FACTA UNIVERSITATIS
Series: **Linguistics and Literature** Vol. 17, N° 1, 2019, pp. 41-56
https://doi.org/10.22190/FULL1901041T

Original Scientific Paper

QUOTATIVE USE ACROSS LANGUAGES: THE CASE OF NEW ZEALAND ENGLISH AND GERMAN

UDC 811.111(931)'367.625
811.112.2'367.625

Agnes Terraschke

Auckland University of Technology, New Zealand

Abstract. *Quotatives, the representation of speech, thought, sound effects or embodiments in spoken language, are a common feature of interpersonal communication. Linguistic descriptions of quotatives have predominantly focused on their use within an individual language or language variety. Little is known about how quotative use differs across languages with regard to their forms, variable content and linguistic features. Based on two datasets of informal dyadic interactions, the present research compares how quotatives are used in New Zealand English (NZE) and Standard German by describing the features of quotative use both overall and in relation to the three most commonly used forms in each dataset. The results highlight marked differences in the way quotatives are used in the two languages. Thus, in the German data, quotatives were mostly used for first person singular speakers in the past tense form to convey internal dialogue, while NZE speakers favoured the use of quotatives for direct speech in the past without clear subject preferences.*

Key words: *quotatives, cross-cultural comparison, German, New Zealand English*

1. INTRODUCTION

English quotatives have been a popular focus of research as a means to describe language change in apparent time. The term 'quotatives' refers here to both the direct speech element itself and the range of verbs that introduce it, such as *she <u>said</u>*, *I <u>thought</u>*, or *he <u>was like</u>* in English. Quotatives are interactive devices that can serve to make a story more engaging, add focus to a particular point, convey the speakers' current or past stance or create a more personal and intimate conversational atmosphere (Buchstaller 2014; Ferrara and Bell 1995; Mathis and Yule 1994; Romaine and Lange 1991). Like other interactive devices, the profiles of quotative use have been found to differ between

Submitted December 7, 2018; Accepted March 12, 2019
Corresponding author: Agnes Terraschke
Auckland University of Technology
E-mail: agnes.terraschke@gmail.com

© 2019 by University of Niš, Serbia | Creative Commons Licence: CC BY-NC-ND

quotative verbs, sociolinguistic groups and across time (e.g. Tagliamonte and D'Arcy 2004; Tagliamonte and Hudson 1999).

While the main focus of inquiry thus far has been on English, there has been a growing interest in the use of quotatives in other languages (e.g. Buchstaller and van Alphen 2012). Steever (2002), for instance, examined the representations of direct and indirect speech in Tamil, Coppen and Foolen (2012) investigated the development of the Dutch quotative *van* over time, and Golato (2002b) described the use of quotatives in the context of reporting past decisions in German. The occurrence of quotatives in other languages raises the question whether quotatives are used at similar rates across languages. Based on data collected from speakers of Standard German and New Zealand English, the current study draws on the features identified as relevant in variationist discussions of quotatives to investigate frequencies and characteristics of use in these two languages varieties.

2. Literature Survey

2.1. Formal features of quotative use

Academic interest in quotatives was ignited by the introduction and spread of the new English quotative form *be like*. The adoption of *be like* into the quotative systems of local and national varieties of English has given particularly variationist researchers the opportunity to study language change in action as it allows them to observe how quickly a new form is adopted across different age groups, who adopts it and which linguistic and sociolinguistic norms are applied to it. In this sense, the provision of detailed description of quotatives offers "possibilities to explore how local varieties interact with and distinguish themselves in terms of rapidly spreading linguistic features" (Kohn and Franz 2009, 260).

First noted by Butters (1982) in American English, *be like* has since been observed and described for a range of national, regional and ethnic varieties. The speed with which it has been adopted throughout the world can be seen in studies featuring the same variety of English at different points in time. Merely seven years after an initial description of quotative use among 18- to 28-year-old speakers of Canadian English in 1995 (Tagliamonte and Hudson 1999), Tagliamonte and D'Arcy (2004) found *be like* to have replaced forms like *say* and *go* as the most commonly used quotative form among the same age group. A similar pattern was also observed for New Zealand English (Baird 2001) and Australian English (Rodriguez Louro 2013).

While *be like* is generally emerging as the most frequently used form, studies also consistently highlight differences in the quotative systems across and within different varieties of English. In Glaswegian English, for instance, adolescents were found to use a range of forms, such as *go like that* and *done that*, that do not appear to be used in this way elsewhere (Macaulay 2001). Some varieties are found to differ in terms of quotative preferences as Texan Chicana teenage girls appear to favour the use of *go* quotatives over *be like* (Hansen-Thomas 2008). Interestingly, this differs from quotative use among Californian Chicana English speakers, who prefer the use of quotative variants involving *like*, suggesting regional variation within the quotative inventory of Chicana English.

To complicate matters further, even speakers of the same speech community can differ in their use of quotatives. Gender in particular has yielded varied results. While some studies suggested that *be like* is a feature of the speech of mostly younger women (Ferrara and Bell 1995; Romaine and Lange 1991; Tagliamonte and D'Arcy 2004),

others found it to be used more often by males (Blyth, Recktenwald, and Wang 1990; Rodriguez Louro 2013) and again others did not note any marked gender difference at all (Ferrara and Bell 1995; Tagliamonte and Hudson 1999, for their Canadian English data).

Different patterns of use can be found when comparing the profiles of individual quotatives. Variationist studies of quotatives tend to provide detailed descriptions of the linguistic and sociolinguistic features of individual forms in order to illustrate patterns of linguistic and functional expansion, i.e. a broadening of scope of use to a wider range of grammatical structures and content. Using the linguistic characteristics of tense and grammatical person to describe quotative use, a preference was found for *be like*, *go* and *say* to occur in conjunction with third person speakers in some varieties, such as Australian and Scottish English (Macaulay 2001; Winter 2002). In Canadian, British and American English, however, *be like* was most closely linked to first person subjects (Blyth et al. 1990; Tagliamonte and D'Arcy 2004; Tagliamonte and Hudson 1999).

Variationist studies also consider the variable content of quotatives in their analyses. The main differentiations made here lie between those quotatives that are used to convey direct speech, those that indicate internal dialogue and those that represent gestures or sound effects (Buchstaller 2014; Kohn and Franz 2009; Tagliamonte and D'Arcy 2004; Tagliamonte and Hudson 1999). This distinction has proven valuable in capturing how particular quotative forms are restricted in their use and in allowing researchers to record their functional expansion. In Tagliamonte and Hudson's (1999) comparison of British and Canadian English, for example, they noted that in British English, quotative *go* was used more in conjunction with direct speech but mainly conveyed internal dialogue in Canadian English. Tagliamonte and D'Arcy (2004) also illustrate the functional expansion of *be like*, which was mostly used in conjunction with internal dialogue in early studies but has since moved into the domain of direct speech.

2.2. Quotatives in other languages

Despite the prevalent focus on English among variationist descriptions of quotatives, the use of reported speech can be regarded as a common feature of informal interaction and has been described in various languages, such as Japanese (Coulmas 1986), Tamil (Steever 2002), Iberian Spanish (Etxepare 2008), or Norwegian (Hasund, Obsahl and Svenning 2012). The use of constructed dialogue has also been described for German. These descriptions have focused on a qualitative examination of their construction in interactions. Günthner (1999), for instance, described the means used to enact and perform reported speech in conversations in German, including the use of prosody, voice quality and code-switching. In her examination of sequences of troubles-telling in spontaneous interactions, Golato (2002b) analysed the forms and effects of self-quotations and identified the individual segments that make up these sequences (troubles telling, troubles acknowledgement by interlocutor, report of decision; evaluation of decision by interlocutor). Her analysis suggests that quotatives that occur in this context usually feature a first-person subject and the quotative verb tends to take a present perfect tense. This notion that certain quotative forms are linked to certain narrative sequences was further developed in another paper by Golato (2002a) where she highlighted that different quotatives forms are used in different contexts and for different purposes.

The fact that quotatives feature in languages from all over the world raises the question of how their use compares across languages and cultures. German *so* and English *like* or *be*

like have received some attention in this context (Golato 2000; Streeck 2002). Both Golato (2000) and Streeck (2002) discuss the parallels of their development into quotatives. While Streeck (2002) focuses on their use to introduce extralinguistic or mimetic content, Golato (2000) found that *und NP so* serves to introduce both mimetic and direct speech segments. Based on her analysis, Golato (2000) showed that, compared to the English form, German *und NP so* was used very little in her corpus of spontaneous conversations. Such a difference in use of this one particular quotative form in languages as similar as German and English raises the question of whether quotatives have different interactional uses in the two languages.

2.3. The current study

The current paper explores these questions of different statuses and uses of quotative in the two languages by comparing the quotative inventories of New Zealand English (NZE) and German. While the analysis considers features identified by variationist approaches, the study does not aim to emulate the same methodology but instead uses the linguistic features of quotatives to conduct a direct text-linguistic comparison of quotative use in the two languages. Based on a corpus of dyadic interactions between university students, the quotative systems of the two languages are described with regard to the variability of forms used and their frequency of occurrence.

The current study draws on data from two sets of informal dyadic interactions: one between native speakers of NZE (NSE) and the other between native speakers of German (NSG). Based on an analysis of these interactions, detailed descriptions of the quotative inventories of both German and NZE are provided with regard to individual forms, frequencies and linguistic features such as tense, person and variable content. The patterns observed among NSG and NSE are then contrasted to highlight differences in the ways quotatives are used in the two languages. The features of quotative use in NZE and German are described and compared concurrently, drawing on examples from both languages, as the results are most informative and revealing when considered in direct contrast to each other.

3. DATA

The study is based on the audio and video recordings of 30 dyadic interactions between near-strangers. Half of the 30 interactions were conducted between Germans, and the other half between NSE. Overall, approximately 9 ½ hours of informal conversation were recorded and transcribed to create a German dataset of 59,884 words (4 ½ hours of conversation) and a NSE dataset of 58,869 words (5 hours of conversation). As illustrated in Table 1, each language group was represented by 15 females and 15 males, resulting in 5 interactions between males, 5 between females and 5 mixed-sex interactions. Table 1 also lists the number of words of transcription in each of the three subsets, which form the basis of measurements and comparisons for the remainder of the paper.

Table 1 The number of interactions and word counts for each dyad type table

	NSE		NSG		
	N	Words	N	Words	Total
F-F	5	20,174	5	22,859	10
M-M	5	17,637	5	14,945	10
F-M	5	21,058	5	22,080	10
		F: 10,163		F: 9,595	
		M: 10,895		M: 12,485	
Total	15	58,869	15	59,884	30

An investigation of gender differences was not attempted as the relatively small size of each subset meant that results would be more susceptible to reflect individual preferences.

All participants were between 20 and 30 years old, and all but three were students at one of the main universities in New Zealand. Most German participants were exchange students who were spending 6-12 months in New Zealand as part of their degree. At the time of the recordings, the German participants had been living in New Zealand between 3 months and 8 years. While the German group came from all over Germany and therefore do not represent a coherent regional variety, their speech still provides a snapshot of quotative use among German university students using a form of Standard German.

Most participants had never met before the recordings; however, since the German student community in this New Zealand city is relatively small, it was unavoidable that some German speakers were acquainted. The study sought to use participants that did not know each other prior to the recordings to ensure the interactions represent comparable social relationships and interactional settings. While this meant that speakers did not have a shared past, which may have fostered the use of story-telling and thereby quotatives, the interactions offer insight into how university students use quotatives as a communicative tool in a very particular social setting, namely with new acquaintances or near strangers.

Data collection involved participants engaging in a conversation for 20-30 minutes about a topic of their choice in the absence of the researcher while being recorded. In this sense, the study relies on staged rather than naturally occurring interactions. The benefit of this approach is that sociolinguistic characteristics such as gender, age and educational background could be controlled for, thus allowing for a direct comparison between conversations. Despite the staged nature of the interaction, the social pressure to engage and create interpersonal relationships can be regarded as similar to those found in naturally occurring settings. In this sense, the set-up of the study has the potential to pinpoint cultural differences in the ways participants use language to engage with and relate to each other and build social relationships. The two datasets were searched manually for instances of quotatives. Each instance was then coded for the identified linguistic variables, namely subject, tense and content. Considering the relatively small speaker groups and small numbers of quotatives per item, it was decided to draw only on descriptive statistics and basic statistical tests to describe and compare the observed patterns of use.

4. QUOTATIVE INVENTORIES

4.1 Classifying quotatives

Quotatives are segments of constructed speech that convey real or imagined conversations, performed reactions and illustrations of personal or collective feelings, thoughts, or attitudes. Instances of quotatives are often syntactically and phonologically marked to clearly distinguish them from the main part of the contribution and they can be introduced by a set of quotatives verbs, such as *say* (*he says "that sounds alright yeah screw this plug on"*) or *be like* (*and everybody's like "what are you talking about"*). Cases where an enacted element was not introduced by a lexical form were marked as zero quotatives (Mathis and Yule 1994).

Following Mathis and Yule (1994) and Tagliamonte and Hudson (1999), zero quotatives were only counted when they introduced a new event, which is constituted either by a clearly marked change in time or context or by a shift in speakers as illustrated in Example 1. Here, Vivianne uses constructed dialogue to describe what she considers to be the arrogant attitude of mostly first-year law students and her response to it. Vivianne's contributions are underlined and the response attributed to the law students, which is marked by a shift in her tone of voice, is presented in italics.

Example 1: NSE/F-F/F1

Vivianne: when you meet especially like little first year law girls + then they are all that what are you doing*law* + that's nice

The example features three segments of reported discourse, namely the initial underlined utterance, the law students' response and the final speaker response, the last underlined element.

Furthermore, only those quotatives were considered that introduce a new speech event – quotative events that are merely interrupted by a short comment (*it's like "ah I actually" you know "produced something today"*) and false starts were counted as one occurrence. Quotative identification was mostly straightforward but when a difficult case was encountered, the decision was made based on the wider discourse context and on prosodic cues gauged from the original recordings.

4.2 Quotative inventories in NZE and German

Table 2 presents the quotative inventories of the NSE and NSG datasets. Since the two datasets differ in size, raw frequency counts are not directly comparable. Instead, the overall frequency of occurrence per 1,000 words was used as a basis for comparison. While quantifying the occurrences of certain linguistic forms can be seen as problematic (Schegloff, 1993) as language use depends on the content of conversation rather than the length of talk, frequency counts still provide an indication of how prominently quotatives are used by speakers in this setting. The numbers of words in the sub-corpora were not adjusted for multi-word quotatives or any other multi-word collocations. In addition to

[1] Examples are marked for the language group of the speaker (NSE), the gender composition of the dyad (M-M) and the gender of the speaker (M).

the raw number and the frequency of occurrence, the table also lists the percentage of use of each quotative form in relation to the entire quotative inventory of each dataset.

Table 2 Quotative inventory of NSE and NSG native-native interactions

NSE	No	Freq	%	NSG	No	Freq	%
Be like	125	2.12	36.55	*Denken* (think)	59	0.98	36.7
Zero	105	1.78	30.7	*Sagen* (say)	36	0.61	22.4
Say	35	0.59	10.23	Zero	21	0.35	13.0
Go	32	0.54	9.36	*Und NP so* (be like)	11	0.18	6.8
Like	18	0.31	5.26	*So* (like)	10	0.17	6.2
Be (all)	13	0.22	3.8	*Meinen* (deem)	8	0.13	5.0
Think	10	0.17	2.92	*Von wegen* (like)	4	0.06	2.5
Decide	1	0.02	0.29	*Überlegen* (consider)	3	0.05	1.9
Ask	1	0.02	0.29	*Drauf stehen* (written)	2	0.03	1.2
Feel all	1	0.02	0.29	*Wissen* (know)	1	0.02	0.6
Write	1	0.02	0.29	*NP nur* (NP just)	1	0.02	0.6
				Beraten (advise)	1	0.02	0.6
				Fragen (ask)	1	0.02	0.6
				Feststellen(realise)	1	0.02	0.6
				Empfehlen (recommend)	1	0.02	0.6
				Erzählen (tell)	1	0.02	0.6
Total	342	5.81	100	Total	161	2.69	99.9

As the data in Table 2 indicates, even though NSG seem to use a greater variety of quotative forms, they use quotatives notably less than NSE overall. A two-sample t-test using the frequency indexes of participants in each group combined indicates that this difference between the two groups is statistically significant (NSE mean 5.14, StDev 4.18; NSG mean 2.89, StDev 2.63; t-value 2.49; DF = 48, p-value 0.016). The small number of tokens in the German data means that all findings for this set are merely indicative and require further exploration in a larger corpus.

A closer look at the spread of quotatives across speakers shows some stark variation within each group. Within the NSG, use ranged from zero (3 speakers) to speakers who used quotatives at a frequency of 0.9 and 1.2, with most participants featuring frequency indexes between 0.2-0.5. The average frequency use across all 30 NSG is 0.29. When adjusting the higher frequency users to a more average value, the average use remains at 0.24.The NSE data also features 3 participants who did not use quotatives. Most speakers used quotatives at a frequency between 0.3-0.7 and 4 speakers reached a frequency of 1.0 and beyond. The average frequency was 0.51, which dropped to 0.49 when the outliers were adjusted. In other words, even when adjusted for high frequency users, NSE still used quotatives on average about twice as often as NSG. The remainder of the paper considers all instances of quotative use.

In addition to this marked quantitative difference in quotative use, there are also noticeable qualitative differences with regard to the quotative forms speakers from the two language groups prefer. Thus, German speakers seem to favour the use of explicit quotative forms, with *denken* 'think' and *sagen* 'say' constituting more than half of the entire inventory. Similar to Golato's (2000) data, NSG do not use *und NP so* 'be like' very often. In contrast, the NSE group exhibits a preference for less explicit forms such as zero quotatives and *be like*. In the following sections, patterns of quotative use in the

NSE and NSG datasets are described to identify qualitative differences of quotative use between the two languages. For this purpose, the two datasets are analysed in terms of the linguistic features of tense, subject and quotative content. The analysis also includes more detailed descriptions of the features of the three most commonly used quotative forms in the two languages. These descriptions contribute to the establishment of the quotative profiles and further highlight the differences in quotative use between the two languages.

5. Describing Quotative Use

5.1. Linguistic features

Differences and similarities of quotative use have been described with reference to their formal characteristics. Following this approach, all quotatives were categorised according to their subject, tense, and quotative content. In most cases, the quotative subject is embedded in the quotative construction itself (Kohn and Franz 2009), as in the case of *I say*, which has a first person singular subject. The subject of those quotative forms that do not carry a clear subject, such as *like* or zero quotatives, was determined from context. However, this was not always possible, as Example 2 illustrates. In this excerpt, Veit describes the initial assurance he received from his university that the courses he took while on exchange would be fully recognised, only to discover later on that that was not actually the case. A translation of Veit's utterance is presented in italics below the original.

Example 2: NSG/M-M/M

Veit:	also weil vorher am Anfang des Studiums oh Mann da geht man dahin und dann "das wird ganz toll anerkannt" nichts da
Veit:	*because before at the beginning of your studies oh man you go there and then "everything will be recognised" but no*

The speaker of the direct speech segment is not clearly identifiable from the context and it could be interpreted either as a comment by one specific person or as a stereotypical response Veit or others received from various people on several occasions when inquiring about this matter. Quotatives that were not explicitly marked for their intended subject were coded as zero subjects.

The categorisation of tense distinguishes between present, past, future, "other" tenses and the use of the historical present. The group of 'other' tenses includes conditional constructions as well as zero quotatives and invariant forms (e.g. *like*), which do not carry tense markers. The historical present refers to the use of the present tense form for a quotative in segments where a clear "past temporal reference" (D'Arcy 2010, 67) has been established. In other words, it is the use of quotatives in the present tense in situations that were clearly marked as past events. Table 3 illustrates the different tenses with examples from the two datasets.

Table 3 Quotative tenses in NSE and NSG

Tense	NSE	NSG
Present	then he goes "ah I'm going to go to Chile"	und die Uni sagt "yo kostet jetzt irgendwas weiss nich fünf tausend Dollar" *and the university says "yo that's five thousand dollars or something"*
Past	and he said "you can't do that"	und dann haben wir gedacht "okay probieren wir's mal aus" *and then we thought "ok, let's try it"*
Historical Present (HP)	so I rang up and I go "can I have a new T-shirt?"	und dann hab ich mirgedacht"ja super was wie wann denn? Nächstes Jahr?" [laughs]. Da meint der "nee in zweiWochen fängt das Semester an". *and then I thought "great what how when? Next year?" [laughs]. And he says "No the semester starts in two weeks"*
Future	and I'll be like "oh my goodness I know yes"	dann werden sie wahrscheinlich alle zu euch kommen und sagen "ah ich hab 'nen Job für euch" *then they'll all come to you and say "ah I have a job for you"*
Other	I'd be like "well I move out then"	ja ich auch so "mhm naja ich geh dann mal ins Bett" *I'm like "mhm well I'm off to bed"*

Table 4 lists how often these different features occurred in conjunction with the quotative inventories of NZE and German. The table lists the raw number count and uses percentages to indicate how often a feature was used in relation to all quotatives found in each dataset.

Table 4 Quotative use according to grammatical person and tense

	NSE		NSG	
	No	%	No	%
1sg	116	33.9	89	55.3
2sg	27	7.9	17	10.6
3sg	124	36.3	30	18.6
1pl	14	4.1	3	1.9
2pl	-	-	-	-
3pl	36	10.5	16	9.9
Zero	25	7.3	6	3.7
Pres	67	19.6	33	20.5
Past	105	30.7	75	46.6
HP	32	9.4	2	1.2
Future	1	0.3	1	0.6
Other	137	40.1	50	31.1

A consideration of the results in Table 4 highlights the areas where quotative use in the two languages differs most prominently. Thus, while NSE use quotatives at similar

rates for both first and third person speakers (they constitute 34% and 36.4% of all quotatives respectively), NSG seem to attribute constructed speech elements markedly more often to the first person (55.3% of all quotatives have a first-person subject). This could be related to the high frequency use of *denken* 'think' by this group, which, as a verb of internal reflection, calls for a first-person subject. Quotatives with a third person singular subject (18.6% of all NSG quotatives) are used comparatively little in the German data. The remaining subject forms (2nd singular, 1st plural, 3rd plural and zero) constitute similar proportions in the NSE and NSG datasets. A Chi-square test comparing quotative subject distributions between NSE and NSG indicates that the differences described are statistically significant (Chi-Sq 28.2 on 5 DF, $p < 0.001$).[2]

The data in Table 4 also shows a clear difference in the distributions across tenses and, based on a Chi-square test, this difference is also statistically significant (Chi-Sq 20.6 on 3 DF, $p < 0.001$). For the purpose of conducting the test and avoiding low numbers in some categories, the values for future tense were added to the 'other' group. The findings for tense highlight a stark preference for past tense quotatives by the NSG group (47% of the German quotative inventory) over present tense forms (20.5%). The data suggests that NSE also prefer past tense forms over present tense forms; however, the difference between the two categories is not as pronounced as in German. In the NSE data, the most frequently used tense group is the 'other' category (39.9% of all quotatives), which is mostly related to the high frequency use of zero quotatives and other tenseless quotative forms. Finally, the data indicates that the historical present is used markedly less in the German compared to the NZE data, suggesting that it is not a prominent stylistic feature of social interaction among this group of German students.

5.1.1. Linguistic features of frequently used quotatives

The following section takes a closer look at the characteristics of the three most frequently used English and German forms found in the data. A comparison of the characteristics of individual quotatives serves to highlight scopes and constraints of these forms within the quotative system of a language community. For simplicity's sake, only the most frequently occurring and most clearly defined characteristics are considered here, namely 1st and 3rd person singular subjects plus present and past tenses. The data presented in Table 4.1 includes the raw frequency count (N) and the percentage (%) marking how many quotatives carried the feature in question, e.g. how many *be like* quotatives featured a first-person subject. This value gives an impression on how strongly a feature is associated with a particular form.

[2] The relatively high occurrence of first person quotatives may be an artefact of the data collection method as participants did not know one another prior to the recording and did not share friends and acquaintances whom they could quote. However, seeing as the data collection approach and social relationships among both groups were the same, the NSG group still exhibits a marked preference for first person quotatives compared to NZE speakers.

Table 4.1 Selected grammatical person and tense of three most commonly used forms

	N	%	N	%	N	%
NSE	*Be like* (125)		Zero (105)		*Say* (35)	
1st pers. sg.	42	39%	35	33%	8	24%
3rd pers. sg.	62	50%	25	24%	19	56%
Present	34	27%	-	-	12	34%
Past	69	55%	-	-	14	40%
NSG	*Denken* (59)		*Sagen* (36)		Zero (21)	
1st pers. sg.	46	78%	12	33%	10	48%
3rd pers. sg.	2	3%	8	22%	4	19%
Present	15	25%	14	39%	-	-
Past	43	73%	21	58%	-	-

The data presented in Table 4.1 indicates some links between features and forms in both languages. The NSG data suggests a strong preference for using *denken* 'think' with a first person singular subject as 78% of all *denken*-quotatives had a first person singular subject. Furthermore, both *denken* 'think' and *sagen* 'say' were used predominantly in the past tense (73% and 58% respectively). *Be like* also seems to be associated with third person singular subjects (50%) and past tense (55%) use, but this link is not as strong.

5.2. Comparing quotative content

The categorisation of quotative content follows Kohn and Franz's (2009) approach, which differentiates between speech, thought, ambiguous and mimetic content. According to this classification system, quotatives were classified as thought quotatives when they were presented as contributions that were not uttered, such as thoughts or feelings, while direct speech quotatives include those forms that were presented as something that was or could be said. In addition to these two groups, Kohn and Franz (2009) further propose the use of a category for ambiguous cases that accounts for quotatives that are not clearly marked as either speech or thought. Mimetic content is not captured as a separate category here but distributed across speech, thought and ambiguous classes, depending on their representation in context.

Mimetic content was grouped together with the speech and thought categories because even enactments of actions or sound effects can be represented as something that has or could occur or not. An example for this can be seen in the following excerpt where Caleb describes how the washing machine in their new rental property was not attached properly and caused some flooding during its first use.

Example 3: NSE/M-M/M

Caleb: 'cos we got in and it was like screwed on a little biteh and we were like yeah this should do first load of washing it goes [splashing noise]

In this example, Caleb uses a sound effect to convey that water came gushing out the first time they used it. Seeing that the sound effect is an integral part of the story that conveys an action, it is a clear example of a mimetic speech quotative.

Another reason why mimetic content was not captured in a separate group in the current data set was that mimetic content tended to co-occur with word-based quotes,

making it impossible to differentiate between mimetic and verbal content. This is illustrated by the following example, where Claudia recounts her reaction to stories about the New Zealand school system.

Example 4: NSG/F-F/F

```
Claudia:    alles was mir die leute ueber's schul- also die
            neuseelaender ueber das schulsystem erzaehlen da
            denke ich auch nur so [sighs] das muss ja wohl
            nicht sein also da haben wir's noch besser
Claudia:    Everything that people have told me about the
            schoo- that the New Zealanders have told me about
            the school system I just think like [sighs]
            that's not ideal it's better at home
```

Claudia uses a sound effect to express her thoughts (marked by an explicit verb of internal reflection *denke* 'think') about the New Zealand school system. By audibly sighing, she conveys her disapproval of how things are run in New Zealand. This is further supported by her next comment where she clearly expresses a negative evaluation.

The different categories are illustrated in Table 5 with examples from the NSE and NSG datasets.

Table 5 Exemplifications for content categories in the NSE and NSG data

	NSE	NSG
Speech	… and the teacher asked everyone "why are you here?"	… da hat er gesagt "hey ja dann könnt ihr eigentlich gleich hier ja ein bissle research machen" *… then he said "hey you might as well do a bit of research there"*
Thought	… I'm just thinking "god, what's wrong with you?"	… und dann dachte ich mir so "Mensch die Story kenn ich doch" *… and then I thought to myself "hm, this story seems familiar"*
Ambiguous	… so they wanted to start a rock band and I was like"oh yeah I'll do that"	... dann guckt sie mich so ganz komisch von der Seite an und meint so"ja ich geh auch".Ich so"hä? was geht?" *… and then she looked at me all funnily and said "yes, I'm going too". I was like "huh? What's happening?"*

The two ambiguous cases are described in more detail below. In the NSE example, Suzanna recounts how her friends announced that they wanted to start a band and how she decided to join them. Based on the conversational context, her use of the constructed dialogue introduced by *be like* (*I was like "oh yeah I'll do that"*) could be taken as a representation of something she said when her friends made that announcement (speech). At the same time, it could also be seen as the representation of her thoughts or general attitude when she heard about her friends' plans, making this an ambiguous case. In the NSG example, Ute relates an incidence where she randomly met a girl at a party in Germany who was also due to come to New Zealand on exchange at the same time as her. The first quotative (*und meint so "ja ich geh auch*" 'and said "yes, I'm going too"') is presented as something Ute's interactant said to her and thus is a clear case of the

speech category. Ute's reply (*Ich so"hä? was geht?*" 'I was like "huh? What's happening?"'), however, could be both a re-enactment of her actual response at the time or serve to signify her inner confusion in response to this news. Table 6 presents the findings for quotative content using absolute numbers (N) and overall percentage of use in relation to all quotatives found in the two datasets (%).

T**able 6** Quotative content

	NSE		NSG	
	N	%	N	%
Speech	179	52%	50	31%
Thought	130	38%	103	64%
Ambiguous	33	10%	8	5%

The data presented in the table provides further evidence that quotatives are used differently in NZE and German. A Chi-square test suggests that the distributions across the three content categories are significantly different in the NSE and NSG data (Chi-Sq 29.8 on 2 DF, $p < 0.001$). While the NSE group prefers the use of speech quotatives followed by quotatives conveying thoughts, German speakers demonstrate a clear preference for thought quotatives. This may not seem surprising since the most frequently used German quotative *denken* 'think' is a verb of internal reflection; however, *denken* tokens make up only about half of all thought quotatives found in the data. Ambiguous forms did not feature frequently in either dataset. Table 6.1 presents the distribution of the different content categories for the three most commonly used quotatives in the NSE and NSG datasets using absolute number (N) and percentages to indicate how often a content type was used in relation to all occurrences of each quotative form (%) as measurements.

T**able 6.1** Quotative content of most frequently used forms in NSE and NSG data

	N	%	N	%	N	%
NSE	*be like* (125)		Zero (105)		*Say* (35)	
Speech	45	36%	67	64%	6	17%
Thought	62	50%	31	30%	29	83%
Ambiguous	18	14%	7	7%	-	-
NSG	*Denken* (59)		*Sagen* (36)		Zero (21)	
Direct speech	-	-	15	42%	10	48%
Internal dialogue	59	100%	19	53%	10	48%
Ambiguous	-	-	2	5%	1	4%

The findings presented in Table 6.1 suggest distinct patterns of use across the three most commonly used quotatives in the two languages. The NSE data indicates a preference for using zero quotatives to convey direct speech while *be like* forms were used to express both internal dialogue and direct speech. In the German data, zero quotatives were used to convey both internal dialogue and direct speech at an equal rate. The use of *sagen* 'say' to convey internal dialogue is related to constructions implying that one said something to oneself. [3]

[3] Prior research has identified that different formats are used for different interactional functions/achievements (e.g. in German "be like" for quoting embodiments, certain past tense constructions for reporting on decisions,

The examination of quotative content presented here further contributes to the descriptions of marked differences in quotative use among German and New Zealand students talking to near strangers. The patterns described suggest fundamental differences in the way quotatives are used in the two languages. It also raises the question whether the difference in use is reflective of a difference in how speakers approached the interaction, for instance, whether the New Zealand students simply told more stories, or whether it is reflective of a difference in how these stories are told. Either way, a detailed examination of the functions quotatives are employed for in the two languages is needed to establish exactly how quotatives are used in NZE and German in terms of their discourse functions and the type of content they serve to convey.

6. CONCLUSION

This paper has provided a description of the quotatives used by speakers of NZE and German based on data from informal dyadic interactions between semi-familiar university students studying in New Zealand. The quotative inventory used by each group was established, and the three most frequently used quotative forms were described in terms of the prevalent linguistic features of subject, tense and content. The results presented showed that quotatives were used significantly more often in the NZE interactions compared to the NSG data. NSG speakers exhibited a preference for more explicit forms such as *denken* 'think' and *sagen* 'say' as opposed the more implicit forms *be like* and zero quotatives favoured among NZE. Other differences of use include a greater preference for first person thought quotatives in the past tense among the NSG group while NSE appear to use more speech quotatives in past or present tense. In other words, Germans appear to use quotatives more to report on their own thoughts whereas speakers of NZE use quotatives to convey what other people have said, which constitutes a qualitative difference in the way quotatives are used stylistically and as an interactional tool in the two languages in this setting. Bearing in mind the small size of the corpus, the results presented here are indicative only; however, the patterns found suggest a fundamental difference in the way quotatives are used in German and NZE, which deserves further exploration.

There may be several different explanations for these marked differences in quotative use by NSE and NSG in the same social setting. One interpretation would be that the data marks a preference for a fundamentally different approach to informal interactions with near strangers, where German students may rely less on, for example, story-telling or other conversational segments that foster quotative use than their New Zealand counterparts. Alternatively, the marked difference in use could also suggest a different approach to enacting real or imagined events in this setting that does not involve the use of quotatives. Both of these implications raise the question of what conversational and pragmatic strategies were pursued instead. This requires further examination of the data with regard to the structures of the conversations as a whole as well as a close discourse analysis of comparable sequences of talk from the NSE and the NSG data. An in-depth qualitative exploration of the different uses of quotatives in the two languages and the kinds of contents they are used to convey would also help enlighten the different patterns of use.

---

etc.), which suggests that an exploration of interactional function of individual quotatives in the two groups would be of interest, Unfortunately, a proper discussion of the different interactional functions and uses of quotatives in the two data set is beyond the scope of the current article, which has already reached its word limit, and warrants a separate paper.

Overall, this cross-cultural study of quotatives brought to light marked differences in the way quotatives are used in social interactions between near strangers by speakers of German and NZE. This suggests that cross-cultural comparisons of quotative use of this kind represents a promising area of further exploration.

TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS

[laughs], [drawls]	Paralinguistic features in square brackets
.	Pause of less than a second
+	Pause of up to one second
↑	High rising terminal on declarative
Publicat-	Incomplete or cut-off utterance

REFERENCES

Baird, Sarah. 2001. “How 'to be like' a Kiwi: verbs of quotation in New Zealand English.”*New Zealand English Journal* 15:6–19.

Blyth, Carl Jr., Sigrid Recktenwald, and Jenny Wang, Jenny. 1990. “I'm like, "Say What?!": a new quotative in American oral narrative.” American Speech 65: 215-227.DOI: 10.2307/455910.

Buchstaller, Isabelle. 2014. *Quotatives: new trends and sociolinguistic implications*. Chichester: John Wiley and Sons.

Buchstaller Isabelle and Ingrid van Alphen (eds.). 2012. *Quotatives: cross-linguistic and cross-disciplinary perspectives*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Butters, Ronald R. 1982. “Editor's Note.”*American Speech* 57: 149.

Coppen, Peter-Arno and Ad Foolen. 2012. "Dutch quotative ‘van’: past and present." In *Quotatives: Cross-linguistic and Cross-disciplinary Perspectives*, edited by Isabelle Buchstaller and Ingrid van Alphen, 259–280. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Coulmas, Florian. 1986. “Direct and indirect speech in Japanese.” In *Direct and Indirect Speech*, edited by Florian Coulmas, 161-178. Berlin/ New York/ Amsterdam: Mouton de Gruyter.

D’Arcy, Alexandra. 2010. “Quoting ethnicity: Constructing dialogue in Aotearoa/ New Zealand.” Journal of Sociolinguistics 14(1): 60–88. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9841.2009.00437.x.

Etxepare, Ricardo. 2008. “On quotative constructions in Iberian Spanish.” In *Studies of Clause Combining: The Multifunctionality of Conjunctions*, edited by Ritva Laury, 35–78. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Ferrara, Kathleen and Barbara Bell. 1995. “Sociolinguistic variation and discourse function of constructed dialogue introducers: the case of ‘be + like’.”*American Speech* 70: 265–290. https://doi.org/10.2307/455900.

Golato, Andrea. 2000. “An innovative German quotative for reporting on embodied actions: Und ich so/und er so 'and I'm like/and he's like '.”*Journal of Pragmatics* 32: 29–54.https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(99)00030-2.

Golato, Andrea. 2002a. “Grammar and interaction: Reported discourse and subjunctive in German.” *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft* 2(1): 24–55. Golato, Andrea. 2002b. “Self-quotative in German: Reporting on part decisions.” In *Reported Discourse: A Meeting Ground for Different Linguistic Domains*, edited by Tom Güldemann and Manfred von Roncador, 49–70. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.

Günthner, Susanne. 1999. “Polyphony and the ‘layering of voices’ in reported dialogues: an analysis of the use of prosodic devices in everyday reported speech.”*Journal of Pragmatics* 31(5): 685–708. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(98)00093-9.

Hansen-Thomas, Holly. 2008. “An investigation of innovative quotatives in adolescent Chicana English in Texas.”*Intercultural Pragmatics* 5 (1): 19–39. https://doi.org/10.1515/IP.2008.002.

Hasund, Ingrid Kristine, Toril Obsahl and Jan Svennevig. 2012. “By three means: the pragmatic functions of three Norwegian quotatives.” In *Quotatives: Cross-linguistic and Cross-disciplinary Perspectives*, edited by Isabelle Buchstaller and Ingrid van Alphen, 37–57. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Kohn, Mary Elizabeth and Hannah Askin Franz. 2009. “Localized patterns for global variants: the case of quotative systems of African American and Latino speakers.”*American Speech* 84 (3): 259-297. https://doi.org/10.1215/00031283-2009-022.

Macaulay, Ronald. 2001. "'You're like 'why not'?: the quotative expressions of Glasgow adolescents."*Journal of Sociolinguistics* 5 (1): 3–21. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9481.00135.
Mathis, Terrie and George Yule. 1994. "Zero quotatives."*Discourse Processes* 18 (1): 63–76. https://doi.org/10.1080/01638539409544884
RodriguezLouro, Celeste. 2013. "Quotatives down under – 'be like' in cross-generational Australian English speech." *English World-Wide* 34 (1): 48–76. https://doi.org/10.1075/eww.34.1.03rod
Romaine, Suzanne and Deborah Lange. 1991. "The use of 'like' as a marker of reported speech and thought: a case of grammaticalization in progress."*American Speech* 66: 227–279.
Schegloff, Emanuel A. 1993. "Reflections on quantification in the study of conversation."*Research on Language and Social Interaction* 26(1): 99–128.
Steever, Sanford B. 2002. "Direct and indirect discourse in Tamil." In*Reported Discourse: A Meeting Ground for Different Linguistic Domains* edited by Tom Güldemann and Manfred von Roncador, 91–108. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.
Streeck, Jürgen. 2002. "Grammars, words, and embodied meanings: on the uses and evolution of 'so' and 'like'."*Journal of Communication* 52(3): 581–596.
Tagliamonte, Sali and Alexandra D'Arcy. 2004. "'He's like, she's like': the quotative system in Canadian youth."*Journal of Sociolinguistics* 8: 493–514. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9841.2004.00271.x.
Tagliamonte, Sali and Rachel Hudson. 1999. "'Be like' et al. beyond America: the quotative system in British and Canadian youth."*Journal of Sociolinguistics* 3: 147–172. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9481.00070.
Winter. Joanne. 2002. "Discourse quotatives in Australian English: Adolescents performing voices."*Australian Journal of Linguistics* 22 (1): 5–21. https://doi.org/10.1080/07268600120122535.

GLAGOLI SAOPŠTAVANJA UPRAVNOG GOVORA: POREĐENJE NOVOZELANDSKOG ENGLESKOG I NEMAČKOG JEZIKA

Glagoli saopštavanja upravnog govora, tj. prikaza razgovora, misli, zvučnih efekata ili predstave o nečemu u govornom jeziku, jesu opšte odlike interpersonalne komunikacije. Lingvistički opisi ovih glagola pretežno su usmereni ka njihovoj upotrebi u jeziku pojedinca ili u varijetetu jednog jezika. Malo se zna o tome kakve su razlike između jezika u upotrebi ovih glagola, imajući u vidu njihov oblik, promenljivu sadržinu i ostale odlike. Na osnovu dva uzorka neformalnog razgovora dve osobe, u ovom istraživanju poredimo kako se pomenuti glagoli koriste u novozelandskom engleskom i u standardnom nemačkom jeziku tako što opisujemo karakteristike njihove upotrebe u opštem pogledu i u odnosu na tri najčešće upotrebljene forme u ova dva jezika. Rezultati ukazuju na znatne razlike između dvaju jezika. Tako, u nemačkom uzorku, glagoli upravnog govora najčešće se koriste za govornike u prvom licu jednine u prošlom vremenu da bi se preneo interni dijalog, dok govornici novozelandskog engleskog pretežno koriste ove glagole u prošlom vremenu bez preferencija prema odlikama subjekta.

Ključne reči: *glagoli saopštavanja upravnog govora, kulturološko poređenje, nemački, novozenlandski engleski*