and its contextual usage well? If unnatural-sounding phenomena occur, why do they sound unnatural? Can we observe any correlation between the non-native speakers’ level of proficiency and the quotation methods they use? These were the main questions that I set out to find answers for.

This dissertation is divided into six main chapters. Chapters 2 and 3 provide background information on the linguistic and pragmatic areas relevant to my research. Chapter 2 focuses on the characteristics of reported speech and, in particular, direct speech. 2.1 explains the concept of reported speech and its main types, direct and indirect speech. 2.2 is dedicated to quotatives (expressions introducing a reported speech segment). 2.3 looks at reporting methods in German including quotatives and enactments and a discussion of the typical German quotative *und ich so / und er so*. 2.4 is a summary

of the characteristics of *like* and *so*, which are both significant components of quotative structures in English and in German.

Chapter 3 provides a literature review necessary to comprehend the pragmatic aspects of the current study. Section 3.1 looks at the rules that govern conversation, namely the concepts of conversational implicature, politeness, footing and turn-taking in interaction. 3.2 is a description of pragmatic competence and interlanguage development, two indispensable notions in the field of Second Language Acquisition. 3.3 discusses pragmatic markers, since the quotatives in my data corpus were used in this role. 3.3 also goes into details on the nature of deictic expressions and code-switching, both of which influenced the quotative structures in my study.

Section 4.1 is a general description of my data corpus and the methodology of Conversation Analysis used in the dissertation. In 4.2, I provide an overview of my main findings. Chapters 5 and 6 go into details on the direct speech methods used by different level non-native speakers in my study, illustrated by segments and their analyses from the speakers' actual conversations. In chapter 5, I present an analysis of the direct speech methods applied by intermediate and advanced level speakers; in chapter 6, those used by superiors. Chapter 6 is divided into three parts: 6.1 shows examples of superior level quotation methods that are common with the lower levels, whereas 6.2 and 6.3 bring examples of quotatives typically used by superiors only. 6.2 is an analysis of quotatives with verbs other than typical verbs of saying; 6.3 investigates quotatives without a conjugated verb. At the end of chapter 6, in the light of the analyzed segments and quotatives, I refer back to discourse markers, deixis and code-switching to explain how

the quotatives can be described as discourse / pragmatic markers, how they are connected to deixis, and how they were influenced by code-switching.

Chapter 7, comparing the verb tense usage of native and non-native speakers of German, rounds off the main chapters of this dissertation, which are intended to show how learners of German handle the sometimes daunting task of speech reporting in the foreign language. Chapter 8 offers concluding remarks as well as some pedagogical implications of the study.

## 2. Linguistic background of the study: reported speech, direct speech and quotatives

In the two upcoming chapters, I will discuss two areas relevant to my study on how non-native speakers of German use direct speech in everyday conversations. Chapter 2 investigates the characteristics of reported speech and specifically, those of direct speech.

In this chapter, I will start with the notion of reported speech and its main types, direct and indirect speech in 2.1. An investigation of quotatives (expressions introducing the reported speech segment) follows in 2.2. 2.3 is dedicated to reporting methods in German, with a special emphasis on quotatives and the enactment phenomenon, including a discussion of the typical German quotative *und ich so / und er so*. Finally, in 2.4, I summarize the characteristics of *like* and *so*, both of which are typical components of quotative structures in English and in German. The participants of my study produced several quotatives that were similar in structure to quotatives with *so* and *like*.

### 2.1 Reported speech and its main types: direct vs. indirect speech

An essential part of conversation is reported speech,<sup>1</sup> where several possibilities are available for quoting something that was said or thought before. Coulmas (1986) notes that in reported speech “we produce a word or words of the same type as the ones

---

<sup>1</sup> Also referred to by scholars as reported discourse.”

uttered by the quoted speaker” (p. 12).<sup>2</sup> By “reported speech,” I refer to methods speakers use when quoting or retelling something that was said or thought previously by themselves or other speakers. The person who produced the original utterance or thought (the speaker being quoted / reported upon) is called the “reported speaker” (also called “internal speaker”) (Janssen & van der Wurff, 1996, p. 4) The speaker performing the reporting / quote is called the “reporter” (or “external speaker”) (Janssen & van der Wurff, 1996, p. 4). Reported speech can be regarded as a complex grammatical phenomenon since it is not only an utterance: it is an utterance about another (usually somebody else’s) utterance. Thus, it has to be made clear who the original speaker was and in what speech situation the utterance took place. Because of this, reported speech has linguistic and metalinguistic features: it is not only speech in itself but also a reflection on speech. As Vološinov (1930) wrote, it is “speech within speech, utterance within utterance, and at the same time also *speech about speech, utterance about utterance*” (p. 115). This implies a certain risk for misunderstandings. For example, in the utterance “John said that our lovely neighbor stopped by again,” it is not clear whether it is the current or the reported speaker who refers to the neighbor as “lovely.” This is called *de dicto* (based on the words in the original utterance) and *de re* (something added by the reporter) interpretation (Coulmas, 1986, pp. 3-6; Partee, 1973, p. 414).

In the literature on reported speech, terminology is not used unambiguously; some authors use the terms “indirect speech” and “reported speech” as synonyms while others

---

<sup>2</sup> However, one needs to proceed with caution. Tannen (1986) remarks that the term “reported speech” is a misnomer and prefers to use the term “constructed dialogue,” since most of the reported lines were probably not actually spoken (p. 311). Clark and Gerrig (1990) solve this problem by distinguishing between “generic” and “specific” referents of quotations, with “specific” referring to a speaker in particular and “generic” evoking utterances that were probably not said in the quoted form (e.g., “Many people have come up to me and said, «Ed, why don’t you run for the Senate?»” (p. 773).

avoid the term “reported speech” altogether (Janssen & van der Wurff, 1996, p. 3). In this dissertation, I am going to use “reported speech” as a cover term and refer to its basic types as direct and indirect speech (Kammerzell & Peust, 2002, pp. 291-293).<sup>3</sup> Direct speech is also called *oratio recta*, indirect speech *oratio obliqua* (Clark & Gerrig, 1990, p. 764; Romaine & Lange, 1991, p. 229). Based on which type or subtype the speaker decides to choose, different pragmatic concerns come to play an important role and this results in different grammar forms, intonation patterns, hearer reactions, etc. However, no matter how different the means are, reported speech seems to be a universal phenomenon in languages of the world (Coulmas, 1986).<sup>4</sup>

The main difference between direct and indirect speech is in the speaker’s attitude: with a direct quotation, the speaker “commits himself to faithfully rendering form and content of what the original speaker said” (Coulmas, 1985, p. 42) while indirect speech “implies a commitment about the contents but not about the form” (Coulmas, 1985, p. 42). Thus, with an indirect quote the original meaning is preserved but it might be expressed by different wording. Haberland (1986) explains the difference in a similar way when he says that any report of a speech act<sup>5</sup> by another speech act which reenacts

---

<sup>3</sup> A third type is often present in literary narration and is called “free indirect speech”, “*erlebte Rede*” or, most often, “*style indirect libre*” based on its French name. Vološinov (1930) refers to it as “quasi-direct discourse” (p. 137), Clark and Gerrig (1990) point out its kinship with direct quotations (p. 788). This type may include lengthy segments of reported speech without a verb of saying introducing each one specifically. It is close to what is called “stream of consciousness” in literary narratives. However, since its occurrence is restricted to literary usage and it is characterized by an absence of quotatives (see 2.2), it will not be discussed in this dissertation. For further details on the *style indirect libre*, see Banfield (1973) and Fónagy (1986, pp. 293-294).

<sup>4</sup> Even though it is worth mentioning that while direct speech is universal, indirect speech is not. Languages without indirect speech are, e.g., the South American Paez and Navajo (Li, 1986, p. 39).

<sup>5</sup> A speech act is an utterance with a certain function (e.g., a request, a compliment, an offer, a declaration, etc.) which comprises 1) a locutionary act or proposition (the literal meaning of the utterance), 2) an



the original is called direct speech; any report of a speech act which only reports the contents is indirect speech (p. 220). With reenactments, Haberland refers to the fact that the illocutionary force of the original utterance is only displayed, but not enforced in the report: the speaker repeats the original utterance without repeating the original speech act (p. 220). The original intonation and / or gestures are imitated by the reporting person. This technique is generally referred to as an *enactment* or *performance* of the quote. Such an enactment enhances the meaning of the quoted utterance in a way that narration cannot achieve because it is not as expressive. Tannen (1986), when studying the reports of Greek women on being molested, observed that “by setting up a little play, the speaker can portray motivations and other subtle evaluations internally – from within the play – rather than externally – by stepping outside the frame of the narrative to make evaluation explicit” (p. 325). Clark and Gerrig (1990) talk about the same experience when they state that quotations are demonstrations (in the sense of ‘illustration by exemplification’), which depict rather than describe the referent (p. 764). They categorize demonstrations as nonserious actions according to Goffman’s division (1974) of human actions into serious and nonserious types (1974), because demonstrations are only played / pretended, not actually occurring (Clark & Gerrig, 1990, p. 766). However, demonstrations are component parts of serious activities (p. 766), which is exactly how they function in reported speech: they illustrate the quoted material by showing how the reported persons said something, what kind of voice or register they used and / or what nonlinguistic actions accompanied their words (p. 782).<sup>6</sup> An enactment is therefore a powerful device

---

illocutionary act or illocutionary force (the intended effect on the recipient) and 3) a perlocutionary act (the effect the utterance actually has on the recipient) (see Austin, 1962 and Searle, 1969).

<sup>6</sup> In a similar context, Heath (2002) shows how patients tend to show rather than tell their doctors about physical symptoms they have experienced, thus rendering their complaint visible (p. 610).

in reporting: it does not simply retell an event but reanimates it. This re-enactment makes the hearer experience the event vividly (Clark & Gerrig, 1990, p. 794). Goffman calls this replaying (1974, p. 504), whereby the hearers' appreciation is desired (p. 546). This is why Streeck (1994) adds that the hearers' attention and participation actually become similar to the role of a theatre audience that is to be entertained, and that quoted dialogue is closely related to stage dialogues (p. 605). Collins (2001) goes a step further when he suggests that the quintessence of direct speech is not mimesis but methexis ('participation'), because it allows the audience to participate both in the new as well as the previous event (p. 74). Sidnell (2006) also emphasizes that re-enactments create moments of heightened coparticipation, more so than simple narration (p. 390).<sup>7</sup>

Direct speech adopts the perspective of the original speaker whereas indirect speech renders the quote from the reporter's point of view, which means that the deictic expressions need to be adapted to the reporting situation (Coulmas, 1985, p. 49). Tannen (1986) summarizes the findings of previous research on the main difference between direct and indirect speech when she notes that "narration is more vivid when speech is presented as first-person dialogue («direct quotation») rather than third-person report («indirect quotation») – and is more commonly found in conversational narrative" (p. 311). However, she warns that exact reporting in oral storytelling is improbable unless it is based on the memorization of a transcript of the conversation (p. 313). By this she means that speakers might leave out or add utterances to the reported material because they may not remember the exact wording of the utterance. This is certainly a noteworthy

---

<sup>7</sup> Sidnell (2006) examines re-enactments as a form of multimodal actions in which talk, gaze and gesture are integrated. His data show that reporters redirect their gaze from their audience before a re-enactment and look away while producing the direct speech, thus marking the boundary between narration and re-enactment (p. 396).

observation that every researcher investigating reported speech should be aware of. This study being one such investigation: Here I would like to point out that all segments discussed in this dissertation were considered to be reported speech in the sense that I supposed that the utterances reported upon were quoted to the best of the reporting speaker's knowledge and memory. Obviously, no study on reported speech of any kind can take responsibility for the accuracy of the quotes it analyzes; but because of Grice's maxim of quality, one assumes that the speakers in any conversation do not say (in this case, quote) what they think to be false (Grice, 1975, p. 46).<sup>8</sup> Therefore, I did not doubt the truthfulness of any occurrence of reported speech in my study and accepted them as being precise, or what the reporting person believed to be precise renderings of the original utterance. Tannen (1986) herself seems to be forgiving of speakers who may be oblivious of the exact wording of the quote: she recounts having been told the same story twice, once in writing and once in conversation; and while pointing out that the spoken version was more effective, she adds that it does not matter whether the words reported were the words actually spoken in the original dialogue (pp. 329-330). The spoken report of the story, rendered in direct speech, made a greater impression on Tannen, because the speaker quoted the original utterance whereas the written version only named the speech act (apology). Tannen's conclusion is that the person who offered the direct quote "seems to have a sense that retelling his apology in the form of constructed dialogue will be vivid (...) and make the sense of what should come next vivid also" (p. 330). This is exactly why speakers seem to prefer direct speech over indirect speech or descriptive narration: because it enlivens the quoted material and draws attention not only to the quote itself but

---

<sup>8</sup> For a more detailed discussion of the Gricean maxims, see section 3.1.1.

also whatever else the speakers would like to point out next in their turn. It certainly gives a valid explanation for the dominance of direct speech in my data.

Direct speech is very often preferred to indirect because it is more expressive. Through direct speech, the reporting speaker can convey his attitude instead of giving his opinion explicitly (Holt, 1996, p. 232). This renders the quoted material more objective: the audience can assess the situation without the reporter's evaluation, because they hear the utterance the way it was originally produced. Direct speech thus has a dramatizing effect, is an effective, economical narrative device and also a way of providing evidence: there is no need for glossing or summarizing, the hearers have direct access to the original utterance (Holt, 1996, p. 236). Fónagy (1986) also points out that direct speech creates the illusion of witnessing the scene evoked by the narrator (p. 255). Because of this, it has the potential of being more convincing than indirect speech.<sup>9</sup> As Tannen (1986) puts it, it creates involvement (p. 327). Streeck goes as far as calling it an art form (1994, p. 580, 2002, p. 591) since it aestheticizes everyday life by entertaining through language (1994, p. 610). It gives the reporting speaker the opportunity to say not only what the content of the quote is, but to actually show this content, therefore it has a theatrical, playful character (Wierzbicka, 1974, p. 272). At the same time, it makes a greater demand on the hearers than indirect speech, because it forces them to be more active and emotionally involved in sense-making (Collins, 2001, p. 69). Direct speech "requires the reporter-speaker to act out the role of the reported speaker" and so it is "the most common mode of expression at the peak of oral narrative" (Li, 1986, p. 40). It is a strategy less complex than indirect speech, since it "involves reproducing or mimicking

---

<sup>9</sup> Wooffitt (1992) observed that it is often applied by speakers talking about paranormal experiences to confirm objectivity (p. 159).

the speech of the reported speaker, whereas indirect speech involves rephrasing or paraphrasing” (p. 40). Obviously, mimicking is simpler than paraphrasing, being an innate ability in all human beings and available “from the onset of first language acquisition” (p. 40). Hence its frequent occurrence in most languages for interactional purposes, that is, for making a quotation more dramatic. Furthermore, direct speech is more suitable to evoke the reported speech situation, because no changes in deixis need to be made; the words (and possibly the gestures) of the quoted speaker are supposed to be exactly the ones originally uttered.<sup>10</sup> In indirect speech, however, the current speech situation is decisive, and the quote is looked upon from the reporter’s point of view. Indirect speech “shows (...) adaptations of deictic and pragmatic elements to the embedding context,” while direct speech does not (Kammerzell & Peust, 2002, p. 293). Schiffrin (1981) explains the frequency of direct quotes in narrative with the fact that they increase the immediacy of a past utterance by allowing the speaker to present it as if it were happening in the present (p. 58). She points out that direct speech has this effect due to a combination of deictic and structural phenomena that indirect quotes do not display: the central reference point in direct speech is the current narrative framework instead of the original speech situation (p. 58). Along the same lines, Holt (1996) refers to

---

<sup>10</sup> On the other hand, direct speech very often evokes only the surface structure of the quoted utterance and due to spontaneity, the reporter may not reproduce the actual wording but change it, e.g., omit the pauses, fillers, etc. the original speaker produced (see Clark & Gerrig, 1990, pp. 795-796). Thus, the quote is a direct but not necessarily a true verbatim (word-for-word) reproduction of the original. This is why Collins (2001) remarks that verbatim reporting is only one subtype of direct speech (p. 51). Because of the limitations of human memory and people’s preference to use their own idioms and personal style, very few speakers quote an utterance in its exact same form (Clark & Gerrig, 1990, p. 796-97). That is why Clark and Gerrig point out the selective character of direct quotations. Holt (1996) agrees and brings an example from her own data to show the sometimes inaccurate character of direct speech (p. 228). Also, as will be discussed below, direct speech is used for rendering not only verbal but also nonverbal utterances, which by their very nature exclude a verbatim interpretation since they include no actual words. Another question is how to interpret direct quotations that report the thoughts of the speaker or of another person. This method makes the narrative very dramatic and conveys the reported event as first-hand experience, yet it claims to retell in direct speech something that was not said and probably not even thought exactly in its reported form. For some examples, see Tannen, 1983, pp. 364-365.

the fact that pronouns, spatial and temporal references as well as verb tenses in direct speech are all appropriate to the reported context rather than the current one, because they are presented from the reported speaker's point of view (p. 222). The retention of the original speaker's prosody also relates the utterance to the reported context and consequently, adds to the dramatic effect of the reported segment (p. 240). Coulmas (1985) summarizes the difference by specifying that direct speech is faithful to the form, while indirect speech shows varying degrees of faithfulness to it: it might be an exact copy of the reported utterance with minimal changes or a complete rephrasing and disregard of form (p. 52).

Since fewer changes need to be made, direct speech is less complicated to use than indirect. This is also supported by the fact that in children's language development, the acquisition of direct speech precedes that of indirect speech (Hickmann, 1982, as cited in Romaine & Lange, 1991, p. 268). Romaine and Lange (1991) note that using direct quotations in a narrative "may be a simplifying device for speakers, particularly immature ones, because it allows them to avoid some of the more problematic aspects of syntactic and semantic incorporation, such as deictic shifting required in the indirect mode" (p. 268). Language learners in their development of the L2 are often supposed to go through similar steps as children acquiring the same language as their mother tongue, who also produce less complicated structures first (see e.g., Lightbown & Spada, 1993, Chapter 4). Reproducing formerly uttered speech in the indirect mode requires a higher level of language skills because of the shift in deixis and, in several languages, also in the verb tense. In German the verb mood may change with indirect speech. These features demand language skills that are not attained at the beginner or lower intermediate level.

There are certain types of expressions that cannot or only clumsily be rendered in indirect speech. Conversational routines and gambits fall into this category, that is, all utterances that show the speaker's opinion, emotions, the development of an idea in the conversation, politeness formulae or phatic expressions (e.g., "What I think is...", "Oh my God, wow!", "With due respect", "Thank you so much", "Beautiful weather, isn't it?"). Quoting such utterances in indirect speech would sound rather unnatural because they do not have an illocutionary force on their own (Coulmas, 1985, p. 46). Vološinov (1930) notes that such expressions are "too colourful" and adds that "they not only convey the exact meaning of what was said but they also suggest the manner of speech" (p. 129). As such, they are incompatible with indirect speech, whose main characteristic is analysis (p. 129). Their expressiveness calls for the usage of direct speech because the speech acts cannot be rendered in indirect speech. The same is true to interjections, onomatopoeic words, modal and discourse particles and nonverbal sequences such as noises, sounds, facial and bodily gestures, etc, in short, all utterances that are not verbatim reporting but rather so-called "token mimicry" (Romaine & Lange, 1991, p. 230). Just like conversational routines and gambits, these can also be reproduced in direct speech only (even if, with the exception of interjections, there is no actual "speech" as such included with most of them) because they give an exact reproduction of the original utterances and are thus direct quotes. Tannen (1986) lists some sound words such as "bam", "plaf" and "dak", which represent action and thus "contribute to involvement by forcing the hearer to recreate the action represented by the sound" (pp. 326-327). Obviously, these sound words would be awkward to paraphrase in indirect speech. Kiefer (1986) brings some excellent examples on the difficulties of including modal particles in

Hungarian indirect speech. To help clarify these problems, he suggests that there are actually two types of verbs of saying ('say' and 'state / assert') and the acceptability of including modal particles in an indirect quote depends on which type is used in the embedding context (p. 216). If the original utterances are reproduced in direct speech, quoting particles ceases to be problematic. Thus, direct speech seems again a choice less clumsy than indirect speech.<sup>11</sup>

Since all of the above mentioned elements can only be paraphrased awkwardly, if at all, indirect speech would sound quite unnatural to introduce them because it involves the pragmatic paraphrasing of speech acts (Coulmas, 1985, p. 49). Consider the following example: when reporting the sequence "Oh, shoot," indirect speech would not only sound unnatural but also grammatically incorrect:

(1) \* She said that oh, shoot.

Thus, rendering interjections and nonverbal elements is possible only and exclusively with some kind of direct speech:

(2) She said: "Oh, shoot!" *or* She was like, oh, shoot!

Reproducing an original sequence which contains an interjection or a nonverbal gesture thus, in my opinion, always has to be accompanied by an enactment on behalf of the reporting person. If the speaker decides to describe the manner or gestures

---

<sup>11</sup> Other scholars who discuss elements that occur only in direct speech are Banfield (1973), Holt (1996) and Mayes (1990).



accompanying the original quote, the reported segment is inevitably turned into either indirect speech, or, probably even more often, simple narration. It thereby loses its pragmatic function of enlivening the reporter's turn in the conversation. This is why Coulmas (1985) noted: "where direct speech is expressive, indirect speech is descriptive" (p. 43). Compare (3) with (2) to see the difference in dramatic effect:

(3) She expressed her agitation over the matter.

In (3), a speech act verb is used to convey the meaning that was originally produced by an interjection. This is a phenomenon investigated by Coulmas (1985). He noted that indirect speech, by the nature of the changes made to the original utterance when it is embedded as a complement clause, isolates the proposition from the illocutionary force of the reported speech act (p. 45). Therefore, "everything that is not part of the proposition has to be described, rather than being included in the complement clause" (pp. 45-46). Some forms are so fixed that no grammatical changes are possible to integrate them into a complement clause, e.g., "Okay", "Right?", "Pardon me?" or "Not that I disagree with you, but" (p. 47). Coulmas also mentions the difficulties one may run into when trying to paraphrase in indirect speech interrogative, imperative and hortative sentences, tag questions, terms of address as well as discourse organizing signals such as starters, false starts, pause fillers, turn claiming and turn passing devices, self-correction, repetition or, for instance, the speaker's stuttering, etc. (pp. 46-48). The main reason for their incompatibility with indirect speech is that these elements are closely tied to the original speech situation and are thus dependent on the original speaker's perspective (p.

48). The conclusion is that indirect quotation requires grammatical-deictic switches as well as “the deletion of expressive elements or their replacement by descriptive elements” (p. 48). However, replacing the performance of the quotation with a description lessens the originality and the dramatic feature of the reported speech segment. Even though it is possible to convey the reporter’s evaluation of the events through certain verbs or expressions (e.g., “He had the nerve to tell me that...” or “She made me believe that...”), these would turn the reporting into narration and thus, again, would result in a loss of expressiveness. Since speakers in conversation generally try to be as expressive as possible, it is understandable that the speakers in my recordings predominantly resorted to direct instead of indirect speech to ensure a more dramatic rendering of their quotations and help the hearers understand why their story is of extraordinary interest.

Note that it is possible to mix indirect with direct speech if changes in pitch or intonation make it obvious that the quote is supposed to be an exact rendition of the original speaker’s utterance (e.g., “John told his girlfriend that ↑I had never seen that girl before!”). Thus, it is possible to bring a fairly high level of subjectivity into a report in indirect speech.<sup>12</sup> However, this type of reported speech did not occur in my recordings.

## **2.2 The role of quotatives**

In writing, reported speech is usually indicated by quotation marks while in spoken language it is generally introduced by a quotative. A quotative, by definition, is “the term we use to refer to any verb or expression which introduces any reported speech” (Blyth, Recktenwald, & Wang, 1990, p. 225). Tannen (1986) as well as

---

<sup>12</sup> For further examples see Tannen, 1986, p. 314; for French and Hungarian, Fónagy, 1986, p. 276-277.

Johnstone (1987) call these expressions “introducers” because they introduce the reported segment. Goffman (1974) talks about “laminators.” Verbs of saying (*verba dicendi*) are the most common quotatives (e.g., “he said”, “she claimed”, etc.) and are extensively used in speaking as well as writing. Holt, who calls them “indicators” (1996), notes that “said” is the most common one: prosody indicates how the utterance was spoken, and this makes other expressions (e.g., “he whispered”, “she moaned”, often used in literary contexts) unnecessary (p. 224). Other quotatives are also widely used, especially in the spoken language which leaves room for more informality. Also, they may be left out entirely in conversations since in speaking, the reporting persons can indicate that they are imitating other speakers and saying what those people originally said by changing their voice. Because a speaker can reanimate a range of different voices, such role-play is by no means limited to only two persons (see Tannen, 1986, pp. 319-321). By its dramatic nature, this reanimation creates greater involvement in conversations than quotation marks in writing or repeated quotatives in speaking can. Since the reanimation assumes acting out the role of the original speaker, it is a characteristic of direct speech. The greater involvement this role-play evokes is a reason why direct speech is so often preferred to indirect in spoken interaction.

Omitting a quotative may serve different purposes, the main one being the creation of a greater dramatic effect. Holt (1996) points out that quoting turn-initials (“well”, “oh”), along with a shift in prosody (both features adding to the dramatic enhancement of the reported segment), can be the indication for an upcoming direct quote if there is no quotative present (p. 238). Tannen (1983) suggests that deleting words, including verbs of saying from a narration forces the audience to fill in the gap and so

become more involved in the storytelling (pp. 365-366). The example she cites is a self-quotation, where the speaker repeats her original utterance twice but does not preface it with a quotative in either case (p. 366). Mathis and Yule (1994) list several usages of this same phenomenon, which they call zero quotatives, and emphasize their dramatic effect, e.g., in reflecting the urgency of the reported interaction (p. 67). One typical case they claim for the omission of quotatives is when the conversation of two speakers is reported (p. 65), where the utterances are distinguished only by changes in the reporter's voice.<sup>13</sup>

Ten Cate (1996), while examining elements introducing indirect speech in written German, found that 75% of them were verbs, namely *verba dicendi* or *verba sentiendi* (verbs that express the speaker's thought or attitude); the most common ones were *sagen* (to say), *schreiben* (to write), *denken* (to think) or *fühlen* (to feel), but other ones such as *erklären* (to explain), *mitteilen* (to inform) and *betonen* (to emphasize) were present as well (p. 193).

Sometimes, speakers use quotatives that are *verba non-dicendi*. These constitute an instance of verbs that, as Tannen (1986) describes them, “do not really describe the way the dialogue was spoken but (...) actually describe something else about the action or the actors” (p. 323). Based on Labov (1972), she calls these verbs “graphic introducers” (Tannen, 1986, p. 322). While this is possible in other languages, research on these so-called secondary verbs of saying is remarkable in Hungarian because this language is extremely rich in them (see Simonyi, 1881-1883; Fónagy, 1986). Their usage implies that a primary verb of saying is omitted and thus an elliptical form is created, in which the secondary verb absorbs the meaning of the primary one in a metaphor (see

---

<sup>13</sup> The other usages they describe all involve hypothetical contexts and not the rendering of utterances that were actually spoken. An example of an actually uttered structure with a zero quotative is e.g., “I'd to fall in with her all right then Dulcie where do we go now to bingo” (McCarthy, 1998, p. 154).

Fónagy, 1986, pp. 268-275). Its meaning is that of a *verbum non-dicendi*, yet it functions as a *verbum dicendi* and it is to be interpreted as a speech act (Fónagy, 1986, p. 268). It might be a native Hungarian occurrence; when Fónagy provided French speakers with translations of such structures from Hungarian to see whether they are found acceptable, most of them were rejected (Fónagy, 1986, p. 271).<sup>14</sup> Sabban (1978) in her article on the syntactic and semantic restrictions of German and French quotatives also gives examples of quotatives that style critics do not approve of, even though authors like to use them as stylistic devices (e.g., with *verba agendi* (verbs that express action, an active doing) such as “«Du»! hob ich die Fäuste.” ‘«You!» I raised my fists’) (pp. 29-30). Sabban claims that only resultative transitive verbs can occur with direct quotations (pp. 32-33), or intransitive verbs that can be nominalized (e.g., *witzeln – einen Witz machen* ‘to be joking’, ‘to make a joke’) (pp. 41-42). However, this is certainly not the case not only in French and Hungarian<sup>15</sup> (Fónagy, 1986, p. 299) but also in English and German. Direct quotation possibilities include in English e.g., “he goes” or “he was like” and “*und er so*” or “*von wegen*” in German. Note that the German quotatives do not even include a verb.

Tannen (1986) suggests that the various ways of introducing dialogue, that is, the usage of a quotative, fall along a continuum with no introducer at all at one pole (typical of informal conversational narrative because of the expressive power of the human voice) and graphic verbs at the other (typical of literary narrative) (p. 323). As one can conclude from this illustration, the ability to signal speaker alternation and role-play by means of the human voice makes a great difference in the expressive force of the quotation: in

---

<sup>14</sup> Speakers of Hungarian, German or English would probably also reject the use of French *faire* (literally ‘to do’) as quotative for direct speech, although it is an extremely common verb in French for this function.

<sup>15</sup> Sabban excludes factive verbs from possible direct speech quotatives, but the non-native speakers in my data did use examples like *beobachten* ‘to observe’ and *aufnehmen* ‘to take (it as something)’, ‘to register’.

spoken language, changes in pitch and intonation, accompanied by gestures and body language creates a powerful reenactment of the original utterance. Therefore, the conclusion is again that direct speech, especially when supported by an enactment, is a more effective way of speech reporting in an informal setting than indirect speech.

### 2.3 Quotatives and the enactment phenomenon in German

The most common quotatives in written as well as spoken German are *verba dicendi* and *verba sentiendi*. Ten Cate (1996) in his study on indirect speech introducers found several other grammatical classes possible as well, such as verbal nouns (e.g., *Behauptung* ‘assertion’, *Auffassung* ‘opinion’), adverbs (*laut*, *so*, *nach Angaben* ‘according to’), verbo-nominal predicates (called “*Funktionsverbgefüge*” in German, e.g., *zum Ausdruck bringen* ‘to express’) or complex predicates (*davon ausgehen* ‘to assume’, *schriftlich geben* ‘to put down in writing’) as part of the quotative (pp. 193-194). The adverb *so* is also part of the now fairly widespread spoken language direct speech quotative *und ich so / und er so* ‘and I’m like / and he’s like’, first described by Andrea Golato (Vlatten).

Golato has done extensive research on the role of reported speech, quotations and self-quotations in German. Her work has led to discoveries formerly not described. She examined the forms and functions of reported speech in German conversations and claimed that it is more than just a grammatical topic: it is an interactional and social phenomenon (1997, p. 47, 2002b, p. 49). She supports Schegloff, Ochs, and Thompson (1996), who stated that “grammar is inherently interactional” (Schegloff *et al.* 1996, p.

38). Golato (2002a) showed how “social interaction can organize grammar” and how this may lead to linguistic innovations (p. 51). Such an innovation is the relatively new German quotative *und ich so / und er so*, which corresponds to American English *and I’m like / and he’s like* (2000, 2002b, pp. 40-41) and is described by Golato to be used when turning the quotation into a performance or enactment (1997, p. 52, 2002a, p. 40). *So* is used in the structure as a demonstrative deictic marker and refers to the performative aspect of the quote (1997, p. 100). Besides this performative quotative, Golato also examined cases of providing information to which the participants of the conversation do not have direct access (2002a, p. 31), rendering past decisions by way of self-quotations (1997, 2002a, p. 43, 2002b) and demonstrating a statement of the speaker’s, that is, claim-backing (1997, 2002a, p. 47). She concluded that particular forms are used for these particular interactional functions (2002b, p. 49), among which the most commonly accepted form of indirect speech in German, the subjunctive I (*Konjunktiv I*), is not prevalent (2002a, p. 30). Much more widespread are: the subjunctive II (*Konjunktiv II*) in reported speech in answer to information elicitation (2002a, pp. 32-39) (even though subjunctive II is the typical mood for hypothetical sentences, not for reported speech),<sup>16</sup> *und ich so / und er so* for enactments, hypothetical speech or summoning witnesses for claim-backing (2002a, pp. 47-49), and using the German present perfect tense with the quotative while using the present tense for the actual quote itself for rendering past decisions (2002b).<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> The use of the subjunctive indicates orientation on the reported speaker: the reporter can express this way that the person responsible for the content of the quotation is not him but the reported speaker, which also explains the widespread usage of the subjunctive I in German journalists’ language (ten Cate, 1996, p. 207). This distance is greatly mitigated if the subjunctive II is used in the function of reported speech because it expresses doubt about the utterance on the reporter’s behalf.

<sup>17</sup> For examples on these different functions, see Golato, 1997, 2002a, 2002b.

Vlatten [Golato] (1997) claims that *und ich so* and *und er so* occur in storytelling situations “to convey the punchline or materials contributing to the climax of the story” and that they seem to “mark for the recipients of the story when important and noteworthy events are to follow” (p. 52). Due to its unusual, fragmental nature, this quotative is capable of creating a dramatic effect and drawing attention to the upcoming conversation unit, which is the quotation (see Golato, 2000). Structures without a conjugated verb are usually not considered correct language use since an important feature of German syntax is the presence of a conjugated verb along with a subject. Exceptions include elliptical sentences, in which a verb is still implied as a rule. *Und ich so / und er so* may imply a verb<sup>18</sup> but, as opposed to elliptical sentences, it could not stand on its own. In this respect, it is a structure that does not behave according to the rules of standard German grammar. Nevertheless, native speakers used it on several occasions in Golato’s data, which signals that they probably find it acceptable. Its role in the discourse is a pragmatic one, namely that of introducing a direct speech segment. It is used as a discourse marker rather than a clause on its own, and so its pragmatic adequacy outweighs its grammatical accurateness.

Vlatten [Golato] (1997) found that while *and I’m like / and he’s like* potentially can introduce an enactment, *und ich so / und er so* always introduces one (p. 111). It also has a particular format: quotative + pause + quotation + unquote, followed by appreciation or interpretation on the hearer’s behalf (Golato, 2000, p. 40). This format contributes greatly to the creation of the hearers’ involvement. Tannen (1983, 1986) found that such an involvement is created by “(1) immediacy, portraying action and dialogue as if it were occurring at telling time and (2) forcing the hearer to participate in

---

<sup>18</sup> Even though it is not clear which one: *sagen, meinen*, or maybe *sein* (“*und er sagt / meint / ist so*”)?



sensemaking” (1983, p. 361, 1986, p. 324). This is exactly the effect that can be reached by the use of *and I’m like / and he’s like* as well as its equivalents in other languages, including German. Their widespread usage may be explained by this strong dramatic effect.<sup>19</sup>

One more observation should be included here. McCarthy (1998) found in his corpus on spoken British dialects (Cambridge and Nottingham), which included more than one million words, that adverbial phrases specifying the context of reporting verbs, common in written language (e.g., *uttered a loud shriek, answered faintly, shouted with joyful eagerness*) did not occur in conversation (p. 171). Golato’s data on German did not include any adverbials either. However, I believe that using *so* as part of the quotative and following it up with an enactment of the original quote is a substitute for the lack of a verbal description of the context. The enactment, introduced by *so*, serves the same purpose in conversation as adverbials in written language: it shows to the recipients how the original utterance was said.

Because of the obviously important role of *like / so* in quotatives, the upcoming discussion shall be devoted to their characteristics and grammaticalization process.

#### **2.4 *Like* and *so*: remarks on their role and grammaticalization process**

The development of a word of comparison (*like, so*<sup>20</sup>) to a quotative can be found in several languages besides English and German, such as in Hebrew (*ke’ ilu*) (Maschler, 2000, as cited in Chevalier, 2001, p. 21), the Creole language Tok Pisin (*olsem*), the new

<sup>19</sup> Another fairly recent, yet less commonly described American English quotative is *be all* (see Streeck, 2002, p. 590).

<sup>20</sup> *So* literally means ‘such’, ‘so’, or ‘in this / that way’.

Guinean Buang (*nabe* or *be*), the Sino-Tibetan Lahu (*qhe*), Sanskrit (*iti*) (Schourup, 1983, pp. 32-35), (Quebec) French (*comme*) (Chevalier, 2001, p. 21) and Hungarian (*így*) (personal observation). This development is a case of grammaticalization, a term first defined by the French linguist Meillet in 1912 (Traugott & Heine, 1991, p. 2). The most prevalent explanation of grammaticalization is the one that states that it is the process in which lexical forms take on grammatical functions or grammatical items acquire new grammatical functions (see e.g., Pagliuca, 1994; Ramat & Hopper, 1998; Traugott & Traugott & Heine, 1991; Hopper, 2003). The pragmatic level is also important: in everyday communication, speakers always look for newer and newer methods to make themselves clear and more expressive. This results in continuous linguistic innovation (Traugott & Hopper, 2003, p. 73). “The speaker, who tries to reduce the potential range of meaning (...) may occasionally produce innovation just because s/he tries to stick to the norms as closely as possible. To the hearer just the same may happen when s/he painstakingly tries to interpret the concrete meaning of a given utterance according to the norms” (Bisang, 1998, p. 18). Speakers and hearers constantly strive to make their interaction as smooth as possible, and this is one of the reasons which cause change over time. Also, these innovations sometimes spread very quickly, which shows their expressive force.<sup>21</sup> Old meanings come to be expressed by new forms. This is what happens in the case of *like* or German *so* being used as a quotative. Traugott and Hopper (2003) note that “grammaticalization affects similar classes of lexical items in similar ways across a wide number of languages” (p. 75). This would explain the strikingly similar development of words of comparison to quotatives in so many different

---

<sup>21</sup> However, as Traugott and Hopper point out, the role of psychological factors such as short- and long-term retention and attention in the grammaticalization process is yet to be looked into (2003, p. 233).

languages. It lies beyond the limits of my study to investigate whether these particular examples may have come into being under the initial influence of English, or if they developed completely independent of each other. Fleischman (1999, as cited in Schiffrin, 2001, p. 64) pointed out that many of the discourse / pragmatic functions of *like* (e.g., focus or hedge) are replicated in languages such as Finnish, French, German, Hebrew, Italian, Japanese, Lahu, Portuguese, Russian and Swedish. The words undergo similar changes while moving toward similar functions, despite the fact that they are neither related nor share the same lexical / semantic source. This would rather support the theory that they developed independent of the influence of another language. *Like* and its equivalents constitute a good example of what one could call “cross-linguistic grammaticalization phenomena” as described by Traugott and Hopper above (2003, p. 75).

Meanings become weaker as grammaticalization proceeds. However, here we should rather talk about shift, not loss of meaning (Traugott & Hopper, 2003, p. 94). When a form is grammaticalized, its original lexical meanings still adhere to it (p. 96). The original comparative meaning in the quotative structures with *like* and *so* is still detectable. Both words can still be used in comparisons, this having been the original grammatical role they played. Through a grammaticalization process however, they have taken up other functions as well and have come to be used not only grammatically but also in a pragmatic sense. *Like* acquired the meaning “approximately” (Golato, 2000, p. 35) and thus took on the role of an approximator, which is how *so* (and Hungarian *így*) also came to be used very often in spoken interaction. Hence, the next step in their grammaticalization process is where they become discourse markers. Underhill (1988)

calls *like* in this function a new information marker and focus marker (1988, p. 244). Jucker & Smith also point to its function as a hedge (p. 187). Blyth and his researcher team call it a “focus quotative” (Blyth *et al.*, 1990, p. 225). There are different views on the origin of *like* in its quotative function. Golato (2000) cites Meehan (1991), who states that it developed from its “as if” meaning (which can be found for example in the sentence “...it was like I was watching someone else do it”) (Meehan, 1991, p. 41). The scope of this *like* here is wider than in its other usages (Golato, 2000, p. 36). Thus it already foreshadows the discourse marker usage, where *like* has its widest scope, namely the whole utterance following it. As the quote does not necessarily contain a verb, Meehan argues that *like* here still contains its “similar”-meaning (Golato, 2000, p. 36). Taking the similarity relationship one step further, Jucker & Smith (1998) state that “the discourse marker *like* flags a clause or an expression to indicate that it should not be taken too literally” (p. 185).

On the other hand, Underhill (1988) considers the “approximately”-meaning as resource of the discourse marker more plausible (p. 245), the “similar”-meaning being unidentifiable in several cases. I am inclined to agree with him, because the “approximately”-meaning can be substituted instead of the discourse marker in far more cases than the “similar”-meaning of “like.” Besides, even though there is no evidence to prove that the discourse marker-meaning of the equivalents of *like* in other languages originates in English, neither German *als ob* nor Hungarian *mintha* works as substitution for *so* and *így* respectively.

It is, however, indisputable that *like* as well as *so* as discourse markers draw attention to whatever is coming up, thus serving as a marker to enhance focus. This is

why they function well as discourse markers of reported speech: “surely the most significant new information in a speech act sentence or sentence containing a quotative is the quotation or direct speech itself” (Blyth *et al.*, 1990, p. 224). We could also consider these three quotatives as simple fillers, arguing that the meaning of a sentence does not change without them. While this is true semantically, we would lose most of the dramatic effect of our utterance, thus we would miss out on the pragmatic aspect. Speakers who are ignorant of this fact may find *to be like* (and its equivalents in other languages) “intrusive... entirely ungrammatical in standard English” that “makes sentences seem disjoined to many listeners” (Underhill, 1988, p. 234). I accept the view that this *to be like* is not the filler that can appear in utterances for focus, because, as we have seen, its omission leads to pragmatic change. Their common feature is that both the filler and the quotative *like* is a focus marker.

Underhill (1988) enumerates several possible roles of the filler-type focus marker *like* (pp. 239-242). One of these is its occurrence in requests, e.g., “Could I like borrow your sweater?” (p. 241). He points out that, since the request may be denied, “the speaker is slightly distancing herself, softening the request and at the same time shielding herself in the case of refusal” (p. 241). I see this as a function that already foreshadows the usage of the quotative *to be like*: the speakers create a hypothetical situation with their request, and thus distance themselves from the actual, real situation. This is a function very similar to that of the subjunctive. Also, placing *like* before the quote signals that what is about to be said may be unexpected, unusual or even shocking for the listener. By creating a certain distance, *like* makes the utterance appear less harsh, if need be. Here I would like to refer to one of Golato’s examples, which seems to be related to this idea: a

dirty joke someone tells, using *er so* to introduce a taboo word. (Golato, 2000, pp. 37-39)

The speaker in this conversation thus distances himself as well as his listeners from this word and the quote respectively. – This takes us back to Underhill (1988), who lists among the usages of *like* the one which marks that “the entire expression is... not intended to be taken literally” (p. 242). As a supplement to this train of thought about the functions of the filler-type *like* foreshadowing the usage in a quotative role, I would like to mention that Underhill (1988) talks about the positioning of *like* and points out: when it is intended to mark the utterance as new, unusual or significant, it is placed in front of the entire sentence (p. 244) (as opposed to its other positions “embedded” in the sentence and standing before constituents.) This positioning is also very similar to the usage of *to be like*, which is put in front of the whole quoted utterance. In a further step, *to be like* can introduce not only what someone has actually said, but also a thought, a state of mind, or an inner monologue (Blyth *et al.*, 1990, p. 222). If this is the case, we can only decide on what the quotative introduces if we examine the context:

(4) And I was like, 'Oh no, not again.'

This sentence does not suggest clearly whether the speaker actually uttered these words or just thought of them. We have to know what the context is to be able to see this. This ambiguity is present in German as well:

(5) Und ich so: „Oh, nicht doch schon wieder!“

Romaine and Lange (1991) note because of this ambiguity that *like* blurs the distinction between direct and indirect mode, between speech and thought: it is able to create “only an example of something that could have been said or thought without implying the kind of commitment that *say* does” (p. 263). This is the exemplifier role of *like*.

The findings of Blyth *et al.* in 1990 still showed that while *say* and *go* are predominantly used with the third person singular, *to be like* is rarely used so (p. 221). By the year 2000 however, as Golato observes, “*be like*’s usage has spread over time across grammatical person and number” (Golato, 2000, p. 42). She also points out the dominance of *ich so* and *er so* in German, referring to the predominant occurrence of the masculine gender with the third person but not the feminine, although the latter (as well as other persons) would be possible too (Vlatten [Golato], 1997, p. 94; Golato, 2000, p. 42). This could be proved based on a larger set of collected data on the subject.

Nevertheless, it seems that the usage of the quotative with the second person singular or plural would not be very common in any language, simply because of the nature of the type of conversation this quotative is used in: these are namely instances of evoking stories or events for the reason of sharing their new or surprising nature. One is not very likely to tell such a story to a person to whom it actually happened, unless it was a case of recalling common memories together and evoking the funny or unusual situation in which they took place. In this case, however, the communicative purpose would be different, since it would not be sharing new information, but remembering certain events together. Thus, the nature of the utterance in the reported speech would not be new to either speaker.

Blyth and his fellow researchers (1990) had conducted a survey before assessing their actual data and found that most people surveyed would associate the usage of *to be like* with female speakers (p. 221). This probably originates in the fact that it first came to be used by white American teenagers and was often observed with girls; later the usage spread on to other age groups (Ferrara & Bell, 1995, p. 271, pp. 273-278; Schourup, 1983, pp. 28-35). However, as the study shows, “the use of *be like* dropped off sharply after the age of 25 and disappeared altogether at the age of 38” (Blyth *et al.*, 1990, p. 219). On the other hand, the data of the study show that men actually tend to use *to be like* more than women (p. 221). This reflects not only the spread of its usage and increasing frequency with both genders and most age groups but also its pejorative status. The respondents to the survey of Blyth and his fellow researchers “considered the use of both *go* and *be like* as stigmatized, ungrammatical, and indicative of casual speech,” mostly associated with the language usage of uneducated, lower-class males and middle-class teenage girls (p. 223). However, the usage of both *go* and *to be like* for quotative purposes has become quite common since the publication of their study. McCarthy (1998) found in his corpus of Cambridge and Nottingham spoken English that *go* occurred frequently in direct reports (p. 164). This shows that British English is also experiencing the influence of reporting verbs other than the common *verba dicendi*. It is important to point out that all speech reports with *go* in McCarthy’s corpus were produced by speakers under 30 and all of them occurred in contexts “where the maximum amount of dramatic/graphic representation is attempted, often with mimicry in voice quality or other paralinguistic features” (McCarthy, 1998, p. 165). These features are very similar to those of *to be like*.



Many people may not even be aware of using forms such as *to be like* (Blyth *et al.*, 1990, p. 224). Golato (2000) points out the frequent usage of *und ich so / und er so* by German teenagers, mentioning also that “most speakers who use this form are college-aged, but there were also speakers in their mid thirties to fifty years of age” who used it (p. 37). The way young people speak can have a great influence on oral discourse in general over a certain period of time, so it is very possible that *to be like* and its equivalents in other languages will sooner or later become commonly accepted constituents of everyday language use. This depends on the stability of the distinguished status of their function, that is, enhanced dramatic effect. However, since these quotatives also function as fillers in oral discourse, one may wonder if their possible “overuse” will lead to semantic bleaching in the long run.

Streeck (2002) categorizes both *like* and *so* as “body quotatives” (p. 581). He points out the remarkable parallel between German and American English in the recent evolution of these words, stressing that *so* has served as a marker of bodily enactments for a long time in German, and that *like* will most probably grow into this role too (p. 583). In an analysis of the development of *like*, he comes to the conclusion that it “enables speakers to make up their sentences as they go along, instead of being bound to a particular construction type from the beginning. This is because different grammatical varieties of *like* coexist in contemporary American English (...) *like* buys the speaker the option of continuing the utterance with an enactment of some sort, to switch from verbal to the nonverbal mode” (p. 586). Streeck emphasizes that *like* is rooted in the Proto-Germanic noun \*llk-, meaning “body” (still recognizable in the German word *Leiche* ‘corpse’), and has remained more or less true to this meaning during its development (p.

586): in the suffix *-ly*, forming adverbs, it implies the meaning “having the body of” or “having the properties of;” as a preposition expressing likeness, it reverberates “sharing a body with” (“He eats like a pig” evokes the embodiment of a pig) (pp. 587-588). Thus, in its quotative function, *I’m like* expresses that the “situated self «shares the same body» (i.e., embodiment) with the narrated self” (p. 590). He mentions both the personal and impersonal versions (*I’m like / it’s like*) (pp. 589-590). This is a remarkable point, because other researchers did not emphasize *it’s like* separately. Streeck describes it as a phrase that creates the space and time for the preparation of the enactment, e.g., to reposition hands for a gesture (pp. 593-594). He argues that *ich so* and its variants are used exclusively for body quotes, whereas *like* has already been generalized to other forms of reported discourse (p. 592).

Streeck does not elaborate on any possible differences between the variants of *ich so*. In quoting Vlatten (Golato), he refers to *und ich/er/sie dann so* ‘and I/he/she then like this’ as the German counterpart of *be like*, the minimal version of which is *ich so* ‘I like this’, which he gives an example of from Vlatten’s (Golato’s) data (2002, pp. 591-592). However, in doing so, Streeck somewhat oversimplifies the German quotative. Vlatten’s (Golato’s) work concentrates on the form *und ich so / und er so*. She does not have the feminine personal pronoun *sie* occurring in her data, but, as mentioned earlier, she finds its usage possible (Vlatten [Golato], 1997, p. 94; Golato, 2000, p. 42). *Und er dann so* is presented in her dissertation as an example of *und er so* accompanied by an adverbial (1997, p. 95). She is also careful to distinguish between *und*-prefaced quotatives and those without *und*, wondering if prefacing any quotative results in very specific interactional achievements not associated with non-prefaced quotatives (1997, p. 93). I

believe that this is an important distinction to make, and agree with Vlatten (Golato) that further studies are necessary to see these functions more clearly.

An essential point Streeck makes is that both English and German recycle and recombine old lexical matter (*be, go, all, like, und, dann, so*) to come up with lively and expressive procedures (2002, p. 592). This is what gives rise to quotatives such as *be like, be all, go like, ich dann so*. About the last example, he remarks that it is achieved by deleting or rather, suppressing the verb that would normally appear before *dann*; thus, *dann* takes over the functional role of the quotative verb (p. 592).

Golato (2000) gives a good summary of the grammaticalization of *so* (pp. 49-50), including its approximation-, as well as conjunction- and demonstrative meaning and pointing out the similar stages *like* and *go* have gone through. However, she misses one step in the grammaticalization process of *so*, because she does not present any examples of its appearance with reported speech. Before *und ich so / und er so* came to be used, *so* had already been present with quotations. One of the examples Askedal (1999) gives in his detailed description of the regrammaticalization process of the German subjunctive could illustrate this:

(6) Die Ritter, so der Bote, seien schon gekommen. ‘The knights, so the messenger, have already arrived.’ (p. 314)

Although this example is taken from the written language, it would not be impossible in oral (if somewhat elevated) discourse either. It is one distinguished step on

the grammaticalization path of *so* from a word of comparison to a quotative and is thus important for any study of this newly emerged German quotative.

Romaine and Lange (1991) quote an example recorded by Rimmer (1988) which is not described anywhere else but is of great interest for my study. It is an occurrence of *like* in a quotative function without a conjugated verb in the quotative:

(7) And he like, “I ain’t saying Ulysses I’m saying Ulilles.” (Rimmer, 1988, p. 54, as cited in Romaine & Lange, 1991, p. 249)

Even though other studies do not mention this structure, it is clearly a form that corresponds word-for-word to German *und er so*. There are no data about the frequency of this *like*-quotative without a verb or whether it is characteristic of certain sociolects only. It would be insightful to learn more about its usage and see how it is similar to its German equivalent and whether there are any pragmatic differences between *like*-quotatives with and without a verb.

In chapters 4, 5 and 6 of this dissertation, it will be shown what kind of quotatives the non-native speakers used in my study. In the following, I will present the phenomenon of pragmatic development and discuss the field of pragmatic markers. I will also talk about conversational implicature, the rules of which govern everyday conversations like the ones in my recordings.

### **3. Conversational implicature, pragmatic competence and pragmatic markers**

Whereas the previous chapter shed light on the linguistic background of this study, chapter 3 will explain the major areas of pragmatics that are relevant to the study. Crystal (1997) defines pragmatics as “the study of language from the point of view of users, especially of the choices they make, the constraints they encounter in using language in social interaction and the effects their use of language has on other participants in the act of communication” (p. 301). This definition very aptly underlines the importance of the choices a speaker may make, and how these choices influence the way others participate in the conversation. By opting for different linguistic devices, the speaker can convey the meaning in more than just one way, depending on how s/he intends to shape the speech situation and what effect s/he wants to achieve. It is left up to the speaker to decide what an appropriate utterance is in the given context.

The meaning of an utterance can be described through semantics as well as through pragmatics. Pragmatics seeks to explain the relation between the literal sense and the illocutionary force of the utterance in a given situation (Leech, 1983, p. 30). Leech (1983) composed a set of postulates to clarify the distinction between semantics and pragmatics. One of these postulates states that while semantics is rule-governed (grammatical), pragmatics is principle-controlled (rhetorical) (p. 21). Another postulate points out that the rules of grammar are fundamentally conventional while the principles of pragmatics are non-conventional, that is, motivated in terms of conversational goals

(p. 24). The rules governing conversations have been studied by many scholars whose works will be addressed in this chapter.

3.1 is an investigation of the rules governing conversation. The notions of conversational implicature, politeness, footing and turn-taking in interaction were rules impacting the conversations in my recordings as well. Therefore, it is useful to look at their major features. In 3.2, I will focus on the notion of pragmatic competence and interlanguage development, which should help explain why learners at different levels in my study used different quotation methods. Finally, 3.3 provides a description of pragmatic markers, since the non-native quotatives used frequently in my data corpus can all be regarded as members of this group. I will also talk about deixis and code-switching in 3.3, two areas that influenced the quotative structures appearing in my study.

### **3.1 General rules organizing conversation. Story telling and the organization of turns at talk**

There are several rules at work in any conversation, and this applies to storytelling as well. The dramatic quality of retelling events was pointed out by Goffman (1981): glances, tone of voice as well as discourse theatrics vivify the replay of the retold event (pp. 1-2). He introduced the concept of ‘participation framework’ based on the idea that when any word is spoken, all those in perceptual range will have a participation status relative to it (p. 3). During an interaction, the roles of speaker and hearer are constantly interchanged, supporting the format of statements and replies. The current speaking right, called floor, is thereby being passed back and forth, and the whole event is referred to as ‘conversation’ or ‘talk’ (p. 129). However, a conversational encounter is also a social

situation where doings other than talk are also featured (p. 140) (this involves for example avoiding long eye gaze, which may be considered rude). Schegloff (1981) points to a very similar fact when he calls discourse an “achievement,” since it needs to be constructed (pp. 74-75). Participants’ alignment to themselves as well as to others, present as expressed in the way they manage the production or reception of an utterance, is called “footing” (Goffman, 1981, p. 128). Footing describes the speaker’s role in the conversation. We often change our footing during an interaction, and this is clearly what happens when we quote someone else’s words instead of saying our own: within the same turn, we shift our perspective from our own to that of the reported person’s.<sup>22</sup> In this case, the person roughly referred to as “speaker” would be specified by Goffman as an “animator,” as opposed to an “author” (who selects his words himself) or a “principal” (someone whose position is established by what he says) (p. 144). The person roughly referred to as “hearer” may also play different roles: he can act as an active or a passive addressee, or may be a mere bystander (pp. 131-133). As we can see, speakers and hearers can have various roles in a conversation depending on the situation. Direct speech is one such situation, determining the roles as ‘animator’ and ‘active participant’.

The roles of speakers and hearers also contribute to sense-making in conversations. Lakoff (1984) divides discourse strategies into speaker- and hearer-based ones, depending on who bears more of the burden of sense-making. Collins (2001) points out that based on this dichotomy, direct speech is hearer-based: “the reporter puts the interpreter on an equal footing with himself, in the position of a witness who must

---

<sup>22</sup> Streeck (2002) explains that *go* and *be like* mark moments when the speaker is changing footing, “lending the body to a character who through its sounds and motions comes alive” (p. 590).

evaluate the represented speech event, analyze (...) information, and make the necessary deictic adjustments for himself” (p. 68).

### **3.1.1 Conversational implicature and the Gricean principles**

One of the most important areas of pragmatics in general is conversational implicature, which has its basic principles. These principles were first described in detail by H. Paul Grice (1975). He stated that conversations are governed by certain conditions (p. 43). The speaker’s communicative intentions are implied in the sentence uttered, but not necessarily part of the logical structure of the sentence (p. 44). The Gricean principles stem from the fact that talk exchanges are not just a succession of disconnected remarks, but rather cooperative efforts. Hence the so-called Cooperative Principle, which Grice characterized by claiming: “Make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged” (p. 45). Speakers’ assumptions about each other’s cooperation can be summarized in four basic principles, referred to as maxims of conversation:

- the maxim of Quantity: make your contribution as informative as is required, but not more informative (p. 45)
- the maxim of Quality: do not say what you believe to be false, or something for which you lack adequate evidence (p. 46)
- the maxim of Relevance: make your contribution relevant (p. 46)
- the maxim of Manner: avoid obscurity and ambiguity, be brief, be orderly (p. 46).



These principles, if observed by all participants in the conversation, should result in cooperative and efficient interaction. And even though not everybody observes all of these maxims all the time, speakers can assume that their conversation partners are conforming to them during the interaction, as far as it is possible in the given situation (pp. 46-47).<sup>23</sup> Conversational implicature as a whole is thus the use of these maxims to imply communicative intentions in a conversation.

Grice mentions that there are other kinds of maxims too, e.g., “Be polite” (p. 47). Leech (1983) points out that the Politeness Principle is not merely another one added to the Cooperative Principle, but a necessary complement (p. 80). In any conversation, the participants expect not only to exchange information but also to be paid attention to and not be interrupted or disrespected in any way. In the case of direct speech, the speakers need to make sure that their reporting segment does not overwhelm the hearers with too many details yet is informative and clear enough, true to the contents of the original utterance and relevant to the conversation in some way (e.g., to illustrate a point). In other words, they have to make an effort not to burden or bore the audience, which would be considered impolite.

### **3.1.2 Turn-taking, politeness, and their implications for storytelling**

Within the field of conversation analysis, storytelling has been of particular interest to many scholars because of its specific characteristics (see e.g., Polanyi, 1981, 1982; Schiffrin, 1981; Sidnell, 2006; Streeck, 1994; Tannen, 1983, 1986; Wolfson, 1978; Wooffitt, 1992). It is different from simply relaying information and has its own

---

<sup>23</sup> When a participant blatantly fails to observe a maxim, Grice talks about “flouting” (1975, p. 49).

organizational rules, as pointed out by Goodwin (1984). He investigated how participants of an interaction orient towards each other when a story is told. Goodwin found that storytelling contains a preface (an offer as well as a request to tell / hear the story, which establishes the collaboration of teller and recipient), background information, and also a climax (p. 226). The tasks of teller and recipient are different in the different sections (p. 227). For example, laugh tokens appear only in the climax part and are not simply comments on behalf of the teller, but also invitations for the recipient to laugh (p. 227). The teller's body position changes during the production of the story, which helps distinguish the different sections of the story (p. 228). Changes in voice and intonation serve the same purpose (p. 227). All of these contribute to the uniqueness of a storytelling sequence.

Mutual participation itself is a crucial element in any interaction. A basic rule of interactions is that speakers and hearers take and have to organize turns in their contribution to it. Storytelling is a special area within turn-organization because most stories are long stretches of talk, and this is true to many retold events included in this dissertation as well. The fact that organized turn-taking is vital in conversations was described in detail by Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974) in their seminal paper. Based on their description, any conversation is characterized by the following: generally, it is one party talking at a time, occurrences of more than speaker are common but brief, it is common to have transitions from one turn to the next with no gap and no overlap

(two or more parties speaking at the same time),<sup>24</sup> the usage of turn-allocation techniques (the speaker selects the next speaker, or the next speaker self-selects himself), several types of turn-constructive units (TCUs) varying in length; repair mechanisms in case there has been a turn-taking error or violation (Sacks *et al.*, 1974, pp. 700-701). The turn-taking system is interactive among the participants of the conversation. This means that the turn as a unit and its boundaries are determined not solely by the speaker but also by the other participants, and are thus part of what Sacks *et al.* call recipient design (p. 727). Recipient design in the construction of a speaker's talk shows an orientation and sensitivity to the co-participants (p. 727), whose task is to listen to and understand utterances and show their understanding (pp. 727-728). The recipients thus need to have "an intrinsic motivation for listening to all utterances in a conversation, independent of other possible motivations, such as interest and politeness" (p. 727).

According to this, recipients' task largely consists in listening to the speaker's turn even if they find it uninteresting. To do otherwise would be impolite. On the other hand, it is just as impolite on behalf of the speaker to take up the floor for too long and hold on to his turn for longer than necessary, thereby imposing himself upon the recipients and flouting one or more of the Gricean maxims. A retold story can consist of several TCUs, most of which would normally belong to more than just one speaker. Hence, the teller of the story needs to adjust his turns in order to comply with recipient design and not deprive the listeners of their turns blatantly. Sacks (1974) describes how speakers act to handle this: first, they tend to preface their story with a turn that suggests

---

<sup>24</sup> For further insights on why participants may not wait for a speaker to finish his turn and complete it themselves, see Lerner (1996) on how anticipatory completion of a turn by another speaker can be used to prevent an emerging dispreferred action and convert it into a preferred one.

to the hearers that a longer one will follow (e.g., “You’ll never believe what a funny thing happened yesterday”). If the hearer reacts to this in an encouraging way (e.g., by asking for details), it signals to the speaker that he has received permission to start a lengthier turn and with that, suspend the normal turn-taking of the conversation. The story preface

is usually also suggestive about the nature of the story (e.g., funny) and thus signals to the hearer what kind of response will be preferred upon its completion (Sacks, 1974, pp. 337-341). Thus, telling a story is not simply a self-contained description, but an action situated within interaction that very often has a specific goal, such as illustrating a point (see Goodwin & Heritage, 1990, p. 300). This should justify the teller’s lengthier turn.

As we have seen in section 2.1, a common method to illustrate a point for the speaker is resorting to direct speech with a re-enactment of the event, which creates the audience’s involvement. Direct speech makes it possible to narrate a story in an interesting way, which is less likely with indirect speech. As Romaine and Lange (1991) put it, “presenting a narrative by re-enacting it (...) stimulates the normal exchange pattern of conversation and may therefore be perceived as less of an interruption than a narrative presented entirely from one’s own perspective” (p. 269). This way, offering a re-enactment with direct speech is a means of justifying the lengthy turn that may otherwise start to overwhelm the hearers, and can thus constitute a part of the speaker’s recipient design. Making a long turn more stimulating through direct speech is an “excuse” for taking up more time than usual for one participant’s turn. This shows the participant’s sensitivity to others and makes his contribution more polite. How a speaker manages his turn-organization is thus related to his conceptions on how to be polite. That

is why the action of storytelling has also received attention from scholars who have investigated politeness.

Brown and Levinson (1987) regard direct speech as a positive politeness strategy of stressing common ground (122, as cited in Collins, 2001, p. 69). On the other hand, Collins (2001) adds that it can also function as a form of negative politeness: if the speaker does not interpret what he reports on and thus implies that it is self-evident, the hearer may have difficulty understanding the reported event (p. 69).<sup>25</sup>

Storytelling is regarded as a failure if it does not keep the audience's attention. In this case, the storyteller suffers a loss of face, having been unable to make the unusually extended turn relevant to others, and thus dominating the floor for too long by relating something that does not seem to go beyond his own interests. Polányi (1982) points out how this causes embarrassment and shame for the unsuccessful speaker (p. 518). On the other hand, the recipient of the story is also required to react by acknowledging that it was understood and appreciated; this is done by back-channel responses (e.g., "uh-huh"), laughter or comments. A poorly received story may cause the reporting person to lose face, but the same can happen to the hearers if they show social ineptness when failing to react properly. However, it is again the storyteller who could be "blamed" for putting his audience in such an awkward situation (Polányi, 1982, p. 519). As long as the story is

---

<sup>25</sup> The description of positive and negative politeness originates in the dichotomy of positive and negative face, defined by Brown and Levinson (1978). The term "face" was first introduced by Goffman (1963, 1967) to refer to an assessable public self-image in social encounters. To maintain this image means enjoying recognition by others in the given social setting.

Brown and Levinson (1978) assumed that "the mutual knowledge of (...) public self-image or face, and the social necessity to orient oneself to it in interaction, are universal" (p. 67). They define negative face as "the want of every «competent adult member» that his actions be unimpeded by others," and positive face as "the want of every member that his wants be desirable to at least some others" (p. 67). Hence, positive politeness is oriented toward the hearer's positive face (i.e., his positive self-image), while negative politeness is oriented toward partially satisfying the hearer's negative face, "his basic want to maintain claims of territory and self-determination" (p. 75).

told in a narrative clear to interpretation, gives the necessary information in the proper order and is adequately evaluated by the speaker in order to make the point clear, there is little risk for loss in face (p. 520).<sup>26</sup> As to the hearer, he may feel overwhelmed and embarrassed if the event is retold without comments and he cannot understand its implications; thus, his positive self-image may be threatened. On the other hand, the hearer may also find it embarrassing if the storyteller offers him an explanation that is unnecessary, which would again constitute a threat to the hearer's positive face.

Relevance is also crucial: a story will be considered "interesting" by the recipients if it is close to them in space, time or relationship, that is, if they feel directly addressed by the retold events (Polanyi, 1982, p. 521). This is very close to Grice's maxim of relevance.

### 3.2 Pragmatic competence

L2 (second language) pragmatic competence and interlanguage pragmatic development have been receiving more and more attention for the past decades.<sup>27</sup> Pragmatic competence is part of a language learner's communicative competence. The term "communicative competence" is defined by Lightbown and Spada (1993) as the ability to use language in different settings, taking into consideration "the relationships

---

<sup>26</sup> Elsewhere, Polanyi (1981) points out that it is also essential not to overwhelm the recipients with information, as this may result in their boredom or annoyance over having their knowledge underestimated (p. 323).

<sup>27</sup> Some of the researchers who offered insight into these topics included e.g., Bachman (1990), Bardovi-Harlig (1999, 2001), Bardovi-Harlig & Hartford (1996) Barron (2003), Belz & Kinginger (2003), Brown (2001), Canale & Swain (1980), Cohen (1996), Harmer (1991), Hosoda (2005), House (1996), Hymes (1972), Kasper (1996, 1997a, 1997b, 2001), Kasper & Rose (2001), Kasper & Schmidt (1996), Niezgodna & Röver (2001), Richter (1995), Takahashi (1996, 2001), Thornborrow (1991) and Wong (2000).

between speakers and the differences in the situations” (p. 119). Gumperz (1982) defines communicative competence as the “knowledge of linguistic and related communicative conventions that speakers must have to sustain and create conversational cooperation” (p. 209). Communicative competence was first described by Hymes (1972) as an answer to Chomsky’s definition of competence (vs. performance) (1965) which takes into consideration correct grammar usage but ignores contextual appropriateness. Davies (1991) points out that it is more difficult for non-native speakers to achieve good communicative competence than good linguistic competence because the learner has little exposure to encounters and knowledge in this area. He thus refers to communicative competence as “the articulation of linguistic competence in situation” that is, “the recognition of appropriacy” in a situation (Davies, 1991, p. 111). House (1996) claims that “to be rated as pragmatically fluent, nonnative speakers’ (NNSs’) talk must meet the expectations of native speakers (NSs) of the foreign language, and it must represent acceptable language behaviour as judged by the types of local responses it triggers in the interactants and in the assessment of a number of NS raters” (House, 1996, p. 229).

Pragmatic competence itself may be defined as the ability to use and understand speech acts and utterances in certain situations. Kasper (1997b) divides pragmatic competence into illocutionary competence and sociolinguistic competence, where illocutionary competence is the knowledge of communicative action and how to carry it out. She finds the term “communicative action” more accurate than the term “speech act”, because “communicative action is neutral between the spoken and written mode, and the term acknowledges the fact that communicative action can also be implemented

by silence or non-verbally” (Kasper, 1997b, p. 1). Sociolinguistic competence describes “the ability to use language appropriately according to context” (p. 1).

The pragmatic competence of a second language learner improves through what is called interlanguage development, which is the subject of interlanguage pragmatics. Interlanguage pragmatics is “the study of nonnative speakers’ use and acquisition of L2 pragmatic knowledge” (Kasper, 1996, p. 145). Thus, it constitutes a part of second language acquisition research. Since it investigates how speakers realize certain speech acts in a foreign language, it is closely related to cross-cultural pragmatics (Barron, 2003, p. 27). It plays an important role in communicative language teaching (Kasper & Schmidt, 1996, p. 149) since it focuses on pragmatic competence instead of linguistic competence. Barron says that research on interlanguage focuses on the “realisations of various speech acts” (2003, p. 3). (Although reporting, the focus of my study, is not a speech act per se but rather a form of “narration,”<sup>28</sup> it is a useful topic for the investigation of interlanguage development: non-natives’ reported speech methods show certain similarities to the ones used by native speakers, and one can distinguish different stages in the development of their competence in reporting.)

Interlanguage pragmatics and pragmatic competence were investigated in detail by Kasper (1996), Kasper and Schmidt (1996) and by Kasper and Rose (2001, 2002). Kasper (1996) pointed out that most studies in interlanguage pragmatics have focused on second language use rather than development (p. 145) and that the topics (mostly the study of speech acts) had generally little relevance to SLA (p. 146). Kasper and Schmidt (1996) thus tried to define interlanguage pragmatics in the framework of SLA research,

---

<sup>28</sup> I would not go as far as Austin (1975) when he calls language used in circumstances such as in stage plays, poems or spoken in soliloquy “parasitic” upon the normal use of language and thus does not include these in his consideration of performative utterances (pp. 21-22).



and emphasized the prominent role of pragmatics in communicative language teaching. They posed and answered several questions pertinent to interlanguage development, such as:

- 1) There are some universals underlying cross-linguistic variation. Every speech community seems to have a basic set of speech acts. However, there are differences as well, which have to be taken into account. A problem is that learners more often assume universality and transferability when they are actually not present than transfer strategies that are in fact universal (Kasper & Schmidt, 1996, pp. 154-155).
- 2) Non-native speakers' approximation to target language norms "is usually measured against a native speaker norm" through discourse completion tasks, role-plays, or (semi-)authentic settings (Kasper & Schmidt, 1996, p. 155). The problem with this approach is that it is questionable whether native speaker norms "are an adequate target for NNSs. If this were the case, any difference between NS and NNS pragmatic comprehension or production would have to be seen as potentially problematic, indicating a deficit in the NNSs' pragmatic competence" (p. 156). Also, non-natives "may opt for pragmatic distinctiveness (...) as a strategy of identity assertion" (p. 156). Therefore, a certain level of convergence instead of total convergence is a more realistic goal (Giles, Coupland, & Coupland, 1991). On the other hand, researchers have found that learners tend to make a less favorable impression on native speakers if their conversational management is insufficient (Marriott, 1990; Bilbow & Young, 1998).

- 3) L1 influences the learning of a second language in this area too, although "little is known about the conditions under which learners are likely to transfer or not to transfer" (Kasper & Schmidt, 1996, p. 157).
- 4) Due to a shortage of studies on early pragmatic development in adult L2 learners, it is difficult to tell whether pragmatic development in a second language is similar to the acquisition of first language learning. Kasper & Schmidt (1996) argue that adults' pragmatic errors stems from the fact that their "sociopragmatic knowledge is not yet sufficiently developed for them to make contextually appropriate choices of strategies and linguistic forms" (p. 157), and not, as Bialystok claimed, from their lack of sufficient vocabulary and incorrect choices (1993, p. 54).
- 5) There is no evidence that children enjoy an advantage over adults in acquiring pragmatic knowledge, since "no critical period has even been proposed for pragmatics" and "in our native languages we continue to expand our pragmatic competence throughout our lives" (Kasper & Schmidt, 1996, p. 158).
- 6) Unlike for morphosyntax, there is no acquisition order for interlanguage pragmatics. Rather, "pragmatic competence seems to evolve through initial reliance on a few unanalyzed routines that are later decomposed and available for productive use in more complex utterances" (Kasper & Schmidt, 1996, p. 159). House (1996) also emphasizes the importance of routines, which, being well-formed, "can serve as important motivation boosters for second language learners" (p. 226). Also, routines "embody the societal knowledge that members

- of a given speech community share” and “are thus essential in the verbal handling of everyday life” (House, 1996, pp. 226-227).
- 7) The type of input makes a difference in the development of pragmatic knowledge. Students are more likely to be provided with a more diverse input in a second language rather than in a foreign language environment, where the instruction may also be noncommunicative (Kasper & Schmidt, 1996, p. 160).
  - 8) Pragmatic knowledge is teachable, so its instruction does make a difference in learners’ development. As studies have shown (Kasper, 1982, 1989; Lörcher, 1986), grammar-centered classroom instruction resulted in insufficient politeness marking on students’ behalf, because they did not get enough practice of conversational strategies needed in contexts outside of the classroom (Kasper & Schmidt, 1996, p. 161).
  - 9) There is evidence that motivation and attitudes make a difference in the level of acquisition in pragmatics. “... Intrinsic motivation (enjoyment of learning for its own sake) might be more relevant (...) than extrinsic motivation (learning motivated by external reward)” (Kasper & Schmidt, 1996, p. 161).
  - 10) No studies have investigated the relationship between personality and interlanguage development. Therefore, one cannot state with confidence that personality plays a role in language learning, although an extroverted, curious, clever person is more likely to achieve a high level of pragmatic competence (John, 1990) (Kasper & Schmidt, 1996, pp. 162-163).
  - 11) There is some contradiction on whether gender plays a role. While Rintell (1984) found no difference in learners’ perception of emotional expressions in the L2,

- Kerekes (1992) claimed that females' responses were more native-like than those of males (Kasper & Schmidt, 1996, p. 163).
- 12) As to the question whether perception / comprehension precede production and acquisition, "it seems likely that acquisition of some aspects (...) must depend on their presence in input" (Kasper & Schmidt, 1996, p. 163). However, we do not know whether and to what extent learners "actually use pragmatic strategies in production without having first heard, noticed and comprehended them" (p. 163).
- 13) Chunk learning (or formulaic speech) does seem to play a role in acquisition. "Routine formulae constitute a substantial part of adult NS pragmatic competence, and learners need to acquire a sizable repertoire" of them (Kasper & Schmidt, 1996, p. 164). – Tateyama (2001) also showed that short pragmatic routines can be taught to absolute beginners already, at a stage where analyzed knowledge of the L2 is not yet present.
- 14) The mechanisms that drive pragmatic development from stage to stage are most likely the same "as those identified for the acquisition of other cognitive skills" (p. 164), though Universal Grammar does not seem to play a role due to its lack of relevance to pragmatics or communicative competence (Chomsky, 1980).

Kasper and Schmidt pointed out the importance of converting input into intake and raised the question whether "more abstract levels of awareness are necessary or merely facilitative or perhaps neither" (p. 164). They also proposed that "focus should be given to the complexities of changes in learners' sociocultural perceptions over time and the impact of such altered perceptions on their strategies of linguistic action" (p. 165).

House (1996) and Cohen (1996) also addressed the teaching aspects of pragmatics. Both of them came to the conclusion that pragmatic abilities can be taught and thus develop over time. To this end, they also emphasized the importance of input, raising the consciousness of students, and communicative language teaching. Wildner-Bassett (1994) also found that beginning level learners of German improved greatly in their use of routine formulae after receiving instruction. Bardovi-Harlig (1991 with Hartford, 1996, 2001) argued as well that contextualized, pragmatically appropriate input and specific instruction of L2 pragmatics are essential to learners from early stages onward, and that learners who do not receive such input differ greatly from the native norms in their pragmatic abilities. The factors that determine L2 pragmatic competence, according to Bardovi-Harlig (2001), are input, instruction, level of proficiency, length of stay in a target language community, and the learner's first language. Bardovi-Harlig and Dörnyei (1998) found that learners of English in a second language environment rated pragmatic violations to be more severe than grammatical errors, while learners of English in a foreign language environment (the classroom in their home country) thought the opposite. However, Niezgodna and Röver (2001) came to the conclusion in a replicate study that the setting may not play a crucial role, and that pragmatic awareness may well be acquired in a foreign language environment. Kasper and Rose (2002) agreed in claiming "that most aspects of L2 pragmatics are indeed teachable, that instructional intervention is more beneficial than no instruction specifically targeted on pragmatics, and that (...) explicit instruction combined with ample practice opportunities results in the greatest gains" (p. 273). However, as Kasper and Rose pointed out elsewhere (2001), "curricular innovations that comprise pragmatics as a learning objective will be

ineffective as long as pragmatic ability is not included as a regular and important component of language tests” (p. 9). Huth and Taleghani-Nikazm (2006) also support the teaching of pragmatics and show how Conversation Analysis can serve Second Language Acquisition in a case of learners of German benefiting from instruction with Conversation Analysis-based materials.

The transfer of L1 pragmatic knowledge, (1) above among Kasper and Schmidt’s questions pertinent to interlanguage development, was addressed by other researchers as well. Takahashi and Beebe (1987) stated that more proficient learners are more successful at transferring L1 sociocultural norms than lower-level learners, because the proficiency of the latter group is still limited.<sup>29</sup> House (1996) compared the pragmatic development of a group that was provided with practice and teacher-initiated feedback alone with a group that also received explicit metapragmatic information, and found that explicit teaching made it “less likely for negative pragmatic transfer to occur” (p. 247). On the other hand, even the explicit group’s production (responding behavior) was pragmatically deficient, which lead House to conclude that “they still lack a well-developed control of processing, which is necessary if incoming input is to be interpreted swiftly and appropriately,” and “the provision of metapragmatic information does not alleviate this problem” (p. 249). Positive transfer, even without instruction, takes place if there is a “corresponding form-function mapping between L1 and L2” (Kasper & Rose, 2001, p. 6). However, learners do not always make use of what they already know. Consequently, Kasper and Rose also emphasize the necessity of pedagogical intervention (p. 6). So does Tateyama (2001), who points out that explicit instruction of pragmatics

---

<sup>29</sup> Other scholars who came to the same conclusion include Blum-Kulka, 1982; Koike, 1989; Olshtain & Cohen, 1989; Scarcella & Brunak, 1981).

tends to be more efficient than exposure alone. Other researchers who argue that pragmatics is teachable and should be part of L2 instruction include Liddicoat and Crozet (2001), Yoshimi (2001), Davies (2004) and Huth (2006, 2007a).

Kerekes (1992) found that learners' perception of qualifiers became more native-like with increasing proficiency. Scarcella (1979) and Trosborg (1987) came to similar conclusions, namely, that learners' usage of pragmatic routines and other speech act realizations increase with their proficiency. However, it is not obvious whether this is due to their greater command of grammar and vocabulary, or a better understanding of pragmatic devices.

Despite the studies listed above, there is no consensus on the question whether the development of linguistic (grammatical) competence goes hand in hand with the development of pragmatic competence. Kasper (1998) states that the level of linguistic competence can have an effect on pragmatic competence and may also be a constraint on its development (p. 188). Huth (2007b) argues that grammatical proficiency may only have an indirect effect on L2 pragmatic performance. While some researchers show that linguistic competence may not necessarily go along with greater pragmatic competence (cf. Barron, 2003, p. 46; Eisenstein & Bodman, 1986; Salsbury & Bardovi-Harlig, 2000), others found evidence that pragmatic abilities increase with proficiency level (Koike, 1996; Norris, 2001; Scarcella, 1979; Takahashi and Beebe, 1987). Koike (1989), in her study on the development of pragmatic ability and grammatical competence, came to the conclusion: "since the grammatical competence cannot develop as quickly as the already present pragmatic concepts require, the pragmatic concepts are expressed in ways conforming to the level of grammatical complexity acquired" (p. 286). On the other hand,

Bardovi-Harlig (1999) found that “high levels of grammatical competence do not guarantee concomitant high levels of pragmatic competence” (p. 686). Kasper & Rose (2002) find an explanation for this in the fact that most studies have compared learners’ performance of one particular speech act with the performance of native speakers, and a general measure of L2 proficiency (e.g., standardized tests) (p. 162). They point out that this approach “does not offer insights on how a *particular* pragmalinguistic feature is related to the *particular* grammatical knowledge implicated in its use” (p. 163). Adults rely on certain competencies that constitute their universal pragmatic knowledge (Blum-Kulka, 1991; Ochs, 1996). This way, although the question remains whether or not linguistic universals have an effect on adult second language acquisition, pragmatic universals “enable learners to participate in L2-mediated interaction from early on and to acquire L2-specific pragmatic knowledge” (Kasper & Rose, 2002, pp. 166-167).

### **3.3 Non-native innovative quotatives as pragmatic markers.**

#### **Deixis and code-switching**

In this section, I will look at three linguistic phenomena: discourse / pragmatic markers, deixis, and code-switching. All of these are relevant to the analysis of my study about quotatives.



*Discourse / pragmatic markers:*

Discourse markers are words or phrases used to signal boundaries between topics in conversation (McCarthy, 1998, p. 178). The term “discourse marker” may be seen as a “fuzzy concept” (Jucker & Ziv, 1998, p. 2) because of the variety of definitions scholars apply to it (for an overview, see Fischer, 2006a). Romaine and Lange (1991) call discourse markers “particles which are used to focus on or organize discourse structure” (p. 245). Schiffrin (1987) defines them as “sequentially dependent elements which bracket units of talk” (p. 31). They can be considered “linguistic expressions comprised of members of word classes as varied as conjunctions (e.g., *and, but, or*), interjections (*oh*), adverbs (*now, then*), and lexicalized phrases (*y’know, I mean*)” and “display relationships that are local (between adjacent utterances) and / or global (across wider spans and / or structures of discourse)” (Schiffrin, 2001, p. 57). Along similar lines, Biber (2006) shows that discourse markers do not have precise meanings, yet serve to structure the overall discourse through their specific function (p. 68). Fischer (2006b) emphasizes that the functions of a given discourse particle depend on the communicative goal of the situation in which it is used (p. 429). Weydt (2006) points out that speakers who use particles are perceived to be friendly and sociable, whereas speech without particles sounds strange (p. 208).

Fraser (1990) prefers the term “pragmatic marker” because these expressions signal how the speaker intends the following message to relate to the prior discourse (p. 387). He emphasizes that they form a pragmatic and not a content class and have “certain privileges of occurrence, which must be specified” (p. 394). Aijmer and

Simon-Vandenberg (2006) also prefer the term “pragmatic marker,” for a similar reason: they see these markers as “signals in the communication situation guiding the addressee’s interpretation” (p. 2). Andersen (1998), Brinton (1996) and Hölker (1991) apply this term as well. Andersen (1998), similarly to Aijmer and Simon-Vandenberg, points out that pragmatic markers are signals that “tell the hearer how an utterance is to be understood” (p. 151). Stenström & Andersen (1996) use the term “pragmatic particle” to refer to words that have no syntactic connection to the previous utterance and lack semantic significance. Östman (1981) uses this term as well. Aijmer, Foolen, and Simon-Vandenberg (2006) consider a construction a pragmatic marker if it does not contribute to the propositional content (p. 101). This does not mean that pragmatic markers are meaningless, but rather that their functions are more interpersonal and textual than ideational (p. 104). As a useful tool to contrast them in different languages and see how languages deal with similar meanings, Aijmer *et al.* recommend the translation method (p.101). Other researchers, based on the linguistic approach taken, call discourse markers “discourse particles” (Abraham, 1991; Kroon, 1995; Schourup, 1983), “pragmatic expressions” for those that consist of more than one word (Erman, 1987), “discourse connectives” (Blakemore, 1987; Crystal & Davy, 1975) and “pragmatic connectives” (van Dijk, 1979). Schiffrin (2006) distinguishes between the terms “marker” and “particle” by defining the former as a linguistic item displaying an already existing meaning and the latter as an item adding a meaning not otherwise available in the discourse (p.336).

The quotatives in my study showed the characteristics of discourse markers. They connected units of talk at both local and global levels (adjacent utterances as well as

narration with a direct quotation), signaled how the upcoming message would relate to previous discourse (by introducing the direct quote whose context had been given) and thus helped guide the hearers' interpretation (by signaling that a quote was coming up in the speaker's current monologue). Because of the two latter characteristics, they certainly fulfill a pragmatic goal in the conversation. This is why I would prefer the more specific term "pragmatic marker" to "discourse marker."

Brinton (1996) enumerates several features that typically characterize pragmatic markers (pp. 32-35). As a matter of fact, the list is so exhaustive that probably no marker would be able to fit into all categories. However, a great number of the features can indeed be applied to the quotatives in my study: they appear in oral rather than written discourse thus are associated with informality and stylistically stigmatized; they are short; form a separate tone group with falling-rising or rising intonation; occur in sentence-initial position but outside the syntactic structure; are optional; have little or no propositional meaning; are marginal and come from a variety of word classes. – Based on the criteria by Schiffrin and Brinton, it is justifiable to say that the quotatives in my study may be regarded as discourse, more specifically, as pragmatic markers.<sup>30</sup>

An indicator of language learners' communicative competence is how they use discourse / pragmatic markers and thus connect stretches of talk. Lindqvist (2007) found that there seems to be a relation between increased fluency and the development of discourse particles. Sankoff, Thibault, Nagy, Blondeau, Fonollosa, & Gagnon (1997) investigated the use of French and English discourse markers by 17 anglophone French speakers in Canada and pointed out the connection between higher frequency of discourse markers and degree of exposure to the L2. They claimed that discourse markers

---

<sup>30</sup> To be very specific, they are quotative markers.

are of special interest because they are not taught explicitly; thus, “only L2 speakers with a high degree of contact with native speakers will master the use of discourse markers” (p. 193). Hellermann and Vergun (2007) came to similar conclusions in their study of learners of English: they found that the learners who used the discourse markers “well”, “you know” and “like” more often were the ones who were more acculturated to the United States.

It seems that acquiring pragmatic markers is a complicated task no matter what the learners’ L1 is. Grieve (2007) found that German adolescents on an exchange trip to Australia showed an increase in their use of pragmatic markers. However, this usage did not reach native-speaker levels and displayed great individual variation. Other researchers have shown that through exposure alone, learners do not necessarily notice how discourse markers are used unless it is pointed out to them explicitly by native speakers (Barron, 2003; Kinginger & Farrell, 2004; Vyatkina & Belz, 2006, Hacking, 2007). Studies also point to certain L1 discourse markers that appear in the learners’ L2 (Sankoff *et al.*, 1997 about French as a L2; Lynch, 2008 about Spanish as a L2). However, these L1 expressions did not completely replace L2 markers in either study (Sankoff *et al.*, 1997, p. 213; Lynch, 2008, p. 269). Furthermore, both studies emphasize the correlation between correct assignment of grammatical gender and frequency of discourse markers (Lynch, p. 269). This seems to suggest that greater proficiency tends to go along with increased use of discourse markers. To date, there have been no studies on quotatives as discourse / pragmatic markers in learners’ L2 development. This is where I hope to contribute to the field with my research.

*Deixis:*

To help explain the structure of several quotatives in my data, it is useful to mention the area of deixis, namely *dann* being a deictic expression of time and *da* that of space. Blühdorn (1993) categorizes *dann* and *da* as “*Nachrichtendeiktika*” (“news deixis”), connected to news components that have been or are to be generated in the same communicative event (p. 51). He defines deixis as “ein kommunikatives Verfahren, zu dem bestimmte Lexeme verwendet werden können” (“a communicative method, for which certain lexemes may be used”) (p. 60). The terms “deictic” and “deixis” were first used by Karl Bühler in 1934 to refer to the linguistic characteristics of demonstrative pronouns and adverbs (as cited in Ehlich, 1982, p. 315). Schiffrin (1987) also indicates the deictic functions that all markers have: utterances, as opposed to sentences, are context-bound since they are presented by a speaker to a hearer at a certain time in a certain place; it is deictic elements that often encode the four contextual dimensions of speaker, hearer, time and place (p. 322).

*Code-switching:*

Code-switching is a fairly common, unconscious phenomenon for a non-native speaker to involuntarily include structures from his L1 in the foreign language. Heller (1988) calls it a conversational strategy (p. 77). It is a bilingual phenomenon that is characterized by the alternation of two or more languages in the same conversation (Auer, 1998, p. 1; Grosjean, 1982, p. 145). Poplack (1980) distinguishes between inter-

and intrasentential code-switching (as cited in Savić, 1996, p. 55). Milroy and Muysken (1995) talk about extrasentential or emblematic switches as well (p. 8). These are the ones that do not belong closely to the sentence and include discourse markers.

Code-switching fulfills a pragmatic goal. Swain and Lapkin (1998) found that French immersion learners used it “to regulate their own behavior” as well as “to focus attention on specific L2 structures” (p. 333). Specker (2008) shows how *Maya and Miguel*, an animated children’s program on television makes use of code-switching between English and Spanish to form the characters’ social identities and to foster a positive attitude towards bilingualism. Auer (1998) calls code-switching a verbal action which has and creates communicative as well as social meaning and needs to be interpreted by co-participants (p. 1). Elsewhere, he mentions reported speech among the typical conversational functions of code-switching (Auer, 1995, p. 121). Sebba and Wootton (1998) also point out that “code-switching is a frequent correlate of reported speech in conversation” (p. 273). This helps explain its appearance in my data with direct discourse.

In summary, this chapter has provided information on phenomena relevant to my study on direct speech methods used by non-native speakers of German at different levels of pragmatic development. Their talk, which was characterized by a lot of storytelling situations, was organized according to the rules of conversational implicature, the Gricean maxims, turn-taking and politeness. Also, their pragmatic competence and approximation of L2 pragmatics, as traceable in the different structures they used to introduce formerly uttered speech, can be described through the conclusions of scholars

who have studied pragmatic development and interlanguage. In the following, after describing the organization of my study, I will go into details on my findings and show how the phenomena presented in this chapter shaped the speech of the speakers in my study at their different levels of competence.

## **4. Data, methodology and main findings**

### **4.1 Data and methodology of the study**

Conversational Analysis (hereafter CA) provides the main supportive background for this research, since it is the most appropriate methodology for the analysis of talk in interaction and it is also closely linked to the field of Second Language Acquisition. CA is an empirical methodology, which examines talk as a social action. This is based on the fact that conversation is not only “the most pervasively used mode of interaction in social life (...) but also (...) consists of the fullest matrix of socially organized communicative practices and procedures” (Atkinson & Heritage, 1984, p. 13). Young (in Seedhouse, 2004) describes CA as a “highly effective means for recording and transcribing naturally occurring talk in interaction” whose aim is “to understand the organization of talk and persons’ experience of it” (p. xi).

CA developed out of ethnomethodology (a branch of sociology) in the late 1960s. As such, it stresses the importance of the social dimension of language study (Leech, 1983, p. 4). CA studies naturally occurring conversation in real-life situations to detect what kind of structures are constructive to interaction. “The 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 behaviour and understand and deal with the behaviour of others” (Atkinson & Heritage, 1984, p. 1). When analyzing conversations,



researchers aim at showing regular forms of organization and demonstrating that these regularities are methodically produced and oriented to by the conversation participants in order to describe the role of different conversational procedures in their relation to one another as well as to other orders of conversational and social organization (Atkinson & Heritage, 1984, p. 2). Accordingly, the current dissertation is investigating how non-native speakers of German organize their talk with quotations and what common patterns are detectable in different speakers' organization of talk.

CA never treats sentences or utterances in isolation, but rather as forms of action situated within specific contexts (Goodwin & Heritage, 1990, p. 287). Instead of analyzing sentences based on their syntactic and semantic features, CA stresses the fact that utterances always occur at a "structurally defined place in talk" (Atkinson & Heritage, 1984, p. 6). Accordingly, at the core of analysis we find sequences and turns within sequences instead of isolated utterances or sentences (p. 5). This is because each conversational action is bound to the here-and-now nature of the current speech situation, and any subsequent talk will be oriented to this situation (p. 5). Conversational turns are constructed by the participants accomplishing these relevant next actions. The participants' understanding and interpretation of the previous turn is expressed in the next one. CA uses close observations of turns to analyze the conversation. "Whatever is said will be said in some sequential context, and its illocutionary force will be determined by reference to what it accomplishes in relation to some sequentially prior utterance or set of utterances" (Atkinson & Heritage, 1984, p. 6).

It is essential to determine which elements of the context are relevant to the participants of the interaction (Atkinson & Heritage, 1984, p. 42). Seedhouse refers to the

fact that based on Levinson's 1983 terms CA, just like discourse analysis (DA) or speech act analysis, characterizes actions in sequences which are initiated by one speaker and responded to by another (Seedhouse, 2004, p. 40). DA is thus a part of CA, the difference being that CA illustrates the fact that utterances often perform several actions at the same time (Levinson, 1983, p. 11), whereas DA generally relates an utterance to one single function (Seedhouse, 2004, p. 40). Young also points out that participants' experience of talk is closely connected to ethnomethodological conversation analysis,<sup>31</sup> so CA "is not simply a means for linguists to understand the organization of turn-taking, sequence, and repair of talk in general, but instead CA aims to understand what this organization means in a particular conversation for particular participants" (as cited in Seedhouse, 2004, p. xi). Thus, CA takes a different approach to language than linguistics, because it is more interested in the social action than the linguistic aspects of the conversation. The participants create the conversation together; this is why CA "focuses solely on human actions which are manifested through talk" (Seedhouse, 2004, p. 13). An important contribution of CA was that, as Sacks pointed out, it recognized that there is order in interaction, which was a radically new idea in the 1960s, when the dominant view in linguistics was that "conversation was too disordered to be studied" (Seedhouse, 2004, p. 14). As opposed to "idealized models of language and action" (Atkinson & Heritage, 1984, p. 17), such as Chomsky's notion of competence (1965), CA makes it possible to detect organization and order in interaction, since it uses data from real-life conversations and not just examples devised by linguists (Atkinson & Heritage, 1984, p. 18). Sacks

---

<sup>31</sup> In the same book, Seedhouse distinguishes two types of CA: ethnomethodological and linguistic, the latter concentrating on language forms instead of social actions (Seedhouse 2004, p. 51). Seedhouse suggests that the term "conversation analysis" be reserved for the original ethnomethodological version; the other one should be called "linguistic conversation analysis" (p. 52).

warns against explanations about the world built “on the basis of assertions, suppositions, proposals about what is typical;” therefore, observations should be the basis for theorizing (Sacks, 1984, p. 25). This is why Sacks relies on transcriptions of actual occurrences: he emphasizes that “conversation is something that we can get the actual happenings of on tape and that we can get more or less transcribed; that is, conversation is simply something to begin with (...) The specific aim is (...) to see whether actual single events are studiable and how they might be studiable, and then what an explanation of them would look like” (pp. 25-26). The conversation provides us access to the products of the interaction (p. 27).

Young (in Seedhouse, 2004) points out the relevance of CA for Second Language Acquisition (SLA): talk has certain characteristics in language learning as well; besides, learning itself is a form of human activity that takes place in social context (p. x). Learning increases participation in social activities. Thus, “the central question in SLA becomes understanding the organization of talk (...) as the primordial site of sociality” (p. xi). Since CA in general investigates talk in interaction and its organization, it is equally suitable for the examination of the talk of language learners and the organization of their conversations. In this area, three concepts are common to any research: the concept of non-native speaker, learner and interlanguage (Kasper, 1997a, p. 309). Learners and non-native speakers are the human agents that are the object of inquiry in L2 studies, whereas interlanguage has relevance for SLA researchers because they have “legitimate and important interests in assessing learners’ [interlanguage] knowledge and actions not just as achievements in their own right but measured against some kind of standard” (Kasper, 1997a, pp. 309-310). This standard in the current study is the

quotative use of native speakers. Kasper emphasizes that any language acquisition theory needs to “address the question of how learners’ interlanguage knowledge progresses from stage A to stage B” (p. 310). My study is not a longitudinal one and so it does not compare the different stages in the interlanguage development of the same learners, but rather it looks at several learners at certain levels and points out the similarities displayed by them at the same level. The three levels in the study show different stages at interlanguage development. CA, with its reliance on the investigation of talk in interaction – including talk in a foreign language – provides a suitable framework for analyzing and investigating these phenomena.

To analyze interaction as closely as possible, CA generally relies on audio- and / or video-recorded data, without supposing anything context-based about it beforehand (e.g., the speakers’ social background, education, gender, etc). These may be considered at a later point, but are not crucial for the initial analysis (Seedhouse, 2004, p. 41). CA thus “represents a departure both from the use of interviewing techniques in which the verbal reports of interview subjects are treated as acceptable surrogates for the observation of actual behaviour and from the use of experimental methodologies in which the social scientist must necessarily manipulate, direct, or otherwise intervene in the subjects’ behaviour” (Atkinson & Heritage, 1984, pp. 2-3). The recordings ensure that no data is the result of the researcher’s invention or selective memory; individual preconceptions are minimized by the direct availability of the exact data, which can even be used for various other investigation purposes after the initial research has been completed (Atkinson & Heritage, 1984, p. 4). As Sacks emphasizes, “when we start out with a piece of data, the question of what we are going to end up with (...) should not be

a consideration. We sit down with a piece of data, make a bunch of observations, and see where they will go (...) if we pick any data, without bringing any problems to it, we will find something. And how interesting what we may come up with will be is something we cannot in the first instance say” (Sacks, 1984, p. 27).

CA searches for recurring patterns in the recordings of conversations (Levinson, 1983, p. 287). This is made possible by the transcriptions of the audio- and videotaped recordings, which can be analyzed in depth. In transcripts, analysts aim at getting “as much as possible of the actual sound and sequential positioning of talk onto the page” (Atkinson & Heritage, 1984, p. 12). The transcript notation for CA was developed by Gail Jefferson and described by Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson in 1974. The current dissertation is in accordance with this transcript notation. By “transcript notation” we refer to the method used by CA in order to render the recorded conversation as precisely as possible. The phenomena described in transcript notation, beside the actual utterances, include the marking of simultaneous and overlapping utterances, latches, intervals, characteristics of the speech delivery (e.g., rising and falling intonation, emphasis, aspirations, etc.) as well as gaze direction, the transcriber’s doubt about what the utterance actually was in case it is undecipherable, and so on (see Atkinson & Heritage, 1984, pp. ix-xvi, as well as Appendix 3 for an overview of the most common transcription conventions).

*Participants:*

The data for this study consists of approximately 12 ½ hours of audio- and partly video taped recordings of eleven conversations. These recordings were made of non-native speakers of German conducting conversation in German. Overall, 22 speakers were recorded, eleven male and eleven female. The number of speakers involved in a conversation ranged from two to five. Most of the recordings took place between two people, two of them involved four conversation partners each, and one recording involved five persons. The proficiency levels of the speakers, based on the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages Proficiency Guidelines – Speaking (<http://www.actfl.org/files/public/Guidelinespeak.pdf>, revised 1999 – see Appendix 1)<sup>32</sup> were as follows:

**Chart 1: Proficiency levels in the study**

<b>Level</b>	<b>Nr. of speakers recorded</b>	<b>Native language</b>	<b>Length of conversations</b>
intermediate	4	American English	01:29:33 00:25:01
advanced-low	6	American English	00:38:24 00:48:38 00:22:31
advanced-mid	2	American English	00:24:09
superior	10	American English (3), Hungarian (5), Russian (1), Ukrainian (1)	01:43:18 01:02:33 01:59:58 01:38:39 01:35:59

<sup>32</sup> These proficiency levels were assigned empirically based on knowledge of the speakers' abilities, proficiency and fluency after careful consultation with the ACTFL guidelines. No OPI interviews were conducted.

The intermediate speakers in my study at the time of the recording were roughly between the intermediate-mid and intermediate-high levels: they could handle uncomplicated communicative tasks, especially about personal information, but when going beyond their level, they had difficulty expressing themselves (e.g., mixed up verb tenses and could not use circumlocution confidently). They hesitated a lot while speaking and errors were present. These speakers were all learners from Intermediate German II classes (fourth semester of German study, the last course to fulfill a language requirement at their large public Midwestern university). They all started learning German at college, which means that they had had four semesters of German altogether during their studies (including Intermediate German II). Their native language was American English in all cases.

The advanced level learners in the study mostly belonged to the advanced-low level (six persons): they were able to handle a variety of communicative tasks, but sometimes they did it haltingly. They could talk about topics related to various activities. They tried to apply circumlocution in many instances, and their self-correction was noticeably present.

The advanced-low speakers in my data were also students in my Intermediate German II classes at the time of the recording. However, in contrast to those who were categorized above as intermediate speakers, most of these students had had more than four semesters of learning German because they had already taken German for several years at high school and had visited a German-speaking country (the average length of their stay was approximately 2-4 weeks). All recordings of students taking fourth semester German were made approximately in the middle of the semester.

Two speakers in the data were at the advanced-mid level. Their German conversation was characterized by a higher degree of clarity and precision, their vocabulary was more extensive and they often resorted to circumlocution or rephrasing. These learners had just started a German minor at the time of the recording, and had spent ten months studying abroad in Germany. Their proficiency and confidence in speaking were greater than those of the other advanced speakers. All advanced level learners in the study were native speakers of American English.

The ten superior level speakers in the study could all communicate with accuracy and fluency about a variety of topics. They were able to use extended discourse instead of speaking in paragraph-length (which is characteristic of the lower levels), and did so without lengthy hesitations. They displayed no patterns of error, although they made some sporadic mistakes. All of them were approximately at the same level of proficiency and fluency. There were no great differences between them in L2 competence and only minor ones in performance.

All but two of the superior speakers had an M.A. degree in German at the time of the recording (one of them has obtained it since the recording took place). 8 out of the 10 had extensive teaching experience of German (at least 2 years, three of them more than 10 years). They had all been to German-speaking countries several times. Six of them were having interaction with native speakers of German on a daily basis at the time of their recording. The one person who does not have a degree in German has two high-level certificates (*Ständige Konferenz der Kultusminister der Länder in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland Deutsches Sprachdiplom Zweite Stufe* and *Universität Wien*



*Wiener internationale Hochschulkurse Zeugnis Deutschkurse Fortgeschrittene*) and fits in with the description of ACTFL guidelines for the superior level.

The native language of the superior speakers was American English (3 persons), Hungarian (5 persons), Russian (1 person) and Ukrainian (1 person). At the time of the recording, all participants were familiar with the grammatical possibilities of reported speech in German, that is, the subjunctive I and II, as well as the stylistic difference between these two forms (the subjunctive I being more neutral than the subjunctive II). Among all the recorded speakers, only one had extensive knowledge of a foreign language besides German and English as a Foreign Language: one superior level L1 Hungarian speaker, who is fluent in Dutch. For more information on the participants of the study, including age, number of years studying German and time spent in a German-speaking country, see Appendix 2.

The data was collected in 2005 and 2006 in the United States (18 participants) and in Hungary (4 participants). All of the participants agreed to be recorded prior to the taping. In compliance with the guidelines of the Human Subjects Committee University of Kansas Lawrence Campus (HSCL), all participants were provided with an information sheet that described the nature of the study. Since the research presented no risk to the participants and involved no procedures for which a written consent would have been required, they did not need to sign a consent form. For all documentation provided for this study by the Human Subjects Committee, see Appendix 6. The participants were not told the exact goal of the study before the recording took place so as to avoid a possible influence on their interaction. They were only asked to conduct a conversation about any

topic they wished and maybe tell some stories. All names used in the segments presented in this dissertation are pseudonyms.

In the following, I will outline the major findings of my study before giving a detailed level-by-level analysis in chapters 5 and 6.

## 4.2 General overview

The participants of the study talked about several different topics and included numerous reported segments. The reported situations mostly consisted of the retellings of former events and what was uttered in those situations by either the reporter or another person. Other reported situations included fictitious ones<sup>33</sup> and the telling of jokes. The speakers in my recordings showed an obvious preference for direct (98 instances) over indirect speech (27 instances). Indirect quotations were few and far between. A reason why the non-native speakers in the recordings preferred direct speech may be that it makes the act of reporting more vivid and dramatic than indirect speech. It might also simply be an easier choice since it does not call for changes in the syntactic and / or semantic structure of the reported utterance (see section 2.1).

---

<sup>33</sup> An utterance is fictitious if it was not actually said but could potentially be. An example in my data is: “*Weil man dann meinen kann: «He, das stand doch im Text»*” ‘Because then someone could say, «Hey, but that was in the text».’ The quotation in segment 2, “American Idol” (see discussion in 5.1.B) may possibly be another fictitious utterance. Fónagy offers a thorough summary of forms of fictitious quotation and includes “for example”-, “what he might think now”-, philosophical dialogue-, inner voice-, as well as negated (“he didn’t say p”)-quotations (Fónagy, 1986, pp. 278-280). Fictitious quotations are thus similar to what Golato calls hypothetical speech for claim-backing, that is, when speakers try to illustrate what they have said by inventing a hypothetical situation. This is done in order to explain or argue the point the speaker has made (Golato, 2002a, pp. 47-50). The term “hypothetical direct speech” was coined by Haberland. Nevertheless, he only uses it to refer to the past; that is, what might have been said but was not (Haberland, 1986, p. 225) and neglects its possibilities of use in the present.

A noteworthy difference to the native speakers described by Golato was that the speakers in my study included no instances of the subjunctive (neither I nor II). Instead, they preferred to use the indicative extensively. This is an important difference, since the subjunctive I and II are capable of expressing the speaker's standpoint on the reported matter. In the following, I will concentrate on instances of direct speech in my data.

Most instances of direct speech were accompanied by enactments and bore great similarities to the turn organization described by Goodwin (1984, see section 3.1.2) inasmuch as they were generally prefaced by an offer / request to tell / hear the story, were accompanied by background information, culminated in a climax and were characterized by shifts in the reporter's body position, gestures and / or intonation. Non-natives' direct speech sequences were typically introduced by a quotative. It is in the usage of the quotative that different levels of competence were distinguishable among the non-native speakers. With higher proficiency levels, non-native and native quotatives became more and more similar. Quotatives thus seemed to be characteristic of the non-native speakers' interlanguage. At a more advanced level of proficiency, innovative quotatives across different L1s appeared, just like with natives. Barron notes that "interlanguage operates according to an incomplete and developing hypothesis of appropriate L2 behaviour" (Barron, 2003, p. 35). Superiors clearly have a greater understanding of such L2 behaviour whereas advanced-low level students, as I will show in the upcoming chapter, produce signs of inappropriate usage of L2 pragmatics by coming up with structures that are creative but unnatural-sounding, and are thus not acceptable as native-like language use.

Although all three levels of speakers in my study used a common quotation method (the typical *verbum dicendi sagen* ‘to say’), after the intermediate level, their array of quotative choices became wider and wider at both subsequent levels. What is noteworthy here is that intermediate and advanced level speakers in the data corpus used only quotatives that contained a conjugated verb. They thus stayed closer to the rules of standard German, that is, avoided sentences without verbs that may be considered ungrammatical. Intermediate and advanced-low level speakers applied only *sagen* (‘to say’) as their quotative. The advanced-mid level speakers also used *meinen* (‘to say’, literally ‘to mean’) besides *sagen*; *fragen* (‘to inquire’) was present as well at both advanced levels.<sup>34</sup> One advanced-low speaker produced instances of code-switching (*und like, it’s like*). At the advanced-low level there were several instances of a novel not appropriate structure, produced by two different speakers: *sein* used copulatively as a quotative (*und er war* ‘and he was’, *und ich war* ‘and I was’, *sie war* ‘she was’, *und alle Leute sind* ‘and all people are’). This seems to be a transitory phase that speakers may go through on their road to proficiency; this kind of inadequate creativity disappeared at later levels and was replaced by increasingly native-like structures by more proficient speakers. However, even if it sounds ungrammatical, using *sein* still implies that the utterance contains a conjugated verb.

In contrast, superior level speakers’ quotatives did not always contain a conjugated verb. Even though they also used the verbal quotatives applied by speakers at the lower levels (*sagen*, *fragen*, *meinen*) and also some other verbs that occurred only at the superior level (*erzählen* ‘to tell (a story)’, *betonen* ‘to emphasize’, *denken* ‘to think’,

---

<sup>34</sup> In upcoming discussions of this dissertation, I will refer to *sagen* and *meinen* as “typical *verba dicendi*” because they are the ones most commonly used to introduce reported speech in German.

*vorschlagen* ‘to recommend’, *bitten* ‘to ask [for a favor]’, *aufnehmen* ‘to take (it as something)’ and *beobachten* ‘to observe’), the speakers at this highest level of language proficiency came up with several structures that were characterized by the lack of a verb, just like in the German *und ich so / und er so*. In an analogy of Golato calling *und ich so / und er so* innovative, I call these “innovative quotatives” because they have not been described yet in previous studies. They included the following: *und* ‘and’, *und dann* ‘and then’, *und dann* + name, *und dann manchmal* ‘and then sometimes’, *und da* ‘and then / there’, *und sie* ‘and she’, *also ich eigentlich* ‘so I actually’. (They are discussed in detail in 6.3.) One speaker produced two zero quotatives, that is, no verbal quotative was present.

The fact that the superiors in my study felt confident in using structures without verbs that were very similar to *und ich so / und er so* shows that just like native speakers, they may also decide to sacrifice standard grammar rules for greater pragmatic effect. None of the intermediate and advanced students in my study omitted conjugated verbs from the quotatives, probably as a result of classroom instruction input, where learners are taught that a correct German sentence must contain a verb. Superior level speakers however, by choosing to use such innovative (and acceptable) forms, relied on a much wider choice of quotatives and showed more creativity in introducing direct discourse. This shows that their greater linguistic competence goes along with greater communicative competence: their conversation sounded more native-like in the sense that they not only resorted to the typical *verba dicendi sagen* and *meinen* but also included other vocabulary items and, most importantly, innovative structures similar to German

*und ich so / und er so* that could just as easily have been used by native speakers in conversation.

Thus, it is clear that the choices learners make when using direct speech become more varied and greater in number as their proficiency increases. Accordingly, I categorized my research participants in three groups, representing three stages in their communicative competence: I found stage 1 to be characterized by the use of *sagen*. At stage 2, where *sagen* was still prevalent, other quotatives appeared as well. Most of these (*sein* used copulatively) were not grammatically correct, yet showed learners' increasing competence and eagerness to express themselves in various ways. Stage 3 was characterized by common *verba dicendi* as well as innovative and strikingly native-like quotatives.

The three stages I could detect during my study correspond to the findings of previous research. Bahns, Burmeister and Vogel (1986) found that increasing L2 knowledge makes learners first move away from target-oriented behavior and towards creative yet sometimes pragmatically inadequate verbalizations; their assumption was that learners would move closer to target language forms at the final stage of pragmatic development (the participants in their study did not reach this stage due to time limitations) (1986, p. 719). The superiors in my study seemed to have reached this high stage and the forms they produced were indeed strikingly native-like. The shift away from target-oriented behavior was also present in the creative but unnatural-sounding quotatives of advanced-low speakers, which then disappeared at subsequent stages.

Another study came to similar conclusions on distinguishing three stages: Kecskés (1999) described stage 1 as a period of strong L1-transfer, stage 2 as one usually

characterized by false generalizations and stage 3 as the one where target-language-like proficiency becomes dominant (p. 304). This model also has relevance to my study, especially in regards to its description of stage 3, which fittingly characterizes the superior level speakers in my study.

My study thus reveals that in the case of reported discourse, greater linguistic competence accompanies greater communicative competence: the superior level speakers produced quotative structures that were similar to the native German quotative *und ich so / und er so*. Thus, not only was their command of grammar more confident than the grammar of lower level speakers, but they also displayed communicative behaviour that resembled more the behaviour of native speakers than that of language learners.

The levels and the quotatives are illustrated in Chart 2.

**Chart 2: Stages of communicative competence detectable in the study (direct speech)**

<b>Level</b>	<b>Common quotatives</b>	<b>Quotatives characteristic at this level only</b>
<b>LEVEL 3: superiors</b>	typical <i>verba dicendi</i> : <i>sagen, meinen, fragen</i>	other verbs used as <i>verba dicendi</i> ; quotatives without verbs (innovative quotatives); zero quotatives
<b>STAGE 2: advanced</b>	typical <i>verba dicendi</i> : <i>sagen, fragen</i> (at the advanced-mid level, also <i>meinen</i> )	<i>sein</i> used copulatively; code-switching
<b>STAGE 1: intermediates</b>	typical <i>verbum dicendi</i> <i>sagen</i>	

The quotatives' frequencies were as follows: *sagen* 40 times, *meinen* 21, *fragen* 7, other verbs 9, zero quotatives (no verbal quotative present) 2, *sein* used copulatively 5, code-switching 2, innovative quotatives 12.

The following table shows examples of direct discourse quotatives used by the non-natives at different levels.



**Table 1: Examples of direct discourse quotatives used by non-native speakers of German**

**I. Intermediate level:**

i) verb of saying “sagen,” e.g.:

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ und sie hat gesagt</li> <li>➤ sie sagt</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ und sie sagt / und er sagt</li> </ul> |
|--|--|

**II. Advanced level:**

i) verbs of saying “sagen”, “fragen”:

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ und er sagte</li> <li>➤ und er fragte</li> </ul> <p>(higher advanced level: also<br/>“meinen”:</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ mein Lehrer meinte so</li> <li>➤ und sie hat gemeint so/ und ich hab gemeint so)</li> </ul> |
|---|--|

ii) “sein”:

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ und er war</li> <li>➤ und ich war</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ sie war</li> <li>➤ und alle Leute sind</li> </ul> |
|---|--|

iii) code-switching: (2 instances, same speaker) und like, it’s like

**III. Superior level:**

i) verbs of saying “sagen”, “meinen”, “fragen”, “erzählen”:

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ und meint zu mir</li> <li>➤ da hat Hans gemeint</li> <li>➤ und ich sagte</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ da hat eine Ukrainerin gefragt</li> <li>➤ er hat mir erzählt</li> </ul> |
|--|--|

ii) other verbs (“sein” only in one case):

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ ich hab dann mal vorgeschlagen</li> <li>➤ und sie haben mich dann beobachtet</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ und dann dachte (<i>implied: ich</i>)</li> <li>➤ er betont das</li> <li>➤ am Ende war ich schon</li> </ul> |
|--|---|

iii) quotatives without verbs:

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ und</li> <li>➤ und dann</li> <li>➤ und dann + name</li> <li>➤ und dann manchmal</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ und da</li> <li>➤ und sie</li> <li>➤ also ich eigentlich</li> </ul> |
|---|--|

The tense of verbal quotatives introducing direct speech varied with all of the non-native speakers. The present perfect and the simple past were used almost the same number of times, with the present perfect slightly outnumbering the simple past (34 instances of the present perfect, 26 of the simple past). An interesting fact is that the present tense was also often used (22 times) in the quotative when rendering past discourse (and not present discourse or general statements, in which cases the present tense quotative is logical). (On some examples of the tense variation with non-native speakers and the difference to native speakers, see chapter 7.)

To help determine what would be considered ungrammatical or native-like in my data, I resorted to the help of native speakers of German. I selected 17 utterances containing reported speech segments, produced by both native and non-native speakers<sup>35</sup> and wrote them up on a sheet (see Appendix 4). Overt grammatical mistakes made by non-native speakers in the utterances (e.g., incorrect gender or ending) were corrected so as to avoid being a clue. 12 native speakers of German evaluated the utterances. These speakers were between the ages 23 and 35; ten of them university graduates of various fields (liberal arts, sciences, engineering, medicine) and two still students; one of them residing in Austria, five in Germany and six in the US. They were asked to determine whether the utterances sounded “rather native speaker”, “rather non-native speaker” or “could be native as well as non-native” and provided comments if they had any. The results of these evaluations proved to be most insightful in categorizing my data and

---

<sup>35</sup> The utterances by native speakers were taken from recordings of native speakers of German conducting naturally occurring conversation. These recordings were not made for the current study or used for any other purpose than to provide some randomly chosen direct speech samples that could be used on the evaluation sheet.

helped me decide what would be “unnatural-sounding” and what would be acceptable (see Appendix 5 for the exact summary of the results). I will refer to these evaluations in my data analysis.

In the following two chapters, I will analyze the direct discourse phenomena of the non-native speakers in detail. Chapter 5 is dedicated to the two lower levels, intermediate and advanced, whereas chapter 6 gives detailed attention to superior level speakers.

## 5. Direct discourse methods of intermediate and advanced level speakers of German

As it was pointed out in chapter 4, the non-native speakers in my study resorted to different direct speech methods. In this chapter, I will analyze and show examples of direct discourse methods produced by the two lower level speakers in the study: intermediate and advanced. As already mentioned, the common characteristic of these two levels was that no matter what quotative they used (even if it was novel but ungrammatical, as it happened with some advanced speakers), a conjugated verb was always present. This separates them from the superior level speakers in the study, who used numerous quotatives without a conjugated verb, a phenomenon that is also widespread in native German talk. Most quotatives used at the intermediate and advanced levels were typical *verba dicendi* (*sagen, fragen*, at higher advanced levels also *meinen*).

An overview of the general findings at the intermediate and advanced levels is as follows:

The earliest direct discourse method to appear in the data was using *sagen* in the quotative, with the verb tense varied (present, simple past or present perfect). *Sagen* was used already at the intermediate level, but higher level speakers applied it often as well. However, at the intermediate level, it was the only typical direct discourse method, whereas at other levels merely one of several.

Advanced level speakers started to vary their quotatives noticeably. *Fragen* started to make its appearance as an alternative to *sagen*. A remarkable phenomenon was, as I have pointed out in chapter 4, the occurrence of novel but ungrammatical forms,

namely *sein* used copulatively as a quotative (*und er war, und ich war, sie war, und alle Leute sind*). At the advanced level, instances of code-switching also occurred (*und like, it's like*), which seemed to be a case of the learners falling back on discourse markers in their L1. The two advanced-mid speakers used *meinen* extensively, probably due to the influence of the spoken language they had encountered while studying abroad in Germany. The same speakers also, almost systematically, added *so* to their verbs in the quotative, which constitutes the first instance of an adverb as part of the quotative in my data. Adverbs are typically found in quotatives of native speakers (*und er so*) as well as, as I will show in chapter 6, in those of superior level non-native speakers. The sporadic appearance of *so* at the advanced level foreshadows the more widespread usage of adverbs at the upcoming level. The appearance of the *verba dicendi fragen* and *meinen*, as well as the ungrammatical forms and the instances of code-switching all constitute examples of the learners' burgeoning language skills and could be interpreted as signs of their eagerness to express the same concept (direct quotations) in different ways.

In the following, I will give a detailed analysis of an intermediate level speaker using *sagen* (segment 1, "München [Munich]") as well as instances of *sein* used copulatively and examples of complete or partial code-switching at the advanced level (*und alle Leute sind* in segment 2, "American Idol," *und er war* and *it's like* in segment 3, "High school teacher," *sie war / und like* in segment 4, "Anrufe (Telephone calls).") Finally, I will show an example of an advanced speaker using *meinen* as well as *so* in segment 5, "Mathe (Math)".

## 5.1 Data analysis and discussion

First of all, I would like to illustrate the quotative structure characteristic of all three levels, that with the typical *verbum dicendi sagen* ‘to say’. It seems to be the first common quotation method applied by non-native speakers and its usage remains widespread at higher levels as well.

### 5.1.1 Speakers’ quotatives at the intermediate level

The following excerpt is taken from a conversation between two intermediate speakers of German who knew each other from an Intermediate German II (fourth semester German) class. In the segment, they talk about studying abroad. Mandy, who is planning to study in Germany to improve her language skills, is mentioning some acquaintances that have already done so and is quoting what they said about the experience. Even though Mandy’s German is good, she is not very confident when speaking, so her utterances tend to be short and the vocabulary is not greatly varied. *Sagen* appears in the quotative in lines 14 and 21.

**Segment 1: München (Munich)**

**Tape 8**

**Count: 1:25:10**

01 Mandy: aber ich äh ich höre dass münchen war sehr  
*but i uh i hear that munich was very*

- 02 gut.  
*good.*
- 03 Mitch: mhm  
*mhm*
- 04 Mandy: von äh ↑zwei(.)zwei persone das äh gibt(.)l- äh-  
*from • uh(.)two persons that uh is(.)l- uh-*
- 05 letztes jahr.(.)de- w- äh i mean das ähm war  
*last year.(.)th- w- uh i mean that uhm was*
- 06 Mitch: du weißt [du kennst ja ja  
*you know [you know yes yes*
- 07 Mandy: [ja,du weißt. ich=ich weiß ich kenne ich  
*[yes, you know. i=i know i know i*
- 08 kenne äh pauline↑ tibon↑(.)äh sie war s-sie  
*know uh pauline tibon•(.)uh she was s-she*
- 09 kommt aus chicago.  
*comes from chicago.*
- 10 Mitch: mhm  
*mhm*
- 11 Mandy: um äh sie sie geht(.)und äh sie äh sie ist sehr  
*mm uh she she goes(.)and uh she uh she is very*
- 12 äh klug  
*uh smart*
- 13 Mitch: mhm  
*mhm*
- 14 Mandy: und sie sagt dass es war sehr sehr gut. sehr sehr  
*and she says that it was very very good. very very*
- 15 gut. ähm und dann ahm eine freunde:(.)mmh ich  
*good. uhm and then mhm a friend: (. )mmh I*
- 16 denke deine name(.)äh rolf geht a nach

- think your name(.)uh rolf goes a to*
- 17           deutschland  
                  *germany*
- 18 Mitch: ralf  
                  *ralf*
- 19 Mandy: münchen  
                  *munich*
- 20 Mitch: mhm  
                  *mhm*
- 21 Mandy: und(.) er sagt das war sehr gut and a er  
                  *and(.) he says that was very good and a he*
- 22           äh deutsch ist ähm(.)besser.  
                  *uh german is uhm(.)better.*
- 23 Mitch: mhm  
                  *mhm*
- 24 Mandy: von dort.  
                  *from there.*

This segment was preceded by Mandy and Mitch expressing their desire to go to Germany to learn the language better. Mandy brings up the conversations with two of her friends, Pauline Tibon and Ralf respectively to support the idea of how useful a study abroad trip to Munich could be. She introduces her direct quotes with *sagen* in the present tense and then uses extra intonation to render the information (lines 14-15 and 21-22). In lines 14 and 15, she quotes Pauline saying that studying in Munich was “very very good” (*sehr sehr gut*), prefacing the quote with *sie sagt* ‘she says’. The repetition of the phrase, which draws extra attention to the study abroad being “very very good” was most probably used by the quoted speaker since Mandy herself, not having had the experience



yet, is probably not capable of passing judgment on the quality and usefulness of the program. It is also possible that she expresses the intensity of her friend's positive experience through the repetition of the adverb, in which case the repetition would be compensating for her lack of vocabulary. The second quotation's format is very similar: she renders the words of another friend, Ralf, in lines 21-22, *das war sehr gut* 'it was very good'. Similarly to the first quote, this one is prefaced by *sagen* as well: *er sagt* 'he says'. The extra emphasis on *sehr* 'very' is most probably Mandy's attempt to reenact Ralf's intonation. The utterance *er Deutsch ist besser* 'he German is better' (meaning 'his German is better') in lines 21-22, closely following *das war sehr gut* seems to be part of the quotation as well: Ralf must have pointed out himself that his German had gotten better during his study abroad (again, Mandy would be unlikely to be in the position to judge Ralf's language skills).

Mandy's reported speech segments are to be regarded as direct rather than indirect quotes, recognizable on the separate sentence *Sehr sehr gut* in lines 14 and 15 as well as on the extra emphasis added on *sehr* in both lines 14 and 21. *Dass es war sehr sehr gut* in line 14 sounds more like an indirect quote, yet the following *Sehr sehr gut* can be recognized by the intonation as a direct one. Accordingly, *und sie sagt* can be identified as the quotative).<sup>36</sup> The extra emphasis on *sehr* in line 21 identifies *er sagt* as another quotative. The reported speech segments can thus be regarded as reenactments because they imitate the original intonation of the quoted speakers. Mandy seems to resort to reenactments to underline the point of the current conversation: that studying abroad in Munich is indeed fruitful, as attested by her friends who have had the experience. She

---

<sup>36</sup> Clark and Gerrig would call this a case of "hybrid quotation," incorporating a description as well a demonstration of the original utterance (1990, p. 791).

makes the effort of reenacting instead of simply mentioning that two of her friends have studied abroad and liked it, a sentence that she could have produced in German (maybe with some mistakes) without great difficulty. At other points during the recording, Mandy used indirect speech several times, making all the necessary deictic and adverbial changes. This shows that she was already capable of producing reported speech and that direct speech was not a strategy she fell back on for lack of other options.

A higher level, more confident speaker with wider vocabulary may have given a lengthier explanation as to why a study abroad in Germany would be a good idea. Not having this proficiency yet, it is remarkable how Mandy overcomes the gaps in her vocabulary to describe the merits of a study abroad program by resorting to direct speech. The direct quotations with the original speakers' emphasis sound just as convincing as reasoning in the form of a monologue would; it is maybe even more expressive. Thus, in choosing direct speech instead of a monologue to reach a more dramatic effect, Mandy seems not only to try to speak in the foreign language but to actually attempt to construct a natural-sounding conversation. This was not always the case with the intermediate and advanced speakers recorded. Some of them, despite having a good command of German grammar, did not conduct a "natural-sounding" conversation. They were rather building sentences, sometimes with excellent grammar, yet concentrated more on making their sentences grammatically correct than pragmatically expressive. As a result, their turns sounded more textbook-like than spontaneous conversation. This shows that pragmatic competence is not only dependent on the speaker's level but that individual differences exist as well, and that good linguistic competence does not necessarily go hand in hand with good pragmatic competence.

Despite Mandy and Mitch's slight insecurity in conversing in the foreign language, the quotation format that seems to be universal to both native and non-native speakers is detectable. There are quotatives (*und sie sagt, und er sagt*), the quotes (*sehr sehr gut / das war sehr gut, er Deutsch ist besser*) and unquotes: falling intonation followed by "ähm" in lines 14-15 and falling intonation in line 22. Mitch indicates his attention and understanding of Mandy's speech by repeating the acknowledgement token "mhm" at his turn-transition opportunities in lines 03, 10, 13 and 23 (see Schegloff, 1981 on listeners' vocalizations as evidence of attention and understanding); it is also what he uses in reaction to the end of Mandy's story in line 23.<sup>37</sup>

*Sagen* was used in my recordings to introduce both direct and indirect speech at all levels by all speakers who used quotations. It was the most common quotative in the data corpus and the only one that appeared at the intermediate level already. In their conversation, both Mandy and Mitch resorted to it several times.

---

<sup>37</sup> It is not completely clear whether *von dort* 'from there' in line 24 is part of the quotation or not. Mandy's falling intonation in line 22 seems to signal the end of her quote, which gives this last, added piece of information more the nature of an afterthought.

### 5.1.2 Speakers' quotatives at the advanced level

Segment 1, “München (Munich)” showed that the typical *verbum dicendi sagen* already appears at the intermediate level. I considered this the first stage of communicative competence with direct speech. The aspirations to be as expressive as possible are already noticeable here, but it requires a certain confidence in producing the foreign language (reached at a higher level of proficiency and definitely attained by superiors) to make it sound really convincing, that is, more like the conversation of native speakers. In the following, I will illustrate the stage 2 phenomenon of advanced-low speakers using a copulative *sein* as quotative; a method that is creative but not very target-language-like. This kind of creative yet pragmatically inadequate behavior tends to appear with learners' increasing proficiency in the L2, only to disappear again later at even higher levels of proficiency (see Bahns *et al.*, 1986; Kecskés, 1999).

The structures produced by two advanced-low learners in my study were *und er war* ‘and he was’, *und ich war* ‘and I was’, *sie war* ‘she was’ and *und alle Leute sind* ‘and all people are’, used as quotatives. Both speakers are extremely communicative learners who talk in German fluently, even if with some grammar mistakes. The fact that two different speakers, both with American English as their L1, came up with a structure consisting of a subject and a form of *sein* could be explained with language transfer: one may assume that the forms came into being under L1 influence, namely “and he was / she was / I was like” or “and everyone’s like,” although an equivalent of *like* is missing.<sup>38</sup>

---

<sup>38</sup> It may be a transfer of the L1 structure “and he/she was / and I was,” which may occur as a quotative without *like* among native speakers. I am grateful to one of my dissertation committee members for pointing this out.

Segment 2, “American Idol,” illustrates this creative but strange-sounding phenomenon. It contains the quotative *und alle Leute sind*. Andy and Peter, two advanced-low speakers who knew each other from my Intermediate German II class, talk about TV shows and seem to agree that *American Idol* is a low-quality program. The quotation appears in lines 26-27.

**Segment 2: American idol**

**Tape 10**

**Count: 00:18:28**

- 01 Andy: alles am fernsehen ist dumm!(.)  
*everything on TV is dumb!(.)*
- 02 Peter: [jaa ja  
*[yees yes*
- 03 Andy: [siehst du haha siehst du was ist das (0.6)  
*[do you watch haha do you watch what is it(0.6)*
- 04 idiotische  
*idiotic*
- 05 Peter: hh hehe  
*hh hehe*
- 06 Andy: ähm (2.0) american idol.  
*uhm (2.0) american idol.*
- 07 Peter: aah hehe ich habe es(.)einmal gesehen  
*aah hehe i have seen it(.) once*
- 08 Andy: hhe  
*hhe*

- 09 Peter: ja  
*yes*
- 10 Andy: es war so dumm ja  
*it was so dumb yes*
- 11 Peter: ja ja es ist sehr dumm  
*yes yes it is very dumb*
- 12 Andy: ja [ich ich auch  
*yes [i i also*
- 13 Peter: [ja  
*[yes*
- 14 Andy: und (0.4) der idiot da ist leute (0.6)  
*and(0.4) the idiot there is people (0.6)*
- 15 Peter: hh  
*hh*
- 16 Andy: hö-(0.6) dass l- dass leute(.)mag(0.6) mögen(0.4)  
*he-(0.6) that p- that people(.) likes(0.6)like*  
*(0.4)*
- 17 ähm ich glaub (1.0)ähm was ist der simon cowell  
*uhm i think(1.0) uhm what ist he simon cowell*
- 18 Peter: simon cowell [er ist ein blöder mann  
*simon cowell [he is a stupid man*
- 19 Andy: [er ist ein böser ja [blöd idiot  
*[he is an evil yes [stupid idiot*
- 20 Peter: [aa ja (2.0)  
*[aa yes (2.0)*

- 21 und (0.4) er kann nicht singen [und tanzen  
*and (0.4) he can't sing [and dance*
- 22 Andy: [ihh hahahaha ja  
*[ihh hahahaha yes*
- 23 Peter: aber (2.0)  
*but (2.0)*
- 24 Andy: ja(.)aber er sagt [andere schlecht oder  
*yes(.)but he says [others in a bad or*
- 25 Peter: [ja  
*[yes*
- 26 Andy: hässlich tanzen und singen und al- und alle  
*ugly way dance and sing and al- and all*
- 27 leute sind ↑Ah ja, er is- er stimmt!  
*people are •Oh yes, he is- he's right!*
- 28 Peter: ja haha  
*yes haha*
- 29 Andy: (.)nein!  
*(.)no!*
- 30 Peter: nein  
*no*
- 31 Andy: er ist ein idiot  
*he is an idiot*
- 32 Peter: hh hehe  
*hh hehe*
- 33 Andy: ja (1.0) vielleicht vielleicht (1.2) die leute  
*yes (1.0) maybe maybe (1.2) the people*
- 34 nicht alle (1.0) vielleicht die leute sind nicht  
*not all(-)maybe the people are not*
- 35 so gut=aber er sollt nicht(-)total(.)zerstören

*so good=but he should not(-)totally(.)destroy*

36 Peter: ja uh hehehe

*yes uh hehehe*

The quotation appears in the middle of a discussion about bad TV programs and “American Idol” specifically. Andy and Peter agree and it is an “idiotic” and “dumb” show and that Simon Cowell (who judged the contestants’ performance in the program) is “stupid.” Andy points out that Simon Cowell can neither dance nor sing (line 21), yet he criticizes others for not being talented: *aber er sagt andere schlecht oder hässlich tanzen und singen* ‘but he says others dance and sing in a bad and ugly way’ (lines 24 and 26). Peter agrees in lines 22 and 25 by producing laughter and *ja* ‘yes’. In lines 26-27, Andy uses a quotation to illustrate how Simon Cowell influences with his opinion other people, who then agree with his assessment of the contestants. As quotative, Andy uses *und alle Leute sind* ‘and all people are’ to preface the quote *Ah ja, er is-, er stimmt!* ‘Oh yes, he is –, he’s right!’ Andy’s pitch goes up after the quotative in line 27 and stays elevated until he finishes the quote. He gets back to his own intonation only after Peter’s agreement token *ja haha* ‘yes haha’ (line 28) and a short pause on his own behalf in line 29: in his normal intonation, he expresses his own evaluation of the reported speech segment, namely, disagreement with the fact that people would listen to Simon Cowell’s opinion: *Nein!* ‘No!’ (line 29). Peter is, again, in agreement with Andy, made clear by his repetition of Andy’s turn: *Nein* ‘no’ in line 30.

Andy’s elevated pitch following the quotative is a signal that a direct quote is coming up. It draws Peter’s attention to the fact that Andy is imitating what people have said in reaction to Simon Cowell’s opinions. The higher pitch thus constitutes an



important part of Andy's reenactment. The short pause he inserts before *Nein!* in line 29 signals the end of his quote and thus creates an unquote.

The quotation format is already noticeably more confident than with the intermediate speaker in segment 1, "München (Munich)." Andy's quote is unmistakably direct speech and he gives a more vivid enactment than Mandy. He is a learner with excellent language skills. With the creativity he shows here, he can be regarded as a speaker on stage 2 of pragmatic development described by Bahns *et al.* (1986) as well as Kecskés (1999): the form he uses is creative, but it is not a standard choice for native speakers, since using *sein* as a quotative is not considered correct German language use. Nevertheless, it is certainly a creative structure since it adds more dynamics to the reported segment than a typical *verbum dicendi* would.

On the evaluation form filled out by native speakers guessing whether certain utterances were said by natives or non-natives or if both were possible (see Appendices 4 and 5), *und alle Leute sind* was marked as "rather non-native" by 6 native speakers, "could be both" by 3 and "rather native" by 2. According to this, the number of German-speakers who would find this quotative appropriate and those who would not is almost equal. Many of those who rejected it remarked that *sein* sounded out of context or ambiguous ("*alle Leute sind was?*" 'all people are what?') or that two words are missing: "*Leute sind der Meinung,*" 'people are of the opinion'). One German speaker accepted it as native usage with the comment "«*sein*»  *klingt etwas merkwürdig, kann aber regionale Umgangssprache sein*" – '«*sein*» sounds a bit strange but it could be regional vernacular'. As one can see, this transitory level in the development of language

proficiency can be quite ambiguous as regards to grammatical correctness and pragmatic acceptability.

One could argue that the form *und alle Leute sind* came into being under the influence of American English *and all people are like*, although the equivalent of *like* is not present. One cannot be absolutely sure that this is the case, but it does seem likely that the form is a pragmatic transfer from American English. As mentioned earlier, all instances of ungrammatical, novel quotatives in my data were produced by two learners whose L1 is American English, and there is indeed the detectable pattern of a subject followed by a form of *sein*, which makes them similar to American English *and I'm like / and he's like: und er war, und ich war, sie war, und alle Leute sind*. Despite the lack of *so*, which would correspond to English *like*, it is feasible that this phenomenon is influenced by American English and is used as part of a construction that is common in the speakers' L1.<sup>39</sup>

It remains debatable whether Andy's quotation is fictitious or not (on fictitious quotes, see footnote 32), that is, whether there actually has been somebody uttering the (most possibly English equivalents of the) quoted words *Ah ja, er is- er stimmt!* or not. Has Andy ever conversed with someone who expressed agreement with Simon Cowell's opinions or is he coining the utterance himself? We cannot tell for sure. This, again, points in the direction of American English, where *to be like* can introduce words that

---

<sup>39</sup> Clark and Gerrig note having recorded instances of a copula used alone as a quotative, such as “and uh **and he's** «oh oh what does that have to do with it»” (Clark & Gerrig, 1990, p. 772) (emphasis mine). In addition, Sidnell also describes a recorded American English quotative where *like* seems to be the missing element. The conjugated verb is present, and is followed by *all*: “ ‘n I wuz all wha:ɪt?” (Sidnell, 2006, p. 400). *All* is a very common adverb / pronoun with various functions in colloquial American English, yet not typically identified as part of quotative structures. Clark & Gerrig's as well as Sidnell's examples sound close to the structures coined by the advanced-low learners in my data, since they include a form of *to be* but not *like*, similarly to *und er war, und ich war, sie war* and *und alle Leute sind*.

have indeed been uttered or words that have merely been thought by someone but never actually got verbalized (see Blyth *et al.*, 1990, p. 222).

Although the quotative form *und alle Leute sind* remained a one-time occurrence in my recordings, the structures that appeared in the speech of another advanced-low level speaker were strikingly similar to it. These structures were also very similar to one another: *und er war*, *und ich war* and *sie war*. I will present *und er war* in segment 3, “High school teacher” and *sie war* in segment 4, “Anrufe (Calls).” The segments also contain other quotatives, namely *sagen* (segment 3) and instances of code-switching (both segments 3 and 4).

Segment 3 illustrates *und er war*, another instance of a creative but incorrect quotative using *sein* copulatively. This was a conversation between Henry and David, two students in my Intermediate German II class who had already known each other at high school; in fact, they had taken German together there. In the upcoming segment, they talk about their high school German teacher, Mr. Richards, reminiscing about the fun they had with him. A fond memory which is remembered here is how Mr. Richards would bring his guitar to school and sing, although he denied being a good singer or guitar player. David quotes him saying so in lines 18-19.

**Segment 3: High school teacher**

**Tape 6**

**Count: 00:13:57**

01 David: a er- er war sehr lustig.

a he- he was very funny.

- 02 Henry: [ja sehr lustig.  
*[yes very funny.*
- 03 David: [sehr lustig. und er  
*[very funny. and he*
- 04 Henry: hehe ja  
*hehe yes*
- 05 David: er konnte singen!  
*he could sing!*
- 06 Henry: Ja und  
*Yes and*
- 07 David: bad bad leroy brown!  
*bad bad Leroy brown!*
- 08 Henry: ja  
*yes*
- 09 David: mit gitarre  
*with guitar*
- 10 Henry: mit mit gitarre ja  
*with with guitar yes*
- 11 David: ja, das war(.)u:h  
*yes, that was(.)oo:h*
- 12 Henry: hehe super  
*hehe super*
- 13 David: ja sehr [gut  
*yes very [good*
- 14 Henry: [wir haben immer gesagt(.)du musst dein  
*[we always said(.)you have to*
- 15 gitarre [mitbringen  
*bring along [your guitar*
- 16 David: [ja

[yes

- 17 Henry: und singen  
*and sing*
- 18 David: ja und er war(.)Ne:in! ich(.)ich kann nicht  
*yes and he was(.)No:! i(.) I can't*
- 19 singen, ich kann nicht spielen, it's like(.)  
*sing, i can't play, it's like(.)*
- 20 ↑was?(.)du (1.0)[du  
*•what?(.)you (1.0) [you*
- 21 Henry: [hehehe  
*[hehehe*
- 22 David: du bist sehr sehr gut, herr richards!  
*you are very very good, mister richards!*
- 23 Henry: [ja (1.0) das stimmt  
*[yes (1.0) that's right*
- 24 David: [spiele die(.)spiele die gitarre und singen  
*[play the(.)play the guitar and sing*
- 25 Henry: ja  
*yes*
- 26 David: und  
*and*
- 27 Henry: ja und und(.)wir(.)wir kuchen hehe  
*yes and and(.)we(.)we cake hehe*
- 28 David: ja  
*yes*
- 29 Henry: kuchen  
*cake*
- 30 David: kuchen alle das war u:h echt gut  
*cake all that was oo:h really good*

31 Henry: ja

*yes*

32 David: echt gut!

*really good!*

David quotes and reenacts in lines 18 and 19 how the teacher modestly denied his abilities when asked to play: *und er war, nein! Ich kann nicht singen, ich kann nicht spielen* ‘and he was, no! I can’t sing, I can’t play.’ The emphasis he puts on *Nein!* sounds like somebody protesting, which renders his quote a reenactment. The quotative he uses to cite the teacher is *und er war* ‘and he was’ in line 18. The typical short pause which generally introduces direct quotes precedes his quote. At the end of it, David inserts another quotative, this time one that is the result of code-switching (*it’s like*, line 19) to introduce what is most probably a self-quotation in lines 20, 22 and 24: *Was? Du bist sehr sehr gut, Herr Richards! Spiele die Gitarre und singen!* ‘What? You are very very good, Mr. Richards! Play the guitar and sing!’ This quotation is also preceded by a short pause at the end of line 19, after the quotative *it’s like*. The quoted material is finished in line 24; David changes the topic in line 26. Henry’s appreciation token in the form of laughter is present in line 21 and a comment in line 23: *das stimmt* ‘that’s right’.

The segment is a good example of the language use of an advanced-low speaker. Despite his insecurities about grammar, David varies his quotation methods in lines 14, 18 and 19. In line 14, he uses *sagen* in the present perfect (*wir haben immer gesagt* ‘we always said’); in line 18, *sein* used copulatively (*und er war*); and in line 19, code-switching (*it’s like*). Even though the result is not grammatically perfect, *und er war* and *it’s like* both serve well as quotation markers. *Und er war* follows the same pattern as *und*

*alle Leute sind* in segment 2 and is also most likely the result of L1 transfer from American English. It was categorized as non-native by 10 German speakers in the evaluations; only one person said it is “rather native” and one that it could be both. Those who found it unacceptable said it was absurd, unfitting in the context or meaningless; one of them actually recommended *und er so* to be used instead. Complementing David’s structure with *so* would indeed render his reporting acceptable as a correct target-language structure.<sup>40</sup>

*It’s like* in line 19 is what Streeck calls the “impersonal version” of the *like*-quotative (2002, p. 590), used to create space and time for the preparation of the enactment (p. 593). Streeck does not find it clear whether *like* is part of the quotative in *to be like*, or whether it is a discourse marker accompanying the quotative verb *be* (p. 584). In my opinion, *like* in line 19 of the above segment is used as a pragmatic marker with a quotative function (as opposed to a hedge, exemplifier or approximator); it focuses Henry’s attention on the next unit of talk, namely a quotation. Also, as mentioned earlier, American English *to be like* can introduce an utterance that was said as well as a thought that never became verbalized. A quote introduced by *to be like* is thus often ambiguous: we cannot tell whether it was actually said or not. This is the case in this segment as well: one cannot tell for sure whether the utterance *Was? Du bist sehr sehr gut, Herr Richards!* ‘What? You are very very good, Mr. Richards!’ was ever uttered or only thought. It is also not clear whom this quote belongs to; it is most probably a self-quotation, but it may refer to what the students of Mr. Richards were thinking as a class. To introduce such a

---

<sup>40</sup> Interestingly, the only example of a superior speaker using a *sein* quotative (segment 7: “Prüfung”) sounded more acceptable to native speakers. I will include it in my analysis of superior speakers’ direct discourse methods in chapter 6.

“hazy” quote, *to be like* is a common American English quotation marker. This is a possible explanation for why David is using it here, temporarily falling back on his mother tongue for the first time, after using several other quotatives in German (*wir haben immer gesagt* in line 14 as well as *und er so* in another segment, to be mentioned in the Conclusion.)

The other instance of a pragmatic marker in a quotative role appearing as a result of code-switching merged a German continuation marker (*und*) with an English focus / quotative marker (*like*). In this section of the same conversation as in segment 3 above, the same two speakers, David and Henry were talking about the party. Henry called the hostess and started talking in German, which she could understand only with David’s help, who was the only guest at the party with knowledge of German. Consequently, David could appear really “cool,” since he could translate German for the girl. David quotes the confused hostess in lines 42, 44 and 46. In line 48, he introduces a self-quotation with another instance of code-switching.



**Segment 4: Anrufe (Calls)****Tape 6****Count: 00:17:07**

- 37 David: ja. ähm(.)well christina war(.)bei(.)ihrem haus  
*yes. uhm(.)well christina was(.)at(.)her home*
- 38 und ich war bei ihrem haus und(.)du hat ihr  
*and i was at her home and(.) you*
- 39 angeruft und äh(.)du hat alle in deutsch zu spre-  
*called her and uh(.)everything in german you tol-*
- 40 a: [gesagt  
*a: [said*
- 41 Henry: [hahaha jaja ja  
*[hahaha yeah yeah yeah*
- 42 David: sie war(.) ↑was ist da:s?  
*she was(.) •what is tha:t?*
- 43 Henry: hehehehehe  
*hehehehehe*
- 44 David: was was like äh  
*what what like uh*
- 45 Henry: hehe  
*hehe*
- 46 David: kennst(.)jemand(.)deutsch?  
*does anyone(.)know(.)german?*
- 47 Henry: [hehe  
*[hehe*
- 48 David: [und like(.)((nonchalant tone)) ja, ein bisschen.  
*[and like(.) ((nonchalant tone)) yes, a little*  
*bit.*

- 49 hm like  
*hm like*
- 50 Henry: ahahaha  
*ahahaha*
- 51 David: ((still nonchalant tone)) ja es sprechen ( )  
 ((*still nonchalant tone*)) *yes there speaks ( )*
- 52 yeah  
*yeah*
- 53 Henry: hehe (1.0) ich-  
*hehe (1.0) i-*
- 54 David: ((normal tone)) es ist alles! hehehehe  
 ((*normal tone*)) *that's all! hehehehe*
- 55 Henry: hehe  
*hehe*

David's ungrammatical quotative *sie war* in line 42 introduces an enactment, where he imitates the girl's higher pitch and somewhat whiny voice: *Was ist das?* 'What is that?' The enactment is preceded by the short pause typical before enactments in line 42. David adjusts his pitch during this pause to imitate the girl he is quoting. There is another quotative *like* in line 44 prefacing the rest of the hostess' quoted words *Kennst jemand Deutsch?* 'Does anyone know German?', and then one more quotative *und like* in line 48. The *und* in line 48 connects the previous utterance to the quotation that David emphasizes the most, since that is where he could casually answer *ja, ein bisschen* 'yes, a little bit' and so impress the girl and everyone else at the party; the focus marker *like* after *und* directs even more attention to the quotation. When quoting himself saying *ja, ein bisschen*, David performs another enactment, recognizable on his changed tone of voice which becomes noticeably nonchalant compared to his narrative voice. This enactment is

again preceded by a short pause, which David uses to change his tone. Yet another *like* appears in line 49, probably in a quotative function again; lines 51-52 are not clearly audible in the recording, but judged by David's still nonchalant tone, he is probably adding something to the previous quotation he made in line 48. Henry shows his amusement by interspersing David's narration with laughter and appreciation tokens in lines 41, 43, 45, 47, 50, 53 and 55.

It seems that relying on English *like* as a pragmatic marker in various roles is a frequent choice for David at the current stage of his interlanguage development, even though he can already use German markers too. This shows how unconsciously directed it is when learners use pragmatic markers: markers were the only expressions that appeared in the conversations in English. This was the case not only with David and Henry but in other conversations too: the non-native speakers at the intermediate and advanced levels were consistent in keeping up the conversation in German and not falling back on English – except pragmatic markers. Striking examples in another conversation were “y’know” and “I mean” in a conversation otherwise conducted solely in German.<sup>41</sup> This shows how difficult it could be for speakers at lower levels of language proficiency to indicate their pragmatic purposes with anything else than their native tongue markers: either because the learners are not yet familiar with corresponding L2 strategies or because the influence of L1 pragmatic markers is so strong that speakers involuntarily apply them even in a L2 situation.

---

<sup>41</sup> Similar examples can be found in data by Sankoff *et al.* (1997), who found several instances of English “so” and “you know” in a conversation otherwise conducted in French and in data by Lynch (2008), who showed the occurrence of these same two expressions in the speech of heritage learners and L2 learners of Spanish.

### 5.1.3 Speakers' quotatives at the advanced-mid level

In this section, I would like to point out how the quotatives of the two advanced-mid speakers in my data differed from those of the advanced-low level speakers. The typical *verbum dicendi meinen* made its appearance at this level. Furthermore, the two speakers used the adverb *so* extensively as part of their quotatives. This is noteworthy, since adverbs constituted an integral part of numerous quotatives at the superior level; in addition, *so* is also part of the native German quotative *und ich so / und er so*. Therefore, I would like to show how quotatives with *so* were first used in my data. Segment 5, “Mathe (Math)” illustrates the usage of both *meinen* and *so*.

Segment 5 was produced by Angie and Cassi, two friends at the advanced-mid level who had spent ten months in Germany. During their conversation, they talked a lot about their time in Germany and shared some memories. In the segment included here, Cassi talks about her Mathematics class in Germany where she was not able to understand anything, so she spent the class drawing. She quotes and reenacts her teacher offering to help her in lines 08 and 11.

**Segment 5: Mathe (Math)****Tape 4****Count: 00:07:19**

- 01 Cassi: ja. also (0.4) ich hatte kein mathe die letzte:  
*yes. so (0.4) i had no math the last:*
- 02 Angie: ((coughs))
- 03 Cassi: die letzte jahr ähm(.)äh: gymnasium und dann wenn  
*the last year uhm(.)uh: high school and then when*
- 04 ich in deutschland war=hab ich mathe genommen  
*i was in germany=i took math*
- 05 aber ich hab(.)gar nichts verstanden=ich hab die  
*but i didn't understand anything=i was*
- 06 ganze zeit gezeichnet hh  
*drawing all the time hh*
- 07 Angie: [hihihi  
*[hihihi*
- 08 Cassi: [und so(.)und mein lehrer meinte so(.)↑ja:, wenn  
*[and so(.)and my teacher said like(.)•yes:, if*
- 09 ich dich helfen kann, und dann(.)dann mach ich  
*i can help you, and then(.)then I will do*
- 10 auch↓(.)hh und (0.4) dann(.)jeden tag ist er zu  
*too•(.)hh and (0.4) then(.)every day he*
- 11 mir gekommen so(.)↑was was kann ich für dich  
*came to me like(.)• what what can I do*
- 12 machen↓und dann ha-hat er gesehen(.)meine:  
*for you•and then he s-saw(.) my:*
- 13 gezeichnete hhe seiten (0.4) o:h(.)es war so  
*drawn hhe pages (0.4) o:h(.)it was so*
- 14 schrecklich(.) [aber

*terrible(.) [but*

15 Angie:                                    [ups hhe

*[oops hhe*

16 Cassi: nee (0.6) es(.)es ist mir egal hehe [ich kann das

*Noo (0.6) it(.)it is all the same to me hehe [I can*

17 Angie:                                    [oh

*[oh*

18 Cassi: nicht verstehen ich(.) ja

*not understand that i(.) yes*

19 Angie: ja:

*ye:s*

Cassi prefaces her first reenactment of the teacher’s quote with *und so, mein Lehrer meinte so* ‘and like, my teacher said like’ in line 08; the second enactment in line 11 is introduced by *so* only. In the first instance, *so* complements the verbal quotative, in the second, it stands alone: Cassi does not repeat the *verbum dicendi* or come up with another one in line 11, just uses *so* to focus Angie’s attention on the upcoming quotation. The adverb signals that she has finished the first part of her quote and frames the second part. *So* in this case (line 11) is the only element present in an otherwise elliptical quotative structure: there is no verb or pronoun accompanying it. It is used as a pragmatic marker to introduce direct speech (see 3. 3 on the usage of quotatives as pragmatic markers).

The quotatives in both lines 08 and 11 are immediately followed by a short pause, which Cassi uses to adjust her pitch. The enactments are recognizable in both lines by the changed pitch, which she keeps elevated until the end of the quotations: *Ja, wenn ich dich helfen kann, und dann mach ich auch* ‘yes, if I can help you, and then I will too’ and *Was*

*kann ich für dich machen* ‘what can I do for you’. The unquote at the end of the cited material is signaled in both lines 10 and 12 by a return to Cassi’s normal pitch; in line 10, a short pause is inserted as well. Cassi follows up her quote by offering an assessment of it in lines 13-14: *oh, es war so schrecklich* ‘oh, it was so terrible’. Angie reacts to the story with the assessment ‘oops’ and laughter in line 15. Accordingly, the quotation format used here (quotative – short pause – direct quote – unquote) corresponds to the one Golato described in her data to be characteristic of quotations with *und ich so / und er so* (Golato, 2000: 40).

During the conversation, Angie and Cassi’s quotations were characterized by *verba dicendi* followed by *so* in many instances. I found this remarkable since this way, they stayed grammatically correct in their utterances but also displayed the influence of everyday colloquial language by adding *so* as part of their quotatives (e.g., *meine Mutter sagt so* ‘my mother says like’, *dann meinte er so* ‘then he said like’, *sie sagen ja immer so* ‘they namely always say like’, *und ich hab gemeint so* ‘and I said like,’ etc.) It is difficult to tell whether the usage of this *so* may come from being familiar with *und ich so / und er so* (which these speakers did not use) or whether it could be L1 transfer from American English, the speakers’ native tongue. As noted in section 2.4, English *like* and German *so* can fulfill similar functions, one of which is introducing words or clauses and marking them as “new and noteworthy information” (Golato, 2000: 50) in the role of focus markers. They also constitute a part of quotative structures. Thus, a traditional quotative mingles with the innovative one in the language use of these two speakers. Angie and Cassi are at a level of competence where they do not yet renounce the usage of a conjugated verb in their quotatives, but the frequent occurrence of the deictic *so* gives

their conversation a more native-like flavor. This already takes them one step further from lower level speakers whose quotatives only consist of a conjugated verb structure but no adverbs.

Adverbs were not used at levels lower than the advanced-mid in my data. Due to the lack of other advanced-mid level non-native speakers in my recordings, it remains a task for future research to see if other learners at this level would also use *meinen* and/or *so* in their quotatives, or whether it was more the influence of living in an authentic German environment in Angie and Cassi's case.

## 5.2 Summary / Conclusions

In this chapter, I have given an analysis of direct discourse methods used by the intermediate and advanced level speakers in my study. I described different quotative structures at these two levels and used them to point out differences in communicative competence. I stated that the usage of the typical *verbum dicendi sagen* appears already in the language use of intermediate speakers. This constitutes the first level in communicative competence. At the second level, reached by advanced speakers, the quotative choices become wider; learners start to "experiment": there seems to be a transitory phenomenon at this level characterized by creative but rather unnatural-sounding structures that consist of *sein* used copulatively. I illustrated this phenomenon with segments containing the quotatives *und alle Leute sind*, *und er war* and *und sie*. Quotatives created through code-switching were also presented (*it's like*, *und like*). In addition, I showed how an adverb (*so*) as well as the typical *verbum dicendi meinen* also



appear in the language use of some advanced level speakers, foreshadowing the more widespread use of adverbs with superiors.

I would like to point to the fact that the structures discussed here are not necessarily used by all non-native speakers. Due to the lack of further studies on the quotation methods of non-natives and the limited number of participants in my study, one cannot tell with confidence how common these methods are and whether it is typical to all language learners to produce exactly these kinds of structures at these levels. However, the examples in my data for a *sein* quotative, produced by two different speakers in different conversations (although with the same L1), point in the direction of a transitory phase which is characterized by creative but rather unnatural-sounding grammatical structures: learners temporarily move away from target-oriented behavior and towards creative yet sometimes pragmatically inadequate forms, or they make false generalizations. This phenomenon has been described in previous research (Bahns *et al.*, 1986; Kecskés, 1999). Further research may reveal if, and what kind of, other forms exist as well.

Nevertheless, one may draw the general conclusion that the aspiration to mark utterances as quoted speech is definitely distinguishable from the intermediate level onwards. Due to limited proficiency and vocabulary, intermediate speakers' direct speech methods are not yet greatly varied, but they are already present. Intermediate learners resort to the most obvious method when reporting: conjugating the lexical item *sagen*, the most common German verb denoting 'to say'. At the advanced level, the quotative choices become wider as learners start to produce other forms as well to express the same concept (direct speech) in different ways. This is possible through their broadening

vocabulary and proficiency, and is a remarkable phenomenon despite some unsuccessful attempts.

*Sagen*, although fitting in any German reported speech context, is the most general verb of saying and is thus a neutral expression when quoting. *Meinen* on the other hand, being more informal, adds a flavor of everyday spoken German not necessarily encountered in textbooks. Using this verb, which first appeared in my data at the advanced-mid level, shows greater confidence in speaking the foreign language and familiarity with a structure that is usually not explicitly taught at a standard German language course, so it adds a certain amount of “nativeness” to the speakers’ conversation.

As I will show in the upcoming chapter, this native-like quality increases with learners’ proficiency. At the superior level in my study, speakers produced several quotative structures that sounded very similar to the native German quotative *und ich so / und er so*. They also used numerous quotation methods, only one of which was coming up with innovative (and grammatically as well as pragmatically acceptable) quotatives. The main difference between the quotatives of superiors and those of lower-level speakers was that at the superior level, a conjugated verb was not always present. However, this did not render their quotative structures unacceptable. I will now turn my attention to the detailed analysis of superior level quotatives.

## 6. Direct discourse methods of superior level speakers of German

I have shown in chapter 5 what direct discourse methods were used by the intermediate and advanced level learners in my study. This present chapter is an investigation of the methods applied by superior speakers.

At this most advanced level of language proficiency, speakers displayed the largest array of choices when rendering formerly uttered speech. The methods used correctly by intermediate and advanced speakers were present at the superior level as well. They used the typical *verba dicendi sagen* and *meinen* extensively. There was one instance of a quotative with *sein* at the superior level, the phenomenon that appeared with some advanced-low speakers as a transitory phase, but was not considered natural-sounding by native speakers. Besides the typical *verba dicendi* and the one instance of *sein*, superior level speakers also used other verbs in their quotatives. Widening their choice of lexical items is a sign of their greater language proficiency and vocabulary. They sometimes opted for verbs that are not necessarily obvious choices in speech reporting. Most of them can be categorized as *verba dicendi* or *sentendi* (*erzählen* ‘to tell (a story)’, *betonen* ‘to emphasize’, *denken* ‘to think’, *vorschlagen* ‘to recommend’, *bitten* ‘to ask [for a favor]’, *aufnehmen* ‘to take (it as something)’, ‘to register’), but there was also an instance of *beobachten* ‘to observe’, which is not typically used to introduce a direct quotation. I will talk about these verbs more in detail in 6.2. The major difference between the quotatives of superior and lower-level speakers was that superiors used several quotatives with no conjugated verb. There was no instance of intermediate or

advanced learners producing a quotative without a verb. 6.4 offers conclusions and further discussion of the topics outlined in this chapter.

### **6.1 Superior level direct discourse methods common with lower-level speakers**

As mentioned above, the superior speakers used typical *verba dicendi* several times, just like intermediate and advanced level speakers in the study. At this level, it is noticeable that the learners render reported speech with more confidence due to their increased fluency. Because of the proficiency level, their conversation sounds more like that of native speakers. Direct discourse with an enactment was used by them as a general method to create a more dramatic effect. The direct speech segments and the enactments are definitely more apparent in the following segment, segment 6, than they were e.g. in the intermediate segment 1 “München (Munich).” Here, we find examples for both typical *verba dicendi*: *meinen* as well as *sagen*, used by a superior speaker.

Segment 6 describes a situation, in which a non-native speaker, Anita (whose native language is Hungarian) was made aware of the fact that an expression she tends to use in German is actually quite old-fashioned. This was new information for her, and she talks about how a native speaker informed her about this. The native speaker (Hans) called her attention in a firm but friendly way to the fact that the expression is not used any more. *Meinen* appears as a quotative in line 05, followed by the quotation itself in lines 05-06 and 08. *Sagen* as a quotative (line 08) introduces another quote in line 10.

## Segment 6: Goethe

## Tape 1

Count: 00:58:10

- 01 Anita: hans hat schon ähm (-) ich (0.6) ((chews)) ich  
*hans has already uhm (-) I (0.6) ((chews)) i*
- 02 ma:g EIN jeder.  
*li:ke EACH one.*
- 03 Helena: mhm  
*mhm*
- 04 Anita: und da da also(.)statt alle ein jeder zu sagen  
*and then then so(.)instead of all each one to say*
- 05 aber das da hat hans gemeint,(0.6)das ist so:  
*but that then hans said,(0.6)that is so:*
  - 06 wie[goethe  
*like [goethe*
- 07 Helena: [((laughter))
- 08 Anita: das sagt man nicht [mehr=und dann habe ich aber  
*that we don't say any [more=and then i however*
- 09 Anna: [((laughter))
- 10 Anita: gesagt es geht [ ( )  
*said it's alright [ ( )*
- 11 James: [das hab ich aber immer noch  
*[but that i still have*
- 12 nicht kapiert. ( ) was[hast du?  
*not understood. ( ) what[did you?*
- 13 Anita: [dass man(.)statt alle(.)  
*[that we(.)instead of*  
*all(.)*
- 14 zu sagen=sag ich EIN jeder.

*to say=i say EACH one.*

15 James: ach so

*oh right*

16 Anita: und das ist schon veraltet.

*and that really is out of use.*

Anita used *meinen*, a typical *verbum dicendi*, in the present perfect to introduce her first quote in line 05. The pause preceding the reported speech in line 05 is relatively long. Anita signals with this pause that she is going to quote Hans' words verbatim, shifting her own perspective to that of the person being quoted. On the other hand, Anita does not insert a pause after Hans' words to emphasize that she is not quoting him any more: *Das sagt man nicht mehr* 'that we don't say any more' (line 08) is still a quote by Hans, while *und dann habe ich aber gesagt es geht* 'and then I, however, said it's alright' (lines 08 and 10) are already Anita's own words. Nonetheless, the two utterances are in latch with no pause in between, although that is where Anita shifts her perspective to her own in the quoted conversation. The lack of an unquote in line 08, where we would expect it, may be explained by the fact that Anita is not done with the reporting yet: a self-quotation ensues, introduced by *sagen* in the present perfect (*und dann habe ich aber gesagt*). Anita gets back to her recent role in the discourse in lines 08 and 10 only to introduce her second quote, *es geht*. No unquote appears because she goes on with her story after the first quotation until James interrupts her to ask for clarification in lines 11-12. This comes in the middle of her reported speech segment. The hearers' appreciation of the story is present in this case as well; it is expressed by sympathetic laughter in lines 07 and 09.

Segment 7, “Prüfung (Exam)” is the only one in my data in which a superior level speaker uses a quotative with *sein*. As explained before, this structure appeared at the advanced-low level and its instances were not found natural-sounding by native speakers. In segment 7, Anita, the same speaker as in segment 6, talks about an exam of hers and how exhausted she became towards the end. To emphasize her growing weariness and exasperation, she inserts an enactment into her report, introduced by the quotative *am Ende war ich schon* ‘in the end I was already’, the only time the copulative *sein* appeared at the superior level (line 04). All other superior quotatives in the data corpus were either commonly acceptable verbs or verbless quotatives.

**Segment 7: Prüfung (Exam)**

**Tape 1**

**Count: 00:06:20**

- 01 Anita: und sie hat auch immer epochenfragen [gestellt.  
*and she also always asked era [questions*
- 02 Helena: [mhm  
*[mhm*
- 03 Anita: und zum beispiel sturm und drang hab ich nicht  
*and for example sturm und drang I have not*

- 04                         so[sehr ähm ähm=am ende war ich schon  
                                   so [much uhm uhm=in the end i was already

05 Helena:         [hihi  
                                   [hihi

*Anita covers her face with her left hand, deeper voice*
- 06 Anita:         (.)oh mein gott lass mich [( )  
                                   (.)oh my god leave me [( )

07 Helena:   [hahaha  
    [hahaha

08 Anita: weiß es nicht, ich kanns nicht, (.) aber die  
                                   don't know, i can't, (.) but they

09                         waren echt sehr nett.  
                                   were really very nice.

10 Helena: mhm:  
                                   mhm:

The quote is introduced by a short pause in line 06 and is followed by an unquote and the hearer's reaction in lines 07 and 10, which follow the general characteristics of enactments. The speaker herself offers an opinion on the situation right after the unquote (lines 08-09).

The unusual quotative used in this segment does accomplish its goals insofar as it describes the state of mind of the speaker and functions as an introducer for a self-quotation at the same time. It definitely underlines the dramatic effect of the enactment more than it would be possible with e.g., *am Ende habe ich gesagt* 'in the end I said'. The self-quotation is verbal as well as nonverbal, since the enactment itself is also very



expressive in this segment: by using the short pause preceding the quote to cover her face and lower her voice, Anita gives her listeners a good impression of her desperation in the quoted situation. This is in line with Golato's observations about speakers using the pause to get their bodies in the right position necessary for enacting the scene (Golato: 2000, 46)

This example of a quotative with *sein*, which basically follows the same pattern as the ones used at the advanced-low level, was not rejected so unanimously by native Germans as *und alle Leute sind* and *und er war*. In fact, it was considered correct by eight native speakers altogether (five said it was "rather native," three that it could be both). Four natives guessed it was uttered by a non-native speaker, with one of them remarking that interestingly, she did not find *war* here as disturbing as the forms of *sein* in the other two examples. It might be the adverbials complementing the copula in this particular quotative, instead of a mere subject-verb structure that make it "less suspicious" for native speakers. In any case, as we have seen before with the example of *und alle Leute sind*, creative forms are not necessarily detected by natives as non-native language use.

While resorting to the most common reporting methods in German, the typical *verba dicendi sagen* and *meinen*, superior speakers' direct speech methods were also characterized by phenomena that appeared only at their level. One of these was quotatives with verbs other than typical *verba dicendi*, the other one was quotatives with no conjugated verb. These were methods used exclusively by superior speakers, who displayed their greater language proficiency by adding these choices to the ones already

present at the lower levels. In 6.2 and 6.3 respectively, I will turn my attention to these exclusively superior level phenomena.

## **6.2 Direct discourse methods typical to the superior level: quotatives with verbs other than typical *verba dicendi***

Superior level speakers' proficiency was displayed through their various choices of reporting methods. They used the direct discourse methods of the two lower levels, but also went beyond these. Although the most common choices of reporting in German were applied several times (quotatives with *sagen* and *meinen*), other, more confident methods appeared as well. This confidence and their grammatical as well as communicative correctness rendered superior-level interaction in my data sound distinctly more proficient than that of intermediate or even advanced level speakers.<sup>42</sup>

The superiors used verbal quotatives other than the typical *meinen* or *sagen*: *erzählen* 'to tell (a story)', *betonen* 'to emphasize', *denken* 'to think', *vorschlagen* 'to recommend', *bitten* 'to ask [for a favor]', *aufnehmen* 'to take (it as something)', 'to register' and *beobachten* 'to observe'. The utterances in which they occurred were all correct German. The only fact about most of these verbs that may be surprising is that they introduced direct quotations, although a subordinate clause might be more common. However, these quotatives are not necessarily unusual but merely another method appearing among the choices of superiors to render reported speech. Using such verbs is similar to ten Cate's (1996) findings about verbs used in written German for quotations,

---

<sup>42</sup> This is reinforced by the evaluations of native speakers, who did not question several superior quotatives and even labeled two of the four examples on the evaluation sheet as "rather native."

e.g., *denken* ‘to think’, *fühlen* ‘to feel’, *betonen* ‘to emphasize’ or *mitteilen* ‘to inform’ (p.193), which are typically *verba dicendi* and *verba sentiendi*, but not in all cases. It is interesting how these non-native superior level speakers used such verbs in spoken German. In the following, I will provide some segments to illustrate the usage of such verbs.

Segment 8 is an excerpt from a monologue by Anna, a speaker of Ukrainian, who is complaining to her fellow students about a course she is not happy with. She mentioned several points of criticism in her monologue: the first one was the material which included a lot of specific background knowledge not clarified by the professor; the second one (included in segment 8) that he was not confident about his knowledge of the language, and the third one that the class was more like a lecture instead of a seminar. The quotative (*betonen* ‘to emphasize’) appears twice in line 09. The quote itself follows in lines 11-12.

### **Segment 8: Professor**

#### **Tape 1**

**Count: 01:14:58**

- 01 Anna: dann zweitens auch(.)ja(.)die sprache↑(-)  
*then secondly also(.)yes(.)the language↑(-)*
- 02 ich finde seine=seine=seine sprache ganz  
*i find his=his=his language pretty much*
- 03 ordnung [zu ( )  
*alright [too ( )*
- 04 Anita: [ja(.)er ist  
*[yes(.)he is*
- 05 Anna: aber ja, genau [aber ER selbst

- but yes, exactly [but HE himself*
- 06 Anita: [er selbst macht sich  
*[he himself makes himself*
- 07 Anna: er selbst fühlt sich nicht gemütlich und (hab ich)  
*he himself doesn't feel comfortable and (i have)*
- 08 Anita: [ja  
*[yes*
- 09 Anna: [und er beTONT das. fast jede stunde beTONT [er  
*[and he he EMphasizes that. almost every class*  
*EMphasizes [he*
- 10 Anita: [ja  
*[yes*
- Anna moves hands up and down and back and forth*
- 11 Anna: •ach mein englisch ist schlecht mein englisch ( )  
*•oh my english is bad my english ( )*
- 12 schlecht ist.(-)also das ist=das kommt dann a:  
*is bad. (-)so that is=that is then u:h*
- 13 auch a: in die fra- (-) dann auch d- weißt du auch  
*also u:h an iss- (-) then also th- you know also*
- 14 d- die form von dem unterricht (...)  
*th- the form of the class (...) - Anna goes on to*  
*talk about how the class is built up as a lecture with no*  
*questions or interaction with the students*

One of the listeners in this segment, Anita, was taking the course herself, and she shows her agreement with Anna by helping her construct her turns (lines 04 and 06) and by acknowledging what Anna is saying (lines 08 and 10). In her description of the shortcomings of the course, Anna quotes the professor belittling his own language skills

in line 11: *ach mein Englisch ist schlecht* ‘oh, my English is bad’. It seems that both Anna and Anita disagree with his claim and are of the opinion that he is exaggerating the situation and making himself feel uncomfortable (lines 06 and 07). Anna evokes the professor’s insecurities by quoting what he says in every class. She uses the verb *betonen* ‘to emphasize’ to give stress to her words. This could function as a verb in her narration, but Anna shapes it into a quotative and follows it up with a direct quote accompanied by an enactment in lines 11-12. This segment is, however, not the retelling of a story; there is no punch line or climax, since there is no actual story retold. The quotation is very short and seems to serve the purpose of underlining Anna’s message, namely the professor’s lack of confidence about his language skills. Except for Anita’s agreement in line 10, even before the quote itself, there is no audible reaction on behalf of the recipients, because Anna immediately goes on to make her third point about her dissatisfaction with the class, namely that it is in a lecture format. The short quotation is merely part of her narration.

In segment 9, the quotation (in this case, a self-quotation) is also part of a narration. Laura, a Hungarian native speaker and high school teacher of German, is talking about a badly timed course (probably workshop) for German teachers, which she had to attend during the month of May. May is the time for exit exams in Hungary and an exceptionally busy time for teachers who are responsible for administering these exams for those completing high school. Laura expresses her frustration and feelings of being overwhelmed by quoting what she claims to have ironically commented on the course, namely, that it should be organized next year in May again (line 15-16 and 18). She introduces the quote by *vorschlagen* ‘to recommend’ in line 15.

**Segment 9: Schlechtes Timing (Bad timing)****Tape 3/A****Count: 00:57:33**

- 01 Betti: warst du an dem kurs(.)für diese(-)  
*were you on this course(.)for this(-)*
- 02 Laura: natürlich war ich.  
*of course i was.*
- 03 Betti: mhm.(.)voriges jahr?  
*mhm.(.)last year?*
- 04 Laura: ähm voriges jahr im(.)im mai.  
*uhm last year in(.)in may*
- 05 Betti: mhm.ich war [in dieses  
*mhm. i was [in this*
- 06 Laura: [WUNderba:r geteimt(.)sozusagen  
*[WONderfu:l timing(.)sotosay*
- 07 [abiturzeit  
*[school leaving exam time*
- 08 Betti: [mit dieser krisztina báthory?  
*[with this krisztina báthory?*
- 09 Laura: abiturzeit(.)ende april(-)den ganzen mai(.)  
*school leaving exam time(.)end of april(-)*  
*the whole may(.)*
- 10 Betti: ja weiß ich  
*yes i know*
- 11 Laura: jedes wochenende(.)ich war klassenleiterin  
*every weekend(.)i was homeroom teacher*
- 12 in einer vierten klasse  
*in a fourth grade*

- 13 Betti: mhm(-)schön  
*mhm(-)nice*
- 14 Laura: ähm wunder- es war wunderbar. also ich ich hab  
*uhm wonder- it was wonderful. so i i have*
- 15 schon mal vorgeschlagen das nächste mal BITte  
*recommended the next time PLEASE*
- 16 auch im mai. [den ganzen kurs. weil ich mich  
*in may as well. [the whole course. because i*
- 17 Ned: [hahaha  
*[hahaha*
- 18 Laura: danach seh:ne, wirklich. haha also  
*long for that, really. haha so*
- 19 Betti: und was ist deine meinung über diese krisztina  
*and what is your opinion about this krisztina*
- 20 báthory?  
*báthory?*

In this segment as well, the quotation's role is to underline the narrator's message. Again, there is no actual story being told that would build up to a punch line. Laura is weaving the self-quotation into her narration to emphasize in an ironic way her frustration with the situation. Ned reacts to her turns by laughing and Betti by smiling a bit, but Betti very soon brings up another topic in lines 19-20 about the main organizer of the workshop, and thus a new topic is initiated. The quotative *ich hab schon mal vorgeschlagen* 'I have recommended' is part of the narration being molded into a quotative role, just like *betont er* 'he emphasizes' in segment 8.

The same speaker, Laura, produced another noteworthy case of a quotative that was neither a *verbum dicendi* nor a *verbum sentiendi*. Segment 10 shows part of her monologue about the first time she encountered a certain professor at college during her graduate studies in German. This professor was famous for his expertise and his kindness to students, but also for his forgetfulness as well as complicated lectures. His classes were sometimes extremely difficult to follow because he used very abstract ideas to illustrate certain linguistic concepts. Students usually sat baffled in his class, or gave up trying to follow him. Laura elaborates lengthily on how scared she became in the first class with this professor and how desperately she tried to understand something, but felt she would never be able to. Then she goes on to talk about the reaction of her fellow students (included in segment 10), who no doubt noticed her effort. She uses the verb *beobachten* ‘to observe’ in line 04 to introduce what must have been their opinion in lines 06-07.

**Segment 10: Streberin (Nerd)**

**Tape 3/B**

**Count: 00:51:13**

- 01 Laura: und dann ähm (0.4) m (-) ähm (-) mitschüler  
*and then uhm (0.4) m (-) uhm (-) fellow pupils*
- 02 [mitstudenten (-)  
*[fellow students (-)*
- 03 Ned: [mhm  
*[mhm*
- 04 Laura: die hatten mich beobachtet (.)  
*they had been observing me (.)*
- 05 Ned: hm  
*hm*



- Laura puts her elbows out, swings from side to side*
- 06      |  
           |-----|-----|  
 Laura: ah ja die kleine streberin  
           *oh yeah the little nerd*  
                       *Laura gestures with hands towards herself*
- 07      die will alles wissen=aber ich war so in einer  
                   *she wants to know everything=but i was in such*
- 08      panik ( )  
                   *panic*
- 09      Ned: aha  
                   *uh-huh*

In this segment as well, the verb *beobachten* is part of the narration and also a quotative. To emphasize her experience, Laura also uses an enactment, which helps the recipients picture the events better. However, similarly to segments 8 and 9, this is not a retold story with a punch line. The quotation is part of the narrative sequence. In this case, it is even more interesting to note that we do not know for sure whether Laura's fellow students ever actually uttered the words quoted in lines 06-07 or whether Laura is merely hypothesizing about their thoughts. It is possible that Laura heard through the grapevine about the other students' opinion of her, but maybe the quotation is only based on what she believed them to be thinking based on their gestures and body language. In American English, this sentence would probably have been uttered using a *like*-quotative (e.g., "and they were watching me, like, oh, the little nerd"), which can be used to render words that have indeed been said or thoughts that never got verbalized (see Blyth *et al.*,

1990, p. 222). It is remarkable how this superior level non-native speaker of German makes her turn more vivid and accessible to the recipients by using an unexpected verb in her narration to introduce a quote.

Two other examples in my data were verbs that referred to mental processes in the reporter's mind: *denken* 'to think' and *aufnehmen* 'to take (it as something)', 'to register'. These can be categorized as *verba sentiendi* and not *verba dicendi*. Rather than quoting what the person actually said, they quote what the person was thinking, hence the verbs that refer to a thought or attitude instead of a reporting verb. The segment containing *denken* also had an instance of *und dann* as another quotative. This segment (13, "Prüfungsthemen [Examination topics]"), which contained the quotation *und dann dachte ach stimmt* 'and then I thought oh, that's right' will be analyzed in detail in 6.3. *Und dann dachte* was used by the American English speaker Ned, whose quotatives are shown in segments 11 and 16 as well. The other *verbum sentiendi* in my data, *aufnehmen* appeared as part of the quote *und zuerst hab ich das so locker aufgenommen, na ich wasche das ab, das macht mir nichts aus* 'and first I took it easily, well I'll wash it, that's no problem for me'. It was produced by a Hungarian native speaker talking about his roommate never doing the dishes. In English, both of these quotative structures could typically be used with *like*, e.g., 'and then I was like, oh, that's right' or 'and first I took it easily, like, I'll wash it'. These *verba sentiendi* also broke a narrative sequence in their contexts to show the upcoming quotation.

The verbs in the quotatives in segments 8-10 (as well as the *verba sentiendi*) all refer to an action, and because of this, a frame is immediately provided for each

quotation. The frame actually determines the quotative in each case: the identification of the relevant action in the reported speech situation (emphasizing, recommending, observing, thinking and taking something easily) is at the same time the quotative itself. The verb describing the action is part of the narration and is also the introduction to the quote. This dual function of a verb in the conversation (an action verb in the narration and a quotative) is a very interesting phenomenon, which, due to richer vocabulary as well as more confidence and fluency in spoken German, seems to appear only at this higher level of language proficiency. It sounds less formal in everyday conversation to fall back on a direct quote instead of constructing a long subordinate clause with an indirect quotation, which would be the alternative with these verbs. Instead, these superior level speakers decided to imitate the intonation of the original speakers (or what the intonation was presumed to be like in segment 10) and thus constructed their turns more vividly. This stands in contrast with the intermediate and advanced level speakers I mentioned earlier who had a good command of grammar but sometimes ended up producing less natural-sounding turns in their conversation because they devoted too much attention to forming perfect sentences. To be more expressive, the superior level speakers who produced the above described examples were confident in breaking up what may be the ideal sentence structure, and introduced a direct quote where it was not necessarily expected.

Direct speech makes the speaker's turn more vivid and brings the quoted situation closer to the recipients than pure narration with subordinate clauses. The quote interrupts the narration of the story to provide a direct insight into the quoted situation through the eyes of either the speaker or the quoted person. As noted above, the quotative in each

example is an action verb which is used to reconstruct the situation being retold. Using an action verb contributes to the dynamics of the narration. Hence the dual function, that of an action verb in the narration and a quotative.

Let us also call to mind here Fónagy's observations about secondary verbs of saying in Hungarian (1986): when a primary verb of saying is omitted, a secondary verb of saying (a *verbum non-dicendi*) incorporates the primary one's meaning and thus acts as a *verbum dicendi* (p. 268). This seems to be the case with the quotatives presented above. Furthermore, *beobachten* 'to observe' and *aufnehmen* 'to take (it as something)', 'to register', two *verba non-dicendi*, were produced by Hungarians. Even though the observations of Fónagy largely reflect indirect speech, the speakers in my study used secondary verbs of saying in direct speech. Further recordings and data would be needed to see how common this phenomenon is and whether it affects speakers of other L1s.

One last observation I would like to point out is that both Anna in segment 8 and Laura in segment 10 redirected their gaze from the listeners before producing the direct quote.<sup>43</sup> This is in line with Sidnell's findings (2006) who stated that reporters tend to redirect their gaze from their audience before a re-enactment and look away, thus showing the boundary between the narration and the re-enactment (p. 396). In the above described segments, the quotation is embedded in a narrative sequence in each case, and marking it makes the audience aware that the narration is temporarily interrupted.

### **6.3 Direct discourse methods typical to the superior level: quotatives without a conjugated verb**

---

<sup>43</sup> During the taping of segment 9, Laura unfortunately moved outside of the videocamera's recording range, so her body language and gestures could not be analyzed.

In addition to verbal ones, superior level speakers used other quotatives as well. These did not include a verb and showed similarities to German *und ich so / und er so*. In the following, I will devote a detailed discussion to these quotatives, since they represent a significant finding in my research due to their frequent occurrence.

The quotative structures that contained no conjugated verb and have not been described previously were: *und, und dann, und dann + name, und dann manchmal, und da, und sie, also ich eigentlich*. On their distribution and the speakers' L1 see Chart 3.

**Chart 3: Innovative quotatives without a verb used by superior level speakers**

Quotative	Number of speakers it was used by	L1 of speakers (number designates different persons)
und	4	American English 1, American English 2, American English 3, Hungarian 1
und dann	2	Hungarian 1, Hungarian 2
und dann + name	1	Ukrainian
und dann manchmal	1	Ukrainian
und da	1	Hungarian 3
und sie	1	American English 3
also ich eigentlich	1	American English 2

All of these structures resemble *und ich so / und er so* insofar as they are fragment-like with no conjugated verb, the quotes following them were presented in direct discourse and no subjunctive forms appeared (see the summary on *und ich so / und er so* in section 2.3). Just like the German innovative quotative, most of them were also followed by a short pause, which the reporter used to adapt his / her intonation and body position to those of the reported person, then the performance of the quoted utterance and finally the unquote.

The “und”-prefaced quotatives in particular show striking similarities to both one another as well as to *und ich so / und er so*. Again, all of them are short and fragment-like without a finite verb (which is very uncharacteristic of a standard German sentence), prefaced by *und* (which refers to the fact that the speakers wish to continue their turn) and they include an adverb or a pronoun (the latter in the case of *und sie*) (*und ich so / und er*

*so* contains both). I believe that they have a dynamic effect due to their shortness: putting two or three words with only one or two syllables next to each other creates a short, but powerful string of words. Because of their unusual structure, these quotatives seem to have the ability to draw more attention to the fact that something noteworthy, surprising or funny is coming up than a more general quotative, like a *verbum dicendi* could do. It seems that this kind of structure is created quite often at the superior level by speakers who may not even be familiar with *und ich so / und er so*. Seven out of the ten superiors who contributed to the recorded conversations produced at least one innovative quotative and only one speaker came up with the “bare” *und* and nothing else. One speaker produced *und* and *also ich eigentlich*; the others came up with a form of *und* + adverb / pronoun. Each one of these quotatives was followed by a pause and then an enactment characterized not only by change in pitch or intonation but also a performance accompanied by bodily gestures. In this sense, the superiors displayed very native-like reporting behavior by using unusual quotative structures and following them with an enactment.

All but one quotatives contain or actually consist of *und*. Speakers are capable of signaling with this conjunction that they are not done with their turn yet but are in fact wishing to continue. This may account for its frequent occurrence in innovative quotative structures: the reporters draw attention to the fact that they are going to say something new (but still related to the previous topic), which is in this case a quotation. When complemented with an adverb (*dann, da*) or pronoun (*sie*), superiors produced quotatives that call to mind the native structure *und ich so / und er so* because of their fragmental structure and lack of verb. Also, Vlatten (Golato) has a recorded example of *und er dann*

*so* in her data (Vlatten, 1997: 95), which proves that natives may use *dann* as part of their quotative as well.<sup>44</sup> *Und* in itself may sound a bit bare; on the other hand, it might be exactly this surprisingly simple quotative form that attracts attention to the reported sequence. *Und* connects the next turn with the previous topic. The characteristics of all the other innovative quotatives apply to this “bare” *und* as well (followed by short pause + enactment + unquote + audience’s reaction). An interesting fact is that it was used by all three of the recorded superior level American English speakers at some point. A question remains whether this could be a case of L1 transfer; there are no records of “and” being used in itself as a quotative in English. It was produced by a Hungarian speaker as well, yet its equivalent *és* is not used as a quotative in Hungarian either. In the following, I would like to show superiors’ innovative quotatives through some examples, starting with the simplest: *und* in itself.

In the upcoming segment Ned, a native speaker of American English and high school teacher of German as well as university professor of English, tells Adél, a former student of his, about being refused to be sold alcohol at the age of forty because he did not have his identity card (a driver’s license) on him. It is a very funny story that lends itself to a performance. Before quoting the shop assistant’s request, he uses *und* in line 22 to introduce his enactment.

---

<sup>44</sup> I also have a native speaker in a recording (not among the ones used for this study) merging *und ich so* with *und dann: und dann ich so*.



**Segment 11: Driver's license****Tape 3/A****Count: 00:49:04**

- 01 Adél: aber ich wollte dich fragen=weil ich in amerika  
*but i wanted to ask you=because i in america*
- 02 immer diese geschichte erzähle=die ich von dir  
*always tell this story=that i heard*
- 03 gehört habe. als du in amerika warst [und(.)  
*from you. when you were in america [and(.)*
- 04 Ned: [ja  
*[yes*
- 05 Adél: mmmh(.)irgendwas wie(.)alkohol kaufen wolltest  
*mmmh(.)wanted to buy something like alcohol*
- 06 (0.4) und dann wollte der verkäufer nicht glauben  
*(0.4) and then the cashier didn't want to believe*
- 07 dass [du schon(.)volljährig bist oder wie war  
*that [you are already(.) of age or how was*
- 08 Ned: [hm  
*[hm*
- 09 Adél: denn diese geschichte?  
*this story again?*
- 10 Ned: stimmt, ja.(0.4) ich war da (0.4)zwei dreimal  
*right, yes.(0.4) i was there(0.4)two three times*
- 11 passiert.  
*happened.*
- 12 Adél: echt?  
*really?*
- 13 Ned: einmal wo ich (0.4)ich war vierzig(.)glaub ich.  
*once as i (0.4) i was forty(.) i think*

- 14           ich war noch da,(.)ich kam da an, ich hatte  
               *i was still there,(.)i arrive there, i had*
- 15           graue haare=kurze graue haare und die verkäuferin  
               *grey hair=short grey hair and the cashier*
- 16           war aus(.)indien oder pakistan oder irgendwo.  
               *was from(.)india or pakistan or somewhere.*
- 17           junge dame.  
               *young lady.*
- 18 Adél: wie so viele verkäuferinnen.  
               *like so many cashiers.*
- 19 Ned: wie(.)wie so viele. aber das war ein großes  
               *like(.)like so many. but that was a big*
- 20           geschäft so so eine (pe and ce)(0.4)groß (groß)  
               *store one of one of these (pe and ce)(0.4)big(big)*
- 21           und äh ich wollt meinem vater zum vatertag(.)  
               *and uh i wanted to buy my father for father's day*
- 22           einen baileys kaufen.(0.8)und (.)  
               *a baileys.(0.8)and(.)*

*with Indian accent, head held stiff*

23 | \_\_\_\_\_ |  
 | |  
 I want to see your(.)I need your driver's  
 24 licence please.(0.8) ((normal pitch)) hhe  
 25 very nice=it's in the car.(0.8)

*with Indian accent, head held stiff*

26 | \_\_\_\_\_ |  
 | |  
 driver's license first. (0.8) und (die war)=dies  
 and (she was)=this  
 27 war ernst. ahh hi  
 was serious. ahh hi

*moves head from left to right, as if screening an ID*

28 | \_\_\_\_\_ |  
 | |  
 hahahahahahaha(0.6)ist es  
 hahahahahahaha(0.6)has it  
 29 dir passiert?  
 happened to you?  
 30 Adél: ne mir ist es noch nicht passiert.(-)[aber ich  
 no it hasn't happened to me yet.(-) [but i  
 31 Ned: [ne?  
 [no?  
 32 Adél: höre das immer wieder.  
 hear it again and again.  
 33 Ned: ja. das ist unglaublich, unglaublich.  
 yes. it is incredible, incredible.

*Und* acts here as any of the innovative quotatives does: it is followed by a short pause in line 22, then the enactment in lines 23-26 (during which Ned switches twice between quoting the shop assistant and himself) as well as the unquote (a longer pause in line 26 followed by Ned's comment and laughter in lines 26-27). After this, he reenacts part of the scene again by imitating the shop assistant screening the ID and laughs again (lines 27-28). Adél is smiling while Ned is retelling the story; their conversation continues after the reported segment as Ned asks her about any similar experiences. Since it has all the characteristics of an innovative quotative, *und* works perfectly well here. At first glance, it certainly sounds unusual. However, as stated above, it is precisely this unusual nature that makes it function well as an attention-getter.

Another feature that renders Ned's performance sound natural (and entertaining) is that he does not use a quotative every time he quotes; instead, he signals by changes in pitch and imitated accent when he is speaking for the other speaker or for himself (lines 24 and 26). This makes the turn and the report sound smoother, not interrupted by the reporter's added words in the current speech situation; he completely reenacts the past event.<sup>45</sup>

---

<sup>45</sup> Another instance of an und-quotative, used only as one of several other quotation options, appears in segment 15, "Student im Zug (Student on the train)" in line 20.

The next segment (#12) includes an example of *und dann*. Erika, a native speaker of Hungarian who works for a lawyer's office specializing in real estate cases, is telling Adél about how a colleague of hers made a mistake by not making a customer pay taxes after selling a property. While explaining the rules of paying taxes in this particular situation, she also talks about how she herself usually resorts to the advice of her older colleagues so as not to make a mistake. She introduces the question asked in this case with the quotative *und dann* in line 21. The quotative is followed by a lengthier pause, which Erika uses to adjust her intonation to the one she uses when making this inquiry. After the reported sequence in line 22, an unquote follows in the form of a short pause, during which she readjusts her intonation to the one used in the current conversation. Then she goes on to conclude her story.

**Segment 12: Steuerzählen (Counting the tax)**

**Tape 2**

**Count: 1:02:33**

- 01 Adél: und wie hast du das bemerkt(.)dass er die steuer  
*and how did you notice(.)that he the tax*
- 02 nicht gezählt hat?  
*didn't count?*
- 03 Erika: hh ja das ist(.)sehr interessant weil (0.4)hh  
*hh yes that is(.)very interesting because (0.4)hh*
- 04 (1.0) das ist nicht so einfach=wenn man wenn ein  
*(1.0) that's not so simple=if one if a*

- 05 (0.4)ein person eine privatperson ein ä:h (0.4)  
 (0.4)a person a private person a u:h(0.4)
- 06 grundstück ä:hm (1.2)verkauft  
 plot u:hm (1.2) sells
- 07 Adél: mhm  
 mhm
- 08 Erika: dann(.) muss man kein steuer äh zählen. aber wenn  
 then(.) one has to uh pay no tax. but if
- 09 eine (0.4) ä:hm (-) wie sagt man eine firma  
 a(0.4) u:hm (-) how do we say a company
- 10 oder eine önkormányzat, weiß ich nicht  
 or an önkormányzat, i don't know
- 11 Adél: selbstverwaltung.  
 self-administration.
- 12 Erika:selbstverwaltung, dann muss man zählen. ä:h mit äh  
 self-administration, then one has to count. u:h  
 with uh
- 13 ist der verkäufer dann muss man mit steuer zählen.  
 is the seller then one has to count with tax.
- 14 hh und wenn kein äh (1.8) aber,(1.0)äh wenn(.)wir  
 hh and if no uh (1.8) but,(1.0)uh if(.)we
- 15 über(.)eine wohnung sprechen wenn man so eine  
 speak about(.)an apartment if one such an
- 16 wohnung von der(.)selbst(.)ver(.)[waltung  
 apartment from the(.)self(.)ad(.)ministration

17 Adél: [waltung  
*ministration*

18 Erika: kauft, dann muss man auch nicht steuer zählen.  
*buys, then one doesn't have to count tax either.*

19 also, man muss sehr achten(.)und also ich frage  
*so, one must be very careful(.)and so I ask*

20 immer meine kollegen,(1.0) die es besser wissen,  
*always my colleagues,(1.0) who know it better,*

*puts thumb and little finger in front of her ear and  
mouth, as if holding the receiver*

→ 21 *so immer telefoniere und dann (1.2)*  
*so always i telephone and then (1.2)*

*puts hand with edge down several times, inquisitive tone*

22 *muss ich mit steuer oder nicht?(.)aber das war für*  
*do i have to with tax or not?(.)but that was for*  
23 *(.)das sah ich dass es keine wohnung war(.)und*  
*(.)that i saw that it wasn't an apartment(.)and*  
24 *ich dachte dass hier(.)vielleicht müssen wir mit*  
*i thought that here(.)maybe we have to*  
25 *steuer zählen.(1.0) also das war nicht (0.8)*  
*count with tax.(1.0)so that was not (0.8)*  
26 *einfach. (...)*

*simple. - ((...)) Erika goes on to talk about what one needs to be careful about when closing a contract<sup>46</sup>*

*Und dann* is followed by a short pause in line 21 before the reported sequence in line 22 which ends with an unquote. The quote itself is accompanied by an enactment. However, it is not followed by the listener's verbal reaction. Adél is nodding her head in appreciation, but not saying anything, which is most probably due to the fact that Erika goes on with her story and does not leave room yet for Adél's turn. *Und dann* is also fragmental; it does not contain a conjugated verb. It is certainly shorter and more dynamic than saying e.g., *und dann frage ich sie* 'and then I ask them', which would sound more grammatical, but due to this, also more formal. Shortening it to *und dann* gives Erika's turn more of a conversational tone, used successfully to draw attention to the reported sequence. Also, starting a quotation by a complete main clause with a *verbum dicendi* would very likely trigger uttering a complete dependent clause as well, such as *und dann frage ich sie, ob ich mit Steuer zählen muss oder nicht* 'and then I ask them if I have to count with tax or not,' which would turn the sequence from a direct into an indirect quote. By definition, speakers use direct quotes to make their contribution to the conversation more expressive (see section 2.1) and so Erika's technique of using a direct instead of an indirect quote fulfils the pragmatic goal of direct discourse aptly. *Und dann* makes the continuation of the turn smoother. – Streeck comes to very similar conclusions when he talks about the quotative *ich dann so* 'and I then like this'. He points out that the structure comes into being "by deleting, or, rather, suppressing, the (often

---

<sup>46</sup> Erika goes on speaking here, initiating another topic without being interrupted by Adél who produces only nonverbal gestures. Since this part of the conversation is not the continuation of the topic in the segment presented here, it is not included any more in my data.



quotative) verb (e.g., *sag-* or *mach*, ‘say’ or ‘do’) – that would normally have to appear before *dann*. Thus, *dann* so occupies the space of the verb in unfolding talk, and it plays the functional role of the quotative verb” (2002, p. 592).

One should also note how the two constructions *und also ich frage* ‘and so I ask’ in line 19 and *so immer telefoniere* ‘so always telephone’ in line 21 set up the frame for the quotation. Since the quotation itself is a question (*muss ich mit Steuer oder nicht?* ‘do I have to with tax or not?’), it seems redundant to use *fragen* again in the quotation. *Telefoniere* (‘I telephone’) provides information about the nature of the context, namely, that it is a telephone conversation as opposed to a face-to-face interaction. Having provided this background information about the context of the quotation in the turns before it appears gives plenty of details to Adél, the recipient, which probably also contributes to the elliptical nature of the quotative.

The other instance of *und dann* was used among similar circumstances. It appears in segment 13: Adél asks her old college professor Ned (the same speaker as in segment 11, “Driver’s license”) about who chooses the three composition topics for the first year comprehensive exam. It turns out that it is actually done by him, and his wife Laura (a Hungarian native speaker and high school teacher of German, the same as in segments 9 and 10) adds immediately that she also helps him do it because he always has difficulty finding a third topic for the composition. Laura illustrates this by pointing at Ned and quoting him, introducing the reported sequence with *und dann* in line 08.

**Segment 13: Prüfungsthemen (Examination topics)**

**Tape 3/A**

**Count: 00:08:30**

01 Adél: und wer wählt denn diese themen aus?

*and who chooses these topics?*

02 Ned: ((laughs and points at himself))hhe hehehehe

*hhe hehehehe*

*Laura points at Ned*

03 Laura: | \_\_\_\_\_ |  
ich hab dir dabei geholfen. [du fragst mich immer |

*i helped you with that. [you ask me always*

04 Ned: [ja der lob (geht an)

*[yes the praise (goes to)*

05 Laura

06 Laura: der fragt mich [immer,

*he asks me [always*

07 Betti: [hehe

*[hehe*

*Laura keeps pointing at Ned, moves hand up and down*

→ 08 Laura: | \_\_\_\_\_ |  
er hat zwei [themen und dann (-) hast du eine |

*he has two [topics and then (-) do you have a*

09 Betti: [also eine ( )

*[so a ( )*

- 10 Laura: hh ein drittes thema oder so (0.6)  
*hh a third topic or such (0.6)*
- 11 [hab ich dann no grades,(.)hab ich dann no grades  
*[did i then no grades,(.)did i then no grades*
- 12 Ned: [und du hast mir=ja du hast mir die idee gegeben  
*[and you gave me=yes you gave me the idea*
- 13 und dann dachte ah stimmt, wo ich studiert hab da  
*and then thought oh right, where i studied there*
- 14 in santa cruz da gabs keine grades.(.)da gabs  
*in santa cruz there were no grades.(.)there were*
- 15 nur diese written evaluations.  
*only these written evaluations.*

This instance of *und dann* is also followed by a pause before the enactment in line 08 and the unquote is signaled by another pause (line 10). The other conversation participants are smiling as a sign of their appreciation of the utterance while Ned in an overlap reacts to what his wife has said (starting in line 12). Like in Erika's case in the previous segment, *und dann* could be lengthened to e.g., *und dann fragt er mich* ('and then he asks me'), yet, again, this would most probably trigger a subordinate clause and as a result, the effect would not be the same. Also, similarly to Erika in segment 12, Laura provides a frame before the quotation: in line 6, she says *der fragt mich immer* ('he always asks me'). This informs the audience that in the upcoming quotation, the quoted person's action was making an inquiry: *hast du ein drittes Thema?* 'do you have a third topic?'

It is noteworthy how both instances of *und dann* are framed by the speakers providing the type of action that the quote was originally determined by. In segment 12,

Erika lets Adél know that the quote was a question uttered in a telephone conversation: *also ich frage immer meine Kollegen, die es besser wissen, so immer telefoniere* ('so I always ask my colleagues who know it better, so I always telephone'). Laura does the same in segment 13 when she says *der fragt mich immer*. Since the context of the quote is thus given in both segments, it is not absolutely necessary to repeat *fragen* 'to ask' to introduce either the self- (in Erika's case) or the other-quotation (Laura quoting Ned). I would also like to point out the quotative *und dann dachte* 'and then thought' in line 13 of segment 13, uttered by Ned to introduce a self-quotation. He quotes his own thoughts, introduced by the interjection "ah." This is an example of a superior level quotative with something other than a typical *verbum dicendi*, a phenomenon that was discussed in detail in 6.2. The verb *denken* 'to think', a *verbum sentiendi*, is a fitting one to quote one's thoughts. *Und dann dachte* is an example of superiors' greater confidence in using the L2. Quotatives with *verba sentiendi* did not appear at earlier levels, probably because lower-level speakers' vocabulary and language proficiency is not wide enough yet to include such verbs among their quotation choices.

Although both cases of *und dann* were produced by Hungarians, it cannot be regarded as L1 transfer. The Hungarian equivalent would be *és aztán*, which is not used as a quotative. It may link clauses in narration but it does not introduce direct speech. The only informal quotative having appeared in spoken Hungarian lately is *én / ő meg így* + direct quote, which corresponds to English *and he / she's like* as well as German *und ich / er so*.<sup>47</sup> *Így* means "so" in English and in German, yet no superior Hungarian (or any

---

<sup>47</sup> Note that because of Hungarian syntax the conjunction corresponding to "and" (*meg*) comes in between the personal pronoun and *így*. This usage seems to be characteristic of this Hungarian quotative structure. It would be possible to use *és* instead of *meg*; *és* would indeed come to the beginning of the structure. However, it is not typically used.

other) speaker in my data used a structure with *so*. *Dann* probably appears as a frequent choice, because just like *und*, it points to the fact that the speakers wish to continue instead of stopping their turn where it could be possible. As a resumptive element, *dann* introduces the quote by establishing a temporal relation and reference back to what has been talked about previously. The reference point is the frame set up by the reporting person when specifying the circumstances of the quote (telephoning, asking). Similarly to storytelling, this frame is referred to by “then...,” which here shows not only a temporal relation but also marks the quote. As mentioned in chapter 3, Blühdorn called *dann* and *da* “news deixis” (1993, p. 51) because they are connected to some kind of news contained in the same communicative event. This seems to be exactly the case in the contexts of segments 12 and 13, where *dann* refers back to the frame which gave the audience details about the context of the upcoming quote.

The other two occurrences of *dann* were the forms *und dann* + name and *und dann manchmal*, both produced by a native speaker of Ukrainian. The usage of these was similar to *und dann*: a short pause following them before the enactment, which is ended by an unquote and followed by the listeners’ reaction, laughter in both cases. One example is included in the next segment (# 14): Anna (the speaker of Ukrainian; the same speaker as in segment 8) is telling, with the help of James, a funny story about a graduate teaching assistant in a German department, identified in the segment as “Toni.” He was sitting at a bar (Henry’s) and struck up a conversation with an undergraduate student, who, not being aware of who she was talking to, claimed she did not want to take German for her foreign language requirement because the German GTAs were not very attractive. Toni, appalled at this, cried out that he was in fact from the German

department, which is re-enacted by Anna. She introduces the quote with *und dann Toni* in line 27.

**Segment 14: GTAs**

**Tape 1**

**Count: 01:06:04**

01 Anna: ha: ah h hast du auch gehört was toni  
*di: ah h did you also hear what toni*

02 einmal erzählt hat, dass er in henry's irgend  
*once was talking about, that he got to know someone*

03 jemanden kennen gelernt hat=so eine  
*at henry's=one of these*

04 undergraduate (0.8) ich weiß nicht  
*undergraduates (0.8) i don't know*

05 und die hat und die haben es irgendwie  
*and she and they somehow*

06 sind sie auf das gleiche thema gekommen,  
*came to the same topic,*

07 und die hat gesagt (-)ahm (-)na, ich möchte  
*and she said (-)ahm (-) well, i would*

08 deutsch gar nicht nehmen weil(.)ich ich  
*not like to take german at all because(.)i i*

- 09 finde die: die: die deutsche:: die deutsche:  
*find the: the: the german:: the german:*
- 10 (.)männer [die es im deutsch gibt  
 (.)men [who are in german
- 11 James: [ah so ne, das war das war diese aus  
 [oh yeah no, that was that was this one  
 from
- 12 spanien die frauen [die sind  
*spain the women [who are*
- 13 Anita: [a: ja: die weil toni  
 [o:h yea:h the because toni
- 14 immer meint dass ↓es gibt so viele schöne  
*always says that •there are so many beautiful*
- 15 frauen also gtas im spanisch department=im  
*women so gtas in the spanish department=in*
- 16 spanischen  
*spanish*
- 17 James: dann hat er dann hat [er die zwei  
*then he then he started to [talk*
- 18 Anna: [ah so: ah so:  
 [oh okay: oh okay:
- 19 James: angeschnackt und dann hat die gesagt (0.4)  
*to those two and then she said (0.4)*
- 20 die wusste nicht dass toni im deutschen  
*she didn't know that toni is in the german*

- 21 [department ist  
[department
- 22 Anna: [im deutschen department ist genau genau  
[is in the german department exactly exactly
- 23 James: und hat sie dann irgendwas gesagt von wegen  
and then sometime she said something like
- 24 ja °da sind keine schönen männer  
yes °there are no handsome men
- 25 [im deutschen department°  
[in the german department°
- 26 [((laughter))
- 27 Anna: genau, so so genau genau und dann toni  
exactly, like that like that exactly exactly and  
then toni  
raises her arms as if asserting herself, pitch goes up
- 28 (0.4) | •ICH bin im deutschen department ja?  
(0.4) •I am in the german department right?
- 29 ((laughter))
- 30 Anna: ne aber [ich  
no but [i
- 31 Adél: [was meinten sie da?  
[what did they say then?
- 32 Anna: ich weiß nicht aber ich denke ich denke  
i don't know but i think i think



33            das war auch das argument dass sie deswegen  
                  *that was also the reason that she because of that*  
 34            nicht deutsch nehmen wollte(.)weil da  
                  *didn't want to take german(.)because there*  
 35            keine schönen männer gibt (0.8)(ich meine)  
                  *are no handsome men there (0.8)(i mean)*  
 36            das war das das das primärargument von ihr  
                  *that was the the the main reason of hers*  
 37            ja?(.)ja?  
                  *right? right?*

The structure and usage of *und dann* + name of the quoted person is very similar to both *und dann* as well as *und ich so / und er so*: it is a fragment-like quotative with no verb, followed by a short pause and then the enactment in line 28 and finally, an unquote signalled by the discourse marker *ja?* in line 28 and laughter in line 29. This is a funny story and accordingly, the audience's appreciation is also amply signalled by a considerable amount of laughter (line 29, where all participants of the conversation are laughing). Like in the cases of *und dann*, the quotative may be seen as an elliptical clause derived from e.g., *und dann sagte Toni* 'and then Toni said,' but attracts more attention to the quote due to its unusual form.

This segment is similar to segments 9 and 10 inasmuch as a frame is provided for the quotation. In segments 9 and 10, the speakers used the verbs *fragen* 'to ask' and *telefonieren* 'to call' to provide the context for their quote, which may well have been the reason for the lack of a conjugated verb in the quotative itself. In the current segment, *erzählen* 'to tell (a story)' serves the same purpose. Anna starts by setting the frame in lines 01-02: *Hast du auch gehört, was Toni einmal erzählt hat?* 'Have you heard what

Toni was once talking about?’ From this introduction, the recipients learn that Anna is going to focus on a story previously told by another speaker (Toni). The verb *erzählen* ‘to tell (a story)’ unambiguously points to reported speech in this context, so the hearers already know that a quotative of some sorts is to be expected. Thus, *dann* as a marker of the upcoming quotation is again connected to the preceding context and relates the quote to this prior stretch of talk. That the context clearly signals reported speech may be a reason why Anna’s quotative is void of a verb of saying.

What is noteworthy here is that this story is told in collaboration between James and Anna. James must be familiar with this story, because as soon as Anna has revealed some background information, he jumps in in line 11 to add more details. At this point, he is interrupted by Anita, who contributes to the development of the story by making a remark about Toni’s opinion on female teaching assistants in the Spanish Department in lines 13-16. Anita’s turn is not closely connected to the retold story itself, and James soon reclaims the floor again (line 17) to continue. Anna assists her by reinforcing what he is saying, mostly by way of agreement tokens (*genau* ‘exactly’) in lines 18, 22 and 27. These turns of Anna’s can also be interpreted as attempts to claim the floor again for herself, after all, it was her story in the beginning. She succeeds in line 27, where right after producing the agreement tokens she quickly goes on to provide the climax of the story which is the quotation: *und dann Toni: ich bin im deutschen department, ja?* ‘I am in the German Department, right?’ It is interesting to see how the co-participants build up the context until they get to the punch line, which is delivered by the speaker who initiated the topic. It would sound somewhat unusual if someone else finished the story she has started to tell, because it would mean taking the floor from her without her

permission. Such an interruption is generally considered impolite in any conversation. This way though, Anna and James (and partly Anita) mutually contribute to the retelling of the funny episode successfully, without either one of them infringing upon the unwritten rules of conversation.

In the upcoming segment (#15), *und* is not followed by an adverb but the personal pronoun *sie*. This was uttered by James, a native speaker of American English, when retelling how one of his students of German, with quite limited language skills, approached a native speaker girl on a train in Germany. Because of his lack of fluency, the conversation was rather textbook-like and not very natural, but the German girl willingly answered the strange-sounding questions. Her first answer is reported and performed by James following the quotative *und sie* in line 09.

**Segment 15: Student im Zug (Student on the train)**

**Tape 1**

**Count: 01:28:58**

01 James: oh, das ist auch(.)so eine heiÙe geschichte also  
*oh, that's also(.)such a crazy story so*

02 als ich mit der nrnberger gruppe unterwegs war(-)  
*when i was traveling with the nrnberg group(-)*

03 letzten sommer(.)im zug zwischen frankfurt und  
*last summer(.)on the train between frankfurt and*

04 nrnberg(.)da war ein student mit und (-) da saÙ  
*nrnberg(.)there was a student and(-)there sat*

05 mhm eine deutsche neben uns. das war (0.4) die

- 06 *mhm a german girl next to us. that was (0.4) they*  
*guckten sie alle an (0.4) und da sagt der student*  
*all looked at her (0.4) and then says the student*  
*looks to the right, as if talking to somebody there*
- 07 *|*  
*|—| —|*  
 (1.2) hallo.  
 (1.2) hello.
- 08 ((laughter))
- 09 James: ( ) na, wie gehts. und sie(.) ((sits straight))  
 ( ) so, how's it going. and she(.) ((sits straight))
- 10 gut, wie gehts dir? (1.0) ((nods head)) gut, danke.  
good, how are you? (1.0) ((nods head)) good, thanks.
- 11 Anna: hahaha so wird er gelehrt, ja?  
*hahaha that's how he is taught, right?*
- 12 James: ja, genau  
*yes, exactly*
- 13 ((laughter))
- 14 James: (1.0) hast du eine Lieblingsfarbe?  
 (1.0) do you have a favorite color?
- 15 ((laughter))

- 16 James: da hat sie gemerkt okay, das sind ahm amerikaner  
*then she noticed okay, these are uhm americans*
- 17 und da hat sie gesagt(.)äh (-) gelb.(1.0) hast  
*and then she said(.)uh (-)yellow.(1.0) do*
- 18 du eine Lieblingsfarbe? [(.) das hat er dann nicht  
*you have a favorite color? [(.)this he didn't*
- 19 [ ((laughter))
- 20 James: erwartet diese frage, und ä:h ä:h ((moves hands  
*expect this question, and u:h u:h ((moves hands*
- 21 around in hesitation))(0.4)blau.  
*around in hesitation)) (0.4) blue.*
- 22 ((laughter))
- 23 James: ich glaube er hat diese fragen wirklich  
*i think he really processed these*
- 24 abgearbeitet. das war echt  
*questions. that was really*
- 25 Anna: aha, aha.  
*uh-huh, uh-huh.*

As seen in this segment, superiors' innovative quotatives may also include a personal pronoun. It is interesting to see that while German *und ich so / und er so* contains both a personal pronoun and an adverb, non-natives opted for either a pronoun or an adverb, yet the structure remained basically the same. *Und sie*, like the other quotatives mentioned above, as well as the German one, is also followed by a pause in line 09, an enactment starting in line 09 and continuing as far as line 21, an unquote (James ends the quotes in line 21 after a falling intonation) and also the listeners'

appreciation token (laughter in lines 13, 15, 19 and 22 as well as Anna's back channel *aha, aha* in line 25).

In the above segment, it is also insightful to notice how James varies his direct quotation methods. The very first quote he makes (line 06) is introduced by a verbal quotative in the present tense (*da sagt der Student* 'and then the student says'). The second one (line 09) is prefaced by the innovative quotative *und sie*. A reason for choosing a quotative other than a *verbum dicendi* could be the aspiration to make the turn more vivid for the audience instead of repeating the same structure. Also, the recipients are familiar with the context at this point, so a repetition of the verbal quotative would be redundant.

The next two quotes are introduced by zero quotatives; James signals by different bodily gestures that he is reporting the utterances of different speakers (lines 10 and 14) (cf. Mathis & Yule, 1994). Then, he weaves a little bit of narration into his story again and then introduces yet another direct quote with the verbal present perfect quotative *und da hat sie gesagt* ('and then she said')(lines 16-17). Finally, he simply uses *und* to signal the last reported speech segment (lines 20-21), which, in its conjunction role, signals that another quotation is going to follow the previous ones. After his quotations, which receive plenty of reactions in the form of laughter and remarks by the audience, he makes a comment on the situation in lines 23-24. Because of the great array of direct quotation methods, this segment is an excellent illustration of the choices superiors can make when reporting. By avoiding the repetition of one structure, James manages to keep the audience's attention during his fairly long turn and earn their positive reaction (laughter)

to the story. (On the variation and possible explanations of the verb tense with the quotative, see chapter 7.)

The last segment (# 16) I would like to show is the only innovative quotative without *und: also ich eigentlich* ‘so I actually’. It was uttered by the American speaker Ned (the same speaker as in segments 11 and 13) while performing a self-quotation of a partly nonverbal sequence. As stated in section 2.1, direct discourse is suitable for rendering nonverbal utterances because it requires no changes in the original, quoted material. Ned is talking to Adél (his former student) about how he was at first reluctant to accept the argumentation in one of her papers, because her analysis of a short story was the exact opposite of his. He evokes his doubts about this situation by mimicking the facial expression he had while pondering about the paper and the gestures of acceptance he eventually showed when finally agreeing to accept Adél’s argumentation. His enactment is introduced by the quotative *also ich eigentlich* (‘so I actually’) in line 15.

**Segment 16: Interpretation**

**Tape 3/B**

**Count: 00:00:57**

01 Ned: du hast einmal einen aufsatz geschrieben in(.)  
*you wrote once an essay in(.)*

02 literatur(.)wo ich absolut nicht einverstanden  
*literature(.)where i absolutely didn't agree*

03 war mit deiner argumentation=aber es war so gut  
*with your argumentation=but it was so well*

- 04           geschrieben, [gut  
                  *written, [well*
- 05 Nathe:                   [anya  
                                  *[mother*
- 06 Laura: melyik, a mikszáth?  
                                  *which one, the mikszáth?*
- 07   Ned: bei adél.  
                                  *with adél.*
- 08 Laura: a mikszáth volt?(.)a tót atyafiak meg a lotterie?  
                                  *was it the mikszáth?(.)the Slovak countrymen and  
  the lottery?*
- 09   Ned: (0.8)[lotterie oder(.)ich weiß nicht (aber)  
                                  *(0.8)[lottery or(.)i don't know (but)*
- 10 Nathe:                   [anya, megehetem?  
                                  *[mother, can I eat it up?*
- 11   Ned: ich weiß nur(.)[ich hab (0.4)du hast eine andere  
                                  *i only know(.)[i (0.4) you wrote a different*
- 12 Laura:                   [hagyd ott, majd ( )  
                                  *[leave it there, later ( )*
- 13   Ned: interpretation [geschrieben  
                                  *interpretation*
- 14   Adél:                   [ja  
                                  *[yes*



*Ned puts left index finger on forehead, grimaces,*

→ 15 Ned: also ich eigentlich(.)ä:::h(.)aber es war gut.  
*so i actually(.)u:::hm(.)but it was good.*

*makes gestures with both hands, signalling acceptance*

16 | \_\_\_\_\_ |  
 okay gut, geht es, [logisch aufgebaut und die  
*okay good, it's alright, [logically built and the*

17 Laura: [mhm

18 Ned: (.)punkte okay. [ ( )  
*(.)points okay. [ ( )*

19 Adél: [das war hundertachtzig grad  
*[that was hundred-eighty degrees*

20 (widrig) ( )  
*(adverse) ( )*

Performing an enactment enhances Ned's narration of the questionable decision he was about to make. A direct quote is a powerful method to make the speaker's turns more vivid. The string of words Ned uses to draw attention to his message is *also ich eigentlich* (line 15), another innovative quotative (in this case, one without *und*), which is yet again similar to both *und ich so / und er so* as well as the *und*-prefaced superior quotatives: it sounds fragmental, contains no finite verb, is followed by a pause, and introduces an enactment. The listeners' reactions include the appreciation token "mhm" by Ned's wife Laura in line 17 as well as Adél's response in lines 19 and 20. (The

recording is unfortunately of rather poor quality, which makes her turn hardly decipherable.)

In this segment, the quotative *also ich eigentlich* is not framed. Ned does not refer to the context of the quotation before he makes it; he does not use any verbs to specify what action he was performing mentally (a possible frame could be *ich dachte* ‘I was thinking’). I find it possible that this structure came into being under L1 influence, namely that of American English “so I was actually like...,” with “actually like” shortened to “eigentlich” in the transfer and with the conjugated verb omitted. This would constitute a part of an interesting pragmatic process, in which the non-native speaker resorts to a structure in his native tongue, but while transferring it to his L2, he equips it with characteristics of a German innovative quotative structure, namely, eliminates a part of it. The result is a creative, but not unnatural-sounding German quotative, which fulfils perfectly its pragmatic function, that of rendering the quotation more vivid.

On native speakers’ evaluations of the various reported speech segments, *also ich eigentlich* was the superior quotative rated by most as “rather native” (7) or “could be both” (4) and guessed only by one German speaker to be non-native. The other generally accepted innovative quotative was *und sie* (“rather native” 6, “rather non-native” 1, “both” 5). The two quotatives that included “und + adverb” did not receive such unanimous approval from the native speakers: *und dann* + name was rather controversial (“rather native” 3, “rather non-native” 6 – the English word “department” was no doubt a big clue for most natives - , “both” 1, undecided 2), just like *und dann, ”hast du ein drittes Thema?”* (“rather native” 2, “rather non-native” 6, “both” 4). This shows that native speakers do not necessarily agree on what may or may not be used in German as

an unusual quotative. It seems that some of them have no problem accepting innovative structures, while others are more suspicious. *Also ich eigentlich* and *und sie* may have passed the test because they are more similar to the German innovative quotative than the other ones. *Und ich so / und er so* is made up of *und*, a personal pronoun, and *so* as an adverb; *also ich eigentlich* contains a personal pronoun as well as a conjunction and an adverb while *und sie* includes *und* plus a personal pronoun. It seems that the presence of a personal pronoun can decide whether an innovative quotative sounds generally acceptable to native speakers or not. The pronoun specifies the quoted person and makes it clear whether it is a case of self- or other-quotation. Maybe it is this clarification of the perspective that makes the structure sound more natural.

Ten Cate brings examples of direct quotations embedded in an indirect speech context (1996, p. 205) which we should evoke here. The paragraph, which originally appeared in the *Zeit-Magazin* in 1993, includes the following: “*Sie sofort wieder: «Salzstreuen ist verboten!» Und dann endlich er: «Gnädigste, das ist kein Salz, das ist Curry!»*’ *She immediately again, «Salting is prohibited!» And then he finally, «Madam, that is not salt, that is curry!»*” (italics mine). *Sie sofort wieder* and *und dann endlich er* are the only quotatives in this excerpt, where quoting other’s speech happens otherwise only by means of subjunctive I forms. Both structures lack a conjugated verb but contain a personal pronoun; *und dann endlich er* is strikingly similar to the superior quotatives *und dann*, *und dann manchmal* and *und dann* + name in my data while *sie sofort wieder* sounds just as fragmental as *also ich eigentlich*.

At this point, one may also evoke Davies’ thoughts about linguistic creativity, namely, how it seems to act as a defining criterion for who is and who is not considered a

native speaker (Davies, 1991, p. 86). He noticed that when non-natives invent words, expressions or sentences, natives often see these as errors. On the other hand, when it is done by natives themselves, they are not regarded as errors but “creative potential additions to the language” (p. 86). At what point do errors become regarded as native-like creations instead of errors? In my study, the turning point was the disappearance of conjugated verbs in the quotative. Creative structures were by far more accepted as native-like by German speakers if the verb was omitted, just like in the German quotative *und ich so / und er so*.

It should be mentioned here that most native speakers also revealed with ease that efforts to be extremely eloquent came from non-native speakers. Thus, overtly well-formulated utterances by superiors (e.g., *Ich habe mit ihr gesprochen und deklariert, dass ich sehr seriös bin* ‘I talked to her and declared that I was very serious’) were considered more as “learners’ German” instead of well-educated native talk. According to this, grammatical correctness may not necessarily vest a speaker with native-like qualities and points out the importance of communicative competence. Non-natives who came up with native-like innovative structures were found to be closer to the acceptable forms of native language behavior than those who used German correctly, but maybe to the extent where it became unnatural-sounding for an everyday conversation and thus lacked appropriacy.<sup>48</sup>

#### **6.4 General remarks on the quotatives in the study as regards to discourse markers, deixis and code-switching**

---

<sup>48</sup> See Hymes (1972) for further explanations on communicative competence and appropriacy.

Following the analysis of direct discourse methods, and especially the quotatives used by non-native speakers in my study, I would now like to refer back to the theoretical chapters 2 and 3, and offer some insights on how these quotatives can be described as discourse / pragmatic markers, how they are connected to deixis, and how they were influenced by code-switching.

As stated in 2.3, *und ich so / und er so* can be regarded as a discourse marker since it signals in a conversation that a direct speech segment will follow. All the verbless quotatives used by the non-native speakers may be seen, just like the German one, as such discourse markers introducing direct speech (*und* ‘and’, *und dann* ‘and then’, *und dann* + name, *und dann manchmal* ‘and then sometimes’, *und da* ‘and then / there’, *und sie* ‘and she’, *also ich eigentlich* ‘so I actually’). As explained in 3.3, I prefer to call them pragmatic, even more precisely, quotative markers. The same applies to the quotatives that came into being through code-switching (*und like, it’s like*) as well as *so* in the segment “Mathe” in section 5.1.

I would like to point out here how the quotatives in my study fit exactly with Schiffrin’s definition of discourse markers as well as with Brinton’s description of pragmatic markers. Schiffrin mentions the following conditions that allow an expression to be used as a marker (1987, p. 328):

- 1) “It has to be syntactically detachable from a sentence.”

This is true to the quotatives in my study: syntactically, they belong neither to the previous sentence nor to the upcoming one.

2) “It has to be commonly used in initial position of an utterance.”

This also applies to all of the quotatives: they appear right before the quote. The short pause that tends to follow the quotative does not interfere with this position to the extent that it would break the continuity of the quotative and the quote.

3) “It has to have a range of prosodic contours; e.g., tonic stress and followed by a pause, phonological reduction.”

Although there is no phonological reduction, the quotatives were all pronounced with a slight rise in pitch and followed by a pause.<sup>49</sup>

4) “It has to be able to operate at both local and global levels of discourse, and on different planes of discourse. This means that it either has to have no meaning, a vague meaning, or to be reflexive (of the language, of the speaker).”

As explained above, the quotatives connect adjacent utterances (local level) as well as a narration sequence with a direct quote (global level). Semantically, they do not contribute to the sentence; omitting them does not interfere with the meaning and interpretation.<sup>50</sup>

Schiffrin indicated that the members of different word classes can be used as markers (1987, p. 57, 2006, p. 319). Among the words that make up the quotatives in my data, *und* and *also* are conjunctions, *dann*, *da*, *eigentlich* and *manchmal* are adverbs, *ich*

---

<sup>49</sup> Phonological reduction is likely to occur at later stages of the grammaticalization process, so it may well happen to quotatives too in the future.

<sup>50</sup> This is supported by the fact that some speakers do not use quotatives to introduce their quotes, yet it is obvious from their paralinguistic features and pitch movement that they are reporting previously uttered speech.

and *sie* are pronouns, and the English quotative *like* also appeared in *und like* and *it's like*. The one used most often was *und*. Its common occurrence in English as well as German as a discourse marker raises the question why it is such a frequent choice. English *and* as a discourse marker was investigated in detail by Schiffrin. She stated that it signals the continuation of a discourse unit and thus has a pragmatic function (Schiffrin 1986, p. 62). She also points out how structure and language use can go both ways from pragmatics to grammar and the other way round since “just as *and* is one means by which sentences of infinite length can be built, so too, could *and* be a means by which speakers can continue their actions through talk” (p. 63). Thus, *and* not only has functions in the building of idea structures but also the continuation of actions, and its communicative role depends less on the word's semantics than its grammatical function (p. 63). I think this is equally true to German *und* and its role in quotatives: speakers use it to hold on to and continue their turn and to introduce their quotations at the same time. As such, it definitely has a pragmatic function and thus qualifies as a pragmatic marker in *und*, *und dann*, *und dann* + name, *und dann manchmal*, *und da*, *und sie* and even in *und like* (also, of course, in the native quotative *und ich so / und er so*). This may be regarded as a step in the pragmatization process of *and* (as well as *und*), where the word has more meaning at the discourse than at the syntactic level.<sup>51</sup>

*Then*, the English counterpart of *dann*, which also occurred frequently in the quotative structures in my study, was also examined by Schiffrin. Just like in the case of *and / und*, there are similarities in the usage of the adverbs *then / dann* as discourse

---

<sup>51</sup> Diewald (2006) argues that the pragmatic functions of discourse markers are actually grammatical functions indispensable for the organization of spoken discourse. Consequently, she does not contribute relevance to the question whether the diachronic development of discourse markers is a case of grammaticalization or pragmatization (p. 405).

markers. Schiffrin notes that *then* brackets prior and upcoming talk (1987, p. 247) and points away from the current utterance to a prior one and thus to prior discourse time (p. 261). This is exactly the way *dann* functions in the quotative structures in my data: it indicates temporal succession in the narration of the reported speech segment while also points to the previous utterance (the quote) and discourse time. Note e.g. how the quotative *und dann* + name separates the narration of the story from the quote and interrupts the narration by evoking the reported person's discourse time (see section 6.3, segment 14, "GTAs").

The deixis used in the quotatives in my data were always distal, that is, pointing away from the deictic center (the current conversational situation). *Hier* 'here' or *jetzt* 'now' were never used with the quotative. The reason for this is probably that the deixis used as part of the quotative referred back to the previous speech situation and so anchored the quotation in that previous discourse time. There is one quotative in English that can be regarded as proximal (pointing toward the deictic center): *like*. (An example from Hungarian also proves that it is possible to use proximal deixis in quotatives: *így*, used in the spoken language as part of a quotative, means 'this way' and is thus proximal (as opposed to distal *úgy* 'that way').

*Like*, appearing in my data as a result of code-switching, has received ample attention as a discourse marker, similarly to German *so* (see section 2.4). The different discourse marker functions of *like* support each other. Its usage as an "information-centered presentation marker" (Jucker & Smith, 1998, p. 179, p. 191) is not far from its usage to draw attention to a reported speech segment, that is, a quotative. Romaine and Lange point out when used as quotatives, verbs of motion such as *come* and *go* point



forward and outward, while *like* to the internal state of the speaker; thus, if the speaker is considered the deictic center, *like* is proximal (whereas *go* is distal) (Romaine & Lange, 1991, p. 266).<sup>52</sup>

Besides the proximal nature of *like*, there is also another reason why it occurred in my data, namely, code-switching. As explained in 3.3, code-switching is a fairly common phenomenon when non-native speakers involuntarily include structures from their L1. This was the case in the segments in my data (section 5.1) containing a quotative with *like* in a German language speech situation (segment 3, “High school teacher” and segment 4, “Anrufe [Telephone calls]”).

Auer’s research conducted about the code-switching habits of Italian migrant workers’ children in the Federal Republic of Germany has implications for the phenomenon of code-switching in my data as well: in both studies, code-switching occurred at sentence boundaries and played a part in the organization of discourse; as a contextualization strategy, it can be compared to the role played by prosodic features such as intonation, loudness or pitch level (Auer, 1988, pp. 209-210). As such, *und like* and *it’s like* in my study indeed created communicative meaning by prefacing direct quotes and thus being used as a discourse-organizing strategy.

---

<sup>52</sup> Romaine and Lange also refer to the fact that, as opposed to other discourse markers, *like* when used as a quotative is not devoid of semantic meaning or syntactic status (Romaine and Lange, 1991, p. 246).

## 6.5 Conclusions and discussion

In this chapter, I have presented the third level of competence in my study. This level is reached by superior level speakers. Besides the typical *verba dicendi sagen* and *meinen*, it includes other verbs (*erzählen* ‘to tell [a story]’, *betonen* ‘to emphasize’, *denken* ‘to think’, *vorschlagen* ‘to recommend’, *bitten* ‘to ask [for a favor]’, *aufnehmen* ‘to take [it as something]’, ‘to register’ and *beobachten* ‘to observe’) as well as quotatives without verbs. I pointed out that several of these non-native structures were actually found acceptable by many native German speakers, especially if they included a personal pronoun (as does *und ich so / und er so*).

The segments generally followed Sacks’ (1974) and Sacks *et al.*’s (1974) description of turn-taking organization and recipient design: The reporting persons tended to preface their reported sequences to signal that they were about to construct a lengthier turn if it was necessary (e.g., *hast du auch gehört, was Toni einmal erzählt hat?* ‘did you also hear what Toni once was talking about?’ by Anna in segment 14, “GTAs”, or *du hast einmal einen Aufsatz geschrieben in Literatur* ‘you wrote once an essay in literature’ by Ned in segment 16, “Interpretation”), make a reference to the nature of the retold event (either by a short description of the context or the usage of attributes, e.g., *ja das ist sehr interessant* ‘yes that is very interesting’ by Erika in segment 12, “Steuerzählen [Counting the tax]”, or *das ist auch so eine heiße Geschichte* ‘that’s also such a crazy story’ by James in segment 15, “Student im Zug [Student on the train]”), and through these, show orientation to the hearers. The retold stories met with positive reactions on behalf of the recipients. No instances of loss of face (negative politeness) occurred. The hearers did not

seem to lose interest in any of the direct speech segments and there was no reason for either the speaker or the audience to feel embarrassed because of an unsuccessfully told or not fully understood reporting. Thus, the participants' efforts to maintain politeness during the conversations turned out to be successful in all cases.

The most important difference between the quotation methods of intermediate / advanced and superior speakers in the study was that a conjugated verb always appeared with the quotatives used at the lower levels, while superiors felt confident leaving them out. Superior level quotatives (*und, und dann, und dann + name, und dann manchmal, und da, und sie, also ich eigentlich*) were similar to the innovative German quotative *und ich so / und er so* described by Vlatten / Golato (1997, 2000, 2002a, 2002b) and also to one another. The characteristics pointed out by Vlatten / Golato as typical to *und ich so / und er so* (Golato, 2000, p. 40) were overwhelmingly present with superior quotatives: they were short and fragmental without a conjugated verb; most of them were followed by a pause which was used by the reporters to adapt their intonation and body positions to imitate those of the reported persons; the direct quote was accompanied by an enactment and it was usually followed by an unquote. The hearers' reaction was usually expressed, even if not always verbally. The video-recorded segments in my study also justified Sidnell's observations about reporters typically redirecting their gaze from the audience before a re-enactment (2006, p. 396).

It needs to be added here that, depending on different speaker and hearer attitudes respectively, one of the characteristics (the short pause, the unquote or the audience's reaction) may be absent or shortened. For example, the reporting person sometimes speaks so fast that there is hardly any pause before or after the quote, while with other

speakers it is quite a long one. This seems to be an individual trait; some people act out an impressive performance with their reported speech sequence, while others are more reserved and signal only by changed pitch or intonation or minor bodily gestures that they are imitating someone else's behavior. The length of the pauses (the first one used for taking on the reported person's characteristics, intonation, bodily gestures and the second one for returning to the reporter's own speech in the current interaction) depends on how dramatic the speakers intend their performance to be. The less the speakers identify themselves with the role, the shorter the necessary pauses; in some cases there is hardly any pause at all before or after the quote.

The main difference I have found when contrasting non-native quotatives with *und ich so / und er so* was, however, that the audience's reaction (which is the preferred action) was not always (albeit often) verbally present, that is, followed by feedback on the hearers' behalf (appreciation or interpretation) (see e.g., segment 13, "Prüfungsthemen (Examination topics)," segment 12, "Steuerzählen (Counting the tax)," segment 11, "Driver's licence" and segment 16, "Interpretation"). Often it was expressed by nonverbal signs such as nodding. The audience was listening attentively and also gave signs of reciprocity by nodding or smiling but did not always give a verbal reaction or produce considerable laughter, like it appeared in Golato's data about native speakers. I have found two main reasons for this absence: one is if the speaker goes on to tell the rest of the story immediately after the quote and thus leaves little room for the listeners to react (see e.g., segment 6, "Goethe," segment 7, "Prüfung (Exam)" and segment 12, "Steuerzählen [Counting the tax]"). The other reason is a more general one. While Vlatten (Golato) stated that speakers use *und ich so / und er so* to convey the punchline or

climax of their story (Vlatten [Golato] 1997, p. 52), this German quotative seems to have become even more widespread in recent years (after her study) and ever more similar to *and I'm like / and he's like*.<sup>53</sup> As such, it is used not only to draw the audience's attention to upcoming noteworthy events or a punchline in the narration, but also as a general quotative to introduce reported sequences of greater as well as of smaller significance. Consequently, the quoted material may not be remarkably funny or striking, and very often it does not constitute the conclusion of the reported event but rather continues. Non-native speakers tend to use their quotatives in a manner very similar to this less extraordinary function, where the quotatives are very often simply embedded in the speaker's reported speech sequence instead of standing out to introduce an exceptionally noteworthy event. Thus, since the quote introduced by an innovative quotative does not necessarily constitute the peak of the narration, hearers' reactions after the unquote may be missing as well because the speaker's turn goes on and there is no room for turn-taking. The audience's feedback is greatly dependent on the speaker's intention of emphasizing something noteworthy in the story: the more dramatic the performance, the greater the effect on the audience, which is usually recognizable by their reactions. The most "impressive" enactments are generally followed by a considerable amount of laughter or amazement (based on the nature of the story) on behalf of the audience and / or the speaker himself. Some hearers react more reserved than others, which might be a personal trait. That is why one should not be surprised at the variety of hearers' reactions, or the lack thereof, when analyzing these segments. In any case, the enactments themselves are always recognizable by at least one phenomenon that usually

---

<sup>53</sup> This observation is made based on my 2005 recordings of German native speakers who use *und ich so / und er so* in more contexts than described by Vlatten (Golato).

accompanies direct speech, be it change in intonation or pitch, be it theatrical bodily gestures, or both. This can be detected in all of the segments mentioned as examples in this study.

I found it somewhat surprising that the superior level speakers who were familiar with *und ich so / und er so* and heard it from native speakers on a daily basis did not use this quotative at all. This may support the findings of Barron (2003), Kinginger and Farrell (2004), Vyatkina and Belz (2006) and Hacking (2007), all of whom argued that exposure to native speakers by itself is not necessarily conducive to the acquisition of discourse markers. This observation points to the importance of including pragmatics in the L2 classroom to raise learners' pragmatic awareness. On the other hand, it is noteworthy that many superior level speakers used quotative structures as pragmatic markers to which they had not previously been exposed. One possible explanation is that they inserted attention-catching quotative structures in the conversation to signal to their hearers that their upcoming turn contains information (a reenacted event) which they believe to be of special interest to the audience. Using quotatives other than typical *verba dicendi* has the potential to draw heightened attention to the following utterance, which could be a lengthy one and take up a turn longer than usual. In this case, the reporter's effort to make his or her turn more interesting can be appreciated as a polite gesture to avoid overwhelming the hearers and to prevent any loss of face. It can also serve as an excuse for potentially violating the Gricean maxims of quantity, relevance and manner. It is, nonetheless, certainly remarkable that the speakers did not use *und ich so / und er so* itself, yet came up with some very similar structures that mostly contained an *und* as well as an adverb, but no conjugated verb.

Last but not least, I would like to refer again to the lack of subjunctive forms in my recordings. As mentioned in section 2.3, using the subjunctive I is the standard German grammatical method for rendering reported speech, and the subjunctive II can be used for this purpose as well. However, they did not occur in my data at all.

It might be understandable that intermediate speakers did not use the subjunctive I (or II): even though all of them were acquainted with the subjunctive, using it in a conversation may not come easily to them since it is one of the more complicated structures of German grammar. On the other hand, the fact that the advanced and especially the superior speakers avoided it as well might be somewhat puzzling, because their command of German is certainly at a level where this should cause no difficulties. In my opinion, the explanation to this phenomenon is the advanced pragmatic competence of higher-level speakers. They can conduct conversations with greater ease and, probably because of their linguistic ability, may pay less attention to grammar and more to content. This way, they may produce utterances that fit in well with the discourse and reach the pragmatic goal of clarity and expressiveness even if these utterances are not the specific structures that could be used to this end in standard grammar. The innovative quotatives used by superior speakers are a good example for this pragmatic expressiveness: it was a method superiors applied to signal their shift in footing from their current role in the conversation to that of a reported person. As Collins notes about choices in reported speech methods, the extension of one strategy at the expense of another usually has pragmatic causes, and innovative strategies are acceptable for pragmatic reasons since they are communicatively effective or aesthetically pleasing (Collins, 2001, p. 16). This seems to be the case in my study as well. It is not improbable

that native speakers would have used some subjunctive (especially the subjunctive II) in the utterances where non-natives used innovative quotatives.

One may also call to mind Viorel's comment on the redundancy of the subjunctive I (used in German exclusively for indirect speech and no other function) in sentences where indirect speech is already marked (usually by way of a quotative); the argument is that in such instances, the indicative is sufficient (Viorel, 1985, p. 60, as cited in ten Cate 1996, p. 195). Ten Cate also points out that indicative verb forms in indirect discourse often occur with first person pronouns, especially when the reported and the reporting speaker is the same person (ten Cate 1996, p. 200). The quotative already signals the upcoming quote, and with a self-quotation, the subjunctive I would sound odd. These may be reasons why native speakers do not seem to find subjunctive I forms with indirect speech necessary. Interestingly, despite the rules generally taught in German language courses, non-natives did not seem to prefer or even make use of the subjunctive I forms when they used a quotation.



## **7. Differences in the verb tense of the quotatives in native and non-native language use**

Irrespective of proficiency level, the non-native speakers in my recordings used the typical *verba dicendi sagen* and *meinen* in various German verb tenses: the present, simple past and the present perfect tense. In the last part of my data analysis, I will show how this tense variation was different in certain aspects to the way native speakers use them.

The tense of verbal quotatives introducing direct speech varied with all three levels of speakers in my data corpus. The two major past tenses, the present perfect and the simple past were both used, even though there were slightly more cases of the present perfect (see section 4.2). The present tense was also often applied in the quotative, which may appear a little bit unusual when quoting an utterance that took place in the past. In the following, I would like to offer insights on the similarities and differences between the tense choices natives and non-natives make.

No regularity could be detected between the choice of the simple past and the present perfect; they were used interchangeably. Golato's data showed that native speakers introduced their reported discourse with either tense; however, they were typically used as a preface to indirect speech in the subjunctive (Golato, 2002a, p. 33, pp. 35-36, p. 38). On the other hand, when non-native speakers opted for the present perfect, their reported segment was usually rendered not in indirect but in direct speech. Also, native speakers preferred the present perfect quotative when talking about past decisions with what Golato calls troubles-tellings (talking about a problem and the trouble source),

rendering the quoted material rendered in the present tense (Golato, 2002b). There were no examples of such troubles-tellings in my recordings, but one can say in general that the present perfect was the most frequent choice for the tense with verbal quotatives. The retold events did not necessarily constitute a troubles-telling.

An example is the next segment where the two advanced-mid speakers talk about having lost a lot of the German they learned during their study abroad. Angie speaks about having recently talked to her host grandmother on the phone, during which the grandmother pointed out that Angie's language skills were deteriorating. Angie narrates as well as reports the whole conversation using the present perfect (lines 04, 08, 11, 12).

**Segment 17: Gastoma (Host Grandma)**

**Tape 4**

**Count: 00:10:05**

- 01 Angie: du: ich hab- also gestern hatte meine GAschtoma  
           you: i- so yesterday my guest grandma had
- 02           geburtsta:g  
               birthda:y
- 03 Cassi: o-oh  
               oh-oh
- 04 Angie: ich hab sie angerufen und sie hat gemeint so(1.0)  
               i called her and she said like (1.0)
- 05           ((deeper voice)) du angie, das ist echt schad,(.)  
               ((deeper voice)) you angie, that's really a pity,(.)
- 06           du verlierst dein ganzes deutsch, du sprichst so:  
               you are losing all your german, you speak so:

- 07 langsam↓=((getting back to her own voice)) verlierst  
*slowly•=(getting back to her own voice) are  
 losing*
- 08 (-)quatsch hat sie nicht gesagt(.)verlernst.  
*(-)nonsense she didn't say(.)forgetting*
- 09 entschuldigung. ahm  
*sorry. mhm*
- 10 Cassi: hehehehehehe  
*hehehehehehe*
- 11 Angie: äh: und ich hab gemeint so (1.0)ja=schon.(.)und  
*u:h and i said like (1.0) yes=right.(.)and*
- 12 sie hat gemeint(.)((deeper voice)) s ech schad  
*she said(.) ((deeper voice)) 'tis real pity*
- 13 kind.ech schad.(.) hahahaha  
*child.real pity.(.)hahahaha*
- 14 Cassi: o:h [( )  
*o:h [( )*
- 15 Angie: [und ich finds Auch schade  
*[and i find it a pity too*
- 16 Cassi: [hehehe  
*hehehe*
- 17 Angie: [also ich bin ich bin [( )  
*[so i am i am [( )*
- 18 Cassi: [nee ich hab auch  
*[noo I did too*

Angie is consequent in using the present perfect throughout: in the narration (*ich hab sie angerufen* 'I called her' in line 04, *hat sie nicht gesagt* 'she didn't say' in line 08) as well in the quotatives for both other- and self-quotation (*und sie hat gemeint so* 'and

she said like' in line 04, *ich hab gemeint so* 'and I said like' in line 11, *und sie hat gemeint* 'and she said' in lines 11-12). The enactment format is the usual one with a pause (line 04), different intonation during the performance, a short pause as an unquote (line 13) and finally laughter after all the reported material. Cassi reacts sympathetically in line 13 and then laughs herself. Quotations with a present perfect quotative like this seem to be a common direct discourse enactment method for non-native speakers.

As stated above, the non-natives' variation of the simple past / present perfect follows no discernable pattern and it was used with other- as well as with self-quotations. On the other hand, it is remarkable that the present tense quotative appeared only when quoting somebody else's words, never the speaker's own. Golato found only one instance of a present tense quotative, and she explains it with the possibility that the events reported upon are still in process (Golato, 2002b, p. 62). However, it is important to note here that Golato only speaks about present tense quotatives with troubles-tellings and no other reported speech narration goals, so further research is needed to investigate the tense choices of German speakers. I do have instances of present tense quotatives produced by native speakers in my recordings (not in the data corpus for this dissertation); however, since natives were not the focus of my study, I would not like to draw conclusions based on the handful of examples I have.

I am relying mainly on Golato's previous findings on German speakers' tense use when I contrast them with the non-native speakers in my study. Based on this, my observation is that the speakers in my recordings used the present tense quotative in plenty of situations which had no relevance to the present (cf. Golato, 2002b, p. 62). In

my opinion, using the quotative in the present tense serves the same function as retelling the quoted material itself in the present: it makes the presentation more vivid and accessible to the hearers. Using the historical present to talk about past events for the purposes of visualisation of the speaker's experiences is a common method in German as well as in English narration (see e.g., Golato, 2002b; Schiffrin, 1981; Wolfson, 1978) and also in Hungarian. Since the non-native speakers in my study had the tendency to resort to the present tense in past tense narratives, this may be L1 influence.

Johnstone (1987) suggests that switching to the historical present in a past tense narration is not a random choice. Polanyi (1981) talks about verbs typically appearing in the simple past or the historical present in American storytellings, used in the active voice and having an instantaneous rather than durative or iterative aspect (p. 326). McCarthy points out that speakers exercise control over topic, foregrounding and relevance by resorting to the historical present (1998, p. 167); it signals the foregrounding of the quoted speech in a way that simple past does not (p. 166). The present tense may also be used when the reported sequence relates to permanent truths, or to utterances that are still relevant (e.g., "She says you've got to twist these round and it makes them solid") (p. 167). However, this latter was not the case in my data.

Schiffrin notes the frequent usage of the conversational historical present with verbs of saying preceding direct quotations (Schiffrin, 1981, p. 58). Tannen remarks that direct quotations regularly co-occur with the historical present (Tannen, 1983, p. 365). While there is not enough evidence to show that it is common in German to introduce a past tense narration by a present tense quotative, it appeared several times in the non-natives' language use at all levels. Even though it was not as prevalent as present perfect

or simple past quotatives, it was used for the rendering of past discourse by several of the recorded speakers. This is an attention-getter especially if the speaker suddenly switches in the narration from a past tense to the present. As such, it can achieve the same goal as the innovative quotatives: it draws the listeners' attention to the reported speech sequence.

The next segment is supposed to illustrate how switching between tenses is able to create a dramatic effect. It includes a present tense quotative in the retelling of a past event. The American speaker James (a superior) is telling the other speakers about a German course he is teaching in the US, and how a little boy went up to him privately and greeted him in German in all sincerity. The comic feature of this situation is accentuated by the speaker switching from the simple past to the present tense with the quotative in line 07. This is followed by an enactment of the boy's utterance (which is obvious from the reporter's change in facial gestures) in line 09:

**Segment 18: Deutschkurs (German course)**

**Tape 1**

**Count: 01:27:38**

01 James: und(.)ich geh immer von raum zu raum und guck  
*and(.)i always go from room to room and see*

- 02 was ähm(.)wie alle auskommen, und ähm(.)ich da  
*what uhm(.)how everyone gets by, and uhm(.)I*  
*there*
- 03 ins zimmer rein und die kinder haben so fleißig  
*into the room and the children were so diligently*
- 04 gesungen  
*singing*
- 05 [((laughter))]
- 06 James: [deutsch das war echt witzig. und da kam ein  
*[in german that was really funny.and there*  
*came a*
- 07 junge zu mir(.)und und meint zu mir auf  
*boy to me(.)and and tells me in*
- 08 deutsch(.)  
*german*
- tilts head to the side, with serious facial expression*
- 09 
$$\begin{array}{c} | \\ \hline \uparrow \text{na, wie geht's denn.} \\ \bullet \text{so, how's it going.} \end{array}$$
- 10 ((laughter))
- 11 Anita: [da:s ist so sü:ß  
*[tha:t is so sweet*
- 12 James: [(also das hat mich)  
*[(so that really)*

13 Anita: das ist aber so nett  
*that is really so cute*

James interrupts a past tense narration (signaled by the present perfect in lines 03-04 and the simple past in line 06) by the present tense quotative in line 07. After a short pause (line 08), he performs an enactment (line 09), then gets back to “being himself” after the quoted material by returning to his original intonation as well as a past tense in line 12. Thus, the dramatic effect of the performance is enhanced not only by the pause and the changes in the reporter’s intonation and paralinguistic features (as is common with enactments), but also a switch in the verb tense. As Schiffrin notes, the reported material is made even more immediate and authentic by the usage of the historical present (1981, p. 60). Using a verbal quotative and thus being able to change the tense accentuates this way the reported speech segment with one more feature. This would not be possible with an innovative quotative without a verb, since if there is no verb, the tense cannot be varied either. The hearers react to the funny story by laughing and uttering an assessment of the situation in lines 10, 11 and 13, so the audience’s preferred appreciation is present.

Another example is given below in a data segment by the two advanced-low speakers Henry and David, who appeared in segment 3 “High school teacher” and segment 4 “Anrufe” (Telephone calls). In the following, I will show another part of segment 4 to illustrate a present tense quotative, this time with advanced-low speakers. Henry and David are talking about two girls who are their common acquaintances and a party that one of these girls, Christina, organized. Henry talked to Christina the weekend before the recording, and here he is talking about how she was asking him to give her a



call. He talks about meeting Christina in the present perfect (lines 05-06 and 08) but uses the present tense before rendering an enactment of Christina's words in line 10.

**Segment 4: Anrufe (Telephone calls)**

**Tape 6**

**Count: 00:16:06**

01 David: sie ist ein hippy hehehe

*she is a hippy hehehe*

02 Henry: ja ich werde vielleicht äh christina(.)später

*yes i will maybe meet uh Christina(.)later*

03 diese woche treffen

*this week*

04 David: mhm

*mhm*

05 Henry: äh ich hab(.)äh ich hab ihr diese diese

*uh i did see her this this*

06 letzte(.)äh(.)wochenende

*last(.)uh(.)weekend*

07 David: ja

*yes*

08 Henry: gesehen

*(saw)*

09 David: mhm

*mhm*

- 10 Henry: sie sagt(.)((squeamish voice)) ↑ruft mich ↑a:n!  
*she says(.) ((squemisch voice)) •call me •u:p!*
- 11 hihhi hh  
*hihihi hh*
- 12 David: bitte?  
*pardon?*
- 13 Henry: hhe ruft mich an=anrufen  
*hhe call me up=to call up*
- 14 David: a ja, okay. a ja  
*oh yeah, okay. oh yeah*

Henry introduces the reported situation by using the present perfect (*ich hab ihr diese letzte Wochenende gesehen* ‘I did see her this last weekend,’ lines 05-06 and 08). Then he switches into the present tense to quote the girl’s words. The present tense signals the upcoming quotation and attracts attention to the performance. The quotation takes place in its usual context: Henry precedes his quote with a short pause (line 10) and follows it with an unquote (in this case, his laughter in line 11). The quote itself is performed in a girly, squeamish voice to imitate the original speaker’s pitch. After a repair initiation (line 12), David understands the story fully, as he shows in line 14.

It seems thus that switching to the present tense to render a quote embedded in a past tense narrative is a grammatically and pragmatically not uncommon method used by the non-natives in my recordings. It made their direct speech segments more expressive and it appeared already at the intermediate level (see segment 1, “München (Munich)”: *und sie sagt dass es war sehr sehr gut* ‘and she says that it was very very good’). The

other technique that seems grammatically and pragmatically correct, quotatives without a verb, appeared only with superiors. The fact that lower-level speakers already “experiment” with different verb tenses (just like native speakers vary them in their quotatives) shows that switching between tenses for a more expressive narration is probably a common discourse method in conversation irrespective of mother tongue.

To summarize the findings of this chapter, we can state that my data showed that non-native speakers of all levels do not insist on using one tense solely in their quotatives but vary the German present, simple past and present perfect tense, with a slight preference to the present perfect. The relatively frequent occurrence of the present tense constituted a difference to native speakers’ language use, who, according to Golato, only used it when the retold events had relevance to the present (Golato, 2002b, p. 62), but she found it to be a very marginal phenomenon. Non-natives seemed to use it in past tense narratives to introduce their quotations. Because of this, switching from a past to the present tense achieved the same goal as innovative quotatives did: they created a more dramatic effect with the enactment and thus drew attention to the upcoming quotation.

## 8. Conclusion

In this dissertation, I have looked at the direct speech quotation methods of intermediate, advanced and superior level non-native speakers of German and have pointed out how these methods are different from each other and from those of native speakers. The main finding of the research is that it shows a growth in communicative competence with increasing language proficiency: the higher the proficiency level, the more complex the pragmatics. While intermediate level learners only rely on *sagen* 'to say', the most common verb of saying for quotations, advanced level learners already try other methods as well to express themselves. These methods include using unusual quotatives such as *und er war* 'and he was' or *und alle Leute sind* 'and all people are' as well as some quotatives that are the result of code-switching. While these quotatives are not grammatically correct, they already show the aspiration to mark direct speech with something more expressive than a common verb of saying. Furthermore, although they possibly stem from L1 transfer, these quotatives prove that at the advanced level, speakers already make an attempt to express a concept (direct speech) in the foreign language with means they would be using in their L1, and not just rely on the safe choice of *sagen*.

At the advanced-mid level, *meinen* 'to say', literally 'to mean' appears as an alternative choice to *sagen*, and it is also the first level where an adverb (*so*) turns up as part of the quotative. This is an important phenomenon, since quotatives with adverbs seem to become noticeably widespread at the superior level of language study, along with the common verbs of saying *sagen* and *meinen* as well as other verbs which are not *verba*

*dicendi*. What makes the use of these other types of verbs possible is the speakers' wider vocabulary and high level language proficiency. An example at the superior level is *und dann dachte* 'and then (I) thought' where *denken* 'to think', a *verbum sentiendi* is used to render a quotation. Hence, it can be seen that with increasing proficiency, learners' communicative choices widen significantly, which is a sign of their developing language competence. The development of interlanguage, that is, their understanding of the use of the foreign language, is illustrated with an interesting example at the advanced level "detour" of experimenting with the grammatically incorrect, albeit expressive quotatives.

The findings of my study thus show us a segment of second language acquisition through the example of direct speech. The research has yielded some unexpected results. One of my original hypotheses was that most learners of German would stick to the subjunctive I or II, the mood used and taught to learners to render formerly uttered speech; however, this was not the case at all. The subjunctive was not preferred but rather neglected even by speakers who were familiar with their usage. While this is surprising inasmuch as it shows a deviation from the rules learned in German language classes, it is also noteworthy since it displays learner behavior striving to express a concept with novel means instead of the traditional ones taught in class. Why is this so? One cannot be certain, but I agree with Streeck (2002) when he observes that the "mimetic mode of narrative representation" (p. 595) (that is, body quotations) seems to have become extremely widespread in the US and in Germany, possibly due to the influence of the media: on one hand, because of the need to reenact scenes from movies and television shows, on the other because, as suggested by Neil Postman in 1985, speakers today

“prefer entertainment to serious conversation” (Streeck, 2002, p. 592). Technology has made our lives incredibly fast-paced and we are getting used to being bombarded with new information in interactive ways and at high speeds. As one possible result, many speakers today are probably more intrigued in everyday communication by means that grab their attention quickly instead of devoting time to narratives; hence the preference of, e.g., “And I was like, oh my God, what am I going to do now?” instead of the less expressive and more narrative “I was really upset and I was wondering what I was going to do,” which could, however, occur in a more formal conversation. As Streeck concludes, “old, dry, lexical matter – things such as *be*, *go*, *all*, and *like*, or *und*, *dann*, and *so* – is recycled and recombined and finds itself in the middle of very lively and expressive procedures: *I’m like* involves extroversion, *ich dann so* action and suspense” (2002, p. 592).

My descriptive and empirical study has shown that non-native speakers, similarly to natives, rely heavily on enactments in free, informal conversation. Nevertheless, there was a difference in what quotative was used to accompany the enactment. The non-natives in my study did not use *und ich so* / *und er so*, which had been found by Golato (Vlatten) to be prevalent with native Germans. Depending on proficiency level, the non-natives used different quotatives to accompany the enactment, yet none of them used this particular structure, including the speakers who were familiar with it. However, it is important to point out that the superior level speakers who used quotatives without verbs (and almost all of them did) came up with quotatives whose structure and format were strikingly similar to *und ich so* / *und er so*: they were a combination of a personal pronoun (or a name) and an adverb and most of them prefaced by *und*. Generally, the

quotatives themselves were preceded by a short pause, which the speakers used to adjust their intonation and / or body position to that of the quoted speaker, which is again similar to what native speakers tend to do according to Golato / Vlatten's research. Their behavior is also in line with Sidnell's findings (2006) which claim that coordinated talk and eye gaze constitute a major part of reenactments (p. 378): the video-recorded speakers in my study also marked the beginning of their enactment with redirected eye gaze.

### *Pedagogical implications*

One surprising finding of the study, as discussed in 6.5, was that the superior level speakers who were familiar with *und ich so / und er so* never actually used it in their conversation. At the same time, I was interested in seeing whether *und ich so / und er so* would appear in the conversation of intermediate and advanced-level students who were tentatively taught this quotative as a lexical unit to introduce reported speech, a structure similar to American English *and I'm like / and he's like*. I provided the students in one of my Intermediate German I classes (third semester of German study) with this information as additional material to the chapter that discussed the subjunctive I and reported speech in German. Six of the students from this class (all advanced-low level speakers) participated in my recordings approximately a week after this class, and two of them used *und ich so / und er so* once each during their conversation. One of them, Henry, actually started to say *und ich hab gesa-* 'and I sa-', when all of a sudden he stopped and produced a self-repair by uttering, in a noticeably more excited voice, *und ich, und ich so*

before changing his intonation to quote the original speaker in a girly voice. The excitement in his voice could undoubtedly be attributed to his suddenly remembering to use this newly learned German structure, which is similar to the colloquial *and I'm like* in his native tongue. The other speaker, David, used *und er so* to introduce a quotation by a professor about study abroad. Although he was lost for words in German (the original utterance must have been in English), he did change his intonation to a certain extent by deepening his voice a little bit. David was also the speaker who produced the instances of code-switching with *like* in my data with the quotatives *it's like* in line 19 of segment 3, "High school teacher" as well as *und like* in line 48 of segment 4, "Anrufe (Telephone calls)." His use of *und er so* is thus probably a successful instance of L1 transfer, facilitated by the recent instruction of the German quotative.

Based on these observations, I cannot but agree with the researchers who advocate the teaching of pragmatics in the foreign / second language classroom (e.g., House, 1996; Kasper & Rose, 2001, 2002; Huth & Taleghani-Nikazm, 2006). The above mentioned segments showed that *und ich so / und er so* could be taught successfully as a lexical unit in the classroom without extensive grammar explanations. This can be regarded as a good example for communicative language teaching: the students internalized a structure to express reported speech that may be easily applied in German conversation without having to be confidently proficient with subjunctive forms. This supports Tschirner's idea, who, in his paper on why teaching vocabulary should dominate over grammar in early years of foreign language teaching, argues that teaching unanalyzed structures as lexical phrases is less overwhelming for students and at the same time already allow for meaningful communication (1999, p. 379). I am, of course,



not suggesting here that teaching the subjunctive is unnecessary, but would merely like to make the point that students can be taught a form of quoting formerly uttered speech without mastering the subjunctive. I agree with Tschirner that learning lexical phrases in communicative contexts not only facilitates communication but may also serve as a prerequisite for grammar acquisition (p. 379). Teaching *und ich so / und er so* may take place long before learners are introduced to subjunctive forms and it makes communication in the foreign language less complicated: this way, learners can express themselves even without a command of the sometimes rather complicated subjunctive forms. In due course, however, it is certainly necessary to learn the subjunctive itself. This process would be an implementation of Tschirner's suggestion and also an instance of teaching current, living German to students. It is also what McCarthy calls a "short-cut to the necessary lexico-grammatical knowledge" (1998, p. 52). McCarthy suggests that discourse markers should be a "part of the most basic lexical input in the syllabus and materials, for they are indeed very useful items and, lexically, usually quite simple and straightforward and often familiar to learners from their basic semantic meanings" (p. 60).<sup>54</sup> *Und ich so / und er so* is definitely such a basic, easily understandable, straightforward item that can be taught as a discourse marker relatively early. Once learners are aware that these forms exist, they are provided access to producing them without having to worry about the correct forms, which can be quite overwhelming in the case of the German subjunctive I and II. Besides, it is always advisable to draw learners' attention to the fact that they are likely to encounter certain forms in the language use of

---

<sup>54</sup> The only difficulty with his suggestion is that discourse markers rarely appear in written language, which remains the main source of input for learners.

native speakers. Generally, once learners know of a form used often by natives, they will make an attempt to reproduce it.

It appears that using *und ich so / und er so* or *and I'm like / and he's like* and their equivalents in other languages is a universal strategy, no matter what the speakers' mother tongue is. One cannot help noticing the number of advanced and superior level participants in my study who used similar structures. It seems that if speakers have not learned any innovative methods, they try to come up with some. But it also seems that this strategy can be learned explicitly, as is apparent in the case of *und ich so / und er so* with learners of American English. *Und ich so / und er so* lends itself to be taught to students of American English since it constitutes a case of relatively automatic transfer from their L1, and it seems easily transferable from other languages as well.

When looking at the tense use of non-native speakers with the quotatives, my data showed a variation of the German simple past, present perfect and present tense.

Although there were more instances of the present perfect than the other two, it was also noteworthy that the speakers made relatively frequent use of the present tense to introduce quotations in past tense narratives accompanied by enactments. Golato/Vlatten's research did not bring similar examples with native speakers, except for situations which had relevance to the present (that is, when the events were retold).

Introducing past tense narratives with present tense quotatives seemed to be another method non-natives seemed to use to enhance the effect of their enactment. This is not surprising, since present tense quotatives (or the historical present) is a common phenomenon in several languages since it makes narration more expressive.

Learners' aspirations to be as expressive as possible when reproducing formerly uttered speech could undoubtedly be seen in the attempts of advanced-low as well as superior level speakers in my study. Although the advanced-low level speakers invented quotatives that could not be considered grammatically correct and pragmatically appropriate, their willingness to express themselves in novel ways is praiseworthy. A possible topic for further research in this area would definitely be an investigation of other non-native speakers and whether they display a similar level of incorrect inventiveness at a relatively advanced level of language study as well, as seems to be supported by the studies of Bahns, Burmeister and Vogel (1986) and Kecskés (1999).

Another question open for further research is what precedes and follows the acquisition of direct speech methods in the list of conversational strategies. What other strategies are learned before learners become confident with direct speech methods? What strategies would be more complicated and follow the acquisition of these? Naturally, it would be also beneficial to see what results a study with yet more participants would yield. My study used data by 22 non-native speakers of German recorded in approximately 12 ½ hours during the course of eleven conversations. The conclusions I have drawn in my research are based on these conversations. It would be illuminating to see what results further investigations would come to, especially if they involved native speakers of languages other than the ones in my study. Direct speech phenomena are a vast topic, and their usage by native and non-native speakers alike will surely keep applied linguists of various nationalities occupied for decades to come.

## References

- Aijmer, K., Foolen, A., & Simon-Vandenberg, A.-M. (2006). Pragmatic markers in translation: A methodological proposal. In K. Fischer, (Ed.), *Approaches to discourse particles*. Studies in pragmatics 1 (pp. 101-114). Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Aijmer, K., & Simon-Vandenberg, A.-M. (2006). Introduction. In K. Aijmer & A.-M. Simon-Vandenberg (Eds.), *Pragmatic markers in contrast* (pp. 1-10). Amsterdam, Boston, London: Elsevier.
- Andersen, G. (1998). The pragmatic marker *like* from a relevance-theoretic perspective. In A. H. Jucker & Y. Ziv (Eds.), *Discourse markers. Descriptions and theory* (pp. 147-170). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Askedal, J.O. (1999). On the grammatical status of the subjunctive in reported speech in German. In G. F. Carr, W. Harbert, & L. Zhang (Eds.), *Interdigitations: Essays for Irmengard Rauch* (pp. 311-321). New York: Peter Lang.
- Atkinson, J.M., & Heritage, J. (Eds.) (1984). *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Auer, P. (1988). A conversation analytic approach to code-switching and transfer. In M. Heller (Ed.), *Codeswitching. Anthropological and sociolinguistic perspectives* (pp. 187-213). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Auer, P. (1995). The pragmatics of code-switching: a sequential approach. In L. Milroy & P. Muysken (Eds.), *One speaker, two languages: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching* (pp. 115-135). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Auer, P. (1998). Introduction. Bilingual conversation revisited. In P. Auer (Ed.), *Code-switching in conversation. Language, interaction and identity* (pp. 1-24). London, New York: Routledge.
- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bachman, L. F. (1990). *Fundamental considerations in language testing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bahns, J., Burmeister, H., & Vogel, T. (1986). The pragmatics of formulas in L2 learner speech: Use and development. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 10, 693-723.

- Banfield, A. (1973). Narrative style and the grammar of direct and indirect speech. *Foundations of Language*, 10, 1-39.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K. (1996). Pragmatics and language teaching: Bringing pragmatics and pedagogy together. In L. Bouton (Ed.), *Pragmatics and language learning* (Vol.7, pp. 21-39). Urbana-Champaign: University of Illinois, Division of English as an International Language.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K. (1999). Exploring the interlanguage of interlanguage pragmatics: A research agenda for acquisitional pragmatics. *Language Learning*, 49, 677-713.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2001). Evaluating the empirical evidence: Grounds for instruction in pragmatics? In K. R. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 13-32). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Dörnyei, Z. (1998). Do language learners recognize pragmatic violations? Pragmatic versus grammatical awareness in instructed L2 learning. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32, 233-262.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Hartford, B. S. (1991). Saying "No": Native and nonnative rejections in English. In L. Bouton & Y. Kachru (Eds.), *Pragmatics and language learning* (Vol.2, pp. 41-57). Urbana-Champaign: University of Illinois, Division of English as an International Language.

- Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Hartford, B. S. (1996). Input in an institutional setting. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 18, 171-188.
- Barron, A. (2003). *Acquisition in interlanguage pragmatics*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Belz, J. A., & Kinginger, C. (2003). Discourse options and the development of pragmatic competence by classroom learners of German: The case of address forms. *Language Learning*, 53, 591-647.
- Bialystok, E. (1993). Symbolic representation and attentional control in pragmatic competence. In G. Kasper & S. Blum-Kulka (Eds.), *Interlanguage pragmatics* (pp. 43-59). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Biber, D. (2006). *University language: A corpus-based study of spoken and written registers*. Studies in corpus linguistics (Vol. 23). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Bilbow, G., & Young, S. (1998). Learning the pragmatics of 'successful' impression management. *Pragmatics*, 8, 405-417.

- Bisang, W. (1998). Grammaticalization and language contact, constructions and positions. In A. G. Ramat & P. J. Hopper (Eds.), *The limits of grammaticalization* (pp.13-58). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Blakemore, D. (1987). *Semantic constraints on relevance*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Blum-Kulka, S. (1982). Learning to say what you mean: A study of speech act performance of learners of Hebrew as a second language. *Applied Linguistics*, 3, 29-59.
- Blum-Kulka, S. (1991). Interlanguage pragmatics: The case of requests. In R. Phillipson, E. Kellerman, L. Selinker, M. Sharwood Smith, & M. Swain (Eds.), *Foreign/second language pedagogy research: A commemorative volume for Klaus Faerch* (pp.255-272). Clevedon, Avon: Multilingual Matters.
- Blühdorn, H. (1993). Deixis und Deiktika in der deutschen Gegenwartssprache. (Deixis and deictics in the contemporary German language.) *Deutsche Sprache*, 21, 44-62.
- Blyth, C., Recktenwald, S., & Wang, J. (1990). I'm like, „Say What?!“: A new quotative in American oral narrative. *American Speech*, 65, 215-227.



- Brinton, L. J. (1996). *Pragmatic markers in English. Grammaticalization and discourse functions*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Brown, J. D. (2001). Pragmatics tests. Different purposes, different tests. In K. R. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 301-325). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1978). Universals in language usage: politeness phenomena. In: E. N. Goody (Ed.), *Questions and politeness: Strategies in social interaction* (pp. 56-289). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1, 1-47.
- Cate, A.P. ten (1996). Modality of verb forms in German reported speech. In T. A. J. M. Janssen & W. van der Wurff (Eds.), *Reported speech. Forms and functions of the verb* (pp. 188-211). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Chevalier, G. (2001). Comment *comme* fonctionne d'une génération à l'autre. (How *like* functions from one generation to the other.) *Revue québécoise de linguistique*, 30(2), 13-40.

- Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge: M.I.T. Press.
- Chomsky, N. (1980). *Rules and representations*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Clark, H. H., & Gerrig, R. J. (1990). Quotations as demonstrations. *Language*, 66(4), 764-805.
- Cohen, A. (1996). Developing the ability to perform speech acts. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 18, 253-267.
- Collins, D.E. (2001). *Reanimated voices*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Coulmas, F. (1985). Direct and indirect speech: General problems and problems of Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 9, 41-63.
- Coulmas, F. (1986). Reported speech: Some general issues. In F. Coulmas (Ed.), *Direct and indirect speech* (pp. 1-28). Berlin, New York, Amsterdam: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Crystal, D. (Ed.). (1997). *The Cambridge encyclopedia of language* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Crystal, D., & Davy, D. (1975). *Advanced conversational English*. London: Longman.

Davies, A. (1991). *The native speaker in applied linguistics*. Edinburgh: University Press.

Davies, C. E. (2004). Developing awareness of crosscultural pragmatics: The case of American/German sociable interaction. *Multilingua*, 23(3), 207-231.

DiDonato, R., Clyde, M. & Vansant, J. (2004). *Deutsch: Na klar!* New York: McGraw Hill.

Diewald, G. (2006). Discourse particles and modal particles as grammatical elements. In K. Fischer, (Ed.), *Approaches to discourse particles*. Studies in pragmatics 1 (pp. 403-425). Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Ehlich, K. (1982). Anaphora and deixis: Same, similar, or different? In R. J. Jarvella & W. Klein (Eds.), *Speech, place and action. Studies in deixis and related topics* (pp. 315-338). Chichester, New York, Brisbane: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

Eisenstein, M., & Bodman, J. (1986). "I very appreciate": Expressions of gratitude by native and nonnative speakers of American English. *Applied Linguistics*, 7, 167-185.

Erman, B. (1987). *Pragmatic expressions in English: A study of you know, you see and I mean in face-to-face conversation*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International.

Ferrara, K., & Bell, B. (1995). Sociolinguistic variation and discourse function of constructed dialogue introducers: The case of *be + like*. *American Speech*, 70(3), 265-290.

Fischer, K. (2006a). Towards an understanding of the spectrum of approaches to discourse particles: Introduction to the volume. In K. Fischer, (Ed.), *Approaches to discourse particles*. Studies in pragmatics 1 (pp. 1-20). Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Fischer, K. (2006b). Frames, constructions, and invariant meanings: The functional polysemy of discourse particles. In K. Fischer, (Ed.), *Approaches to discourse particles*. Studies in pragmatics 1 (pp. 427-448). Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Fleischman, S. (1999). Pragmatic markers in comparative perspective. Paper presented at PRAGMA 99, Tel Aviv, Israel.

Fónagy, I. (1986). Reported speech in French and Hungarian. In F.Coulmas (Ed.), *Direct and indirect speech* (pp. 255-309). Berlin, New York, Amsterdam: Mouton de Gruyter.

Fraser, B. (1990). An approach to discourse markers. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 14, 383-395.

Giles, H., Coupland, J., & Coupland, N. (Eds.) (1991). *Contexts of accommodation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Goffman, E. (1963). *Behavior in public places: Notes on the social organization of gatherings*. New York: Free Press.

Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual: Essays on face-to-face behavior*. New York: Random House.

Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame analysis*. New York: Harper.

Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Golato, A. (2000). An innovative German quotative for reporting on embodied actions: *Und ich so / und er so* 'and I'm like / and he's like'. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 32, 29-54.

Golato, A. (2002a). Grammar and interaction: Reported discourse and subjunctive in German. *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft*, 21(1), 25-56.

- Golato, A. (2002b). Self-quotation in German: Reporting on past decisions. In T. Gldemann (Ed.), *Reported discourse* (pp. 49-70). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Goodwin, C. (1984.) Notes on story structure and the organization of participation. In: J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action. Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 225-246). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Goodwin, C., & Heritage, J. (1990). Conversation analysis. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 19, 283-307.
- Grice, Paul. (1975). Logic and conversation. In: P. Cole & J.L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics* (Vol. 3), (pp. 41-58). New York, San Francisco, London: Academic Press.
- Grieve, A. (2007, March). *The acquisition of pragmatic markers by German study abroad adolescents*. Paper presented at the 17th International Conference on Pragmatics & Language Learning, Honolulu, HI.
- Grosjean, F. (1982). *Life with two languages. An introduction to bilingualism*. Cambridge, London: Harvard University Press.
- Gumperz, J. J. (1982). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Haberland, H. (1986). Reported speech in Danish. In F. Coulmas (Ed.), *Direct and indirect speech* (pp. 219-253). Berlin, New York, Amsterdam: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hacking, J. (2007, March). *Acquiring socio-pragmatic competence in Russian: How input is not enough*. Paper presented at the 17th International Conference on Pragmatics & Language Learning, Honolulu, HI.
- Harmer, J. (1991). *The practice of English language teaching*. London, New York: Longman.
- Haßler, G. (2002). Evidentiality and reported speech in Romance languages. In T. Güldemann & M. von Roncador (Eds.), *Reported discourse* (pp.143-172). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Heath, C. (2002). Demonstrative suffering: The gestural (re)embodiment of symptoms. *Journal of Communication*, 52, 597-616.
- Heller, M. (1988). Strategic ambiguity: code-switching in the management of conflict. In M. Heller (Ed.), *Codeswitching. Anthropological and sociolinguistic perspectives* (pp. 77-96). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Hellermann, J. & Vergun, A. (2007). Language which is not taught: The discourse marker use of beginning adult learners of English. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 39(1), 157-179.

Heritage, J. & Atkinson, M. J. (1984). Introduction. In M. J. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp.1-15). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hickmann, M. (1982). *The development of narrative skills: Pragmatic and metapragmatic aspects of discourse cohesion*. Dissertation. University of Chicago.

Holt, E. (1996). Reporting on talk: The use of direct reported speech in conversation. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 29(3), 219-245.

Hosoda, Y. (2005). Directives and assessments in Japanese native and nonnative conversation. *Japan Association for Language Teaching Journal*, 27, 5-31.

House, J. (1996). Developing pragmatic fluency in English as a foreign language: Routines and metapragmatic awareness. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 18, 225-252.



- Hölker, K. (1991). Französisch: Partikelforschung. (French: Particle research.) In *Lexikon der Romanistischen Linguistik* (Vol. V.1.), (pp. 77-88). Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Huth, T. (2006). Negotiating structure and culture: L2 learners' realization of L2 compliment-response sequences in talk-in-interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 38, 2025-2050.
- Huth, T. (2007a). Pragmatics revisited: Teaching with natural language data. *Die Unterrichtspraxis / Teaching German*, 40, 21-33.
- Huth, T. (2007b, March). *Proficiency and identity: Pragmatic performance in L2 talk*. Paper presented at the 17th International Conference on Pragmatics & Language Learning, Honolulu, HI.
- Huth, T. & Taleghani-Nikazm, C. (2006). How can insights from conversation analysis be directly applied to teaching L2 pragmatics? *Language Teaching Research*, 10(1), 1-27.
- Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics: Selected readings* (pp. 269-293.) Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Janssen, T. A. J. M., & van der Wurff, W. (1996). Introductory remarks on reported speech and thought. In T. A. J. M. Janssen & W. van der Wurff (Eds.), *Reported speech. Forms and functions of the verb* (pp. 1-12). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

John, O. P. (1990). The “big five” factor taxonomy: Dimensions of personality in the natural language and in questionnaires. In L. A. Previn (Ed.), *Handbook of personality theory and research* (pp. 66-100). New York: Guilford Press.

Johnstone, B. (1987). ‘He says...so I said’: Verb tense alternation and narrative depictions of authority in American English. *Linguistics*, 25, 33-52.

Jucker, A. H., & Smith, S. W. (1998). *And people just you know like ‘wow’*. Discourse markers as negotiating strategies. In A. H. Jucker & Y. Ziv (Eds.), *Discourse markers. Descriptions and theory* (pp. 171-201). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Jucker, A. H., & Ziv, Y. (1998). Discourse markers: Introduction. In A. H. Jucker & Y. Ziv (Eds.), *Discourse markers. Descriptions and theory* (pp. 1-12). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

- Kammerzell, F., & Peust, C. (2002). Reported speech in Egyptian: Forms, types and history. In T. Güldemann & M. von Roncador (Eds.), *Reported discourse* (pp.289-322). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Kasper, G. (1982). Teaching-induced aspects of interlanguage discourse. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 4, 99-113.
- Kasper, G. (1989). Interactive procedures in interlanguage discourse. In W. Olesky (Ed.), *Contrastive pragmatics* (pp. 189-229). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Kasper, G. (1996). Introduction: Interlanguage pragmatics in SLA. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 18, 145-148
- Kasper, G. (1997a). "A" stands for acquisition: A response to Firth and Wagner. *Modern Language Journal*, 81(3), 307-312.
- Kasper, G. (1997b). *Can pragmatic competence be taught? (NetWork #6)* [HTML document]. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i, Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center. Retrieved April 16, 2007, from the World Wide Web: <http://www.nflrc.hawaii.edu/NetWorks/NW06/>

- Kasper, G. (1998). Interlanguage pragmatics. In H. Byrnes (Ed.), *Learning foreign and second languages: Perspectives in research and scholarship* (pp. 183-208). New York: Modern Language Association.
- Kasper, G. (2001). Classroom research on interlanguage pragmatics. In K. R. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 33-60). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kasper, G., & Rose, K. R. (2001). Pragmatics in language teaching. In K. R. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 1-9). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kasper, G., & Rose, K. R. (2002). *Pragmatic development in a second language*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Kasper, G., & Schmidt, R. (1996). Developmental issues in interlanguage pragmatics. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 18, 149-169.
- Keckés, I. (1999). Situation-bound utterances from an interlanguage perspective. In J. Verschueren (Ed.), *Pragmatics in 1998. Selected papers from the 6<sup>th</sup> International Pragmatics Conference* (Vol. 2), (pp. 299-309). Antwerp: International Pragmatics Association.

- Kerekes, J. (1992). *Development in nonnative speakers' use and perception of assertiveness and supportiveness in mixed-sex conversations (Occasional Paper No.21)*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i at Manoa, Department of English as a Second Language.
- Kiefer, F. (1986). Some semantic aspects of indirect speech in Hungarian. In F. Coulmas (Ed.), *Direct and indirect speech* (pp. 29-45). Berlin, New York, Amsterdam: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Kinginger, C. & Farrell, K. (2004). Assessing development of meta-pragmatic awareness in study abroad. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 10, 19-42.
- Koike, D. A. (1989). Pragmatic competence and adult L2 acquisition: Speech acts in interlanguage. *Modern Language Journal*, 73, 279-289.
- Koike, D. (1996). Transfer of pragmatic competence and suggestions in Spanish foreign language learning. In S. Gass & J. Neu (Eds.), *Speech acts across cultures* (pp. 257-281.) Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Kroon, C. (1995). *Discourse particles in Latin. A study of nam, enim, autem, vero and at*. Amsterdam: Bieben.

Labov, W. (1972). *Language in the inner city*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Lakoff, R. T. (1984). The pragmatics of subordination. In: C. Brugman & M. Macaulay (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Tenth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* (pp. 481-492). Berkeley.

Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. London and New York: Longman.

Lerner, G. H. (1996). Finding “face” in the preference structures of talk-in-interaction. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 59(4), 303-321.

Levinson, S. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Li, C. N. (1986). Direct and indirect speech: A functional study. In F. Coulmas (Ed.), *Direct and indirect speech* (pp. 29-45). Berlin, New York, Amsterdam: Mouton de Gruyter.

Liddicoat, A. & Crozet, C. (2001). Acquiring French interactional norms through instruction. In K. R. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 125-144). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Lightbown, P., & Spada, N. (1993.) *How languages are learned*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lindqvist, H. (2007, March). *On the role of discourse particles in L2 oral performance*. Paper presented at the 17th International Conference on Pragmatics & Language Learning, Honolulu, HI.
- Lörscher, W. (1986). Conversational structures in the foreign language classroom. In G. Kasper (Ed.), *Learning, teaching and communication in the foreign language classroom* (pp. 11-22.) Aarhus: Aarhus University Press.
- Lynch, A. (2008). The linguistic similarities of Spanish heritage and second language learners. *Foreign Language Annals*, 41(2), 252-281.
- Marriott, H. (1990). Intercultural business negotiations: The problem of norm discrepancy. In A. Pauwels (Ed.), *Cross-cultural communication in the professions in Australia* (pp. 33-65). Melbourne: Applied Linguistics Association of Australia.
- Maschler, Y. (2000). *On the grammaticalization of ke' ilu ('like' lit. 'as if', 'as though') in Israeli Hebrew talk-in-interaction*. 7<sup>th</sup> International Pragmatics Conference (IprA). 9-15 July 2000, Budapest.

- Mathis, T., & Yule, G. (1994). Zero quotatives. *Discourse Processes*, 18, 63-76.
- Mayes, P. (1990). Quotation in spoken English. *Studies in Language*, 14, 325-363.
- McCarthy, M. (1998). *Spoken Language and applied linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Meehan, T. (1991). It's like, 'What's happening in the evolution of *like*?': A theory of grammaticalization. *Kansas Working Papers in Linguistics*, 16, 37-51.
- Milroy, L., & Muysken, P. (1995). Introduction: code-switching and bilingualism research. In L. Milroy & P. Muysken (Eds.), *One speaker, two languages: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching* (pp. 1-14). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Niezgoda, K., & Röver, C. (2001). Pragmatic and grammatical awareness: A function of the learning environment? In K. R. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 63-79). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Norris, J. M. (2001). Use of address terms on the German Speaking Test. In K. R. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 248-282). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.



- Ochs, E. (1996). Linguistic resources for socializing humanity. In J. Gumperz & S. Levinson (Eds.), *Rethinking linguistic relativity* (pp.407-437). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Olshtain, E. & Cohen, A. D. (1989). Speech act behavior across languages. In H. W. Dechert & M. Raupach (Eds.), *Transfer in language production* (pp. 53-67). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Östman, J.O. (1981). *You know: a discourse functional approach*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Pagliuca, W. (Ed.) (1994). *Perspectives on grammaticalization*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Partee, B. H. (1973). The syntax and semantics of quotation. In: S. Anderson & P. Kiparsky (Eds.), *A Festschrift for Morris Halle* (pp. 410-418). New York: Holt.
- Polanyi, L. (1981). Telling the same story twice. *Text*, 1(4), 315-336.
- Polanyi, L. (1982). Linguistic and social constraints on storytelling. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 6 (5/6), 509-524.

- Poplack, S. (1980). Sometimes I'll start a sentence in English Y TERMINO EN ESPAÑOL: Toward a typology of code-switching. *Linguistics*, 18, 581-618.
- Postman, N. (1985). *Amusing ourselves to death: Public discourse in the age of show business*. New York: Viking.
- Ramat, A. G., & Hopper, P. J. (Eds.) (1998). *The limits of grammaticalization*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Richter, G. (1995). On promoting oral competence in second language instruction [German as a Second Language]. *Glottodidactica*, 23, 65-69.
- Rimmer, S.E. (1988). *Sociolinguistic variability in oral narrative*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Aston University, Birmingham.
- Rintell, E. (1984). But how did you feel about that? The learner's perception of emotion in speech. *Applied Linguistics*, 5, 255-264.
- Romaine, S., & Lange, D. (1991). The use of *like* as a marker of reported speech and thought: A case of grammaticalization in progress. *American Speech*, 66(3), 227-279.

- Sabban, A. (1978). Verben der Redeeinleitung im Französischen und im Deutschen.  
(Speech introducing verbs in French and German.) *Zeitschrift für Französische Sprache und Literatur*, 88, 28-63.
- Sacks, H. (1974). An analysis of the course of a joke's telling in conversation. In: R Bauman & J. Sherzer (Eds.), *Explorations in the ethnography of speaking* (pp. 337-353). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sacks, H. (1984). Notes on methodology. In M. J. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp.21-27). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking in conversation. *Language*, 50, 696-735.
- Sakita, T. I. (2002). Discourse perspectives on tense choice in spoken-English reporting discourse. In T. Güldemann & M.von Roncador (Eds.), *Reported discourse* (pp.173-198). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

- Salsbury, T., & Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2000). Opposition talk and the acquisition of modality in L2 English. In B. Swierzbin, F. Morris, M. Anderson, C. Klee, & E. Tarone (Eds.), *Social and cognitive factors in second language acquisition* (pp. 56-76). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.
- Sankoff, G., Thibault, P., Nagy, N., Blondeau, H., Fonollosa, M., & Gagnon, L. (1997). Variation in the use of discourse markers in a language contact situation. *Language Variation and Change*, 9, 191-217.
- Savić, J. M. (1996). *Code-switching: Theoretical and methodological issues*. Beograd: Belgrade University.
- Scarcella, R. (1979). On speaking politely in a second language. In C. Yorio, K. Perkins, & J. Schachter (Eds.), *On TESOL '79: The learner in focus* (pp.274-287). Washington, DC: TESOL.
- Scarcella, R., & Brunak, J. (1981). On speaking politely in a second language. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 27, 59-75.
- Schegloff, E. (1981). Discourse as an interactional achievement: Some uses of 'uh huh' and other things that come between sentences. *Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics* (pp. 71-93).

- Schegloff, E., Ochs, E., & Thompson, S. (1996). Introduction. In: E. Schegloff, E. Ochs, & S. Thompson (Eds.), *Interaction and grammar* (pp. 1-51). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schiffrin, D. (1981). Tense Variation in Narrative. *Language*, 57(1), 45-62.
- Schiffrin, D. (1986). Functions of *and* in discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 10, 41-66.
- Schiffrin, D. (1987). *Discourse markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schiffrin, D. (2001). Discourse markers: Language, meaning, and context. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, & H. E. Hamilton (Eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 54-75). Malden, Mass.: Blackwell.
- Schiffrin, D. (2006). Discourse marker research and theory: Revisiting *and*. In K. Fischer, (Ed.), *Approaches to discourse particles*. Studies in pragmatics 1 (pp. 315-338). Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Schourup, L. (1982). Quoting with *go 'say'*. *American Speech*, 57, 147-48.
- Schourup, L. C. (1983). Common discourse particles in English conversation. *Working Papers in Linguistics*, 28, 1-119.

- Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts. An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sebba, M., & Wootton, T. (1998). We, they and identity. Sequential versus identity-related explanation in code-switching. In P. Auer (Ed.), *Code-switching in conversation. Language, interaction and identity* (pp. 262-286). London, New York: Routledge.
- Seedhouse, P. (2004). *The interactional architecture of the language classroom: a conversation analysis perspective*. Maldon, MA: Blackwell.
- Sidnell, J. (2006). Coordinating gesture, talk, and gaze in reenactments. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 39(4), 377-409.
- Simonyi, Zs. (1881-1883). *A magyar kötőszók, egyúttal az összetett mondat elmélete.* (*The theory of Hungarian conjunctions and complex sentences.*) (Vol. 1-2). Budapest: Akadémiai kiadó.
- Specker, E. (2008). The use of bilingual discourse markers: Identity in mediated learning. *Arizona Working Papers in Second Language Acquisition and Teaching*, 15, 97-120.

- Stenström, A. B., & Andersen, G. (1996). A corpus-based investigation of the discourse items *cos* and *innit*. In C. E. Percy, C. F. Meyer, & I. Lancashire (Eds.), *Studies in synchronic corpus linguistics* (pp. 189-203). Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Streeck, J. (1994.) Leichte Muse im Gespräch. Über die Unterhaltungskunst älterer Frauen in der Filsbachwelt. (Light muse in talk. On the conversation art of elderly women in Filsbach.) In W. Kallmeyer (Ed.), *Exemplarische Analysen des Sprachverhaltens in Mannheim (Exemplary analyses of language behavior in Mannheim)* (pp. 578-610). Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Streeck, J. (2002). Grammars, words, and embodied meanings: On the uses and evolution of “so” and “like.” *Journal of Communication*, 52, 581-596.
- Swain, M. & Lapkin, S. (1998). Interaction and second language learning: Two adolescent French immersion students working together. *The Modern Language Journal*, 82, 320-337.
- Takahashi, S. (1996). Pragmatic transferability. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 18, 189- 223.
- Takahashi, S. (2001). The role of input enhancement in developing pragmatic competence. In K. R. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 171-199). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Takahashi, T., & Beebe, L. (1987). The development of pragmatic competence by Japanese learners of English. *Japan Association for Language Teaching Journal*, 8, 131-155.
- Tannen, D. (1983). "I take out the rock – dok!": How Greek women tell about being molested (and create involvement). *Anthropological Linguistics*, 25(3), 359-374.
- Tannen, D. (1986). Introducing constructed dialogue in Greek and American conversational and literary narrative. In F. Coulmas (Ed.), *Direct and indirect speech* (pp. 311-332). Berlin, New York, Amsterdam: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Tateyama, Y. (2001). Explicit and implicit teaching of pragmatic routines. Japanese *sumimasen*. In K. R. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 200-222). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Thornborrow, J. (1991). Language in use: Teaching cross-cultural competence. *Franco-British Studies*, 11, 83-92.
- Traugott, E.C., & Heine, B. (1991). Introduction. In E. C. Traugott & B. Heine (Eds.), *Approaches to grammaticalization* (Vol. II) (pp. 1-13). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.



- Traugott, E.C., & Hopper, P.J. (2003). *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Trosborg, A. (1987). Apology strategies in natives/non-natives. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *11*, 147-167.
- Tschirner, E. (1999). Vocabulary vs. grammar in beginning language instruction: An easy choice. In G. F. Carr, W. Harbert, & L. Zhang (Eds.), *Interdigitations: Essays for Irmengard Rauch* (pp. 379-389). New York: Peter Lang.
- Underhill, R. (1988). *Like is, like, focus*. *American Speech*, *63*, 234-46.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1979). Pragmatic connectives. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *3*, 447-456.
- Viorel, E. (1985). Der Modusgebrauch in der indirekten Rede. (Mood usage in indirect speech.) In A. Schöne (Ed.), *Kontroversen, alte und neue: Akten des Internationalen Germanisten-Kongresses* (Vol.4), (pp. 60-63). Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Vlatten, A. (1997). *Quotatives, reported speech, and constructed dialogue in everyday German conversation: A conversation analytic perspective*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Texas, Austin.

- Vološinov, V. N. (1930). *Marxism and the philosophy of language* (L. Matejka & I.R. Titunik, Trans.). New York and London: Seminar Press, 1973.
- Vyatkina, N. & Belz, J. (2006). A learner corpus-driven intervention for the development of L2 pragmatic competence. In K. Bardovi-Harlig, C. Félix-Brasdefer, & A. S. Omar (Eds.), *Pragmatics and language learning, 11* (pp. 315-357). University of Hawai'i at Manoa, National Foreign Language Resource Center.
- Weydt, H. (2006). What are particles good for? In K. Fischer, (Ed.), *Approaches to discourse particles*. Studies in pragmatics 1 (pp. 205-218). Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Wierzbicka, A. (1974). The semantics of direct and indirect discourse. *Papers in Linguistics, 7*, 267-307.
- Wildner-Bassett, M. (1994). Intercultural pragmatics and proficiency: 'Polite' noises for cultural appropriateness. *International Review of Applied Linguistics, 32*, 3-17.
- Wolfson, N. (1978). A feature of performed narrative: The conversational historical present. *Language in Society, 7*, 215-237.
- Wong, J. (2000). Delayed next turn repair initiation in native / non-native speaker English conversation. *Applied Linguistics, 21*, 244-267.

Wooffitt, R. C. (1992). *Telling tales of the unexpected: the organization of factual discourse*. Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Yoshimi, D. R. (2001). Explicit instruction and JFL learners' use of interactional discourse markers. In K. R. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 223-244). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Young, R. (2004). Series editor's foreword. In P. Seedhouse, *The interactional architecture of the language classroom: a conversation analysis perspective*. Maldon, MA: Blackwell.

## APPENDICES

### Appendix 1: ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines

Source: <http://www.actfl.org/files/public/Guidelinespeak.pdf>

#### ACTFL PROFICIENCY GUIDELINES SPEAKING

Revised 1999

The *ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines C Speaking* (1986) have gained widespread application as a metric against which to measure learners' functional competency; that is, their ability to accomplish linguistic tasks representing a variety of levels. Based on years of experience with oral testing in governmental institutions and on the descriptions of language proficiency used by Interagency Language Roundtable (ILR), the *ACTFL Guidelines* were an adaptation intended for use in academia (college and university levels particularly) in the United States. For this reason, the authors of the *Provisional Guidelines* (1982) conflated the top levels (ILR 3-5), expanded the descriptions of the lower levels (ILR 0-1), and defined sublevels of competency according to the experience of language instructors and researchers accustomed to beginning learners. Their efforts were further modified and refined in the *ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines* published in 1986. After additional years of oral testing and of interpretation of the *Guidelines*, as well as numerous research projects, scholarly articles, and debates, the time has come to reevaluate and refine the *Guidelines*, initially those for Speaking, followed by those for the other skills. The purposes of this revision of the *Proficiency*

*Guidelines C Speaking* are to make the document more accessible to those who have not received recent training in ACTFL oral proficiency testing, to clarify the issues that have divided testers and teachers, and to provide a corrective to what the committee perceived to have been possible misinterpretations of the descriptions provided in earlier versions of the *Guidelines*.

An important example is the treatment of the Superior level. The ILR descriptions postulate a spectrum of proficiency abilities from 0 which signifies no functional competence, to 5 which is competence equivalent to that of a well-educated native speaker. Due to the language levels most often attained by adult learners, the *ACTFL Guidelines* do not include descriptions of the highest ILR levels. The ACTFL Superior level, roughly equivalent to the ILR 3 range, is thus to be seen as a baseline level; that is, it describes a particular set of functional abilities essential to that level, but not necessarily the whole range of linguistic activities that an educated speaker with years of experience in the target language and culture might attain. Keeping this distinction in mind reduces the tendency to expect the Superior speaker to demonstrate abilities defined at higher ILR levels.

For this reason, among others, the committee has broken with tradition by presenting this version of the *Speaking Guidelines C* in descending rather than ascending order. This top-down approach has two advantages. First, it emphasizes that the High levels are more closely related to the level above than to the one below, and represents a considerable step towards accomplishing the functions at the level above, not just excellence in the functions of the level itself. Second, it allows for fewer negatives and

less redundancy in the descriptions when they refer, as they must, to the inability of a speaker to function consistently at a higher level.

Another significant change to the 1986 version of the *Guidelines* is found in the division of the Advanced level into the High, Mid, and Low sublevels. This decision reflects the growing need in both the academic and commercial communities to more finely delineate a speaker's progress through the Advanced level of proficiency. The new descriptors for Advanced Mid and Advanced Low are based on hundreds of Advanced-level language samples from OPI testing across a variety of languages. The committee has also taken a slightly different approach to the presentation of these *Guidelines* from previous versions. The full prose descriptions of each level (and, when applicable, its sub-levels) are preceded by clearly delineated thumb-nail sketches that are intended to alert the reader to the major features of the levels and to serve as a quick reference, but not in any way to replace the full picture presented in the descriptions themselves. Indeed, at the lower levels they refer to the Mid rather than to the baseline proficiency, since they would otherwise describe a very limited profile and misrepresent the general expectations for the level. This revision of the *ACTFL Proficiency GuidelinesCSpeaking* is presented as an additional step toward more adequately describing speaking proficiency. Whereas this effort reflects a broad spectrum of experience in characterizing speaker abilities and includes a wide range of insights as a result of on-going discussions and research within the language teaching profession, the revision committee is aware that there remain a number of issues requiring further clarification and specification. It is the hope of the committee that this revision will enhance the *Guidelines*'s utility to the language teaching and testing community in the years to come.

## **SUPERIOR**

Speakers at the Superior level are able to communicate in the language with accuracy and fluency in order to participate fully and effectively in conversations on a variety of topics in formal and informal settings from both concrete and abstract perspectives. They discuss their interests and special fields of competence, explain complex matters in detail, and provide lengthy and coherent narrations, all with ease, fluency, and accuracy. They explain their opinions on a number of topics of importance to them, such as social and political issues, and provide structured argument to support their opinions. They are able to construct and develop hypotheses to explore alternative possibilities. When appropriate, they use extended discourse without unnaturally lengthy hesitation to make their point, even when engaged in abstract elaborations. Such discourse, while coherent, may still be influenced by the Superior speakers own language patterns, rather than those of the target language. Superior speakers command a variety of interactive and discourse strategies, such as turn-taking and separating main ideas from supporting information through the use of syntactic and lexical devices, as well as intonational features such as pitch, stress and tone. They demonstrate virtually no pattern of error in the use of basic structures. However, they may make sporadic errors, particularly in low-frequency structures and in some complex high-frequency structures more common to formal speech and writing. Such errors, if they do occur, do not distract the native interlocutor or interfere with communication.

**ADVANCED HIGH**

Speakers at the Advanced-High level perform all Advanced-level tasks with linguistic ease, confidence and competence. They are able to consistently explain in detail and narrate fully and accurately in all time frames. In addition, Advanced-High speakers handle the tasks pertaining to the Superior level but cannot sustain performance at that level across a variety of topics. They can provide a structured argument to support their opinions, and they may construct hypotheses, but patterns of error appear. They can discuss some topics abstractly, especially those relating to their particular interests and special fields of expertise, but in general, they are more comfortable discussing a variety of topics concretely. Advanced-High speakers may demonstrate a well-developed ability to compensate for an imperfect grasp of some forms or for limitations in vocabulary by the confident use of communicative strategies, such as paraphrasing, circumlocution, and illustration. They use precise vocabulary and intonation to express meaning and often show great fluency and ease of speech. However, when called on to perform the complex tasks associated with the Superior level over a variety of topics, their language will at times break down or prove inadequate, or they may avoid the task altogether, for example, by resorting to simplification through the use of description or narration in place of argument or hypothesis.



## **ADVANCED MID**

Speakers at the Advanced-Mid level are able to handle with ease and confidence a large number of communicative tasks. They participate actively in most informal and some formal exchanges on a variety of concrete topics relating to work, school, home, and leisure activities, as well as to events of current, public, and personal interest or individual relevance.

Advanced-Mid speakers demonstrate the ability to narrate and describe in all major time frames (past, present, and future) by providing a full account, with good control of aspect, as they adapt flexibly to the demands of the conversation. Narration and description tend to be combined and interwoven to relate relevant and supporting facts in connected, paragraph-length discourse. Advanced-Mid speakers can handle successfully and with relative ease the linguistic challenges presented by a complication or unexpected turn of events that occurs within the context of a routine situation or communicative task with which they are otherwise familiar. Communicative strategies such as circumlocution or rephrasing are often employed for this purpose. The speech of Advanced-Mid speakers performing Advanced-level tasks is marked by substantial flow. Their vocabulary is fairly extensive although primarily generic in nature, except in the case of a particular area of specialization or interest. Dominant language discourse structures tend to recede, although discourse may still reflect the oral paragraph structure of their own language rather than that of the target language. Advanced-Mid speakers contribute to conversations on a variety of familiar topics, dealt with concretely, with much accuracy, clarity and precision, and they convey their intended message without misrepresentation

or confusion. They are readily understood by native speakers unaccustomed to dealing with non-natives. When called on to perform functions or handle topics associated with the Superior level, the quality and/or quantity of their speech will generally decline.

Advanced-Mid speakers are often able to state an opinion or cite conditions; however, they lack the ability to consistently provide a structured argument in extended discourse.

Advanced-Mid speakers may use a number of delaying strategies, resort to narration, description, explanation or anecdote, or simply attempt to avoid the linguistic demands of Superior-level tasks.

### **ADVANCED LOW**

Speakers at the Advanced-Low level are able to handle a variety of communicative tasks, although somewhat haltingly at times. They participate actively in most informal and a limited number of formal conversations on activities related to school, home, and leisure activities and, to a lesser degree, those related to events of work, current, public, and personal interest or individual relevance. Advanced-Low speakers demonstrate the ability to narrate and describe in all major time frames (past, present and future) in paragraph length discourse, but control of aspect may be lacking at times. They can handle appropriately the linguistic challenges presented by a complication or unexpected turn of events that occurs within the context of a routine situation or communicative task with which they are otherwise familiar, though at times their discourse may be minimal for the level and strained. Communicative strategies such as rephrasing and circumlocution may be employed in such instances. In their narrations

and descriptions, they combine and link sentences into connected discourse of paragraph length. When pressed for a fuller account, they tend to grope and rely on minimal discourse. Their utterances are typically not longer than a single paragraph. Structure of the dominant language is still evident in the use of false cognates, literal translations, or the oral paragraph structure of the speaker's own language rather than that of the target language. While the language of Advanced-Low speakers may be marked by substantial, albeit irregular flow, it is typically somewhat strained and tentative, with noticeable self-correction and a certain >grammatical roughness.= The vocabulary of Advanced-Low speakers is primarily generic in nature. Advanced-Low speakers contribute to the conversation with sufficient accuracy, clarity, and precision to convey their intended message without misrepresentation or confusion, and it can be understood by native speakers unaccustomed to dealing with non-natives, even though this may be achieved through repetition and restatement. When attempting to perform functions or handle topics associated with the Superior level, the linguistic quality and quantity of their speech will deteriorate significantly.

### **INTERMEDIATE HIGH**

Intermediate-High speakers are able to converse with ease and confidence when dealing with most routine tasks and social situations of the Intermediate level. They are able to handle successfully many uncomplicated tasks and social situations requiring an exchange of basic information related to work, school, recreation, particular interests and areas of competence, though hesitation and errors may be evident. Intermediate-High

speakers handle the tasks pertaining to the Advanced level, but they are unable to sustain performance at that level over a variety of topics. With some consistency, speakers at the Intermediate High level narrate and describe in major time frames using connected discourse of paragraph length. However, their performance of these Advanced-level tasks will exhibit one or more features of breakdown, such as the failure to maintain the narration or description semantically or syntactically in the appropriate major time frame, the disintegration of connected discourse, the misuse of cohesive devices, a reduction in breadth and appropriateness of vocabulary, the failure to successfully circumlocute, or a significant amount of hesitation. Intermediate-High speakers can generally be understood by native speakers unaccustomed to dealing with non-natives, although the dominant language is still evident (e.g. use of code-switching, false cognates, literal translations, etc.), and gaps in communication may occur.

### **INTERMEDIATE MID**

Speakers at the Intermediate-Mid level are able to handle successfully a variety of uncomplicated communicative tasks in straightforward social situations. Conversation is generally limited to those predictable and concrete exchanges necessary for survival in the target culture; these include personal information covering self, family, home, daily activities, interests and personal preferences, as well as physical and social needs, such as food, shopping, travel and lodging.

Intermediate-Mid speakers tend to function reactively, for example, by responding to direct questions or requests for information. However, they are capable of

asking a variety of questions when necessary to obtain simple information to satisfy basic needs, such as directions, prices and services. When called on to perform functions or handle topics at the Advanced level, they provide some information but have difficulty linking ideas, manipulating time and aspect, and using communicative strategies, such as circumlocution. Intermediate-Mid speakers are able to express personal meaning by creating with the language, in part by combining and recombining known elements and conversational input to make utterances of sentence length and some strings of sentences. Their speech may contain pauses, reformulations and self-corrections as they search for adequate vocabulary and appropriate language forms to express themselves. Because of inaccuracies in their vocabulary and/or pronunciation and/or grammar and/or syntax, misunderstandings can occur, but Intermediate-Mid speakers are generally understood by sympathetic interlocutors accustomed to dealing with non-natives.

### **INTERMEDIATE LOW**

Speakers at the Intermediate-Low level are able to handle successfully a limited number of uncomplicated communicative tasks by creating with the language in straightforward social situations. Conversation is restricted to some of the concrete exchanges and predictable topics necessary for survival in the target language culture. These topics relate to basic personal information covering, for example, self and family, some daily activities and personal preferences, as well as to some immediate needs, such as ordering food and making simple purchases. At the Intermediate-Low level, speakers are primarily reactive and struggle to answer direct questions or requests for information,

but they are also able to ask a few appropriate questions. Intermediate-Low speakers express personal meaning by combining and recombining into short statements what they know and what they hear from their interlocutors. Their utterances are often filled with hesitancy and inaccuracies as they search for appropriate linguistic forms and vocabulary while attempting to give form to the message. Their speech is characterized by frequent pauses, ineffective reformulations and self-corrections. Their pronunciation, vocabulary and syntax are strongly influenced by their first language but, in spite of frequent misunderstandings that require repetition or rephrasing, Intermediate-Low speakers can generally be understood by sympathetic interlocutors, particularly by those accustomed to dealing with non-natives.

### **NOVICE HIGH**

Speakers at the Novice-High level are able to handle a variety of tasks pertaining to the Intermediate level, but are unable to sustain performance at that level. They are able to manage successfully a number of uncomplicated communicative tasks in straightforward social situations. Conversation is restricted to a few of the predictable topics necessary for survival in the target language culture, such as basic personal information, basic objects and a limited number of activities, preferences and immediate needs. Novice-High speakers respond to simple, direct questions or requests for information; they are able to ask only a very few formulaic questions when asked to do so.

Novice-High speakers are able to express personal meaning by relying heavily on learned phrases or recombinations of these and what they hear from their interlocutor. Their utterances, which consist mostly of short and sometimes incomplete sentences in the present, may be hesitant or inaccurate. On the other hand, since these utterances are frequently only expansions of learned material and stock phrases, they may sometimes appear surprisingly fluent and accurate. These speakers' first language may strongly influence their pronunciation, as well as their vocabulary and syntax when they attempt to personalize their utterances. Frequent misunderstandings may arise but, with repetition or rephrasing, Novice-High speakers can generally be understood by sympathetic interlocutors used to non-natives. When called on to handle simply a variety of topics and perform functions pertaining to the Intermediate level, a Novice- High speaker can sometimes respond in intelligible sentences, but will not be able to sustain sentence level discourse.

## **NOVICE MID**

Speakers at the Novice-Mid level communicate minimally and with difficulty by using a number of isolated words and memorized phrases limited by the particular context in which the language has been learned. When responding to direct questions, they may utter only two or three words at a time or an occasional stock answer. They pause frequently as they search for simple vocabulary or attempt to recycle their own and their interlocutor=s words. Because of hesitations, lack of vocabulary, inaccuracy, or failure to respond appropriately, Novice-Mid speakers may be understood with great

difficulty even by sympathetic interlocutors accustomed to dealing with non-natives.

When called on to handle topics by performing functions associated with the Intermediate level, they frequently resort to repetition, words from their native language, or silence.

## **NOVICE LOW**

Speakers at the Novice-Low level have no real functional ability and, because of their pronunciation, they may be unintelligible. Given adequate time and familiar cues, they may be able to exchange greetings, give their identity, and name a number of familiar objects from their immediate environment. They are unable to perform functions or handle topics pertaining to the Intermediate level, and cannot therefore participate in a true conversational exchange.



## Appendix 2: Information on the participants of the study

Note: All names are pseudonyms.

Name	Level	Age group	Nr. of years studying German / degree	Time spent in German-speaking country
Mandy	intermediate	20-25	2	none
Mitch	intermediate	20-25	2	none
Tony	intermediate	20-25	2	none
Paul	intermediate	20-25	2	none
David	advanced-low	20-25	4	less than a month
Henry	advanced-low	20-25	4	less than a month
Adrienne	advanced-low	25-30	2	none
Jeff	advanced-low	20-25	4	less than a month
Andy	advanced-low	25-30	2	less than a month
Peter	advanced-low	20-25	4	several short trips as visitor
Cassi	advanced-mid	20-25	3	10 months
Angie	advanced-mid	20-25	3	10 months
Helena	superior	25-30	M.A.	several shorter trips
Anita	superior	25-30	M.A.	several shorter trips
Anna	superior	25-30	B.A.	several shorter trips
James	superior	35-40	M.A.	10 months
Erika	superior	20-25	15	several shorter trips
Ned	superior	40-45	M.A.	several shorter trips
Laura	superior	40-45	M.A.	shorter study trips; accompanying students on shorter exchange programs (2-3 weeks)
Betti	superior	25-30	M.A.	several shorter trips
Adél	superior	25-30	M.A.	10 months
Csaba	superior	30-35	M.A.	several shorter trips

### Appendix 3: Transcription conventions

The following transcription conventions, used in the transcriptions in this dissertation, are based on the transcript notation developed by Gail Jefferson and published in Atkinson, J.M., & Heritage, J. (Eds.) (1984). Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis (pp.ix-xvi). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[	indicate utterances by two speakers in overlap; the brackets are placed at the point where the overlap begins
=	indicates no pause between two adjacent utterances; the second one is latched immediately to the first
(.)	micropause
(-)	short pauses (less than 0.4 seconds)
(0.6)	pause measured in tenths of a second
:::	indicates the extension of the sound or syllable it follows
-	an utterance abruptly cut off
.	indicates falling intonation (not necessarily the end of a sentence)
,	continuing intonation
?	rising intonation (not necessarily a question)
!	animated tone (not necessarily an exclamation)
↑↓	rising and falling shifts in intonation, marked immediately before the rise or fall
<u>ja</u>	indicates emphasis
beTONT	louder voice
◦	quieter voice
hhh	audible aspiration
hahaha	laughter
( )	unintelligible
(groß)	transcriptionist doubt

((coughs)) description of events in speech situation

(...) indicates that the speaker continues talking, but the rest of the turn is not relevant

*Anna moves hands up and down* description of body position and actions

Anna: | \_\_\_\_\_ |  
 •ach mein englisch ist schlecht mein englisch

## Appendix 4: Native speakers' evaluation sheet

Lesen Sie bitte die folgenden Äußerungen durch und entscheiden Sie, ob sie wohl von einem Muttersprachler oder eher von einem (fortgeschrittenen) Nichtmuttersprachler formuliert worden sind, oder ob es „sowohl-als auch“ sein kann. Schreiben Sie bitte dementsprechend eine Nummer von 1 bis 3 nach den Äußerungen. Wenn Sie auf irgendetwas stoßen, was Ihnen seltsam vorkommt, schreiben Sie bitte kurz hin, warum Sie es ungewöhnlich finden.

Tausend Dank!

Viki

**1) - eher Muttersprachler**

**2) – eher Nichtmuttersprachler**

**3) - könnte sowohl Muttersprachler als auch Nichtmuttersprachler sein**

- 1) Mein Vater sagte, Studieren ist meine Arbeit.
- 2) Und dann meint sie, „ich komme vielleicht nicht zurück“, und ich so, wie bitte?!
- 3) Mein Vater hat immer gesagt so, oh, sie gucken, also wohin du deinen Geldbeutel steckst und dann werden sie ihn dir klauen.
- 4) Wir haben immer gesagt, du musst deine Gitarre mitbringen und singen! Und er war, nein, ich kann nicht singen!
- 5) Und ich habe ihn gebeten, bitte übergebe diese Karte deinem Bruder.
- 6) Mehrere Leute meinen, es sei ein Irrtum.
- 7) Er hat mir gestern erzählt, dass er so in der Innenstadt von wegen ja wenn er wollte, könnte er da locker eine Wohnung finden.
- 8) Aber er sagt, andere sind dumm und hässlich und können nicht tanzen und singen. Und alle Leute sind ah ja, er hat Recht!
- 9) Ich habe mit ihr gesprochen und deklariert, dass ich sehr seriös bin, ich bleibe da.
- 10) Er meinte, es hätten vier Leute Interesse gezeigt.
- 11) So, so, genau, und dann Toni, ich bin im deutschen department!
- 12) Und da sagt der Student, hallo, na, wie geht's? Und sie, gut, wie geht's dir?
- 13) Ich hab ihm dabei geholfen. Der fragt mich immer, er hat zwei Themen, und dann, „hast du ein drittes Thema?“

14) Ich weiß, du hast eine andere Interpretation geschrieben. Also ich eigentlich, ääääh... aber es war gut. OK, gut, logisch aufgebaut, OK.

15) Zum Beispiel Sturm und Drang hab ich nicht so sehr ähm ähm, am Ende war ich schon, oh mein Gott, lass mich.

16) Und da kam ein Junge zu mir und und meint zu mir auf Deutsch, na, wie geht's denn.

17) Aber da hat Hans gemeint, das ist soo wie Goethe.

### Appendix 5: Native speakers' evaluations of reported utterances

Utterance nr.	Nr. of NSs who evaluated it as "rather native speaker"	Nr. of NSs who evaluated it as "rather non-native speaker"	Nr. of NSs who evaluated it as "could be both"	Nr. of NSs who were undecided	Actual speaker of the utterance
1	2	5	4	1	intermediate NNS
2	9	0	3	0	NS
3	0	11	1	0	advanced NNS
4	1	8	2	1	advanced NNS
5	2	5	5	0	superior NNS
6	8	0	4	0	NS
7	7	3	1	1	NS
8	3	6	1	2	advanced NNS
9	1	9	2	0	superior NNS
10	5	0	7	0	NS
11	3	6	1	2	superior NNS
12	6	1	5	0	superior NNS
13	2	6	4	0	superior NNS
14	7	1	4	0	superior NNS
15	5	3	4	0	superior NNS
16	6	4	2	0	superior NNS
17	4	1	7	0	superior NNS

**Legend:**

NS – native speaker

NNS – non-native speaker

## Appendix 6: Information sheet and approval forms provided for the study by the Human Subjects Committee Lawrence Campus (HSCL)

**Approved by the Human Subjects Committee University of Kansas, Lawrence Campus (HSCL). Approval expires one year from 9/7/2005.**

### Information Statement

The Department of Germanic Languages and Literatures at the University of Kansas supports the practice of protection for human subjects participating in research. The following information is provided for you to decide whether you wish to participate in the present study. You should be aware that even if you agree to participate, you are free to withdraw at any time without penalty.

We are conducting this study to better understand how non-native speakers of German use the German language in everyday conversations. This will entail your participation in spontaneous everyday conversations in German which will be audio-recorded and / or video-taped. The duration of each conversation is determined by the participants, but should preferably last for at least thirty minutes.

The recording of the conversations should cause no discomfort to you. Although participation may not benefit you directly, we believe that the information obtained from this study will help us gain a better understanding of the use of conversational German by non-native speakers. Your participation is solicited, although strictly voluntary. Your name will not be associated in any way with the research findings. If you would like additional information concerning this study before or after it is completed, please feel free to contact us by phone or mail.

Participating in a recorded conversation indicates your willingness to take part in this project and that you are over the age of eighteen. If you have any additional questions about your rights as a research participant, you may call (785) 864-7429 or write the Human Subjects Committee Lawrence Campus (HSCL), University of Kansas, 2385 Irving Hill Road, Lawrence, Kansas 66045-7563, email dhann@ku.edu.

Sincerely,

Viktória Bagi  
Principal Investigator  
Department of Germanic Languages  
and Literatures  
Wescoe Hall  
University of Kansas  
Lawrence, KS 66045  
(785) 864-9180  
bagiv@ku.edu

Carmen Taleghani-Nikazm Ph.D.  
Faculty Supervisor  
Department of Germanic Languages  
and Literatures  
Wescoe Hall  
University of Kansas  
Lawrence, KS 66045  
(785) 864-9174  
nikazm@ku.edu

# The University of Kansas

Office of the Vice Provost for Research  
Contract Negotiations and Research Compliance

9/7/2005  
HSCL #15419

Viktoria Bagi  
Germanic Languages & Literatures  
2097 Wescoe

The Human Subjects Committee Lawrence Campus (HSCL) has reviewed your research project application

15419 Bagi/Taleghani-Nikazm (GERMANIC LANG & LIT) Techniques of Reported Speech in Non-native Speakers' German Language Use

and approved this project under the expedited procedure provided in section III.E.3.(c) of KU's Assurance Policies, 45 CFR 46.110 (f) (7) Research on individual or group characteristics or behavior (including, but not limited to, research on perception, cognition, motivation, identity, language, communication, cultural beliefs or practices, and social behavior) or research employing survey, interview, oral history, focus group, program evaluation, human factors evaluation, or quality assurance methodologies. As described, the project complies with all the requirements and policies established by the University for protection of human subjects in research. Unless renewed, approval lapses one year after approval date.

Since your research presents no risk to participants and involves no procedures for which written consent is normally required outside of the research context HSCL may waive the requirement for a signed consent form (45 CFR 46.117 (c) (2)). Your information statement meets HSCL requirements. The Office for Human Research Protections requires that your information statement must include the note of HSCL approval and expiration date, which has been entered on the form sent back to you with this approval.

1. At designated intervals until the project is completed, a Project Status Report must be returned to the HSCL office.
2. Any significant change in the experimental procedure as described should be reviewed by this Committee prior to altering the project.
3. Notify HSCL about any new investigators not named in original application. Note that new investigators must take the online tutorial at <http://www.research.ku.edu/tutor/hsp/index.shtml>.
4. Any injury to a subject because of the research procedure must be reported to the Committee immediately.
5. When signed consent documents are required, the primary investigator must retain the signed consent documents for at least three years past completion of the research activity. If you use a signed consent form, provide a copy of the consent form to subjects at the time of consent.
6. If this is a funded project, keep a copy of this approval letter with your proposal/grant file.

Please inform HSCL when this project is terminated. You must also provide HSCL with an annual status report to maintain HSCL approval. Unless renewed, approval lapses one year after approval date. If your project receives funding which requests an annual update approval, you must request this from HSCL one month prior to the annual update. Thanks for your cooperation. If you have any questions, please contact me.

Sincerely,

David Hann  
Coordinator  
Human Subjects Committee - Lawrence

cc: Carmen Taleghani-Nikazm





10/29/2009  
HSCL #15419

Viktoria Bagi  
Germanic Languages & Literatures  
2097 Wescoe

The Human Subjects Committee Lawrence reviewed your research update application for project

15419 Bagi/Taleghani-Nikazm (GERMANIC LANG & LIT) Techniques of Reported Speech in Non-native Speakers' German Language Use

and approved it through an expedited review process according to 45 CFR 46.110 (b)(2) minor changes (or no changes) in a previously approved project. Your project has continued approval to 9/7/2010. Approximately one month prior to 9/7/2010, HSCL will send you a Status Report request, which will be necessary for you to complete in order to obtain continued approval for the next twelve months. Please note that you must stop data gathering if you do not receive continued HSCL approval. Notify HSCL of any changes you wish to make during this approval period.

Please use the HSCL "approval stamp" on your consent forms. Just cut and paste. You may resize and reshape the text to fit your documents.

**Approved by the Human Subjects Committee Lawrence (HSCL)  
on 8/25/2009. Approval expires one year from 9/7/2009.  
HSCL#15419**

If you complete your project before the renewal date, please notify HSCL. Thank you for providing us with this update information.

Sincerely,

Mary Denning  
HSCL Coordinator  
University of Kansas