

1. Urban Voices – Linguistic and communicative diversity in face to face-interaction of Russian-speaking interlocutors in Sankt Petersburg and German cities

Stimmen der Stadt – Sprachliche und kommunikative Vielfalt in *face to face*-Interaktion russischsprachiger SprecherInnen in Sankt Petersburg und deutschen Städten

Applicant

Dr. Nadine Thielemann (as coordinator)

[...]

Research area and field of work (Fach- und Arbeitsrichtung)

Slavic Linguistics (sociolinguistics, pragmatics, linguistic analysis of talk-in-interaction)

Anticipated total duration (Voraussichtliche Gesamtdauer): 36 months

[...]

Summary (Zusammenfassung)

Face-to-face-interaction in the urban space is characterized by a wide spectrum of differentiation. Communicative situation, composition of the group and social as well as ethnic background of the speakers varies. All these aspects involve processes and mechanisms of accommodation and separation or *othering*. The network aims at analyzing how various linguistic, paralinguistic and pragmatic means relate to sociolinguistic dimensions and how they convey social meaning (e.g. display the social, ethnic, local identity of a speaker, the institutional character of a communicative situation etc.). The members of the network focus on different aspects and choose different methods (qualitative as well as quantitative). The design of the network is essentially based on methodological triangulation and assesses the benefits as well as the challenges in applying and combining different analytic approaches. The overall nexus is established by the work with spoken language, including the collection of data reflecting linguistic and communicative diversity of urban speakers of Russian in Russia and abroad. Long-lasting recordings of a speaker's communicative day of the kind provided by the *One day of Speech*-corpus (ORD, Sankt Petersburg) are a source which is able to reflect this linguistic and communicative diversity.

Sprachliche Interaktion im städtischen Raum zeichnet sich durch ein großes Variationspektrum aus. Die kommunikative Situation variiert, aber auch die Gruppenzusammensetzung sowie die lokale, soziale und ethnische Identität der Sprecher_innen, was verbunden ist mit verschiedenen Mechanismen der Anpassung und Abgrenzung. Ziel des Netzwerkes ist es, den funktionalen Zusammenhang verschiedenartiger sprachlicher, para-sprachlicher und pragmatischer Ausdrucksmittel mit soziolinguistischen Dimensionen zu untersuchen und zu analysieren, wie diese soziale Bedeutung (z.B. soziale, ethnische oder lokale Identität, den institutionellen Charakter einer kommunikativen Situation etc.) anzeigen.

Die Mitglieder des Netzwerks setzen dabei jeweils unterschiedliche Akzente hinsichtlich der untersuchten Aspekte und des Datenmaterials und wenden auch unterschiedliche (sowohl qualitative als auch quantitative) Methoden an. Das Netzwerk beruht in seiner Anlage im Wesentlichen auf methodischer Triangulation, wobei Nutzen und Herausforderungen hinsichtlich der Anwendbarkeit als auch Kombinierbarkeit unterschiedliche Analyseansätze im Rahmen von Arbeitstreffen vorgestellt und diskutiert werden. Die verbindende Basis ist die Arbeit mit gesprochensprachlichen Daten, was notwendigerweise akustische und auditive Untersuchungsmethoden erforderlich macht. Alle Teilnehmer greifen auf ein gemeinsames Pilotkorpus zurück. Langzeitaufnahmen der Gespräche eines Sprechers bzw. einer Sprecherin über einen ganzen Tag hinweg, wie sie beispielsweise im *Ein gesprochener Tag*-Corpus (ORD, Sankt Petersburg) enthalten sind, sind eine besonders geeignete Datenquelle, die diese Vielfalt reflektiert.

2. State of the art and preliminary work (Stand der Forschung, eigene Vorarbeiten)

2.1 Description (Darstellung)

Language as well as the shape of discourse are influenced by and reflect social meanings. Due to the frequent turnover of communicative situations in which urban dwellers happen to find themselves in their everyday lives, they have a multitude of linguistic, paralinguistic and pragmatic resources at their disposal to display and highlight a relevant social identity, to accomplish a given task accordingly to the speech event etc. Attempts to describe linguistic and communicative variation and hence to capture the pragmatic competence of inhabitants of Russian cities have been made from different vantage points. Nevertheless, there is a lack of analyses with a necessarily wide scope of possibly relevant linguistic, paralinguistic and pragmatic phenomena and a trend to neglect specific sociolinguistic variables revealing social differentiation such as migration or ethnic background. The first desideratum is partially due to certain preferences regarding methodology. The second desideratum is strongly connected with the lack of data from specific groups and situations. The network will work on both desiderata by analyzing a wide scope of social meanings conveyed linguistically by urban speakers of Russian in Sankt Petersburg (Spb) and in German cities, and by applying different methodological approaches capturing how social meaning is encoded in spoken language and talk-in-interaction. Features stemming from all linguistic subsystems as well as pragmatic and interactional features or preferences for specific discourse genres can be involved in signaling social meaning. Approaching this wide scope of potentially relevant phenomena, different methodologies will be applied in a triangulating fashion, which allows for capturing all potentially relevant dimension of variation and for cross-checking and validating single analyses. This enterprise crucially depends on data reflecting linguistic and communicative diversity and allowing for the application of methods

rooted in pragmatics and research on prosody and, therefore, mainly relies on audio-data from authentic talk-in-interaction.

Research on Russian talk-in-interaction has so far concentrated on specific varieties and contexts of use and favored certain methodological approaches. An important point of departure is the work on Colloquial Russian (CR, *rususkaja razgovornaja reč'*) (e.g. Zemskaja 1973, 1983, Lapteva 1976, Zemskaja/Kitajgorodskaja/Širjaev 1981, Zemskaja/Koester-Thoma (eds.) 1995, Mills (ed.) 1999, Borisova et al. 1996). CR is thereby defined by Zemskaja as the variety of Russian used by well-educated urban inhabitants in casual and unprepared face-to-face-interactions. The data bases mainly consist of interactions within families and gatherings of friends or relatives recorded in Moscow (Zemskaja/Kapanadze 1978, Kitajgorodskaja/Rozanova 2005) and fewer data from other cities such as e.g. Ekaterinburg (Matveeva 1995, Šalina 2011). It is the variety of CR that features prominently in the analysis of Russian talk-in-interaction and that has been described as the essential variety of communication in the urban space (cf. Borisova et al. 1996, Rozanova/Kitajgorodskaja 2010).

Descriptions of this oral variety of Russian pay special attention to syntax, word order, strategies of nomination, word formation as well as to phonetic and prosodic features. Features of CR concerning all these aspects are described and explained in terms of deviation from the norm of Russian codified literary language. Zemskaja et al. conceive of CR as of a specific linguistic subsystem typical of certain extra-linguistically modeled situations which makes it extremely difficult for them to account for variation and deviation from CR frequently occurring in otherwise standard CR-situations. Deviation from as well as variation of this default variety rather provides a socially meaningful resource fulfilling specific functions (e.g. in the context of positioning oneself in opposition to an out-group or in attempts to change the framing of the event). Interestingly, Zemskaja (1983) points to instances when speakers switch to an 'inferior' as well as a 'superior' variety in default CR-talk in order to frame an utterance as humorous.

Another variety that received significant attention in Russian (and Soviet) sociolinguistics is qualified as substandard and ascribed to poorly educated urban dwellers (*prostorečie*) (e.g. review article by Patton 1990, Zemskaja (ed.) 1983, Kitajgorodskaja 1988). Similar to CR, this variety has also been described as a relatively stable and closed subsystem characterized by specific linguistic features which are habitually ascribed to a particular social group. This picture of social stratification in the urban space is challenged by the Perm' school of sociolinguistics (Docenko/Erofeeva/Erofeeva 2009) who advocates a variationist approach integrating different social (e.g. gender, age, social status/education) and regional parameters. In assessing phonetic features and checking their statistical relevance mainly based on elicited data from Perm', Erofeeva (2005), for example, reveals the complex

relationship and interaction of regional dialects, substandard, CR, and the codified literary language and argues for the formation of regiolects. Especially in times of increased mobility the urban space turns into a platform nurturing processes of convergence between standard language and dialects, dialect leveling or the emergence of new regiolects as Krause (2010) assumes with regard to several larger Russian cities apart from Moscow and Sankt Petersburg. In effect the linguistic situation in Russian cities is far more complex.

Linguistic and communicative behavior is further affected by the situation in which interlocutors converse; this factor interacts with the social identity of the speakers. Analyses based on authentic face-to-face-interaction revealing variation in natural settings are still scarce (e.g. Kitajgorodskaja/Rozanova 2010), especially when compared to analyses conducted in Western cities (see e.g. Kallmeyer (ed.) 1994-1995). Here it is the market place which attracted some attention (e.g. by Krysin 2003 or Kitajgorodskaja/Rozanova 2010). As a platform which brings together people from different ethnic backgrounds the market and communication there introduces a new and largely neglected social parameter to Russian sociolinguistics – the speakers' ethnic or migration background. Kirilina (2009) observed among other things the language of migrants from Middle Asia and the Caucasus on Moscow markets by linguistic landscaping. Oglezneva (2008) describes the Russian-Chinese-Pidgin which originates in the communication on the markets in Blagoveščensk. But we still know little about the communicative as well as linguistic competence of migrants in Russian cities in the various settings in which they happen to communicate during the day.

Judging from the literature, especially concerning the early analyses of Zemskaja and her team, it is not always clear whether a social constructivist approach to variation is favored or not, although their analyses are conducted on situationally embedded, authentic data. It is, therefore, important to discuss the relationship between linguistic features, pragmatic and communicative preferences and the social meaning constituted or indexed to by these features (Sappok forthcoming). Only detailed analyses accurately following the interaction data reveal the socially relevant meaning potential of certain features and allow for checking whether the interlocutors themselves orient to them, for example, if there occurs variation. If we assume that variation of linguistic as well as pragmatic features is actively exploited by the speakers to convey social meaning, it follows that speakers have several linguistic and communicative styles at their disposal. Then, it is also presupposed that speakers can actively switch and, therefore, also accommodate to different situations or highlight a certain social identity respectively. We still know little about the stylistic repertoire forming the communicative competence of Russian urban dwellers (cf. Kitajgorodskaja/Rozanova 2010). Social constructivist approaches to linguistic and communicative variation in face-to-face-interaction favor a qualitative approach. Features situated on several levels of the linguistic system as well as pragmatic features are listed, but the role of a certain feature within a

variety is neither assessed nor quantified (cf. Zemskaja et al. 1981, 1983, 1995). So, we know little about the relevance or significance of single features and about the interaction with other features within the context of a certain style. In assessing the role of single features, it will be fruitful to combine qualitative methods e.g. from interpretive sociolinguistics and quantitative methods rather inspired by variationism. Since the phenomena that account for a style reach from features from all linguistic subsystems up to pragmatic, interactional features and preferences for certain speech genres, it is necessary to look at phenomena on all levels of discourse and language, in order to see how they interact with each other (Selting 1997, 2009). Such a synthesizing view of variation favors methodological triangulation and as well helps to show which speech activities and genres are connected or associated with certain styles. How is an activity accomplished by a certain social group or within a specific setting? This requires the analysis of interaction embedded in various situations. Only analyses of different private and institutional settings in which inhabitants of a city come together during their days reveal the wide range of communicative genres typical of urban communication during a day, and give insight into how they are accomplished by members of different social groups.

Pragmatics offers models to describe activities and genres jointly accomplished in interaction as well as explanatory frameworks to account for a particular communicative behavior. There are a few attempts which try to theoretically conceptualize a style as, for example, deriving from certain meta-communicative norms guiding communicative behavior and linguistic strategies. Yokoyama (1994, 1999) explains pragmatic and linguistic peculiarities of CR and of the Russian female genderlect that have been described by Zemskaja et al. (1993) in purely descriptive terms as the output of a 'grammar of closeness' guiding linguistic and pragmatic choices, if speakers make specific situational and personal presuppositions. Rathmayr (1996) or Brehmer (2009) rely on the framework of politeness research in explaining certain preferences regarding the expression of excuse and thank in colloquial Russian, and Kreß (2010) or Thielemann (2010) extend the concept of face-work in order to account for cultural and genre differences in conflict talk. For communicative situations including disagreement Richter (2009) shows how evaluation can be used as a means to convince the communication partner. Linguistic and pragmatic output is then viewed as deriving from a second order norm guiding a specific communicative behavior and correspondingly also linguistic choices and preferences of particular genres. It is, therefore, necessary to check whether concepts such as politeness, face or cooperation can serve as a tool to account for specific speech styles indexing social identity or characterizing specific institutional settings.

Since a wide spectrum of linguistic, paralinguistic as well as pragmatic and interactional features may be involved in socially meaningful variation, the scope of potentially relevant

phenomena has to be broad. This requires a more thorough look at Russian talk-in-interaction. Its distinctive linguistic shape has been described by Zemskaja and her team as resulting from the general pragmatic and communicative conditions of face-to-face-dialogue. Nevertheless, there is no systematic account of interactional properties such as turn-taking, repair or sequential organization for the specific shape of Russian talk-in-interaction that would explain e.g. syntactic features of spoken language as determined by its occurrence in turns in talk-in-interaction (cf. the program of Interactional Linguistics e.g. proposed by Selting/Couper-Kuhlen 2001, Fox 2007, Ford/Fox/Thompson 2007). A first attempt is made by Grenoble (2008) who shows how Russian interlocutors 'share' syntactic constructions by incrementally continuing the other's turn after turn-taking extending or finishing the interlocutor's syntactic construction. Research by Kibrik and his colleagues based on the analysis of dream telling monologues raises the question how units in spoken language can be defined, regarding prosody and syntax as two subsystems contributing to segmentation in oral discourse (Kibrik/Podlesskaja 2009, Kibrik 2008). Among other things they offer a description of incremental turn-extensions in Russian monologues. It can further be assumed that the shaping of linguistic units in talk-in-interaction is influenced and affected not only by discourse genre but also by situational and social factors.

Prosody of Russian talk-in-interaction is mainly described in terms of Bryzgunova's intonation contours (e.g. Barinova 1973) and, therefore, often restricted to single utterances. Schallert (1990) offers a very short analysis of the contribution of prosody to the structuring of larger discourse units using the example of monologues. A similar approach is taken by Janko (2008) who also analyzes the contribution of prosody to the creation of cohesion in narratives. Odé (1989) in her revision of Bryzgunova's intonation patterns is probably one of the first who applies the analysis of stylized pitch contours also to spontaneous face-to-face-interaction. However, she does not aim at a description of prosody in interaction and its contribution to the organization of interaction. Nevertheless, she touches prosodic aspects influencing the construction of turns such as the marking of boundaries. Analyses of prosodic means including not only intonation but also other vocal features and rhythmic patterns and their contribution in the shaping of units in talk-in-interaction such as turn-constructive units (TCUs) and transition relevance places (TRPs) are still scarce (e.g. Lublinskaja/Sappok 1996 on experimental data). As prosodic means interact with verbal and pragmatic means in shaping units of talk-in-interaction (Selting 1998, Szczepek Reed 2010, Auer 2010) it is as well necessary to integrate and embed analyses of the syntax of talk-in-interaction in this context (see Kanel 2011 for a pilot study based on media interaction). Yet, there is no systematic analysis of Russian talk-in-interaction which consequently focuses on the interplay of syntax, prosody and pragmatics as responsible for the specific shape of units in talk-in-interaction due to its occurrence in turns in interaction. Sociolinguistic factors which as

well have an impact on the shape of discourse units located on the micro level of discourse (see e.g. Wells/Peppé 1996 on the prosodic projection of TRPs in an English dialect or Selting 2004 on specific intonation contours in German dialects) have also been neglected so far in Russian.

Research in this field has probably also been impeded, since there have not been sufficient data bases of recorded institutional and non-institutional talk-in-interaction of interlocutors from different social backgrounds, including the audio-recordings necessary for checking and re-evaluating especially prosodic and interactional features. This kind of data is e.g. partially included in the ORD-corpus (*Odin rečevoj den'*) (Asinovsky et al. 2009, Sherstinova 2009) comprising authentic face-to-face-interaction taped by several informants during one day. In choosing different informants and in taping private as well as institutional communication during one day, the ORD-data offer rich access to a variety of speech styles and discourse genres typically occurring during the speech day of an urban dweller of Sankt Petersburg. To a certain degree elicited data e.g. from sociolinguistic interviews are a viable source, too. This material has to be supplemented by recordings of Russian speakers living in Germany enabling researchers to check the impact of migration on the social and situational variation of Russian spoken abroad. So far there are no data corpora comprising natural interaction of Russian migrants from different settings. First attempts have been made by Beatrix Kress recording lessons in Russian Sunday schools in Germany offering access to certain linguistic and discourse practices fostering language acquisition with young heritage speakers. Nevertheless, additional data have to be collected replicating the ORD-method in order to compare linguistic and pragmatic variation of migrant speakers of Russian in Germany.

[...]

3. Objectives and work schedule (Ziele und Arbeitsprogramm)

3.1 Objectives (Ziele)

The network aims at bringing together researchers interested in the analysis of Russian talk-in-interaction and in the impact of social as well as ethnic diversity on linguistic and communicative styles, on the shape of discourse genres, on communicative behavior guided by norms such as politeness or cooperation and on the shape and structure of talk-in-interaction as such. The central question connecting all participants' subprojects is: How are linguistic, pragmatic and prosodic means employed in order to convey social meanings (e.g. ethnic/social/local/institutional identity, aggression/politeness)? Or: How are linguistic, prosodic and pragmatic features affected by sociolinguistic variation? *The synthesizing view of potentially meaningful features as well as the integration of a wide spectrum of social stratification can be regarded a novelty.*

This requires a necessarily broad perspective on what can become a potentially relevant feature conveying social meaning. We do not confine ourselves to the analysis of single linguistic, prosodic or pragmatic features but view them in their interplay, since different features may be employed in order to signal a specific social meaning. Due to this essentially broad scope of potentially relevant phenomena, different methodologies are employed and tested (e.g. phonetic and prosodic analysis, discourse and conversation analysis, interactional linguistics, interpretive sociolinguistics, variationism). *This methodological triangulation facilitates a broad view of the phenomena under analysis, allows for checking and validating analyses and represents a further novelty.*

All members of the network follow data-driven empirical approaches within their subprojects. Questions concerning data collection and corpus design will, therefore, be raised and discussed during the initial episode. Data apt for analyzing the network's central question have to suffice several requirements: They have to allow for the variation of (several) sociolinguistic variables and for the analysis of so far neglected sociolinguistic variables (e.g. age, ethnic/migration identity). Apt data should allow for the more or less systematic variation of several variables in showing the same speaker in different situations and settings or in showing several speakers in a similar situation handling similar or the same tasks. Data should offer access to all potentially relevant phenomena including interactional features and phonetic as well as prosodic information. They should offer the opportunity to check, whether the interlocutors themselves orient to the analyzed features e.g. whether they react to changes, hence, whether we deal with phenomena of interactional relevance. A prime data source sufficing these criteria are audio-taped, naturally occurring face-to-face-interactions as, for example, collected within the ORD-corpus, although data with variation along certain sociolinguistic variables (e.g. migrants) is missing there. Their method of data collection, nevertheless, offers rich access to linguistic and communicative diversity in the urban space. Accompanying methods of data collection such as the sociolinguistic interview and other elicited data should not be excluded as well, since they allow for the controlled extension of the data pool. *Extending the data base by adding recordings of migrant speakers of Russian both in Spb and in several German cities is a further innovative aspect of the network.*

3.2 Work schedule (Arbeitsprogramm)

The network is conceived of as a platform to discuss and develop joint projects of the members. Participants will have the opportunity to present their ideas for research projects within the group during three thematically ordered workshop sessions. **Sociolinguistics**, **pragmatics** and the **linguistics of talk-in-interaction** will each be in the focus of one workshop. These workshops also serve as a forum to present pilot studies, project ideas and to conduct data sessions. To each of these workshop sessions researchers specializing in

the field but not necessarily working on Slavic languages will be invited in order to stimulate the discussion and to give feedback from another perspective.

The workshops will be preceded by a **kick off meeting** in Hamburg (organized by Marion Krause, Nadine Thielemann, Bernhard Brehmer) focusing on questions of data collection and corpus development. It will be discussed, which kind of data (elicited data vs. naturally occurring interaction), are apt for our research questions and how they can be gathered in different situations. Since the members of the ORD-team are experienced in collecting naturally occurring data, it will also be discussed, how their method can be replicated in e.g. collecting Russian migrants' speech in several German cities and in enlarging ORD itself, according to the demands of the subprojects. As a researcher experienced in field work N.V. Bogdanova from the Sankt Petersburg State University will be invited to the kick off meeting. Subsequently, additional recordings will be made in Sankt Petersburg and in several German cities. Therefore, digital voice recorders (see 4.12.) will be distributed among the members. During the initial stage of the network the members collect additional data and supplement the pilot corpus which serves as a common data pool for all subprojects and which are accessible for all members of the network.

Workshop 'sociolinguistics' (organized by Beatrix Kress, Hildesheim)

The sociolinguistic subprojects within the network deal with linguistic as well as pragmatic variation and view style or variation as a linguistic and communicative resource, by which interlocutors index social meaning. It is assumed that speakers can adjust to specific settings, situations or tasks by means of linguistic and pragmatic variation, since this flexibility characterizes their communicative competence and is a prerequisite of communicative and linguistic diversity. The subprojects introduce social parameters so far rather neglected in Russian sociolinguistics such as age, social status and ethnic background and raise the question how these factors influence language as well as communicative behavior and interact with other factors (e.g. different institutional settings). They test and combine different methodological approaches to linguistic variation such as variationism, interpretive sociolinguistics and interactional stylistics as well as prosody research, since all linguistic subsystems as well as features of discourse are prone to socially meaningful variation. Here, crucial questions emerge from triangulation of qualitative and quantitative approaches in trying to assess the relevance of single features. Specialists in the field of sociolinguistics such as Nikolas Coupland (Cardiff University) or Peter Auer (Albert Ludwig University Freiburg, FRIAS) would be rewarding discussants for this workshop.

Nadine Thielemann is interested in **communicative styles as a display of social identity**.

Taking a social constructivist point of view, interlocutors are assumed to activate and highlight a certain social identity according to the situation they are in by means of style

shifting. The repertoire of styles which interlocutors have at their disposal makes up their communicative competence. Data such as ORD allow for the description of different styles used by Russian interlocutors during their speech days. If supplemented by analogous Russian migrants' speech days in German cities, these data also allow for analyzing the development of the communicative competence under conditions of migration. It is proposed that contextualization theory (Gumperz 1982, Auer/diLuzio (eds.) 1992) offers a suitable methodological framework to describe communicative styles and their effect of making a social identity relevant in interaction. Communicative style is then conceived of as a complex contextualisation cue consisting of a bundle of features (stemming from different linguistic subsystems as well as interactional and pragmatic cues such as e.g. the preference for particular genres) that index meanings associated with social or situational identity. In line with Selting (1997, 1999) or Tannen (1984) style is understood as a *gestalt* phenomenon that is perceived holistically but that has to be decomposed analytically. The effect of a style is only achieved by the co-occurrence of several style features. This methodological framework necessarily favours a qualitative approach to the following questions: Which styles are employed by a speaker during his or her day in private as well as in more official situations and form his/her communicative competence? Which features (linguistic, pragmatic, prosodic) account for a certain style? Which of them are crucial, which are peripheral? How is a style shift accomplished in interaction? What styles are actively used by Russian migrants in German cities? Hence, what is the impact of migration on the communicative competence of a heritage speaker?

Marion Krause is interested in **the social impact of linguistic variation in intraethnic and interethnic discourse situations** in a more general sense drawing on the concept of variation. As a fundamental characteristic of linguistic systems variation seems to differ qualitatively and quantitatively with regard to different communicative situations. Diaphasic and diastratic variation is further overlapped by the diatopic factor as shown e.g. by Erofeeva (2005) comparing inhabitants of Perm and Sankt Petersburg. Current research argues that variation is one of the means people use for framing and constructing communicative situations actively (cf. the concept of *contextualization* introduced by Gumperz 1982). Theories such as *accommodation* (Giles 1991) and *auditory design* (Bell 2001) offer an approach to the interactional grounding of speech variation. By choosing different styles which are characterized by specific kinds and numbers of variation on all levels of the linguistic system, people convey socially relevant meaning (Coupland 2007).

Systematic variation of the place and character of communicative situation (family – workplace – institution) and ethnic belonging of the interlocutors (Russians – migrants) raises several questions: Which variables on different linguistic levels undergo change? Do frequencies of variants indicate the switch to a specific style? To which extent and within

which linguistic domains are processes of accommodation involved (including adaption as well as separation)? Which information can be inferred about the discursive construction and, maybe, reframing of the communication situation – for instance, on dimensions like solidarity and power? What is the dynamic of such discursive construction with respect to the social character of interaction? What are the salient linguistic indicators? Are there discursive patterns which in fact convey stereotypes and latent prejudices?

Marion Krause proposes a research design combining quantitative, variationist methods, especially in case of phonetic variants, and qualitative approaches from discourse linguistics. The latter zooms into the interactional structure of communication with respect to the social load of linguistic means.

Christian Sappok focuses on **interaction between generations: A lifespan approach to everyday communication**. Apart from sex, gender and social status, generation is a further crucial dimension of sociolinguistic variation according to Chambers (1995). Pioneering work can be found in Coupland/Nussbaum (eds.) (1993). Basic aspects are the language development over the life span (cf. de Bot/Schrauf (eds.) 2010) and the positions and styles a speaker of one generation adopts when communicating with a partner from a different generation or designed (Bell 1984) as a speaker of a different generation. Investigations of this orientation can be classed as poor in Russian linguistics and elsewhere.

The ORD data offer rich access to oral inter-generational communication as the speakers are systematically ordered along the lifespan dimension, and as they interact with people of different generations – own or other. Observation of these discourse constellations can be expected to reveal relevant insights into the contemporary space of Russian sociolinguistic variation. Research methodology embraces all domains of discourse, from linguistic categories and variants in the proper sense to parameters of voice, discourse situation and text (themes and genres), expecting that all are actively used in the interaction of generations.

Svetlana Stepanova concentrates on **prosodic characteristics of speech depending on the communicative situation**. Previous research of the average individual speech rate of all 40 informants from the ORD corpus has revealed that social (age, sex) as well as discourse and linguistic (level of speech competence, length of the utterance) factors influence the speech rate in reading tasks. This raises the question which other social, situational as well as attitudinal factors influence the speech rate, and which should better be analyzed in situated speech, i.e. talk-in-interaction: How does the communicative situation and the social role affect a speaker's speech rate e.g. in communication with parents/children, with friends/colleagues, with chief/subordinate? What is the impact of psychological features of the interaction (sympathy/antipathy, friendliness/aggression) on speech rate? Is there a correlation of the speaker's speech rate and the interlocutor's speech rate? Speech rate has

other pragmatic functions as well. Based on reading tasks, it has been shown that speech rate is involved in marking main vs. less important information from the speaker's point of view. Analyses of spontaneous talk-in-interaction may verify the earlier described results. Nevertheless, speech rate is just one prosodic feature sensitive to diaphasic or diastratic variation and used to signal pragmatic or discursive meanings. Potentially all prosodic features (tempo, pausing, pitch, intensity, timbre) can be checked for their potential to express nuances of meaning and emotions in an utterance. Consequently, it will also be discussed how prosodic features generally contribute to social and attitudinal (e.g. aggression) meaning.

Workshop 'pragmatics' (organized by Nicole Richter, Frankfurt/Oder)

The pragmatic subprojects are interested in the varying ways of accomplishing speech actions in different private as well as institutional settings with a strong focus on conflict communication. Communicative strategies used in conflict situations as well as in cooperative discourse shall be compared in order to achieve an overall picture of private and institutional discourse. The researchers further raise the question, whether variation can be accounted for in terms of (meta-)pragmatic norms such as politeness or cooperation and how emotive language can be described as a specific communicative mode comprising features from all linguistic subsystems. Therefore, researches working on the pragmatics of Russian discourse such as Olga Yokoyama (UCLA) or Tat'jana Janko (RAN), or colleagues specializing on politeness (such as Eva Ogiermann (University of Surrey)) are considered to be rewarding discussants. Since two subprojects focus on institutional discourse, the workshop will also benefit from the participation of Jiří Nekvapil (Charles University Prague).

Bernhard Brehmer is interested in **Politeness in Interaction of Russian interlocutors**. Politeness and address in Russian has been studied mainly relying on data collected by questionnaires or from corpora containing a substantial amount of literary texts. Sometimes these data have as well been supplemented by the researcher's own (impressionistic) observations on norms of verbal behaviour in Russian. Previous studies also incline to presuppose a certain kind of (internal) homogeneity of the Russian culture with regard to what is considered polite behaviour in a given context (and mostly research is carried out on the verbal behaviour of "educated" speakers). However, data from authentic interactions which also allow for accounting for the dynamics of polite or impolite behaviour are hardly used and analyzed systematically. Departing from these desiderata, Bernhard Brehmer proposes to systematically analyse means of politeness in authentic interaction taking place in a variety of social and communicative situations (informal gatherings at home, in the workplace, at institutions, interactions between family members, friends, fellow workers, anonymous interlocutors, interlocutors from different social and regional backgrounds etc.).

This includes two perspectives on Russian politeness: On a micro level politeness is negotiated jointly by the speaker and the addressee (cf. Eelen 2001, Watts 2003, Mills 2003). However, in a further step micro and macro level views on politeness in Russian by adopting a frame-based view on politeness have to be combined as proposed by Terkourafi (2005). Her model aims at uncovering regularities of co-occurrence between expressions realizing particular acts (e.g. requests, apologies, thanking) and types of contexts (i.e. certain types of speakers [characterized by sex, age, social class, regional background etc.] interacting with a certain type of addressee [characterized by sex, age, social class, regional background etc.] with whom the speaker is in a certain type of relationship and while the interaction takes place in a certain type of setting). By using quantitative methods for the analysis of these correlations, the study will contribute to a finer grained understanding of how polite behaviour is achieved in particular encounters than existing approaches by taking into account more diverse settings and speaker-addressee-constellations using authentic data. Furthermore, comparable data could be collected in different Russian cities (or rural areas as well), thus contributing to a better understanding of regional variation in verbal politeness behaviour in Russia.

Elena Markasova is interested in a related yet opposed phenomenon, i.e. in **verbal aggression in every-day face-to-face-interaction**. Forms of verbal aggression frequently occur in authentic everyday conversations. Aggressive communicative behavior is strongly connected with communicative dominance of one interlocutor, whereupon in 'true' dialogue it is presupposed that speakers do not override their interlocutors' feelings, tastes, and intellect. In lack of a shared evaluation of the situation and of mutual knowledge and understanding, interlocutors may adopt different models of conversational behavior such as e.g. 'polite aggression'. Based on data from ORD, it will be analyzed which verbal and pragmatic strategies are involved in 'polite aggression' within different social groups. It will also be analyzed how they are connected with the suppression of the interlocutor. Interaction data allow for checking the uptake of a strategy by an interlocutor and give us insight in the course of 'aggressive' dialogues. Interlocutors' reactions to 'aggressive' moves e.g. prescribing future events or revealing negative feelings are of special interest. Following a conversation analytic next-turn-proof-procedure, interlocutors' reactions serve as a validation of the researcher's analysis.

Nicole Richter shifts the focus to specific actions sensitive to both, politeness and aggression, in comparing **agreeing and disagreeing in every day conversation and academic discourse**. Speakers structure their reactions differently, so that they may range from pure rejection to approval or take the shape of questions or suggestions of alternatives. There seems to be a pragmatic difference in these kinds of reactions which also imply either cooperative or non-cooperative behaviour. In spontaneous everyday talk-in-interaction from

different settings as well as in academic discourse several linguistic features are involved in the expression of agreement and disagreement. Especially from an interactional point of view (cf. Couper-Kuhlen/Selting 1996) characteristics from several layers of communication have to be considered: phonetic-prosodic cues (Ogden 2006) (such as pitch intervals, pitch level, tempo and pauses), text structuring devices (especially with turn-taking) and rhetoric elements that typically occur with agreement and disagreement. Data from academic discourse are then compared to data from ORD in order to achieve a better understanding of how disagreement and agreement is conveyed according to the situation and the discourse type. It will be particularly interesting to find similarities in the linguistic expression of agreement and disagreement in the differing discourse types. Analysing and comparing the ways in which agreement and disagreement is expressed in several discourse types, gives us insights in the structure of different discourse types and is also fundamental for intercultural academic as well as economic cooperation. The pragmatic subprojects aim at a better description of everyday as well as institutional discourse and the strategies used in them in order to convince an interlocutor.

This aspect is also at the heart of **Beatrix Kress'** subproject dealing with the **communicative genre of conflict in institutional settings**. Her project focuses on the verbal negotiation of controversial questions in organisations and institutions, i.e. in business communication as well as in administrative settings. In this discourse type three parameters interfere: the social interpersonal level condensed in the relational work (in the sense of Locher/Watts 2005 and their interpretation of the face-paradigm), the institutional level where certain institutional roles have to be fulfilled by the interlocutors and the occurrence of conflicting positions which have to be negotiated by balancing the personal social role, the interpersonal and the institutional relationship. The difficulties in equilibrating these different tasks (verbal display of social identity through the use of a certain communicative style, relational work, institutional identity in the case of conflicting opinions) is increased when we have an intercultural communication setting, e.g. ethnic diversity within a group. Here, diverse assumptions on/knowledge of the 'right behaviour' in the case of a conflict and differing institutional contexts may lead to intercultural clashes which have to be handled as well. Based on authentic data, a qualitative analysis with the instruments of linguistic pragmatics, especially the methods of discourse analysis and politeness research, will concentrate on the following questions: How do interlocutors in the above sketched situations make relevant their social and institutional roles? How do they cope with the task of relational work in this situation? How do interlocutors cope with an occurring conflict and how does this influence their display of social communicative style and relational work? In a second step conclusions about the underlying norms leading to certain verbal behaviour/display phenomena might be drawn, whereupon social and institutional factors have to be

distinguished. The intercultural setting might help to answer the last question, as in the case of intercultural communication apparently self-evident assumptions have to be communicated and disambiguated.

Elena Graf finally analyzes **linguistic, pragmatic and prosodic features of emotive language**. The fact that speech occurring in authentic everyday talk-in-interaction considerably differs from a read speaking style is well known. Thus, the ORD data including authentic talk-in-interaction from several settings provides numerous opportunities to precisely investigate the distinction between a spontaneous and a prepared speaking style. The differences between these two styles can be found on each language level, starting from prosodic peculiarities and lexical specifics of extemporaneous speech up to specific features on the morphosyntactic level (including emphatic means of word formation and specifics of word order). Furthermore, pragmatic means such as particles and other pragmatic markers (hesitation markers, parentheses etc.) as well as the interdependence between the functions of interjections and their intonational realization can be analyzed on the basis of the empirical corpus data. Apart from the analysis of linguistic, prosodic, morphosyntactic and pragmatics features of Russian talk-in-interaction, the question will be raised, which of these features characterize the "language of emotions", which is more specific for spontaneous speech and penetrates all spheres of language.

Workshop 'linguistics of talk-in-interaction' (organized by Peter Kosta, Potsdam)

The linguistic subprojects analyse different aspects of talk-in-interaction reaching from syntax and morphology to prosody in the widest sense (also covering speech rate, vocal features and rhythmic patterns). They are interested in linguistic features specific of talk-in-interaction and raise the question how these characteristics are affected by their occurrence in turns, i.e. units of interaction and vice versa. Units in interaction are shaped linguistically (e.g. by an interplay of syntax, prosody and semantics) and pragmatically (e.g. by turn-taking and action units). The emergence of syntactic units in talk-in-interaction is influenced by turn-taking, the rhythmic structuring of units in talk-in-interaction affects its verbal shape (e.g. insertion of additional words) and so on. Interactional Linguistics tries to reveal this interplay of pragmatic and linguistic resources in shaping talk-in-interaction. The subprojects further analyse the impact of social and situational factors on the shape of discourse units on the micro-level of interaction. Lenore Grenoble (University of Chicago) as one of the very few linguistics combining CA and the linguistic analysis of talk-in-interaction working on Russian data has to be considered as a guest for this workshop. Further candidates specializing in the field of Interactional Linguistics are e.g. Peter Auer (Albert Ludwig University Freiburg, FRIAS).

Aleksandr Asinovskij is interested in the specific shape of **inflection in Russian talk-in-interaction**. He aims at extending the empirical basis of grammatical descriptions of the

Russian language by analyzing the sound shape of Russian inflections realized in authentic talk-in-interaction. This analysis will be conducted on a sample of grammatical indicators realized at the juncture of words (in sandhi-position) extracted from ORD, which allows for a description of the Russian complex inflectional system and its phonetic and prosodic realization. If it is assumed that talk-in-interaction is shaped by its occurrence in turns, this pilot analysis further allows for checking which factors from other linguistic and pragmatic levels of discourse influence the specific realization of inflectional markers in language embedded in talk-in-interaction.

Peter Kosta follows up this line in analyzing **spoken syntax** using data from ORD and Russian migrant speakers. His subproject is concerned with the interplay of pragmatics and syntax in talk-in-interaction. There is a stark contrast between the notion of *sentence* on the one hand, and that of *utterance* on the other hand which is especially emphasized by generative grammarians. The notion of the sentence as a 'perfect, highly economic' linguistic unit of an abstract system of rules fulfilling economy and perfection of language design contrasts with the utterance as an externalization of this notion (as token) including the imperfections of production and comprehension (misunderstandings, conversational implicatures, indirect speech acts, conflicts). Utterances are shaped by their occurrence in turns which are structured by turn constructional units (TCUs) ending in transition relevance places (TRP) crucial for turn allocation. TCUs and TRPs are members' categories that can only be analytically revealed in talk-in-interaction. This contrast methodologically favors an approach of Interactional Linguistics combining the interlocutors' perspective essential in CA with the analytic categories of linguistics. Starting from a bottom-up analysis of TCUs and turn allocational units (TAU) in talk-in-interaction, the following questions will be raised revealing the interplay of syntax and pragmatics in the shaping of syntactic units typical of talk-in-interaction: What is the role of interruptions, corrections and meta-commentaries in discourse on the formal and semantic levels of utterances and speech acts? Why do these procedures seem to be limited in some cases and how do interlocutors handle vagueness and ambiguity in discourse? How do interfaces (of sound-meaning) propagate language creativity in discourse? How does configurationality and projectivity appear in syntax of talk-in-interaction?

Tatiana Sherstinova finally focuses on prosody as a factor structuring and influencing the real shape of linguistic units in interaction and analyses **rhythmic patterns in Russian talk-in-interaction**. A pilot study of Russian everyday talk-in-interaction has revealed a strong trend to isochrony, although there is no strict correspondence between rhythmic patterns and particular linguistic levels. Rhythmic patterns seem to be a stable element and strong structuring device in the emergence of units in Russian talk-in-interaction, since interlocutors either use extra words (often called parasitic words) or change the 'normal' syntactic order of

the utterance (up to complete ellipsis of some elements) in order to match the pattern. The project, therefore, aims at identifying and describing typical rhythmic patterns in spontaneous Russian speech and at studying the mechanisms of their combination and possible adaptation in authentic talk-in-interaction. It is assumed that such patterns are best found in elementary utterances (short verbal and non-verbal utterances consisting of one or more words or word-like elements with max. 7 syllables) frequently used in everyday interaction. Realizations of the most frequent Russian utterances extracted from ORD will then be analyzed phonetically and statistically, and their typical temporal templates and phonetic characteristics will be described. The identification and description of elementary rhythmic patterns facilitates the analysis of the rhythmic structure of turns consisting of a continuous utterance. Since rhythm is closely connected with syntax, an analysis of the correlation between main rhythmic structures and frequent syntactic structures is planned as well. Having described rhythmic and syntactic patterns typical for spontaneous speech as a whole, the question may be raised, if and how social and situational factors influence the shape of these patterns.

The episode of close cooperation within the network ends with a **closing conference** (organized by A.S. Asinovskij & ORD-Team) which makes the results of our discussions, documented in sample analyses and pilot studies as well as in project proposals, accessible to a wider audience of specialists. The conference will take place in Sank Petersburg which makes it easier for the Russian scientific audience to participate. Further, a publication of the pilot studies conducted during the duration of the network is planned which sketches a first linguistic and communicative topography reflecting linguistic and communicative diversity in Sankt Petersburg.

[...]

5. Prerequisites for carrying out the project

5.1 Your team – Members of the network

Prof. Dr. Aleksandr S. Asinovskij, Sankt Petersburg State University, Russia
 JProf Bernhard Brehmer, assistant professor (non-tenured), University of Hamburg, Germany
 Dr. Elena Graf, lecturer (non-tenured), Ludwig Maximilian University Munich, Germany
 Prof. Dr. P. Kosta, University of Potsdam, Germany
 Prof. Dr. Marion Krause, University of Hamburg, Germany
 JProf. Dr. Beatrix Kress, assistant professor (non-tenured), University of Hildesheim, Germany
 Dr. hab. ('docent') Elena Markasova, senior researcher (non-tenured), Sankt Petersburg State University, Russia
 JProf Nicole Richter (non-tenured), Viadrina University Frankfurt/Oder, Germany
 Prof. Dr. em. Christian Sappok, Ruhr University Bochum, Germany
 Dr. Tat'jana Sherstinova, senior researcher (non-tenured), Sankt Petersburg State University, Russia
 Dr. Svetlana Stepanova, senior researcher (non-tenured), Sankt Petersburg State University, Russia
 Dr. Nadine Thielemann, PostDoc (non-tenured), University of Hamburg, Germany

5.2 Cooperation with other scientists

Prof. Dr. N.V. Bogdanova, Sankt Petersburg State University
 Dr. Irina V. Koroleva, psycholinguist, member of ORD-project team
 Prof. Dr. Angelika Redder, Lima, University of Hamburg

[...]

References

- Asinovsky, A.S. et al. (2009): The ORD Speech Corpus of Russian Everyday Communication "One Speaker's Day": Creation Principles and Annotation. In: Matoušek, V./Mautner, P. (eds.): Text, Speech, and Dialogue 2009. Berlin, Heidelberg (=LNAI; 5729), 250–257.
- Auer, P. (2010): Zum Segmentierungsproblem in der Gesprochenen Sprache. In: InLiSt 49. <<http://www.inlist.uni-bayreuth.de/issues/49/InList49.pdf>> [latest access 10.05.2012]
- Auer, P./diLuzio, A. (eds.) (1992): The Contextualization of Language. Amsterdam, Philadelphia.
- Barinova, E.A. (1973): Nekotorye osobennosti intonacii RR. In: Zemskaja et al. (eds.), 129-150.
- Bell, A. (1984): Language style as audience design. In: Language and Society 13, 145-204.
- Borisova, I.N. (2007): Russkij razgovornyj dialog: Struktura i dinamika. Moskva.
- Borisova, I.N. et al. (eds.) (1996): Russkaja razgovornaja reč' kak javlenie gorodskoj kul'tury. Ekaterinburg.
- Brehmer, B. (2009): Höflichkeit zwischen Konvention und Kreativität: eine pragmalinguistische Analyse von Dankesformeln im Russischen. München.
- de Bot, K./Schrauf, R.W. (eds.) (2009): Language Development over the Lifespan. New York.
- Couper-Kuhlen, E./Selting, M. (eds.) (1996): Prosody in Conversation. Interactional Studies. Cambridge.
- Coupland, N. (2007): Style. Language Variation and Identity. Cambridge.
- Coupland, N./Nussbaum, J.F. (eds.) (1993): Discourse and Lifespan Identity. London.
- Docenko, T.I./Erofeeva, E.V./Erofeeva, T.I. (2009): Permskaja škola sociolingvistiki: teoretičeskie i metodologičeskie osnovanija. In: Vestnik Permskogo Universiteta, rossijskaja u zarubežnaja filologija, vyp. 5, 16-28.
- Eelen, G. (2001): A Critique of Politeness Theories. Manchester, Northampton.
- Erofeeva, E.V. (2005): Verojatnostnaja struktura idiomov: sociolingvističeskij aspekt. Perm'.
- Ford, C./Fox, B./Thompson, S. (2003): Social Interaction and Grammar. In: Tomasello, M. (ed.): The New Psychology of Language. Vol. II. Mahwah, London, 119-143.
- Fox, B. (2007): Principles shaping grammatical practices: an exploration. In: Discourse Studies 9/3, 299-318.
- Graf, E. (2011): Interjektionen im Russischen als interaktive Einheiten. Frankfurt/M.
- Grenoble, L. (2008): Sintaksis i sovместnoe postroenie repliki v russkom dialoge. In: Voprosy Jazykoznanija 1, 25-36.
- Gumperz, J.J. (1982): Discourse Strategies. Cambridge u.a.
- Janko, T.E. (2001): Kommunikativnye strategii russkoj reči. Moskva.
- Janko, T.E. (2008): Intonacionnye strategii russkoj reči v sopostavitel'nom aspekte. Moskva.
- Kallmeyer, W. (ed.) (1994-1995): Kommunikation in der Stadt I-IV. Berlin u.a.

- Kanel, H. (2011): Multimodale Darstellung des Kampfes um das Rederecht in Gesprächen zwischen Politikern in russischen Fernsehtalkshows. Masterarbeit, Kommunikationslinguistik, Universität Potsdam.
- Kibrik, A.A. (2008): Est' li predloženie v ustnoj reči. In: Archipov, A.V. et al. (eds.): Fonetika i nefonetika. K 70-letiju Sandro V. Kodzasova. Moskva, 104-115.
- Kibrik, A.A./Podlesskaja (eds.) (2009): Rasskazy o snovidenijach. Korpusnoe issledovanie ustnogo russkogo diskursa. Moskva.
- Kirilina, A.V. (2009): Russkij jazyk v megapolise kak indikator izmenenija jazykovoju situacii. In: Ždanova, V. (ed.): Russkij jazyk v uslovijach kul'turnoj i jazykovoju polifonii. Sbornik statej. München, Berlin, 75-89.
- Kitajgorodskaja, M.V. (1988): Nabljudenija nad postroeniem ustnogo prostorečnogo teksta. In: Šmelev/Zemskaja(eds.), 156-181.
- Kitajgorodskaja, M.V./Rozanova, N.N. (1994): Russkij rečevoj portret. Moskva.
- Kitajgorodskaja, M.V./Rozanova, N.N. (2005). Reč' moskvičej: Kommunikativno-kul'turologičeskij aspekt. Moskva.
- Kitajgorodskaja, M.V./Rozanova, N.N. (2010): Jazykoe suščestvovanie sovremennogo gorozhanina. Na materiale Moskvy. Moskva.
- Kosta, P. (1998): Argumentation, Persuasion und der turn-taking-Mechanismus. In: Čmejrková, S. et al. (eds.): Dialoganalyse VI: Referate der 6. Arbeitstagung, Prag 1996, Tübingen, 115-131.
- Kosta, P. (2005): Direkte und indirekte Direktiva als Strategien des (Miss-)Verstehens in Dialogen tschechischer Frauen und Männer. In: van Leeuwen-Turnovcová, J./Richter, N.(eds.): Mediale Welten in Tschechien nach 1989: Genderprojektionen und Codes des Plebejismus. München, 191-198.
- Kosta, P. (2011): Modalité Epistémique et Evidentialité et sa disposition à la base déictique. In: Schlaak, C. / Busse, L. (eds.): Sprachkontakte, Sprachvariation und Sprachwandel. Festschrift für Thomas Stehl zum 60. Geburtstag. Tübingen, 257-283.
- Kosta, P. (2012): Konversationelle Implikaturen und indirekte Sprechakte auf dem Prüfstein. In: Kotin, M.L./ Kotorova, E.G. (eds.): Die Sprache in Aktion: Pragmatik - Sprechakte - Diskurs. Heidelberg, 55-70.
- Kosta, P./Thielemann, N. (2009): Gesprächsanalyse. In: Kempgen, S. et al. (eds.): Die slavischen Sprachen. Ein internationales Handbuch ihrer Struktur, ihrer Geschichte und ihrer Erforschung. Berlin, New York (=HSK; 32.1), 1029-1047.
- Krause, M. (2010): Zur Typologie von Sprachsituationen: Binnensprachliche Variation zwischen Standard und Dialekt im heutigen Russland. In: Wiener Slawistischer Almanach 65, 53-81.
- Kreß, B. (2010): Kooperation und Konflikt: Äußerungsstrukturen in Konflikten und Konfliktlösungen auf der Grundlage russischer und tschechischer literarischer Texte. München.
- Krysin, L.P. (ed.) (2003): Sovremennyj russkij jazyk. Social'naja i funkcional'naja differenciacija. Moskva.
- Lapteva, O.A. ([1976] 2007): Russkij razgovornyj sintaksis. Moskva.
- Lublinskaja, V./Sappok, Ch. (1996): Speaker attribution of successive utterances: The role of discontinuities in voice characteristics and prosody. In: Speech Communication 19/2, 145-159.
- Matveeva, T.V. (1995): Živaja reč' ural'skogo goroda. Ekaterinburg.
- Mills, M. (ed.) (1990): Topics in Colloquial Russian. New York u.a. (=American University Studies; Series XII, Vol. II).
- Mills, S. (2003) Gender and Politeness. Cambridge.
- Odé, C. (1989): Russian Intonation: A Perceptual Description. Amsterdam, Atlanta. (=Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics; 13).
- Ogden, R. (2006): Phonetics and Social Action in Agreements and Disagreements. In: Journal of Pragmatics 38, 1752-1775.
- Oglezneva, E.A. (2008): Russko-kitajskij pidžin: Opyt sociolingvističeskogo opisanija. Blagoveščensk.
- Patton, F. (1990): Soviet Research on Urban Substandard Speech. In: Mills (ed.), 143-165.
- Rathmayr, R. (1996): Die Pragmatik der Entschuldigung. Vergleichende Untersuchung am Beispiel der russischen Sprache und Kultur. Köln, Weimar, Wien.
- Richter, N. (2009): Prosodie evaluativer Äußerungen: Experimentelle Untersuchungen zum Russischen. Frankfurt/M.
- Sappok, Ch. (forthcoming): Sprache, Diskurs und Identität: Suche nach einem methodischen Zugang. In: Wiener Slawistischer Almanach.
- Sappok, Ch./Šenkeřík, K. (1998): Überlappende Repliken: auditive Analyse und pragmatische Interpretation. In: Čmejrková, S. et al. (eds.): Dialoganalyse VI: Referate der 6. Arbeitstagung, Prag 1996. Tübingen, 517-526.
- Schallert, J. (1990): Intonation beyond the Utterance: A Distributional Analysis of Rising and Falling Contour. In: Mills, M. (ed.), 51-66.

- Selting, M. (1997): Interaktionale Stilistik. Methodologische Aspekte der Analyse von Sprechstilen. In: Selting, M./Sandig, B. (eds.): *Sprech- und Gesprächsstile*. Berlin, New York, 9-43.
- Selting, M. (1998): TCUs and TRPs: The Construction of Units in Conversational Talk. In: *InLiSt 4*. < <http://www.inlist.uni-bayreuth.de/issues/4/index.htm> >
- Selting, M. (2004): Regionalized intonation in its conversational context. In: Gilles, P./Peters, J. (eds.): *Regional Variation in Intonation*. Tübingen, 49-73.
- Selting, M. (2009): Communicative style. In: D'hont, S./Östman, J.-O./Verschuere, J. (eds.): *The Pragmatics of Interaction*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia, 20-39.
- Selting, M./Couper-Kuhlen, E. (2000): Argumente für die Entwicklung einer 'interaktionalen' Linguistik. In: *Gesprächsforschung 1*, 76-95.
- Sherstinova, T. (2009): The Structure of the ORD Speech Corpus of Russian Everyday Communication. In: Matoušek, V./Mautner, P. (eds.): *Text, Speech, and Dialogue 2009*. Heidelberg (=LNAI; 5729), 258-265.
- Szczepek Reed, B. (2010): Intonation phrases in natural conversation. A participants' category. In: Barth-Weingarten, D./Reber, E./Selting, M. (eds.): *Prosody in Interaction*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia. (=Studies in Discourse and Grammar; 23), 191-212.
- Šalina, I.V. (ed.) (2011): *Živaja reč' ural'skogo goroda: ustnye dialogi i ėpistoljarnye obrazcy*. Ekaterinburg.
- Šmelev, D.N./Zemskaja, E.A. (eds.) (1988): *Raznovidnosti gorodskoj ustnoj reči*. Moskva.
- Tannen, D. (1984): *Conversational Style. Analyzing Talk among Friends*. Norwood.
- Terkourafi, M. (2005): Beyond the micro-level in politeness research. In: *Journal of Politeness Research 1:2*, 237-262.
- Thielemann, N. (2010): *Untersuchungen zum weiblichen Diskussionsstil am Beispiel von Gesprächen russischer, polnischer und ukrainischer GesprächspartnerInnen*. München.
- Vinokur, T.G./Zemskaja, E.A. (eds.) (1993): *Russkij jazyk v ego funkcionirovanii*. Moskva.
- Watts, R. J. (2003): *Politeness*. Cambridge.
- Wells, B./Peppé, S. (1996): Ending up in Ulster: prosody and turn-taking in English dialects. In: Selting, M./Couper-Kuhlen, E. (eds.): *Prosody in Conversation: Interactional Studies*, 101-130.
- Yokoyama, O.T. (1994): Iconic manifestation of interlocutor distance in Russian. In: *Journal of Pragmatics 22*, 83-102.
- Yokoyama, O.T. (1999): Russian genderlects and referential expressions. In: *Language in Society 28*, 401-429.
- Zemskaja, E.A. (1973): *Russkaja razgovornaja reč'. Lingvističeskij analiz i problemy obučenija*. Moskva.
- Zemskaja, E.A. (1979): *Russkaja razgovornaja reč'. Lingvističeskij analiz i problemy obučenija*. Moskva.
- Zemskaja, E.A. (ed.) (1983): *Russkaja razgovornaja reč'. Fonetika. Morfologija. Leksika. Žest*. Moskva.
- Zemskaja, E.A. (1983). *Jazykovaja igra*. In: Zemskaja, E.A. (ed.): 172-214.
- Zemskaja, E.A. (ed.) (1984): *Gorodskoe prostorečie*. Moskva.
- Zemskaja, E.A./Kapanadze, L.A. (1978): *Russkaja razgovornaja reč'. Teksty*. Moskva.
- Zemskaja, E.A./Kitajgorodskaja, M.V./Širjaev, E.N. (1981): *Russkaja razgovornaja reč'. Obščie voprosy. Slovoobrazovanie. Sintaksis*. Moskva.
- Zemskaja, E.A./Koester-Thoma, S. (eds.) (1995): *Russische Umgangssprache*. Berlin.
- Zemskaja, E.A. et al. (1993): Osobennosti mužskoj i ženskoj reči. In: Vinokur, T.G./Zemskaja, E.A. (eds.), 90-136.