

7. SOCIAL AND INTERACTIVE ASPECTS OF DIRECTIVE ACTIVITIES: THE GROUP IN FOCUS

The following chapter focuses upon the group-oriented aspects of directive activities in the Big Brother houses, the interlingual similarities and interlingual contrasts in this respect. The interlingual comparison in this domain touches upon the relative values of individualisation and group bonds, and on the related topic of considerateness and involvement as strategies of verbal interaction in directive activities observable in the German, Polish and British Big Brother houses. Requestive utterances are analysed with a view to their implications for the notion of proper behaviour as displayed by different nationals in the Big Brother houses. The available material is approached from perspectives offered by interpretative sociolinguistics, spoken language analysis, ethnography of communication, and social psychology.

The analysis is based on all the available material, including the entire E3, P3 and G4 editions and some episodes from E1, E2 and G1 editions. Taking into account a full edition of the program in each language provides a broad perspective, showing the absence, occurrence, and recurrence of some types of verbal and non-verbal behaviour, and suggesting conclusions about their culture-specificity or otherwise.

The I/C issue is important in this discussion. My claim is that impositiveness and tentativeness in directives in the context analysed is related to I/C of the respective societies, in such a way that higher impositiveness corresponds to a stronger attachment to the collectivist perception. The claim relies on the premise that the preference for collectivism is higher among the Poles, as indicated by research in comparative social psychology (cf. chpt. 4.2). The premise was supported by indicators of I/C attitudes within the program itself, which will be pointed out prior to the discussion of directive activities. These indicators, which are related to the perception and maintenance of interpersonal distance, group solidarity, and group-orientation, include:

- aspects of program design,
- aspects of verbal and non-verbal behaviour of the housemates in particular houses,
- voices of people outside the Big Brother houses, such as the audience, the presenters, and the housemates' relatives.

Finally, some episodes containing directive activities will themselves provide an illustration of inter-cultural difference in I/C attitudes. At the same time,

other episodes selected will substantiate the link between impositiveness and group-orientation of directives in all three cultures under study.

7.1. THE PROGRAM DESIGN

I assume that just as the events which took place in the Big Brother house are expressions of national cultures, so are the conceptions of the various Big Brother Houses. I also assume that the “for sale” character of the program, in which evictions of unpopular participants by votes by all the housemates and the TV audience were applied to uphold the viewers’ interest, amplified the distinctive features of the three cultures under consideration. In short, the commercial aspect promoted a design which offered good prospects of being rewarded, the reward for the designers being high viewing figures for the program, and the reward for particular housemates being their high personal acceptance by other housemates and the audience. It promoted a design, and behaviour resulting from this design, which were in line with the cultural logic of a given society, that is, which were in one way or another admissible, understandable and commendable within the frame of a given culture and subculture.

7.1.1. THE EXPOSURE OF FAMILIES AND FRIENDS

The different conceptions of the program in the three countries involved different degrees of exposure of the social backgrounds of the participants. While interviews with families and friends were frequently used in the Polish and German versions of the program, there were very few of them in the British version. The Polish and German housemates were shown against the background of their family ties and other social relationships, which were thus visibly conceived as being relevant information for the public. This aspect of the program’s design can be interpreted either as confirming the high value of discretion and privacy in British society, or as reflecting a view of an individual which stresses personality and observable behaviour rather than social bonds as the central defining characteristics of a person.

Notwithstanding this, it should be noted that the family background of the housemates in E4 was sketched in short portraits of the housemates which were presented in the beginning of the program.

A childless single person was the preferred type of housemate in the German and English series, which made the program attractive to teenagers and unmarried adolescents by the potential it provided for sexual idolisation. In Poland, the ratio of married housemates and parents was notably higher

than in the other two countries. The housemates were portrayed in their roles as children, mothers and fathers, competing for better futures for themselves and their relatives. As a result, unlike the other two countries, the audience of the Polish series was not confined to teenagers and adolescents. According to my observations, the series attracted viewers from all generations; and spectators of different ages, including persons two generations older than the housemates themselves, were interviewed by the TV team in the editorial part of the program.

7.1.2. BIG BROTHER BATTLE – GROUP STABILITY

The Polish and the third British series of Big Brother, as well as the fourth German series, were based on the concept of the “Big Brother Battle”, distributed by the Dutch company Endemol B.V. This concept replaced the earlier, less eventful design. It introduced a contest for living standards as a new element into the game in order to increase the attraction of the spectacle, which had become rather monotonous and repetitive.

By the end of 2003, four series of Big Brother had been broadcast in the United Kingdom, four in Germany and three in Poland. The third Polish and the fourth German series of the program were created in line with the outline owned by Endemol B.V. In accordance with this outline, two teams, red and blue, fought “battles” against each other; and the individual performance of each team member on a task contributed to the fate of the whole group who were subsequently moved to the “poor” or the “rich” living area, depending on the success in combat, for the following several days or hours. This created an awareness of interdependence promoting the development of responsibility for others and mutual reliance. While competing individually for the final victory, the housemates are at the same time fighting daily for the group’s sake. They are rewarded for their good performance by the group’s gratitude and the perception of “their” group enjoying a certain collective well-being; and they risk punishment in the form of the group’s disappointment for having performing badly on competitive tasks. The common fate is crucial to the emergence of identification (Reykowski 1994). Experiments in social psychology showed that mere assignment of people to antagonistic groups performing competitive tasks were sufficient to induce group solidarity within particular groups; these effects were enhanced when distinctive names and clothing were assigned to the competing groups (Brown 2000).

A comparison of the course of interaction in Polish editions P1 and P3, as well as German editions G2 and G4, suggests that the difference in design exerts an influence upon the perception of mutual responsibility of the

housemates towards each other. Instances of assuming responsibility for the team or group in the “battle” editions in the context of directive activities will be discussed in sections 7.1.3. SOLIDARITY AND CONFLICTS OF CONSCIENCE, and 7.4.5. DIRECTIVES IN DECLARATIONS AND SYMBOLIC DISPLAYS OF SOLIDARITY.

Contrary to the original concept by Endemol B.V., there were no teams in the third British series. The weekly “combat” between the housemates for their standard of living (being on the losers’ “poor side” or the winners’ “rich side”) was exclusively individual. Each person could become a member of the “rich side” as a result of his or her own performance on a task. The design prevented the formation of feelings of solidarity within each group of current winners and current losers because the configuration of both groups changed from one week to another, which minimised the opportunities for forming stable multilateral bonds. While the design does not prove anything about the strength of the interpersonal bonds in the British Big Brother house, these bonds were more based on choice and less group-oriented than in the other two groups: each housemate chose the persons with whom to interrelate. As mentioned before, though, the choice of the design does not reveal much about the program editors’ evaluations concerning the preferences of their viewers, because it is likely to have been influenced by the occurrence of group combat in another reality TV series, “Survivor”, broadcast at about the same time. For that reason, a meaningful comparison between the details of the respective “battle” designs can be made for Polish group P3 and German group G4 only.

In these two series, the “battles” were realised in slightly different ways, reflecting the production team’s expectations concerning the audience’s tastes and preferences. In both of them, there were two stable teams. However, in the German “battle” group, a re-shuffling of groups by moving one or two members from one team to the other was relatively frequent and occurred several times when a temporary lack of balance in the gender structure and the size of the groups occurred. In the Polish edition, it only happened once because there were only four participants left. The program’s designers chose to find ways to adapt the combat to the unbalanced group structure, rather than stick to the balance at the cost of shifting loyalties. Presumably the popularity of the program would have suffered had a different policy been adopted. After the initial period, in which the groups were growing together, the constancy of the teams as “basic units” of action was taken for granted by viewers and housemates, and was strictly observed by the program’s creators. In the German version, the teams were temporary: yesterday’s allies were sometimes today’s enemies. This promoted the perception of mutual support involved in the team combat as a matter of individual strategy for survival, in

which each person profits individually by membership in a collective performance. The introduction of team mixing in G4 accorded with the attitude of the housemates in G4 towards the team identities, in particular seen in the reaction of team members in G4 in the fifth week of the competition to the news that they needed to, for the first time in the program, appoint one of their male team members to join the other team. Instrumental rather than integrative factors are named as a reason for dissatisfaction with this arrangement. Rather than express regret because of the bonds of friendship that had grown in the team, the team captain reacted by commenting that this was going to be a loss because both candidates are strong, capable players who contribute a lot to the team's success in the sporting competition. Hofstede (1980) found a correlation between his individualism score and the view of collective actions as a means to an end rather than an end in themselves. Similarly, Triandis (1988) views individual benefit as the engine of co-operation in individualist societies, whereas co-operation tends to be based on the ingroup's benefit and mutual duty in collectivist ones. In the German scheme, where loyalties change from one day to the next, striving for a group victory is about a pursuit of co-directional individual goals rather than about the team as a "basic unit of survival". At the same time, this scheme promotes the bonds within the greater ingroup consisting of all housemates that are not related to the competitive tasks. The design highlights the playful aspect of the competition and reduces the participants' emotional identification with just one of the two teams. There where the teams are not mixed, as in the Polish version, initial loyalties – even if they result from a configuration of the teams which from the perspective of the housemates are due to "mere chance" – are constant and promote stronger emotional bonds within the smaller ingroup. The housemates felt safe to profile their emotional bonds in accordance with this design, and verbalise them without running the risk of appearing superficial or two-faced when the next piece of luck forced them to join "the enemy's" formation.

To sum up, the German Big Brother Battle design, which included moving individuals from one side to the other, promoted the awareness that the participants constituted one group and that division into teams with antagonistic aims was purely accidental. Hence, both team bonds and the antagonism between the two teams are to be viewed as instrumental and temporary: the housemates must work hard in whatever team they happen to be a part of in order to reach their aims, shared by other members of their team. The attitude promoted in the participants by the Polish design is to make strong emotional associations with people with whom they have been united by coincidence, to develop strong feelings of team solidarity and loyalty, and to

show themselves off by displaying these emotions: “feel with others and talk about it”.

7.1.3. COLLECTIVISM AND CONFLICTS OF CONSCIENCE

An instance of the interaction of the program’s design with I/C tendencies of the cultures under consideration is the emergence of conflicts of conscience. The program formula of Big Brother places its participants concurrently within two schemes which are out of step with each other: competition and developing interpersonal bonds. The manifestations of the competitive scheme are the different living conditions of the two teams in design B and C (editions P3, G4, E3), and the task faced by each housemate of eliminating other persons from the game by a weekly vote in spite of the reality and sincerity of the interpersonal bonds which arise in the Big Brother house. The three national groups manifest diverging attitudes towards both aspects of interpersonal combat.

The nominations in which one of the participants is being voted out of the house become at times a heavy burden for the housemates. While explicit confessions about the difficulty of nominating other housemates as potential candidates for leaving the house were missing in the British edition, a female housemate reacted emotionally to the pressure, weeping before she made her nomination. For the Polish housemates, this situation occasionally gives rise to the loyalty question, in which the rules of the program and the principles of friendship are viewed as divergent and necessitate a personal decision of which set to follow.

A facet of team bonds is the loyalty towards one’s team members and its authenticity transgressing the frame of the program design. This is visible in particular in situations where this loyalty clashes with the loyalty and obedience owed by the housemates to the program’s editors, in view of their voluntary agreement to respect the rules of the game and a written contract. An illustration of such a clash is the following scene from P3:

- After several weeks, one of the teams is given the task of nominating two members of their own team for eviction from the house by public vote, while the other team is allowed to vote for any two persons (members of one team or the other). This causes an “uprising” in which F1 and M (from the first team) declare that they are not going to vote against their friends, break the rules of the play and are themselves nominated for eviction. The program’s editors must have realised the commercial value of the immense popularity which these two persons won among the public by the display of

emotional bonding with their team; without actually specifying the reasons, they quickly gave the viewers an option to vote out a different person, which the viewers actually did.

In the scene, the program's editors utilised the integrative needs of team members in order to maximize the excitement by forcing them into an ethically repelling situation, and putting them under pressure that was only as exciting for the viewers as it was authentic for the housemates themselves. The scene illustrates how the display of collectivist predilections of the Polish participants was promoted by the team design. It also exemplifies Reykowski's (1999: 33) contention that in ingroups within collectivist cultures, "harmony within the group rather than effectivity on a task is the main criterion for structuring mutual relationships ... This is particularly significant with respect to tasks whose recipients are others ... It can lead to a situation where a "collective of suppliers" promotes harmony and good relationships among themselves at the cost of the clients, patients, pupils etc." (transl. HP). Rejecting competitive activity within the closest ingroup, the housemates rejected the obligations towards their employer Endemol-Neovision which they had accepted earlier. Miller and Bersoff (cited in Reykowski 1999: 27), comparing how conflicts between the norms of justice and personal bonds were solved by the Hindus and Americans, showed that the Hindus preferred loyalty to the norm resulting from personal relationships to the norm of justice. The results show that members of collectivist cultures (India favours collectivism, in contrast with the USA) manifest a much stronger tendency to define themselves in terms of group membership, and to define the group as "we" – a network of bonds; at the same time, the obligations towards their own group have for them a higher status than the obligations towards impersonal norms of justice. Within the ingroup, which can be based on bonds of family, culture (nationality, language, religion), region and friendship, the greatest importance is associated with internal harmony and support, and not with task fulfilment.

The scene illustrates the principle of the priority given to the ingroup loyalties over any tasks and obligations from outside the group, and demonstrates the collectivism of the Poles in the exception of social norms. It also shows that the team is viewed as an ingroup by the housemates involved. Asked to give reasons of her refusal to play by the rules, one of the rebellious housemates emotionally explains that the nomination would be a betrayal of "her" people. When Big Brother points out that the participants consented to play by the rules when subscribing to the game, the other rebel explains that he no longer likes the game because the game has become "unhealthy" (morbid): *to się zrobiła niezdrowa zabawa*. He explicitly uses the

notion “solidarity”, making a reproachful comment about the program’s creators: oni nie wiedzą co to jest solidarność # komuna ich jeszcze nie nauczyła chyba (“they do not know what solidarity is # the commune did not teach them in its time”)¹²². The word *komuna*, “commune”, is a derogatory name of the communist regime which collapsed in 1989 when the speaker was about twenty years old. The comment refers not so much to brotherhood as the value proclaimed by the communist system, as to the solidarity which developed in reaction to the hardships of living in a totalitarian state, and which gave the name to the workers’ union Solidarity, a major force in the abolition of the old regime. The relatives (mother, father, and wife) of the two “rebellious” housemates interviewed by the host of the program were asked whether they were proud of the decision made by their respective relative. The very fact that this question was asked shows that the reasoning behind the rule-breaking was perceived as rational by the program’s editors, too, because “communication requires that speakers should base their interactions on validity claims that are acceptable to their fellows” (Agozino 2003: 104).

The rebels’ parents interpreted the decision as a manifestation of loyalty to friends, group solidarity and high moral standards. Votes and interviews showed that the decision also gained audience approval and generated popularity for the “rebellious” housemates. In the same edition, another female housemate (F2) refused to nominate anybody explaining that she could not nominate friends, and that this was a decision of conscience. F2’s mother, commenting on this event in an interview explained approvingly that her daughter “didn’t want to nominate anybody because she regarded them as her nearest and dearest” (nie chciała nikogo nominować # ponieważ uważała że to są jej bliscy). In the final stage of the competition, two other housemates conspired and refused to vote, possibly believing that they would increase their popularity among the audience by such a display of solidarity and friendship. After they were “broken” by Big Brother and withdrew their decision, they both lost to the third candidate in the final audience vote.

This contrasts with the German cultural standard, described in the following way by social psychologist Sylvia Schroll-Machl (2003: 78-79):

¹²² The translation of “jeszcze” as “in its time” follows the assumption that the line of thought was “we have been taught solidarity as early as by the commune, and they have not”. The translation of “jeszcze” as “yet” would be absurd as it would presuppose that the “commune” still existed as the utterance was produced.

[Die] Verlässlichkeit wird nun nicht vorrangig dadurch erreicht, dass es Instanzen gibt, die von außen kontrollieren, sondern dass jeder an seinem Platz von sich aus das tut, was von ihm erwartet wird. »Deutsche machen vieles ohne ersichtlichen Zwang dazu«, sagen nichtdeutsche Beobachter. Der Handelnde hat nämlich gar nicht mehr das Gefühl, dass er Erwartungen anderer erfüllt, sondern es ist ihm selbstverständlich, das zu tun. Er hat sich im Prozess der Planung, der Strukturierung oder als er die Stelle antrat, damit bereits identifiziert. Das ist mit »internalisierter Kontrolle« gemeint: Durch Einsicht in die »Notwendigkeit« oder Optimalität bestimmter Regeln oder Verfahrensweisen kontrolliert sich ein Individuum weitgehend selbst. Es hält sich dabei entweder an vorgegebene Normen oder an selbst erstellte Pläne. Eine Person erlebt von innen gesehen diese Selbststeuerung weithin als persönliche Autonomie und Selbstbestimmung ... Weil hier Strukturen, Normen, »Objektives« internalisiert werden, besteht auch die deutsche Zuverlässigkeit gegenüber der Sache ... Die Beziehungen, die zu den beteiligten Personen existieren, beeinträchtigen oder fördern die gezeigte Gewissenhaftigkeit wenig ... man hat die Aufgabe zu erledigen. Und man will das auch, denn man findet die Sache im Prinzip gut, sonst wäre man nicht an dieser Stelle und nicht in diesem Job. Das Pflichtbewusstsein gilt somit in erster Linie den konkreten Vorgaben, die Loyalität der Firma, bei der man (gerade) arbeitet. Die Pflicht ist - zumindest beruflich - wichtiger als das Vergnügen: Ob jemand Lust hat oder nicht, ob er gerade von Problemen heimgesucht ist ... ob es ihm sehr viel Mühe abverlangt oder ... Spaß macht, spielt eine untergeordnete Rolle: Er hat die Selbstdisziplin aufzubringen, sein Bestes zugeben. Denn er hat Ja gesagt zu dieser Vereinbarung oder dieser Stelle und nun steht er in Pflicht und Verantwortung.¹²³

¹²³ "The reliability is achieved in the first place not through the existence of control from outside, but by everybody doing at their positions what is expected of them. >>The Germans do a lot without visible pressure<<, non-German observers say. The agent no longer has the impression of acting because of the expectations of others; rather, it is obvious to do what needs to be done. In the process of planning and structuring or already at the moment of entering a given position, he identified himself with it. This is meant with an >>internalised control<<: a person controls himself through understanding the >>necessity<< or optimality of certain rules or procedures. He orients himself after pre-existent rules or self-made plans. He experiences this from inside as personal autonomy and self-governance ... The internalisation of structures, norms, "objectives" constitutes the German reliability with respect to the thing ... The relationships towards persons involved do little to disturb or aid the reliability ... one has a task to fulfill. And one wants to do it, too, because one finds the thing good in principle, otherwise one would not be in this position and doing this job. The sense of duty is oriented first of all towards the task, loyalty towards the company for which one is currently working. The task is – at least in work-related contexts – more important

Another potential ground for conflict of conscience is the different standards of living of the housemates in the “battle” set-up. The following scene from P3 showing the conflict of conscience faced by the “winners” in the battle concept is quoted here for two related reasons. Firstly, it shows the collectivist predilections of at least some Polish group members, in accordance with Reykowski’s (1999) contention, discussed before, about collectivists favouring unwritten obligations towards the current group at the expense of formal obligations (in this case, a written contract with the producer). Secondly, it shows plainly the link between social attitudes and the occurrence of directives, and contradicts the instrumental view of directives by showing how they emerge in response to the conceptualisation of the situation induced by the particular cultural logic of the interactants, in this case dictating to the winners a bad conscience towards the underprivileged.

106-P3. SHARING FOOD

M2, M3 and F1: winning team; M1, F2, F3 and F4: losing team. After the victory in the very first contest between the two teams, team blue are rewarded with a hot luxurious supper. The losing team, red, serve the food to the winning team, but are not allowed to join in.

1 M1 *prosimy bardzo*

help yourselves please

(simultaneous group speech)

2 F1 *czerwoni # e # - boli was to bardzo?*

team red # ei # is this very painful for you?

3 M1, F2 *nie:*

no

4 F3 *nie absolutnie # jedzcie*

not at all # eat-IMP-plural

5 F1 *no to*

well then

6 F4 [*jedzcie*]

eat-IMP-pl.

7 M1 [*o czym ty mówisz w ogóle*]

what are you talking about (conversational formula meaning: don't talk nonsense)

than pleasure: whether one likes it or not, whether one has personal problems, whether it requires much effort or is fun is of secondary importance: one is to bring enough self-discipline to do one's best. Because one has said Yes to this agreement or this position and now one is bound to duty and responsibility.” (transl. HP)

8 F3 <start laughing><ale jedzcie>
do eat-IMP-pl.

9 F1 <start laughing><jeszcze siłę maja>
they are strong in spite of it
 (The following moves take place against a noisy background of simultaneous group speech. M1 and M2, both from the winning team, are sitting at the table next to each other together with the rest of their team.)

10 M3 to M2: --- co się buntujesz
why are you rioting

11 M2 to M3: nie to nie chodzi o bunt # tylko o jakiś moralny-
 # wiesz
no this is not about a riot # but something like a moral- # you know

12 F1 jedz # zjadaj normalnie jedz
eat-IMP-sing. # eat-IMP-sing. it off normally eat-IMP-sing.

13 M3 to M2: [bicie] żeś poczuł # no [---] to jest inna lekcja
you have sensed the beating # and this is a different lesson

...

14 M2 to M3:[---] ja tego dobrze nie przeczytałem [---]
 podpisałem [---]
I have not read through that exactly # I have signed it

...

15 M3 (decides to strike the fork into the food) a zresztą kurwa mać
well after all CURSE

16 F2 to M2: wsuwaj Bartek i nie marudź
eat-COLLOQUIAL FIRST NAME and don't grumble

17 M3 Bartas jedz
FIRST NAME eat

18 M1 (stops the gesture of striking the fork into the food) no Bartek # no nie:
 wiem # weź się bo się będziemy co pięć minut- # . to się
 dzielimy # grupa się dzieli
*well FIRST NAME # well I don't know # now every five minutes we are going to- # well then
 we share # the group is going to share*

In line 2, F1 from the winning team makes accepting the privilege of the luxurious supper contingent upon the emotions of the members of the losing team, who are reduced to watching the winners enjoying their meal:

2 F1 czerwoni # e # - boli was to bardzo?
red team # hey # is this very painful for you?

In the turns 4, 6, 7 and 8 members of the losing team insist politely that the winners should eat their meal; by implication, they see it as viable that the winners might feel bad about the situation and refrain from eating out of consideration for the losers. In the lines 10-13, M1 and M2 talk about M2's bad conscience and in line 14, M2 speaks about the rules of the contract with the producers of Big Brother, admitting that he has not read through them. The utterance implies that that M2 did not know or was not fully aware of what might be expected of him in the Big Brother house, and was taken by surprise by so much hardship. While members of both teams try to persuade M2 to eat (turns 16 and 17), M2 inflicts his own bad conscience upon M1. Finally, under M2's pressure, M1 proposes that the winning team should make a group decision concerning whether the program's rules should be violated and the food shared with the "poor" team (turn 18).

Two Polish viewers who watched the scene were divided in their opinions: while one thought that M2 was sincere and found it difficult to eat a luxurious meal under the other team's jealous eyes, the other viewer thought that he may have been conscious of the popularity he would gain among the audience by a display of solidarity and moral uprightness. Both interpretations point towards a positive social evaluation of putting solidarity with peers above playing by the rules of the game.

Shortly after that, M1 was interviewed by Big Brother, who referred to the fact that M1 decided to eat the food rather than follow the other option, and required an explanation for the reasoning behind this. M1 explained that because he was ill and had been excluded from the competition for this reason, he decided to eat the food so that he could recover and become a useful member of his team. Even if it is legitimate to doubt the genuineness of this post-factum justification, the point is made: M1 finds it necessary to justify his "playing by the rules" of Big Brother by highlighting his allegiance to the team, and to play loyalty and "bad conscience" towards his team against loyalty and bad conscience towards the whole group.

In German "battle" edition G4, the sense of guilt and doubts about the propriety of the rules is explicitly expressed by two members of the team on the rich side. A male housemate does it repeatedly while reporting his emotions to Big Brother and the viewers in his daily "confessions", and while talking to his team members; among other things, he expresses regret for his achievement in a boxing match saying *ich bin traurig, weil ich einen Freund geschlagen habe* ("I am sad because I have beaten a friend"). A female housemate admits that it was extremely unpleasant to her to join in the luxurious meals while watching the other team having their poor supper. Both housemates who admitted remorse were non-native speakers of German and

had migrated to Germany from the former Yugoslavia and the Ukraine as teenagers or young adults¹²⁴. They think in a similar way as Polish housemates in the above-quoted scene. The same male housemate proposed not to take part in a combat in a discipline which he was good at, arguing that the other team, with its temporarily higher proportion of female contestants, had lost the sporting contest several times in a row and the chances should be balanced. The proposal met with a firm objection from several German members of his team, who commented on it among themselves as being outrageously unreasonable. They also attempted to change their Yugoslavian teammate's stance, pointing out in individual conversations that the rules were just and justified. Incidentally, the decision not to take part in the contest on exactly the same grounds was taken and, in absence of protests from any but one female housemate, was put into action by the strongest member of one of the teams in P3.

Another manifestation protest of solidarity with the underprivileged in G4 came from a Hungarian female housemate, who, while on the winning team, proposed repeatedly that her team should beg Big Brother to arrange a celebration of a birthday of a housemate on the "poor" side, which was rejected by her team members: they thought that it was not their business, and that Big Brother could not be influenced anyway.

While it does not share the Slavic background of Poland, Ukraine, and Yugoslavia, Hungary shares their recent membership of the East European block.

While the few scenes quoted above have in themselves only an anecdotal value, and cannot serve as a basis for any generalisations, Reykowski (1994, 1999) claims that the collectivist stance regarding some aspects of social life in Poland was associated with the state ideology, and that a shift from collective to more individualist attitudes took place after 1980, the year which marked the beginning of the decline of communism in Poland. Song Mei Lee-Wong (2000) concluded in her study that impositive formulations of directives had a higher social acceptability in PRC than among the speakers of Chinese in Singapore. She hypothesises that it might be due on the one hand to the Anglo-Saxon cultural influence on the social and linguistic perception of Singapore subjects, and on the other to the communist ethos of the PRC which might have played a considerable role in the formation or perseverance of linguistic habits and underlying social perceptions.

¹²⁴ According to Reykowski (1994), quoting Smolenska and Wieczorkowska (1990), different measures of collectivism and individualism in different nationals appear early in personal development; there was a strong difference between German and Polish subjects for the population aged 14-16.

Rather than looking for the roots of collectivist attitudes in the ideology of the protective and totalitarian state, I propose to divorce the attitude towards the state and anonymous society at large from the attitude resulting from identification with the current group. Hofstede (1990) argues that collectivism is inversely correlated with national wealth; this suggests that it might not be the state communist ideology in itself but rather its oppressive methods and meagre economic results that, by making survival dependent on co-operation rather than compatible with competition, promoted the need for nurturing and collectivist attitudes.

7.2. ENTERING THE BIG BROTHER HOUSE

While watching the initial scenes from various versions of the program, my attention was attracted by differences in the behaviour of various nationals when they first met. I assume that they reflect culturally rooted assumptions about the level of intimacy appropriate between young people who meet for the very first time, knowing that they are going to have intensive contacts with each other enforced by living together. The entrance scenes available for comparison were those from series 1, 2 and 3 in German; series 3 and 4 in English; series 3 in Polish, and a short fragment of the entrance scenes from P1 showing the entrance of the first and the last couple out of six. I am highly indebted to Endemol Germany and Endemol-Neovision Poland for providing videotaped material.

The following brief presentation of the verbal and other indicators of the ease of the first contact and the strategies of approaching each other suggests how different stances on I/C may contribute to different shapes of these encounters, and provides a background for the following discussion of directive utterances which occurred in this context.

In order to avoid both presenting my subjective judgements as facts and a lengthy and meticulous description of what happened, I discussed the scenes with six respondents, one per gender and country¹²⁵. A spontaneous comment was provided by each respondent after watching each scene, and after watching all scenes twice they had an opportunity to make comparative comments. After that they were asked specific comparative questions concerning openness, togetherness and nervous tension¹²⁶.

¹²⁵ A much more detailed discussion of the outcomes of these interviews can be found in Pulaczewska 2006.

¹²⁶ P1 has not been included in this procedure because only a short fragment of the entrance sequence was broadcast and made available for analysis.

Asked a specific question regarding how they evaluate the extent to which the participants acted together as a group, all the viewers apart from the British male respondent agreed that the Poles in P3 behaved most like a group, in that they acted together and greeted the newcomers together as a group. The British male respondent selected both the British group in E3 and the Poles in P3 as showing most coordinated action. He pointed to the team spirit that developed among the male housemates in E3 already before the women's arrival, shown in the fact that several men performed consecutively the same action of walking to the top of the stair and carrying a woman's suitcase downstairs. All the respondents paid attention to the fact that the Poles greeted newcomers together doing the same things at the same time, and all but the German male respondent paid attention to the fact that they entered the house simultaneously as a group only after the last person arrived. The German female respondent used the notion of a "welcoming committee", which I had applied myself when describing the scene in my notes, to characterise the line built in the yard facing the newcomers and acting jointly to greet them by singing and cheering. Asked a specific question about the group consolidation, she said that the Polish group was the only one where there was definitely a group action, while the greetings exchanged in the other groups were on an individual point-to-point basis, even if the participants stood at times in a circle or a line as in G1, E3 and E4.

While in both Polish and British groups, all persons who had already entered the house are present during the entrance of every new housemate and focus their attention upon the newcomers, the German groups show a markedly different approach. Greetings and hand-shakes frequently took place in pairs or threes. All the German series shared a pattern of forming groups of two or three persons engaged in conversations, who temporarily didn't interfere with each other. The quick building of smaller subgroups in all the German scenes, observed by several respondents, suggested that the German participants might have found it easier to communicate with fewer numbers of individuals than with the group as a whole.

All but the German male respondent characterised the Poles as being most open and the British as being between the Poles and the German. The German male respondent redefined openness as having a real interest in each other and thought it was displayed in G1 and sporadically in the initial stages of the English entrance scenes in small group conversations (before they were joined by a larger number of newcomers arriving one by one), while superficial masks dominated most of the time everywhere else; in the Polish group, individuals hid behind the group ("*sie verstecken sich alle hinter der Gruppe*"), which was the opposite of showing one's real self.

While the German male respondent thought that it is natural to build small groups in order to really get to know one's interlocutors and it shows an authentic interest in each other, the male British respondent interpreted "splitting into groups" as a sign of tension and reserve and juxtaposed it with "*interacting with each other straight away*"; while the Polish male viewer commented approvingly that the Poles did not isolate themselves by launching into conversations as the German housemates did ("*nie było tak że ktoś się izoluje i sobie rozmawia*"). The German female respondent commented that she probably once viewed forming small subgroups as the most natural thing to do in similar circumstances but could not continue to hold this view because of her long-term experience of going out with a group of British friends and colleagues who managed to have conversations "with the whole table" rather than form conversations among two or three people.

As confirmed by the respondents' comments, all the German entry scenes were characterised by spatial dispersion, the building of small groups, and especially the immediate engagement in a conversation with people around, while not paying attention to those who were currently entering the building. In the remaining three groups, the focus of the encounter was upon the welcoming of the newcomers and the verbal interaction with the persons present was temporarily suppressed when a newcomer entered; this led to some amount of coordinated action in all these groups, while they differed on its amount and the speed of its development. My impression from the German scenes of the first encounter was that the scheme of a social encounter activated in all of them was such in which the care and interest shown to one's current interlocutor precludes the simultaneous display of the same care and interest to others. This relates to the issue of group-oriented interaction, because a group action makes it possible to simultaneously attend to many persons in a differentiated way: as those who are currently at the centre of attention, and as those who share an interest in the current "centre of attention" and cooperate in its display. The difference pertains also to a further differentiator of cultures proposed by Hall and Hall (1989) known as "monochronic" versus "polychronic" time. The notion concerns the approach to the chronological arrangement of activities acquired in the process of social maturation: while the monochronic time concept tends to promote successive attention and action, polychronic time promotes a split of attention and piece-by-piece completion of many simultaneous activities, in particular during social encounters involving several interlocutors, without perceiving them as being in conflict with each other. The German first encounter was organised on a person-to-person basis, and the interest in other group members was shown in a consecutive way, suggestive of the monochronic time concept observable

as a norm of social behaviour in many everyday situations in the German social context, where diverging behaviour may cause irritation and be interpreted as a deficit in social skills. Conversely, the monochronic characteristics of the German first encounter were viewed as impolite and earned a pejorative comment by the polychronic Polish viewers, while the British respondents did not reveal judgements in their comments even if they noted the facts. Conceptually and geographically, monochronic time roughly correlates with high individualism (cf. Hall and Hall 1989 and Hofstede 1983), while Hall and Hall (1989) place the German culture on the upper extreme of the scale in monochronic time.

Another concept applicable in analysing the differentiated structure and perception of the encounters is Brown's (2000: 9) notion of the distinction between an interpersonal and a group encounter. In the former, people meet as unique individuals and in the latter, they act towards each other as representatives of a group towards members of the same or the other group or groups. An indicator of group behaviour is the uniformity of behaviour of group members, which "suggests that the participants appear to be interacting in terms of their group membership rather than their distinctive personal characteristics" (while one needs to remember that "the interpersonal/group distinction is based on a continuous dimension and is not an either/or dichotomy", *ibid.*).

The behaviour of the German housemates, coupled with the commentaries provided by the German observers, suggest that they tended to view encounters between peers in interpersonal rather than group terms to a higher degree than the other two groups. The building of smaller subgroups or pairs during the entrance scenes in all the German series, suggesting that they felt less at ease interacting with larger groups, points in the same direction as the higher degree of negative politeness displayed by the German speakers in directives addressed at multiple addressees compared to directives at individuals, as noted in the statistical analysis. It supports the assumption that the statistical difference was systematic, rather than being just a casual property of the sample.

The picture that emerges is that in the German groups, the level of intimacy and the tone of the interaction proper for a given social occasion depends crucially on the degree of personal acquaintance which determines how much common background is assumed. This hypothesis is supported by a decrease of negative politeness in favour-asking by the German speakers in the middle part of the program compared to its initial stage, which was not observed in the other groups. The communicative behaviour of the British and the Poles and the comments by native respondents seem to indicate a

conception of common background in which it is to a larger extent co-constituted by the awareness of a shared past and future experience than by the duration of the acquaintance alone.

7.3. IDENTIFYING INTERDEPENDENCE AND AUTONOMY IN VERBAL INTERACTION

I assume that the tendency of Big Brother participants to manifest “high on involvement” or “high on considerateness” (Tannen 1984) interaction styles in general, and in directive activities in particular, is a function of their perception and interpretation of social relationships in the given situational context. This perception is influenced by the subjects’ cultural background. The assumption to be defended in what follows is that a crucial factor in this influence is the degree of collectivism or individualism promoted by the interactants’ culture-dependent social experience.

The following list enumerates some properties of interaction which I propose to regard as manifestations of the “high on involvement” interaction style with respect to directive activities in (in)group interaction, that is, most generally, devices reducing interpersonal distance¹²⁷ and maximising familiarity. In the context analysed, most facets of this interaction style are related to the group-orientation of the interactants’ social attitudes. This reflects the fact that the reduction of distance between members of a small group takes place for a large part in the form of group integration rather than cultivation of separate dyadic, interpersonal relationships.

High frequency of directive activities. A mutual nurturing attitude of the ingroup members; the view that they are mutually responsible for acting toward the benefit of each other; the high legitimacy of requests to act in favour of other ingroup members; the expectation that advice and instructions will be accepted, and the promotion of group activities all result in a high frequency of directives.

Family metaphor in legitimating directive activities. In high-on-involvement and group-oriented interaction style, the ingroup can be metaphorically conceptualised as a family. The conceptualisation legitimises certain types of directive activities, in particular of a corrective and nurturing type with respect to other group members.

Blurred boundaries between advice and instruction. High-on-involvement style corresponds to nurturing attitudes between the ingroup members. As in

¹²⁷ Or, to use another spatial metaphor conceptualising social experience in terms of physical experience, “lowering interpersonal boundaries” between people involved.

other nurturing relationships, this results in many instructional directives being produced.

Blurred boundaries between request, demand and advice. In involvement situations, the boundary between actions that are in the interest of the addressee and those which are in the interest of the speaker becomes less clear; speakers treat the addressee's worries as their own, and solutions to the addressee's problems as solutions to problems affecting the speaker herself. Verbal insistence is used to change the addressee's temporary preferences. The distinction between the advice, request and demand, in the non-technical sense of these words, is blurred and the predicated action is implicitly or explicitly presented as beneficial to both the addressee(s) and the speaker.

Impositiveness of form. Directives are perceived as obviously legitimate by the speaker and are correspondingly realised by impositive head acts, such as imperatives and realisation declaratives, mitigated by positively polite modifiers.

Creativity in naming practices. Creating nicknames and derived (distorted) names corresponds to the perception of the right of in-group members to mutually influence each other, including influence on the name as a person's icon, and creates an insider language that reflects the possession of common ingroup history.

Frequent use of plural forms of address and plural self-reference. The addressees of directives are frequently groups; speakers conceive themselves as benefiting from the proposed action together with others and formulate the directives accordingly.

Directives for another group member's benefit. The nurturing and protective attitude of the ingroup members towards each other is accompanied by a high legitimacy of requests made in favour of other ingroup members.

Appeals for the display of bonds. Interpersonal bonds may be displayed by a symbolic joint action that must be called for and arranged.

Demands for personal information. In a high-on-considerateness context, the insistence on receiving personal information is viewed as being boorish; ingroup members feel free to emphasise explicitly their and everybody else's right to keep personal information private, and to openly articulate the opinion that certain interpersonal boundaries should not be transgressed. In contrast to this, in high-on-involvement contexts, group members expect to obtain personal information about each other and feel entitled to demand it.

Well-meant abuse. Offensive and critical behaviour can be used to express the desire to sustain and deepen the relationship with the addressee, and as a

means to persuade the addressee to abandon actions reducing her bond with the group.

Requests for action against the recipient's will. Extreme manifestations of involvement and the assumption of joint responsibility for other group members are calls to act in ways viewed as being beneficial to the recipients of the action while opposed to their temporary preferences.

Joking directives. Directives that are not meant to be followed are used as humorous socialisers and “general interaction modifiers”. In social psychology and interpretative sociolinguistics, humour is predominantly regarded as a means of expressing and enhancing group integration. Joking directives are based on the assumption of having a common background, that is, the assumption that the audience and the addressee will be able to recognise the lack of an actual directive intention although it is signalled by the utterance’s syntactic form and propositional contents.

Teasing and practical jokes. A reduction of distance corresponds to a tolerance and the expectation of tolerance of humorous abuse; teasing and practical jokes are typically collective activities in which the actors collaborate against a single “victim”.

Fake directives. The habit of verbal impositiveness, acquired in interactions abundant in impositively formulated directives, may give rise to (non-joking) utterances that resemble directives in that they are realised in imperative sentences, but are not really meant to result in the addressee’s performance of an action, and are in fact comments on the current situation or declarations of intention.

Politeness as mainly a matter of non-verbal supportiveness. The main component of politeness in high-on-considerateness encounters is verbal mitigation; strong impositiveness is viewed as being boorish. In a high-on-involvement approach, a lesser significance is attached to verbal non-imposition and higher significance to being helpful.

Primacy of concern for group integrity over individual relationships. If a conflict occurs between group integrity and point-to-point relationships, the group may insist on individuals subordinating some aspects of their bilateral bonds to the interests of the whole group.

Gender-based subcategorisations. Gender-based use of “we”, “you-PLURAL”, and gender stereotyping corresponds to the focus upon group aspects of the social encounter, rather than its interpersonal aspects.

Joint performance of directives. Directives can be performed collectively, in a consecutive way (through repetition, paraphrase, completion) or simultaneously (choir chanting).

The observation that the high-on-involvement style, with its impositive verbal form of directives, occurs in all groups in situations particularly relevant to the maintenance of group ties lends support to the claim that group-orientation and the involvement attitude are closely related.

In what follows, I will examine selected occurrences of these elements in the data and indicate the properties of the context which promote their occurrence.

7.4. INTERACTIVE AND RHETORICAL CONTRIBUTIONS OF DIRECTIVE ACTIVITIES TO FORMING AND EXPRESSING SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS

7.4.1. FIRST ENCOUNTER – FIRST DIRECTIVES

The following description of the very first directives uttered in each of the Big Brother houses during the entrance scenes, or immediately following exchanges, should be read against the background of the description of these scenes in the preceding section 7.2. Just as the first encounter in general exposes differences in social expectations, first directives reflect the spirit of the encounter and capture some characteristics of later interaction.

G1, G2 and G4. Two of the respondents in the interviews mentioned in the previous section noted that focusing interest upon the shared material environment was used as a strategy for initiating interaction specific to German first encounters. The following three scenes present the first directives uttered in the German series.

5-G1. Immediately after introducing themselves upon entering the house, F1, F2, F3 and F4 are on their way to the women's bedroom.

1 F1 to F2: guck mal # der Garten # ist doch total lustig # es sind die Hühner drin

look # the garden # it is quite funny # there are hens in it

2 F2 (laughs)

3 M <starts shouting from a distance>< --- >

4 F3 to M: <starts shouting from a distance><ja # du kannst auch mitkommen>

yes # you can come along too

48-G2. F1 and F2 are walking along the hallway after their brief introductions upon entering the house.

1 F1 Küche # schau # schau # schau

the kitchen # look # look # look

2 F1 guck ma

let's have a look

3 F2 genau

exactly

4 F1 ganz ruhig # wir nehmen das super relaxed

quite calm # we stay quite-COLLOQUIAL calm now

5 F2 das ist das Badezimmer

this is the bathroom

6 F1 das ist doch groß # ne?

but it is large # isn't it?

7 F2 sag mal # diese Dusche # wo ist das jetzt

say MITIGATING PARTICLE # this shower # now where is it

(F2 enters the shower and lets water run)

8 F1 Dusche ge:ht

the shower works

9 F2 ein Mikro unter der Dusche

a microphone-COLLOQUIAL under the shower

10 F1 ein Mikro # sie müssen es heiß machen

a microphone-COLLOQUIAL # they will make it hot

11 F2 wie geht die Tür zu

how does the door close

12 F1 (closing the shower door) na geht doch # guck mal

it does work # look MITIGATING PARTICLE

21-G4. The first pair enters the house. Prior to the start of the program, the press reported that the house was going to be divided into the "rich" living area and the "poor" area with straw beds.

1 F cool # (laughs) # .so # jetzt müssen wir gleich zum Stroh

right # now we must walk straight to the straw

2 M Klasse

great

3 F (moving along the floor) <start whisper><komm # guck mal>

come # look MITIGATING PARTICLE

4 M müssen wir gleich zum Stroh? wow # du weißt schon mehr .

mehr als ich wohl

must-we walk straight to the straw? # wow # you seem to know more than I

5 F (pointing to a wardrobe with towels) hei # guck # wir müssen keine
Handtücher mitbringen

hey # look # we don't need to bring any towels

(F and M walk through the house to the straw beds)

- In turns 5-G1/1, 48-G2/1, and 21-G4/1 comments on the material environment are being produced, and a personal relationship is introduced by an invitation to share an interest about an aspect of the surroundings. The speakers create a common background in a one-to-one encounter by offering comments about the current situation and the environment, and by inviting each other to share attitudes (turns 48-G2/4, 21-G4/1) and recognitions related to the environment (turns 48-G2/1, 48-G2/6, 48-G2/12, 48-G2/2, 21-G4/5) by means of imperatives of verbs of sensation and speech. The utterance in 5-G1/1 is morpho-syntactically marked as being directed to a single person even if the current group which is spatially close together consists of four persons. All three scenes realise a pattern of one-to-one interaction even when it is not enforced by the situation itself.
- In turn 5-G1/2, a joking directive not meant to be followed is being produced, which reduces distance by means of a teasing tone which will recur in the German interaction. Even if M's utterance which provoked F3's response was not identifiable, two German respondents agreed that the response could not be meant seriously; they based their judgement on the incompatibility of the propositional contents with the actual situation (male and female speakers were expected to sleep separately) and the cultural acceptability of exchanging teases between men and women in informal encounters between young peers. The utterance is notable in so far as teasing practices, including fake directives meant to be interpreted as such, contribute considerably to the ice-breaking activities in the initial stages of the German editions.

P3 and P4. The characteristic features of the conversational style which will be perpetuated in Polish edition P3 are displayed within the first minute of their contact. The housemates arrive sliding down a slide dressed up in helmets and boxing-gloves which turn the mutual embraces into a somewhat clumsy action. The female housemate F, approached and hugged on her arrival down the slide by a male housemate, reacts by uttering a request:

107-P3. EMBRACE

F dajcie nam się porozbierać z tego

let-IMP-pl. us take this off

While uttering these words, the speaker is on her way towards embracing the addressee and embraces him immediately after that.

Several properties peculiar to a group-oriented and high-on-involvement style are displayed in this initiation.

- The interaction is initiated by producing a directive utterance. It anticipates the ease and high frequency with which directives will be produced in the Polish group.
- Its linguistic form is the imperative. It displays a tendency towards impositiveness in directives.
- As shown by the accompanying action, it is not meant to be followed but is produced as a mere socialiser, and a comment on an aspect of the situation.
- It is marked as being directed at a plural addressee by the use of 2nd plural, in a direct reaction to the behaviour of one of the addressees (the intended embrace), displaying the speaker's tendency to see herself as confronted by a group rather than by individuals, and to attribute actions by individuals to groups.
- The 1st plural personal pronoun is used in self-reference. This signals that the speaker is speaking on behalf of the speaker and the person following her, assuming that what she says represents also her follower's wish and is in her follower's interest. It shows the speaker's tendency to view herself as facing her environment together with somebody else who shares her perceptions and attitudes. Pluralisation of the beneficiary constitutes a group-oriented politeness strategy which neutralises what otherwise could be interpreted as the speaker's hint at her negative face want (the desire not to be impeded), and a selfish rejection of a friendly gesture (the embrace). The "we" and the plural "you" are being construed on the spot.

The sequence concludes with a group-oriented proposal and the carrying out of the predicated action by the group:

108-P3.

1 (simultaneous speech)

2 F1 Jezus jak zimno # chodźmy do środka

Jesus it's terribly cold # let's get inside

- 3 (simultaneous speech)
 3/1 F1 (to F2 who is the only person who still has the fancy gown on, and starts taking it off) chodź
come
 3/2 F1 (takes F2 by the arm)# . chodź się tam przebierz # . tam
come change clothes there # over there
 4 (simultaneous speech)
 5 M1 wszyscy jesteście?
are we all there
 6 (simultaneous speech)
 (the group enters the building)

In turn 2, F1 expresses the expectation of a coordinated action: she expects all the participants to enter the building as a group. Since F2 is still busy undressing, F1 persuades her to postpone the individual action until the completion of the group action, and allows her no choice by physically interfering with her attempt to undress. M1 makes sure that nobody was left out, and the group enters the house.

Further directive activities occurring as functions of consolidating the group and breaking the ice follow immediately after the first encounter. The second scene, which directly follows the entrance scene, shows the female housemates gathered in the living room.

109-P3. F1, F2, F3, F4, F5, and F6 are sitting or standing in a circle in the living room.

- 1 F1 chce-my-jeść! [chce-my-jeść!]
we-want-to-eat
 2 F2, F3 [chce-my-jeść!]
we-want-to-eat
 3 F1, F2, F3 [chce-my-jeść! chce-my-jeść!]
we-want-to-eat # we-want-to-eat
 4 F4 na jedzenie trzeba sobie zasłużyć
one must earn one's food
 5 [(simultaneous speech)]
 6 F3 ta:k
yes
 7 [simultaneous speech]
 8 F5 [będziemy ganiać]
we will be made to sweat (literally: we will run-IMPERFECT)
 9 [(simultaneous speech)]

10 F2 właśnie

exactly

11 F3 zawody # no

contest # yes

12 F1 (clapps her hands) no to drogie panie # poruszamy tutaj jakieś takie tema:ty fa:jne # trzeba się poznać

well dear ladies # we start talking about like cool themes # one-must get to know each other

In turn 1, F1 attempts to animate the current group to join in a collective performance of the demand addressed to the program production team, in the form of the routine formula *chce-my-jeść* whose formulaic properties include a chanting intonation and a group performance. Jointly chanting demands to a third party is a powerful means of creating group spirit. The attempt is partially successful since two or possibly three of the five group members present choose to join in. In turns 4 through 11, the participants refer to their shared future experience, anticipating that they will be forced to take part in a sporting competition before they get food. In turn 12, F1 proposes in factual terms (realisation declarative in present tense) a round of talk about “cool themes”. F1 is evidently referring to the type of conversation known to the participants from the preceding two series of the program, where the housemates were made to discuss themes related mainly to ethical questions and interpersonal relationships. Clapping hands prior to uttering the directive is typical of teacher-pupil and parent-child contacts, and can only be interpreted here as a humorous “as-if” – a fake sign of F1 assuming authority. F1 addresses all persons present at the same time, and faces them as a group, acting as a teacher in a teacher-class interaction. This contextualisation cue marks the proposal as not being meant seriously. It is not intended to be followed but is meant to create a common background by pointing to the shared knowledge about the conventions of the program, and by anticipating a shared experience: it is not expected that the women will start having serious discussions out of the blue. At the same time, F1 refers to the current situation and speaks of the necessity to get to know each other using a deontic predicate. It is a recurring feature of the early stages of the Polish edition that the participants expect a general readiness to talk about intimate themes, and that they speak about getting to know each other in terms of a social obligation.

7-P1 . The housemates, including M1, M2 and M3, have gathered in the living room shortly after the arrival of the last couple. M2 is walking through the room.

1 (simultaneous speech)

2 M1 to M2: ^daj jakąś zapalniczkę # bo on chce palić
BEGGING INTONATION

bring a lighter # because he wants to smoke

M1 utilises the integrative function of requests made for the sake of another group member, triggering a small favour paid by M2 to the beneficiary M3. He attends simultaneously to M3 as the beneficiary of the predicated action, and to M2 as its actor, and construes a situation in which the needs of a group member are responded to by a co-operative action of two people. At the same time, using begging intonation as a mitigating device, M1 construes himself and M3 as a unit whose needs M2 is expected to respond to. M1 construes a group plane of interaction by placing himself at the intersection of two (dyadic) units, i.e., people expressing a need and people responding to the need of the other. In what follows, I will refer to directives of this type as “diagonal”.

E3 and E4. In E4 and E3, no directives occurred in the greeting sequence. The large amount of simultaneous speech occurring in the early stage of the encounter did not allow me to identify with certainty the occurrence of the first directive speech acts in E4; the exchange in 10-E4 below refers to one of the earliest intelligible ones.

93-E3. The interaction takes place immediately after greeting the last newcomer. The speaker is male, and the addressees are all the female housemates. In turn 4, the speaker, M2, points to the door of the less comfortable of two unlabelled bedrooms. M2 and other male participants are aware of the differences between the two bedrooms.

1 (simultaneous speech)

2 M1 shall we show you around?

3 (simultaneous speech)

(the group walk towards the bedrooms, M2 points to the door of the “poor” bedroom)

4 M2 this is the girls’ bedroom # this is the number two

5 (simultaneous speech)

(the women walk into “poor” bedroom 2)

Further consequences of the scene will be discussed in the following section. Here, it is sufficient to remark that it anticipates several recurrent properties of interaction in the British programs:

- A proposal is being made, anticipating a high frequency with which proposals will be made in this and both British groups in the early part of the program.
- It is put into a tentative formulation that makes it dependent on the addressee’s acceptance.

- The female and male subgroups are being distinguished as points of reference by the use of “we” and “you” in turn 2, as well as by the trick itself.
- A practical joke is being played which paves the way towards reducing interpersonal distance.

The reference to the distinction between the male and female sub-groups also occurs early (after the first half-hour of the encounter) in E4:

10-E4. Men and women are having an argument about whether the toilet seat should be left up or down.

1 M let's have a national debate # right now # the toilet seat stays where it is

(simultaneous talk)

2 M please pay attention to the men's rules

In turn 1, M makes a joking proposal referring to the debate among the housemates as a “national debate”, thus placing the interaction in the Big Brother house on a larger group plane, as an event representing the entire British nation. The debate itself is built around a piece of gender stereotyping (different toilet habits of men and women). In turn 2, M makes a request directed at the female part of the population on behalf of the male part, for whom he is (jokingly) speaking as a representative.

According to Brown (2000), gender stereotyping is a typical component of group encounters, where people conceive themselves as representatives of groups, rather than interpersonal ones. The uniformity of behaviour, discussed earlier as an indicator of a group-oriented concept of a social situation, may take the form of social stereotyping, gender stereotyping being one of its current forms:

Take, for instance, an interaction between just two people who happen to belong to different social categories (e.g. a man and a woman). Is this encounter an interpersonal one because just two people are involved or is it a group-based interaction because of the category difference? ... what would be needed before we could characterize this situation would be a close study of the content of the interaction between them. If it appeared by word and gesture that the participants were orientating towards each other in a relatively predictable and sex-stereotypic fashion then this would indicate an instance of group behaviour. In the absence of this, the idiosyncratic nature of the interaction would suggest a more interpersonal encounter ... (Brown 2000: 9).

While gender stereotyping indicates self-concept of the interaction participants as members of different groups, I assume that it does not preclude the possibility that the participants perceive themselves at the same time as members of the same superordinate group. On the contrary, the group-oriented perspective on self and other promotes the “identification” attitude in general. Taking a group-oriented perspective on the current interaction facilitates sub-grouping of the participants by differentiated roles or status difference. In other words, the conception of a group as a “we” encourages rather than precludes the perception of self and others as participants in further “we”-formations, as it encourages viewing people in terms of their social similarities rather than their unique characteristics. I propose to view gender stereotyping in a group context as a facet of group-orientation, and a contribution to the perception of its participants as a group – composed of gender subgroups – rather than an aggregate of persons. Thus, it plays an integrative role not only internally for each of the two gender camps but also for the larger group as a whole. Gender stereotyping fosters group integration not only because it facilitates the adoption of an identification perspective (“we”-think) in general, but also because it is based on gender-sensitive rules of conduct we acquire when growing up, regulating some aspects of interaction between men and women. The evidence of sharing the knowledge of these rules confirms the common background of the people involved in the interaction. It also gives each participant a ready-made recipe of how to behave towards others in a socially appropriate way, and promotes social closeness by diminishing the “unknown” component of interaction, that is, the necessity to get to know other people personally in their idiosyncrasies in order to be able to interact with them in adequate ways. As with any stereotyping, gender stereotyping increases the feeling of safety of interaction. In contrast, however, to some other, phobic kinds of stereotyping, gender stereotypes are mutually known, free of serious antipathies and largely agreed upon, so that in the context given they help group members to overcome the initial distance, and promote a fast development of social closeness.

To sum up, the ice-breaking role of directives could be observed in all three languages but the observation suggests that particular strategies were culture-specific. Among the Germans, directives occurred mainly in calls for interpersonal sharing of perceptions of the environment. Humorous gender grouping and stereotyping formed the context in which they occurred among

the British¹²⁸. The Poles produced directives which involved many people at the same time (as actors and beneficiaries), and presented the speaker as having needs shared with others. Of these three strategies, the first one is more strongly affiliated with the interpersonal dimension of the interaction and the latter two with its group dimension.

7.4.2. HOW TO CLAIM A BED IN THE BIG BROTHER HOUSE

The following scenes have been selected as illustrations of conversational styles occurring in particular language groups because they take place in very similar situational contexts. At the same time, secondary contextual differences provide coverage of issues such as group construal, gender bonds, responsibility towards external beneficiaries and the influence of these social constructs upon both the occurrence and the linguistic form of directives.

The scenes transcribed below take place in slightly different set-ups:

G1. ENTERING THE WOMEN'S BEDROOM, E4. ENTERING THE WOMEN'S BEDROOM, G1. ENTERING THE MEN'S BEDROOM and E4. ENTERING THE MEN'S BEDROOM – the female and male subgroups sleep in separate bedrooms which have been assigned to them in advance.

E3. ENTERING BEDROOMS – the male and female subgroups are also going to share separate bedrooms, but the two bedrooms have not been assigned to the groups in advance, a condition that paves the way for group negotiation.

P3. ENTERING THE RICH BEDROOM 1 and P3. ENTERING THE RICH BEDROOM 2 – mixed groups consisting of both male and female housemates are going to share bedrooms appointed to them.

P3. ENTERING THE POOR BEDROOM 1, P3. ENTERING THE POOR BEDROOM 2, P3. ENTERING THE POOR BEDROOM 3 and G4. ENTERING THE POOR BEDROOM – groups of male and female housemates enter unfurnished rooms where they are going to sleep on the floor or on straw.

G4. TALKING ABOUT THE RICH BEDROOM does not take place in the bedroom but in another room, and the arrangement is only verbally negotiated, without corresponding action.

P3. OFFERING NEIGHBOURHOOD 1, P3. OFFERING NEIGHBOURHOOD 2, G4. OFFERING NEIGHBOURHOOD and E3. OFFERING NEIGHBOURHOOD – one of

¹²⁸ Humorous gender stereotyping may be present in 5-G1, involving cross-gender teasing; the amount of stereotyping cannot be assessed because of the difficulty interpreting the male participant's speech..

the housemates suggests to another that he or she should occupy a bed or place next to his or her own bed.

7.4.2.1. CONSIDERATENESS: THE OTHER AND I

6-G1. ENTERING THE WOMEN'S BEDROOM

F1, F2, F3, and F4 enter the bedroom. F1 walks a few steps and puts her bag on a bed. F2 who follows her was just about to put her bag on the same bed.

1 F2 bleibst du da?

are you taking this spot here?

2 F1 ist egal

all the same

3 F2 mir ist auch egal

it is all the same to me too

4 F1 ich gehe auch dahin # ich gehe da # okay?

I will also go over there # I am going over there # okay?

(F1 moves her bag to another bed)

5 F1 ich gehe da # okay # ist ganz gut

I am going over there # okay # it is fine

6 (F3 and F4 laugh)

7 F1 ist alles gut

it is all right

8 F2 wir können immer tauschen (smiling)

we can always swap

9 F1 kein Problem

no problem

The scene takes place a short time after the interlocutor's first encounter. The exchange results from the conflicting preferences of F1 and F2 for the same bed. F2 has been surprised by F1 who put her bag on the bed of F2's choice. In turn 1, F2 declares her preference for the same bed in a negatively polite manner by a mild hint, inquiring about F1's intention which has been unambiguously manifested a second before by F1's action. In the situational context given, F2's utterance implies that she is interested in occupying the same bed; it is the most plausible and situationally relevant interpretation, and this is how the utterance is actually interpreted by F1. In turn 2, F1 disclaims her preference for the bed, and F2 withdraws her indirect request in turn 3. Rather than taking this response at face value, F1 enhances the plausibility of her earlier declaration by proclaiming, in a realisation declarative, her

readiness to move to a different bed, followed by a question tag, a signal of consultative strategy:

4 F2 ich gehe auch dahin # ich gehe da # okay?

I will also go over there # I am going over there # okay?

Having met with no objection, F2 carries out the declared action and comments on it reassuringly, saying:

5 F1 ich gehe da # okay # ist ganz gut

I am going there # okay # it is fine

In uttering (5), F1 is making it clear that she has not interpreted the situation as harmful to her in any way, be it by material disadvantage or by suffering a face threat. The group contributes to releasing any potential tension by laughter. In turn 6, F1 again reassures F2 that everything is fine and that there are no ill feelings. F2 offers to swap beds in the future in a competence declarative, leaving it open and up to F1 as to whether the switch will actually take place:

9 F2 wir können immer tauschen (smiling)

we can always swap

F2 reacts to it with a conversational formula *kein Problem*, offered also in response to apologies and thanks. Thus, she is both re-iterating her satisfaction with the solution and recognising F1's offer as an appreciative response to her own behaviour. Consideration is shown on both sides for the preferences of the interlocutor, visible in the appearance of disclaimers of own preferences and redressive action, behavioural and verbal, by both parties. Both F1 and F2 show unwilling to impose upon their interlocutor and to carry out their initial intentions. On-record directives do not occur.

7-G1. ENTERING THE MEN'S BEDROOM

M1, M2, M3 and M4 move into the men's bedroom.

1 M1 gibt es besondere Wünsche # wo jemand schlafen will?

are there any special wishes # where someone wants to sleep?

2 M2 ja # Bettnässer schläft ganz oben # ne?

yes # bed-wetter sleeps on the top # right?

3 M3 meinst du?

do you think so?

4 M4 hehehe
hehehe

5 M3 aber
but

6 M1 (stretches his hand to M3) Thomas
FIRST NAME

(M1 and M4 shake hands)

7 M4 nimmt es mir bitte nicht übel # ich muss öfter mal
nachfragen
don't blame me please # I need to go quite often

8 Mx ^ja ja
yes yes

9 M3 ja ich auch
yes me too

(M3 leaves; M1, M2 and M4 stay in the room)

10 M1 habt ihr etwas dagegen wenn ich- (points to a bed)
to you mind if I-

11 M2 haben nichts dagegen
we don't mind

The considerateness strategy is shown at the very beginning by by M1's polite inquiry about the addressee's preferences concerning the sleeping arrangement. M2 reacts in a positively polite manner producing a paradoxical joke in a realisation declarative, referring to an imaginary "Bettnässer" and proposing an unreasonable solution with a potentially catastrophic outcome. M3 receives the joke po-faced, and M4 shows appreciative through laughter. M4 takes up the theme introduced jokingly by M1 by a polite apology for his future "bad habits" which could be disturbing to the addressees. Mx (not identifiable) reacts by an affirmative particle that functions as an acceptance of apology; the repetition functions as emphasis and assures M4 that his misbehaviour is not only excusable but also something likely to occur, and as such not to be criticised. M3 further excuses M4 by declaring that he, too, suffers from the same problem. In turn 10, M1 reintroduces the subject of sleeping arrangements and declares his preference non-verbally by pointing to the bed of his choice, while inquiring in a negatively polite manner whether this is going to clash with the others' preferences. M1 declares his specific preference in turn 10 only after he has made sure, by means of his earlier interrogation in turn 1, that nobody else has declared interest in the same bed. M2 responds on behalf of the group, displaying a sign of the interdependence-based approach to the situation.

In this exchange, too, negative politeness and the consideration for the others' territory are predominant. Anything which might provide a potential for conflict is disarmed. On-record directives do not occur. The final claim for a particular bed by M1, amounting to a request for the others making a different choice, is realised indirectly by means of interrogation, making sure that no clashes of interest exist or might result from this act.

11-E4. ENTERING THE MEN'S BEDROOM

M1, M2, M3 and M4 enter the men's bedroom.

1 M1 it's not bad # eh

2 M2 this is swish # boys

3 M3 you want that one # do you

4 M4 ah ah I'll have # is everybody happy if I take this one?

The same strategy is applied by M3 and M4 as in the preceding scenes, G1. ENTERING THE WOMEN'S BEDROOM and G1. ENTERING THE MEN'S BEDROOM. While a joint background is created by comments in turns 1 and 2, where the speakers are sharing their impressions with the rest of the group, expressions of preference for one or another bed are framed into interrogation about the interlocutor' preferences in the following two turns. On-record directives do not occur.

A contrary strategy is exemplified by turn 2 in the following interaction in E4, which takes place within the female group of five on entering a bedroom where there is one double bed and four single ones.

12-E4. ENTERING THE WOMEN'S BEDROOM FEMALE

F1, F2, F3, F4 and F5 enter the women's bedroom.

1 F1 oh my God

2 F2 I'm having the big one

3 F3 (looking round the room) oh # I like this (referring to the room not a bed)

4 F4 I'm not fast # I will have a small one

5 F5 I take it # this one is mine then (sits on the remaining vacant bed)

The reaction of F4 in turn 4 is a comment upon F2 directly claiming the best bed in the turn 2, and has an accusatory overtone: F4 agrees to have a smaller bed while she suggests that it is an act of resignation and that she would also like to have the big bed, but was too slow in claiming it for herself. F4's reaction shows that the immediacy and directness with which F2 claimed the privilege of the big bed for herself in the same gender group was prominent enough to be worth a comment. Later in the series, one of the

female housemates nominated F2 for eviction from the house on the grounds of her having claimed the big bed for herself. F2, a minority native speaker of English, was also simultaneously nominated for eviction on first impression by all the other housemates, who believed she did not fit in with the group because of her outspoken and uninhibited style of interaction.

All four scenes above involve an individual negotiation of the sleeping arrangement. In all but the (consequential) last one, the individual negotiation finds a correlation in negative politeness strategy, based on attentiveness directed towards non-interference with the other's wishes and intentions. A very different stance is taken by the interlocutors in the following scenes from British edition B3 and Polish edition P3.

7.4.2.2. IMPOSITIVENESS: THEM AND US – CLAIMING RIGHTS IN MIXED GENDER GROUPS

The scene discussed below comes from the beginning of the third British series and is a continuation of E3. FIRST DIRECTIVE quoted in section 7.4.1. The negotiation is framed into the separation of the negotiating parties into two gender camps, pre-established by the program's creators. Group negotiation replaces individual negotiation; the local "Schicksalgemeinschaft" within two gender groups changes claims for one's own benefit into claims for the benefit of the whole group, including the speaker. In this scene, the female housemates, led by a minority native speaker, F1, claim a more comfortable sleeping room in ways that are on par with the directness of the Polish women in the Polish scene that will be discussed later. The forms chosen contrast sharply with preferences shown in asking for one's individual benefit above, where the negatively polite interrogative was the preferred form and unmodified impositives were exceptions.

94-E3. ENTERING BEDROOMS

The last female housemate has entered and finished shaking hands with the rest of the group in the central area. It is known to the housemates that there are separate bedrooms for men and women. The men arrived before the women, and had some time to look around. The suitcases of all the housemates are standing in the central area.

1 M1 to F1, F2, F3, F5 and F5: shall we show you around?

2 (simultaneous speech)

(The group walks towards the bedroom doors. M2 points to the door of the "poor" bedroom.)

3 M2 this is the girls' bedroom # this is the number two

4 (simultaneous speech)

(The women walk into the "poor" bedroom. The women talk simultaneously entering the bedroom while M1, M2 and M3 stay silent behind the door. M3 laughs silently and

appreciatively pats M2 on the back, unobserved by the women. After the women disappeared behind the bedroom door, the men laugh silently and M1 moves his arms in a sprinter-like manner in a gesture expressing suppressed joy. The men run away from the door.)

(F1 leaves the "poor" bedroom, approaches M1)

5 (simultaneous speech of women in the "poor" bedroom)

6 F1 to M1: (smiling) where are you sleeping? # _ where are you sleeping?

7 (simultaneous speech)

editorial cut

(M3 and M4 enter the "rich" bedroom and occupy two beds)

8 M3 ---

(M5, M1 and M2 enter)

9 M5 oh that's nice # they've been told that this is the lads' room

10 M3, M4 (laugh)

11 M5 I think we've got to wait # surely they will tell us or the girls will

(F1 and F2 enter the "rich" bedroom)

12 (simultaneous speech)

13 F2 oh # no # why

14 F1 that's too much # I'm having not bad bed # . oh I don't care # what anyone says right # I'm having no arguments (F1 lies down on the double bed)

15 (simultaneous speech)

16 F2 [Big Brother # this is our room # .. this is our room]

(F3 and F2 place themselves on the beds next to F1)

17 F3 [---] haven't sorted their room yet # ha ha ha

18 M5 what do you reckon lads

19 M2 yeah # we are getting thrown out

21 M3 yeah

22 F1 to M2, M3 and M5: go there # you should be all right with that

23 F2 this is our room

(F2 gets upon a bed and jumps several times, laughing)

24 F3 to F1: our room is so much better than theirs

(M2 approaches F1)

(F1 smiles, looking at M2, and clings to her bed as though she were afraid that he wants to claim it)

25 (simultaneous speech)

(all housemates walk out of the “rich” bedroom)

26 F2 who’s taking the double bed

The construction of the gender-based grouping already takes place in the first line of this interaction, where M1 construes the plural “you” and the “we” along the gender boundary by the corresponding use of the pronouns:

1 M1 to F1, F2, F3, F5 and F5: shall we show you around?

By their use of the personal pronouns “you” and “we”, and their treatment as obvious and self-explanatory, M1 maintains male and female “sub-group” identities that have already been introduced by the conditions set by the program’s creators, who let all male housemates enter the house prior to the female ones. The use of the pronouns is based on the fact that it is the male members of the group who now have “expertise” of the house and may serve as guides to the female housemates.

Typical for the spirit of the British programs, a practical joke is being played here, immediately following the first meeting of the housemates. The female housemates are deceived into occupying the poorer of the two bedrooms. Male solidarity is displayed in a joking collaboration against the women, and generates non-verbal gestures of solidarity such as M2 patting M1 on the back as a sign of appreciation for the successful deception. That the men treat it as a joke (possibly with the exception of M5, as suggested by his utterance in turn 11), and anticipate that things may not end up that way, is visible in the fact that they do not take their suitcases with them into the “good” bedroom but leave them outside in the hall.

The women react by claiming their traditional privilege of comfort. The reaction is modified by non-verbal signs of non-aggression such as smiles and laughter, but on the verbal plane the attack upon the women’s privileges is taken and fought back seriously, leading to the production of requestive speech acts. In demanding that the men move to the other room, F1 and F2 use a speaker-centred strong hint and the imperative:

14 F1 that’s too much # I’m having not bad bed # . oh I don’t care # what anyone says right # I’m having no arguments

17 F3 --- haven’t sorted their room yet # ha ha ha

22 F1 to M2, M3 and M5: go there # you should be all right with that

In turn 17, F3 “drops a remark” based on the presupposition that the “rich” bedroom belongs to the women. The utterance functions as a “strong hint” in which F3 presupposes an arrangement she prefers, that is, presents the possession of the better room as unquestionable, and implies the men should leave. The directive intention and the intentionality of letting the men “overhear” the remark are signalled by emphatic laughter, whose intentionality is contextualised by the rhythmical and over-articulated production of laugh particles in absence of genuine laughing. The sarcasm of the remark functions as a positively polite modifier; it is intended that the men recognise the remark as an intentional “shameless joke”, “witzige Unverschämtheit” (Kotthoff 1998).

The gender difference puts in force its own rules, based on the rules of social conduct which prescribe chivalrous behaviour for men and legitimise the claims of the women. The scene shows how the awareness of membership in a group is reflected in the verbal behaviour in directives, pushing the form towards more impositiveness in situations where claims are being made on behalf of a group including oneself rather than for individual benefits. I interpret this as a sign that the impositive style in directives reflects not just nationality per se but, more essentially, the degree to which the claims are perceived as legitimised by the rules of social conduct, referring not to individuals alone, but to the frame of socially and situationally rooted bonds and alliances, such as the gender bond. The highly impositive style of the above quoted utterances seems to reflect an awareness of a group right; by claiming comfort for herself, each woman is also claiming it for other female housemates. The scene displays male and female ingroup solidarities, as well as a presupposition of consensus about the values and standards of behaviour, in the impositive directives directed towards the men by the female group. Four native speakers who watched the scenes judged it utterly unlikely that any of the women involved would claim a better room for herself only, that is, if the rooms were single and each of them individually were the only beneficiary involved, using an impositive verbal form like in the scene above. Significantly, in turn 26, F2 switches to a negatively polite interrogative (“giving options”) when introducing the topic of bed distribution in the “rich” room within the female group (who’s taking the double bed). The utterance in 26 shows that F2 regarded the preceding negotiation between men and women as a collective act whereby an individual occupying one or another bed (the double bed was occupied by F1) didn’t mean making a claim for this particular bed. Rather, F2 viewed the negotiations as a means to the

collective end, and assumed that after this end was achieved, the situation could be or needed to be renegotiated among the women on an individual basis.

Three native speakers, one male and two females, interviewed about this scene thought that although the men were prepared to leave and not be bothered by it, they might have kept the room if they had not been made to leave; the fourth female viewer thought that they would have given the room up in any case. The male respondent thought that if the women did not realise at once that they were occupying a worse room, the men would have told them anyway. All respondents thought that men would not have insisted on staying in the better room as soon as it was claimed by the women, and all confirmed that the event was a practical joke. For the two female and two male German respondents it seemed obvious that the men really intended to stay in the better room. The third male respondent took the spontaneous affirmative answer back on reflection and thought that the men would eventually propose a more democratic solution, such as throwing a coin or turn-taking, of their own will. The same respondent failed to realise that the utterances in 18-21 signalled the women were successful in getting the men to leave, and did not know who was going to sleep in the better room after it was vacated by both the men and women¹²⁹, which indicates that he did not take the actual outcome of the negotiation for granted. The other male German respondent thought that after a couple of days the men might become more prepared to reject the women's claim, while they were probably more polite and prone to make concessions at the start when the interpersonal distance was greater. He found it interesting to see that the women managed to push their claim through (*"es ist interessant, dass die Mädchen es schaffen, dort zu bleiben"*). All the German respondents thought that the outcome of the negotiation was uncertain, as the men could as well have insisted on staying in the better room, while one of them reckoned that the men did not really mind leaving the better room because they could more easily put up with less comfortable leaving conditions, and because they were already satisfied by the successful joke which was actually more important than successfully claiming the better room. All the German observers and two of the British respondents thought that a different group of women might have put up with the situation and stayed in the worse room; the reaction depended on their personalities. The remaining two British respondents thought that it was quite unlikely that the

¹²⁹ This could not be due to deficient acoustic reception or semantic interpretation of the verbal clues as the transcript was read to all non-native speakers to ensure understanding. All non-native respondents were highly proficient students of English or used English as their only language in long-term intimate relationships.

women would have stayed in the worse room knowing that it was worse. The four Polish respondents thought that the behaviour of the male housemates was meant as a joke, that the men would have left the better room anyway, that any serious attempt by them to stay there would be a breach of social norms, and that no group of women would put up with occupying the worse room. The difference between the German and the Polish respondents in answers to questions about the men's actual intention to stay in the better room, the possibility of a different outcome of the negotiation, and the possibility that a group of women would not have made the demand for the better room were statistically significant¹³⁰. To sum up, while the German respondents tended to experience the directive activities of women in this scene as framed in a real clash of goals, most remaining respondents, including all the Poles, experienced it as merely fulfilling the inevitable based on a cultural script. This suggests a lesser degree of gender stereotyping in the perception of this scene among the German viewers and a more interpersonal conception of the situation.

7.4.2.3. INVOLVEMENT: BE FRIENDLY AND IMPOSE – THE CASE OF THE POLISH

The following interaction shows a mixture of the contextual features of the preceding scenes. On the one hand, the negotiation of sleeping arrangements takes place individually. On the other, the group consists of men and women, so that the gender aspect may influence individual behaviour by differentiated, gender-based legitimizations of claims, offers, and proposals made within the scene. Like the preceding ones, the scene takes place on the first day of the program. In the transcript below, two parallel conversations are distinguished by separate turn counts and by moving one of them to the right hand column.

¹³⁰ Question 1: $df=1$, $\chi^2 = 4.8$; $p<0.05$; question 2: $df=1$, $\chi^2 = 8.0$; $p<0.005$; question 3: $df=1$, $\chi^2 = 8.0$; $p<0.005$.

110-P3. ENTERING THE RICH BEDROOM 1

The team that has just won the competition enters the luxurious bedroom, as ordained by Big Brother. M2, M3 and M4 won a boxing match against the other team who will have to sleep in the “poor” bedroom. The walls of the rich bedroom are padded with pink fabric.

1A M1 to M4: to ty to zrobiłeś # popatrz
it's you who did it # look

(F1 enters the room and walks up to a bed)

1B F1 ja chcę to

I want this one

2A M1 to M4: dzisiaj zrobiłeś demolkę # [chodź zobacz jak] tu jest

today you have given a beating # come and see what it is like in here

2B F2 [gdzie śpimy]

where do we sleep

3B M2 ale bajera

wow

4B F1 [albo nie # ja chcę to]

(turns to the other bed and picks up a cushy pillow)

or no # I want this one

3A M3 [przecież to jest pokój] dla Mariolek

but this is plainly a room for Mariolas-FEMALE FIRST NAME PLURAL

4A (simultaneous speech)

5B F1 albo nie # ja chcę to

(turns back to the bed she chose before and throws the pillow back to the bed she picked it from)

or no # I want this one

6B F3 [ja od ściany] # bo ja się-

I'm next to the wall # because I-

7B M3 no to [ja chcę to] (sits down on the bed vacated by F1)

then I want this one

8B F3 ja się się gdzieś muszę przytulić # o # proszę bardzo
(walks to a bed in the corner)

I must nestle against something # o # here you are

5A M1 wiecie co wam powiem #
you know what I will tell you
6A (simultaneous speech)

9B F2 ja tu # . ty tu? (to F1,
pointing to a bed next to hers)
me here # you here ?

10B F1 no (nods)
yeah

11B M2 to M3: no wskakuj
między laski # [bożeś
kawaler] # no
*well jump between the girls # as you are a
bachelor # yeah*

7A M1 e # chłopaki # ... słuchajcie # ja myślę od razu taka
jedna rzecz
eh # boys # listen # I am immediately thinking about one thing

8A M2: no
yeah

12B F1 to M3: albo nie ja tu
chcę # (picks up a cushy pillow lying on
the bed on which M3 is sitting) mogę ja
tu?
or no # I want here # can I be here?

9A M1 że jak oni będą na przykład spać w gorszych warunkach #
to my pójdziemy --- # a dziewczyny przyjdą tu
*that when they for example will sleep in worse conditions # then we will go --- # and the girls
will come here*

13B M3 no ^dobra # no (stands up
from the bed he is sitting on and turns to sit
down on the bed vacated by F1)
well okay # good

14B F2 to ja chcę tu (points to the
bed vacated by F1 and occupied now by
M3)
then I want to be here
(M3 walks to another bed)

10A M4 nie wolno
it is not allowed

11A F3 nie pozwolą #[proponowaliśmy już]
they will not allow that # we have proposed that already
12A M4 [nie ma takiego ---]
there is no such ---

Tannen (1984: 110) makes a point about “the strategy of involvement” saying:

Throughout the Thanksgiving dinner, our conversational behaviour shows that Peter and Steve and I operate on the assumptions that if someone wants to say something, s/he will find the time to say it. By this system, the burden of the speaker is not to make room for others to speak nor to ascertain whether others want to hear one’s comments. Rather, the conversationalist’s burden is to maintain a show of rapport by offering comments. (87) ...The “high-involvement strategists” showed a high tolerance for noise and diffuse topics as opposed to silence. All these devices operated to give the conversation its ‘frenetic’ tone, and to establish among us a sense of a rapport and successful communication (95) ... Peter verbalised one aspect of the high-involvement strategy that has been discussed: the expectation that, having something to say, speakers will say it. It is not the burden of the interlocutor to make it comfortable and convenient for others to express their ideas, but rather to be free and spontaneous with reactions.

While Tannen’s observations refer to “conversations” in the classical sense, her remarks can be generalised to apply to the field of directive activities. Conversationalists applying a high-on-involvement style seem to “care about themselves” rather than offer room for others’ contributions, led by the assumption that everybody will be able to fulfil his or her needs by pursuing the same strategy. In the same vain, preferences are expressed forcefully when it comes to making directives within an ingroup in the high-on-involvement style, and the resulting frenetic tone of the interaction establishes a sense of rapport and successful co-operation.

All three female housemates execute their right to choose first by making lively and direct claims for a bed of their choice. F1 changes her mind several times and contributes significantly to the “frenetic” tone of the scene. Her indecision can be interpreted as an expression of enthusiasm about the luxurious standards in the “rich” bedroom: by claiming one bed after another, F1 is also showing that she likes them all and is appreciative about being able to choose among several tempting alternatives. In turn 12B, she makes M1 get

up and vacate a bed which she allowed him to have after a period of indecision. As this is the third time that F1 causes M1 to move, and involves him being physically removed from the place he is occupying, the situation poses a relatively high face threat to M1, and she pays tribute to his negative face wants by reformulating her initial impositive utterance as a request for permission:

12B F1 to M3: albo nie ja tu chcę # mogę ja tu?
or no I want here # can I be here?

M3's permission amounts to his fulfilling the request by moving to another bed, from which he is banned again by F2 in turn 14B. M3 responds to the negative politeness of F1's utterance in 12B by saying *no ^dobra # no* ("well okay # good") with a distinguished high rise-fall intonation. In making assents, this intonation pattern is a carrier of a precisely identifiable recurrent "meaning" in the relationship space. It expresses not only the a lack of objections to a proposition (or assertion), but also communicates that insistence, be it begging or impositive, is pointless because the current speaker has absolutely no intention of refusing.

Previously, M3 adopted the plain assertive tone introduced by the women in turn 7B by claiming a particular bed after F1 had vacated it:

7B M3 no to [ja chcę to] (sits down on the bed vacated by F1)
then I want this one

but is far from actually showing any preferences and eventually takes what F1 and F2 left for him, illustrating the the workings of a premise analogical to Tannen's (1984: 87) description of the attitude underlying the conversationalist involvement strategy: "My message in conversation is the excitement and exuberance ... It is not my intention to hog the floor. I fully expect that others will talk over me."

While all three female group members in the scene above exercise their customary right to choose first, the male group members assert themselves in other ways. M1 commands M3 to "jump between the girls" (occupy the bed between F1 and F2), explaining that M3 is a bachelor and implying that it is proper for a bachelor to sleep between women while it might not be appropriate for the rest of the men (including himself), who are married:

11B M2 to M3: no wskakuj między laski # bożeś kawaler # no
well jump between the girls-colloquial # as you are a bachelor # yeah

In commanding M3, M2 seems to be anticipating what M3 might like doing, and acts and acts in such a way as to facilitate M3's decision to carry this out. The attentiveness of M2 is directed not towards non-interference with the others' territory, but, rather, towards an active facilitation of the addressee's decision by guessing his preferences and imposing on him to act to his own advantage. At the same time, M1 proposes to the male group members to give up their privileges to the women from the other group:

9A M1 [że jak oni będą] na przykład spać w gorszych warunkach
to my pójdziemy --- # a dziewczyny przyjdą tu
that when they for example will sleep in worse conditions # then we will go --- # and the girls will come here

Involvement and positive politeness, that is, the presupposition of consensus, are central to the linguistic behaviour in this scene. Claims for a particular bed are made in a self-assertive and emphatic tone, even where there is no intention of insisting on the choice declared (as shown in 7B). Besides, directives are being produced which are directed towards the benefit of either the addressee himself (11B), or an external beneficiary (7A), and are articulated in an impositive verbal form.

These properties of interaction, including its linguistic form, recur in the next scene, which shows the other team moving into the rich bedroom two days later.

111-P3. ENTERING THE RICH BEDROOM 2.

M1, M2, F1, F2, F3 and F4 enter the "rich" bedroom.

1 M1 no już czuję że się zaraz stąd będziemy stąd wynosili # w
sumie ładnie # . dobra to już widzę # . swoje wyrko
well I already feel that we will march out of here after a short while # pretty in general # well I see it already # my bed-COLLOQUIAL

(M1 walks up to a bed in the corner)

(F1 sits on the bed of her choice)

(F2 sits on the bed of her choice)

(M3 enters)

(F2 sits on the bed of her choice)

(F3 goes up to the bed next to F4)

(M2 picks up a pillow from a free bed)

2 M3 (to M1 who is situated next to the bed of his choice in the other corner of the room):
Pablo (points to a bed situated a distance away from M1 and close to himself)

*Pablo-CREATIVE DISTORTION*¹³¹

3 M1 to M3: tam?

there?

4 M1 (to F1, F3, F4; F1 and F4 are occupying the beds next to the bed of his choice, and F3 is standing close to him) chcecie Mirki?

do you girls-COLLOQUIAL want?

5 F3 'no

yeah

6 M3 (to F4, who cuddled with him last night and is sitting on a bed next to the one he chose) --- spać tu w środku tutaj

--- sleep-INF in the middle here

(M1 walks towards M3)

In turn 1, M1 declares a preference for a particular bed by saying “już widzę swoje łóżko”, “I see my bed already”. A declaration of possession of an object can be a joking way to claim this object for oneself, and not only in Polish, as shown by its occurrence in a British episode:

2-E2. F1, F2 and M are unpacking a gift of cosmetics from Big Brother.

(M looks into the basket of presents)

M non-strip bronzer? that I think is mine

Clearly, such emphatic possessive declarations communicate satisfaction and strong appreciation of the object in one's possession.

During the following couple of seconds, other housemates enter and place themselves on the beds of their choice. M3 ignores M1's declaration of preference in turn 1, assuming, quite in accordance with the involvement strategy described above, that declarations of intention are not to be taken too seriously as they can be overridden by an equally vigorous declaration of contrary intention by another speaker. M3 wants M1 to occupy a bed next to him. He produces a directive by addressing M1 in a creatively distorted Spanish version of his name and by pointing to the bed that he wants M1 to occupy. The term of address accompanying the directive gesture expresses intimacy and closeness. The appeal to M1 to occupy a bed close to his own is a declaration of togetherness, in which M3 takes it for granted that M1 wants the same as M3, that is, to tighten the bonds to M3 by sleeping next to him. M1

¹³¹ The Italian version of the Polish *Paweł*.

responds with an interrogative *tam?* (“there?”), showing consensus with M3 concerning M3’s right to make a choice for him. At the same time, M1 notices that F1 and F4 occupy the beds next to the bed of his choice, and that F3 is standing close to him, possibly aspiring to the same bed. Rather than ask F3, who is the only one who has not yet placed herself on any bed, whether she would like to have “his” bed, he produces an interrogative in the plural. He directs the check of preferences to all three women in his vicinity, that is, as well as to F3, to F1 and F4, who are already sitting on their beds. M1 believes that the three women might want to sleep next to each other, and articulates his perception of the interaction in terms of the encounter of two gender “camps”. F4 (rather than F3) confirms this and M1 starts walking towards M3. In the meantime, M3 seems to have produced a directive to F2, with whom he was cuddling the night before, concerning which bed she should, or might want to, sleep on – unfortunately, the actual form of his utterance is not recognisable.

The scene reflects a spirit of involvement and group-orientation, reflected both in the housemates’ impositive claims making plain their own preferences and in the construction of “we” and plural “you”. M1 firmly assumes that nobody else will aspire to the bed of his choice and declares it to be his, making a strong claim which expresses his satisfaction with the present arrangement. M3 overrides M1’s declaration and presupposes that M3 has the same preferences as he does, taking it for granted that M1 is willing to sleep next to him, and that it will be more important to him than adhering to his first choice. M1 perceives a group of three female housemates as the proper addressee for his offer to vacate a bed in the form of a preference check, in a situation where a different, more interpersonal logic of social encounter might dictate that he address only one of the persons present (F3), because the other two have already chosen their beds.

During this scene, the action taking place in the other “poor” room is partly audible to the TV audience. The utterances which could be transcribed are those of one housemate only (M4). His female interlocutor’s (or interlocutors’) responses were hardly audible and their wording could not be identified.

112-P3. ENTERING THE POOR BEDROOM 1
Voices over (coming from the other, “poor” bedroom)
1 M4 kobiety śpią od y: drzwi
women sleep at the e:rm next to the door
2 Fx ---

3 M4 nie
no

4 Fx ---

5 M4 nie mieszaj porządku
don't mix up the order

6 Fx ---

7 M4 Biedronka no nie możesz tam spać # nie możesz tu
Ladybird-NICKNAME you can't sleep there # you can't here

8 F1 ---

9 M4 ^nie mo:żesz BEGGING INTONATION
you can't

Even if the female part of the exchange is missing, the general traits of the impositive conversational style can be clearly observed in M4's verbal behaviour. He attempts to impose a particular sleeping arrangement upon other team members, turning it into a rule that the women should sleep next to each other on one side of the room. His proposal apparently meets with objections on the part of at least one female interlocutor, and M4 appeals to her not to "mix up the order" in a bare imperative:

5 M4 nie mieszaj porządku
don't mix up the order

M4 is married and, knowing his wife will be watching the TV show, does not want her to get jealous. Two days before, he referred to the relationship between the sleeping arrangement and the people's marital status when his group were locating themselves in the "rich" bedroom:

110-P3. ENTERING THE RICH BEDROOM 1
 10B M2 to M3: no wskakuj między laski # [bożeś kawaler # no]
well jump between the girls # as you are a bachelor # yeah

Another situation in which M1 produces directive utterances which are motivated by thoughts of his wife's sense of decency is described in section 6.2.4. In view of this repeated behaviour, M4 appears here to be acting as a guardian of proper group conduct rather than insisting on his own preferences.

While M4's initial "matter of fact" declarative

1 M4 kobiety śpią od y: drzwi
women sleep at the e:rm next to the door

presupposes consensus and compliance of the addressees, the responses of the addressees (or one of them) show that there is a clash of preferences. In what follows, M1 declares, obviously in response to a noncompliant behaviour by one of the female housemates, that she cannot sleep in the spot she had chosen:

7 M4 Biedronka # no nie możesz tam spać # nie możesz tu
Ladybird EMPHATIC PARTICLE you can't sleep there # you can't here

The repetition of the inhibitive in turn 9, following a not identifiable response made by F1, is mitigated by the begging intonation that makes it obvious that M4 is not trying to exert authority but, rather, appealing to his interlocutor's goodwill. This is the only negatively polite aspect which occurred in M1's contribution to the exchange, and it occurred only after his interlocutor's repeated objection (be it verbal or behavioural) showed a conflict of preferences between him and the former. Besides, a non-impositive positively polite modification was used in the appeal, the nickname "Ladybird" with which the speaker signalled intimacy, confidence, and lack of bad feelings towards the non-compliant addressee.

7.4.2.4. DE-GENDERING OF NEGOTIATION: GROUP VERSUS INTERPERSONAL PERSPECTIVE

The following exchange comes from German edition G4, realised in design B ("Big Brother battle"), as was the Polish exchange above. The interlocutors are members of one team who have won a competition and are about to move into the "rich" bedroom.

22-G4. TALKING ABOUT THE RICH BEDROOM

M1, F1 and F2 are in the bathroom to the "rich" bedroom, talking about the different kinds of beds: a pair of double beds and a pair of single beds.

1 F1 Jungs wo wollt ihr denn
boys where do you want to be

2 M1 ihr dürft die großen haben # ist ja selbstverständlich
you may have the large ones # it is EMPHATIC-PARTICLE obvious

3 F1 ne # mir ist es wurscht # kann auch auf dem kleinen # wer
bedeckt sich dann viel

no # I don't care # I can also have a small one # who covers themselves a lot

4 F2 ich

me

M1 is the only male housemate present. In turn 1, F1 refers to male and female sub-group identities, addressing the single addressee (M1) through the use of a term of address in the plural, Jungs “boys”, followed by an interrogative with a verb in 2nd plural. While talking to a single addressee, F1 makes it plain that she addresses him as a representative of his gender group, and implicitly suggests that the sleeping arrangement should be established according to gender-based groupings. F1’s form of address implies that she takes it for granted that the two men will sleep next to each other as will the two women. In negotiating the sleeping arrangement with M1 as a representative of “the boys” rather than with F2, F1 presupposes that F2 will sleep next to her. At the same time, she applies the considerateness strategy in dealing with the addressee as a representative of “you-plural”, and starts the negotiations by means of a preference check. This is an approach contrary to the involvement strategy in which “everybody cares for himself”, counting firmly on everybody else doing the same within the limits set by common rules of conduct. This scene contrasts with the behaviour of female housemates in the Polish group in the analogous situation, where the excitement about and the satisfaction with the luxurious living conditions are expressed by explicit and forceful claims being made for the bed of one’s choice.

M1, who is Swiss, seems to interpret F1’s initial contribution as an indirect claim for the more comfortable pair of beds on behalf of herself and F2. M1 reacts to F1’s gender-based subcategorisation by referring to gender-stereotyped rules of conduct as the underlying source of his offer. He perpetuates F1’s gender-based use of the pronoun *ihr* (you-plural), and offers the female group more comfortable beds in a negatively polite competence declarative, continuing F1’s strategy of non-imposition and offering a choice. The use of the modal “dürfen” marks it as permission, and does not contain any impositive element. Instead, it signals the offering of an option, which the addressees may make a use of according to their own preference:

2 M1 ihr dürft die großen haben # ist ja selbstverständlich

you may have the large ones # it is PARTICLE obvious

In reaction to M1's offer, F1 distances herself from the gendered group perspective which she has herself introduced through her earlier reference. In turn 3, in which she declares that she has no preference, the togetherness of F1 and F2 (membership in a gender group) is not evoked, and any self-evident privileges are denied. F1 proposes to replace the gender-based principle (women sleep on large beds and men on narrower ones) by an individual one: big beds should be occupied by people who need a lot of space while sleeping, independent of gender. This is implied through F1's interrogation of the addressees' sleeping habits. This time, F1's formulation includes F2 as an addressee, rather than a person represented by F1:

3 F1 ne # mir ist es wurscht # kann auch auf dem kleinen # wer
bedeckt sich dann viel

no # I don't care # I can also be on the small one # who covers themselves a lot

In turn 4, F2, a minority native speaker of German, reacts in a self-assertive way, admitting the habit of "covering herself a lot", and, by implication, claiming a wide bed for herself.

Although the concept of the team naturally falling apart into two sub-groups along the boundary of gender is clearly invoked, it is rejected again by one of the potential beneficiaries when she receives a signal that this might have been interpreted as claiming a group privilege of comfort, and an individual, gender-free difference is pushed into the foreground instead. F1 occupies a narrow bed and one of her male housemates has a larger one. In the English and Polish scenes quoted earlier, negotiations of group benefit and the more or less explicit appeals to the male obligation of courteous behaviour correlate with the occurrence and impositive style of women's directives. In the exchange currently under discussion, the eventual refutation of the principle of group benefit legitimizing a privilege through gender finds a correlation in considerateness being the main strategy applied in turns 1 and 3.

7.4.2.5. OFFERING CLOSENESS: THE STRATEGIES

The scene quoted above, P3. ENTERING THE RICH BEDROOM 2, involves a sequence in which a male housemate appoints his male mate a bed next to his by means of non-verbal communication, seeking spatial and social closeness to the addressee, signalling that he perceives their relationship as being intimate, and presupposing co-directionality of the addressee's desires and preferences with his own. The scenes below further illustrate two different interaction strategies available to the speakers when they declare interest in tightening

social bonds with the addressee by means of proposing a “neighbourhood” in the bedroom.

G3. ENTERING THE POOR BEDROOM

M1 and M2’s team just lost a contest and were moved to the “poor” bedroom, whose floor is covered with smelly straw to sleep on.

1 M1 so eine Scheiße ei # .. o:h # .. fuck
such shit ei # o:h # fuck

(M1 throws a knapsack upon one of the mattresses lying on the floor)

2 M2 es ist aber echt # ich finde es hat aber was # hihi # .
bist du hier? (points to a mattress) ich schlafe hier (points to the
neighbouring mattress)

*it is really # but I find this is somehow good # hihi # are you taking this spot? I will sleep
here*

3 M1 ist mir scheißegal # hier liegt überall Scheiße # glaube
ich

I don’t care # here there is shit lying everywhere # I think

M1 is applying a high-on-involvement strategy producing a strongly-emotionalised expression of opinion intensified by cursing and interjections. After M1’s pejorative comment on the living conditions in the poor area in turn 1, in turn 2, M2 seems to be indirectly suggesting that M2 might occupy a place next to his. M1 does not respond to what might be a mild hint that M2 would like to tighten his bond with M1; instead, he continues to comment expressively on the situation and to express his dissatisfaction. The hint turned out to be too mild to catch on (since M1 and M2 are applying incompatible rhetoric).

An offer of closeness occurs in E3, in a scene where F1 proposes to F2 to occupy a bed next to hers:

95-E3. OFFERING NEIGHBOURHOOD

F1, F2 and M1 enter the bedroom.

(F1 sits down on a bed)

1 F1 to F2: Joan # you can go here (pointing to a bed next to hers)

F1 does not leave any doubt about her directive intention, and F2 complies. Although the utterance expresses the intention clearly, it is realised by a means of conventional indirectness; F1 expresses her belief that F2 might want to sleep next to her, but signals politely that she does not take it for granted and shows her respect for F2’s freedom of choice. This strategy

contrasts strongly with the gestural-vocative directive used by M1 in turn 2 of scene 111-P3 which was discussed above.

7.4.2.6. CHOOSING BEDS: A SUMMARY

To sum up, the following tendencies occurred in particular languages, providing a potential guideline for the analysis of inter-cultural difference:

In German, negatively polite strategies are used in negotiations both in mixed and homogenous gender groups; a gendered, i.e. group perspective is offered in a mixed group, but it is eventually withdrawn and replaced by the interpersonal perspective.

In English, the gendered perspective is offered in negotiations involving male and female groups, and co-occurs with the use of positively polite formulations of directives. Negative politeness occurs in negotiations within the same gender group; the user of impositive forms receives a negative social evaluation and is perceived as a trespasser of the rules of proper conduct.

In Polish, in mixed groups negotiations take a gendered character; men and women are perceived as groups. Forceful claims are being produced, independent from the producer's gender; their impositive linguistic form substantiates their perception as highly legitimate by the producers. People tend to guide actions of others "for their own good", "for mutual benefit" or as guardians of proper conduct.

Most generally, gendered negotiations correspond to the tendency to use positively polite forms of directives and non-gendered (interpersonal) negotiations correspond to the tendency to use negatively polite ones. This substantiates the relationship between the speakers' group-based perspective and their estimation of the legitimacy of claims and expectations.

7.4.3. PACKING THE SUITCASE: DIFFERENT CULTURES, DIFFERENT SPEECH ACTS?

The discussion below is concerned with some culture-specific courses of interaction including, or centred on, "altruistic" requests, where the only beneficiary is neither the speaker nor the hearer, and demonstrates some intercultural contrasts as well as similarities. The scenes have been selected so as to involve similar themes and analogous contexts; a full commensurability of themes and contexts could not be achieved or expected in natural interaction.

The following two interactions result alike from the announcement of a group member's eviction from the Big Brother house. Some of the remaining housemates offer to help the evicted persons pack their belongings.

In the Polish scene, which takes place on the third day of the program, F3 (the evicted) has just taken part in a contest and is wearing wet clothes. She is given five minutes to leave the Big Brother house. The housemates have been together for two days. For the sake of brevity, some passages have been omitted.

115-P3.

1 BB ...[i przygotuj się do wyjścia] # _ masz pięć minut na opuszczenie domu Wielkiego Brata

and prepare to leave # you have got five minutes to leave the Big Brother house

2[simultaneous speech]

(F3 goes to the bedroom)

3 M1 Wielki Bracie # to dopiero pierwszy raz # do trzech do dwóch razy sztuka

Big Brother # this was just for the first time # all good things are thr- are twos (meaning: let the limit be two times)

(7 seconds)

4 F1 pomożemy jej się spakować # nie?

we will help her pack # right?

5 BB decyzja Wielkiego Brata jest nieodwołalna

Big Brother's decision is final

6 F1 możemy pomóc Weronice?

can we help Weronika?

7 F2 (in the bedroom, speaking from far away) nie # ja sobie poradzę

no # I will manage myself

(2 second)

8 F2 możemy # nic nie mówi

we may # he doesn't say anything

(F1 and F2 walk towards the bedroom)

... (8 seconds)

9 F1 to F3: chodź pomożemy ci

come on we are going to help you

(F1, F2 and F3 go up to F3's suitcase)

10 F3 nie # czekajcie ja tylko # <[wiecie co # nie]

no # wait a moment # you know what # no

11 F2 [gdzie jest twoja torba]

where is your bag

12 F1 [_ szybko --- . ty znos rzeczy]> # a my ci pakujemy #

quick # you carry-IMP-sing. the things in and we are packing # carry-IMP-sing. the things in

13 F2 my ci pakujemy

we are packing for you

(F3 draws her suitcase to the middle of the doorway, F1 starts opening it)

14 F1 [znoś rzeczy]

bring-IMP-sing. the things

15 F1 [otwórzcie ją] # . ale ja mam tylko to

open-IMP-pl. it # but I only have this

(F3 puts a handful of things into the case)

16 F3 [---]

17 F1 [klapki] sobie ubierz # buty ci przyniosę

put the slippers on # I will get your shoes for you

... (about 13 seconds during which the remaining housemates walk from the living room to the hall)

18 F2 (loudly to the group): dajcie jej klapki # tutaj # te

give-IMP-2nd pl. her slippers # here # these ones

19 F4 te?

these ones?

20 F3 --- dżinsowe

--- denim

21 F2 (loudly, to everybody): gdzie są jej dżinsowe klapki

where are her denim slippers

... (8 seconds during which the issue of the slippers has been settled, and everyone in the group has gone to the doorway; the rest of the group are now standing around while F1 and F2 are packing F3's suitcase)

22 F3 (running to the bathroom): ja mam spodnie mokre # wszystko # dajcie mi tą walizkę tu

my trousers are wet # and all # bring-IMP-2nd pl. me this case over there

23 M2 dajcie jej się przebrać # _ przebieraj się # a my ci wiesz # . pomożemy

let-IMP-2nd pl. her change her clothes # change-IMP-sing. your clothes # and we will you know # help you

24 (simultaneous speech)

25 F4 Weronika # wykup się

Weronika # take a bath

(M2 picks up a bottle of water from the floor and walks slowly away from the bathroom, while F2 pulls F3's suitcase to the bathroom; F3 changes her clothes in the shower)

26 (simultaneous speech)

27 BB Weronika # masz trzy minuty na opuszczenie domu wielkiego brata

Weronika you have got three minutes to leave the Big Brother house

28 M2 ile ma?

how many?

29 M3 [---]

30 F4 [trzy minuty] ma na opuszczenie domu

three minutes to leave the house

31 (simultaneous speech, F3 walks towards the bathroom)

32 F5 to F3: ty się nawet nie kąp przecież

you don't-IMP even take a shower

33 F3 tam gdzieś została moja kurtka ze skóry przynieście mi
ja

there is my leather jacket somewhere over there # bring-IMP-2nd pl. it to me

... (8 seconds)

(F4 comes in with a jacket)

34 F4 Weronika # czy to jest twoja kurtka?

Weronika # is this your jacket?

35 F3 nie: # taka brązowa

no # it is like brown

36 F1 Weronika # czy to twoje buty?

Weronika # are these your shoes?

(editorial cut)

37 F3 mordę muszę sobie umyć

I must wash my face-AUGM

(runs to the sink and starts washing her face)

38 F2 to F5: dawaj wsadzaj (putting clothes into A's suitcase)

come on put it in

39 F4 zo.staw # lepiej idź # . karę ci dadzą czy coś [...]

leave that # you better go-IMP-sing. # they will give you a punishment or something

40 (simultaneous speech)

(F1, F2 and F4 search for F3's jacket in the background. F3 walks to the doorway, puts her overcoat on and runs back to the sink, while F6 pulls her suitcase to the door)

41 BB Weronika # . masz dwie minuty # na opuszczenie domu

Weronika # . you have got two minutes # to leave the Big Brother house

42 F3 pozwól mi się chociaż umyć

at least let me wash my face

43 F2 chodź tu # Weronika

Weronika come here

44 F3 czekaj umyję się tylko (running back to the sink)

wait-IMP-sing. I only will wash up

The tone of this scene is dictated by the short time given to F3 to leave the house. Under these circumstances, the remaining housemates create an

atmosphere of rushed confusion. The proposal to help F3 pack her belongings, addressed towards the remaining housemates, is uttered by F1 in turn 4 in the form of a realisation declarative predicating the future action of the speaker and the multiple addressees:

4 F1 pomożemy jej się spakować # nie?
we will help her pack # right?

The intonation pattern of this utterance, with a rise-fall in the middle, expresses both the expectation of F1 that the proposal will be accepted and her uncertainty whether the others also take it for granted. This is iconised as a rise typical of questions followed by a fall typical of declaratives. The intonation pattern fulfils a function similar to the following question tag. Both the intonation pattern and the following question tag are devices of negative politeness in which the consensus is yet to be negotiated. This is the only occurrence of negative politeness within the scene.

After permission was requested of Big Brother and the absence of a reply is interpreted as a positive answer by F2, F1 and F2 proceed to pack F3's suitcase. Although F3 reacted to F1's earlier utterance (addressed at the group) shouting from outside that she would be able to pack her things herself, F1 and F2 fail to react to this announcement. F1 produces an offer directed towards F3 in the form of a realisation declarative predicating the future action she and F2 will take:

9 F1 to F3: chodź pomożemy ci
come on we are going to help you

The declarative is prefaced by the auxiliary imperative *chodź* (come) which endows the offer with a directive force. It declares that the offer requires F3's active cooperation, which is taken for granted. This type of construction has been discussed in section 6.1.3., dealing with the functions of the imperative-declarative (periphrastic imperative), containing grammaticalised imperative auxiliary verbs ("*chodź*", "*daj*", and "*weź*").

After declaring that she plans to help F3, F1 assumes the role of the instructor in a joint activity and proceeds to tell F3 how to contribute to the joint action, ignoring completely F3's verbal behaviour. F3, who is busy getting her suitcase, seems to be mildly protesting against the plan being put into operation by F1 and F2 since she produces a negative particle twice, and an inhibitive requestive (*czekaj* "wait-IMP-sing"), but it is not clear what she is referring to; she fails to make a point and seamlessly engages in the joint

action. It seems that for F3, packing is less of a problem than finding her things scattered all over the house. F3 accepts help and addresses imperative requests in the plural to her helpers in turns 15 (open the suitcase), 22 (carry the suitcase to the bathroom) and 33 (search for and get her leather jacket). F1 tells F3 to put on her slippers in turn 17, which leads to F2 going to look for F3's slippers. In turns 18 and 21, F2 passes on the task of getting them to the whole group.

Subsequently, contrary to advice given to F3 by different persons, who variously tell her to take a bath and then not to in lines 25 and 32, respectively, in the unmitigated imperative. A piece of advice and another directive, both in the imperative, to F3 follow in turns 39 and 43.

In the meantime, M2 admonishes the helpers to let F3 change her clothes, and promises her that they will take care of the rest, speaking in the first person plural ("change your clothes # and we will you know # . help you"). No action of that sort by M2 actually follows; M2 walks away in a relaxed manner and F3's suitcase is brought to the bathroom by F2 and F4. None of the men and all but one of the women participated in packing and collecting F3's belongings and carrying her suitcase.

Several types of participant structures appear in the directives contained in this interaction: from the beneficiary to the actors (request) in turns 15, 22 and 33; from a helper to other helpers (request) in turns 18 and 21; from a helper to beneficiary as a co-actor (offer and instruction) in turns 9, 12 and 14; from a helper to the beneficiary as actor (advice/nurturing command) in turns 17, 25, 32 and 39; from a spectator (M2) to the helpers on behalf of the beneficiary (request) in turn 23; and from a spectator (M2) as a representative of the helpers to the beneficiary (offer and advice/nurturing command) in turn 23. The syntactic patterns used are the imperative, the imperative-declarative and the realisation declarative.

The attitudes of involvement and interdependence are displayed throughout the scene:

- the speaker F1 assumes initially that some others will join her in performing an action beneficial to EXT, and expresses her proposal in the positively polite form of a realisation declarative while expressing attention to the interlocutors' negative face wants by means of partially interrogative intonation and a question tag;
- the other speaker, F2, assumes that the group are willing or obliged to join, asking them to provide help by means of a plain imperative (turns 18 and 21);
- it is presupposed of the beneficiary that she will accept help and cooperate in receiving it;

- numerous pieces of advice are given to the beneficiary in a categorical tone, presupposing her compliance;
- an offer of help is made by M2 on behalf of the group as a whole, although M2 himself does not engage in helping the beneficiary;
- the beneficiary submits to the actions and commands of the others;
- the beneficiary presupposes the cooperation of other persons by requesting in an impositive form that her jacket be brought to her, and her case carried to the bathroom;
- the beneficiary formulates all her requests in the plural, without specifying the actor.

The amount of attention the interlocutors offer to the negative face in both form and content of the interaction is minimal. Nearly all the face work is directed towards the positive face needs of all the addressees and stresses ingroup responsibility. The speakers manifest a nursing and patronising attitude towards the beneficiary, and feel entitled to act for her benefit through straightforward demands, both initiating and inhibitive, directed at the other group members. The actions of the individuals are viewed as actions by the group.

The following is a piece of interaction following the announcement of M1's eviction from the Big Brother house in E3. F1 and M1 (the evicted person) are bound by an intimate relationship; despite M1's declaration that they are just "mates", in the days preceding the eviction they exchanged hugs and engaged in intimate conversations. M1 is given one hour to pack his belongings and say his goodbyes. The housemates have been in the Big Brother house for about three weeks.

B3.

F1, F2 and M1, are sitting at the table, M2 standing close to them. M2 was a candidate for eviction along with M1 but M1 is the one who has been voted out by the public. After the result was announced, M1 and M2 hugged each other.

1 F1 do you want help packing

(M1 starts walking towards the bedroom)

2 M1 if you want

3 F1 oh # I won't then # I'll be sitting here

4/1 F2 to F1:(standing up) yeah # . come on with me

(M2 moves to join F1 and F2)

4/2 F2 # . let's go baby (clapping M2 on his back)

(F1, F2 and M2 move to the bedroom)

5 M1 I'm wicked # . I don't- # no change in what I'm feeling

6 F1 sure?

7 M2 are you sure (pats M1 on his shoulder)
8 M1 I'm wicked # honestly
9 F2 [what are you wearing # can you show me what you] are wearing please?
10 M1 yeah # ---
11 M2 [I'm so- # I'm so-] # . God # [I was so sure it was going to be me]
12 F1 he is just happy # he's going out
(F1 walks to M1 to hug him)
(M1 embraces F1 and pats her on her back)
13 F1 what # that's not a hug
(M1 and F2 hug; F1 and M1 hug)
14 M2 ---
15 M2 to F1: are you all right
16 F1 yes?
17 M2 are you sure
18 F1 yeah?
19 F1 ---
20 M2 (patting M1 on his shoulder) you're sure # you're all right # yeah?
(F2 hugs M2)
21 M1 totally
22 F1 Tom # you've got two shoes over here mate
23 M1 like you said # I have experience # I've done it # I've done it
24 M2 do you want a hand to pack # do you want to give him a hand to pack
25 M1 ehm # I'll pack # I'll pack # if you want to hang by you can do but I'll pack

Compared to the scene from P3 discussed above, M1 is given enough time to complete packing his belongings, which is reflected in the slower tempo of interaction, and in the major part of the conversation (turns 5-8, 10-21) concentrating on issues unrelated to packing, such as the participants' impressions and emotions. Still, a comparison is made possible by the fact that, as in the previous scene, help is being offered and directives are produced in the course of putting the offer into action. In turn 1, F1 offers help by asking M1 whether he desires help. Rather than accepting enthusiastically, M1 makes F1's action dependent on her own decision. It seems less than F1 expected; as a result, she feels offended and takes back her offer. F2 interferes with the

developing ill-feeling by producing an affirmative particle, standing up and commanding F1 and possibly M2, who is also present, to come with her to the bedroom where the packing of M1's suitcase is to take place. In the same turn, F2 issues an imperative addressed to M2 who declared an inclination to join in by moving in the same direction (towards the bedroom), and modifies it positively by signals of intimacy such as clapping his back and a pet name. In the bedroom, the conversation focuses on the feelings of the persons involved, while F1 tries to be helpful and reminds M1 to think about his appearance during the studio interview he is going to give immediately after leaving the house; the reminder has the form of polite interrogation mitigated by *please* (turn 9). In turn 24, M2 returns to the subject of packing; he offers help to M1 and asks the remaining housemates present (F1 and F2) to join him in helping M1. A native-speaking respondent suggested that the directive utterance (*do you want to give him a hand to pack*) in turn 24 was in fact directed at M1 and meant to be "overheard" by him. Through the complex structure of this turn, consisting of an offer of help directed at M1 (*do you want a hand to pack*) followed by a directive in the form of a preference check directed at other potential helpers, a differentiation was introduced between the person offering help (M1 only) and other people present. Contrary to an offer made in the first person plural, this differentiation made it possible for M1 to react to the offer selectively, for example by accepting M2's help and rejecting the other housemates' participation. Rather than viewing the action as a joint action by the group, a perspective was offered that differentiated between the potential actors and made selective reactions by the beneficiary possible. In turn 25, M1 objects to being actually helped while he agrees that the others can watch him pack, provided that this is what they want.

The following characteristics highlight the contrast to the preceding scene, constituted by the degree to which the speaker verbally signals attention to the addressee's negative face wants:

- F1's offer of help is declared in the form of a check of the beneficiary's preference (turn 1), and the beneficiary's response is taken seriously;
- the beneficiary accepts the offer provisionally making it dependent on the preference of the person offering help (turn 2);
- the conventionally indirect (negatively polite) interrogative form is used in a reminder on changing clothes (turn 9);
- M2 makes an offer by asking about the beneficiary's preference (turn 24);
- M2 asks other persons to join in helping M1 by asking about their preferences (turn 24);

- producing two speech acts in turn 24, M2 differentiates between his and other potential helpers' actions;
- M1 permits the others to assist him passively during his action, making it dependent on their preference (turn 25).

The hearer-centred interrogative or conditional including the verb "want" appears five times in this scene, for instance, in M2's act of asking other housemates to help M1 (turn 6), and an imperative is used twice. The verbal considerateness strategy, in which the speakers express their respect for negative face wants and refer clearly to the preferences of the hearers as preconditions for any actions, predominates. At the same time, the opposite or complementary strategy of a positive face address is by no means absent. First of all, it is present in the area unrelated to the issue of packing, offering help and directive utterances, namely, questions and responses expressing mutual concern by showing interest for other persons' emotional states (turns 7, 8, 16, 18, 21). On the action-oriented plane, attention to the beneficiary's positive face wants is first expressed in the proposal to help M1 and a step is taken towards realising it, in the form of following M1 to the bedroom. It is also visible in numerous details of form and contents of verbal interaction:

- F1's taking offence at M1 making her help contingent on her own preference rather than affirming his need for help (turn 3). F1 signals that she expected an answer appealing to her positive face needs, and that these needs were not met by M1's distancing reaction;
- F2's decision to help M1 although he did not ask for it (turn 4/1);
- F2's impositive appeal to M2 to join her in helping M1, positively modified by a pat and an intimate vocative (turn 4/2);
- M2's appeal to other team members to join in helping M1 (turn 24).

These two sequences illustrate how the strategies of involvement and considerateness intermingle in the British patterns of interaction, and how impositiveness is used as a predominant means of expressing care and involvement in the Polish group, without any attention given to the beneficiary's and only minimal attention given to other group members' negative face wants. While British housemates F1, F2 and M2 signal "giving options" to both the beneficiary and other potential helpers, Polish housemate F1 judges for herself that F3 is in need of help, that this help is to be granted by the group, and takes it for granted that F3 will be willing to accept help and the role of the instructee during this joint action, overriding the beneficiary's innocuous attempts to manage the course of action. Polish beneficiary F1 submits to this role. In contrast with this, M1 in the British scene adheres to his negative face wants and defends his personal territory by rejecting help, which

in this case involves a manipulation of his personal belongings by the others: obviously, his choice does not need any justification, since no justification is offered. At the same time, concern is expressed by talking about emotions, and the interest shown by particular housemates concerning the emotional states of their interlocutors.

The group-orientation of the Polish scene is expressed by the beneficiary formulating her requests in the plural, which signals her perception of the helpers as a group rather than as individuals who have to be addressed separately in directives. The helpers themselves also treat actions by any members of the group as an action of the group, and they mutually take the participation of other persons for granted. In the British group, speakers make offers on their behalf, and expressions of involvement tend to be based on one-to-one interpersonal bonds.

7.4.4. EXTERNAL BENEFICIARY

7.4.4.1. INTERLINGUAL COMPARISON: POLISH AND ENGLISH

The statistics showed that the Poles tended to produce considerably more directives for the benefit of a third person or persons (“external beneficiary”, EXT) than the British; the difference was impressive (every 11 minutes of interaction, compared to every 58 minutes in the case of the British, or 11% versus 4% of all requestives). Initiating (i.e. non-inhibitive) requestives were the preferred type (about 73% in each language).

The following two sets of data demonstrate the intercultural contrast concerning the presupposition (or its absence) of the beneficiary’s consent, and the effects of the underlying attitudes – group-orientation and interpersonal orientation, with their links to interdependence-involvement versus autonomy-considerateness preference – upon the types of directives produced. In particular, they show how this contrast contributes to the above-mentioned quantitative difference. A proposal on the (putative) beneficiary’s behalf is produced in the one case, and a P-offer at the beneficiary (non-requestive, i.e. not included in the statistically analysed data) in the other. The context of the directives is in both cases the arrival of a new housemate in the Big Brother house.

116-P3. WALK GIRL AROUND

Week 5. F1 has just arrived in the Big Brother house. M1, M2, M3, F2 and F3 have been waiting for her in the yard.

1 M1 może ją oprowadzimy
maybe we will show her around

(simultaneous speech)

2 F2 to M1, M2: *weźcie się zajmijcie dziewczyną # no*
AUX-IMP-2nd pl. take-IMP-2nd pl. care of the girl # yeah

Consider now the analogous situation in which a new female housemate, E3, is offered a walk round the house with the speaker:

96-E3. WALK GIRL AROUND

Week 3. F1 has just arrived in the Big Brother house.

1 F1 to F2: *do you want to see the house*

2 F2 to F1: *yeah # go on then*

Offering to show F2 the house, F1 makes the predicated action dependent on F2's preference. As shown in the reaction of F2, and confirmed in the native respondents' judgements, she makes the offer in her own name. This contrasts with P3. WALK GIRL AROUND where the predication in turn 1 is based on the speaker's own judgement that the action will be beneficial to the beneficiary, whose compliance is taken for granted and whose opinion is not being consulted. The utterance in turn 1 of P3. WALK GIRL AROUND is a proposal directed at the other team members. This scene is reminiscent of the entrance scene in which the Poles reacted to the newcomers collectively, by means of a coordinated action. It is one of the hearers, F2, and not the beneficiary, who reacts to M1's tentatively formulated proposal on the (putative) beneficiary's behalf. She strongly supports the idea in an imperative utterance addressed to the previous speaker and his addressees. It should increase the probability that the action will be performed; at the same point, by producing a diagonal request F2 shows that she has interpreted the proposal as addressed to the male part of the group only, and that she assumes it to be their gentlemanly duty to take care of the female newcomer. In this move, F1 introduces gender role stereotyping, emphasising the group-based rather than interpersonal component of the encounter, and offers attention at the same time to F1 as a beneficiary and other team members as actors. A verbal negotiation and action concerning an external beneficiary expresses and confirms the consolidation of the existing group, who collectively deal with the recipient of the favour.

One should not have the impression that the "benevolent incapacitation" is a matter of gender perception by the Polish speakers. The scheduling of activities for guests and newcomers as a Polish cultural script has been documented by Boski (2003: 121), using the "cultural standard" method and reporting on the cultural shock of a male German visitor to a Polish host family: "... er wurde als kostbares, zerbrechliches Objekt behandelt, ja genau,

als Objekt, nicht als Subjekt, das eigenständig Entscheidungen treffen konnte. Er wurde nicht einmal nach seinen eigenen Wünschen gefragt.”¹³²

In Polish and English alike, the prevailing majority of requests for the sake of an external beneficiary are realised using impositive head act forms. Hardly any cultural contrast could be assessed by means of form analysis alone. The cultural difference pertains in the first place to tendencies in choosing the speech act to be performed in response to a given situation (see diagram 2, chpt. 1). These tendencies are constitutive of differences in “interaction styles” characterised by a stronger or weaker presence of directive activities. They are distinct from directly observable differences in “communication styles” characterised by a stronger or weaker impositiveness of actually produced directives. Briefly, taking only the form aspect of interlingual contrasts into account would obscure rather than expose the degree of interlingual and intercultural difference.

7.4.4.2. INTERLINGUAL COMPARISON: GERMAN AND POLISH

The quantitative analysis revealed that in German, half the requestives produced on behalf of an external beneficiary was of the inhibitive type, in contrast with Polish where their ratio was under 30%. Only the initiating sort occurred with considerably higher frequency in Polish than in German (8% versus 4% of all requestives, about every 13 versus every 51 minutes of recorded interaction, respectively).

A closer look at the data reveals that directives in favour of EXT (non-speaker, non-addressee) form a spectrum of activities from such that aim at initiating an action beneficial to EXT, to such that are directly critical of the undesirable behaviour of the addressee:

- reprimands: they are corrective, and can be therefore interpreted as meta-comments on the rules of proper conduct;
- admonitions: result from S’s belief that H would not pursue a rule of politeness if not told otherwise, rather than comment directly on H’s improper behaviour which has occurred before; they are only mildly critical by implying an anticipation of a trespass;
- attention organisers: do not imply criticism but make H attentive to aspects of the situation that make H’s current behaviour undesirable;

¹³² “He was treated as a valuable brittle object, yes, exactly, as an object, not as a subject who could make decisions on his own. He was not even asked about his own wishes.”

- triggers: directives aiming at triggering action advantageous to EXT, referring in no way to any actual or anticipated trespass.

As shown in the following examples, reprimands are prevalingly although not necessarily inhibitive. Admonitions and triggers cannot be reliably distinguished alone on the basis of their syntactic and lexical form and the context; the prosodic characteristics of the utterance, such as the occurrence of reproachful intonation, may need to be taken into account.

TRIGGER

23-G4. F is preparing to leave the Big Brother house.

F ich will auf jeden Fall einen Kuchen haben # ja?

I want to have a cake in any case # right?

M1 to M2: schneide schnell ein grosses Stück für die Khadra ab
quickly cut a big piece for Sandra

REPRIMAND

24-G4.

1 M to F1: Carmen

Carmen-FIRST NAME

2 F2 warte # sie unterhält sich doch gerade # warte # nicht dazwischen

wait # she is EMPHATIC PARTICLE having a conversation right now # wait # not in between (meaning: don't interrupt)

49-G2.

1 M1 to M2: und wie viele Frauen hattest du schon so?

and like how many women have you already had?

2 F to M1: [oh komm # Stefa:n] # [e:cht]

oh come on # Stefa:n # really

ADMONITION

117-P3.

A new female housemate descends a ladder to the yard.

1 F1 to M1, M2: ^idźcie po dziewczynę REPROACHFUL INTONATION

go-IMP-2nd pl. pick up the girl

2 F2 ^no idźcie REPROACHFUL INTONATION

EMPH-PARTICLE go-IMP-2nd pl.

ATTENTION ORGANISER

118-P3.

M mogę wam coś powiedzieć? to jest tak # do wszystkich #
drużyno czerwonych # poproszę o chwilę ciszy # [i do drużyny
czerwonych]

*may I tell you something? it is like that # everybody # team red # I am asking for a moment
of silence # so team red*

F [e # posłuchajcie na chwilę]

e # listen for a while

Abstracting from the ethically neutral case of attention organisers, the speakers of German frequently decided to react correctively to improper behaviour, while the Poles showed a preference for triggers; admonitions were rare in Polish. In the German scenes quoted above, the breach of the norm which elicits a corrective comment on behalf of an external beneficiary is a transgression by the impostor of the personal territory of the other, e.g. by demanding confidential information (24-G4) or an interruption in a conversation (49-G2). The sanctioning of tactless or verbally aggressive behaviour is undertaken by a group member who is not directly affected by the trespass. Such diagonal reprimands hardly occurred in Polish.

A clear illustration of the social sanctionability of a group member's failure to perform a small favour to EXT suggested by the situation in Polish is provided in episode P3. MUSIC BOX below.

119-P3. MUSIC BOX

F, M1 and M2 are sitting at the table, the music box in front of M1; M2 moves to reach for the music box

1 F to M1: patrz patrz patrz # ojciec po magnetofon sięga
look-sing. look-sing. look-sing. # Father reaches out for the tape recorder

(M1 pushes the music box to M2)

2 F zamiast zakręcić sam # to wziął mu popchnął
instead of winding it up himself # he just pushed it to him

3 F (laughs) (points at M1 with her finger)

(M2 winds up the music box)

4 M1 [nie- # no ale- # ja-]

no # but- # I-

5 F [(laughs)]

F ridicules M1 for having failed to pre-empt M2's intention of winding up the music box, which could have been expected of him because it was standing on the table in front of M1. M1 reacted falsely to F's attentive reference to M2's intention to reach for the music box in turn 1. The reaction F expected of M2 was to wind up the box for M1 (M1 obviously wanted to listen to the music). F humorously distances herself from M2 by pointing at him, which is a conventional way of punishment through ridicule for misbehaviour – among children and, jokingly, among intimates. At the same time, F depersonalises M1, talking about him in the third person, in contrast with her previous utterance in which M1 was explicitly marked as an addressee by the imperative *patrz* ("look"). The utterance is not directed to M2 who, like M1, is referred to in the third person, but marked by F as an "inner monologue" commenting on the situation and meant to be "overheard" by M1. This device has a punitive function: M1 is temporarily deprived of the status of the interlocutor. Laughter signals that the "punishment" staged by F1 is not seriously intended, and turns it into friendly criticism. However, in order to be meaningful, and to be capable of being "disarmed" by laughter, a criticism of this kind must be expected to have validity for others. F expects her interlocutors to share her understanding of social co-operation.

High acceptability of demands for information on self among the Poles, and the near non-occurrence of reprimands for verbal transgressions of personal territory, suggest that the issue of such transgressions is non-central to the Polish concept of proper interpersonal conduct. At the same time, the data suggest that it constitutes an important component of this concept in the German groups. The number of situations is small and not sufficient for a definite generalisation but the constellation, including the case of non-directive criticism in P3. MUSIC BOX, suggests that for the Poles an important aspect of impolite behaviour is non-verbal – a failure to perform a small favour required or made possible by the situation. These two perspectives correspond respectively to the cultural focus on freedom from imposition, characteristic of individualist societies, and on interdependence, characteristic of collective societies. At the same time, members of both the German and the Polish groups display the tendency to regulate the conduct of other group members with respect to each other (and, in a few cases, also towards outgroup members), which is an element of interdependence attitude.

7.4.5. DIRECTIVES IN DECLARATIONS AND SYMBOLIC DISPLAYS OF SOLIDARITY

Discussing the occurrences of strongly impositive formulations of requests for personal favours, I suggested that the impositive form was part and parcel of directives whose predicative content depended on the assumption of closeness and intimacy, and which could hardly occur outside an intimate relationship. The following discussion offers a more detailed look at directives of the integrative type, in which the message itself expresses the aspiration to bond with others and the expectation of its reciprocation. The data in all three languages include actions symbolic of group ties, which need to be called for and arranged. The following exchanges from E3, E4, G4 and P3 make visible the relation between group ties and the degree of impositiveness perceived as appropriate in issuing directives.

9-E4.

1/1 **F1 does everybody want champagne? everybody should have a little drink**

1/2 F1 (pouring champagne into wine glasses) **no one drink anything yet # no one drink** anything yet # no one is to drink anything # okay?

2 F1 Ron (extending her hand, holding a glass of wine)

M1 (takes the glass)

3 F1 to M1: **don't drink it yet # don't drink it yet**

4 F2 please sir # can we have some more?

5 F1 **we have to wait for Pablo**

6 **F1 Pablo!**

7 F1 (to M1, M2, M3, M4, F2, F3, F4 and F5): **okay # wait # now we'll drink # because we've got quite a bit left # I thought # I'll let you know** (pours champagne into the glasses kept by M1 and F2)

A strongly impositive inhibitive requestive whose directive force is enhanced by repetition is being directed at the group in turn 1/1-1/2. F1 activates the phatic function of raising toasts and joint drinking, and appeals to the group members not to drink until everybody else is prepared to join the toast. The requestive is legitimised by the integrative goal rooted in social ritual. Uttering it, F1 appeals to the housemates to perform an integrative symbolic gesture and invokes a group spirit. Impositives in the form of the imperative and the deontic declarative occur in turns 3 and 5. In turn 7, F1 uses the strongly impositive form of realisation declarative leaving no doubt

about the addressee's compliance (although it is mitigated by the negatively polite past tense in the following supportive move).

The type of situation that strongly promoted integrative directive behaviour was the departure of a participant from the Big Brother house. Directive speech acts produced in this context frequently serve as declarations of friendship and solidarity, foster team spirit and highlight concern for the integrity of the group. An emphatically impositive form is used in the next scene in the context of appealing to the group for a collective performance of a symbolic enactment of togetherness by means of a "group hug", in reaction to the group integrity being threatened by F1's sudden decision to leave.

97-E3. F1 has told M1, M2, M3 and F2 that she has decided to leave the house, and discusses it with them.

(F1 stands up, embraces M2)

(M1 stands up)

1 M1 I tell you what we need # . we need a group hug #

2 M3 [hehehe]

3 M4 [I've never done one # ---]

4 (simultaneous speech)

5 M1 come on # group hug

(M1 makes a hand movement in the direction of F2, M2 and M3 as though he was collecting them in front of him, and stretches his hand out to M2 and F2)

6 (simultaneous speech)

7 M1 we have all seen group hugs before

8 F2 (approaching M1, F1, M2 and M3) group hug

9 (simultaneous speech)

10 F1 to F2: you are going in the middle

The scene shows the close ties between impositiveness and ingroup bonding. The head act of the proposal in turn 1 has the form of a deontic declarative stating the performance of the proposed joint action as a necessity, and is introduced by a positively polite modifier in the form of a speaker-centred preparatory, a strong statement of a speaker's opinion ("+committer" in Kasper and House 1981). Compared to a bare deontic declarative, the additional reference to the speaker as the source of the directive (I tell you what we need) by means of a performative speech act verb expresses an even higher degree of the speaker's self-assurance. The directive is repeated in turn 5 in the elliptical form whose illocutionary force is enhanced by the utterance-initial imperative.

By symbolically enclosing F1 in a group embrace, group unity and the status of F1 as a group member are displayed and emphasised. The highly impositive form is legitimised by the propositional contents, because the directive dramatises unity and group solidarity itself. Indirect strategies, signalling the recognition that the individual group members are free not to participate, and that consensus is perceived as optional and putative, to be created rather than already in existence, would carry pragmatic implications contrary to the function (cf. “*would you like to do a group hug?*”).

In Polish, where impositive forms are strongly preferred in all contexts, the use of the imperative cannot substantiate the relationship between impositiveness and symbolic manifestations of group integrity. As discussed elsewhere, the realisation declarative, which is used frequently and inconspicuously in proposals (especially in Polish and German), is more impositive than the imperative in requests, and is only used in them in exceptional circumstances. As it is the only direct form of request which is remarkable as regards impositiveness, in the following exchange this form is selected in the realisation of an appeal for a symbolic display of group solidarity.

120-P3. SAD TUNE

M1, F1, F2 and F3 are talking of M2's exit from the Big Brother house; a music box is playing a nostalgic melody. F1 comes from the same team as M1 and M2; and F2 and F3 are from the other team.

(F1 starts weeping)

1 F2 nie płacz_ # nie płacz mała
don't cry # don't cry little one

2 F3 to F1: mamuśka
mum-DIM

3 F2 ty i Ojciec zgasicie tu światła
you and Father will turn the lights off here

4 F3 mamuśka nie płacz # --- pozytywka gra
mum-DIM don't cry # the music box is playing

5 F2 **ostatni stąd wyniesie tą pozytywkę i da Bartkowi**
the last one will take this music box and give it to Bartek

6 F1 mhm

F2 interprets F1's tears as a sign of nostalgia with which she responds to the gradual diminution of the ingroup, prompted directly by M2's exit and the tune playing on the music box. In turn 5, F2 pins it down by reference to M2 and implies that he remains part of the group. She predicates a future action of

the last person to leave, symbolic of group bonds. She uses the realisation declarative in the future tense to demand an action on behalf of the group (taking the music box with him or her and giving it to M2) from whoever happens to stay longest. During her departure from the house several days later, F2 reminds the remaining housemates about the music box by saying *zabierzcie pudełko* ("take-IMP-pl. the box out"). In fact, the winner in the game took the music box with him when he left the Big Brother house.

The following set of data comes from the German series, G4, carried out in the battle design. The initial period of distance reflecting the awareness of diverging team goals, in which the housemates tended not to include the members of rival teams in the definition of their ingroup, was followed by a period in which the competitive goals were no longer viewed as an obstacle to group-wide integration, and relationships were formed regardless of which team the individuals were members. The following scene comes from day 28 of the program.

25-G4. RON'S DEPARTURE

1 HOST: also # Ron oder Sandra # wer muss heute das Haus verlassen # ich mache es kurz und schmerzlos # ...# und zwar wird das . Ron sein

so # Ron or Sandra # I will make it quick and painless # ... # it will be Ron

2 F1 ^Scheiße

shit

3 HOST: Ron verabschiede dich bitte # und . atme tief durch # wir freuen uns auf dich # . bis gleich

Ron say your good byes please # and take a deep breath # we are waiting for you # see you soon

4 M1 komm lass uns alle zusammen --- # ehrlich

come let us all --- together # honestly

(M2 hugs M3)

5 M1 to M3: hol die Zigarre

fetch the cigar

6 M3 (hugs SANDRA-F3) <starts to whisper><--->

(M2 hugs F3)

(F3 hugs F2)

(M2 hugs M4)

7 M1 Ron # komm # hei lass dich feiern # ganz ehrlich # (hugs M2) # _ Scheiß

Ron # come # hey celebrate # honestly # shit

8 M1 irgendwie Scheiß
somehow shit

9 M5 (hugs M2) <starts to whisper> <--->

10 M2 (hugs F4) kleiner --- # **trinkt im Team auf mein Glück # okay?**
little --- # drink-IMP-pl. as a team to my good luck # okay?

11 F4 ja (laughs)
yes

12 M2 to M3, F2, M2: **hier wird geraucht auf mich**
one will-IMPERS. smoke for me here

13 M6 sogar ich rauche ne Zigarre (hugs M2) # _ in zwei Wochen
 drüben # definitiv
even I will smoke a cigar # in two weeks over there # definitely

14 F5 hei Ron # fahr rein (hugs M2)
hey Ron # drive in

15 SANDRA-F3 (sobs)

16 M2 Sandra nicht # ist ja okay # Sandra # . ist völlig okay
 # Quatsch (embraces weeping F3) # <starts to whisper>Quatsch Quatsch
 Quatsch # . es ist okay # Baby es ist okay # es ist völlig
 okay # Bonbon # wir sehen uns draußen # wir sehen uns draußen
 # . wir sehen uns draußen # okay? # . --- Zeit zu genießen # -
 -- # es ist absolut kein Thema (kisses F3) # mach dir bloß keinen
 Vorwurf # hörst was ich gesagt # _ okay?>
*Sandra no # it is all right # Sandra # it is quite all right # rubbish # rubbish rubbish rubbish
 # it is all right # baby it is all right # it is quite all right # sweetie # we will see each other
 outside # we will see each other outside # we will see each other outside # okay? # --- time to
 enjoy # --- # it is no problem # do not blame yourself in any case # you hear what I said #
 okay?*

(M2 stops hugging F3)

17 F3 (sighs)

18 M2 (sighs) # <starts to whisper><Scheiße ist es # . mai>
shit this is # gee

(M2 embraces F1)

19 M2 <starts to whisper> <nicht weinen # nicht weinen # --- # nicht
 weinen # du machst es auch ohne mich>
don't cry # don't cry # don't cry # --- # don't cry # you will make it even without me
 (F5 hugs SANDRA-F3)
 (M2 stops hugging F1)

20 M2 <starts to whisper> <kriege noch ein Stück Torte vor dem Scheiß Ding>

I will have a piece of cake before this shitty thing

(F4 puts a piece of cake on a plate and gives it to M2)

(F1 hugs F3)

(M3 eats cake)

(M4 comes up to M2 and gives him a cigar)

21 M3 ah # Danke # . soll ich jetzt

ah # thanks # should I now

22 M1 ja

yes

23 M2 okay

okay

(M3 gives M2 a light)

(M2 starts smoking the cigar)

(M1 hugs F3, M6 is standing next to them)

24 M1 Ron # ich passe auf die Naddel auf

Ron # I will take care of Naddel-NICKNAME

25 M6 ne # . Ron # . ich bin verheiratet # ich passe auf

ne # Ron # I am married # I will take care

26 F3 er ist auch verheiratet

he is married too

27 M2 passt alle auf sie auf

everybody take care of her

28 M1 aber --- # (laughs)

but

(F3 hugs M6)

29 M2 soll ich euch was sagen? # . es war für mich hier # die schönste Zeit meines Lebens bei euch # . echt # . bleibt so wie ihr seid # ehrlich # ist absolut geil # . ihr seid eine super Truppe # . ne? # bei den Battles Gegner ist okay # . bei- # **wenn ihr euch hier in die Haare kriegt # . ich komme hier rein # versohle jedem einzelnen von euch den Arsch**

can I tell you something? for me this here was # the most beautiful time of my life with you # really # stay as you are # honestly # it is absolutely great # you are a great team # right? # it's okay to be an opponent in the battles # if you start being at loggerheads in here # I will come in here # spank the ass of every single one of you

30 F4, M3 (laugh)

31 M3 gut

good

(F3 embraces M2)

32 M2 <starts to whisper> <nicht weinen # so ist das # nicht weinen # Mäuschen>
don't cry # don't cry # mousy-DIM

33 M5 ich warte auf das was jetzt passiert
I'm waiting for what will happen next

(F3 and M2 kiss)

34 F1 <starts to whisper> <ei # zum Kotzen # ei>
hey # this is puking bad # hey

(M2 stops embracing F3, shows the cigar he is holding to M3; M3 walks over to him and takes the cigar)

(M2 embraces M1)

35 M1 wir sehen uns # ich will dich sehen # wenn ich da rauskomme will ich dich dort stehen sehen
we will see each other # I want to see you # when I get out of here I want to see you standing there

(M3 embraces M1 and M2 who are embracing each other)

36 M2 auf jeden Fall
definitely

37 M1 es wird wahrscheinlich nächste Woche sein (laughs)
that will probably be next week

(M1 stops embracing M2)

(M2 and M3 walk up to the exit; M3 is embracing M2)

38 M3 und wenn du mal wieder kotzst # ist alles weg # . ruf mich an
and if you puke again # it will all be gone # give me a call

(F1, F2, F3, F4, M3, M4, M5 and M6 follow M2 and M3)

39/1 M2 (nods) <starts talking extra loud><**und ich will je:den Ta:g beim Statement meinen Namen hören**><end extra loud>
and I want to hear my name in the statement every day

39/2 M2 <start whisper><shit # verdammte # ei # Scheiße # _ Nadinchen # komm mal # meine Süße> (M2 hugs F1)
and I want to hear my name every day in the statement # shit # damn # ei # shit # Nadin-DIM # come # my sweetie

40 M1 komm # lass uns --- Friedenspfeife ziehen # .wir werden dann --- # und bei Aufräumen wir sagen was (M1 gives a cigar to M3)
come # let us --- smoke a pipe of peace # we will then --- # and when we're clearing up we will say something

(M6 embraces F3)

(M1 gives the cigar to M4)

41 M4 (takes the cigar from M1) ich habe noch nie geraucht

I have never smoked

42 M1 egal

it doesn't matter

43 M4 heute

today

(M2 hugs F1)

44 M2 unterstützt mein Captain weiter # ne? .. Team Red

keep supporting my captain # will you? team red

45 F1 hol mich nächste Woche ab # ja? hast du gehört? hol mich nächste Woche ab

The strongly emotional tone of this exchange is visible on the extra-verbal plane as the housemates seek physical closeness to each other, in sobbing and sighing, and the phonetic characteristics in particular of the vocal performance of M2, who whispers as though he does not want his voice to give away his becoming emotional. On the verbal plane, directives oriented towards positive face wants are produced frequently and without redress to a negative face. The sequence of turns 4 through 43 (interaction between housemates) contains a record number, for any of the German series, of 15 requestive utterances within five minutes of interaction, and four further imperatives in consolations. In turn 10, M2 produces an imperative predicating the team drinking to his luck, presupposing positive affection on the part of the remaining housemates and their willingness to perform its symbolic display in a ritual joint action. The predicative content of the message is strongly oriented towards everybody's positive face wants, and so is its linguistic form. In turn 12, M2 addresses members of the rival "loser" team, who are not allowed to drink alcohol: they should smoke to his luck instead. Again, M2 displays his trust in their positive affection. M2 uses a realisation declarative in the passive voice, a strong form of impositiveness¹³³ anticipating no argument. The utterance carries a humorous overtone as there is a clash between the expectation of the addressees' concern expressed by the predicative content, and the depersonalised form of reference – the passive voice. In turn 20, M2 demands a piece of cake, choosing a form of the impositively modified impositive head act. The head act has the form of a definite statement of a future event: *kriege noch ein Stück Torte vor dem Scheiß Ding (I will have a piece of cake before this shitty thing)*, meant as a request for cake, and centred upon the speaker's want without specifying the actors of the

¹³³ In requests; it is moderately impositive in proposals.

implied action. Through choosing the impositive form not accompanied by means of negative modification, M2 expresses the presupposition that his claim is viewed as highly legitimate by the remaining group members, and that they are willing to respond to his needs.

The topic of remembrance and tribute to M2 during his absence is reassumed in 39/1, where M2 declares that he wants the remaining housemates to mention him in their daily reviews ("statements") in the diary room, which were intended to depict the insiders' perception of current events and were broadcast regularly on television. The utterance in turn 39/1 is realised as a strong statement of the speaker's will, in impositive linguistic form and without mitigation by any modifiers of the "intimacy" type. This substantiates the point that impositiveness alone (contrary to the background assumption in Blum-Kulka's 1990 study of parent-child interaction) can function as an adequate vehicle for expressing and addressing positive face wants. The same strategy of unmitigated impositiveness characterises the utterance in 35, a strong statement of the speaker's will uttered by another housemate, M1, and addressed to M2. M1 expects M2 to wait for him when he himself leaves the house. The compliance with the request might possibly involve an extreme "cost" to the addressee, who lives in a different part of Germany. The request is a declaration of friendship and presupposes the reciprocation of positive affection on the part of M2. The declaration of concern constitutes in itself a compensation of the extreme cost involved in compliance with the directive. The integrative character of the request is based on the assumption that asking M2 to do a favour to the speaker will give him an opportunity to prove his affection towards the speaker, and benefits M2 as well as M1. Rather than maximise the need for redress to the negative face, the high cost in association with the presupposition of benefit to both sides via the bond of friendship makes an impositive linguistic form the only viable choice for the speaker. Two native speakers of German were asked to imagine the same request formulated in a negatively polite linguistic form (competence interrogative): one found it inappropriate, although he could not find an explanation for this impression. The other interviewee commented that if he had used a tentative formulation, M1 would fail to communicate how important it was to him to have M2 by his side when he left the house, which was an integral part of the intended message and the justification of the directive.

In turn 29, M2 expresses his concern for group harmony, threatening humorously that he would come in and punish the remaining housemates if they quarrelled and stopped being friends in the future course of events. Although leaving the house, M1 declares himself to be responsible for the

group's conduct, implicitly claiming the status of a group member despite his physical absence from the house. This is a powerful proclamation of ingroupness and solidarity. The inhibitive directive is preceded by another explicit reference to being a group, in the form of a compliment addressed to everybody present for being a "great team" (*ihr seid eine super Truppe*). The impositive form of the directive corresponds to the communicated intention to support group solidarity and to claim continued group membership. The form and the communicated intention show that the speaker perceives the addressees as his ingroup rather than just a temporary "community of interest".

I have argued elsewhere that one aspect of group orientation is the production of diagonal directives to ingroup members, i.e. directives whose beneficiaries are persons other than either the speaker or the hearer, in particular other ingroup members. Such directives certify the speaker's belief that he or she is entitled to interfere with the behaviour of the addressee towards others. A diagonal directive occurs in turn 5, in which M1 asks M3 to fetch a cigar for M2 to smoke. M1 is here appropriating the role of a stage director for M2's exit, and by issuing a directive to another group member, he turns it into a group enterprise rather than an issue between himself and M2. After M4 turns up with the cigar, M2 signals that he consents to the role of being a participant in a cooperative enterprise by interrogation whether or not he is expected to smoke the cigar right now. M2 therefore recognises the right of other group members to decide on his actions, confirming his perception of the event as a joint enterprise. M1 persists in shaping the course of events by an unmitigated confirmation in turn 22. Between turns 34 and 35, M2 shows the cigar to M1 who comes up and takes it from him freeing M2 for another embrace. It has been argued elsewhere that non-aggressive communication through gesture alone is a powerful display of shared background, as it implies empathic "understanding without words".

In turn 40, M1 proposes that the group should smoke the cigar together as a ritual display of group friendship. In turn 41, after the suggestion was made by M1, M4 stresses how exceptional his participation is in the ritual by revealing that he had never smoked before. M1 responds with *egal* "all the same", responding to the possible illocutionary force of M4's utterance as an objection to smoking in general. M1 strongly imposes on M4 by stating that M4's preferences and principles do not count in the present situation, implying that M2's departure is far more important than M4's general inclinations. Thus, M2 takes it upon himself to decide on the hierarchy of values which he sees as binding for M4. This is a facet of the collectivist attitude towards social relationships, where social control is regarded as good (cf. Triandis and

Vassiliou 1972). Gender stereotyping occurs (only men are expected to smoke the cigar), which is an aspect of a group-oriented, rather than an interpersonally-oriented, concept of the situation.

The episode concludes with M2's directive addressed to the members of his "team red" to support the group captain, F1, in turn 44. By producing the directive, and by using the possessive pronoun when calling F1 "my captain", M2 not only expresses positive affection towards F1 but also emphasises his continued membership in the group.

The scene shows that although it has taken the German housemates longer than the Poles, because the housemates presupposed less intimacy among themselves in the beginning, high group integrity was in fact achieved in the "battle" edition, G4.

For comparison, the following scene from P3 contains a recorded monologue of a former male housemate broadcast to the house after he had voluntarily left the house.

121-P3. MONOLOGUE FROM TAPE. The scene takes place shortly after M1's unexpected exit from the house after three weeks of the program.

1 BIG BROTHER: (loudspeaker) uwaga # Big Brother zaprasza drużynę czerwonych i drużynę niebieskich na sofę
attention # Big Brother invites everybody to the sofas

(M1's voice comes from the loudspeaker)

(shouts, laughter)

2 M1 (voice over) przepraszam że w tej chwili nie będę dżentelmenem #

excuse me for not being a gentleman at the moment

3 chciałbym w tej chwili uderzyć do chłopaków #

I would like to appeal to the boys at the moment

4 ty Mario I ty Harnasiu a i ty również Chemiku #

you Mario¹³⁴ and you Mountaineer-NICKNAME¹³⁵ and also you Chemist-NICKNAME

5 mam nadzieję że przejmiecie moje obowiązki # znaczy # m:: #

I hope that you will take over my duties # I mean # m::

6 przejmiecie # _ y:: # rolę # . moją jaką # _ tam pełniłem w domu Wielkiego Brata #

take over # y:: # the role # . mine that I # played there in the Big Brother house

¹³⁴ The first name of the addressee playfully distorted by the use of its Italian version.

¹³⁵ "Harnaś: ringleader of a band of robbers in the Tatra mountains". *The Great Polish-English Dictionary*.

Edited by Jan Stanislawski, Warszawa 1989. The addressee comes from the Tatra Mountains..

7 podzielicie się tym i będzie sprawiedliwie #
you will divide it among yourselves and it will be just

8 ty Maras z Harnasiem # sądzę że będziecie tutaj twardzi i
 _ mocni do końca #
*you-sing. Maras¹³⁶with the Mountaineer # I believe that you will be strong here and tough
 till the end*

9 _ róbcie wszystko po prostu tak jak robiliście do tej pory #
do everything just like you have done before

10 mam nadzieję że będzie wszystko grało # wam powierzam pole
 bitwy # na zewnątrz #
I hope that everything will go well # to you I turn over the battlefield # outside

11 _ a ty Chemik # bądź podpora przede wszystkim dla naszych
 dziewczyn #. czyli dla Stasi która myślę że zrozumie to co
 zrobiłem # to co się wydarzyło w dniu dzisiejszym w domu
*and you Chemist # give support first of all to our girls # . that is to Stasia who I think will
 understand what I have done # what has happened today in the house*

12 F1 czekaj tam na mnie i nie marudź!
wait there for me and don't grumble

13 M1 też sobie myślę że będziesz podpora dla pani kapitan
I think you also will support Ms. Captain
 (F1, F2, Mx and Mxx laugh)

14 M1 a resztę dopowiedzcie sobie sami
and the rest fill-IMP-2nd pl. in yourselves

15 i jest wszystko w porządku # mam nadzieję że nie będzie wam
 . ciężko po tej . rozmowie którą w tej chwili .. skierowałem
 do was # trzymam za was kciuki # trochę będę nadal z wami #
 na- nadal będę walczył # tylko że (laughs) troszeczkę w innych
 warunkach # trochę gorszych
*and everything is all right # I hope you will not be grieving after this talk which I have given
 to you # I cross my fingers for you # I will still be with you a bit # I will sti- still be fighting #
 but in slightly different (laughs) conditions # a bit worse*

16 także co # _ trzymajcie się i za każdym za każdym razem
 kiedy będzie ktokolwiek z was wychodził # pamiętajcie o tym że
 ja tam jestem i będę za wami czekał obojętnie na to co by się
 nie wydarzyło
*and what else # take care and every time when anyone of you goes out # remember that I am
 there and will be waiting for you no matter what happens*

¹³⁶ A playfully distorted version of the addressee's first name.

The manifestations of the high-on-involvement style of interaction pertaining to directive activities included, next to the frequent use of directives, the impositive linguistic forms: the imperative and the future realisation declarative; frequent use of nicknames and playful treatment of first names (Maras vel Mario, Stasia, Chemik “Chemist”, Harnaś “Mountineer”, pani kapitan “lady captain”), zero use of regular forms of the first names; the use of the imperative as a socialiser in performing a speech act other than a directive (promise in turn 16: *pamiętajcie o tym że... remember that...*); directives based on the feeling of shared responsibility for others, including directives reflecting the assumption of the need of female housemates for care and support and gender-based responsibility of male housemates for the female ones; and “blurring” of advice with a categorical demand. Another element of form suggestive of a collectivist perception of the situation was the occurrence of a formal indeterminacy between plural and singular address (*ty Maras z Harnasiem, sing-you Maras with Harnaś*).

Common aspects of 121-P3. MONOLOGUE FROM TAPE and the previously cited episode, G4. RON’S DEPARTURE include:

- gender stereotyping and gender sorting; next to “we” including both male and female participants, a secondary gender-based “we” was introduced by addressing a directive to male hearers by a male speaker,
- taking for granted the positive affection of the hearers,
- the frequent use of directives,
- their impositive form,
- the occurrence of directives as an expression of responsibility for the group,
- the occurrence of directives as vehicles of self-aggrandisement, based on the speaker’s awareness of being an important group member.

The latter facet of both interactions illustrates a point made by Hofstede (1980, 1983, 1991) that ego enhancement (masculinity) and interdependence (collectivism) are not contrary values. Significantly, in both cases the housemate parting company from the ingroup produces a number of directives formulated in an impositive linguistic form as a means to express the desire to be viewed as a group member even after departing from the Big Brother house.

To summarise, the presupposition of consensus entrenched in the impositive linguistic form seems to be part and parcel of directive activities oriented towards confirming and strengthening group bonds and initiating the realisation of joint acts symbolic of team spirit; this could be observed in all three languages.

7.4.6. ADVISORY DEMANDS

In the chapter on method, I argued that in view of existing social relationships and the complementarity or co-directionality of interacting agents' aims and perspectives, the boundaries between advice and request are not at all as clear as have been postulated in classifications undertaken from the perspectives of the speech act theory. The next set of data, consisting of three successive scenes separated by editorial cuts, illustrates the function of impositiveness as an expression of responsibility for, and the resulting nurturing attitude towards, the addressees-beneficiaries. The blurring of boundaries between advice, instruction and demand in the context of group activities comes clearly into play.

98-E3. CAMPING IN THE YARD 1

F1 and M1 are talking about the plan to sleep in a tent.

1 M1 I did warn you # are you camping with us?

2 F1 yeah

3 M1 we are setting up camp at the moment # have you got a fleece for yourself

4 F1 no (turns and starts walking towards the bedroom)

5 M1 put some trousers on # put some trousers on
(F1 leaves)

98-E3. CAMPING IN THE YARD 2

F1, F2, M1, M2 and M3 prepare to leave the living room and sleep outside. F2 is the youngest housemate; M1 is two years older.

(M2 and M3 are talking to each other)

(M1 enters the room)

1 M1 to F2: --- # _ you haven't got any T-shirt on you

2 F2 no

(M1 walks up to F2 and puts his hands crossed over his breast)

3 M1 go and get them then # . off you go (makes a head gesture)

4 F2 why are you patronising me

5 M1 I'm not patronising `you # . I am telling you # . so that you'll keep warm!

6 F2 <starts singing><nanana>

7 M2 what? what is she saying

(F2 sips some champagne, puts her glass down and leaves)

8 M3 to M1: have I got to get my mattress and covers?

9 M1 I don't know # . it would be best if you did but # . but
. PJ's at the moment trying to make a canopy
(F2 comes in with a sweater)

98-E3. CAMPING IN THE YARD 3

1 M1 you want thin layers # girls # lots of thin layers
(F1 nods)

2 (simultaneous speech)

3 M2 short or long

4 M1 I'd put on a long T-shirt # and then a T-shirt and a
fleece # and you can't go wrong

5 (simultaneous speech)

6 M1 to F1: you should definitely put socks on # and you
should definitely put another T-shirt on # . between that one
and your other one

7 F1 [these socks are=]

8 M1 to F2: [Jane # I'm not] telling you again # it's up to
you what you want to do

9 F2 to M1: all right # what's the matter with you # . why are
you being rude to me

10 M1 because I've told you ten times # and you are still not
doing it

11 F1 Trevis # . are these socks suitable camping socks

12 M1 oh come on # camping supervisor # [no they're not] # _
wear proper socks and thin layers

13 F1 [can I wear them and that]

M1's taking command of the group is shown by the amount of directive activity on his part in turns 5/-1, 1/-2, 3/-2, 9/-2, 1/-3, 4/-3, 6/-3, and 11/-3. His directive behaviour has a gendered profile. In E3. CAMPING IN THE YARD 1, M1 signals the inclination to assume the position of authority by the use of the verb "warn", presupposing his knowledge of what happens if F1 does not comply with his directive. A strong hint is offered in turn 3, and F1 signals compliance by setting off, apparently in order to get some warm cloths. An imperative intensified by repetition follows in turn 5. Another strong hint referring to the missing warm clothes is directed at F2 in E3. CAMPING IN THE YARD 2; as the addressee, F2, does not react in the expected way, an imperative and the strongly impositive routine formula "off you go" follow. F2 does not accept M1's self-appointment as a person in charge entitled to display a paternal attitude towards her, and reacts defensively to the offence against her negative face wants. In turn 8 M3 asks M1 for instructions, which can be

read as an indirect comment on the earlier exchange between M1 and F2, showing that, contrary to F2, M3 accepts M1 as an expert and a supervisor of the joint undertaking, supports him in this role and does not find his impositive behaviour illegitimate. M1 limits his claim of expertise and signals deference by admitting uncertainty and giving no definite answer. E3. CAMPING IN THE YARD 3 starts with M1 directing further instructions at “the girls”. M2 joins the position appointed by M1 to the “girls”, that is, the role of a non-expert dependent on M1’s instruction, asking for instructions in turn 3. M1 shows that he is unwilling to impose on M2 in the same way. Rather than use an impositive form, he uses a deferent form of advice based on the conditional in his response in turn 4. He continues the instruction in a deontic declarative intensified by the lexical emphasiser “definitely” when addressing the women in turn 6. In turn 8, while speaking to F2, M1 produces a resignative routine formula recognised by the native speakers as being characteristic of parents talking to unsubordinated children, implying that he has lost patience with F2, who interprets it as being highly offensive. Another routine formula I have told you ten times typical for the same context of parent-child interaction follows in turn 10. F1 re-directs M1’s attention and ostentatiously confirms his role as a supervisor by asking for instructions in turns 11 and 13; in doing that, she appeals to his positive face want “that his wants be desirable to (at least some) others” (Brown and Levinson 1978: 67). While commenting with apparent dissatisfaction about his role of “camping supervisor” in turn 12, M1 in fact sticks to the role, giving a blunt and definite answer: no they’re not # wear proper socks and thin layers. The three scenes include four turns in which other housemates confirm their acceptance of M1 in the leader’s role by consulting him on matters of proper preparation.

M1 shows concern for the needs and comfort of the group during the joint undertaking, takes the responsibility for the group and, in doing that, leaves the concern for F2’s negative face wants aside, going so far as to provoke a reproach of being patronising. Speaking of parental instruction, Blum-Kulka (1990) commented that the signs of involvement can be threats to the other’s individuality, and, “as stated by one of our Israeli informants, conveying involvement with no threat to individual space can be difficult; one needs ‘to find a proper balance between involvement and interference’”. As involvement means basically that you are treating other people’s affairs as your own, a massive amount of involvement wipes away the distinction between advice and demand and may lead to a neglect of negative face wants displayed in selecting highly impositive ways of expression. Whether we may still talk of “positive politeness” here is controversial; clearly, F2 interpreted

the utterance as not polite at all, while assuming an impositive, parental attitude by one's interlocutor can also be experienced as pleasant and reassuring, in particular by members of a culture that puts more emphasis on supportiveness than on the need to stay unimpeded¹³⁷. A test of correlation between collectivism-individualism measured by Hui's (1988) INDCOL Scale and psychological needs as measured by Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (EPPS) showed that collectivist orientation correlates highly with the need of succorance and nurturance (Hui and Villareal 1989)¹³⁸.

Three native speakers who watched the scenes – E3. CAMPING IN THE YARD 2 and E3. CAMPING IN THE YARD 3 – agreed that M1 was quite rude and patronising, while two of them, a male and a female respondent, thought that it was justified by the benevolent intention: it expressed how seriously M1 took his volunteered function. The female respondent confirmed that M1 was quite rude but at the same time thought that he was “being nice” to F2. The fourth, a female respondent, thought that the directive utterance in E3. CAMPING IN THE YARD 2 was produced within the joking frame of a parent-child role play and, therefore, was not improper or impolite (translated in the language of politeness research, it displayed “positive politeness”), while he was rude in the following scene, E3. CAMPING IN THE YARD 3.

Of five German respondents, four agreed on the evaluation of M1's interference with F2's freedom of action in E3. CAMPING IN THE YARD 2 as highly inappropriate, as F2 was an adult and could decide for herself, and one of them thought that M1 must have suffered as a result of F1's having caught a cold and becoming a burden to him in the past. The remaining German respondent judged the behaviour of M1 in E3. CAMPING IN THE YARD 2 as quite improper because of his body language only. All five German interviewees found that M1 behaved in a way that was impolite and improper, interfering heavily with F2's freedom of action in E3. CAMPING IN THE YARD 3, and they found her reaction proper and reasonable.

Of four Polish respondents, one also noted the impoliteness of M1's head gesture and bodily posture in E3. CAMPING IN THE YARD 2, and thought that it was the non-verbal component which triggered the self-defensive reaction by F2 rather than his verbal action. Two respondents failed to observe any

¹³⁷ Cross-cultural misunderstandings continue to occur even after a long exposure of one of the interlocutors to the other's native culture. Anecdotally, a close German friend of mine, having issued an impositive directive that prevented me from trodding on scattered shards of glass, interpreted my sincere thanks as ironic and apologised for the patronising tone of the advice.

¹³⁸ One might object, though, that the whole idea of making such measurement is circular in its results and premises; it presupposes that the high need of concern and nurture is separate from the collectivist stance rather than included in its definition (see also Reykowski 1999).

rudeness, and one registered a verbal imposition but thought that it was justified by the benevolent intention. The three Polish respondents who did not find M1's behaviour impolite or improper described the scene as M1 giving a piece of advice to F2. All Polish respondents found that F1 showed an exaggerated reaction. Three Polish respondents thought that M2's impositive behaviour was justified by the benevolent intention even if not particularly polite in E3. CAMPING IN THE YARD 3, too, and that F2 overreacted in turn 9. The remaining female respondent evaluated M2's behaviour as being excessively teacher-like and inappropriate, motivated probably by an aspiration to self-aggrandisement rather than actually caring for F2, and found F2's reaction appropriate.

On the whole, the German respondents showed themselves least sympathetic to any impositive verbal behaviour based on assuming a father-child relationship between the speaker and the addressee that restricted the addressee's freedom of action "for her own good", while the other respondents regarded it as at least partly justified. Because the answers to the questions posed were of a complex nature rather than "yes" or "no", no attempt will be undertaken to translate them into statistical significances. What could be shown was that well-meant impositiveness "for the beneficiary's own good" within the peer group has some amount of social acceptability in both Poland and Great Britain, and that the benevolent intention may override the impositiveness of form in the perception of social acceptability of an impositive directive at least for some observers, and at least for constellations involving male speakers and female addressees-beneficiaries. It seems to be least acceptable in the German cultural context.

The following scene where male speakers are giving categorical advice to a female housemate comes from P3. The speakers assume that the supportive intention offered legitimises the heavy impositiveness of the advice, and formulate it as a categorical demand. As in the preceding exchange, the scene shows that advice and requestives formulated in categorical, strongly impositive terms are not exclusive categories in the ingroup context. While the hearer is meant to be the main beneficiary of the advice, the speakers insist heavily that the advice should be followed – for her own good, and for the good of the group. The advice is offered by collaborating group members rather than by a single person.

The two essential features of the interdependence stance are mutual supportiveness directed towards positive face needs and group-oriented pressure directed against the negative face wants. The latter is visible when group members insist on an individual following a piece of advice, because his or her problems or inadequacies are being regarded as problems affecting the

group and as inadequacies of the group. The following scene illustrates the social acceptability of the stance that personal problems should be shared with the group. The distinction between request and advice is neutralised by M1's explicit expression of the view that the hearer is obliged to reveal personal problems to the group, since group integration can only be achieved by intimate mutual knowledge. The speakers M1 and M2 insist that if she keeps her personal problem to herself, the addressee F1 has little chance of regaining emotional stability and also threatens the group integration. The interaction takes place on the second day of the program.

122-P3. PERSONAL PROBLEM

Conversation in a circle including M1, M2, F1, F2 and F3.

1 M1 to F1: to co masz w sercu to jest napewno bardzo cen[ne]
#

what you have in your heart is certainly very valuable

2 M2 [ta:]

yeah

3 M1 ja to czuję # _ **ale musisz się troszeczkę do nas otworzyć
jak mamy taki jakiś kontakt złapać**

*I feel this # but you must open yourself up a little bit-DIM towards us # if we are to make
some sort of contact*

4 M2 ta:

yeah

... (editorial cut)

5 F1 natomiast # ja miałam ostatnio związek który miał się
skończyć 'mał`żeń`stwem # (sighs)

and # I had a relationship lately which should have ended in marriage

6 M2 <start fast speech rate><nie musisz o tym mówić>

you don't need to talk about that

(F1 starts to cry)

7 M1 (sighs) ojejku: # oh oh

INTERJECTION # INTERJECTION

(silence 3 seconds)

8 F2 to nic złego # _ emocji się nie ukrywa

it's not a bad thing # emotions are not to be hidden

9 M2 to jest Marta dobre jak się wyładujesz tutaj # wiesz? bo:

. ja widzę że ty się męczysz od samego początku # **musisz się
tak właśnie- # . wywa:lić z siebie**

*it is good Marta when you let yourself go here # you know? as I see that you're aching from
the very beginning # you must just so- # . throw it out of yourself*

10 M1 a my ci w tym pomożemy

and we will help you

11 M2 my ci pomożemy # po prostu

and we will help you # simply

12 M1 [przegadaj się i tyle]

talk yourself out

13 F2 [każdy ma swoje słabości] # każdy jakoś cierpi na swój sposób # każdy z nas coś przeszedł i musiał przez to przejść # bo inaczej byśmy się tu nie znaleźli # bo to . o to chodzi # szoł szołem a ludzkie uczucia są ludzkimi uczuciami # nie?

everybody has a weakness # everybody suffers in one way or another # everybody has gone through something and had to go through # otherwise we would not be here now # as this . it is all about that # a show is a show and human feelings are human feelings # right?

14 M1 nikt ci nie będzie miał za złe że ci coś nie wyszło # traktuj to normalnie jako rozmowę # taką towarzyską # bo w sumie wiesz no # dobrze że tak się dzieje # człowiek musi czasem wywalić z siebie coś # Marta

nobody is going to hold it against you that you have had a bad outcome # treat this simply as a conversation # a collegial one # because all in all you know # good that this happens # one has to spit certain things out of oneself # Marta

After gratifying F1's positive face wants by a complement regarding her personality in turn 1, in turn 3 M1 appeals to F1 to open herself up to the group. He formulates it in terms which imply that he is talking as the representative of the whole group, and presupposes the group's consent. He articulates the view that F1 should do something for herself and by doing so she will do something for the group, namely, integrate into the group – "open up" so that the group members can "make some sort of contact" to each other. In his appeal to F1's positive face, M1 expresses his personal appreciation for F1's feelings (turns 1 and 3); but this is the group ("us") which she should "open up" to (turn 3). M1 presupposes the shared perception of the individuals involved as an ingroup already in the beginning of the program. The reference to "us" exposes the view that "being in it together" is sufficient for treating the participants as a unit, whose interests he can voice. Good personal acquaintance (which is not yet there on the second day of the program) is not necessary for that. Group integration and openness among group members are seen as values in themselves, and the implication is that individual members should feel obliged to contribute to this integration by self-disclosure. The request-advice in turn 3 is formulated in direct terms using a deontic declarative mitigated by a lexical hedge in the diminutive: *musisz się*

otworzyć do nas troszeczkę “you must open yourself up a bit-DIM towards us”. M1 receives support from M2 in turns 2 and 4.

F1 shows that she perceives the directive as legitimate by her unsuccessful attempt to be co-operative and comply in turn 5. M2 shows consideration by granting F1 the right not to speak of her experiences. F2 attempts to make F1 feel relaxed about her emotional reaction declaring that an open display of emotions is a social norm, and M2 concludes that an opening in the form of a disclosure of an intimate experience will be good for F1, and uses a deontic declarative in a request-advice directed at F1, who “must throw everything out of herself” (*musisz się tak właśnie- # wywa:lić z siebie*). The focus of attention is now shifted towards the benefit of the addressee herself: opening herself to the group will do F1 good because it will relieve her suffering. In turns 6 and 7, M1 and M2 offer of help in strong declarative terms: *my ci w tym pomożemy/my ci pomożemy po prostu*, “we will help you on that/we will simply help you”, unmitigated by means of conditional or interrogative expressions, presupposing the supposed beneficiary’s compliance with the preceding advice, as well as the consensus on the part of the rest of the group on whose behalf the offer is made. Three native speakers who watched the scene thought that in using the plural personal pronoun “we”, M1 and M2 are acting as representatives of the group, presupposing the group’s consensus for their intention. The fourth respondent thought that in using the form “we”, M1 and M2 were referring to each other rather than the group as a whole, on the basis of their recognition that they represented the same point of view.

Contrary to Lakoff’s politeness maxim “give options”, F1 is told that she must comply with the advice because it is good for her, and she is told that she will be helped, rather than given an offer in a form signalling that she is free to comply.

The scene displayed several features characteristic of the interdependence stance:

- The speaker M1 marks his utterance as made on behalf of the group by the use of the personal pronoun in the first person plural (turn 1).
- Keeping a personal problem to oneself is regarded as bad for the addressee and sharing the problem with the group is regarded as good for the addressee.
- Keeping a personal problem to oneself is regarded as bad for the group and sharing the problem with the group is regarded as good for the group.
- It is implied that the addressee is obliged to do what is good for the group.

- Little distinction is made between what is good for the addressee and what is good for the group.
- The value of mutual understanding is emphasised.
- The addressee legitimises the speaker's point of view by making an initial effort to comply with the directive.
- An offer of help is articulated in the verbal form presupposing acceptance rather than inquiring about the addressee's need of help.
- The offer is made on behalf of a group, minimally involving the speaker and at least one other; the group's consensus regarding cooperation in helping the addressee is presupposed.
- The consensus is confirmed by another speaker producing an utterance that repeats the previous speaker's formulation (turn 11), thus emphasising that he is of one mind with the previous speaker.

Three Polish respondents asked to evaluate the scene reacted to it as an attempt by the group to support a group member through a difficult time, while the fourth respondent thought that M1 was insensitive in particular at the beginning of the scene, talking in too casual a tone about a grave personal problem. All the respondents denied that the interlocutors were exerting pressure (Polish: "wywierali nacisk") on F1, and did not think that she may have experienced it as an illegitimate intrusion into her personal sphere. The occurrence of the scene as well as the respondent's reactions suggests that a strong impositiveness has a high legitimacy in the Polish cultural context if a supportive intention is declared, and in particular when issues related to group integration, viewed as advantageous to all group members, are at stake.

A high status of group integration relatively not only to individual but also to interpersonal goals and perspectives is confirmed by another episode from this series, not included here for the sake of brevity, in which three team members criticise the open display of bilateral bonds existing within their team (a male friendship and a heterosexual relationship) as drawbacks to team integrity. The broadcast part of the response to the criticism comes from the female housemate involved: she apologises and promises improvement. This confirms her perception of the directive as legitimate rather than an unwarranted intrusion into her and her friend's private affairs.

7.4.7. OVERPOWERING THE BENEFICIARY: WITHDRAWALS FROM THE BIG BROTHER HOUSE

The strongest form of a directive intervention is issuing directives that oppose the current preferences of the putative beneficiary. A situational context recurring in various series of the program is the confrontation of the

group with a group member who turns her back upon joint activities, or decides to leave the Big Brother house altogether. This forces the remaining housemates to respond to the act itself, and the potential threat it poses to their sense of group integrity. The directive activities emerging as a part of the behavioural and verbal responses to this situation form the content of this chapter. The following scene comes from Polish edition P3.

123-P3. F1 climbs up onto the roof, obviously intending to escape from the Big Brother house.

1 F2 to F1: Kaśka chodź tutaj

Baśka-FEMALE-FIRST NAME-TRUNCATED-AUGM come here

2 F3 Kaśka wariatko

Baśka you're nuts

3 F2 Baśka weź ją! weź ją!

Baśka take her # take her

(M1 runs towards F climbing up the wall)

(M1 supports M2 who starts climbing up the wall in the direction of F1, who reached the roof and is walking on it towards the exit)

4 F3 Basia schodź # .. prosiłam cię żebyś dwa razy przemyślała zanim coś zrobisz

Basia-FEMALE FIRST NAME TRUNCATED get down # I asked you to think twice before doing something

5 F4 to M1: ty # zostaw Pabla # zostaw Pabla # nie

you # leave Pablo-MALE FIRST NAME CREATIVE DISTORTION # leave Pablo # no

6 M1 to M2: ściąg ją stamtąd # a bo jeszcze ty zjedziesz # nie nie nie

pull her down # oh lest you slide down yourself # no no no

7 F5 Pawulo nie wychodź

Pawulo-MALE FIRST NAME CREATIVE DISTORTION don't get up

8 M1 nie # nie # nie # bo jeszcze ty będziesz miał

no # no # no # lest you will have (implied: problems)

The housemates remaining in the yard produce a cross-fire series of imperative directives of two types. On the one hand, there are directives addressed to the beneficiaries themselves: to F1 to stay in the house (turns 1 and 4), and to M2 to abandon his intention of stopping F1 because he might harm himself, by getting physically hurt or by being punished for breaking the rules (turns 6, 7 and 8). On the other hand, there are directives in which the speaker appeals to the potential actor to act in favour of EXT in ways contrary to the latter's current choice. M2 is asked to hinder F1's escape (turns 3 and 6),

and M1 (who helps M2 climb the wall) is asked to abandon the support potentially harmful to M2 (turn 5). Benevolence is expressed by countering the beneficiaries' (F1's and M2's) observable intentions, i.e., displaying "benevolent incapacitation", which was discussed before as a cultural script of Polish and a facet of the interdependence stance.

Significantly, when a voluntary departure occurs in the third British series, it is similarly accompanied by impositive directives as a device of showing care, accompanied by a joint verbal action symbolic of team bonding and fostering camaraderie. In the following scene, M2, who had proclaimed before that he was going to leave the house of his own will, unexpectedly leaves the group while they are watching television, and is preparing to escape from the house by climbing onto the roof.

99-E3. M2 goes out to the yard and starts climbing the wall. Other housemates are watching television in the living room. M1 is on the "rich" side of the yard and M2 on the "poor" side of the yard; the rules of the program do not allow the housemates to cross the dividing line.

1 F1 Sammy!

2 M1 no:::!

3 M1 don't let him # don't let him go # [do= # do= # don't let him go]

4 F2 [is he doing this]

5 M1 # cause he'll hurt himself # don't let him go

6 M3 is he being ^serious

7 F2 no: # Sammy

8 R F3 Sammy!

(the group leave the house and run to the yard)

9 F4 go # go Sammy

10 F3 Sammy go

11 F2 <starts singing><[go:: # Sammy # go] ><ends singing>

15 M4 [you're having a laugh]

12 F3 <starts singing> <[go # go]

13 F4 [go # go # go]> <ends singing>

14 F3 <starts singing> <[[go:: # Sammy # go]

15 F2 [go go]

16 F4 [go go go]> <ends singing>

17 M1 [Sammy be care]]ful! Sammy be careful!

18 F3 Sammy be careful!

19 (loud cheers)

When M2 starts climbing the roof, the group is confronted by the necessity to react to this rather than leave him alone and leave his spectacular act without an audience. The display of bonds with M2 consists of two phases. In turn 3, M1 starts displaying an “ingroup identity” by appealing to the responsibility of other housemates for M2 in imperative form, signalling the intensity of the intention and the assumption of its high legitimacy. The multiple repetitions in turn 3 and 5 intensify the directive and forcefully express insistence. In these imperatives, M1 demands that the addressees stop M2, i.e. act against his will, which is a powerful expression of preference for interdependence rather than autonomy. In turns 6 and 7, M1 finds support in F1 and F2 who verbalise their care for M2 as an attempt to interfere with his intention. Then, in turn 8, F4 expresses concern for M1 by an affirmative verbal act, consistent with the autonomy perspective, which is then immediately taken up by F3 and also by F2, who had previously joined M1 in his protest. F2 joins in, “discovers” the melody of the popular funk song “Go Sally” as a means of articulation of encouragement for M5, and is joined by F3 and F4, who sing the chorus part. F2, F3 and F4 engage in a collective performance of verbal action. At the same time, two housemates from the “poor side”, F2 and M3, break the rules of the Big Brother game through stepping over the fence dividing them from the “rich” part of the yard (from which M2 is climbing to the roof), and join the group on the rich side in applauding M2. The rest of the current “poor” group stay behind the fence. In this crossing of the symbolic barrier, the two group members symbolically break out from the staged reality of Big Brother in order to manifest the authenticity of their feelings for M2. While M2 is physically leaving the territory of the Big Brother House, F2 and M3 are enacting the same move by transgressing the conventional border, and at the same time the conventional order. Thus, for a moment they turn the symbolic territory of the Big Brother house – a stage with its symbolic “boundary” – into a “normal” territory, stressing that they are acting as their true selves and not as a part of the game. This violation of the rules is a manifestation of the authenticity of their feelings and an act of solidarity with M2. Asked by Big Brother for the reasons for this transgression, F2 explains: I just wanted to show that I respect him. M3 responds to Big Brother’s requirement that he think over the breaking of the rules, and his ability to live by them, by asking Is Sammy okay?, clearly juxtaposing the concern for the ex-housemate with concern for the rules and implying that the former matters more to him. These comments contextualise the transgression as a symbolic display of concern and authenticity, which confirms the high emotional load present in the escape scene.

Although the initial directive addressed by M1 to the group for the sake of external beneficiary in turn 3 runs counter to what happens next (the group starts encouraging M2 instead of stopping him), it shows that in the dramatic moments relevant to group integration, such as a housemate's departure, the responsibility of the group for a group member is being emphasised, and the means of this emphasis can be categorical demands. The strongly impositive linguistic form (imperative and multiple repetitions) on the formal side is accompanied by a dominance of values characteristic of interdependence: the responsibility of a group for particular group members, and the view that it is legitimate to act against a group member's own will if this is perceived as beneficial to him or her. Wierzbicka (1985: 167) states: "If our view of what is good for another person does not coincide with his/her own, Anglo-Saxon culture requires that one should rather respect the other person's wishes (i.e., his/her autonomy) than to do what we think is good for him/her; Polish culture tends to resolve the dilemma in the opposite way". Here, we see the dictum attributed by Wierzbicka to the Anglo-Saxon culture being violated in a group-oriented directive promoting interdependence values.

The following two sets of data also provide support for the claim that a factor which triggers an interaction style contesting the principle of non-imposition, independent of nationality, are circumstances that threaten group integrity by putting it into doubt, such as a housemate's decision to leave the Big Brother house voluntarily or such as refusing to participate in group activities.

100-E3. The housemates are bobbing for apples. M1 is the next contestant. F2, a high-ranking professional, refused to participate in some group activities, especially some that might be viewed as uncultivated. On this occasion, again, she chose not to participate.

1 M2 hey # you're not even playing # so leave him alone (laughs)

2 F1 (laughs)

3 F2 I threw the dice man # I threw the dice

4 M2 (laughs)

While I initially interpreted the directive as purely a joke because of the laughter, two native speakers evaluated the laughter as a lubricant and the directive as an expression of irritation at F2's refusal to participate in a joint activity. In the following scene, M1 comments on the offensive strategy he had applied towards F1. The notation preserves the identities of the housemates in the previous data.

101-E3. UNDERCONFIDENT

1 F1 I've decided to leave the house # _ tomorrow

2 M2 to[morrow]!

3 M1 [---]

4 F1 yeah

(M2 hugs and kisses F1)

6 M1 [---] a bit more

7 M3 I'm not surprised

8 F1 hehe

9 M1 I'm just a bit e:= # .you know # this is= # this is your=
this is= # this is something different # you know # you're=
we are twelve people # that have been given the opportunity
to do this # you know #. because I've met people before that
are a little bit timid you know

10 F1 I'm so not timid!

11 M1 [not timid # . not timid #. you know # but ---
underconfident ---]

12 F1 [I'm so not timid # I'm not underconfident ---]

(editorial cut)

13 M1 and now I've given you a hard time about it # because [-
--]

14 F1 [but mate # you know what I mean]

15 M1 but that's what I said to my mom # --- my mom ---
computers # and I know that she can't work the telephone # or
the radio # and I always said to her # you can't do it # . you
can't work the computer

16 F2 (laughs)

17 F1 [---]

18 M1 [---] listen # the way that my mom is # if I tell her
you can do something # with her # she's all well # . I can't
do it # it's too complicated #. but if I tell her # you can't
do it # . she's all # hm # I'm gonna show him # . and she has
and I can't believe my mum has done so well # [she's got her
first]

19 F1 [---]

20 M1 computer this week # you know

In turns 13-15 and 18, M1 justifies his earlier attacks on F1's self-esteem by revealing that it has been both intentional and well-meant. M1 interprets F1's conduct as lack of confidence, and explains the psychological mechanism

he intended to spark off: he has been using an offensive strategy as an instrument to provoke F1 into doing the opposite, for her own benefit. At the same time, from M1's perspective, a group benefit was at stake, as shown by his comment regarding F1 in an explanation given to Big Brother: the reason why we nominate people # is that they are not a part of the group. In M1's eyes, group integration suffers from F1's unwillingness to join in; the use of the plural in the personal pronoun emphasises the aspiration towards group consolidation. A face threat seems to be a justified and legitimate means of persuasion because it can benefit both the addressee and the group.

The offensive strategy referred to by M1 in the explanation of his motives appears in the contributions of German speakers M2 and M3 in the following scene. The offensive strategy initiated by M3 is taken up by M2 and is developed in a joint action of the two speakers.

50-G2. BE A MAN

The conversation takes place among M1, M2, M3 and M4. Because of some clashes with some members of the house, M1 previously declared that he was going to leave voluntarily. He has just proposed in a circle of his supporters to play a trick on those housemates who are happy about his decision. The trick would be to proclaim, contrary to his actual intention, that he has changed his mind and is going to stay in the Big Brother house. The topic is continued in the following sequence.

1 M1 aber so Spaßes halber könnte man das durchziehen # oder?
wenn ich heute Abend ins Bettchen ´gehe

but just for fun one could carry it out # right? when I go to bed-DIM. tonight

2 M2 wieso Spaßes halber # mach's doch einfach
why for fun # just do it

3 M1 ne # nur um die blöden Fressen zu sehen
no # just to see these bloody mugs

4 M2 Chrischi
FIRST NAME-distorted

5 M1 ihr müsst dann voll mit darauf einsteigen # ihr müsst
dann aber nicht so:-
you must fully play along with it # but you mustn't then like-

6 M2 Chris # du bist hier in einem Spiel # das hast du nie
wieder # du hast nichts zu verlieren # wenn du jetzt
rauskommst-

*FIRST NAME-truncated # you are here in a game # you'll never get to do it again # you
have nothing to lose # if you get out now-*

7 M3 Mann du hast doch mindestens uns
man you at least have us
 ...

8 M1 hei # soll # sollen wir es mal spaßeshalber durchziehen?
hey # should we carry it out just for fun?

9 M3 welche Spaßes halber # mach's Mann # mach's! ich meine
das `ernst # habe dir schon im Zimmer mal gesagt # ich finde
 es cool wenn du bleibst # du hast hier kein Grund zu gehen
*what fun # do it man # do it! I mean it seriously # have told you in the room already # I find
 it cool if you stay # you have no reason to leave*

10 M2 ich wusste dass er das nicht packt # --- # ich wusste
 dass er seinen Schwanz einzieht und haut ab
*I knew that he wouldn't manage to do it # --- # I knew that he would chicken out and run
 away*

11 M3 --- Wette?
bet?

12 M1 hei Penner # soll ich euch mal den Schwanz lang ziehen?
INTERJECTION you beggars # should I pull your cocks?

13 M2 komm ran
come up

14 M3 da musst du erst mal die Eier haben um hier zu bleiben
 dann kannst du erst mit mir reden # --- wie wir
first you need the balls to stay here and only then you can talk to me # --- like we

15 M2 erst mal musst du Mann sein # um mal einfach durchziehen
first you must be a man # to just get through it

16 M3 und du # kaum wird es dünn um dich # ode:r . bissche
 Glatteis-
and you # as soon as you are on shaky ground # or things get slippery-

17 M1 dünn? Glatteis? seid ihr blöd?
shaky ? slippery? are you stupid?

Turns 4 and 6 include the use of a creatively transformed and a non-standard truncated form of the addressee's first name (Christian), which is relatively rare in the German material and shows a high involvement of the speakers. In turn 7, M3 speaks for the whole group present referring to it as "we" (acc. uns) and declaring loyalty to M1 on everybody's behalf. When warm positively polite persuasion in turns 2, 4, 6, 7 and 9 does not seem to work, the speakers take recourse to offence. In turns 10, 14, 15 and 16 the male virtues of M1 are put in doubt by M2 and M3, and he is declared faint-hearted and lacks confidence. In turn 10, M2 uses a provocative strategy of

claiming that M1's decision was predictable because it resulted from weakness which is an essential trait of the addressee's personality, which M2 is familiar with.

By apparently offending F1 and M1 (violating their need for free choice and non-impingement on their positive image of themselves), the speakers in both episodes are attempting to make them join in or stay in the house, and thus expressing the wish to continue and intensify the relationship with the addressees. In this context, pressure on the addressee may take impositive and offensive forms which attack the addressee's self-esteem and threaten his or her negative face. As a desire for the hearer to stay in the house amounts to a declaration of positive feelings towards him or her, the violation of negative face needs and personal territory is legitimised through emotional involvement and "meaning well" for the addressee. As Tannen (1986) notes, "everything said as a sign of involvement can be in itself a threat to the other's individuality". In the exchanges above, a face threat is consciously used as a device of the involvement strategy which provides its legitimation. When others join in and collaborative persuasion results, as in G3. BE A MAN, the group-oriented character of the act is made explicit.

7.4.8. MODESTY

While the preceding sections emphasise the role of impositive directive strategies in minimising distance and fostering group integration, the observations of the occurrence of interactional modesty point to alternative options applied in this function. The term "interactional modesty" is used here to denote the principle of minimising self-praise and maximising self-criticism, included by Leech (1983) in his Politeness Principle under the heading of Modesty Maxim. While it does not involve any degree of imposiveness, it does not belong to the repertoire of negative politeness, either, and is applied in directive activities as a "third choice" constitutive of a distance-diminishing strategy of a non-impositive sort. English was the only language in which it occurred (and repeatedly so) as a modifying device in directives within the analysed data.

An admittance of one's own weakness may function as a confirmation of a fraternising disposition by indicating openness and trust. It hints at the speaker's view of the others as benevolent persons with whom he may talk openly about his weakness as they will not use it against him, and his relationship with them as being not loaded with a face threat requiring constant attention to his own positive image.

In the following scene 91-E3, the housemates have been given a task of answering several quiz questions and writing the answers on a board. M proposes that the other housemates should answer the questions and he will write the answers down on a board.

91-E3.

M do you want me to write it # now guys # it's going to be on TV and films # and all that # isn't it # . and I'm not the best # so I'll write it

Here, M's comment on himself implies that he does not feel the need to pay much attention to working on his image as a capable person without any flaws because he feels at ease with his companions and takes their benevolence for granted.

This interaction strategy relates to the "honesty and openness" emphasised by a native British respondent commenting on the first encounter as a specific property of the British interaction style (*it is typically British to be completely honest and open with emotions*), an attribution that apparently reversed Schmid's (2003) comment referring to the "typically British" constraint on showing intense emotions (anger, joy and impatience were used as examples). The source of the apparent controversy is revealed by the broader context of the respondent's comment: according to the respondent, Germans would not admit to nervous tension because it could be interpreted as a sign of weakness, while the British applied it as a device for breaking the ice and a means by which common ground was created. The British speakers reduced distance offering comments on their undesirable emotions, as well as their minor flaws. Gonzáles Bermúdez (2005), who analysed Spanish and British directives using the questionnaire method, observed that in asking for a pen from a mate during a university lecture young British respondents usually offered self-derogatory comments referring to their lack of organisation skills.

Interactional modesty as a politeness device has been emphasised by Marcjanik (1997) as being characteristic of the Polish style of politeness, conceived in terms of a "verbal play". Marcjanik referred to ritualised forms of outgroup interaction, though. I didn't note any occurrences of polite modesty in the Polish data.

7.4.9. THE CONSTRUAL OF THE BIG BROTHER HOUSE AS A FAMILY

One of the indicators of perceiving the joint presence in the Big Brother house as producing strong and not just voluntary bonds and mutual obligations is when the group are metaphorically referred to as a family. The two scenes below, both from P3, show how the family metaphor reflects the self-perception of the group, and illustrate the role which this perception plays in legitimising directives. In both scenes, the scope of the family metaphor is the whole group, consisting of members of the “red” and “blue” teams.

124-P3. RHINOCEROS

On the third day of their stay in the Big Brother house, M1 criticises M2 for abusing F2, and is supported by F1 who claims the group is a family.

(M2 enters)

1 M1 to M2: --- facet # żeby to zrobił z wiewiórą # to musi być tak jak. nosorożec

a man # who does it with a squirrel-AUGM # must be like a rhinoceros

2 M2 jak to z wiewiórą # ---

what do you mean by a squirrel-AUGM

3 M1 bez . bez uczuć # bez- # bez- # no . ta:k # jak nosorożec
without feelings # without # without # well just so # like a rhinoceros

4 M2 bez ^uczuć

without feelings

5 M1 bez ^uczuć jak nosorożec #

without feelings like a rhinoceros

6 F2 co ma wiewióra do seksu # przepraszam bo nie rozumiem

what does a squirrel have to do with sex # excuse me because I do not understand

7 F1 no ja też nie wiem # w ogóle

yeah I don't know either # at all

8 F2 sam nie wie o czym mówi

he himself doesn't know what he is talking about

9 M2 Bartek # o co ci chodzi (laughs)

Bartek # what is this about

10 M2 wiesz zrób to dobrze # . żebym- # ja potem-

do it well though # so that I- # afterwards I do not-

11 F3 nie # no ta: k # on ma rację

no # well yes # he is right

12 M2 ale przecież ty nie będziesz świecił za mnie oczami

but this is obviously not like you will have to be ashamed of me

13 M3 żeby on nie musiał poprawiać
so that he will not have to amend this

14 F3 nie no # słuchaj # jesteśmy rodziną
well no # listen # we are a family

15 M1 mnie chodzi o to żebyś-
what I am after is that you should-

16 F2 proszę bardzo # jeżeli któryś z moich przyjaciół to
ogląda # proszę mi to nagrać
please # if a friend of mine is watching this # please record it

17 F1 (laughs)

18 M1 mnie chodzi o to żebyś jej nie zawiódł bo ona- . #
zranisz jej uczucia po prostu
*what I am after is that you don't disappoint her because she- # you will hurt her feelings
simply*

In this interaction, M1 is trying to intervene in the sexual relationship between F1 and M2, whom he accuses of having no true feelings for F1, amounting in his eyes to animal and insensitive behaviour. "With a squirrel", an expression for having sex without any emotional bonding, is unknown to other group members, who react towards his performance without understanding (turns 6 and 7), requiring additional comment. Upon understanding M1's intention, F3 in turn 11 declares that he is correct. In turn 12, M2 expresses his hypothesis about the intention behind M1's preceding unfinished utterance (turn 10): he interprets M1's intervention as hinting that he is afraid of being made responsible for M2's actions and having to be ashamed of them. In turn 14, F2 uses the family metaphor as a justification of M1's behaviour and as support for his involvement. In her eyes, M1 is acting correctly because like family members, the housemates have the right and duty to control the behaviour of other group members towards each other. The scene takes place on the third day of the program; the conception of the group as a family and F2's claim is not legitimised by the housemates' intimate knowledge of each other and mature friendship, but by the fact that they are taking part in the show together. Polish respondents interpreted the use of the family metaphor alternatively as pointing out that the advice is meant well for the addressee (*radzimy ci jak rodzina*, "we advise you like your family"); pointing out that M2's behaviour is putting the group's image at risk and the "good reputation" of the group; or pointing out the right and duty of group members to interfere with actions which put one member of the group at a disadvantage. All interpretations legitimise interference by rendering M1's behaviour towards F1 as an aspect of collective conduct.

In the following interaction which comes from the fourth week of the program, the family metaphor also occurs in the context of moral persuasion. F1 persuades F2 and M1 to stop quarrelling, arguing that it is the Easter holidays and they are her only family present.

125-P3.

1 BB uwaga # Wielki Brat prosi o chwilę skupienia # __
zblizają się . święta . Wielkiej Nocy # _ niech w domu
Wielkiego Brata zapanuje zgoda #

*attention # Big Brother is asking for a moment of concentration # Easter is coming # let
peace rule in the Big Brother house*

2 M2 o # . tak samo mówię

hear hear # this is exactly what I say

3 BB kto się kłócił # . niech wyciągnie do siebie ręce

who was quarrelling # extend your hands to each other

4 F1 w tej chwili?

right now?

5 (several housemates applaud)

(F1 and M1 join hands, approach each other, then embrace)

(some other housemates embrace in pairs, are reconciled)

...

6 M3 jakby-

like

7 F1 jakby czuję lekki niedosyt

I feel like not quite having got enough

8 M3 no # tak

right # yes

9 M4 ja tak samo

the same about me

10 F1 to M1, F2: **jest jakaś szansa żebyście się pogodzili? _
to są święta # słuchajcie # w tej chwili wy jesteście moja
rodziną**

*is there any chance that you will put an end to your clash? it's Easter # listen-IMP-pl. # at
this moment you are my family*

11 M2 dokładnie

exactly

12 M4 no to podnieść tyłki # . i # . podać sobie ręce

then lift-INFINITIVE your bottoms # and give-INFINITIVE each other your hands

(simultaneous talk)

13 M3 do wtorku

till Tuesday

14 F1 chociaż do wtorku (laughs)# naprawdę # w tej chwili
jesteście moją rodziną # nie mam nikogo innego ---

at least till Tuesday # really # at the moment you are my family # I have nobody else

In turns 10 and 14, F1 insists upon reconciliation between F2 and M1 grounding the requestive in the metaphorical conceptualisation of the group as her family. The grounder at the same time explains why F1 puts a high value upon peace within the group, especially during the Easter holidays (lasting till the following Tuesday) which are celebrated as an important family feast in Poland. F1 gives F2 and M1 an additional incentive to comply by pointing out their obligation to care for F1's well-being as a member of their family. The Polish logic of the interaction encourages overt references to ingroupness, and there is little restriction on emphasis in their verbal realisation.

Another marker of the conceptualisation of the Big Brother communities along these lines is the emergence of Mum and Dad figures. In P3, the group assigns these roles to two housemates through giving them appropriate nicknames. They are from different teams and play their respective roles for the whole of the house. The roles of the Mother and the Father are assigned to the oldest man and one of the oldest women in the house, who are also parents several times over in their life outside the Big Brother house. This stereotyping is exhibited by repeatedly addressing them as "Mum" (*mamuśka*), "Mother" (*Matka*), "Father" (*Ojciec*) and "Dad" (*tato*), as well as the occasional longer stretches of interaction involving a verbal play on the parental role, such as the following:

126-P3. F1, F2, F3 and F4 are sitting in the yard; M1 and M2 are playing volleyball; M3 is standing nearby

(M1 throws the ball)

1 M3 stłuczą szybę a ja będę płacił za to
they're going to break the window and I'll have to pay for that

2 F1 ^chodź tato tutaj

come here daddy

3 M3 to M1, M2: _ a ja będę za was płacił!
and I'll have to pay for you!

4 F2 ^cho:dź tato lato # tato la:to BEGGING INTONATION
come daddy maeddy (a nonsense rhyme)

5 F1 ^chodź tato tutaj # do dzieci adoptowanych się nie przyznawaj # --- # znam taki kawał
come here daddy # don't admit adopted children # --- # I know a joke that goes like that

In turn 1, M3 comments humorously on M1's action (who is of approximately the same age as M3) by producing a stereotypical complaint of a parent afraid that his or her children's play might cause damage which s/he will have to pay for. M3 is here verbally enacting the parental role attributed to him by the housemates.

Scenes in which older housemates behave in ways which could be interpreted as involving a parental attitude are also present in the German program. In a later stage of G4, after the housemates had spent two months together, a female group "captain", a mother in "real life", displayed an authoritarian attitude towards a male housemate's order of food he delivered by phone to Big Brother, arguing that he is not really going to need as much as that, and actually cancelling some of the order in her call to Big Brother. This behaviour was interpreted as "maternal" by the host of the show, who commented on it as being typical of mothers who deny unreasonable demands by their children. While his role as a father figure was not overtly referred to in the material available to me, the oldest male housemate in G2, a father of six, displayed a style of interaction which was suggestive of a parental attitude towards the younger housemates, as in the following scene where he adopts an authoritarian attitude predicating the interlocutor's compliance with a directive as a matter of fact:

51-G2. ROPE

M1, M2 and F1 are in the yard, M1 is preparing a loop on a rope, while M2 is close to him, and F1 is watching from a distance.

1 M1 ich werde es einmal ganz ausrollen # _ jetzt wirst du mir mal helfen

I will just uncoil all of it # now you are going to help me

(M2 approaches M1)

2 M2 wie ist das Thema?

what's the topic?

3 M1 Knoten # jetzt wirst du hier machen einen Knoten

a knot # now you will make a knot here

(M2 makes a knot on the rope)

4 M1 zieh

pull

(M2 pulls the rope)

The same German speaker also imposes in a parent-like manner on another younger housemate in the scene 50-G2. BE A MAN, discussed earlier in 7.4.7. This impression, however, which I shared with all three Polish viewers who watched these and other scenes featuring M1, was not confirmed by the native German respondents. While all the Polish viewers claimed that age difference might have contributed to both the occurrence and the impositive form of the directives produced by M1, all five German viewers perceived his impositive behaviour in terms of a dominant personality and rank co-determined by bodily posture, and did not note the age factor. None of the Poles, including two male respondents, noted M1's bodily posture as a potential source of his high self-assurance. The difference was statistically significant¹³⁹. Two out of four British respondents also claimed that the age difference might have played a role in M1's verbal behaviour.

In the third British series, a potential candidate for the father figure because of his age was a childless bachelor, who on the second day of the program signalled an inclination to take over the responsibility for the group of younger inmates by suggesting to his female equivalent, the oldest woman in the group, that she cooperate with him for the sake of the group – by cooking something to prevent the food from decaying. F not only rejected the implicit suggestion but also was critical of M because of what she saw as excessive involvement. A verbal construal of family bonds in E3 was restricted to one case of nicknaming using a family term, where M is called “uncle” rather than “father”. The non-explicit metaphorisation of the group into a family-type of ingroup is present, however, in the nickname “baba” given to the youngest female group member, and the paternal attitude displayed towards her by some group members. In E4, the family metaphor was once used jokingly by a male speaker who was the oldest person in the group and about 14 years older than the addressee:

15-E4 . M is reading in the garden and F enters.

M sit down # sit down son # tell your old man a story

To sum up, the conceptualisation of the Big Brother house as a family found explicit expression within the analysed material only in P3, where the family metaphor was repeatedly used to legitimise directive acts. While some elements in the German and English editions suggest that this perspective was

¹³⁹ df=1; $\chi^2 = 7$; $p < 0.01$

compatible with at least some insiders' perception of the group, the absence of explicit predications of the metaphor precludes definite conclusions.

7.4.10. PLURAL REFERENCES: "WE" AND "YOU-PLURAL"

It has been noted before that the form of directive utterances can contribute to the verbal construction of others as groups, oneself as a group member, and individual actions as actions by the group. This section deals with a small range of linguistic devices which help articulate such a perception and construction of relationships in current interaction. While the linguistic construal of a group as interaction and discourse participant occurs in the data involving all three languages under analysis, different cultures and languages are likely to facilitate such a perception in different degrees.

In several Polish scenes, the perception of "the other" as a group rather than a number of individuals was manifested in underspecifying the actor while making requests by means of a plural form of address. On the other hand, the perception of self as sharing attitudes and goals with the others was reflected by the speaker using the first person plural for self-reference. The speakers "spoke for the group" (including at least the speaker and one other person) on the assumption that they were articulating the group's feelings and attitudes. This is to be distinguished from the hearer-inclusive "solidarity plural".

7.4.10.1. SOLIDARITY PLURAL

The best-known application of the use of the first person plural in directives referring to the action by the addressee in the 1st person singular is the so-called "Krankenschwesterplural", used in hierarchical set-ups in role-based communication in instructions by a person in authority towards a patient, pupil, child, etc. In peer-to-peer communication, the we-plural is used in a different way, in order to promote rapport by an appeal to a background common to the speaker and hearer (in the form of having to obey the same rules, or wanting the same thing, etc.), or by a re-casting of the action by the hearer as the joint action of the speaker and the hearer. Consider the following examples of solidarity plural:

52-G2.

M1 wollen wir es machen oder?

do we want to do it or?

This form is a routine formula of German, by which a “joint volition“ of M1 and M2 is created; the speaker symbolically signals that he is inquiring about the “joint preference“ of himself and the addressee, implying that he will treat the addressee’s preference as his own, sharing it in advance. A semantically analogous construction appears in the English data:

103-E3.

F1 to M1: are we ready to do this outside # because it’s getting hot in here

In the following exchange in Polish, M1 is using the plural to minimise the face threat posed by a corrective directive addressed at M2 by stating it as a general rule applying to everybody, including M1 and himself:

33-P3.

M1 to M2: nie puszczamy bąków dobra?
we don’t fart # okay?

The re-casting of the predicated action of the hearer as a joint action is visible in the following two sets of data:

127-P3. F1 has been talking into her microphone for the last couple of minutes, begging the sound technicians to play her favourite song for her.

F2 *dajmy dźwiękowcom życ*
let’s let the sound people live (meaning: let’s leave them in peace)

104-E3.

M let’s just end all conversation about it

In 104-E3, M directs his utterance to a group of housemates engaged in a discussion. M is free not to participate in the conversation, and his own participation is not at issue here. What he is in fact doing by means of this utterance is not issuing a proposal of doing (or not doing) something together, but a request to the other participants that they stop talking about a subject that he finds not worth talking about. While I do not share the view represented by Aijmer (1996) that all apparent proposals are in fact camouflaged requests, I believe that in some cases the use of a plural self-reference is an act of re-casting a request into a form typical for proposals for reasons of promoting rapport and solidarity.

Besides the routine formula “wollen wir x” in German, the use of the solidarity plural is sporadic, and qualitatively similar in all three groups. The data does not provide any structured insight into the differences between the interaction strategies at this point between the three groups. It was to be expected because the use of the solidarity plural does not imply the existence and significance of a group as the a background to the interaction between the speaker and the addressee, and can be analysed within the interpersonal dyadic model of speaker-hearer communication.

7.4.10.2. SINGULAR SPEAKER, PLURAL SELF-REFERENCE

I have selected the following scene as an illustration of the plural “you” in addressing others and the plural “we” in self-reference:

128-P3. SLEEPING IN THE CORNER

The members of the winning team – F1, F2 and M1 – enter the “rich” bedroom after the losing team have had to move out. F1 and F2 are the only women in the team, which also includes M1, M2 and M3.

1 F1 nie no # my z Barbi idziemy spać tam w kącie # (to M1:) a wy tu

no # Barbi and (literally: we with Barbi)¹⁴⁰ I go sleeping there in the corner # (to M1:) and you-pl. here (F1 points to two beds in the corner)

¹⁴⁰ The functionality of the personal pronoun “we” in Polish exemplified in turn 1 above contrasts with the two other languages under study. The literal translation into English is:

we with Barbi go-Ist pl. to sleep there in the corner

“We with Barbi” is the standard construction in the Polish language that corresponds to the English “Barbi and I” and the German “Barbi und ich”, which results in numerous cases of communicative disturbances due to its transfer by Polish learners into German and English. Self-reference can also be made in the singular as in English and German, for example:

Idę	z kolegą	do kina.
<i>I'm going</i>	<i>with a friend</i>	<i>to the cinema.</i>

This form is infrequently used and carries different social connotations; it individuates the speaker, and focuses on the speaker rather than the action itself. In contrast, forms of expression with a self-reference in the singular – *Barbi and I*, *Barbi und ich* – are standard ways of predicating the state of affairs in English as well as in German. The use of addressee-exclusive “we” requires specification of the referents in an attached nominal phrase:

We go to the cinema today, Jaś and myself.
Wir gehen heute ins Kino, Jaś und ich.

2 F2-BARBI a czemu?
and why?

3 F1 tak # bo tu poprzestawiali # i dobrze
yes # because they have moved the furniture around # and this is good
 (M2, M3 come in)

4 F1 ej # . wy śpicie teraz tu (points to a place)
hey # you sleep here now

5 M1 dlaczego?
why?

6 F1 ^bardzo prosimy BEGGING INTONATION
we ask-please very much

7 F2 to M1 dajcie nam tutaj # weź mi tą # . walizkę # _ daj mi
 tą walizkę
give-IMP-pl. us # bring-IMP-sing. me the # the suitcase # give-IMP-sing. me that suitcase

In this scene, the plural is used three times in the contexts where a different form could also be applied but would carry a different social value:

Singular speaker – plural subject

- In turn 6, F1 uses “we” referring to herself and the other female housemate, F2, when declaring that they are begging the male group members for their consent to the proposal, without actually having checked whether F2 accepts the proposal. She does it even if at first F2

If Wierzbicka (1985, 1986) were right in arguing that each language grammaticalises forms of expressions corresponding to the values and attitudes of its members, this plural form of reference unique to Polish could reflect the preference for a relationship-oriented perception of self. The issue of the link between syntactic structures and the perceptions of reality, social reality included, in a given culture counts as one of the most controversial issues in functional grammar. It concerns, for example, such widely divergent phenomena as subjectless sentences in Slavic and other languages, or the obligatory use of the third person honorifics in Japanese. The opponents of easy-made back-tracing of grammaticalisation phenomena to underlying social perceptions and construals of reality argue that language is a historically grown phenomenon which has an evolution behind it, influenced by a complex network including factors such as social change, language contact and historical incident; and that any attempt to explain grammatical structures by reference to culture-dependent conceptual structure is deemed to be overly simplistic and speculative. Currently, any systematic model is missing for the link of grammaticalisation phenomena to sociocultural characteristics of a language community. I assume that a massive amount of detailed studies of synchronic contrastive studies and diachronic studies of particular languages is needed before such a model can be postulated, or before the viability of any such model can be rejected in principle.

does not understand the reason for F1's proposal, as shown by her question in turn 2 (a czemu? "and why"?)

- In turn 7, F2 confirms the perception of the team as consisting of "we" (a female subgroup) and "you" (a male subgroup), as introduced by F1 in turn 1, when she asks two male housemates to carry her suitcase into the room. She uses the dative of the personal pronoun 1st. plural *nam* ("us") rather than the 1st. singular in the indirect object, referring to herself and F1 as beneficiaries (recipients). Later in the same turn, she narrows the reference down and specifies herself as the recipient (beneficiary) by the use of the pronoun *mi* (me-dative) as the indirect object.

7.4.10.3. SINGULAR ACTOR, PLURAL ADDRESSEE: SPEAKING TO THE GROUP

I observed in the statistical analysis that the high frequency with which requests are directed to a plural addressee in Polish can be partly due to the frequent use of the plural in directives at an indefinite singular actor or a particular single person. The following exchange illustrates the use of 1st and 2nd person plural in this function.

129-P3. A cat enters the house. M1, M2 and F2 are sitting as F1 approaches the cat.

1 M1 *usiadźmy # usiadźmy słuchajcie # bo się będzie bał i będzie w szoku*

sit-IMP-1st pl. down # sit-IMP-1st pl. down listen # otherwise it will be afraid and will be in shock

...

(F1 picks the cat up)

2 M1 *zostawcie go # . połóż go # on się musi oswoić*

leave-IMP-2nd pl. it # put-IMP-2nd sing. it down # it must get used to everything

(F1 walks around with the cat)

3 M1 *puść go Basia*

let it go Basia

4 F2 *puść go Basiu # niech on się oswoi # _ on niech sobie pobiega*

let it go Basia # it should get used to everything # it should run around a bit

(F1 lets the cat go and follows it)

5 M1 *to nie chodźmy za nim*

so not follow-IMP-1st pl. it

6 M2 *nie chodźmy za nim # siedźcie*

not follow-IMP-1st pl. it # sit-IMP-2nd pl.

In turn 1, M1 reacts to F1's undesirable action (lifting the cat) by means of an inhibitive directive in 2nd plural in the initial part: *zostawcie go* ("leave-IMP-2nd pl. it"), and narrows down the scope of address in the following phrase *połóż go* ("put-IMP-sing. it down"). The use of the plural (in the first and second person) in turns 5 and 6 of the exchange above may be interpreted as a means of polite modification of a terminating request directed at F1. The directive loses some of its critical force directed against F1's behaviour when formulated by the speaker as directed to a group, and as self-inclusive (*nie chodźmy za nim*, "NEG follow-IMP-1st pl. it"). In the end of turn 6 the speaker switches to 2nd plural (*siedźcie* "sit-IMP-2nd pl."), directed to all the persons present rather than to F1, who was the only person to follow the cat and is the only person not seated. Both uses of the plural – in 1st and 2nd person – show the tendency to refer to an action of particular group members as an action by the group, and blunt the critical edge of the corrective directives by defocalising the actual trespasser.

I propose to interpret the tendency to address inhibitive requestives to groups when the actors performing undesirable activities are single persons as symptomatic of a collective perspective taken by speakers when attributing trespasses and distributing blame. The following exchange does not contain requestive utterances relevant to this subject but is quoted here as support for this interpretation.

130-P3. RED HAIR

F is dyeing M1's hair.

(M2 comes up to M1 and points at his head)

1 M2 a tu nie ma w ogóle tego?

and here there is no stuff at all?

2 F nie # jest # wszędzie jest dużo farby

but yes # there is # there is a lot of dye everywhere

(M2 walks away, leaving M1 and F alone)

3 M mój tata patrzy i mówi # co ten debil robi

my dad is watching and saying # what is this idiot doing

4 F czy ty możesz uklęknąć # cokolwiek zrobić # tak żebyś nie musiał na razie patrzeć # w lustro?

can you-EMPHATIC kneel down # do anything # so that you do not have to look right now # into the mirror?

5 M głowę nawet mam czerwoną # przecież skórę # . ej mam czerwoną nawet skórę # zafarbowaliście mi skórę # zobacz # że mi zafarbowaliście skórę

but even my head is red # the skin # ei I have red skin # you-PLURAL have dyed my skin # look-SINGULAR # that you-PLURAL have dyed my skin

There is only one person involved in dyeing M1's hair. Some other members of the group function as passive observers at some stage and later have left the scene. However, in turn 5, even though only the actual actor is present, M1 blames the outcome on the group, using the plural form of the pronoun "you".

Selected examples of directives formally addressed to a plural addressee while predicating an action that can be performed by one person only are listed below. In all of them, the speaker removes the focus from individuals, expressing his or her perception of the situation as him- or herself dealing with a group rather than with individuals, and implying that the predicated action is a collective enterprise of the addressees.

131-P3. F1, F2, F3 are dining at the table.

F1 weźcie podajcie mi sól

take-IMP-2nd pl. pass-IMP-2nd pl. me the salt

115-P3. F is preparing to leave the Big Brother House.

F tam gdzie została moja kurtka ze skóry # przynieście mi ją
my leather jacket is lying around somewhere # bring-IMP-2nd pl. it to me

132-P3. F approaches a group in which one person is smoking a cigarette.

F dajcie mi fajkę # bo ja nie wiem gdzie są # bo schowałam # .
ale znajdę

give-IMP 2ndpl. me a cigarette # because I don't know where mine are # because I've hidden them # . but I'll find them

133-P3. The housemates enact a talk-show; the interviewee, F1, goes back to her place. Previously, the group had confiscated her sunglasses in an effort to watch her facial expression.

F2 okulary oddajcie

the glasses give-IMP-2nd pl. back

134-P3. F2 enters the room.

F2 to M1, M2: dajcie na moment zapalniczkę

give-IMP-2ndpl. for a moment the lighter

The strategy of referring to the plural when directing a request to a singular referent (typically indefinite in initiating, and identifiable on the basis of the situational context in inhibitive directives), observable in Polish, cannot be observed in English on the basis of spoken data alone because the plural and singular forms of the imperative are not differentiated. In German, the two forms are differentiated in informal relationships, where the T-address is used. The underspecification of the addressee by using the second person plural imperative while the predicated action can only be performed by one person, or when a specific referent was meant, did not occur in the German data.

To realise underspecification of the addressee (actor) of an imperative request, Polish, German and English have developed the imperative form VP-IMP-2nd sing. + INDEFINITE PERSONAL PRONOUN, as in:

German: komm mal einer her
 komm mal jemand her
 come someone here

English: come here # anybody

Polish: chodź/chodźcie no tu który/która
 come-IMP-2nd sing./pl. here someone-sing.masc./-sing.
 fem.

Alternatively, it is possible to formulate a request using a hortative particle and an indefinite personal pronoun in the singular:

niech mi ktoś poda sól
HORTATIVE-PARTICLE me someone give-sing. the salt

The above quoted exchanges in Polish manifest a preference for using the plural address rather than any of the available forms quoted above of an underspecified address using the indefinite singular personal pronouns *który*, *która*, *ktoś* ("someone-male", "someone-female", "someone"), which hardly ever occurred in the data. In English, speaker-centred formulations were used in some contexts where the plural occurred in Polish:

16-E4.

M can I get some butter?

17-E4.

M could I have the sugar and milk # please?

Alternatively, an indefinite personal pronoun was used:

18-E4.

M can anyone pass me the milk?

The imperative in the 2nd person plural seems to be functionally equivalent to such constructions in Polish in the peer ingroup context. This function-form correspondence is reflected in the repertoire of choices offered by the grammar. As indicated before, the following construction is grammatical in colloquial Polish:

chodźcie no tu	który/która (masc./fem.)
<i>come-IMP-2nd pl. here</i>	<i>someone-sing.</i>

The plural form of the imperative is used while the singular pronoun indicates that only one person is meant to perform the predicated action and the speaker relies on a single volunteer's reaction.

7.4.11. COLLABORATIVE PERFORMANCE OF DIRECTIVES

Trying to analyse natural data using the conceptual equipment developed in the analysis of (dyadic) role plays and questionnaires, the analyst will soon be irritated by the fact that instead of making it easy by supplying neatly distinct occurrences of spontaneous, original Head Acts and Supportive Moves, people frequently repeat, paraphrase, and complete each other's directives. The status of an utterance supporting, repeating, or completing somebody else's directive is controversial: it may be classified either as a minimal unit (head act), a supportive move for another speaker's earlier move, or else a second head act within a multi-head collaborative speech act. Sometimes, speakers collaborate on performing long speech events consisting of many turns, together constituting a piece of instruction or a plea. The most powerful articulation of the collective performance of directives is choir chanting, in which the group is profiled as being in unity by its simultaneous realisation.

A "collaborative performance" of a directive speech act occurs when two or more persons collaborate in performing a speech act. This can be realised by the speakers

- jointly chanting a demand or request,

- completing fragments of each other's utterances in such a way that only the combination of turns by more than one person constitutes a directive speech act or a sequential directive speech event, or
- supporting each other's utterances through paraphrase or repetition.

In what follows, choir chanting, remarkable for being a simultaneous rather than sequential realisation of a collective speech act, is examined in more detail. Then sequential collaborative directive speech is discussed, utilising linguistic devices such as paraphrase, repetition, and collaborative topic development.

7.4.11.1. SIMULTANEOUS COLLABORATIVE DIRECTIVE SPEECH ACTS: CHANTING

Chanting a text is a directive routine where the routine feature is prosody in itself. The lexical content of chanting may undergo lexicalisation yielding a chanting "formula" which is applicable in particular recurrent situational contexts. Specific metrics is the basic element of ritualisation, necessary for giving the formula their illocutionary force.

Choir chanting is a means of articulating requests by a group of people sharing a need or attitude. As a directive, which does not exhaust all of its conventionalised applications, it is used to

- express group support for somebody; includes applauding in a competition,
- articulate a group's request directed at a person or persons in power,
- articulate a group's request whose content is the addressee's public performance,
- perform other directives showing some "family resemblance" with the basic usages listed above.

In Big Brother, choir chanting appears in all three basic functions:

- directed to group members as a way of supporting them in a competition or in performing a task (Polish, German)
form: imperative, vocative
- directed to group members as requests for a public performance
form: imperative (Polish), vocative (Polish, German)
- directed to Big Brother (the production team)
form: declarative need statement

EXAMPLES:

53-G2. All the housemates are gathered on the sofas in the living room

1 GROUP: Da-vid-Da-vid-Da-vid (GROUP: clap their hands)

(F1 pulls M1 by the hand, forcing him to stand up)

2 (applause)

3 M2 Emma auf den Bullen!

Emma on the bull

4 F1 Emma auf den Bullen

Emma on the bull

5 M3 Emma geht auf den Bullen

Emma is getting on the bull

(simultaneous speech)

(M1 starts acting out Emma's bull ride which took place earlier)

6 (applause, laughter)

135-P3.

GROUP: chce-my-jeść! chce-my-jeść! chce-my-jeść!

we want food – we want food – we want food

In these types of directives, the primary function of choir chanting is not to improve the audibility of the request but to articulate group solidarity and group power which are already in existence, or to create group solidarity and collective identity by stimulating individuals to join in a group activity in the form of a physically powerful expression of collective will. Chanting organises individuals into a group, individual requests to group requests, and individual support into group support. The articulation of solidarity by chanting a text formula has two directions: inward – by providing the feeling of solidarity, belonging and joint action to the group members involved; and outward – by the articulation of group power before the group's interlocutor. In cases when the chanting is directed at a group member, the addressee is temporarily excluded from the group and transformed into the group's interlocutor. By yielding to pressure, she or he rejoins the group and releases the tension created by the temporary suspension of membership.

Other cases of joint vocalisation of ritualised texts that create and enhance group identity and confirm the group membership of the participants include declamation of prayers, singing political hymns, and football chants. In P3, the ritual function of simultaneous speech acts is also utilised by one of the competing teams (Team Red) by an appropriation of a melodic football chant comprising four lines each with eight syllables of text, appropriately adapted.

The necessity of having a team chant was referred to on the very first evening after the first team defeat. After that, the chant was half-sung, half-shouted at the beginning of each competition. The number of group members who joined the singing increased with time. Persons who seemed rather reserved at the beginning, probably in view of the low cultural connotation of the text and the whole song, later lost their reserve, possibly recognising the consolidating effect on their own team, as well as the intimidating effect on the other team.

7.4.11.2. REPETITION AND PARAPHRASE

Expressing affirmation and support for a directive proposition can be articulated by numerous means, for example the use of affirmative particles, statements of agreement, or naming additional grounds for performing the directive by the predicated actor(s). What is peculiar about a paraphrastic or repetitive utterance is its redundancy of the propositional contents in the “content space” of the discourse. The speaker apparently “ignores” the earlier utterance’s propositional contribution to the content space; the resulting message in the “rhetorical space” is that of being fully of one mind with the earlier speaker, not merely affirming but actually thinking the same thoughts and enacting the same piece of interaction.

Repetition is one of the simplest ways of expressing support. In the following sequence, turn 2 merely copies a part of the preceding turn:

136-P3. M1 is trying on a vest; M2 is helping M1 as M3 watches.

1 M3 *dobra jest # ściagaj*

okay # take it off

2 M2 *ściagaj*

take it off

The following scene from G2 involves a uniform and strongly impositive collective verbal action in a situation where an ethical norm, breaking a promise, is involved. M1 is a member of a religious and ethnic minority from a conservative family background, and is the only male housemate who wears underwear when he is in the shower. After a great deal of comment on his stance by the group, M1 reveals to a group of female housemates that he is considering breaking the promise given to his mother. The group reacts collaboratively by a vivid disagreement. Emotional involvement and the uniformity of the speakers’ opinion is expressed by producing utterances expressing the same propositional contents, involving repetition and paraphrase in turns 2, 3, 4, 5, 9 and 10.

1-G2. NUDE IN THE SHOWER

M has just declared that he is going to take a shower undressed, contrary to what he had promised his mother.

1 M ja # vielleicht überlege ich mir das mal # aber-
yeah # maybe I will give it some more thought # but-

2 F1 hör auf # tu's deiner Mami nicht an # [wenn du es
versprochen hast?]¹⁴¹

stop that # don't do this to your Mum # if you promised?

3 F2 [nein # du hast es versprochen]
no # you promised

4 F3 [versprochen ist versprochen]
a promise is a promise

5 F4 [du hast es versprochen]
you promised

6 F1 komm # also # . wir wollen kein Gruppenzwang # das finde
ich . blöd

come on # well # we do not want a group pressure # I think that's stupid

7 M1 ja # wenn das sich nicht ändert # werde ich: . das aber-
yeah # if this does not change # I will anyway-

8 M2 wieso dann? [---]
but why?

9 F1 [du machst] dir hier # [. völlig unnütz Gedanken]
you are worrying about nothing

10 F2 [das ist völlig in Ordnung]
that is quite all right

Although each of the women produces the directive just once, repeating the same proposition in partly the same wording in turns 2 through 5, they accumulate in their effect, resulting in heavy impositiveness. Gender solidarity with M's mother might be playing a considerable part in this discussion. The performance of the directive becomes strongly impositive not only because it is realised in an impositive verbal form, but also because it involves a collective action by several speakers repeating and paraphrasing contributions of their precedents.

7.4.11.3. COOPERATIVE PRODUCTION OF DIRECTIVES IN VERBAL PLAY

Co-operation with others and being a part of a group is not only a way to achieve task-oriented and survival-oriented goals but also an opportunity for

¹⁴¹ Square brackets indicate simultaneous speech. Hashes indicate tone group boundaries.

playing. It evokes Huizinga's notion of "homo ludens", the conception that a human being is primarily a socially-oriented creature and playing is a basic way of self-expression by entering into and cultivating bonds with others. For "homo ludens", play is an activity basic to life rather than being second-rate and inferior to task-and-survival-oriented activities. The following exchanges show how the fun function of directive activities is triggered and furthered by their collaborative execution.

In the following collective joke, containing a long act of group persuasion, the sense of co-ordinated action among the speakers is created by simultaneous vocalisation and interactive, multi-vocal repetition, paraphrase, topic development, and prosodic similarity between consecutive utterances.

105-E3. NAKED WOMEN

F1, F2, and F3 are in the hot tub together; M1 is nearby taking a shower outside.

(shouting)

1 F1 slave boy # . come and lick my eyes!

2 F2 slave boy # . come and lick my ass!

3 F1 slave boy # . come and lick my feet!

4 F3 come hither now # slave boy!

5 F1,F2,F3 slave boy!

(silence 4 seconds)

6 F1 we've got to be really seductive and try and lure him #
our aim is to lure him into the hot tub

...

7 F2 we'll show you our bits honestly # we promise # come on
Tom!

8 F1 we want to play with you!

9 F2 yes Tom # we want to play with you

10 F3 we want to do things to you that haven't been done for
ages

11 F1 three naked women # when has that ever happened to you
in the hot tub

12 F1 this is your wildest dream what you've been thinking
about every night with your gin screaming hard on

13 F2 Tom

14 F3 it's an offer that won't come back in a hurry

15 F1 we're slipping off each other

16 F2 we need your help

17 F1 we're waiting for you

18 F3 we can't keep still

19 F1,F3 Tom!
 20 F2 we can't stop thinking about you
 21 F2,F3 To:::::m!

Consecutive speakers repeat the utterance of the preceding speaker as in turns 8 and 9, develop the theme by repeating the beginning of the utterance and alternating the final element, as in turns 1, 2, 3 and 13, 14, 25, 16, 18, or produce the same text simultaneously, as in turns 5, 19 and 21. The 1st person plural pronoun is used throughout. The groups of utterances in turns 1-3 and 10-18 have the same intonation pattern, and form a rhythmical consecutive chant. The joint objective is explicitly stated in turn 6:

6 F1 we've got to be really seductive and try and lure him #
 our aim is to lure him into the hot tub

It is formulated as a deontic declarative and followed by a factual statement defining "our aim", in which the group consensus about the joint goal is taken for granted.

In the next set of data, coming from the German data, a collective is formed by a group of females by means of repetition, partial repetition, mimetic code mixing and the statement of will formulated in the 1st plural:

54-G2. A group of male and female housemates practise riding a mechanical bull one by one in a self-appointed order which is yet to be negotiated. The utterances below are produced by a subgroup of female housemates who are sitting in the stands awaiting the next performance.

1 F1 der Mister Großkotz # einmal die Sieben # [wir wollen unbedingt-]

mister boaster (literally: Big Puke) # the seven once # we definitely want-

2 F2 [wir wollen ---] # wir wollen Bigmause

we want --- # we want Big Mouse

3 F1 [Mister Bigmaus # genau]

mister Big Mouse # exactly

4 F3 [wir wollen ihn fliegen sehen]

we want to see him fly

5 F2 ja # wir wollen ihn fliegen sehen

yes # we want to see him fly

6 F1 Mister Bigkotz

mister Big Puke

7 F3 sieben!
seven
 8 F2 sieben! einmal die Sieben fährt
seven ! the seven rides once
 9 F1 Walter
Walter-FIRST NAME
 10 F2 little Walter

The elliptical (bare vocative) formulation of F1's directive in turns 1 and 3 consists in the identification of the next contestant by his starting number, which is then repeated by F3 and F2 in turns 6 and 7. As well as being identified by the starting number, the addressee is identified by the use of a humorously abusive, colloquial term of reference "Großkotz", meaning "boaster", and the derived ad-hoc nickname *Bigkotz*, "Big Puke". Code mixing is introduced by the formal English term of address *mister* and adding the English adjective *big* to the augmentative German root *kotz* ("puke") in a neologism which has the form of a compound noun. The procedure of code mixing introduced by F1 is taken up by F2 in another nominal compound in turn 2, *Bigmaus*, and in another English adjective, *little*, in turn 10. The first name *Walter* in turn 8 is pronounced as in English in turn 9 by F1, and recurs in turn 10 by F2 using the same pronunciation. The collaborative authorship of the directive is signalled by F1 in turn 1 in the explicit declaration of a joint preference (1st person plural), and confirmed in its repetitions by F3 in turn 4 and F2 in turn 5. The male housemates present in the audience do not join in.

Both scenes above, as well as the previously quoted scene 93-E3. ENTERING BEDROOMS, involving a practical joke illustrate the fact that collective fun is frequently gendered in mixed gender groups, that is, co-operation takes place within one gender group and is directed against a member or members of the other gender.

The last scene above belongs to the category of speech events known as "teasing" in English and "frotzeln" in German (cf. Günther 2000). In Polish, it can be roughly translated as either "kpiny" or "przekomarzanki"¹⁴². Teasing is a non-serious mode of discourse implying the a division of roles into its temporarily superior performers and the inferior victim of their criticism which is not quite intended to be serious. The scenes 105-E3. NAKED WOMEN displays a central characteristic of teasing, i.e. collective fun at the cost of the

¹⁴² These notions that are close to each other but not synonymous; "przekomarzanki" involve the expectation of self-defense by the initial victim, leading to a balance of roles, a point-scoring game of equal partners; "kpiny" may seriously offend the victim's negative face wants.

“victim”; at the same time, it misses the humorously critical element typical of teasing (cf. Günther 2000). Directives have a central role to play in teasing, where the addressee is frequently being non-seriously persuaded to do something which she or he does not wish, which makes no sense, or which gives the performers the opportunity to continue the tease. Teasing in the Big Brother house occurs in all three languages, and nearly always involves a group of speakers collaborating against an individual victim and the corresponding self-reference in plural, “we” (cf. also Pulaczewska 2006: 483-504).