



Department of Languages, Linguistics and Area Studies

i-mean@uwe

I-Mean First International Conference on Meaning in Interaction
University of the West of England, Bristol, 23-25 April, 2009

Conference Proceedings

CONTENTS

List of Contributors	3
Doctor-Patient Interactions: Accommodation Strategies in a Malaysian Context/ Maya Khemlani David and Chu Geok Bin.....	5
Interpreting modality markers in political speeches/Olga Dontcheva-Navratilova	22
Unmentioned, but present: The local negotiation of 'patriotism' in the football reception situation/Cornelia Gerhardt	37
Strategies for the derivation of ironic meaning: the case of non-cancellable irony/Eleni Kapogianni	51
Gender, language and occupational roles: Exploring male nurses' linguistic behaviour/Joanne McDowell.....	62
Forced self-positioning as part of identity construction in narratives about the workplace/Marlene Miglbauer	79
The GENTT Corpus of Specialised Genres: Meaning and Interaction within Specialised Translation/Pilar Ordóñez López	93
Patterns of ellipsis from an interpersonal point of view/Kyoko Otsuki	109
Txtng in three European languages: does the linguistic typology differ?/Rachel Panckhurst	122
Interpeting meaning in spoken interaction: the case of <i>I mean</i> /Renata Povolná	138
Stylistic meaning in interaction/Irene Theodoropoulou	151

List of Contributors

Doctor-Patient Interactions: Accommodation Strategies in a Malaysian Context

Maya Khemlani David, Professor, Faculty of Languages and Linguistics, University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

Email: mayadavid@yahoo.com

And

Chu Geok Bin, Post-graduate Student, Faculty of Languages and Linguistics, University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.

Interpreting modality markers in political speeches

Olga Dontcheva-Navratilova, Faculty of Education, Masaryk University, Brno and Department of English Language and Literature, Porici 9, 603 00 Brno, Czech Republic

Email: navratilova@ped.muni.cz

Unmentioned, but present: The local negotiation of ‘patriotism’ in the football reception situation

Dr. Cornelia Gerhardt, FR 4.3 Anglistik, Universität des Saarlandes, PF 15 11 50, D-66041 Saarbrücken

Email: c.gerhardt@mx.uni-saarland.de

Strategies for the derivation of ironic meaning: the case of non-cancellable irony

Eleni Kapogianni, University of Cambridge, King’s College 715, CB2 1ST, Cambridge, Cambridgeshire, UK.

Email: ek322@cam.ac.uk

Gender, language and occupational roles: Exploring male nurses’ linguistic behaviour.

Dr Joanne McDowell, University of Reading, Department of Applied Linguistics, Faculty of Arts and Humanities, Whiteknights, PO Box 218, Reading’ RG6 6AA

Email: j.a.mcdowell@reading.ac.uk

Forced self-positioning as part of identity construction in narratives about the workplace

Marlene Miglbauer, University of Applied Sciences Wiener Neustadt, Johannes Gutenberg-Strasse 4, 2600 Wiener Neustadt, Austria

Email: marlene.miglbauer@fhwn.ac.at

The GENTT Corpus of Specialised Genres: Meaning and Interaction within Specialised Translation

Pilar Ordóñez López, Departamento de Traducción y Comunicación. Facultad de Ciencias Humanas y Sociales. Universitat Jaume I. Campus del Riu Sec, s/n. 12071 Castellón de la Plana (Spain).

Email: mordonez@trad.uji.es

Patterns of ellipsis from an interpersonal point of view

Kyoko Otsuki, School of Philosophy, Psychology and Language Sciences, University of Edinburgh, Dugald Stewart Building, 3 Charles Street, Edinburgh EH8 9AD

E-mail address: k.otsuki@sms.ed.ac.uk

Txtng in three European languages: does the linguistic typology differ?

Rachel Panckhurst, Praxiling UMR 5267 CNRS, Université Paul-Valéry Montpellier 3, Route de Mende, 34199 Montpellier cedex 5.

Email: rachel.panckhurst@univ-montp3.fr

Interpeting meaning in spoken interaction: the case of *I mean*

Renata Povolná, Faculty of Education, Masaryk University, Brno, Department of English Language and Literature, Poříčí 9, 603 00 Brno, Czech Republic

Email: povolna@ped.muni.cz

Stylistic meaning in interaction

Irene Theodoropoulou, Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies Department and Centre for Language, Discourse and Communication, King's College, London, Strand, London, WC2R, 2LS, UK.

Email: eirini.theodoropoulou@kcl.ac.uk

Unmentioned, but present: The local negotiation of ‘patriotism’ in the football reception situation/Cornelia Gerhardt

Abstract

This paper investigates talk-in-interaction in the reception situation, i.e. by people watching football on television, with regard to the local construction of ‘patriotism’. Conflict arises between the viewers when one member of the audience shifts his stance towards the media text from that of England supporter to neutral football expert. Furthermore, during England versus Argentina the viewers protest against an alleged reference to the Falklands war by the commentators. The viewers’ idea of ‘patriotism’ does not seem to support such a recasting of the game in political terms, even though this seems all pervasive in the media.

Introduction

This paper is concerned with the media reception situation to explore the co-construction and negotiation of meaning in talk-in-interaction.² In this very specific setting an issue surfaces that does not seem to be satisfactorily explained by current research. First, the concrete local interplay between media discourse and everyday talk-in-interaction seems largely unexplored (cf. Scollon 1998: vii). Based on the transcriptions from video-tapes of people watching football on television, I will study the appropriation of media discourse and trace the immediate uptake of the language and the pictures on television in the talk of the viewers. A special focus is on how the meaning of broader categories, here ‘patriotism’, is negotiated in everyday interaction against the backdrop of the media discourse. For two reasons, the data, the ATTAC-corpus (Analysing The Television Audiences’ Conversations), provide a fruitful basis for work on the negotiation of meaning: First, they represent transcribed talk-in-interaction. Hence, just as in other settings, the participants’ interactional work on meaning construction can be witnessed. Secondly, similar maybe in some respects to intercultural encounters, the topic of other papers in this volume, two realms come together here: On the

² I would like to thank Neal Norrick, Melanie Gros, and Hanna Kiefer for their comments.

one hand, there is the more official or institutionally sanctioned media discourse, i.e. the BBC commentary and the pictures from the international feed. On the other hand, there is the talk-in-interaction by the viewers at home. This allows investigating the actual linguistic practices with which people appropriate media discourse, or in other words, produce meaning based on the televised pictures and language. We will see that in both cases conflicts may arise as to what it means to be for England, to be an England supporter. We will be able to witness the interactional work it takes for the participants to negotiate this role, and hence their meaning of the concept ‘patriotism’ in this specific setting for these specific people. However, the word ‘patriotism’ is my choice of terminology for the demarcations which can be found in the data. It is never actually used by the participants and as such also up to debate.

I will start with a general account of talk-in-interaction in this specific setting. In the body of the paper, I will first focus on the negotiation of meaning amongst the viewers. The example shows how the viewers have to carefully (re-)negotiate their positioning (Davies et al. 1990) against the media discourse, because of a sudden frame shift (Goffman 1974) of one of the participants. The following part will illustrate that conflicting ideas about ‘patriotism’ also exist between the viewers and the commentators. Thus, in the second example the fans at home strongly oppose the alleged stance by the presenters indexing their differing conception of ‘patriotism’.

Talk-in-interaction in the reception situation

The interactions of the viewers in the television reception situation (Holly et al. 2001, Klemm 2000, Gerhardt 2009, 2008) can be characterised as an ‘open state of talk’ (Goffman 1981). The viewers do not have an obligation to talk, but they can talk if they wish. Different ‘footings’ (Goffman 1979) account for the behaviour of the viewers. For instance, during a story-telling frame the interaction of the viewers does not differ from conversation in general. It is fully coherent and no traces of the televised media text can be found. However, even during those passages a number of ‘view signs’ (Scollon 1998) such as posture and gaze direction (Gerhardt 2007) signal that the television is part of their ‘contextual configuration’ (Goodwin 2000). These view signs can be interpreted as an ‘embodiment’ (Goodwin 2000) of

the constant likelihood of a shift to the ‘watching football’ frame. In other words, such regular conversational talk may potentially be abandoned or interrupted at any given moment because of events on the screen.

These shifts are marked by ‘contextualisation cues’ (Gumperz 1982) such as interjections or rise in volume. ‘Notability’ (Gerhardt 2008), the importance assigned to the mediated events by the participants, licenses e.g. other-interruption or cutting off ‘turn constructional units’ (Sacks et al. 1974) without any markers of dispreference (Pomerantz 1984) in the ensuing talk. Hence, a goal, for instance, is generally ‘notable’ and warrants the speaker e.g. to leave his/her utterance unfinished and start celebrating, or the listener to interrupt e.g. a story-telling phase.

Formally, ‘watching football’ is realised differently depending on the general linguistic behaviour of the recorded groups. The groups of friends talk a lot about different matters such as acquaintances, their work, or the Golden Jubilee of the Queen, which was celebrated concurrently. When these shifts occur in ongoing talk, the frame is often realised through side-sequences (Jefferson 1972). In the more taciturn families, however, the talk consists of ‘free units’ or ‘islands of talk’ (Baldauf 2001) only. Hence, long periods of silence are broken up by single utterances or short passages of talk mainly concerning the mediated contents.

Within the ‘watching football’ frame, the viewers’ talk is only coherent with reference to the media text. The media text or media discourse is understood here as both, the talk on television (football commentary or ‘sports announcer talk’ (SAT, Ferguson 1982) and the transmitted pictures (the international feed). A number of cohesive ties (Halliday et al. 1976) link the talk-in-interaction and the media text. For instance, the 3rd person pronoun *he* or the definite article *the* can be used intertextually by referring to a person just mentioned on television, or multimodally by referring to someone concurrently visible on the screen. Often, the interlocutors also construct coherence interactionally (Schegloff 1990) in this frame, e.g. by backchannelling to utterances on television. At times, they even construct adjacency pairs together with the commentators, for instance when the viewers answer questions put forth on television. At these moments of intense interaction with the television, the viewers also start leaving gaps in their talk to accommodate the SAT.

To conclude, talk in the television reception situation varies enormously ranging from full-blown conversation or storytelling with no traces of the media text to passages where it can only be interpreted coherently by taking the media text into account.

Conflicting stance amongst the viewers

The following example (for a turn-by-turn discussion cf. Gerhardt 2006) illustrates that conflicting ideas exist between the viewers concerning the linguistic behaviour of Englishmen and -women when they watch England play. In the transcript below, one of the viewers, Darrell, changes his footing from that of an ardent England supporter to the more neutral standpoint of a football expert. England are playing Argentina. They are leading 1:0, and it is only ten minutes to go.

Transcript 1

- | | | |
|----|---------|---|
| 1 | Henry | <i>I can't watch it eit[her.] {laughing}=</i> |
| 2 | Darrell | <i>[no?]</i> |
| 3 | Henry | <i>it's dreadful.</i> |
| 4 | | <i>(3.4)</i> |
| 5 | Darrell | <i>well it's-</i> |
| 6 | | <i>but it's fair,</i> |
| 7 | | <i>I don't think Argentina deserve to lose.</i> |
| 8 | | <i>(0.5)</i> |
| 8 | Henry | <i>{coughs}</i> |
| 9 | | <i>oh shut up Darrell, =</i> |
| 10 | Darrel | <i>=ya-=</i> |
| 11 | Wilma | <i>={laughs}=</i> |

12 Darrell =well do you?=
 13 =I mean-=
 14 Wilma ={laughs}
 15 (1.3)
 16 I know,=
 17 =I- I think-=
 18 Henry =believe we're being [totally fair.]=
 19 Wilma [I- I-]
 20 Darrell =yeah.

Before the pause (line 4), there is a longer passage (of which only the end is given here) where the viewers all agree that they fear a goal by the Argentines any time because of England's poor performance. Then, lines 5 – 7 indicate a repositioning by Darrell from England fan to neutral football expert *well it's- but it's fair, I don't think Argentina deserve to lose*. This sudden shift of footing causes conflict between him and the other viewers. This is signalled for instance by the long pause (line 8), the coughing (line 8) and the open reprimand (line 9). However, after quite some latching (lines 9 – 20), an indication for the high involvement (Tannen 1984) of the viewers, in lines 18 – 20 the group renegotiates their stance against the media text: since they now evaluate the game as neutral experts and no longer from the standpoint of fans, they also support Darrell. In other words, the participants have negotiated that it is permissible for a Brit to take a stance which indicates that the English team should not win a game in the World Cup. Hence, it is permissible to be patriotic and still take a neutral view on the match played. Note that Henry uses the adjective *fair*, which is traditionally attributed to English national identity (Langford 2000). Hence, *being totally fair* does not contradict being patriotic.

This illustrates that the specific setting of the media reception situation allows tracing conflicting views about the appropriation of media discourse amongst the groups watching. Depending on the positioning of the audience or of different members of the audience, the media text will be read in different ways. The appropriation of media texts by a neutral

football expert is different from that by a biased supporter of England's national team. Both positions are covered by the groups' locally negotiated meaning of 'patriotism'.

Conflicting stance between the viewers and the commentators

In the following I will illustrate conflicting stance between the viewers and the commentators. We will see that the commentator's words are openly criticised by the viewers and rejected as being beside the point or inappropriate. So there are also conflicting views as to the significance of televised discourse, i.e. the football game, between the institutionally sanctioned commentators and "regular folk" at home in their living rooms. Again, the transcript is taken from Argentina against England, and we will see that more than football seems to be at stake.

Transcript 2

- | | | |
|----|-------|---|
| 1 | TV | England a::re, |
| 2 | | what. |
| 3 | | (1.5tv) |
| 4 | | one minute plus stoppage time awa::y= |
| 5 | | =from avenging, |
| 6 | | (0.9tv) |
| 7 | | the last two, = |
| 8 | Wilma | =u::h, |
| 9 | | ¹ [don't-] ¹ |
| 10 | TV | ¹ [world cup] ¹ defeats ² [by] ² ³ [Argentina.] ³ |
| 11 | Wilma | ² [don't-] ² |
| 12 | Henry | ³ [(that's-)] ³ |
| 13 | | it's just a GA::me, = |

14 =isn't-
 15 it's just a GA::me,=
 16 nothing to do with the world cup before,

At the beginning of the transcript, the commentator is giving the time that the two teams still have in the second half: *one minute plus stoppage time* (line 4), an act that can be found frequently on SAT, especially towards the end of games. Note that the commentator is giving that information from the point of view of the English team using *England* as the grammatical subject (line 1), again a position that is often assumed by the commentators in international games (Billings et al. 2004). Also, he uses metonymy, *England*, the country, to refer to the English national football team. This common practice in SAT nevertheless evokes the idea of the English team fighting vicariously for the English nation. Furthermore, officially the game itself is also called England versus Argentina and not the English men's national football team against the Argentinean men's national football team because the squads are officially conceptualized as representatives of their nations. In other words, the World Cup is conceived as a tournament of nations against nations, and the country whose national team wins the final becomes World Champion.

In line 5, the commentator uses the term *avenge* which may have the connotation of righting wrongs (cf. also below). After a short pause (line 6) which may be due to the time it takes the commentator to mentally check whether the following number is indeed correct, he continues *the last two* (line 7). At that point, one of the viewers, Wilma, interrupts by producing a sound *u::h*. It starts with a long drawn out [u:] and finishes in a rounded high front vowel [y]. Once the tongue starts shifting its position, the sound is also accompanied by strong expiration which ends in a slight whistling sound. This sound seems connected to situations where one witnesses some kind of mishap in a position with no control over the situation. Her immediately following quick *don't-* (line 9) is in overlap with the talk on TV. Because of the emergent nature of talk, Wilma at that point has only heard what was said until then. For this reason, her reaction to SAT seems surprising.

First, the language of sports is generally very much marked by the use of vocabulary from the field of war. The SPORTS IS WAR metaphor (cf. Lakoff et al. 1980, Lakoff 1994 COMPETITION IS WAR, Lönneker 2003 SPORTS IS WAR and SPORTS IS FIGHT)

seems inescapable when it comes to sports reporting. For this reason, not a single episode can be found in the ATTAC-corpus where a viewer takes note of this connection. The notions that players attack or defend go completely unnoticed in the corpus (and in general, I assume) since sports is for the most part conceptualised this way. Here however, the unexpected happens: Wilma does react and interrupts the ongoing commentary.

A closer look at the discourse surrounding the World Cup, i.e. the amalgam of sports, politics and the media will be helpful here, especially with a view to this particular pairing. I will show that in England the pairing Argentina against England still today immediately evokes the Falklands war. The following text should underline this point. It is a jocular list of so-called “Actual BBC World Cup guidelines for commentary team” (mrbrown 2001) which was circulated via the internet before

Actual BBC World Cup Guidelines for commentary team

- 1 Within 1 minute of kick off in the opening match (France v Senegal), the commentator must mention England.
- 2 Regardless of what two teams are contesting the final, England have to be mentioned within the first minute.
- 3 The commentator shall refer to the Falkland Isles in passing at some point during the England v Argentina match...
- 8 When Germany are playing, they must be referred to as being arrogant by the commentator on at least 14 occasions. This must refer to their style, their passing, their haircuts and their general footballing ability...
- 9 Should England play Germany, mentions of Winston Churchill, Dambusters, The Luftwaffe and Adolf Hitler will be compulsory. And 1966.
- 10 All Scottish members of our commentary team must continue to refer to England as "we" and "us".
- 11 We must ensure that nationalistic stereotypes are adhered to. Of course, the Germans are arrogant. The Spanish are bottlers, The Nigerians are fast but bad at defending, The Cameroonians are disorganised, The Argentineans are cheats and the French are only good because their best players play in England...

These guidelines list some of the typical features of SAT at international competitions such as the tendency to comment from an English perspective (cf. guidelines 1 and 2). Clearly, for such a text to appear humorous, the guidelines mentioned must match the general experience of the readers with SAT. The stereotypes both of SAT (and of the nations in questions) must be general world knowledge. Of special interest here is guideline 3 *The commentator shall refer to the Falkland Isles in passing at some point during the England v Argentina match*. For this guideline to appear humorous, there must be a general notion that the Falklands war is salient when it comes to this specific pairing. To illustrate this point, for instance *The commentator shall refer to Copenhagen in passing at some point during the England v Denmark match* would generally not represent a coherent piece of writing because the Battle of Copenhagen (1801) between England and Denmark is not salient when the two nations pair in football.

To return to England and Argentina in particular, because of the common history between the two nations, this pairing has a particular significance (cf. Alabarces et al. 2001). It is marked by the long history of rivalry both insides and outsides of sports. For instance, Diego Maradona, an Argentinean who can be ranked amongst the best football players ever, scored an illegal, but unpenalised goal via a handball in the quarter final in the World Cup in 1986, kicking England out of the tournament. After the game, Maradona allegedly said that it was “la mano de dios”, i.e. ‘the hand of God’ one could see scoring on the television screens. Furthermore, that quarter-final was preceded by jingoistic reports on both sides of the Atlantic implying that the Falklands war would be fought again on the pitch that afternoon (cf. also below).

A few examples from the English press coverage shall underscore the point that the media and its institutional discourse produces an amalgam between sports, politics and the common history of the nations in question (mostly the common history regarding wars). We will see in the following that rule no. 3 in the guide lines above seems, at least in the following example, to be truly followed by the sports reporters. It suggests that the Falklands war is so very immediate in the discourse of football that it can be mentioned without any apparent reason, solely because the pairing England v Argentina is mentioned. Note that the Spanish, hence Argentinean, name for the islands is Las Malvinas. The following snippet is taken from The Times at the time when Beckham was playing for Real Madrid. The reason for the article was that Beckham had touched his genitals (through his pants) in public (and when cameras were around).

The Times, Dec. 6th, 2003

Most Spanish fans are only dimly aware that the England-Argentina saga is akin to the long and noble mutual loathing enjoyed between Barcelona and Real Madrid. But they instinctively know that the real name for the Falklands is Las Malvinas.

As we can see, there is no exophoric grounding for mentioning the crisis in this commentary. If this connection between the pairing in football and the war is drawn in *The Times*, it is even more popular in tabloids such as *The Sun*. The following quotes from the time of the game illustrate how the Argentineans are stylised as wanting to take revenge on the pitch for their loss of the Falklands war.

The Sun, June 6th, 2002

Teddy Sheringham: I think some of the quotes which have come out of their [i.e. the Argentineans'] camp in the last couple of weeks, about this being revenge for the Falklands War, builds it up for them..."

The Sun, June 6th, 2002

DAVID BECKHAM and his World Cup troops have been told: Don't mention the war.

With England's showdown against Argentina just 48 hours away, the debate over the Falklands conflict is back on the agenda. The Argies still claim the islands they call Las Malvinas belong to them. And FA bosses have warned skipper Becks and Co are likely to be questioned about the disputed territory. A Soho Square source said: "We will make sure the players and the manager are made well aware of the potential pitfalls before they do any interviews." Most of the England squad were only kids when the conflict took place 20 years ago, but one wrong answer could spark an international incident.

The Sun, June 8th, 2002

We have lived through one nightmare after another as the South Americans, bound together as a nation after the Falklands War, took their revenge on the football pitch.

These examples illustrate that matches between England and Argentina immediately evoke the crisis from 1982. Albeit these are all passages taken from the British press coverage, it is the Argentineans who are portrayed as the ones who draw this connection.

To continue with the discussion of the viewers' talk (transcript 2), in the light of the press quotations above, it seems feasible that Wilma's overt forceful protest should be interpreted in this context. She seems to try to prevent the commentators from uttering something foolish or nationalistic with her exclamation. She then breaks off *don't*- (line 9) and repeats her quick

don't- (line 11) at the next transition relevance place (after *defeats* line 10). However, since the commentator continues, again she stops (in this way displaying that she follows the general rules of watching football (cf. the 'watching football frame' above)). At that point, the topic of SAT has crystallised: the commentators are "only" talking about sports, since they now refer explicitly to Argentinean football victories, amongst them the one in 1986 *the last two world cup defeats by Argentina* (lines 7 and 10).

Then Henry, her husband's friend, starts talking immediately after Wilma's second *don't* (line 11) and in overlap with the last word on television *Argentina* (line 10): *that's* (line 12). Since he starts at a point where the commentator has not yet finished, he signals that the commentary should be disregarded. The setting under study allows these shifting participation frameworks (Goffman 1981) constructed by the viewers: either they can listen intently and make space in their own talk to accommodate the commentary, e.g. by respecting the turn-rights of the commentators. In that way the commentators are turned into ratified speakers in the participation framework of the viewers at home. On the other hand, they can also "rudely" interrupt and disregard SAT building their own participation framework with the other viewers as participants only. So Wilma follows the interactional rules of the 'watching football' frame by interrupting herself twice (lines 9 and 11): in the first instance because she realises that she does not manage to insert her words in the pause on TV, and in the second instance because she realises that the journalist means to continue. This very same kind of pattern (lines 8-11) could be found in face-to-face interaction where one person attempts to get the floor because s/he means to challenge the current speaker's position. Henry, however, by starting in the middle of a syntactically, semantically and intonationally unfinished unit, signals that he is at that point disregarding the commentary. Note that he does not, however, interrupt Wilma who (line 12) has already yielded the floor after her second self-interruption. He then voices his anger about this particular piece of commentary through the reiteration of his key sentence *it's just a GA::me* (lines 13 and 15) which he repeats not only verbatim, but also with the same intonation contour and the same tone of voice. As to the semantic content, his utterance does not seem coherent with regards to SAT: TV: *England are one minute... away from avenging the last... world cup defeats by Argentina.* Henry: *It's just a game.* After all, the sportscaster does conceptualise the current game as a football game in the context of earlier games with the same pairing in the same tournament. The expression 'it's just a game' is usually employed to defend football as a simple recreational pastime and straightforward ballgame against more general implications about its significance in society (cf. literature in sociology claiming that sports is NOT just a game Harvey and et al. 1988, Baker et al. 1997, Archetti 1999). Furthermore, it is used to counter excessive emotional reactions during or after ball games. However, neither does the journalist leave the sphere of sports, nor is his announcing here marked by affectivity. Only the term 'avenge' may presuppose an earlier wrong doing in referring to 'retribution' (in contrast to 'revenge' which may entail malicious retaliation) (cf. 'avenge' Oxford English Dictionary 2009). So Henry's protest just like Wilma's seems to be countering a perceived misappropriation of the game in political or societal terms much rather than the actual utterance by the commentator that emerges only when their protests are already being voiced. Henry's last utterance *nothing to do with the world cup before* (line 16) then reframes

Wilma's and his disapproval in the light of the actual utterance by the reporters. Hence, he by then realises that the commentators do not actually mention the Falklands and makes their talk cohere again.

To conclude, the strong resistance voiced by the viewers towards the official reading of the game by the journalists must be seen in the light of this amalgam between sports, politics, and the media, which surrounds football in general and even more so the pairing Argentina vs. England in the World Cup. Albeit on the surface in the end sports only is mentioned, this unparalleled reaction by the participants seems only explicable in that the viewers fear some jingoistic comments and try to shush the journalists. To return to 'patriotism', this transcript illustrates resistance against the reading of the game by the media and uneasiness towards an extension of football into politics. The viewers' linguistic construction of 'patriotism' does not support an interpretation of the football game as a re-enactment of a political crisis between the two nations concerned.

Conclusion

I hope to have shown how an abstract concept like 'patriotism' surfaces in the talk-in-interaction by the viewers. The audience does not use the word itself. However, one can clearly see the imprints or effects of some such concept in this setting. One focus was on how patriotism gets negotiated by the viewers amongst themselves. The example suggests that one of the viewer's linguistic behaviour is first interpreted as being unacceptable for a patriot. However, after the audience repositioning themselves as neutral football experts, his behaviour gets ratified by his co-viewers. In relation to SAT, a fissure appears in the viewers' talk that further supports the existence of such a demarcation. Although the commentator talks about sports only, the mere possibility that he might broach the topic of the Falklands war induces the viewers to distance themselves from this sort of jingoistic, chauvinist patriotism.

Due to lack of space, the connection between the pictures on television and the language in the corpus had to be excluded from the written version of this paper. One interesting perspective regarding the negotiation of meaning in this particular setting opens when the participants see a clash between what is shown in the pictures and what is said in SAT. These multimodal issues have to be treated elsewhere.

References

- Alabarces, P., Tomlinson, A. and Young, C. 2001. Argentina versus England at the France'98 World Cup: Narratives of nation and the mythologizing of the popular. *Media, Culture and Society* 23(5): 547–66.
- Archetti, E. P. 1999. *Masculinities: Football, polo and the tango in Argentina*. Oxford: Berg.
- Baker, A. and T. Boyd (eds.). 1997. *Out of bounds: Sports, media and the politics of identity*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Baldauf, H. 2001. Strukturen und Formen des fernsehbegleitenden Sprechens. In *Der sprechende Zuschauer. Wie wir uns Fernsehen kommunikativ aneignen*, W. Holly, U. Püschel and J. Bergmann (eds), 61-82. Wiesbaden: Westdeutscher.
- Billings, A. C. and Tambosi, F. 2004. Portraying the United States vs portraying a champion. US network bias in the 2002 World Cup. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport* 39: 157–165.
- Davies, B. and Harré, R. 1990. Positioning: The discursive production of selves. *Journal for the theory of social behaviour* 20(1): 43–63.
- Ferguson, C.A. 1982. Sports announcer talk: Syntactic aspects of register variation. *Language in society* 12: 153-172.
- Gerhardt, C. 2009. Intertextual and multimodal humour in the media reception situation: The case of watching football on TV. In *Humor in interaction*, N. R. Norrick and D. Chiaro (eds), 79-98. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Gerhardt, C. 2008. Talk by television viewers watching live football matches: Coherence through interactionality, intertextuality, and multimodality. Dissertation, Saarland University.
- Gerhardt, C. 2007. Watching television: The dilemma of gaze. *Toegepaste Taalwetenschap in Artikelen* 77: 91-101, 140.
- Gerhardt, C. 2006. Moving closer to the audience: Watching football on television. *Revista alicantina de estudios ingleses* [Special issue on linguistics and media discourse] 19: 125-148.
- Goffman, E. 1981. *Forms of Talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Goffman, E. 1979. Footing. *Semiotica* 25: 1-29.
- Goffman, E. 1974. *Frame Analysis*. New York: Harper & Rowe.
- Goodwin, C. 2000. Action and embodiment within situated human interaction. *Journal of pragmatics* 32: 1489-1522.
- Gumperz, J.J. 1982. *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Halliday, M.A.K. and Hasan, R. 1976. *Cohesion in English*. Harlow: Longman.
- Harveyand, J. and Cantelon, H. (eds.). 1988. *Not just a game: Essays in Canadian sport sociology*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.
- Holly, W., Püschel, U. and Bergmann, J. (eds.). 2001. *Der sprechende Zuschauer: Wie wir uns Fernsehen kommunikativ aneignen*. Opladen: Westdeutscher.
- Jefferson, G. 1972. Side sequences. In *Studies in Social Interaction*, D.N. Sudnow (ed), 294-338. New York: Free Press.
- Klemm, M. 2000. *Zuschauerkommunikation: Formen und Funktionen der alltäglichen kommunikativen Fernsehaneignung*. Frankfurt: Lang.
- Lakoff, G. 1994. Conceptual metaphor homepage. <http://cogsci.berkeley.edu/lakoff/>
- Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M. 1980. *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Langford, P. 2000. *Englishness Identified: Manners and Character 1650-1850*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lönneker, B. 2003. Is there a way to represent metaphors in WordNets?: Insights from the Hamburg Metaphor Database. *Proceedings of the ACL 2003 workshop on Lexicon and figurative language*, 18 – 27. Morristown: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- mrbrown. 2001. Actual BBC World Cup guidelines for commentary team (I am told). http://www.mrbrown.com/blog/2001/10/bbc_world_cup.html
- Pomerantz, A. 1984. Agreeing and disagreeing with assessment: Some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes. In J.M. Atkinson and J. Heritage (eds), *Structure of social action: Studies in conversation analysis*, 57-101. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E.A. and Jefferson, G. 1974. A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking in conversation. *Language* 50(4): 696-735.
- Schegloff, E.A. 1990. On the organization of sequences as a source of ‘coherence’ in talk-in-interaction. In Bruce Dorval (ed), *Conversational organization and its development*, 51-77. Norwood: Ablex.
- Scollon, R. 1998. *Mediated Discourse as Social Interaction: A Study of News Discourse*. London: Longman.
- Tannen, D. 1984. *Conversational Style: Analyzing Talk Among Friends*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.