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1 Introduction

Given the recent trend of globalisation, English as a *lingua franca* (henceforth also referred to as ELF) appears to become more and more important all over the globe. Nowadays a considerable number of people from different countries and various language backgrounds are confronted with the challenge of conversing with a great number of other people on a daily basis, without sharing the same mother tongue or cultural background. But then what exactly is a *lingua franca*?

Jenkins (2007) refers to a *lingua franca* as:

a contact language used among people who do not share a first language, […] which is commonly understood to mean a second (or subsequent) language of its speakers. (Jenkins 2007: 1)

Due to the international spread of English throughout the 20th century, this language is often selected as the mutually understandable language “in settings such as conferences, business meetings, and political gatherings”. (op.cit: 1-2)

Even though there might seem to exist a great number of similarities between contact languages such as pidgin and a *lingua franca*, one must necessarily recognise that the latter distinguishes itself from the former in that its users have usually learnt the language in question at a formal level. Hence the participants of the interaction are assumed to share a similar background as regards their language acquisition processes and their overall language competence. (Zeiss 2010: 6; Mauranen 2003: 514-515)

Yet some scholars even go further and argue in favour of the total exclusion of native speakers when defining the concept of *lingua franca*. Knapp and Meierkord (2002) write that the first *lingua franca*, being a pidgin and “a variety that was spoken along the South-Eastern coast of the Mediterranean between approximately the 15th and the 19th century” (Knapp & Meierkord 2002: 9) did not have any native speakers. (ibid)

Thus some scholars, for instance Firth (1996), still appear to prefer the traditional interpretation of the term *lingua franca*. He therefore defines the concept as being:
a ‘contact language’ between persons who share neither a common native tongue nor a common (national) culture, and for whom English is the chosen foreign language of communication. (Firth 1996: 240)

Seidlhofer (2004) however disagrees, arguing that native speakers should not be excluded from the lingua franca definition entirely and that “it has to be remembered that ELF interactions often also include interlocutors from the Inner and Outer Circles”. (Seidlhofer 2004: 211-212) Nevertheless, one needs to be careful not to include too great a number of native speakers in the empirical investigation of ELF because native speakers do not constitute a majority of ELF interactions worldwide, a factor which was also considered during the creation process of VOICE. Although the corpus does not completely exclude mother tongue users of the language (a choice which seems rather sensible when one considers the reality of ELF usage where native speakers also often take part) it avoids the inclusion of too great a number of English native speakers. Thus, only about seven per cent of the words in VOICE (7.07 per cent equal a total of 72,372 words) are produced by native speakers.


As was pointed out by the creators of VOICE themselves, one should not neglect the fact that

the most wide-spread contemporary use of English throughout the world is that of English as a lingua franca (ELF), i.e. English used as a common means of communication among speakers from different first-language backgrounds. (VOICE Project 2009: http://www.univie.ac.at/voice/page/corpus_information, 1.3.2011)

In addition, it has to be mentioned that all over the globe there are far more non-native speakers of the English language than native speakers, or as House (2002) puts it:

English has acquired an unparalleled status as a language spoken by more non-native speakers than native speakers. (House 2002: 246)

Moreover, Gnutzmann (2000) supporting Beneke (1991) argues that in the majority of all verbal exchanges where English is used as a lingua franca (around
80 per cent) no native speakers of the language are involved. (Gnutzmann 2000: 357)

Considering this debate, one can easily recognise the significance of ELF. Nonetheless, linguistic descriptions have thus far concentrated primarily on the language as it is used by its native speakers and seeing that English plays such a great role as a *lingua franca*, it appears to be obvious that this specific usage of the language needs to be thoroughly examined as well. This thesis thus sets out to fill this gap. The corpus that is used in the current paper, namely VOICE, constitutes a new milestone in this sort of data analysis, as it is the first freely accessible corpus providing spoken ELF interactions. (VOICE Project 2009: http://www.univie.ac.at/voice/page/corpus_information, 1.3.2011)

Through use of this excellent basis and in referencing a previous corpus-based study on additive adverbials by Fjelkestam-Nilsson (1983), it is possible to investigate ELF language use and to subsequently evaluate the results drawn from the VOICE analysis against those provided by native speakers of the English language. The current study will therefore attempt to locate similarities and differences between native and *lingua franca* speakers of the English language with regard to the usage of additive adverbials and discuss the reasons for any possible variation.

The principal aim of this study thus lies in the uncovering of an often occurring difficulty in present-day English, namely the usage of more or less synonymous additive adverbials. Given the fact that these items are similar in their meaning, ELF speakers frequently face the problem of choosing the appropriate word for a given context. As can be seen in the third chapter of this work, not even grammarians appear to be certain about the rules concerning this grammatical aspect of the English language. Indeed they do not even appear to be able to agree on the question of which items are to be included in the category of the additive adverbial. The explications and discussions concerning both the correct positioning and the decision involved in selecting the so-called appropriate additive adverbial for a given context are quite imprecise and vague. Therefore, one might expect that learners of English as a second or foreign language as well as ELF speakers might face problems in this area; hence there is a per-
ceived need for a more intensive treatment of additive adverbials through empirical investigation to shed some light on this rather confusing matter.

Fjelkestam-Nilsson (1983) has already investigated the everyday usage of additive adverbials by native speakers of English in respect of this issue. Therefore her results constitute a basis for an ELF study in this field, as only corpora, it is argued, are able to reflect the authentic language use. Second or foreign language learners often regard the native speaker language usage as the desirable norm and thus try to imitate it as closely as possible. As such, these native English language corpus-based results will be compared to ELF speaker usage to arrive at a better understanding of how English as a lingua franca is used.

The research interest of this paper can be expressed in the following research questions:

× How frequent are additive adverbials in VOICE in comparison to Fjelkestam-Nilsson’s results (1983) of written and spoken native speaker corpora?
× Does the ELF usage of additive adverbials actually differ from native speaker usage? and
× In what way does the frequency of also and too correlate with the speaker’s sex?

Having considered Fjelkestam-Nilsson’s results (1983) and various empirical ELF studies on different matters, the principal hypothesis for this study is that the VOICE speakers (that is to say the ELF users presented in the corpus) are likely to use additive adverbials in a different manner to native speakers of the language because their main interest is usually the exchange of meaning without sharing the same mother tongue. The exact way in which the usage of these two speaker groups differs remains to be seen. It is, however, to some extent expected that the lingua franca speakers might also occasionally use the additive adverbials in question in non-conventional positions and to serve purposes other than addition because previous studies on ELF (e.g. Dorn 2010: 118) have shown that lingua franca usage often differs from native speaker use. Furthermore, given the fact that females are claimed to use language differently than men in Fjelkestam-Nilsson’s study (1983), it is presumed that the female speakers in VOICE, mirroring the results of the native female speakers
provided by Fjelkestam-Nilsson’s investigation (1983), might also tend to use additive adverbials in general more often than the males in the ELF corpus.

The thesis will start off by providing an overview of the previous corpus study on additive adverbials by Fjelkestam-Nilsson (1983). Chapter 3 will present various empirical works concerning additive adverbials from the point of view of descriptive and prescriptive grammarians. The fourth chapter will then define the concept corpus and elucidate the different corpora that are relevant to the current study - VOICE, BUC, LOB and LLC. In the following section (Chapter 5) the methods used to carry out this analysis will be explained in more detail. The sixth chapter will then analyse the frequency of also, too, as well, in addition, again, likewise, equally, similarly, moreover and furthermore in the ELF corpus. In addition, the results drawn from VOICE will be compared to the corpus results presented by Fjelkestam-Nilsson (1983) and the possible differences will be accounted for. In Chapter 7, the usage of the adverbs also and too will be analysed with regard to the sex of their speakers and the results of the ELF corpus will subsequently be compared to the native speaker outcomes. Last but not least, additive too will be analysed with regard to Halliday’s communicative functions in order to complement the outcomes and to detect whether female lingua franca speakers do indeed tend to make language more interactive as far as additive too is concerned. In the conclusion (Chapter 8) the outcomes will be summarised and presented again. Furthermore, some pedagogic implications of the lingua franca will be discussed.
2 Previous corpus study on additive adverbials

The particular motivation to carry out the current study concerning additive adverbials in ELF was triggered by the encounter of a corpus study of written and spoken native speaker language by Fjelkestam-Nilsson (1983). Her study concerning both British and American English focuses on the two additive adverbials also and too but also investigates additional additive adverbials (as well, in addition, again, likewise, equally, similarly, moreover, furthermore) in the written corpora. Whereas Fjelkestam-Nilsson set out to investigate the frequency of occurrence of these additive adverbials in spoken and written mother tongue usage, she also discusses the additional meanings these adverbs are able to express. Furthermore, she considers whether the frequency of also and too correlates with the speaker’s sex by investigating a corpus of fiction consisting of twenty novels by female and male American and British native speakers of English.

Fjelkestam-Nilsson’s corpus data shows that while also and too are used more frequently in American than in British written language, also is preferred over too in both corpora. Moreover, both written corpora show that also and too are most frequently used to express addition, i.e. also and too as additive adverbials.

The analysis of the spoken corpus (LLC) demonstrates that both also and too are far less common in spoken native speaker language than in both American and British written language. Again, the adverb also is chosen more frequently than its counterpart too.

The data of BUC and LOB indicate that also and too are far more common than the other adverbials, i.e. as well, in addition, again, likewise, equally, similarly, moreover and furthermore.

The examination of the corpus of fiction showed that the female authors used also and too more frequently than the male authors.
Even though Fjelkestam-Nilsson's investigation dates back to 1983, her results and the empirical works presented in the next chapter appeared to be a valuable starting point for the analysis of VOICE.
3 Adverbials in empirical works

To fully comprehend the current study of VOICE, it is worthwhile to have a closer look at adverbs and adverbials in general. So as to get a detailed overview of the principal grammatical phenomenon the current study is most concerned with, i.e. the additive adverbial, descriptive as well as prescriptive grammars were consulted.

Due to the fact that Biber et al. (1999) attempt to explain how the English language is used on a descriptive level in great detail, their work is treated as the main reference in this study. First of all, they state that “[a]dverbs are more heterogeneous than the other lexical word classes” (Biber et al. 1999: 65) and that the items belonging to this particular category are therefore able to differ considerably in terms of their form and their meaning. (ibid)

Prat Zagrebelsky (2009) points out that the position of adverbials in a clause is not exactly restricted to a particular place, but that their occurrence in phrases is rather flexible. According to their role and function in discourse they are able to occur in various positions, namely at the beginning, middle or end of a clause. (Prat Zagrebelsky 2009: 212)

While their close relatives, adjectives, are primarily used to modify nouns, adverbs are usually applied to serve other purposes. Thus their principal function lies in the modification of both (1) adjectives and (2) verbs, as well as (3) other adverbs and (4) whole sentences. (Biber et al. 1999: 544-549)

1. This is slightly larger than the calculated value. (op.cit: 544)
2. His book undoubtedly fills a need. (op.cit: 549)
3. Thank you very much for listening. (op.cit: 547)
4. Unfortunately he was not able to make it in time.

As Penston (2005) explains in simple and straightforward terms:

An adverb is a word giving us information about how, where, when or to what degree something is done, e.g. do it quickly, go out/home, completely destroyed. (Penston 2005: 51)

With regard to morphology, it can be said that adverbs are either created by adding the suffix –ly to adjectives (e.g. slow, slowly) or that they do not possess
any recognisable endings according to the above paradigm (e.g. too). In addition, they can occur in a simple form (e.g. often), may be found as a compound form (e.g. anymore) or can be composed of fixed phrases (e.g. no longer). (Prat Zagrebelsky 2009: 212)

One important distinction is the one between adverbs and adverbials. Chalker and Weiner (1994) put it succinctly by stating that an adverb is “a word that usually modifies or qualifies a verb (e.g. spoke quietly), an adjective (e.g. really awful) or another adverb (e.g. very quietly)” [emphasis added] (Chalker & Weiner 1994: 13) whereas an adverbial is “[a]ny word, phrase, or clause used like an adverb (including the simple adverb alone)” [emphasis added] (op.cit: 14). While all adverbs simultaneously belong to the category of adverbials, this does not apply vice versa. Therefore, the current study uses the term *adverbial* as a kind of more general and superordinate term (including the meaning of the adverb alone) and only specifically chooses the term *adverb* when a single word performing an adverbial function, e.g. too, is referred to.

Furthermore, Biber et al. (1999) emphasise the fact that similar to other word classes, such as verbs or adjectives, the meaning of certain adverbs is frequently context-dependent. In light of this Biber et al. (1999) define seven main categories of adverbs, namely *adverbs of place*, *adverbs of time*, *adverbs of manner*, *adverbs of degree*, *adverbs of stance*, *linking adverbs* and finally *additive adverbs*, as well as their close relatives the *restrictive adverbs*. (Biber et al. 1999: 552)

Taking into account Prat Zagrebelsky’s (2009) belief that the work of Biber et al. (1999) is valuable for a corpus-based analysis of adverb positioning, one has to consider their detailed and properly thought-out categorisation as a starting point for any corpus analysis that is concerned with adverbials. Due to the fact that this particular grammar was based on a corpus and data-based approach, which takes conversation and news as well as written findings into account, it is definitely worth consideration. (Prat Zagrebelsky 2009: 212) The classification carried out by Biber et al. (1999) is presented in the following.
3.1 Adverbs of place

The adverbs belonging to the first category by Biber et al. (1999) are not only able to express a certain (5) position, but are also often used to indicate a specific (6) direction or (7) distance. (Biber et al. 1999: 552)

5. He loves it there. (ibid)
6. It hopped backward among its companions. (ibid)
7. Don’t worry, he can’t have gone far. (ibid)

3.2 Adverbs of time

According to Biber et al. (1999), this category specifies time with regard to (8) position, (9) frequency, (10) duration and (11) relationship to a point in time. (Biber et al. 1999: 552-553)

8. They looked intently at him, then at each other, then executed a smart about-face. (op.cit: 553)
9. She always eats the onion. (ibid)
10. She will remain a happy memory with us always. (ibid)
11. When they took the old one out it was already in seven separate pieces! (ibid)

3.3 Adverbs of manner

The adverbs belonging to this category give information about how something is done. Most of these adverbs of manner are derived from adjectives by (12) simply adding the suffix -ly and hence adopt the meaning of the respective adjective. Some of them, however, are not formed through the suffixation of -ly and distinguish themselves through (13) their own orthographical form. (Biber et al. 1999: 553)

12. Automatically she backed away. (ibid)
13. Recorded interviews and reports of observations were transcribed verbatim and checked for accuracy before analysis. (ibid)
3.4 Adverbs of degree

According to Biber et al. (1999), the adverbs that are to be found in this category, namely the “[a]dverbs of degree [,] describe the extent to which a characteristic holds” (Biber et al. 1999: 554) by (14) somehow expressing that their degree deviates from the usual meaning. This special type of adverb is divided furthermore into two subcategories; Biber et al. (1999) distinguish between *intensifiers* which are said to (15) increase the intensity of a clause and *diminuishers* which are (16) able to cause the exact opposite. (op.cit: 554-556)

14. Fluids were withheld *completely* for 4 hours prior to surgery. (op.cit: 554)
15. Our dentist was *very* good. (ibid)
16. Consequently, Marx often uses the term Klasse in a *somewhat* cavalier fashion. (op.cit: 555)

3.5 Adverbs of stance

The adverbs belonging to this class can be used as epistemic stance adverbs to express (17) certainty or doubt, (18) the reality and actuality or (19) the limitations of something. In addition, they are asserted to be able (20) to convey imprecision (hedges) and are frequently used to express (21) a certain attitude or (22) a particular style as regards the speaker or writer of the respective piece of discourse. (Biber et al. 1999: 557-558)

17. No it’s alright I’ll *probably* manage with it. (op.cit: 557)
18. *Actually* I’m not very fussy at all. (ibid)
19. Our losses were *mainly* due to promotional activity from our rivals. (ibid)
20. It was *kind of* strange. (ibid)
21. *Unfortunately*, I have lost it.
22. *Quite simply*, life cannot be the same. (op.cit: 558)
3.6 Linking adverbs

Linking adverbs are used most commonly to render a given piece of discourse more cohesive and more comprehensible. Hence Biber et al. (1999) state that their principal function does not only consist of (23) enumerating or adding something to something else and (24) summing up information, but also (25) making appositions and (26) presenting different results or inference. Moreover, they mention some of their additional functions, including those that serve the purpose of expressing (27) contrast and concession as well as (28) transition. (Biber et al. 1999: 558-559)

23. First, management must systematically investigate and acquire knowledge and information. […] Secondly, […]. Additionally, […]. (op.cit: 558)
24. Overall, there are several major issues confronting us on the media front right now. (op.cit: 559)
25. It must be remembered that evaluation usually takes place while another, more primary, activity is going on – namely, that of the service program. (ibid)
26. She is quite old. Therefore, you should try to be kind to her.
27. The police would like another chance to talk to Michaels […]. Alternatively they want us to put certain questions to him. (ibid)
28. […] the constant prodding kept the clams lying low until the tide came back in. Incidentally, out of some 40 or 50 people on the beach that day, the only ones with clams carried small hand shovels. (ibid)

3.7 Additive and restrictive adverbs

According to Biber et al. (1999), restrictive adverbs, as well as their close relatives the additive adverbs, principally serve the purpose of placing a certain part of discourse at the centre of focus. The former (29) are said to be able to achieve their main objective by “restricting the truth value of the proposition either primarily or exclusively to that part”. (Biber et al. 1999: 556)

29. Only those who can afford the monthly payment of $1,210.05, plus $91.66 a month during probation, can be ordered to pay. (ibid)
However the latter, as their name suggests, serve the function of indicating that something has been added to a given item. Additive adverbs can occur both on a (30) clausal and on a (31) phrasal level. (ibid)

30. Oh, my dad was a great guy, too. (ibid)
31. I can hear the hatred, but also the need. (ibid)

Even though Biber et al. (1999) offer an excellent overview of additive adverbs, other grammars (prescriptive and descriptive) are worth consideration as well. The next section will therefore present a selection of several discussions of additive adverbials by other grammarians.

### 3.7.1 Various discussions concerning additive adverbials

#### 3.7.1.1 Prescriptive grammars

In his prescriptive grammar (1999), Ungerer is of the opinion that additive adverbials are those that signify either (32) an intensification of the respective item by simultaneously introducing additional information or (33) the provision of a basis for reformulation. Furthermore, in contrast to other grammarians, who only concede to place a small number of items in this class (usually also, as well and too), Ungerer (1999) includes additional adverbials that introduce both (34) a comparison as well as (35) a summary into the category of additive adverbials. (Ungerer 1999: 96)

32. The Australian climate itself attracts many tourists to the area. In addition, the Australians are a warm and hospitable people. (ibid)

33. There are many ways of exploring the wonders of the Middle East: for example, you can take a coach or a jeep or even a camel. In other words, the choice is yours. (ibid)

34. During the holiday season roads are overcrowded. Similarly, charter flights are also booked solid. (ibid)

35. All in all, India can offer you the experience of a lifetime. (ibid)

Penston, however, in his reference work for English language teachers (2005) appears to prefer to talk about the term degree adverbs, a group in which addi-
tive adverbials, although he calls them *maximizers or emphasers*, are said to be included. (Penston 2005: 51)

In addition, Méry and Ranger (2006) emphasise the fact that, as Quirk et al. had already suggested in 1985, the linguistic item *so* is also to be considered as belonging to the group of additive adverbials. Méry and Ranger (2006) thus base their argument on the one by Quirk et al. (1985) and underline that, seeing as there is no feeling of emphasis provided in (36) some cases where the word *so* is used, this adverb clearly serves the function of connecting items. Hence it is actually not to be regarded as a pro-form but as expressing a somewhat equivalent semantic meaning to *too* or *also*. (Quirk et al. 1985: 882; Méry & Ranger 2006: 18)

36. Plants and animals do immigrate, and *so* do humans. (Méry & Ranger 2006: 18)

### 3.7.1.2 Descriptive grammars

Similar to the explanations provided by Biber et al. (1999), Cowan’s descriptive reference guide for teachers of English (2008) also defines additive adverbials as a category which indicates that “something additional was done or something was added to something else” (Cowan 2008: 250) and ascertains the adverbials *also, as well, even* and *too* as being additive. (ibid)

In contrast to Biber et al. (1999) and Cowan (2008), who mainly talk about additive adverbials as being opposed to restrictive adverbs, Quirk et al. (1985) appear to favour the definition of *focusing subjuncts*. Nevertheless, they also make an obvious distinction between additives and restrictives. With regard to the former category they state that “additive subjuncts indicate that the utterance concerned is additionally true in respect of the part focused” (Quirk et al. 1985: 604). According to them, this function can only be realised by a limited number of items, most of which are said to be adverbs. Correspondingly, they include a restricted number of items in the category of the additive adverbial: “*again, also, either, equally, even, further, likewise, neither, nor, similarly, too, as well, [and] in addition*” (ibid). (ibid)
As Fjelkestam-Nilsson pointed out in 1983, one of the most important examinations of adverbial positions had already been carried out in 1964 by a scholar named Sven Jacobson, whose work, *Adverbial positions in English*, can still be regarded as crucial and influential in this specific field of English grammar. While Jacobson’s investigation (1964) takes British English material exclusively into account and offers a detailed discussion of many additive adverbials which includes both their meanings as well as their positions in pieces of discourse, Fjelkestam-Nilsson (1983) provides the American counterparts as well, using the former’s work as a starting point for her own investigation of spoken and written American and British English corpus data. (Fjelkestam-Nilsson 1983: 3-4; Jacobson 1964)

Another major contribution to this specific class of adverbs can be found in Quirk and Greenbaum’s *University Grammar of English* (1973). In this work they argue that all adverbials should be divided into three different categories—“adjuncts, disjuncts [and] conjuncts” (Quirk & Greenbaum 1973: 207). The adverbials belonging to the former class are usually found to be somehow integrated into the respective clause; the latter two categories on the other hand imply that the adverbials are not at all incorporated but are, rather, peripheral to the clause. According to Quirk and Greenbaum (1973), conjuncts and disjuncts are therefore to be distinguished from one other due to the fact that conjuncts, as their name clearly suggests, serve the function of connecting elements, whereas disjuncts do not usually fulfil this particular purpose. In addition, it is in fact also possible for some of the items to belong to two classes simultaneously, for example, to be part of the (37) adjunct as well as the (38) disjunct category. (op.cit: 207-208)

37. They aren’t walking *naturally* (‘in a natural manner’) (op.cit: 208)

38. *Naturally*, they are walking (‘of course’) (ibid)

In Quirk and Greenbaum (1973) the subcategory of the adjunct is then subdivided into a further eight categories, one of which being labelled as the focusing adjuncts. Additive adverbs (for instance *also* and *too*) are, according to Quirk and Greenbaum (1973), to be found in this specific category. As is the case with the restrictives of Biber et al. (1999), who talk of *focusing subjuncts* subdivided into additives and restrictives, Quirk and Greenbaum (1973) make a
clear distinction between the terms *limiters* and *additives*. In addition to those items belonging to the second group which are used to express that something is added to something else, Quirk and Greenbaum (1973) mention the additive adjuncts “*also, either, even, neither, nor, too, as well as, in addition*” (Quirk & Greenbaum 1973: 211). Furthermore they argue that focusing adjuncts cannot usually be the subject of any modification. It would, for example, be incorrect to say “*extremely also*” (op.cit: 212). Moreover, it is impossible to coordinate most of these adjuncts, for instance the usage of “*equally and likewise*” (ibid) would not be considered as being part of a sophisticated standard language usage. (op.cit: 210-212)

In most other grammatical works that treat the topic of Modern English (such as Christophersen and Sandved’s *An advanced English grammar* 1969) adverbials, and especially additive adverbials, are somewhat neglected. However, some grammarians attempt to explain the correct positions which a selected range of additive adverbials might obtain in the context of a variety of different clauses. (Fjelkestam-Nilsson 1983: 6)

### 3.7.2 Additive adverbials and their conventional position

Considering the hypothesis that ELF speakers are likely to use additive adverbials in a different manner to native speakers of the language, the suggested guidelines (prescriptive and descriptive) for their correct positioning are worth consideration.

#### 3.7.2.1 Prescriptive grammars

Swan (2005) argues that even though there is no considerable difference in meaning between the items *also, as well* and *too*, these adverbials are not to be used interchangeably as regards their position in a clause. According to him (39) *also* is usually to be inserted immediately with the verb into the middle of a clause, while (40) *as well* and (41) *too* always need to be placed at the end of it. In addition, *as well* is claimed to be used with less frequency in American varie-
ties of the English language in his work. While Swan (2005) concedes that it is occasionally possible to (42) use also in an initial position of a clause to emphasise new information, as well and too are, according to him, never and under no conceivable circumstances to be placed at the beginning of a clause. (Swan 2005: 37)

39. She not only sings; she also plays the piano. (ibid)
40. She not only sings; she plays the piano as well. (ibid)
41. She not only sings; she plays the piano too. (ibid)
42. It’s a nice house, but it’s very small. Also, it needs a lot of repairs. (ibid)

Furthermore, (43) as well and (44) too are said to be favoured in imperative forms as well as in short answers, whereas their close relative (45) also would sound unnatural in these instances. Moreover, Swan (2005) is of the opinion that one can also place the additive adverb (46) too directly after the subject in a very formal style. (ibid)

43. Give me some bread as well, please. (ibid)
44. I’ve got a headache. ~ I have too. (ibid)
45. I’ve got a headache. ~ *I also have. (ibid)
46. I, too, have experienced despair. (ibid)

Penston (2005), however, basing his work on the information provided by the Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary, argues that as well and too are to be regarded as being more informal than also, which usually needs to be placed “before the main verb or after be” (Penston 2005: 54). Moreover, he asserts that British native speakers would not normally tend to use also at the end of a sentence. (ibid)

Following Swan’s (2005) idea of the additive adverb too as generally being used in imperatives and short answers, Penston (2005) claims that this item is generally preferred in spoken English and in informal situations where it is also to be found in clause final positions. Moreover, he argues that as well is used in rather the same way as too but that the former is thought to sound somewhat “formal or old-fashioned” (ibid) in American English variables. (ibid)
Given the fact that, as has been mentioned before, not even grammarians appear to be completely certain of when to use which additive adverbials and often question where to place these adverbials in different clauses, it is worthwhile to engage in a closer examination of the matter from a more descriptive point of view rather than relying on exclusively prescriptive suggestions.

### 3.7.2.2 Descriptive grammars

To this end Prat Zagrebelsky (2009) carried out a brief but nevertheless interesting investigation of the International Corpus of Learner English (ICLE) to find out where the difficulties for Italian native speaker learners of English as a second or as a foreign language could have their roots. Due to the fact that her analysis exclusively focuses on the Italian sub-category of the corpus (ICLE), this result is naturally not representative of all learners or users of English as a second or foreign language. Nevertheless, this small yet significant investigation proves that the complexity of additive adverbials might often be underestimated and therefore is prone to lead to problems and insecurities on the part of non-native speakers of the English language. Thus, there is an apparent need for a great number of more practically orientated studies. With respect to additive adverbials, Prat Zagrebelsky (2009) found that learners particularly appear to face problems with regard to the correct positioning of the additive adverb *also*. This, in fact, proved to be (47) rather problematic in the majority of all cases. (In this instance eight out of thirteen cases.) (Prat Zagrebelsky 2009: 202; 217-218)

47. not every crime should be attributed to guns because [...] *also* human mind and behaviour are responsible (op.cit: 218)

Biber et al. (1999), who also present a brief corpus-based overview of the additive adverbs *too* and *also*, show that there are indeed considerable differences in usage in two of the most significant varieties of English, namely between British English and American English. According to them, the use of *also* is not very prominent in British English conversations, while it occurs far more frequently in oral communication in American English. Yet no such difference could be located with regard to the additive adverb *too*. (Biber et al. 1999: 561-562)
Similarly to both Penston’s (2005) and Swan’s (2005) points of view, Quirk and Greenbaum (1973) approach the matter of adverbial positioning by explaining that the additives “again, also, equally, similarly [and] in addition” (Quirk & Greenbaum 1973: 213) are usually expected to “precede a focused part in the predicate but follow a focused subject” (ibid), whereas too and as well are normally required to stand after the respective focused part. Hence, they determine that the appropriate positioning of additive adverbials (before or after) depends on the particular part these adverbials refer to. (op.cit: 213-214)

Leech and Svartvik (1975) discuss that, as in Swan’s (2005) argument, the additive adverb also, generally speaking, appears to show preferential placement in the middle of a clause. In addition, as well and too, which together with also are certainly more common in informal style, are to be put at the end of a clause. Their somewhat more formal relative in addition however, is usually predominantly to be found at the beginning of a clause. (Leech & Svartvik 1975: 121)

Huddleston and Pullum (2002), on the other hand, specifically claim that the adverb also is indeed acceptable in final positions; nevertheless, they appear to be the only ones to argue in favour of this adverb at the end of a clause. (Huddleston & Pullum 2002: 593)

Supporting Swan’s (2005) argument and asserting that as well and too are required to appear at the end of a clause at all times, Quirk et al. (1985) state that these adverbials normally need to stand immediately after the focused part and should never be placed in the middle of a clause. However, they also concede that there are some rare exceptions to the prescriptive rule. First of all, Quirk et al. (1985) claim that both (48) too and (49) as well are “[i]n rather ‘prepared’ usage” (Quirk et al. 1985: 609) occasionally able to stand in front of the focused part. Furthermore, it might also be possible to place the two adverbials (50) too and (51) in addition at the end of a clause for they focus on the subject itself. According to Quirk et al. (1985), the latter is usually only acceptable in informal speech. (ibid)

48. She has invited too some of her own family. (ibid)
49. She has invited as well some of her own family. (ibid)
50. John has seen it too. (ibid)
51. ... John has seen it in addition. (ibid)

Referring to Scheurweghs (1959), Fjelkestam-Nilsson (1983) notes his attempts to briefly describe the most crucial positions of also and too. In his view, the former usually occupies the (52) same position as all adverbs of indefinite time are supposed to do. Furthermore, Scheurweghs (1959) argues similarly to Quirk and Greenbaum’s (1973) statement by explaining that the additive adverb too is normally supposed to be placed after the very item it qualifies (53). Nevertheless, he also argues that whenever (54) this adverb qualifies the verb of a clause it needs to stand directly after the aforementioned verb. (Fjelkestam-Nilsson 1983: 6; Scheurweghs 1959: 40)

52. Two millennia ago primitive men also found sanctuary on islands. (Scheurweghs 1959: 40)

53. I want to forget the number because it is Henry’s number too. (ibid)

54. He says, too, that these bombs will do their work by heat and fire alone. (ibid)

### 3.7.3 Summary

**Also**

Whereas the additive adverb also is claimed to be part of a formal register in Swan’s (2005) prescriptive grammar and therefore more often to be found in written language, the descriptive work of Leech and Svartvik (1975) states the exact opposite to be true by saying that also is more common in informal style. Hence, prescriptive and descriptive opinions clearly do not concur in this respect.

As far as the positioning of the additive adverbial also is concerned, prescriptive as well as descriptive grammarians appear to agree that it needs to be placed with the respective verb in the middle of a clause and stand either before the main verb or after the verb be. Yet, some grammarians, i.e. Swan (2005 prescriptive) and Huddleston and Pullum (2002 descriptive) concede rare occasions in which these guidelines might be violated. Swan (2005) by suggesting that it is occasionally possible to use also in clause initial position and Hudder-
ston and Pullum (2002) by stating that it might also be acceptable in final positions. Yet, both suggestions are not supported by the other grammarians and will therefore not be considered in the current study. The adverb also will be considered to be applied conventionally in native speaker usage norm whenever the following two principles can be detected throughout the data analysis:

× According to Standard English native speaker usage, also needs to be placed before the main verb or after the verb be.
× Usually, also should be placed with the respective verb in the middle of a clause.

Too

While prescriptive and descriptive opinions do not concur as far as the adverb also is concerned, all grammarians (prescriptive and descriptive) agree on the fact that the item too is part of a more informal register and therefore should be found more often in spoken language.

As far as the positioning of the additive adverbial too is concerned, prescriptive as well as descriptive grammarians appear to agree that it needs to be placed directly after the respective part it focuses on and stand at the end of a clause. However, Quirk et al. (1985 descriptive) concede that the adverb too is occasionally able to stand in front of the part it focuses on. Nevertheless, this argumentation is denied by all of the other grammarians (prescriptive as well as descriptive). Thus, this suggestion will not be considered in the study at hand but the adverb too will be seen to be applied conventionally whenever the following principle can be detected throughout the data analysis:

× The adverb too needs to be placed at the end of a clause and after the respective focused part.
**As well**

As with the adverb *too*, all grammarians (prescriptive and descriptive) agree on the fact that the adverbial *as well* is part of a more informal register and therefore should be found more often in spoken discourse.

As regards the positioning of the item *as well*, prescriptive and descriptive grammarians state that it needs to be placed directly after the respective part it focuses on and stand at the end of the clause. However, again Quirk et al. (1985 descriptive) argue that the adverbial *as well* is occasionally able to stand in front of the part it focuses on. Nevertheless, this argumentation is once again denied by all of the other grammars (prescriptive as well as descriptive). Thus, this proposition will not be considered in this study but the item *as well* will be seen to be applied canonically in native speaker usage norm whenever the following criteria apply:

- *As well* needs to be found at the end of a clause.
- It is generally required to be placed after the respective part it focuses on.

**In addition**

As far as the adverbial *in addition* is concerned, all grammars (prescriptive and descriptive) agree on the fact that it is part of a more formal register and therefore should be found more often in written language.

As regards the positioning of this adverbial, prescriptive as well as descriptive grammarians state that it needs to be placed at the beginning of a clause. Nevertheless, Quirk et al. (1985 descriptive) argue that the adverbial *in addition* is sometimes able to stand at the end of a clause. Yet, as usual this argumentation is not supported by any of the other grammarians (prescriptive as well as descriptive) and will therefore not be considered in this study. The item *in addition* will be seen to be applied canonically in native speaker usage norm when the following principle applies.

- *In addition* needs to be placed at the beginning of a clause.
In concluding this chapter one can easily detect that even though there is a considerable amount of empirical material concerning this interesting matter, the topic still appears to be rather insufficiently explored. As expected, grammarians are still not able to formulate appropriate and easily comprehensible rules concerning the application and positioning of additive adverbials because the whole matter does not appear to be as straightforward as it might seem on first glance. In fact, there is still a need for them to enter into a comprehensible agreement about which items should be treated as additive adverbials and which should be excluded from this grammatical category altogether.

There is certainly considerable variation in the definition of this specific grammatical class because, as has been proven throughout this chapter, various scholars include different items in it and for various reasons. All in all, they determine that the items too, also, as well (as), even, in addition, for example, in other words, similarly, all in all, again, either, equally, further, likewise, neither, nor, so and naturally are to be considered as belonging to the category of the additive adverbial.

Due to the nature of this paper, it will not be possible to treat all of them in great and sufficient detail, yet given that most experts agree on the inclusion of four particular items, namely too, also, as well and in addition, these four adverbials will be treated as the main foci for the current investigation. However, a certain number of the others will be briefly referred to as well.
4 Corpus analysis

As has already been mentioned, this study is based on computer-processed corpora. Therefore it is necessary to provide a clear definition of the linguistic concept of corpus as well as some basic information about the origin of the data collection for the current investigation.

4.1 Definition

Defining the term corpus is not as straightforward a matter as it might initially appear. Svartvik (1991) differentiates the concept from that of text banks or its synonym text archives. He thus argues that while text banks or text archives consist of

[a]n open set of texts in machine-readable form, to which new texts can be added continuously, [emphasis added] (Svartvik 1991: 167)

a corpus is said to be

[a] closed set of texts in machine-readable form established for general or specific purposes by previously defined criteria. [emphasis added] (ibid)

Baker, Hardie and McEnery (2006), on the other hand, state that

a corpus is a collection of texts (a ‘body’ of language) stored in an electronic database. Corpora are usually large bodies of machine-readable text containing thousands or millions of words. [...] Individual texts within a corpus usually receive some form of meta-encoding in a header, giving information about their genre, the author, date and place of publication etc. (Baker, Hardie & McEnery 2006: 48-49)

Kennedy (1998) puts it succinctly:

In the language sciences a corpus is a body of written text or transcribed speech which can serve as a basis for linguistic analysis and description. (Kennedy 1998: 1)
4.2 Information about the corpora consulted

The different corpora this study is linked to in various ways are the Vienna Oxford International Corpus of English (main point of reference: henceforth also referred to as VOICE) and the three corpora examined by Fjelkestam-Nilsson (1983): a corpus of English conversation (the London-Lund Corpus, henceforth also referred to as LLC), the American Brown University Corpus (BUC) and the Lancaster-Oslo/Bergen Corpus (LOB) which consists of British material and is compiled according to the principles of BUC, which serves as the American model. The first corpus, VOICE, is the most up-to-date study of English as a lingua franca and investigates the use of additive adverbials in this context. However it is also important to provide some key information about LLC, BUC and LOB, as these three corpora serve as the basis for Fjelkestam-Nilsson’s analysis (1983) which proved to be the most important source for comparison for the current study. (Fjelkestam-Nilsson 1983: 9-10)

Yet, it needs to be pointed out here that due to the very nature of this study that focuses on spoken language, LLC is naturally to be considered as the most important corpus for comparison. Nevertheless, Fjelkestam-Nilsson’s results (1983) from BUC and LOB are used to briefly relate to the spoken results as well.

4.2.1 VOICE

The Vienna Oxford International Corpus of English consists of approximately one million words and is based on recorded and professionally transcribed conversations of the English language used as a lingua franca. Its documents are, according to the creators of VOICE, all classified as “naturally occurring, non-scripted face-to-face interactions” (Voice Project 2009: http://www.univie.ac.at/voice/page/corpus_description, 1.3.2011) and comprise a total of around 120 hours of recorded oral material. (ibid)

In addition, some selected recordings of speech are also available on the VOICE website in the form of audio files. The corpus, compiled at the University of Vienna’s department of English studies, is widely considered to be the first
computer-readable corpus consisting of spoken English in *lingua franca* interactions (although native speakers of English are not completely excluded from VOICE). (Voice Project 2009: http://www.univie.ac.at/voice/page/what_is_voice, 1.3. 2011; Voice Project 2009: http://www.univie.ac.at/voice/page/corpus_description, 1.3.2011)

The data of the corpus is comprised of numerous recordings originating from about 1250 fairly experienced users of English as a *lingua franca*. These speakers of the English language have various linguistic backgrounds and as such, VOICE consists of a considerable number of subjects with a total of around 50 different mother tongues. (This includes a number of speakers who use English as their first language, a proportion that numbers less than 10 per cent of the entire scope of the data recorded by VOICE.) Another important aspect which needs to be mentioned at this point lies in the fact that a considerable number (that is to say the large majority) of the speakers represented in this corpus come from a European language background. This does not mean that VOICE does not comprise interactions and conversations from other parts of the world as well, although there is a significant difference as far as numbers are concerned. Moreover, it is worthwhile mentioning that the corpus aims to provide a decent range of speech events with regard to various domains, functions, speech event types, participant roles and relationships. (VOICE Project 2009: http://www.univie.ac.at/voice/page/corpus_description, 1.3.2011; VOICE Project 2009: http://www.univie.ac.at/voice/page/faq, 1.3.2011)

### 4.2.2 BUC

As elucidated in both the Fjelkestam-Nilsson study (1983) and BUC corpus manual (1979), the standard corpus of present-day American English was assembled at the American Brown University in 1961 and consists of edited English prose texts produced by native speakers of American English. Indeed all of these texts were printed in the United States of America in 1961. As is the case with VOICE, this corpus counts about one million words in total. All of these words are contained in 500 samples, each consisting of approximately 2000 words. Most samples comprise one continuous passage from one source. The samples, which had all been selected at random, were then divided into 15
categories and therefore, represent various different varieties and styles of prose. Notably the authors intentionally decided against the inclusion of the genre of drama in the corpus, as this style was considered to share far more features with spoken discourse than with the real, authentic written speech the corpus actually aimed for. The genre of fiction, however, was partially included, although samples which contained large passages of dialogue were excluded on the same grounds as drama. (Fjelkestam-Nilsson 1983: 9; Francis & Kucera 1979)

4.2.3 LOB
As Fjelkestam-Nilsson (1983) points out, the size of BUC and LOB, which are similar in size to VOICE and comprise about one million words in total, and the year of publication of the texts they provide are identical. As such, LOB also offers 500 written texts that consist of approximately 2000 words each, with the principles of sampling taken from its American predecessor, BUC. (Fjelkestam-Nilsson 1983: 10-11; Johansson, Leech & Goodluck 1978)

Even though the two corpora, BUC and LOB, aimed to be completely equivalent to enable and facilitate the comparison of their results, Fjelkestam-Nilsson (1983) detects some minor differences in their text selections and in the composition of different categories. However, as the similarities far outweigh the differences, the study and comparison of the two corpora still appears to be valid and sensible, a conviction that is also voiced by the authors of the manual (1978). (Fjelkestam-Nilsson 1983: 10-11; Johansson, Leech & Goodluck 1978)

4.2.4 A corpus of English conversation – LLC
To be able to further compare her findings of written American and British prose texts to the authentic usage of spoken English as a first language, Fjelkestam-Nilsson (1983) included a corpus of spoken native speaker English, namely the London-Lund corpus. Due to its very nature, the results of this corpus of English conversation will prove to be valuable with regard to the current study of spoken interaction as well. While only 34 texts of spontaneous conversation were pub-
lished in the print version by Svartvik and Quirk in 1980, the whole corpus offers precisely 87 transcribed interactions, each of which accounts for approximately 5000 words. Even though the sizes of LLC and VOICE are not identical, this spoken native speaker corpus is naturally the most important source for comparison for the current study of spoken ELF. (Fjelkestam-Nilsson 1983: 11; Svartvik & Quirk 1980)
5 Methods

To be able to abstract the appropriate and sufficient material required to carry out the respective analysis of VOICE (research questions: How frequent are additive adverbials in VOICE in comparison to native speaker results? Does their usage differ from native speaker usage? In what way does the frequency of *also* and *too* correlate with the speaker’s sex?), a set of suitable and convenient search criteria had to be defined in the first instance. After extensive and detailed consideration and after having carried out an efficient trial phase of different possibilities offered by VOICE to extract the data needed, none appeared to be suitable to fulfil the conditions of the purpose.

Considering the size of VOICE, it was therefore finally decided to select all the instances of the additive adverbials in question, for example the adverb *also* was keyed into VOICE and all of its 2976 instances appeared. The overall number of outcomes from the corpus of spoken English as a *lingua franca* was still acceptable and fell within the limitations of this study. Therefore, a predominantly manual mode of analysis was justified and favoured in the present case. This approach seemed to be more efficient to retrieve every single conversation in which the expected results might be included than an entirely automated search which, as regards the current study, did not prove to be at all manageable.

First of all, the VOICE program located all instances of additive adverbial usage in question; initially only *also*, *too*, *as well* and *in addition* were investigated, which resulted in a total of 4519 occurrences that were found in a total of 3870 utterances.

This particular procedure of course meant that the output of VOICE included numerous instances in which the presence of the additive adverbials in question did not entirely correlate with the expected occurrences. As a result these inoperative outcomes had to be extracted manually, i.e. the occurrences of the adverbials that were found to be part of German utterances were excluded (55). In addition to this, the remaining utterances which proved to be useful and relevant for this specific study, had to be searched and analysed individually.
55. naja aber zum samplen also die idee gefaellt mir sehr gut i really like this idea (VOICE 2009: PBmtg462:2031)

Given that VOICE is a corpus of spoken English as a lingua franca, it also accords with the principles of spoken language in general. Hence, the data provided by this corpus is usually not given in sentence form as would be expected of a corpus of written language. Instead, the VOICE data is in general provided in the form of utterances (see (56)). The utterances were transcribed in the order of their natural occurrences in the conversation.

56. and i think russia as well er after they (VOICE 2009: EDcon521:1354)

Considering this it was often not possible to analyse the additive adverbial in question by pure investigation of the utterance in which it was found. It was therefore often a matter of great importance to take the co-text into consideration and so a longer excerpt of the conversation with the respective utterance was analysed. In addition, it is in the nature of spoken interaction that people interrupt one other, begin a sentence but do not complete it, or use fillers, such as *erm*. All of these characteristics of spoken language were included by the creators of VOICE.

Furthermore, it needs to be highlighted that in the case of simple repetitions, for example (57), only one, namely the first of all occurrences, was usually counted. Whenever it was rather obvious (considering the co-text of the utterance) that the speaker did not desire to express an additional thought but merely repeated the same adverbial, the utterance was classified as a simple repetition (57). Even though all of the occurrences of a word (e.g. all instances of the word *also*) convey important features of spoken language they were excluded to avoid any possible distortion of the overall outcomes. However, if there were several occurrences of additive adverbials in longer utterances which did not constitute a form of simple repetition (because they appeared to express an additional meaning), all occurrences were counted as can be seen in the example below (58).

57. and *also* and *also* now there is er another trend here in malta perhaps i think it’s even in other countries that our second language was english now (VOICE 2009: EDint328:572)

58. and *too* we’re not *too* proud of ourselves something like that *erm* the international reputation this that must have been before
According to these working criteria, one needs to be aware that occasionally more than one additive adverbial was retrieved from a single utterance provided by one speaker of ELF. Therefore one needs to be careful with generalisations.

After the retrieval of those additive adverbials that the study is most concerned with (also, too, as well and in addition) some other adverbials of the same group were investigated according to the same principles. These six additive adverbials were additionally selected because they had been investigated by the previous study on additives by Fjelkestam-Nilsson (1983) and are also frequently placed in this category by English grammars (cf. Chapter 3). The VOICE program was then employed once again to find all instances of again, likewise, equally, similarly, moreover and furthermore, which eventually resulted in a total of 689 occurrences in an overall total of 614 utterances.

After this stringent process of selection, the overall number of occurrences of the additive adverbials relevant to this study (i.e. the ten adverbials mentioned above: also, too, as well, in addition, again, likewise, equally, similarly, moreover and furthermore) comes to a total of 5208 occurrences distributed across 4484 individual utterances of ELF.

At this point it is also important to mention that although the corpus has mainly been analysed in the voice-style which offers useful additional information as far as the individual utterances and conversations are concerned, the examples taken from VOICE are always given in plain-style to facilitate the readers’ comprehension of the texts.
6 Results

6.1 The adverbial also

6.1.1 Also according to grammarians

While also is said to be part of a formal register in prescriptive grammars, descriptive grammarians state the exact opposite to be true. Thus, prescriptive and descriptive opinions do not concur in this respect.

Both prescriptive and descriptive grammars state that also needs to be placed with the respective verb in the middle of a clause and stand either before the main verb or after the verb be.

6.1.2 Also in native speaker corpora

Fjelkestam-Nilsson’s data shows that also is more common in written than in spoken native speaker language. The adverb also is used most frequently to express addition in both written corpora. The data of BUC and LOB indicate that also and too are far more common than the other adverbials, i.e. as well, in addition, again, likewise, equally, similarly, moreover and furthermore.

6.1.3 Also in spoken ELF

6.1.3.1 Results from VOICE

Having carried out the actual investigation of the four items this study is most concerned with (also, too, as well and in addition) it can be seen that the adverb also is far more frequently used by lingua franca speakers of English than its three counterparts. Due to the fact that spoken language is frequently considered as less formal than written language (even though VOICE comprises transcripts from professional and therefore probably more formal conversations as well as informal leisure conversations), ELF speaker usage of also in VOICE deviates from the prescriptive Standard English norm. After all, certain prescrip-
tive grammarians, such as Swan (2005), argue that this adverb is most commonly used in formal language situations. However, as can be seen in Chapter 3, descriptive grammarians, such as Penston (2005), concede that *also* is part of a more informal style. Therefore, the results from VOICE simply appear to reflect the authentic language use that does not always follow prescriptive norms. The distribution of all the occurrences of the four adverbials in the English as a lingua franca corpus is given below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adverbial</th>
<th>Occurrences</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Also</td>
<td>2976</td>
<td>57.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>14.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As well</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>14.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In addition</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>13.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>5208</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indeed a quick glance at the statistics shows that *also* is not only far more common than the other adverbials in question, it accounts for more than half of all occurrences - 2976 out of 5208 occurrences or about 57 per cent, in the corpus of the lingua franca users of English.

According to expectations it was not possible to include all 2976 occurrences of *also* in the actual investigation. To avoid running the risk of distorting the data provided by VOICE all 2976 occurrences of the adverb *also* were analysed thoroughly. In the course of this primary investigation, a considerable number of items had to be excluded due to various reasons.

First of all, due to the fact that this study is primarily concerned with spoken English as a lingua franca material, many of the occurrences of the adverb proved to be little more than repetition, i.e. expressing one single idea and no additionally discernible thought (59) and therefore were excluded. After all, the current investigation is concerned with the usage of additive adverbials and does not aim to analyse the phenomenon of repetition in spoken language.
Secondly, a great number of utterances which contained the adverbials had to be regarded as being too unclear and unspecific to draw meaningful conclusions about the ELF usage of adverbials in VOICE. Therefore, in all those instances where it was impossible to be certain about the intended meaning of the additive adverb also, the piece of data was excluded to avoid potential distortion. The number of instances that proved to be irrelevant for this particular study can be seen in Table two.

59. [...] er an astronaut or someone or erm hh erm hh someone erm in er hh in sport or so you can also also call these person crazy [...] (VOICE 2009: EDsed363:217)

Furthermore, one can frequently find the adverb also in utterances consisting of incomplete phrases. This phenomenon of incompleteness of pieces of discourse can naturally be put down to the fact that VOICE provides spoken and unscripted material. However, whenever one was confronted with an utterance of this kind, for example (60), the preceding and subsequent utterances were checked thoroughly, for participants of course interrupt each other in natural spoken interaction. Hence, in those instances where it was possible to reconstruct the utterance to detect the full usage of the adverb also, the occurrences were treated as though they had occurred in one single utterance.

The environment of the piece of discourse that can be seen in (60), was for instance, analysed in-depth and it was possible to detect its full meaning by adding the second part of the utterance given in (61), which was to be found a few lines below. Given that the two utterances match and that the placement of also is to be regarded as conventional standard usage of the English language, this and similar occurrences of also provided by VOICE, were labelled as belonging to the category of canonical and standard use of the adverb. Whenever it was still not possible to comprehend the meaning of the adverb also by the means of thorough investigation of the whole utterance it occurred in, the instance of also was disregarded and classified as unclear.

60. erm australians perceive themselves to be very charming but this charm can also hh (VOICE 2009: EDsed31:917)

61. be considered [...] (VOICE 2009: EDsed31:919)
Due to the fact that a considerable number of the speakers in VOICE have German as their mother tongue, *also* was frequently to be found in exclusively German utterances as well. After all, the item *also* is not only part of the English lexis but can also be found in the German language. The latter can be seen in example (62) where the German word *also* mainly needs to be considered as fulfilling the role of its English counterpart *thus*. Therefore any instances of the adverb in this sense are irrelevant to the analysis of English as a lingua franca.

62. naja aber zum samplen also die idee gefaellt mir sehr gut i really like this idea (VOICE 2009: PBmtg462:2031)

This phenomenon of using one’s mother tongue in English utterances might be put down to the fact that the speakers recorded in VOICE appeared, on occasion, to have minor difficulties in finding the right words to express themselves in a meaningful way. Furthermore some of these German native language expressions appear to be part of parallel German conversations between two or more native speakers of the language that were led at the same time as those in English. All of these occurrences of the adverb *also* had to be excluded as one could not be certain of its meaning.

Moreover one additional utterance provided by VOICE needed to be excluded as an irrelevant instance of the adverb because in that particular case the English adverb *also* was actually part of an utterance carried out by an Italian native speaker in the Italian language (63). This instance is part of the irrelevant occurrences, i.e. other languages.

63. A: casserole is that in english or not
   B: hm
   A: i've never heard of that before you said it
   B: no hm
   B: also pesce bu- l- er pesce in forno

Even though it has just been mentioned that in the end a considerable number of occurrences of the adverb *also* had to be regarded as irrelevant to the analysis of ELF, the remaining body of data was still considered more than sufficient to continue with the current study. The composition of the data distribution provided by the ELF corpus is given in Tables 2 and 3.
### Table 2: Relevant and irrelevant occurrences of the adverb *also* in the ELF corpus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occurrences</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevant occurrences</td>
<td>× Additive <em>also</em> &amp; copulative adverb</td>
<td>2761</td>
<td>92.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>× Filler/unclear</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>4.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrelevant occurrences</td>
<td>× Other languages</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>× Repetitions</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>2976</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen above, a total of 215 instances of the adverb *also* had to be excluded from this study, as their overall usefulness as far as this investigation is concerned was considered insignificant.

The remaining body of data (2761 instances of *also*) was then analysed more thoroughly in order to define the particular functions this adverb serves to express in VOICE, e.g. *also* as an additive adverb or as a copulative adverb. The latter, copulative adverb, also referred to as *coordinating or correlative construction* by grammarians means that “words, phrases, clauses or sentences of equal grammatical value” (Aitchison 1996: 61) are linked together by “a small closed class of function words” (ibid). The category of copulative adverbs includes the expression *not only… but also* (64).

64. The beggar remained *not only* calm *but also* cool when the pedestrian made a disparaging comment. (two adjectives) (Mulvey 2009: 86)

After the investigation of this adverbial, it needs to be pointed out that the lingua franca speakers in VOICE appeared to use the word *also* beyond its primary function as an adverb. The users of English recorded in this corpus also use the item in question as simple discourse markers, such as fillers, hedges or hesitation marks in conversation (65).

65. A: he’s he’s himself don’t know what to do any more
B: yeah
A: yeah and he’s he is er *also* er one nice sentence he had in there maybe […] (VOICE 2009: PBmtg27: 664-666)
Hidalgo, Querada and Santana (2007) refer to these three discourse markers or discourse particles (fillers, hedges and hesitation marks) with the umbrella term of *features and strategies of spoken conversation*. While, for instance, *you know, you see, sort of, kind of* and *uh sh* are often considered to serve important purposes in conversation, the adverb *also* appears to be used according to the same principles by the lingua franca speakers of English in VOICE. (Hidalgo, Querada & Santana 2007: 145) Aijmer (1996) in addition, summarises the function of discourse markers lucidly by stating that they “function as cues or guides to the hearer’s interpretation” (Aijmer 1996: 210) and are used as signposts by native speakers to facilitate comprehension. (Hidalgo, Querada & Santana 2007: 145; Aijmer 2002: 3)

In fact, as Table 2 illustrates, about five per cent of all occurrences of the adverb *also* in the ELF corpus can be classified as belonging to the category of discourse fillers due to the fact that their meaning was in no way transparent. Given the fact that the data provided by the corpus of spoken English that was used by Fjelkestam-Nilsson (1983), LLC, was not analysed as far as the usage of *also* as a discourse particle is concerned, it is not yet possible to compare and evaluate the respective data provided by VOICE to a native speaker equivalent. Therefore, one cannot be certain about the uniqueness of the usage of *also* as a discourse marker in ELF speech. This could also be a natural phenomenon in all sorts of spoken interaction (including native speaker language). Nevertheless, it should not be ignored that ELF users tend to use this adverbial to perform the function of discourse fillers.

To comprehend the processes involved in the analysis of the data, which will eventually lead to the uncovering of the most important outcomes, it is necessary to further elucidate the working procedure. During the analysis, all 2687 instances of the item *also* in VOICE – i.e. all of the utterances in which *also* is used as an additive adverb – were compared manually against the criteria that were set out in Chapter 3. Considering these criteria, the adverb *also* was considered to be applied conventionally in native speaker usage norm whenever the following two principles (which all grammarians - prescriptive and descriptive – agree on) could be detected unequivocally:
According to Standard English native speaker usage, *also* needs to be placed before the main verb or after the verb *be.*

Usually, *also* should be placed with the respective verb in the middle of a clause.

Whenever these two basic guidelines did not correspond with the occurrences of *also* in VOICE, that occurrence of the adverb was labelled as a representation of non-conventional usage of the English language, for lingua franca usage deviates from the standard native speaker norm as formulated by prescriptive and descriptive grammarians (cf. Chapter 3.7.2 and Chapter 3.7.3).

Yet, it needs to be emphasised at this point that the occurrences where additive *also* is used in a non-canonical way as regards native speaker English should not be regarded as incorrect usage. After all, the motivation for this investigation is of an entirely different nature as it aims to ascertain the ways in which VOICE speaker usage differs from native speaker usage with regard to the application of additive adverbials.

Furthermore, it needs to be pointed out that hesitation marks, e.g. *er* or *erm,* were disregarded because they were considered to be part of natural spoken interaction in English as a lingua franca; examples such as (66) were hence considered as canonical usage of the English language.

> 66. [...] to integrate this the people that we *er* that come to our country and *er* it’s it’s a hard question and we’re also *er* getting xx about whoever can come to sweden any more (VOICE 20009: EDcon521:1147)

The principles provided by grammarians did not always prove to be sufficient for an analysis of adverbial positioning either. Theories of adverbial positioning, which have already been presented in Chapter 3 of this study, do not, for instance, consider the fact that syntax, and hence the clause position of the adverb *also,* is subject to modification in the form of questions, for example (67).

Furthermore, grammars appear to simplify the whole matter by neglecting the frequent use of *also* in cases where another adverbial is involved and where the adverb *also* naturally does not stand directly in front of the main verb (as grammarians expect it to do), for instance (68), and by disregarding negation, as in (69). Nonetheless, these instances, which are of course acceptable in native speaker English, were considered as conventional usage of the language.
67. are you also er a student here p h d are you working together [?] (question mark added as this particular symbol is used to show rising intonation in VOICE and therefore does not indicate questions as such) (VOICE 2009: EDcon250:139)

68. […] have the space in the afternoons when we can also actually go more in depth […] (VOICE 2009: POwsd266:77)

69. the menu here the waiter is not being unpolite the waiter is also not being unfriendly the waiter is not somebody who hate americans (VOICE 2009: EDsed31:964)

Given the great empirical simplification, it was occasionally necessary to judge personally the conventionality of certain utterances with regard to the additive adverb also. Even though these somewhat subjective judgements were avoided to the greatest possible extent by occasionally labelling them as being unclear when a subjective decision did not seem feasible, there might be some occurrences of also which, according to grammarians, are not to be regarded as conventional usage of English. However, it appeared to be somewhat unjust to disregard these appropriate and conventionally applied utterances in conversation using English as a lingua franca. In addition, the extent of personal judgement bore no great influence in the process of data collection, and so the final outcomes are not distorted.

Due to the reasons that have been given above as well as the very nature of English as a lingua franca, the numerous instances in which the additive adverb also is used in a non-conventional or non-canonical way in comparison to native speaker English should not be regarded as incorrect or inappropriate usage. After all, the exact purpose of the current study is not to detect perceived errors committed by ELF speakers of the language.
6.1.3.2 Meanings of also

Whilst Fjelkestam-Nilsson (1983) detects three different meanings in her investigation of the corpus-based analysis of the adverb also, only two of these classifications were taken into account in the current study. Due to the fact that the present investigation is concerned with spoken language material, it was impossible to define all those utterances in which also is used to express the meaning of the items moreover or furthermore because, in this sense, also is usually used at the beginning of a sentence and followed by a comma. It would naturally have been promising to include this particular usage of the adverb in a written corpus of English as a lingua franca. However, considering the very nature of spoken language as far as the utterances consisting of inconsistent phrases and the variability of its sentences are concerned, this study does not make any distinction between the meanings of also in the sense of too and in the sense of moreover and furthermore but simply labelled all of the instances belonging to one of these two categories as being part of the ample category of additive adverbials. (Fjelkestam-Nilsson 1983: 13)

Nevertheless, each one of the 2761 relevant instances of also in the ELF speaker corpus were classified into two main categories, namely into (70) also as an additive adverb and (71) also as a copulative adverb. Whereas the former category consists of items that serve the purpose of connecting “what has been said before and what will come” (Fjelkestam-Nilsson 1983: 14), the latter usage of also is, generally speaking, only to be found in connection with not only. (Fjelkestam-Nilsson 1983: 14; Östman 1982: 140)

70. and like bavaria erm the southern part of germany and then tirol and salzburg like the language is very similar and i also think that the culture is quite similar actually (VOICE 2009: ED-con250:336)

71. and er they were saying you know we’re not only just producing food but we’re also supporting the touristic industry in france because […] (VOICE 2009: EDsed301:143)

According to Greene (1849), clauses are to be considered as being copulative

[w]hen one clause is so united to another as to express an additional thought, and thereby give a greater extent to its meaning […] (Greene 1849: 177)
Whenever the speaker desires to emphasise an additional thought, “the conjunction has a correlative placed in the first clause” (ibid). In the case of the item also, the combination required consists of the two words not only… and the elements but and also, as illustrated in (71). This combination of not only… but also is applied when the user of the language wishes to make an emphasis and simultaneously desires to show a certain degree of addition. (ibid; Greene 1860: 133-134)

Even though Swan (2005) points out that this precise formulation is not frequently applied in informal English due to the fact that it is regarded as a rather formal structure, Table 3 and the results provided by Fjelkestam-Nilsson (1983) prove that this usage of the copulative adverb also in combination with not only is not to be regarded as uncommon in spoken language. (Swan 2005: 356, Fjelkestam-Nilsson 1983: 15)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3: The composition of individual occurrences of also in VOICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additive adverb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copulative also</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrelevant occurrences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although an in-depth investigation of the copulative usage of the adverb also would have been rather interesting and certainly worthwhile, the main focus of the current study is on the usage of also as an additive adverb. Nevertheless, as the table suggests, the category comprising all instances of the copulative also accounts for approximately 2.5 per cent of the entirety of occurrences in VOICE and should therefore also be analysed briefly.

Closer investigation of all of the occurrences in this category shows that in general, the copulative also is applied according to the guidelines of Standard English, namely in combination with the three words but, not and only. As the table below illustrates, conventional usage of the copulative also in VOICE accounts
for approximately 77 per cent (i.e. 57 out of 74 instances) of all of its total usage.

Table 4: Copulative also in the ELF corpus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occurrences</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canonical usage</td>
<td>According to grammarians</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>77.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-canonical usage</td>
<td>Modified word order</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Omission of but</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17.57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 74 100%

In addition, it is important to note that those instances that make up the non-canonical usage of the adverb also as a copulative (approximately 23 per cent) are not entirely misused as far as the Standard English norm is concerned. In fact, the first category, modified word order, which accounts for approximately 5 per cent of the total, merely consists of utterances in which the two obligatory parts of the copulative combination not only... but also are reversed, for example (72). Furthermore, the items belonging to the second category of non-canonical usage of the English language (the omission of but) are only to be considered as representing non-conventional usage due to the fact that one part of one of the two elements, namely but, is omitted, for instance (73). Nevertheless, Huddleston and Pullum (2002), for instance, do not appear to consider the omission of the element but as non-canonical usage, but rather see it as an acceptable construction in Modern English. (Huddleston & Pullum 2002: 588) Hence, it can be stated that grammarians do not appear to be certain of how to treat the phenomenon of the copulative also.

72. there should also be education for education’s sake and not only education for (VOICE 2009: POwsd256:102)
73. [...] it’s not only production that’s been subsidized it’s also non-production that’s been subsidized [...] (VOICE 2009: EDsed301:210)

Even though the table proves that there are certain departures from the norm which grammarians attempt to establish for the usage of Standard English, it
needs to be emphasised that these in no way impair communication. If one takes Huddleston and Pullum’s (2002) view into account, a further 17.57 per cent of the non-canonical usage needs to be added to the category of canonical usage. This would subsequently mean that only about five per cent of the total-ity of occurrences of the copulative also would not be entirely conventional.

Yet the main focus of this study is, of course, on those instances that can be classified as additive adverbials. Therefore all 2687 occurrences in which also is used to express addition were analysed in more depth. It can be seen in Table 5 that just over 50 per cent of all occurrences of additive also can be classified as representing conventional usage of the English language, such as (74), as they conform to the criteria defined by grammarians. The remaining 1295 instances, which account for about 48 per cent, are categorized as representing non-conventional usage, for example (75) and (76). These classifications are based on the two principles that have been laid out above.

74. [...] you go out you turn left and you go along universitaetstrasse and then turn right into garnisongasse you can also go with the tram number forty-three or forty-four one station (VOICE 2009: EDsve421:24)

75. er yes that’s some bit different i will er give also the information sheet of e s n to you (VOICE 2009: EDsve421:36)

76. it’s really old also i think (VOICE 2009: EDcon521:740)

As one can see, also is not positioned canonically (after the main verb or after be) in both (75) and (76).

As one can see, also is not positioned canonically (after the main verb or after be) in both (75) and (76).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canonical usage</strong></td>
<td>1392</td>
<td>51.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-canonical usage</strong></td>
<td>1295</td>
<td>48.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2687</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Even though the percentage of non-conventional usage appears to be rather high at first glance (almost 50 per cent of the total) it needs to be emphasised at this point that the category of non-canonical usage of the additive adverb...
also does by no means imply incorrect usage of the item in question. After all, ELF speakers use language in a way which is appropriate for their particular purpose, namely to be able to communicate effectively with people from different language backgrounds who do not share the same mother tongue but who all have some command of the English language.

After the analysis of the additive adverb also, it can be discerned that its usage works well as far as the communication between the participants in an English as a lingua franca conversation is concerned. In fact, non-canonical usage of the adverb does not appear to be problematic at all.

It must also be specified that those instances displaying deviation from the conventional norm are in reality not too different to Standard English. As the examples of the speakers in VOICE indicate, the additive adverb also is often used without a verb, i.e. the verb which, according to grammarians, is essential is often omitted by the ELF speakers in the corpus, as in (77). Nevertheless, these constructions usually work out well in expressing addition, which is the desired effect. Furthermore, quite contrary to Standard English, ELF speakers often appear to choose also – rather than too or as well, which are the supposed Standard English forms to be employed in this instance – for clause final positions, for example (78). Moreover, ELF speakers frequently reverse the subject, the verb and the element also, as in (79), which according to grammars of Standard English is to be considered as deviating from the norm as well.

77. @ and I came here and also same language i just love that (VOICE 2009: EDwsd15:173)
78. don’t forget to introduce the member and the agenda for the meeting also (VOICE 2009: EDcon496:188)
79. erm also i’ve seen that er they’re smiling they are nice people they smile when they speak (VOICE 2009: EDsed31:582)

Although this investigation indicates the existence of obvious differences between native and lingua franca usage of the English additive adverb also, it has to be emphasised that all of these non-conventional uses do not appear to impair communication.
6.1.4 Comparison to native speaker results

The table below shows the figures from VOICE compared to the results from BUC and LOB. Even though all of the respective figures related to the native speaker corpora are evidently represented in Fjelkestam-Nilsson’s study (1983), they are reproduced here in order to facilitate comprehension.

Table 6: The frequency of the adverb also in various corpora consisting of about 1 million words in total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th>BUC</th>
<th>LOB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instances of also</td>
<td>2976</td>
<td>1069</td>
<td>994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>0.2976%</td>
<td>0.1069%</td>
<td>0.0994%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Considering the instances of also, one can easily detect that there is a considerable difference between its frequencies in the various corpora. Whereas the number of occurrences in both BUC and LOB do not actually differ all too significantly, the frequency of the adverb also is to be regarded as being rather low compared to the findings of the lingua franca speaker corpus. In fact Table 6 shows that the users of English as a lingua franca recorded in VOICE appear to use also about three times more often than both American and British native speakers of the English language seem to do in writing. According to the table, the adverb also accounts for approximately 0.3 per cent of the totality of all items in VOICE, yet this figure only comes up to about 0.1 per cent in both BUC and LOB.

Nevertheless, it needs to be elucidated that, as has been mentioned before, not all of the 2976 instances of also in VOICE were appropriate and useful for the present investigation due to the nature of spoken language. Nonetheless, as one can see in Table 2, the relevant occurrences in this corpus still account for 2761 instances. One can therefore extrapolate from this that even after the necessary extraction of irrelevant occurrences of also in the ELF corpus (215 instances of fillers, repetition and the occurrence of also in the speakers’ native language) the remaining number of occurrences is still considerably higher compared to the two written native-speaker corpora.
Similar to the results provided by VOICE, Fjelkestam-Nilsson (1983) concludes that the usage of also as an additive adverb far outweights the occurrences in which also is used in other contexts in both BUC and LOB. (Fjelkestam-Nilsson 1983: 15)

Given that the relevant occurrences of the adverb also were far more frequent in VOICE than in both LOB and BUC, the results provided by the spoken ELF corpus were subsequently also compared to those provided by its native speaker counterpart, LLC. Seeing as LLC comprises of approximately half of the total number of words provided by VOICE, the results of the two corpora were slightly adapted to facilitate their comparison, i.e. the total number of words as well as the entirety of the relevant occurrences of the adverb also in VOICE and LLC were calculated on a 10,000 word basis.

As can be seen below, also occurs considerably less frequently in LLC and is only to be found in about 0.06 per cent of the entire corpus. Even though the numbers had to be adapted for both corpora, one can detect a tendency. The ELF speakers recorded in VOICE appear to use also noticeably more often in spoken interaction than native users of the language. (op.cit: 26)

Table 7: Also in the spoken ELF and native speaker corpora

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th>LLC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approximate words in total</strong></td>
<td>1 000 000</td>
<td>435 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relevant occurrences of also</strong></td>
<td>2761</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage</strong></td>
<td>0.2761%</td>
<td>0.0552%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.2 The adverbial *too*

6.2.1 *Too* according to grammarians

Prescriptive and descriptive grammarians state that *too* is part of a more informal register and should be more common in spoken language. This item needs to be placed directly after the respective part it focuses on and stand at the end of a clause in Standard Modern English.

6.2.2 *Too* in native speaker corpora

Fjelkestam-Nilsson’s study shows that *too* is less common in spoken than in written native speaker language. This item is most often used as an additive adverb in the written corpora. The data of BUC and LOB indicate that *also* and *too* are far more common than the other adverbials, i.e. *as well*, *in addition*, *again*, *likewise*, *equally*, *similarly*, *moreover* and *furthermore*.

6.2.3 *Too* in spoken ELF

6.2.3.1 Results from VOICE

It can be seen in Table 1 that the item *too* appears to be far less frequently used by lingua franca speakers of English recorded in the corpus than its counterpart *also*. In fact the latter, which accounts for 2976 instances, is almost four times more common in VOICE than *too* which displays 749 occurrences. However, the most striking feature provided by the ELF corpus is the difference in numbers between *too* and its close relative *as well*. Both items, which claim to be very similar in their clause positioning as well as their meaning, account for approximately 14 per cent of the total of all the instances of the adverbials in question (*also*, *too*, *as well*, *in addition*, *again*, *likewise*, *equally*, *similarly*, *moreover* and *furthermore*) in the ELF corpus. Nevertheless, certain grammarians, as can be seen throughout Chapter 3, assume the item *too* to be more commonly found in spoken language because it is generally said to be part of a far more informal language than its counterpart *also*. 
Yet, as with the item *also*, certain instances of the adverb *too* proved to be irrelevant for the current study. To ensure the desired accuracy of the final results, certain occurrences once again needed to be excluded from the study at hand due to various factors. Given the nature of the ELF corpus as well as the outcomes of the analysis of the adverb *also*, it was expected beforehand that a considerable number of instances of *too* would prove to be mere repetitions. This is shown in Table 8 below. In addition, several instances of the adverbial could not be interpreted and therefore were not included, such as (80).

80. A: of number three is also just as bad because that would be total chaos and nobody will understand each other
B: okay
A: erm so its xx *too* @@ er it’s it’s xxx
(VOICE 2009: EDwsd306:48-50)

Table 8: Relevant and irrelevant occurrences of the adverb *too* in the ELF corpus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occurrences</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevant</td>
<td>Additive and copulative <em>too</em> &amp; <em>too</em> as moreover and <em>too</em> much</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>91.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrelevant</td>
<td>Filler/unclear</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Repetition</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>749</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To be able to analyse the data and achieve meaningful classification, all of the 749 occurrences of *too* were checked manually and subsequently placed into different categories of meaning. In the case of incomplete phrases (81), the entire instance was not automatically labelled as being unclear; the context of the adverb *too* was also checked so as to detect and reconstruct its meaning (82). If this, too, shed little light on the nature of the additive adverb *too*, then the sample was excluded. Whenever its meaning emerged to be comprehensible, the instance of *too* was treated as if it were not separated into two individual utterances but as if it were placed in one single utterance. Nevertheless, whenever the meaning did not appear to be clear and comprehensible, the in-
stance of *too* was put into the category of unclear/filler occurrences to avoid any possible distortion of the data.

81. costs *too* (VOICE 2009: EDwgd241:592)

82. A: because you can er you have the international communication with one language
   B: yeah
   C: costs *too* (VOICE 2009: EDwgd241:590-592)

Although this procedure eventually meant that some instances were not considered, the remaining occurrences were regarded as being satisfactory for the purpose of this investigation. The precise composition of the various categories of *too* can be found in Tables 8 and 9. As can be seen, a total of 63 instances of the item *too* had to be excluded from the current study due to the various reasons explained above. As was already stated in relation to the adverb *also*, its close relative *too* does not prove to be exclusively used with regard to its main function as an adverb either. Indeed ELF speakers in the corpus occasionally appear to use *too* as a filler in spoken discourse as well. As Table 8 indicates, slightly less than five per cent of all instances of the word *too* extracted from VOICE were regarded as belonging to the separate group of discourse fillers because their meaning could not be reconstructed. This outcome mirrors the usage of *also* which functions as a discourse filler in approximately five per cent of all its occurrences in VOICE.

After the exclusion of all irrelevant and unusable occurrences that appeared in the given context, the 686 remaining instances of *too* were further analysed. All the utterances in which *too* was used as an additive adverb (a total of 211 instances) were then investigated with reference to descriptive and prescriptive works of Modern English grammar. The additive adverb *too* was consequently considered as being applied according to the norms of Standard English when the following criteria applied:

- The adverb *too* needs to be placed at the end of a clause and after the respective focused part.

Any occurrence of *too* which did not fulfil criteria, was labelled as being part of the category of non-conventional usage of English. However certain grammarians, such as Quirk et al. (1985: 609), concede that the additive adverb *too* can,
under special circumstances though quite rarely, also be found in front of the part it aims to focus on, such as (83).

83. She has invited too some of her own family. (Quirk et al. 1985: 609)

Nonetheless, this principle was not taken into consideration in the present investigation, due to the fact that even leading grammarians do not share this opinion and actually are in disagreement about it. Swan (2005), for instance, states that the two additive adverbials “as well and too do not go at the beginning of a clause”. (Swan 2005: 46)

By strictly following the criteria named above, the procedure of classifying the instances in which too is used as an additive adverb in VOICE was a rather straightforward matter. Hence, personal and subjective judgements which occasionally needed to be employed to categorise the additive adverb also, did not have to be applied throughout the analysis of the additive adverb too at all.

6.2.3.2 Meanings of too

While one meaning of the adverb also detected by Fjelkestam-Nilsson (1983) for her analysis of written native speaker English (in which also is applied to express moreover or furthermore) had to be excluded from the study of the ELF corpus on various grounds, all four of her classifications of the item too (meaning as well, too much, moreover or furthermore and as a copulative) could be determined with regard to the spoken ELF material provided by VOICE. All of these different categories are discussed briefly in order to get an insight into how the word too is used in spoken ELF. Yet, the focus is on the additive usage of this item.

All relevant occurrences of too in this corpus were also classified into these four categories, namely (84) too as an additive adverb with the meaning as well, (85) too as a copulative, (86) too assuming the meaning of moreover or furthermore and (87) the additional category too as a degree adverb with the meaning of too much. In addition, it is worth mentioning that the latter meaning was assigned to all occurrences in which too was used to express excess. Thus, this study did not make any distinction between the two distinctive forms
of *too many* and *too much* as both of them are regarded as expressing the same semantic meaning in the English language.

84. [...] i always use the example of if the british stand in line even if you don’t understand why they stand in line you would start standing in line *too* because [...] (VOICE 2009: EDsed31:1659)

85. and important to say is that you can do courses on lingua franca too it’s *not only* for children *but* for adults *too* (VOICE 2009: EDwdg305:1072)

86. and *too* we’re not too proud of ourselves [...] (VOICE: EDsed31:905)

87. it will drop so there will be no er n- *not too* many expensive products but there will be lots of er let’s say more cheaper products (VOICE 2009: EDsed301:218)

Whereas the second meaning of *too* (the copulative *not only* … *but too*) found to be present in VOICE tends to be absent and not treated in many grammars (see Jacobson 1964), Swan (2005) acknowledges that this exact combination is frequently preferred over *not only* … *but also* in informal situations. (Swan 2005: 356) However, contrary to Swan’s (2005) claim, its frequency appears to be rather low in real language use as far as corpus studies have been able to show until now. Entirely in accord with this pattern of authentic language usage, the results of VOICE display only one instance of this *not only* … *but too* structure. In addition, Fjelkestam-Nilsson (1983) points out that her corpora only displayed a total of two instances of this meaning of *too* in her study on additive adverbials (Fjelkestam-Nilsson 1983: 20). The composition of the relevant data of the ELF corpus is given in Table 9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additive adverb</strong></td>
<td>211</td>
<td>28.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Too meaning too much</strong></td>
<td>473</td>
<td>63.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Copulative too</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Too meaning moreover</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Irrelevant occurrences</strong></td>
<td>63</td>
<td>8.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>749</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As can be seen in the table above, the most common meaning of *too* in VOICE is that of *too much*. In fact, this usage accounts for about 63 per cent of all of the instances of this adverb. Therefore the distinct category the current study is most concerned with - *too* as an additive adverb – makes up a considerably lower percentage and accounts for approximately 28 per cent of all occurrences. In addition, the other two categories belonging to the relevant part of the data both only account for 0.13 per cent of all instances of *too*.

The instances of additive *too* were then analysed. The table below illustrates the outcomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Conventional usage</em></td>
<td>200</td>
<td>94.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Non-conventional usage</em></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>211</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be seen that almost 95 per cent of the occurrences of additive *too* in the ELF corpus were classified as canonical usage of the English language, such as (88). These instances comply with the criteria defined in Chapter 3. The remaining 11 occurrences, which account for about five per cent of the entire body of data of the additive adverb *too*, are to be found in the group of non-conventional usage (see 89, 90 and 91), for they are to be considered as deviating from the Standard English norm. The adverb *too* is placed at non-canonical positions in all of these cases (before the respective part).

88. ja and one and there is one important point and i’ve just mentioned it to the other working group *too* [...] (VOICE 2009:POwgd243:69)
89. there are *too* national interests in it so (VOICE 2009: EDwgd5:196)
90. it’s *too* a loss of xxx literature and i mean it’s quite xxxxxxx (VOICE 2009:EDwgd241:561)
91. i i i ask er [S13] to speak a little bit slower because you speak *too* English not a lingua franca (VOICE 2009:EDwsd303:558)
Although Table 10 illustrates that ELF speaker usage of additive *too* provided in 
VOICE occasionally deviates from Standard English usage, there is no evi-
dence in the corpus that this caused any communicative problems.

Taking into account the data provided above, one can see that throughout the 
analysis of additive *too*, one striking feature was extracted. ELF usage of the 
additive adverb *too* by the speakers in VOICE does not considerably differ from 
native speaker use as they use additive *too* in quite the same way and accord-
ing to the same principles as most native speakers of the English language.

Nevertheless, it should be made clear that the somewhat limited occurrences, 
in which additive *too* was not used in a canonical manner with regard to the 
Standard English norm, should not be considered as representing an inappro-
priate and incorrect usage of this item. After all, the additive adverb in question 
still appears to serve its primary purpose of indicating addition. As can be seen 
throughout the examples of the whole corpus, the intended meaning of additive 
*too* is understood by the interlocutor(s) in VOICE. Therefore, the non-
conventional usage of the additive adverb *too*, as far as the position of this item 
in the clause is concerned, does not appear to influence or even hinder com-
munication between ELF users of the language.
6.2.4 Comparison to native speaker results

Table 11 shows the figures from VOICE compared to the results from BUC and LOB. Although the respective figures related to the native speaker corpora are evidently represented in Fjelkestam-Nilsson’s study (1983), they are reproduced here in order to facilitate comprehension.

Table 11: The frequency of the adverb *too* in ELF and native speaker corpora of approximately one million words

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th>BUC</th>
<th>LOB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Instances of too</em></td>
<td>749</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>0.0749%</td>
<td>0.0841%</td>
<td>0.0929%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As one can see in the table above, there is no significant difference in the frequency of *too* across the written and spoken corpora of English investigated. Hence, as has been previously mentioned, the results drawn from VOICE on no account reflect the grammar that implies that the adverb *too* should be found much more often in spoken than in written interaction. In fact the rate of occurrences in both BUC and LOB is even slightly higher than for the spoken lingua franca corpus. Table 11 thus illustrates that the adverb *too* appears to be used more frequently in written native speaker language than in spoken ELF.

Taking into account that some of the occurrences of *too* eventually proved to be irrelevant for this investigation (that is to say repetitions as well as fillers) 63 instances of the 749 instances counted in VOICE need to be extracted. Thus a total number of 686 occurrences of *too* offered by the speakers in the lingua franca corpus need to be compared to the results of BUC and LOB. However this minor decrease in number does not affect the overall outcome.

Whereas Fjelkestam-Nilsso (1983) concludes that additive *too* is seen to be used by far the most frequently in her written corpora, it only accounts for about 28 per cent of all cases (211 occurrences) in the spoken ELF corpus. Yet the number of instances of the adverb *too* as expressing excess (*too much*) in VOICE far outweighs the occurrences of the same group in the written native speaker corpora as it is by far the most common use of *too* in VOICE. (Fjelkestam-Nilsson 1983: 19-20)
Given that the above variations could have their roots in the different media of the corpora rather than in innate differences between speakers (for instance in written and spoken discourse) the results provided by the spoken ELF corpus were then additionally compared to those provided by the spoken native speaker corpus, LLC, to clear up these uncertainties. Once again the results of both corpora had to be adapted to allow for a reasonable and useful comparison of native speaker and lingua franca conversation (the total number of words as well as the entirety of the relevant occurrences of the adverb *too* were calculated on a 10,000 word basis).

As the table below indicates, *too* occurs considerably less frequently in the native speaker corpus than that of lingua franca. The speakers recorded in VOICE seem to be far more likely to use the adverb *too*, as the percentage for this corpus is almost three times as high as for the native speaker corpus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th>LLC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Approximate words in total</em></td>
<td>1 000 000</td>
<td>435 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 000</td>
<td>10 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Relevant occurrences of too</em></td>
<td>686</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.86</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Percentage</em></td>
<td>0.0686%</td>
<td>0.0292%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12: *Too* in the spoken corpora of English as a lingua franca and native speaker English
6.3 The adverbial *as well*

6.3.1 *As well* according to grammarians

Prescriptive and descriptive grammarians state that *as well* is most common in informal and spoken language. It needs to stand directly after the respective part it focuses on and stand at the end of a clause.

6.3.2 *As well* in native speaker corpora

The data of BUC and LOB indicate that *as well* is far less common than *also* and *too*. *As well* is most commonly seen to be part of the preposition *as well as* in both of the written native speaker corpora.

6.3.3 *As well* in spoken ELF

6.3.3.1 Results from VOICE

Table 1 illustrates that the adverbial *as well* is far less frequently used by ELF speakers recorded in VOICE than its close relative *also*. Nevertheless, *as well* is still the second most commonly chosen item in the entire body of data. While the most outstanding and prominent category *also* makes up approximately 57 per cent of the corpus, *as well* accounts for about 14 per cent of all instances of those adverbials being analysed in the ELF corpus - 775 instances in 731 utterances.

Hence it can be seen that apart from *also*, both the closely related items, *too* and *as well*, are more often selected than the entirety of all the other adverbials in VOICE, i.e. *in addition, again, likewise, equally, similarly, moreover and furthermore*, which together account for approximately 13 per cent. However, as has already been emphasised with regard to the adverb *too*, the adverbial *as well* is, according to grammarians, also considered to be part of informal register and should therefore be found far more frequently in spoken than in written language.
Seeing that there is a certain imbalance between the prescriptive and descriptive theories presented in Chapter 3 and the results drawn from VOICE, one could indeed argue that speakers of ELF appear to apply the item *as well* in a somewhat non-conventional way. After all, *as well* and *too* should be far more common in spoken language than the item *also* which is argued to be more formal. Nevertheless, the respective numbers provided by VOICE shown in Table 1 demonstrate that quite the opposite is true of real ELF interactions in the corpus.

After a primary investigation, a certain percentage of occurrences of *as well* have to be classified as irrelevant to the study at hand. Due to the very nature of VOICE, a number of instances of *as well* again proved to be repetitions and were therefore excluded to maintain the overall accuracy of the final outcomes. Moreover, some instances of this adverbial appeared to be too incomprehensible as to be included in this analysis of additive adverbials. The composition of all the irrelevant and relevant instances of *as well* throughout the whole corpus of English as a lingua franca is provided in Table 13 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occurrences</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevant occurrences</td>
<td>Additive <em>as well</em> &amp; <em>as well as</em></td>
<td>702</td>
<td>90.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Filler/unclear</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>8.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Repetition</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>775</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To arrive at the classification shown in the table above, all 775 occurrences of *as well* had to be checked manually and were subsequently placed in their respective categories (additive *as well* & *as well as*, filler/unclear and repetition). In addition, the context of a considerable number of utterances containing the adverbial in question frequently needed to be taken into consideration as well so as to ensure the comprehensibility of the item because participants do of course interrupt one another in natural spoken language.
Whenever the meaning of the adverbial *as well* appeared to be clear in the given context, the occurrence in question was treated as if its meaning were not split into two or more utterances, but rather as though it were found in one single utterance. However, in those cases in which it was not possible to reconstruct the meaning of the item *as well*, the whole instance was categorised as being too incomprehensible and was hence put into the category of unclear/filler (92).

92. A: no let’s go out and buy everything right@ look at these @@@@ so funny leek and potato soup recipe hh then you have a jamie oliver home cooking five tips you loose belly fat @your belly is fat because @@ stop making this one major mistake and you finally loose your belly fat
B: this doesn’t look nice *as well* by the way (VOICE 2009: Lecon565:227-228)

Even though Table 13 shows that approximately nine per cent of the whole body of data with respect to *as well* could not be included in the present study, the remaining 90 per cent of data were still assumed to be sufficient in order to carry out this investigation. Similar to the adverbs *also* and *too*, the adverbial *as well* does not seem to exclusively serve its main purpose as an adverbial in the ELF corpus either. The speakers in VOICE are likely to consciously or unconsciously make use of the item *as well* as serving the purpose of a discourse filler in about 9 per cent of all cases. Although a closer and more thorough investigation of these particular uses of *as well* as discourse particles would have been interesting, the present study sets out to investigate additive adverbials and therefore does not aim to treat other uses in as great detail.

All those utterances in which *as well* served as an additive adverbial, i.e. in 657 instances, were then analysed and compared against the grammar criteria outlined in Chapter 3 of this paper. In the course of this more thorough investigation, the additive adverbial *as well* was categorized as being used in a conventional and prescribed manner as far as Standard Modern English is concerned when the following two grammar-based principles applied:

× *As well* needs to be found at the end of a clause.
× It is generally required to be placed after the respective part it focuses on.

Whenever the material in the lingua franca corpus did not comply with these criteria, the instance in question was classified as non-canonical use of the
English language. Nevertheless, Quirk et al. (1985: 609), acknowledge the infrequent occasions in which it is possible to position both the adverbials as well and too in front of the respective part they actually focus on, as can be seen in example (93). However, as was emphasised in Chapter 3, not even leading grammarians manage to come to an agreement as far as this matter is concerned. Therefore, it appeared neither rational nor valuable to take this proposition by Quirk et al. (1985) into consideration in the study at hand. Nonetheless, this deliberate disregard does not influence the overall outcome in a critical way, due to the fact that this specific usage is only acceptable in very rare occasions, a fact that Quirk et al. (1985) themselves acknowledge.

93. She has invited as well some of her own family. (Quirk et al. 1985: 609)

The two guiding principles that have been mentioned for as well facilitated the analysis. Thus the somewhat subjective judgements which were occasionally necessary during the course of the investigation of also were kept to a minimum as far as the additive adverbial as well was concerned. Although a certain percentage of additive as well eventually had to be declared as being part of the category of non-conventional usage of Modern English, once again the required level of communication between the participants during ELF conversations provided by VOICE was usually at no risk, even in those cases in which the usage of additive as well deviated from the norm. The overall purpose of expressing addition was recognised regardless of the standard or non-standard positioning of the item itself.
6.3.3.2 Meanings of as well

Even though Fjelkestam-Nilsson’s study (1983) of additive adverbials in native speaker language does not particularly focus on the item *as well* but on its close relatives *also* and *too*, the author manages to distinguish three different categories of meaning for the combination *as well*. Due to the fact that little evidence was found for the distinct group comprising phrases such as *might as well* or *just as well* in the English as a lingua franca corpus, this exact meaning had to be excluded from the current study of lingua franca speaker language use. (Fjelkestam-Nilsson 1983: 44-45)

The other two meanings that have been suggested by the previous study of written native speaker corpora (additive *as well* as and *as well* as part of the preposition *as well as*) could be detected in the corpus of English as a lingua franca as well. Hence, all the relevant occurrences of *as well* in the lingua franca speaker corpus, (a total of 702 instances) was classified into two individual categories, namely (94) *as well* as an additive adverbial and (95) the preposition *as well as*. The figures illustrating the distribution of the occurrences of *as well* in the VOICE are given in the table below. (ibid)

94. and if you want to do something you can just ask xx he can show you around and obviously er er he had to- er told the same thing to the other groups *as well* so er yah (VOICE 2009: EDcon521:802)

95. no but again the nature over here in this area is so unique and so relaxing *as well as* his pictures (VOICE 2009: EDsed364:220)

Table 14: The distribution of instances of *as well* in the spoken ELF corpus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additive adverbial</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>84.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preposition as well as</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrelevant occurrences</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>9.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As one can see above, *as well* is most frequently used to express addition by the speakers recorded in the ELF corpus. In fact, the instances comprised in
this distinct category make up almost 85 per cent of all occurrences of *as well* in VOICE. The second group that comprises of instances of the preposition *as well* as accounts for a mere six per cent of this corpus. The first and largest category, namely additive *as well*, was then analysed in more depth with regard to the principles that had been formulated prior to the investigation. The exact findings of this analysis of additive *as well* in the corpus of spoken English as a lingua franca material are shown in Table 15.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canonical usage</strong></td>
<td>584</td>
<td>88.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-canonical usage</strong></td>
<td>73</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>657</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Considering the table above, one can ascertain that almost 89 per cent of all the occurrences of additive *as well* in VOICE were classified as representing (96) canonical usage of Modern English because they corresponded with the criteria given above. The remaining data, (approximately 11 per cent) deviated from the Standard English norm in one way or another and was therefore labelled as representing non-canonical usage, such as (97) or (98). ELF users move *as well* to non-conventional places in the clause.

96. [...] what we meant was not only on a formal level but also on an interpersonal level we included friendship and love in that *as well* because [...] (VOICE 2009: EDwsd302:2131)

97. er which is making it pretty difficult for the for the consignees to obtain the cargo and it’s *as well* higher costs involved (VOICE 2009: PBmtg300:631)

98. include *as well* that we will teach english only as a lingua franca (VOICE 2009: EDwgd305:569)

Even though Table 15 attempts to prove that ELF speakers in VOICE occasionally use additive *as well* in a non-canonical manner by illustrating that this precise usage accounts for approximately 11 per cent of all cases, most of these deviations are not to be considered as pronounced departures from the
prescriptive norm. The majority of all non-canonical cases of additive *as well* arise from the placement of the item in an uncommon position in the clause in which other additive adverbials such as *also* or *in addition* are said to be preferred by native speakers of English. In (99) for instance this minor discrepancy is displayed and makes clear that to be considered as acceptable usage of Modern English, one either needs to change the position of *as well* in the clause, as shown in example (100), or replace the item *as well* with another additive adverbial as in (101). Yet, as was the case with *also* and *too*, these minor deviations do not endanger the exchange of knowledge nor lead to a break-down of communication.

99. [...] from countries who were here at the conference who found many similarities but *as well* xxx differences but [...] (VOICE 2009: PRpan13:1)

100. [...] from countries who were here at the conference who found many similarities but xxx differences *as well* but [...]  
101. [...] from countries who were here at the conference who found many similarities but *also* xxx differences but [...] 

Nevertheless, one additional rather striking feature was detected during the analysis of the two additive adverbials *as well* and *too*. Whereas no more than approximately 5 per cent of all usage of the additive adverb *too* proved not to be applied in accordance with Standard English criteria, about twice as many instances of additive *as well* (approximately 11 per cent) were considered to be non-conventional. This difference in number could have its roots in the fact that the additive item *as well* consists of two words which might be more difficult to position than its one-word counterpart *too*. Nonetheless, this is only a notion.
6.3.4 Comparison to native speaker results

The table below compares the figures from VOICE to the ones from BUC and LOB.

Table 16: The frequency of the adverbial *as well* in ELF and written native speaker corpora of approximately one million words

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th>BUC</th>
<th>LOB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Instances of as well</em></td>
<td>775</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage</strong></td>
<td>0.0775%</td>
<td>0.0307%</td>
<td>0.0236%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the table above illustrates, there is quite a considerable difference with regard to the frequency of *as well* in the spoken lingua franca and the two native speaker corpora of English. Considering grammarians' point of view, one can conclude that the results provided by the three corpora reflect the prescriptive and descriptive assumptions which imply that the item *as well* should be detected as being far more frequent in spoken than in written language. In fact, the rate of occurrences of both BUC and LOB do not even account for half of all the instances provided by the ELF corpus. Hence, it could be argued that the item *as well* tends to be preferred in interactions in lingua franca English as provided by the corpus, while it appears to be less common in the written native speaker corpora.

Although some 73 instances of *as well* in VOICE had to be disregarded due to various reasons related to the nature of spoken interaction, this obligatory reduction does not significantly influence the overall results of the study. Thus, a total of 702 occurrences of the item in question in the English as a lingua franca corpus need to be compared to the 236 and 307 results of the British and American written native speaker corpora respectively.

While *as well* is seen to be part of the preposition *as well as* in the vast majority of both of the written native speaker corpora, this distinct usage of the item only accounts for about six per cent of all occurrences - a total of 45 instances - in VOICE. Nevertheless, the usage of *as well* as an additive adverbial in the lingua franca corpus far outweighs the instances of this meaning in both of the written mother tongue corpora. (Fjelkehall-Nilsson 1983: 44-45)
Taking into account that these significant variations could of course arise due to the different media of the three corpora (spoken versus written interaction) it would have been interesting to compare the results of VOICE to the material of LLC. Regrettably, Fjelkestam-Nilsson (1983) does not provide any data with regard to *as well* in this spoken native English language corpus. Therefore, it can only be concluded that the lingua franca speakers of English recorded in VOICE appear to use *as well* far more often in spoken interaction than native speakers tend to do in written language.
6.4 The adverbial *in addition*

6.4.1 *In addition* according to grammarians

All grammars (prescriptive and descriptive) agree that *in addition* is part of a more formal register and should be most common in written language. This item needs to stand at the beginning of a clause.

6.4.2 *In addition* in native speaker corpora

*In addition* is far less common than *also* and *too* in the written corpora. Whereas this adverbial is most frequently used as an additive adverbial in BUC, it is used more often as a preposition in combination with *to* (*in addition to*) in LOB.

6.4.3 *In addition* in spoken ELF

6.4.3.1 Results from VOICE

Table 1 illustrates that the item *in addition* is much less commonly used by the speakers of English as a lingua franca in VOICE than the other three adverbials this investigation is most concerned with, i.e. *also*, *too* and *as well*. In fact, *in addition* is only selected in 0.36 per cent of all cases when the speakers in VOICE desire to use one of these more or less synonymous adverbials. This considerable difference in numbers could of course be rooted in the fact that *in addition* is claimed to be far more formal than the other three items in question by numerous grammarians. Thus, the assumptions appear to match the real outcomes of authentic spoken interaction in English as a lingua franca by showing that those adverbials that are supposed to be more informal are far more frequent in VOICE than their more formal counterpart *in addition*.

As before in the case of the other adverbials, a certain percentage of the overall number of occurrences of *in addition* in the ELF corpus had to be excluded to avoid a possible distortion of the overall body of data. As Table 17 illustrates, about five per cent of the results were eventually disregarded by the study at
hand for one simple reason: the exact meaning of *in addition* in the given context could not be ascertained.

Table 17: Relevant and irrelevant occurrences of *in addition* in VOICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occurrences</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevant occurrences</td>
<td>Additive <em>in addition</em> &amp; preposition</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>94.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrelevant occurrences</td>
<td>Filler/unclear</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To arrive at this classification of the adverbial, all 19 instances of *in addition* were analysed. After the exclusion of the single instance that was considered as being too irrelevant for the study at hand, the remaining 18 occurrences of the adverbial *in addition* were analysed in more depth. Eight of these subsequently proved to be part of the preposition *in addition to*, as in (102). Hence, the ten remaining samples were investigated with regard to the criteria provided by grammarians of Modern English.

102. […] that would also erm allow to build virtual classrooms *in addition to* real international classrooms […] (VOICE 2009: POmtg315:142)

Those instances of the additive adverbial that appeared to be part of utterances consisting of incomplete phrases were again investigated with regard to the surrounding co-text to make them comprehensible. Eventually, the meaning of almost 95 per cent of all occurrences of *in addition* (additive adverbial and preposition) could be reconstructed and classified as representing the relevant usage as far as this study is concerned. The additive adverbial *in addition* was regarded as being applied conventionally according to grammarians of Standard Modern English whenever the instances in question proved to follow and respect the subsequent principle:

> *In addition* needs to be placed at the beginning of a clause.

Each occurrence provided by the corpus of English as a lingua franca that did not correspond with this guideline and in some way deviated from the norm established by grammarians, was classified as belonging to the rather significant
group of non-conventional usage of English. As in the investigation of too, the entire analysis of in addition proved to be a rather straightforward and objective matter due to the fact that the guideline itself is a very straightforward one which meant that it was indeed rather easy to compare it to actual and authentic spoken ELF usage as can be found in VOICE.

However, the occurrences which were considered as representing non-canonical usage of English should again not be regarded as being incorrect. In fact, the desired meaning, indicating addition, can still be understood in all of these cases.

6.4.3.2 Meanings of in addition

Due to the fact that Fjelkestam-Nilsson (1983) concentrated on the two items also and too in her corpus analysis of additive adverbials, she does not provide extensive information as far as the adverbial in addition is concerned. Nevertheless, she divided her respective body of data into two main categories that can be defined in the ELF speaker corpus as well: in addition as an additive adverbial (103) and in addition in connection with the item to which in these combinations is used as a preposition (in addition to), as can be seen in (102).

103. in addition i would also er just mention that outside […] (VOICE 2009: PBqas410:30)

As Table 18 aims to illustrate, the most common meaning of the item in addition in VOICE is that of in addition as an additive adverbial. Nonetheless, this exact usage of the adverbial accounts for only 53 per cent of the data in which the combination of in and addition can be detected. Thus, in addition as part of the preposition in addition to, displays approximately 42 per cent of the overall usage of this item.
Table 18: The distribution of instances of *in addition* in the ELF corpus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additive adverbial</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>52.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preposition in addition to</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrelevant occurrences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The category consisting of all those utterances that contain the principal meaning of *in addition* as an additive adverbial (ten out of 19 instances or approximately 53 per cent) was then analysed with respect to grammatical criteria that had been defined prior to the investigation. The exact outcomes of this supplementary analysis are given in the table below.

Table 19: Conventional and non-conventional usage of *in addition* as an additive adverbial in VOICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conventional usage</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-conventional usage</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Considering the data provided in Table 19, one can see that 80 per cent of all usages of *in addition* as an additive adverbial in VOICE are to be regarded as conventional usage of the English language, as in (104). Thorough analysis showed that its usage matches with the principle that this investigation is based on. The remains of the respective body of data in VOICE must be categorised under non-canonical usage, see (105) and (106), due to the fact that the usage of *in addition* as an additive adverbial deviates from the guideline. *In addition* is placed at the end of a clause in both cases, a place which is usually reserved for its synonyms *as well and too.*

104. *in addition* comes what what [S3] has mentioned [...] (VOICE 2009: PBmtg300:403) [original material and formatting but shortened citation]

105. we could do that in *in addition* (VOICE 2009: PBmtg300:2578)
Thus, Table 19 shows that *in addition* as an additive adverbial is applied non-canonically with regard to the Standard English norm defined by grammarians in only one fifth of all occurrences in VOICE. In fact, both of these non-conventional items already account for 20 per cent. Due to the fact that the data provided by the corpus is however restricted with regard to the item *in addition*, one should not read too much into their use.

Nevertheless, the ELF speakers in VOICE use *in addition* as an additive adverbial according to the norm of Standard Modern English in the majority of all cases. In those rather rare cases where the use of *in addition* somehow deviates from this conventional standard, this unconventionality does in no way impede communication. Hence, the occasional non-conventional positioning of the additive adverbial in question does not disturb interaction between two participants of an ELF conversation in any way.

### 6.4.4 Comparison to native speaker results

Table 20 shows the figures from VOICE compared to the results from BUC and LOB.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th>BUC</th>
<th>LOB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instances of <em>in addition</em></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>0.0019%</td>
<td>0.012%</td>
<td>0.0089%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 20 illustrates, there is a significant difference in numbers between the corpora of written and spoken English. In fact, the item *in addition* is far less frequently applied in the spoken corpus of English as a lingua franca than in its written native speaker counterparts. Strictly speaking, *in addition* is to be found more than four times as often in LOB (the written British English native corpus)
as in VOICE. Yet, the difference is even more meaningful with regard to the American native speaker corpus of written English, BUC. As can be seen, in addition is actually applied about six times more frequently in BUC as in VOICE. Therefore, the results of the three corpora do indeed reflect the grammar principles given in Chapter 3. The implication that the item in addition is used more often in formal written language than in spoken language is portrayed by the outcome provided in Table 20. (Fjelkestam-Nilsson 1983: 46)

While approximately 42 per cent of all instances of the item in addition eventually proved to be part of the preposition in addition to in the ELF corpus, this particular usage accounts for about 49 per cent of all instances in BUC and 58 per cent in LOB. Thus, whereas the item in addition is in general far more common in the written native speaker corpora, its particular usage as part of the preposition in addition to is, generally speaking, also more common in the material provided by BUC and LOB than in VOICE. (ibid)

Considering the overall outcomes of the three corpora, it would have been interesting to compare the results of VOICE with respect to in addition to the results displayed by its native speaker counterpart. Regrettably, Fjelkestam-Nilsson (1983) did not investigate this item in LLC because she defined the principal aim of her own study of additive adverbials as mainly consisting of the exploration of the usage of too and also. Seeing that only a particular part of the spoken native speaker corpus has been published in 1982 and is therefore open to the public while the other part was prepared personally and exclusively for the use of Fjelkestam-Nilsson’s study (1983), it appears to be impossible to reconstruct the whole scope of her data to meaningfully investigate LLC on one’s own initiative. (op.cit: 25)

Hence no appropriate results can be used to investigate the possible differences between native and ELF spoken language as far as the item in addition is concerned. Yet the outcomes determined by the comparison of VOICE to both LOB and BUC appear to be sufficient and appropriate to attempt to draw minor conclusions about the ELF usage in VOICE and the mother tongue use in the written native speaker corpora. Nevertheless, due to the somewhat restricted body of data provided by the ELF corpus, one needs to be careful not to read too much into these differences.
6.5 Comment on the outcome

One has to consider the question of how the presented results and differences between grammars, the native speaker corpora and VOICE can be accounted for.

The usage of also and too in ELF does not reflect the native speaker norm. Whereas also is the most common in spoken ELF, prescriptive grammars claim it to be more common in formal Standard Modern English and while too is categorised as spoken language by grammarians, it is more common in written native speaker language. Yet, the adverbs too and also are more commonly used in the ELF corpus than in LLC. This usage is special to ELF conversation.

One of the reasons could be that lingua franca users select additive adverbials more arbitrarily because they do not possess as great a language repertoire as native speakers of English. Thus the speakers in VOICE might occasionally have to cope with a limited range of expressions to convey addition and therefore tend towards the selection of the first appropriate item that comes to mind.

However, the spoken ELF use of as well and in addition corresponds with the observations of grammarians. The former is frequently used in spoken ELF discourse whereas the latter is not very common in VOICE.

Both items could be used canonically in VOICE because of the Standard English criteria that determine their usage. In other words, foreign or second language learners of English might simply be taught that the item as well is part of a more informal spoken register while in addition is more formal lexis and used as serving the purpose of rendering discourse more coherent especially with regard to advanced level essay writing. Furthermore, in addition is probably taught much later in second and foreign language classrooms than its two more simple-to-use counterparts also and too. Therefore, the speakers recorded in VOICE might often consciously or unconsciously prefer to use the supposedly “easier” variants to avoid possible difficulties with regard to the positioning of the two separate parts that make up this adverbial. Nevertheless, the suggestions given above are of course only to be considered as mere assumptions and conjectures.
The majority of instances of the four items *also, too, as well and in addition* in VOICE were classified as canonical usage of English. The category of non-canonical usage consists of occurrences that deviate from the Standard norm because the respective additive adverbial is positioned non-conventionally, i.e. in a non-conventional place in the clause. In addition, the rather small proportion of instances that were eventually labelled as representing non-conventional usage of these items, indicates that canonical positioning of additive adverbials is indeed not necessary in order for spoken ELF communication to function well.

To sum up, lingua franca usage of additive adverbials occasionally differs from that of native speakers and does not always follow grammatical criteria. The presence of additive adverbials appears to be important in English as a lingua franca communication. Yet, ELF usage of these adverbials allows for far more flexibility with regard to register and positioning than the Standard English norm. As can be seen throughout this chapter, this specific more liberal lingua franca usage of additive adverbials functions well and does not impair communication. Lingua franca speakers adapt and use the English language according to their specific needs (communicating with different people who do not share one mother tongue).
6.6 Other additive adverbials in spoken ELF

6.6.1 Results from VOICE

Given the fact that the study at hand particularly focuses on those four additive adverbials that are most frequently classified by grammarians as belonging to this particular category, namely also, too, as well and in addition, some other items that are often stated to be related to this cluster have so far been neglected. Yet, as has been mentioned before, another six items which are related to also, too, as well and in addition, were looked into in the ELF corpus. The items that were additionally extracted from VOICE are again, likewise, equally, similarly, moreover and furthermore. Their distribution throughout the entire corpus of English as a lingua franca is given in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adverbial</th>
<th>Occurrences</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Again</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>12.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likewise</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equally</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similarly</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moreover</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furthermore</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (four main adverbials)</td>
<td>4519</td>
<td>86.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>5208</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Considering the table above, one can see that the overall number of the additional six items in question is rather reduced in the ELF corpus of spoken interaction. In fact, five of the six adverbials do not even account for one per cent of all of the instances in which an additive adverbial occurs. Therefore, it appears to be obvious why the other four items, which account for almost 87 per cent of all occurrences in VOICE, are far more prone to be acknowledged as belonging to the group of additive adverbials by most grammarians, while those six ele-
ments are occasionally neglected by the corresponding works of Modern English.

Whereas initially this study aimed to investigate more than the four items that are considered as being the most common in their field and therefore intended to include the six elements named above, it has to be acknowledged that a quantitative in-depth analysis of all of these additional items does not appear to be sensible and useful due to the fact that VOICE does not provide a sufficient number of corresponding occurrences. The single item that would indeed lend itself to a more profound investigation is *again*.

However, due to the very nature of this distinct item which, in addition to its usage as an additive adverb, can of course also be used in the sense of expressing “duration and repetition” (Bain 2005: 70), it was decided against a more thorough analysis of *again*. This decision has its roots in the fact that the number of those instances in which the item *again* is used to convey addition was expected to be incredibly low with regard to the English as a lingua franca corpus.

Furthermore, Fjelkestam-Nilsson (1983) also states that the item *again* is most frequently used to express the idea of “once more”, “a second time” or “back to the original state” (Fjelkestam-Nilsson 1983: 47) in both BUC and LOB. Therefore, she did not investigate the element *again* any further and so no comparable and appropriate material was provided to allow for the comparison of the outcomes of VOICE.

Considering these minor drawbacks, the current study attempts to compare the overall usage of the six items in question to their use in the two native speaker corpora without going into great depth. Therefore this chapter is dedicated to giving a brief account of the frequency of *again, likewise, equally, similarly, moreover* and *furthermore* in VOICE and to compare the corresponding results provided by the lingua franca speakers of English to the outcomes of the written native speaker corpora, BUC and LOB. This decision was taken as a distinct dearth of data in the lingua franca English corpora is no reason for absolute disregard for instances in which the aforementioned items do occur, for they do still bear some significance to the study as a whole.
6.6.2 *Again* in ELF and native speaker usage of English

The numbers of occurrences of the item *again* in the two written corpora and in VOICE are shown in Table 22.

Table 22: The frequency of *again* in VOICE, BUC and LOB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th>BUC</th>
<th>LOB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Instances of again</em></td>
<td>660</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>0.066%</td>
<td>0.058%</td>
<td>0.0663%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen in the table above, no pronounced differences between the two written native speaker corpora and VOICE can be found when comparing the outcomes of the word *again*. While the overall body of data is almost exactly the same as far as VOICE and the British native speaker corpus are concerned, the frequency rate of its written American counterpart shows slightly fewer instances in which the word *again* is used in BUC. Hence, one could argue that both groups of native speakers provided in the corresponding corpora use the item *again* in written language according to the same principles as the ELF users recorded in VOICE in spoken interaction.

Even though Table 21 indicates that *again* is by far the most commonly used item of the six additional elements in question because it exceeds their instances, one should perhaps not read too much into this considerable difference in numbers. After all, as has been pointed out before, *again* is expected to be used to express duration and repetition in the majority of utterances that have been extracted from the ELF speaker corpus.
6.6.3 *Likewise* in ELF and native speaker usage of English

Whereas over 600 instances of *again* could be retrieved from VOICE, only one single instance could be found for the item *likewise*. The number of occurrences extracted from BUC and LOB is given below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th>BUC</th>
<th>LOB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instances of likewise</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>0.0001%</td>
<td>0.0018%</td>
<td>0.0017%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Looking at the table, one can see that none of the three corpora provides an extensive number of occurrences of the adverbial *likewise*. Yet it is also shown that both of the written native speaker corpora comprise far more instances of the item than their spoken ELF counterpart. Therefore, one could state that the word *likewise* is used in a different way by the speakers recorded in VOICE and by native speakers of English in BUC and in LOB.

Whereas the overall percentage of *likewise* in the entire ELF corpus only accounts for 0.0001 per cent, this figure is significantly higher in both of the native speaker corpora - 0.0018 per cent and 0.0017 per cent respectively. Thus, both American and British native speakers are far more likely to use the adverbial *likewise* in written discourse than the lingua franca speakers in VOICE. This clear disparity in numbers could be accounted for by stating that the item *likewise* is to be regarded, as Fjelkestam-Nilsson (1983) points out in her own study of additive adverbials, as belonging to the register of more formal language and is therefore supposed to be avoided by the participants in spoken conversation. (Fjelkestam-Nilsson 1983: 47)

While Fjelkestam-Nilsson (1983) also states that the usage of *likewise* as meaning *also* or *as well* is the most frequent in both of her corpora (the other meanings are said to be *in like manner* and *moreover*), the single occurrence extracted from VOICE also belongs to this particular category and is thus to be regarded as representing an additive usage of *likewise*. (ibid)
6.6.4 *Equally* in ELF and native speaker usage of English

The figures of occurrences of the item *equally* in the ELF and in the two written native speaker corpora are shown in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th>BUC</th>
<th>LOB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instances of <em>equally</em></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>0.0023%</td>
<td>0.0052%</td>
<td>0.0088%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 24: Occurrences of *equally* in ELF and native speaker corpora

As Tables 21 and 24 indicate, the item *equally* is not only far less common than its close counterpart *again* in VOICE, its overall number of occurrences in the ELF speaker corpus is also outweighed by the frequency rates of both of the written native speaker corpora. In fact, the adverbial *equally* is used twice as often in the American BUC, and around four times as frequently in LOB, than in the lingua franca corpus. Therefore, one can discern a distinct tendency of usage.

This significant disparity in numbers could be accounted for due to the fact that ELF speakers appear to consider *equally* as being part of a more formal style and hence do not usually tend to use it in spoken language. Therefore, the lingua franca speakers in VOICE might prefer more or less synonymous items, such as *again*, to fulfil the purpose of the word *equally*. Nevertheless, this is of course only an assumption and should also be treated as such at all times.
6.6.5  *Similarly* in ELF and native speaker usage of English

The numbers of occurrences of the item *similarly* in the two written corpora and in VOICE are shown in Table 25.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th>BUC</th>
<th>LOB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instances of <em>similarly</em></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>0.0000%</td>
<td>0.0036%</td>
<td>0.0046%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen in Tables 21 and 25, not even a single instance of the item *similarly* could be retrieved from VOICE; indeed this particular item does not appear to be particularly popular in written mother tongue usage either, as can be seen by the low frequency in these corpora as well. However, it is clear to see that its usage is still far more common in both of the written native speaker corpora.

Seeing that Fjelkestam-Nilsson (1983) determines the item *similarly* as being part of a more formal lexis, the overall results of the comparison of all three corpora support her argument. Hence, it can be stated that *similarly*, as its close relative *equally*, tends to be preferred in written mother tongue use while these two elements are somehow quite excluded by the lingua franca speakers in VOICE. (Fjelkestam-Nilsson 1983: 48)
6.6.6 *Moreover* in ELF and native speaker usage of English

Even though the instances that were extracted from VOICE as regards *moreover* only account for approximately 0.06 per cent of all cases in which additives are used in this corpus, this word is still the third most popular of the six items in question. The figures showing the frequency of *moreover* in the ELF and in the written native speaker corpora are given in the table below.

### Table 26: The frequency of *moreover* in VOICE, BUC and LOB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th>BUC</th>
<th>LOB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instances of moreover</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>0.0003%</td>
<td>0.0088%</td>
<td>0.0055%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results provided by BUC and LOB once again far outweigh those retrieved from VOICE. In fact, the data extracted from the ELF corpus does not even account for one-tenth of the data provided by the native speaker corpora. Hence, both of the native speaker groups show that *moreover* tends to be far more frequently used in native written English than in the spoken lingua franca discourse in VOICE.

Due to the fact that the word *moreover* is usually considered as being rather formal by most reference works of grammar, such as Lambotte, Campbell & Potter (1998: 102), the outcomes illustrated in the chart above are not at all surprising. It seems that both ELF and native speakers of Modern English are aware that the item *moreover* generally prefers to be applied in formal language. While mother tongue users might of course know this peculiarity intuitively and would not normally consciously reflect on their usage of *moreover*, ELF users might have been taught that this adverbial is favoured in formal written style.
6.6.7 Furthermore in ELF and native speaker usage of English

Similarly to its close relative moreover, there was only a small sample of data with regard to furthermore held within VOICE. How the outcomes of the ELF corpus relate to those of the native speaker corpora is shown in Table 27.

Table 27: The frequency of furthermore in various corpora

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th>BUC</th>
<th>LOB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instances of furthermore</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>0.0002%</td>
<td>0.0039%</td>
<td>0.0025%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Just as was the case with its counterpart moreover, the overall occurrence of furthermore in the ELF corpus is far lower than that in BUC and LOB. In fact, the two instances that were retrieved from VOICE do not even account for one tenth of the overall usage of additive adverbials in both of the mother tongue corpora. Therefore, as was the case with moreover, the item furthermore appears to be used far more often in native written language than in spoken lingua franca English.

As has been pointed out before with regard to moreover, furthermore is also deemed to be part of a somewhat more formal register (Lambotte, Campbell & Potter 1998: 102) and is therefore believed to be more commonly used in written language. Thus, the aforementioned grammar principles can be supported by the findings resulting out of the comparison of the three corpora. After all, the frequency of furthermore in the written corpora, BUC and LOB, far outweigh the occurrences in the material calculated for VOICE.

Whilst it appears that the adverb also is often preferred in conversational English over its two more formal counterparts moreover and furthermore by the lingua franca users, Fjelkestam-Nilsson (1983) emphasises that quite the opposite appears to be true with regard to the written usage of native speakers of English. (Fjelkestam-Nilsson 1983: 50)
7 Factors influencing the use of also and too in VOICE

So far the frequency of a number of additive adverbials has been studied on a more general level with regard to ELF use. It therefore makes rational sense to continue to analyse these findings in greater depth. In the following chapter the general usage of the adverbs also and too will be investigated and the question will be posed as to whether the frequency of their use is sex-specific. Furthermore, the additive adverbial too will be analysed according to the two functions prescribed by the influential linguist Halliday (2002), who discerns the ideational and the interpersonal function, to see if sex difference has its roots in the fact that one of the grammatical functions is preferred by one of the sexes.

7.1 Sex and language

7.1.1 Empirical research

While some languages possess certain words that are exclusively reserved for the use of men or women, the “most differentiation in English is ‘sex preferential’, a matter of frequency of occurrence” (Thorne & Henley 1978: 10-11). Thorne & Henley (1978), for instance, give the example of the use of –ing or its less formal counterpart –in in pronunciation and argue that men are far more likely to use the latter whereas women would rather tend to select the more formal -ing. It is therefore argued that the various features related to male or female speech “add up to two distinct styles or varieties of spoken English” (op.cit: 11). Kramer (1974) goes even further and claims that the English language as used in the United States of America could be classified into “gender-lects”, so great is the distinction between male and female usage of the language. (Thorne & Henley 1978: 10-11; Kramer 1974: 14)

Acknowledging the different features of male and female speech, Yule (2006) points out that certain characteristics, such as back-channelling (the use of words like really? or sounds such as hmm while listening to another person) or
indirect speech acts are far more frequently found in female speech than male. In addition,

[the use of rising intonation (Æ) at the end of statements (It happened near San DiegoÆ, in southern CaliforniaÆ), the more frequent use of hedges (sort of, kind of) and tag questions (It’s kind of cold in here, isn’t it?) have all been identified as characteristic of women’s speech. (Yule 2006: 224)

While women in this context are often said to use certain features which make speaking a shared activity, interaction between males is usually far more hierarchical. All of the features named above appear to serve the purpose “of inviting agreement with an idea rather than asserting it” (op.cit: 224-225).

Thorne and Henley (1978) provide a more detailed list of typically female characteristics which they state to be drawn from numerous sources. This includes

× “the co-occurrence of certain phonological features (e.g., -ing and other more formal phonetic variants)”
× “certain intonation patterns rarely used by men”
× “less frequent use of swearing […], joking […] and hostile verbs”
× “more frequent use of psychological state verbs”
× “expressive intensifiers like so and such”
× “certain adjectives like adorable and lovely”
× “the words mm hmm […] and tag questions”
× “the use of conjunctions rather than interjections to mark topic shifts”
× and the “preference for certain conversational topics and speech genres”

(Thorne & Henley 1978: 11)

Hence, one can see that there is a clear difference between male and female language usage, which makes it worthwhile to look into this matter in the ELF corpus as well.
7.1.2 Methods

To be able to verify the principles presented above, which argue that there is a marked difference in the usage of language between male and female speakers, the sex of those ELF users recorded in VOICE who employed the corresponding adverbials was reviewed. Due to the fact that Fjelkestam-Nilsson (1983) only provides outcomes of the two additive adverbs *also* and *too* in her own study, it was eventually decided to focus on these two items in the ELF speaker corpus to facilitate a comparison.

It must be stated at this point that Fjelkestam-Nilsson (1983) did not investigate the difference of sex as far as *also* and *too* are concerned in her three native speaker corpora, BUC, LOB and LLC. Instead she decided to analyse this specific aspect of additive adverbials in various novels. Nevertheless, the outcomes of this particular study are thought to be equally appropriate and lend themselves to a comparison of the results provided by VOICE. (Fjelkestam-Nilsson 1983: 95)

Due to the fact that the ELF corpus does not provide a more effective means of verifying the sex of a speaker, all 3725 instances in which one of the items *also* or *too* had been found were analysed manually before being placed into their corresponding category of male or female speaker. The exact distribution can be seen in Tables 28 and 29.

All occurrences of the respective adverbials were counted. In other words, the entirety of the different categories of *too* and *also*, i.e. additives, copulatives, fillers, repetitions, *too* in the sense of *too much* and *moreover*, was included into the investigation given the fact that Fjelkestam-Nilsson (1983) herself includes all categories in her own study. The only items that had to be excluded from this analysis of male and female language are those instances in which *also* was employed by the ELF user whilst speaking in his or her mother tongue, such as (107).

107.  *also* ich glaube die feiern das schon (VOICE 2009: LEcon351:97)

Due to the fact that the remaining occurrences of *also* and *too* are included even if they are mere repetitions, for example (108), one needs to be aware that a number of the adverbials might result from the same speaker. Yet this is
not to be regarded as a deterioration of the overall outcome because this chapter desires to illustrate the overall frequency of *also* and *too* and their distribution over the two different sex categories, in the corpus. Nevertheless, one must of course be careful not to read too much into the outcomes.

108. xx it’s er er not normal hh now it’s er *too too too* busy in er in our city there are too many people it’s er (VOICE 2009: EDcon521:1113)

In addition the 2898 instances of the *additives also* and *too* were analysed in the same way as the entirety of all other occurrences.

### 7.1.3 Results from VOICE

After the necessary exclusion of the thirteen non-English utterances, such as (107), two additional instances of *also* had to be excluded because the sex of their speakers was not specified in the corpus. Therefore, a total of 2961 instances of *also* were classified according to the user’s sex. The distribution between female and male usage of the item *also* is given in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Instances of <em>also</em></th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Female speaker</em></td>
<td>1637</td>
<td>55.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Male speaker</em></td>
<td>1324</td>
<td>44.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2961</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen in Table 28, there is a notable difference between male and female usage of *also* in VOICE. The women in the corpus appear more likely to use this word than men. In fact female usage of *also* accounts for about 55 per cent of all cases, whereas male usage lies at around 45 per cent. Nevertheless, the difference is not very significant.

As far as the item *too* is concerned, no exclusions had to be made but all 749 instances provided by VOICE were analysed. The results of classification into male and female usage of *too* are provided in the table below.
Table 29: Usage of *too* in female and male speech in VOICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Instances of <em>too</em></th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Female speaker</em></td>
<td>428</td>
<td>57.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Male speaker</em></td>
<td>321</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>749</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The female speakers of lingua franca English recorded in the corpus use *too* more often than the male speakers. Whereas the item *too* is used by women in approximately 57 per cent of all its occurrences in the corpus, it is only applied by 43 per cent of male speakers.

To sum up, it can be said that both *also* and *too* are preferred by the female ELF speakers in VOICE. Nevertheless, this disparity is not very significant in both cases. Yet, the empirical implications which indirectly suggest that women should use these two items more often than men have been confirmed with regard to the ELF corpus.

Now it is interesting to see whether this slight difference between male and female usage also holds true for those particular cases in which the two adverbs are used to express addition. Therefore the 2687 instances of additive *also* were analysed separately. Again, two instances could not be evaluated because the sex of the speaker was not indicated by VOICE. The exact distribution of the remaining 2685 instances of the additive adverb *also* in VOICE with respect to their speakers’ sex can be seen in the table below.

Table 30: Additive usage of *also* by female and male speakers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Instances of <em>also</em></th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Female speaker</em></td>
<td>1470</td>
<td>54.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Male speaker</em></td>
<td>1215</td>
<td>45.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2685</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 30 illustrates that there is a difference between male and female usage of additive *also* in the ELF corpus. In fact, the results for this particular subgroup, approximately 55 per cent female and approximately 45 per cent male, mirror those drawn from the investigation of the entirety of the occurrences of *also* in the corpus - about 55 per cent female and about 45 per cent male usage. Hence, the female speakers in VOICE are not only likely to use the item *also* more often than men but they additionally use the additive adverb *also* more frequently than the male ELF speakers. While there is a certain difference in numbers, one should be aware of the fact that this disparity is not actually pronounced.

As far as additive *too* is concerned, no exclusions had to be made but all of its 211 occurrences provided by VOICE were analysed further. The results of this classification into male and female usage of *too* as expressing addition are provided in the table below.

### Table 31: Additive usage of too by men and women in the ELF corpus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Instances of <em>too</em></th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female speaker</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>62.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male speaker</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>37.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>211</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 31 illustrates, the female speakers use additive *too* far more often than the male speakers in VOICE. Whereas *additive too* is used by women in approximately 63 per cent of all cases, it is only applied by male speakers in about 37 per cent. Even though the item *too* is usually used by female speakers more often (as indicated by Table 29) the numbers for the subcategory of the additive adverb *too* far outweigh the general figure. Thus, the female speakers in VOICE tend to use *too* and additive *too* more often than the male speakers.

To sum up, it can be said that both *also* and *too* are preferred by the female speakers in VOICE. This general outcome also holds true for the particular subgroups in which *also* and *too* are applied to express addition. Therefore one might argue that both items could be regarded as special features that are
more often selected by female lingua franca speakers than by the men in VOICE.

Considering the precise outcomes of the current investigation it is particularly interesting to relate the sex-specific usage of also and too with the results of the native speakers provided by Fjelkestam-Nilsson (1983). A brief comparison will be made in the next subchapter.

7.1.4 *Also* and *too*: markers of female language?

Fjelkestam-Nilsson (1983) points out that where the items *also* and *too* are concerned there are various perceivable differences between the American and British use of the English language according to sex. Her findings in the fiction-based corpus indicate that “the female American authors use *also* significantly more often than the male American authors” (Fjelkestam-Nilsson 1983: 100). However, the sex discrepancy in British English is said to be far less substantial. Nevertheless, the overall outcome of her study illustrates that the group consisting of British and American native females shows a considerably higher frequency of the item *also* than can be found in its male counterpart. (ibid)

Yet, the opposite appears to be true for the item *too*. The British female authors are said to use *too* significantly more often than their male counterparts, whereas this disparity is not especially evident amongst the American native speakers. Nonetheless, if the native English speaker group is considered as a whole, *too* is far more frequently used by female than by male users of the language. (op.cit: 103)

Considering the outcomes of VOICE and taking into account the results provided for native speakers of English, one could claim that there is an obvious difference between female and male usage of the two items in question in both the native speaker and the ELF corpora. However, the sex difference of usage is significantly greater in written native speaker language.

Whereas the results of the separate investigation of the additive adverb *also* in VOICE show that this item is used marginally more often by female lingua franca speakers, the difference in the native speaker corpus appears to be more pronounced. This fact also holds true for the usage of additive *too*;
Fjelkestam-Nilsson (1983) even points out that “the female authors use additive forms significantly more frequently than the male authors, in the American as well as in the British group” (ibid). Nevertheless, the difference between female and male usage of *additive too* in the ELF corpus is noticeable as well.

Given the fact that there is a difference between male and female usage of *also* and *too* in VOICE, one could argue that features of language usage pertaining to women that serve the purpose of making speech a shared activity (tag questions, back-channelling, certain vocabulary etc.) do not only appear to hold true for native speaker usage but to a certain extent also as phenomena in lingua franca English. Nevertheless, when considering the minor differences in numbers that were found for the ELF corpus and Fjelkestam-Nilsson’s (1983) comment that *also* and *too* are applied in similar ways by women and men, one should indeed be careful not to jump to conclusions. (op.cit: 114)

Thorne and Henley (1978) remark that sex differences are often overestimated by stating:

> Some empirical studies which hypothesized sex differences in speech did not find them [...] This is significant knowledge, and one must be wary of a general tendency to exaggerate differences and underestimate similarities between the sexes. (Thorne & Henley 1978: 15)

Considering these facts and arguments, it was eventually decided in favour of a more thorough investigation of the additive adverb *too* with regard to its metafunction (cf. Halliday 2002). Hence, the last subchapter of the current paper will be concerned with the question of whether there is a correlation between the two functions of the additive adverb *too* (the ideational and the interpersonal function) and the sex of its users. Due to the fact that Fjelkestam-Nilsson’s analysis does not include such an approach, no comparable results for native speaker language are available.
7.2 Different functions, different adverbials?

7.2.1 Interpersonal and ideational function

Attempting to explain the system of language, Halliday (2002) distinguishes between its two basic functions - the ideational and the interpersonal function - which, according to him, broadly divide the grammar of a language. The first is explained as follows:

Language serves for the expression of “content”: that is, of the speaker’s experience of the real world, including the inner world of his own consciousness. (Halliday 2002: 174-175)

Hence, the ideational function serves the purpose of expressing things which are internal to the speaker - in other words the internal world of the speaker - or it represents processes in the external world. (Bearne 2002: 13)

On the other hand, the second interpersonal function, as its name suggests, involves other parties. Halliday (2002) explains:

Language serves to establish and maintain social relations: for the expression of social roles, which include the communication roles created by language itself – for example the roles of questioner or respondent, which we take on by asking or answering a question; and also for getting things done, by means of the interaction between one person and another. (Halliday 2002: 175)

Therefore, the latter serves the purpose of delimiting groups as well as reinforcing and identifying the presence of the individual and the development of his or her own personality through interaction with others (ibid), or as Bearne (2002) puts it, the interpersonal function “reflects social interactions and relationships in the processes of communication” (Bearne 2002: 13).

7.2.2 Methods

After the investigation of the correlation of sex with the usage of certain additive adverbials, it was decided that the whole matter might not only have its roots in the difference between men and women but that the functions presented by Halliday (2002) may also be embedded in male and female usage of these items.
To be able to test this assumption the 211 instances of *too* that are used to express addition were once again analysed manually. It was decided to focus only on this particular additive adverb because the male-female discrepancy in ELF usage appears to be far greater than in the additive adverb *also*. A more detailed analysis of all of the additive adverbials presented throughout this study would go beyond the scope of this work.

All the relevant occurrences of *too* were considered with regard to the functions proposed by Halliday (2002) so as to detect how these additive adverbials add to speech in the lingua franca corpus. Every instance of additive *too* had to be regarded in its environment, to find out whether the corresponding occurrence served an ideational function (an exchange of meaning, experience etc. about something outside of the particular conversation, such as in (109)), or whether it primarily served an interpersonal function inside realm of communication, for as in (110).

109.  i think austrian are very polite people everywhere i went in university in the street *too* in the shops everyone speaks very polite (VOICE 2009: EDsed31:580)

110. A: i think maybe in fifty years russia can make er yah  
    B: well i think so *too* hh but what is worrying about the politics of putin is that (VOICE 2009: EDcon521:1359-1360)

Naturally it was not always ascertainable whether an utterance primarily served the interpersonal or the ideational function. Furthermore, one needs to be aware that even Halliday (2002) himself concedes that a complete distinction between these two functions will never be possible because every clause displays simultaneous use of both functions. (Halliday 2002: 237) Consequently, instances in which no significant tendency towards one of the functions could be identified had to be regarded as unclear.

In addition, those occurrences of the additive adverb *too* that were classified only represent a tendency towards one or the other function and so categorisation is to some extent subjective. A comprehensive list of all instances of additive *too* that were classified according to Halliday’s functions (2002) can be found in the appendix. The corresponding figures are shown below.
7.2.3 Results from VOICE

As Table 32 indicates, about 28 per cent of the relevant data had to be classified as being unclear as no obvious tendency towards one of the functions could be detected. However, the remaining 72 per cent of data shows that additive *too* is used more often to fulfil the ideational function than the interpersonal function in the corpus of lingua franca usage. Nonetheless, taking into account the grammatical suggestions presented throughout subchapter 7.1.1 the second, i.e. the interpersonal function, might be employed far more often by female users than by male; as Yule (2006) suggests, women are said to be more likely to use certain features which make speech a shared activity. (Yule 2006: 224-225)

Table 32: Additive *too* and the functions by Halliday

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instances of additive <em>too</em></th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ideational function</strong></td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpersonal function</strong></td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unclear</strong></td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>211</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hence, the 65 instances in which the additive adverb *too* is used to fulfil an interpersonal function were investigated independently. The results of this final categorisation are shown below.

Table 33: Female and male usage of the interpersonal function of additive *too*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total of additive <em>too</em></th>
<th>Instances</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female speaker</strong></td>
<td>132</td>
<td>62.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male speaker</strong></td>
<td>79</td>
<td>37.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>211</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpersonal function</th>
<th>Instances</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female speaker</strong></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>61.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male speaker</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>38.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>65</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As the table above indicates the female lingua franca speakers in VOICE tend to use additive *too* to perform the interpersonal function far more often than the male speakers in the corpus. Indeed the results of female usage almost exactly mirror those drawn from the overall usage of *additive too* in the corpus, which displayed approximately 63 per cent of female use. Therefore, it could be argued that female ELF speakers in VOICE are more likely to use *additive too* than their male counterparts. This outcome also holds true with regard to the interpersonal function. Hence Fjelkestam-Nilsson’s (1983) suggestion that additive *too* is to be regarded as a marker of female language in native written English and Yule’s (2006) remark that women use a more interpersonal communicative language can both be confirmed by the outcomes in this study of the additive adverb *too*. (Fjelkestam-Nilsson 1983: 103; Yule 2006: 224-225)

Yet one needs to be careful not to read too much into these disparities. After all, the overall volume of data containing additive *too* is rather restricted in VOICE and the subsequent process of categorisation is inevitably subjective.
8 Conclusion

The principal objective of this study was to investigate the particular usage of additive adverbials by *lingua franca* users of the English language in authentic spoken communication, with a special focus on the sex of these speakers. The investigation set out to gain a deeper insight into ELF talk to better comprehend how its speakers use language for their specific purposes.

In the course of writing this paper many interesting patterns emerged. The adverb *also*, which in VOICE is used more often than all of the other adverbials in question, proved to be far more frequent in the ELF corpus than in all of the native speaker corpora in instances of both written and spoken language as well. Even though this item is commonly used as a discourse filler and as a mere repetition, even when we discount these its additive usage far outweighs all other instances in VOICE. When applied to express addition, *also* is often used non-canonically as far as the Standard English norm is concerned. However, these deviations do not usually impair communication.

*As well*, which after *also* is the most common of the adverbials in the ELF corpus, is far more frequently used in VOICE than in the two written native speaker corpora. Although it is occasionally used as a filler, in mere repetition or as part of the preposition *as well as*, its usage as an additive adverbial is the most common. In the many cases in which it is used to express addition, it is mostly used according to the principles of Modern English.

The adverb *too*, which is the third most common adverbial in question in VOICE also appears to be used more frequently in native spoken language as it is far less frequently found in the ELF corpus than in the written BUC and LOB. In those cases in which *too* is used, it often proves to be a marker of spoken language (filler or repetition) or serves the purpose of expressing the meaning of *too much*. Therefore, it is not very common as an additive adverb and, when used to express this specific meaning, it is not often used non-canonically but rather appears to be applied according to the prescriptive norm.

The least frequent of the four main adverbials in this study, namely *in addition*, is also far less common than in BUC and in LOB. In VOICE it is often used as
part of the preposition in addition to and was applied on one occasion as a discourse filler. However it is most frequently found in the form of an additive adverbial and in that sense is used non-conventionally in some instances. Nevertheless, these deviations once again do not impair communication.

Whereas three of the four items that the current thesis is most concerned with appear to be rather common in VOICE, the other six adverbials investigated are rather uncommon in the lingua franca corpus, the only exception being the item again. The comparison of the latter and the results of BUC and LOB demonstrated that no significant difference could be found between the spoken lingua franca and the written native speaker corpora. However, again was expected to be more commonly used to express the meaning of “once more”, “a second time” or “back to the original state” (Fjelkestam-Nilsson 1983:47) in VOICE as than in BUC and in LOB. With regard to the other five items, likewise, equally, similarly, moreover and furthermore, it was detected that they are far more frequently applied in the written native corpora and hardly ever appeared to be selected by the speakers recorded in the ELF corpus.

The following investigation of the sex of the users of too and also showed that both lingua franca and native speaker females tend to use these two items more often than men. However, the difference is said to be greater with regard to native speaker usage and the disparity between men and women is not very significant for both items in VOICE. Yet the difference in additive usage proved to be more pronounced with regard to both elements in the lingua franca corpus and in the native speaker corpora. Further analysis of additive too in respect of Halliday’s meta-functions (2002), demonstrated that the additive adverb too is most often used to serve an ideational function, i.e. to exchange meaning, and experience something outside of the particular conversation. However, when it is used to perform the interpersonal function (internal communication) it is most often applied by females.

As one can see, the basic assumptions which had been formulated prior to this investigation showed themselves to hold. ELF users use the corresponding adverbials in a different manner to native speakers of English as they often apply adverbials as markers of spoken discourse. Yet, this could be mainly due to VOICE interaction being naturally occurring spontaneous interaction. Secondly,
female lingua franca speakers were shown to use adverbials more often than male speakers of ELF. Last but not least, additive *too* was used by female speakers far more often than by male speakers, performing Halliday’s (2002) interpersonal function.

To sum up it could be further stated that additive adverbials are frequently applied according to the principles of native speaker language and to the prescriptive views by the lingua franca users of English in VOICE. Whenever their usage deviates from the norm, the non-canonical use has no negative impact on lingua franca communication. In fact, non-conventional selection or positioning of additive adverbials does not appear to be disturbing to spoken lingua franca interaction.

Considering the outcomes of this thesis and taking into account that, as has been stated before, the majority of users of English worldwide are non-native speakers of the language one should reconsider the basic principles of some pedagogical institutes which still appear to prefer the form-oriented approach. After all, it was shown throughout this study that the selection and positioning of additive adverbials does not appear to be too important in order for communication to take place. Hence, pedagogical institutes should consider changing their somewhat obsolete form-oriented ideal into a more meaning-oriented approach for, as the ELF speakers recorded in VOICE prove, it is not mandatory to follow the rules based on native speaker language of English so as to communicate effectively. Indeed quite the contrary seems to be true because lingua franca speakers appear to adapt the language according to their specific needs of communicating without a common mother tongue.

Despite its limited scope this thesis hence offers interesting implications for conducting additional academic research concerning the usage of additive adverbials. It is obvious that many issues remain unresolved, such as the sex-division with regard to Halliday’s (2002) interpersonal and ideational functions and the other additive adverbials.

Nevertheless, this study hopefully adds some insights to the world of authentic English as a lingua franca usage and adds new facets to ELF research. At any rate, in the course of writing this thesis I became more aware of the system of English as a lingua franca. I have particularly gained a valuable insight into the
organisation of the English language and therefore have acquired a better understanding of languages in general.
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10 Appendix

10.1 Extracts

*Given in voice style*

**Ideational function**

EDcon250: Lunch conversation about different university systems and other topics
- 394S3: but they are very thin (1) at least {parallel conversation SX and SX in german starts}
  - 395S6: yes (.)
  - 396S5: @@@ @<1> @@ @<1>
  - 397S6: <1> the only </1><2> advantage </2>
  - 398S3: <2><soft> yeah but </soft></2> the <@> o- </@> <3> @@ </3> (.)
  - 399S5: <3> @@ </3>
  - 400S3: <soft> @@ </soft> (9)
  - 401S6: probably it is an italian cook (.). (.) yes (.). cos e:rm (.) in slovakia the (.) try and
  - 402S3: yeah
  - 403S6: pizza pizza's like in <4><un> xxx </un></4> try and
  - 404S3: <4> but here </4> too
  - 405S6: yeah but (.) there are only (.) so. (1) <5> and they are </5> (.) this yeah
  - 406S3: <5> very thick </5>
  - 407S3: @@@ hh but er but you will get things like that here **TOO** (.)

EDcon250: Lunch conversation about different university systems and other topics
- 407S3: @@ hh but er but you will get things like that here too (.)
  - 408S5: @@@ yeah </@> =
  - 409S6: = they are more er like a CAKE then
  - 410S3: @ <@@> yeah </@@> true. (1) american pizzas look like that **TOO** huh?
  - 411S6: yeah (6) {SS are eating}

EDcon250: Lunch conversation about different university systems and other topics
- 428S4: you're welcome (16) {SS are eating}
  - 429S3: are you staying erm (.) over the weekend then? <2> until </2>
  - 430S2: <2> yes </2> mhm (2) i have two friends here **TOO** <3> that i'm visiting </3> yeah (9) {SS are eating}

EDcon250: Lunch conversation about different university systems and other topics
- 220S3: many peo:ple (.) started flying e:r to er booking their flights now not from vienna any more but from <13> bratislava </13> because er hh <14> it's </14>
  - 221S2: <13> mhm </13>
  - 222S5: <14> ah it's </14> very cheap <15> no? yeah </15>
223S3: <15> there are </15> cheaper air<16>lines or cheaper </16> things yeah (.)
224S4: <16> they're very cheap mhm </16>
225S6: but will it be cheaper erm er later TOO (.) do you think because er now the:
er the airports are (.) they united by one company? i think (.) one <5> company bought
<5> or bought <6> our airport </6>

EDcon496: Conversation between business students

481S1: = i'm stretch introDUCtion i'm not gonna @@ stretch </8> that </8></@
482S2: <8> no </8> you can stretch it in a wa:y that erm (1) you can ask the audience
for an example. (.) so if you (.) like if you're stuck on forward integration you go like
<4> [first name7] </4> can you give me e:r
483S1: <4> i'll </4>
484S1: [first name7] will choke me.
485S2: @ <5> @@@@ </5>[S2 hits table three times]
486S1: <5> i'll but i'll do that </5><fast> i'll like guys i'm a little bit confused here
you know i'm a student TOO </fast> (.) i'm <6> learning </6><7> i'm </7> in the <1>
learning </1> process help <2> me out </2>

EDCon521: Conversation between students from Europe about working and studying in
different European countries

399S2: <un> xxx </un> i <8> i mean we (have) europe </8> as a whole <un> x </un>
400SX-5: <8><soft> yah europe </soft></8>
401SX-5: yah =
402S2: = it's kind of a: that's kind of e:r hh
403S4: because that includes the businesses <9> TOO </9>

EDCon521: Conversation between students from Europe about working and studying in
different European countries

912S4: = that's how it is for e:r e:r (1) technology (.) <1> e:r </1> and (.)
913SX-f: <1><soft> yah </soft></1>
914S4: civil engineering in sweden
915SX-f: <soft> yah </soft>
916S4: they <2> have that system </2> TOO (.)

EDCon496: Conversation between business students

140S2: <to S3> he sent you his phone number </to S3>
141S1: who? who? what happened?
142S2: [first name1] i can stalk him <2> he </2><3>  probably </3> would send me
his phone number <4> TOO </4>

EDInt604: Interview about attitudes towards the use of English and Maltese in Malta
102S1: <to S3> hh because i i tried to ask er to interview a receptionist at a hotel in
<sliema {city in malta} </LNmlt> a:nd (.) i ask with whether he would like a
questionnaire in english or in maltese (1) exactly the same (.) and he was like <imitat-
ing> of course in maltese but like really offended </to S3>
103S3: yeah @ @ so i guess some people are <4> not that happy about it </4> (.)
104S4: <4> yeah we do we DO have some </4>
105S1: but (.) <5> er younger </5> people i assume (.)
106S4: <5> i mean we </5>
107S4: no not really (. ) depends (. ) it has to do with some {mobile phone receives a message} areas in the country TOO

EDcon250: Lunch conversation about different university systems and other topics
394S3: but they are very thin (1) at least {parallel conversation SX and SX in german starts} 
395S6: yes (.) 
396S5: @@@ @ @<1> @@ @<1> </1>
397S6: <1> the only </1><2> advantage </2>
398S3: <2><soft> yeah but </soft><2></2> the <@@> o- </@@><3> @@@<3> (.)
399S5: <3> @@@<3> </3>
400S3: <soft> @@@ <soft> </soft></soft> (9)
401S6: probably it is an italian cook (. ) there. (. ) yes (. ) cos e:rm (. ) in slovakia the (. )
<un> xxx </un> try and
402S5: yeah 
403S6: pizza pizza's like in <4><un> xxx </un></4>
404S3: <4> but here </4> TOO

EDcon250: Lunch conversation about different university systems and other topics
864S2: = you get money FROM the university. 
865S5: yeah money er:
866S4: it de<14>pends on the marks </14>
867S5: <14> university </14>
868S2: <14> for your living ex- </14> for your living expenses? or: (.)
869S5: yes yes 
870S2: <soft> yes </soft></soft> (. )
871S5: it depends on the (. ) <soft> point. </soft></soft> (. )
872S4: on the points <8> on the marks </8>
873S5: <8> depends on the </8> grade <9> yeah </9>
874S4: <9> you know </9>
875S2: <9> o:h </9> okay
876S4: er we've GOT it TOO but er: it's like you have to we've got two semester? (.) and er: (. )

EDsed31: Seminar discussion about Austrian stereotypes and cultural differences in general
1659S1: this curve is. (. ) it goes up again also meaning (. ) that you get used to the new (. ) sort of environment you get used to the people people's way of dealing with situations (2) the blue curve (. ) is not your OWN perception of the situation but it's how others perceive YOU . this is how the austrians perceive you in the beginning hh HOW (. ) appl- this is called <L1ger> verhaltensangemessenheit. {suitability of behavior} </L1ger> how applicable how suitable is your behavior in a certain kind of situation. hh and in many situations your (. ) behavior will NOT be what the austrians would expect (1) <slow> from another person in general.</slow> hh erm so (1) in the beginning this will be very low but it will also rise because (. ) first of all you will try to imitate the austrians' behavior (. ) (e-) i always use the example of if the british stand in line <fast> even if you don't understand why they stand in line you would start standing in line TOO because that's what everybody does.</fast> hh <5> so </5> even if you don't really KNOW what's the concept behind it you know that this is what they do so you do it also. hh so even without understanding it and this is like at this point {S1 points at picture}
hh the orientation clarity is down here. and your behavior is already up here. so you're
already ON the way to the right kind of behavior even though you have <@> no idea
why you do this </@> hh the way you do it (1)

EDsed251: Seminar discussion about academic mobility

☐ 377S9: hh can think in this hh in this way. and e:r the the other things <soft> that's
not important. is it? </soft> hh (.) of course for a law? hh you must you k- must (1)
<LNger> kennen [know] </LNger> it (.) yes i know <fast> er i </fast> know TOO what
is accounting in ukraine and (know the) e:r banking system in ukraine hh <LNger>
aber {but} </LNger> hh it is (.) it is the (.) the BASE is the SAME in i- in in: in: germany
and in america and in africa. (1) so (.) this (was) (.)

EDsed251: Seminar discussion about academic mobility

☐ EDsed251:528S3: i wanted to make another remark <fast> but it's </fast> on: what
you said before with labelling the bachelor system? (.) the bachelor degrees? hh and
erm: <smacks lips> it's a question of what? (.) what (.) you want to: erm: provide with a
bachelor for example: erm: in the united states (.) you you mainly erm: a liberal art-
er arts education (.) and you have to (.) take subjects like math and physics and a language
and hh erm a certain (.) <fast> like a </fast> third of your: curriculum? is erm: (.) is de-
determined? hh and a third you do you can choose freely? (.) and then you specialize on
one (.) erm topic and major in it. (.) so you get (.) you HAVE like (.) a s- (.) specific
focus that you major in but you also have (.) hh a broad education that you get with your
bachelor. (.) and in: (.) germany probably in austria TOO i don't know about the (.) other
european countries? but (.) with your first erm: university degree? (.) which was (.) at
least five years hh you specialized in: (.) erm one topic in one subject. (.) law or eco-
nomics or (.) political science (2) and then erm: <fast> the idea behind it was that </fast>
at school (.) you already learned (.) ALL that you have to know for maths and chemistry
and (.) all the other subjects? and then you could (.) decide which subject <fast> you
were going </fast> to specialize in? (1) so if NOW (.) if you con- (.) if you want to con-
dense it and make (.) a bachelor from it? (1) at the moment we're thinking of: erm: (.)
staying within a subject. (.) <fast> and so it's a </fast> question of (1) do we want to
stick with that? (.) or do we want to integrate (1) more other components (.) so that it (.)
becomes a bit more broad and so afterwards yo- you are NOT labelled to: (1) go into a
certain (.) job but (.) you have this idea of (1) being open for different possibilities and
(.) then being able to (.) go on <soft> with lifelong learning. (.) <un> x </un><soft> </fast> (.)

EDsed31: Seminar discussion about Austrian stereotypes and cultural differences in
general

☐ 1145S6: and in the german language you have except the word <L1ger> freund
{friend} </L1ger> you have the word <8><L1ger> bekannter {acquaintance}
</L1ger></8>
☐ 1146S18: <8><LNger> bekannter {acquaintance} </LNger></8> yeah
☐ 1147SS: mhm
☐ 1148S18: in <9> in italy TOO </9>

EDsed31: Seminar discussion about Austrian stereotypes and cultural differences in
general

☐ 1536S2: <@> okay that would be a shock <4> in austria @ @ @ </4></@></@></@> @ @
</7>
☐ 1537SS: <4> @ @ @ @ </4>
EDwgd241: Working group discussion about the advantages and disadvantages of different scenarios concerning the future of English in Europe

EDsed364: Seminar discussion on a film about Gustav Klimt

EDwgd5: Working group discussion about organizing a presentation on a common foreign policy for the European Union

EDwgd241: Working group discussion about the advantages and disadvantages of different scenarios concerning the future of English in Europe

EDwgd241: Working group discussion about the advantages and disadvantages of different scenarios concerning the future of English in Europe
289S3: but how do ho- how is the system sorry? (.).
290S5: so we have (.), actually it's like (it's it's) changing now TOO because it's to adapt to european (1) ways. (.), but actually we learn in the erm (1) at the age of ten (.), we learn french (1) for two year only french and then er (1) it CONTinues up to end of school (.), and (.), afterwards <loud> one year </loud> later you can choose if you wanna learn (.), english or italian generally it is english =

EDwgd241: Working group discussion about the advantages and disadvantages of different scenarios concerning the future of English in Europe
590S5: <5> because </5> you can (.), er you have the international communication with ONE language
591S1: yeah
592S2: costs TOO (.)
593S1: ex<6>actly </6>

EDwgd241: Working group discussion about the advantages and disadvantages of different scenarios concerning the future of English in Europe
620S3: <4> politics </4>
621SX-f: <5><un> x </un></5>
622S2: consciousness
623S19: i- in your <6> mind </6>
624S2: <6> in in </6> the mind
625S20: uhu
626S2: and the media <7> TOO </7>

EDwgd241: Working group discussion about the advantages and disadvantages of different scenarios concerning the future of English in Europe
628S20: media? (.), <soft> mhm </soft> (1) e:r but e:r (.), and education
629S2: yeah
630S20: <1> but you have </1>
631S5: <1> and politics </1> TOO the <2> sup- er sup</2> the porting of (.)

EDwgd241: Working group discussion about the advantages and disadvantages of different scenarios concerning the future of English in Europe
937S2: you don't spend so much money on it (.), and THAT money you can put in <un> xxx </un><5> things or </5> in other <6> cultures </6> to (.)
938S5: <5> mhm </5>
939S5: <6> mhm </6>
940S2: to get <un> x </un> (that) teaching TOO (.)

EDwsd15: Workshop discussion on the possible future of Europe as regards linguacultural unity and diversity
586S23: er what what what where (there) er (1) so the unity and <pvc> multilingualism </pvc> er was (.), in the education system in work and er (.), in the family (.), er that was the main thing that we chose er fo- for this to show how it how it is er (.), the most hm (.), how is it (.), erm (.), for example there was a family er (.), maybe who didn't understood that the mum was from switzerland dad was from russia but they were living in (.), erSpain so the children er (.), did know er the (.), three languages in that time and they if they wanted to they could er choose er two more languages er in the school at
mhm like in education er in education and er (.) there was some subjects er which were
\text{<pvc> taught</pvc>} in all the europe (.) er in (.) that was like erm (.)
\text{\ding{587}SX-f: <5> european history</5>}
\text{\ding{588}S24: <5> european culture</5> =}
\text{\ding{589}S23: = yeah european (.) er}
\text{\ding{590}S24: european <6> culture</6> TOO}

EDwsd302: Workshop discussion on the five most important values for human life
\text{\ding{2060}S17: and it's more important to re\text{<spel>pect</spel>} otherness (1) \{parallel conversation between between SX-m and SX starts\}}
\text{\ding{2061}S-f: but if you love then: (.) i think you respect \text{<pvc> TOO</pvc>} (.) you CAN'T love people (7) and don't respect them.</7>

EDwsd306: Workshop discussion about the best, the worst and the most likely scenari-
ous concerning the future of English and regional cultures in Europe
\text{\ding{612}S9: cos (.) i think this is so important (.) the media and it's really not er not not not er (1) not (.) easy cos w- (.) in for instance in germany (.) we pay for (.) for \text{<spel>} t v \text{<spel>}} (.)
\text{\ding{613}S6: <4> mhm</4>}
\text{\ding{614}S11: <4> (as) in</4> england <5> TOO </5>}

EDwsd464: Workshop discussion about the organization of a student conference
\text{\ding{866}S1: <8> it's GEnerates 2 and it it it er hh well: contributes towards clarity for the for the next organizers TOO =}

EDwsd499: Workshop discussion on issues related to students and citizenships
\text{\ding{EDwsd499:8S2: (all right) er we TALKED about the elected er students. and no we}}
\text{\ding{EDwsd499:8S2: gonna talk about the one who DO not want to be elected but that NEED to become ci-
\text{\ding{EDwsd499:8S2: tizens of the university TOO. (1) so the problem we: er we (identify) the bodies is (.) the}}
\text{\ding{EDwsd499:8S2: first one there was no more students are conc- don't go to the UNiversity to have (.) a citizen's attitude. they go there to follow their studies? (.) and that's it. (.) so the question is HOW are we gonna help (.) the students to feel that university can be (.) a place where}}
\text{\ding{EDwsd499:8S2: you LIVE ? how can we make the student feel that university is a real community where act- they can be INVOLVED not this is only as er an: (1) a <pvc> representant <pvc> of the student but just you know as as (.) basic citizen that is interested by (.) the func-
\text{\ding{EDwsd499:8S2: the <pvc> functionment <pvc> of the institution that is ready to vote et cetera et cetera so the problem? (we identified) was erm (.) a lack of information. so i don't think we}}
\text{\ding{EDwsd499:8S2: will have to talk a lot about this because the solution is (.) {S2 draws on whiteboard, takes down notes}} pretty obvious like more information? (2) erm (1) i mean WILL we}}
\text{\ding{EDwsd499:8S2: addressed this quickly the biggest one is (.) there's not the feeling of a community in university. i know you like this idea so (.) it's an \text{<@>\text{<spel>xxx</spel>} one \text{<@>}}} so erm NO feelings (2) {S2 deals with whiteboard (2)} no. (.) university is not (1) perceived (.) as a community. it's not a place where student live and interact. it's just a place where they study. and this is probably WHY (.) it doesn't work. if they don't feel it's their community why should they act it's their community they don't care. so (.) university is not perceived (2) {S2 takes down notes (2)} oh by the way}

EDwsd499: Workshop discussion on issues related to students and citizenships
\text{\ding{1065}S8: no in <6> spain</6> we go in strike (.)}
\text{\ding{107}S12: <6> but</6>}
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LEcon329: Conversation in car while driving around to show sights
- 249S2: <L1mlt> borg cassar caruana {maltese family names} </L1mlt> (1) they are all very common
- 250S4: mhm
- 251S2: <L1mlt> [last name2] {maltese family name} </L1mlt> is quite common TOO that's ours <un> xx </un>

LEcon405: Conversation between exchange students about tourism and settling into a new city
- 151S1: <5> yes </5> (.) yes (. ) but the problem is it is in german @@
- 152S2: @@
- 153S1: i can also (.) i can only look at er the film
- 154S2: no (.) but i think that it's a really big festival so maybe there's something in english TOO

LEcon418: Conversation between two students about festivals in different cultures
- 5S1: erm: in sweden they celebrate it (.) very much (.) er we celebrate it TOO but not as much as they do in sweden

LEcon545: Conversation among exchange students who are invited to celebrate pancake day
- 391S1: it's TRUE my grandparents have a flat <10> in edinburgh. and they haven't been there for almost ten years because they can't get up and <1> down </1> the stairs (. )
- 392S5: <10> yeah </10>
- 393S5: <1> o:h </1> (1)
- 394S6: that's a big problem at home TOO cos they didn't like the hospitals like (.) in the thirties and forties they don't have elevators none of them so (. )

LEcon545: Conversation among exchange students who are invited to celebrate pancake day
- 653S1: i used to listen to the radio a lot there
- 654S3: mhm =
- 655S1: = i don't have a radio here @@
- 656S6: no that's a <3> good i- </3> a good way to to practise your <4> spanish TOO </4> (2)

LEcon545: Conversation among exchange students who are invited to celebrate pancake day
- 1217S5: = that's one of the FEW that i remember =
- 1218S6: yeah @ <7> @@ <7>
- 1219S4: <7> m:hm </7>
- 1220S6: it was kind of funny TOO it was something different <1> like </1> and

LEcon560: Conversation among exchange students about their first experiences in Austria and various other topics
1363S3: and then i was sitting e:r later i was sitting at this schizophrenic e:r woman's apartment () listening to her talking about the war () that was going on outside and all the people that were e:r con- <2> <pvc> conspirating {conspiring} </pvc> </2>
1364S4: <2> o:h yeah </2> yeah yeah they do that ()
1365S3: and then she started singing () and then afterwards i went to: THIS woman's house and she had a daughter who was () handicapped TOO ()

LEcon562: Conversation among exchange students about various topics
680S5: <5> er don't come to the netherlands </5> then because it's all flat
681SS: @@@@@@
682S1: yah () <smacks lips> denmark denmark TOO

LEcon562: Conversation among exchange students about various topics
1122S6: so then () switching from euro to leva () and then () like we were in hungary for a bit TOO so the forint then () MAN i had like my wallet () it's full with all these different currencies <2> @ and i'll </2><3> pull </3><4> something out and </4> ()

LEcon562: Conversation among exchange students about various topics
1403S8: <8> EVERYthing is the other way around </8>
1404S8: and and the same is in slovenia (1) i was surprised TOO when i was there it's also the other way around

LEcon562: Conversation among exchange students about various topics
2060S4: it must be with the university it's () so there should be this erm () mobility: institution ()
2061S7: <1> you have </1> to go and sign up for that TOO

LEcon573: Conversation between a couple about a trip to Liverpool
100S2: quite different. (1) hh with <loud> HIGH </loud> street SHOPS <@> probably and </@> stuff like that. (2) {turning a page of a book or paper}
101S1: <whispering> yeah </whispering>
102S2: hh
103S1: BRISTOL was cool <soft> TOO </soft> ()

LEcon573: Conversation between a couple about a trip to Liverpool
200S2: when did your sister go there?
201S1: recently. (.) i went there recently TOO

PBmtg3: Business meeting at a food company
1690S1: and and a lack of er our (1) INVESTMENT in promotion () of course the er () in- er investment should be JUSTIFIED by the er er SALES but er () we saw these TOO as er (1) major e:r (1) cause () for this very low consumer uptake

PBmtg3: Business meeting at a food company
1934S2: <1> the problem is not </1> the product but also the () display in it TOO. uhu <2> uhu </2> ()
PBpan25: Panel on the economic situation of the South-eastern European member states of the EU and their potential accession to the European Monetary Union

PBpan25:6S2: erm already this year (.) that er means that the government er thinks (both) er desirable and feasible to adopt (er) euro (.) as soon as possible. (.) and the [org1] (.) supports this goal. (.) in the convergence program there is a fiscal consolidation in magnitude of (.) two point five per cent of <spel> g d p </spel> foreseen until two thousand eight (.) er JOINING <spel> e r m </spel> two (.) and in-\[spel]eflation should come down (.) er from the current five point six per cent er <un> xxxxx </un> (three) per cent by the time. (.) er no need to go er into much details why's the adoption of euro advantageous for us i think (.) that's er (.) <soft> er er er er that's er er </soft> already (there) no one (.) erm (or i'll) just mention a few advantage (of the) we think er it's exchange rate er (.) e:r disappears (.) transaction costs er decrease transpar-\[spel]ency of prizes and (.) er competition increases all in all (.) it er increases (out) (1) erm (.) however (.) whether or not we adopt euro (.) er er macroeconomic consolidation (.) must be DONE because of that sustainability risks in hungary. (.) er net foreign debt of the country is currently erm twenty-fi-\[spel]t won-ty-six per cent and government debt is around (.) SIXTY per cent. (.) and we expect er both items to increase further. (.) in the: er (.) coming years (.) er CURRENTLY the MAIN concern is the position of (.) the EXTER-\[spel]nal balance isn't it? (.) public sector growing amounted to (.) eight point five per cent er <spel> g d p </spel> two thousand FOUR (.) and financing of it was er (.) provided almost exclusively by (.) foreign investors (.) due to the lack of net domestic savings. (1) SIMILAR what was the (.) er public financing position in the year two thousand three and it is expected to continue like that (in) two thousand five as well (.) NO wonder that net foreign debt has been increasing rapidly (.) and by now (reached er) twenty-six per cent of <spel> g d p </spel><spel><soft> as i (mentioned) </soft> (2) as YOU mean that other factors remaining er unchanged government deficit should be reduced (.) by about two two and a half per cent of <spel> g d p </spel> (.) to stabilize the current level of net foreign debt (1) to stabilize government debt (we issue) around a current sixty per cent of <spel> g d p </spel> level (.) a sizeable deficit deduction is needed TOO (1) fiscal consolidation in is is thus unavoidable (with) immediate (er) (.) if successfully accom-\[spel]plished (.) maastricht criteria that are shared <un> x </un> (within) reach. (1) a fixed DATE for euro change over (.) in the foreseeable future (.) lends er credibility to any consolidation program. (.) er deadline indicates the speed and the means of the consoli-\[spel]dation as well. (.) if er there is a plan(ned) exit to <spel> e r m </spel> two and <un> x xx </un> to the euro (.) then markets expect a consolidation (.) by means of fiscal <spel> x </spel> and <un> xx </un> not by means of monetary (.) easing at speeding er inf-\[spel]ation (.) currently financial markets with the benefit of doubt to the convergence program (.) of er the hungarian authorities and that's of course the stability of the currency (.) if EURO introduction would be (.) postponed for an indefinite (.) er TIME credibility of er (.) er ANY consolidation program would suffer (2)

POcon543: Lunch conversation between professionals working in higher education
in their wordings (1) and to challenge universities or researchers (.) whatever they are (1) and he quite recently told me that (.) quite often he meets panels who <un>xx x </un> with that encouragement that <2> they </2> sort of (.)

feel it's very (.) alien and er <imitating><3> why should </3> we be that blunt <imitating> =

yay =

and (.) well there there is a difference (.) there TOO (2)

POcon549: Conversation over lunch between professionals involved in European higher education matters

8S8: = one by one. (1)
9S10: what this and this TOO =

POmtg541: Meeting on quality assurance issues in European higher education

948S4: hh yeah then in: the footnote the footnote two (.) <reading_aloud> internal feedback mechanism (.) means to collect feedback from its own (.) BODY and staff <reading_aloud> (2) at least i- in <1> in the hurry in our </1> case w- we ask er our board <2> members </2> TOO (.)

POmtg541: Meeting on quality assurance issues in European higher education

970S4: a:nd (1) yeah and STILL that was raised in the last meeting TOO (.) {S4 turns pages in his documents} in: in page seven (1) {participants turn pages in their documents (1)}<reading_aloud> each organization may nominate </reading_aloud> according to MY mind this this should be tackled within a separate point. (.) perhaps i- at the very end of this section as point <5> three </5> three five?

POmtg541: Meeting on quality assurance issues in European higher education

1098S2: we would never take (1) that upon us to be those who actually make the decision that must be a- because we know that such decisions are always (.) or often heavily politically influenced anyhow so we RATHER wish to steer er away from it (.) th- the NORWEGIANS have done it the other way the the [org7] makes the final (.) deci<7>sion yes or no </7> (1)

1099S5: <7>yay yay </7>

1100S4: and sweden TOO

POwgd12: Working group discussion on administrative matters concerning joint degree programs in Europe

930S1: universities even within (1) a country universities can have (.). different (.) starting times and finishing times and exami<5>nation times </5>

931S12: <5> oh yes </5> oh yes (.)

932S1: and these can be nightmares TOO so if it may be that once we decide on the academic content and structure we should then be (.). thinking in terms <6> of </6> the (.)

POwgd26: Working group discussion about academic issues with regard to establishing a joint European degree
then there are learning outcomes defined as competencies, skills, and knowledge. (.)

mhm (.)

as er (.)

skill knowledge. yes (.) mhm

yes (.) yes (.) yes

yes

i know

ha- (this is) (.)

i agree (.) yeah (.)

qualification is (perhaps) er (.) qualification they are learning outcomes TOO (.) yeah (.)

Working group discussion on the improvement of communication between the members of the organization

and that would be very important for external

yeah =

= communication TOO =

Working group discussion on the timing of the implementation of joint degree programs

and one and there is one important point and i've just mentioned it to the other working group TOO (.) at which points (1) is decisions by university leadership NEEDED (.) and which kinds of decision (2)

Workshop discussion on youth and jobs in Europe

this is also one of the PROblems now of course that (1) in the NETHERLANDS because we (are) (a lot of) xxxx. (.) it's more (.) yah that is there's a mismatch

kind of conditionality TOO perhaps. (1) (.)

Workshop discussion on youth and jobs in Europe

one might have to be er it's ALSO a problem we are now talking about young people of course but (.) OLD PEOPLE who are like er from fifty years older the- they are ALSO been er discriminated a LOT er in the labor market and then (.) you would ha- to need er like physical incentives for them maybe TOO and it's like a (.) never-ending story so i would be

PRcon534: conversation about the solution of functions in the Hartogs domain

it is only KNOWN in c (2) that is known, but er in two dimension is s- still open (1)

well then one why why going up in dimensions then it's okay. (.) well (good) (2)

and it is even KNOWN that (.) both of them are even stronger than the hull condition TOO. (.)

PRcon534: conversation about the solution of functions in the Hartogs domain

and so the OTHER bound was the PROblem and there he as he would just p- PUT that bound on the(re) (.) on those arrow terms @ (.)
□138S2: hm. (2)
□139S1: <@> and (i had) **TOO** i think </@> (3)

PRcon534: conversation about the solution of functions in the Hartogs domain
□181S1: that's the horrible thing i played with </@> that **TOO</@> © © © <@> that that there should(n't) </@> @ @@ the the essentially there is just log (.)

PRpan1: Panel about the role of women in the Islamic world and the question of modernity
□65S3: and they are saying that this is NOT er not correct and not right. but let me just (.) the FINAL thing i want to say is that (.) the problem? from the secular position **TOO** (.) is that erm as FAR as we as far as the experience the empirical experience the empirical evidence shows us (2) islamic LAWS […]

PRpan1: Panel about the role of women in the Islamic world and the question of modernity
[...] you see they have no civil status hh but in PUBLIC EVERY woman has to VEIL . (.) you see. now if you watch iranian (.) cinema you see that in the cinema **TOO** (.) the characters have to veil even at HOME (.) […]

PRpan13: Panel discussion on the role of women and reproduction policies in different countries
[...]er a dual er (.) system where (.) according to languages so it's er er erm hungarian and a romanian (.) and possibly other languages **TOO**. […]

PRpan225: Panel discussion about gender issues
[...] @@ and erm so it has (.) two frontiers as (.) as i see the the erm the (.) russian area erm doesn't like er the the feminist studies as much (.) because of the WESTern import? (.) and erm (.) as we heard today (.) e:r (2) er the <pvc> anti-americanism </pvc> is quite erm: used in europe so it has to (fight) with that **TOO** (.) […]

PRpan225: Panel discussion about gender issues
□11S3: […] so that er often english words can't be translated e:r (1) so that the MEAN-ing is different e- er (.) in in russian (in english for) example (1) and <4> er </4>
□12S2: <4> (or) in german </4>
□13S3: hm?
□14S2: or in german **TOO**

PRpan225: Panel discussion about gender issues
□15S3 […] i think (1) i- (1) it's a mixture. (.) it's a mixture of er of the (.) of the american erm writings and the erm (1) and the (1) writings from the: from the special country. (.) {S3 looks at notes} hm: (2) yeah. (3) but no (.) erm? (1) <L1ger> ja genau {yes ex-actly} </L1ger> (.) and (.) erm: what i found interesting **TOO** was the (.) there's a gap between the <slow> institutionalization </slow>

PRpan225: Panel discussion about gender issues
□158S6: the paper yesterday (.) when she was talking about erm er people from: czechoslovakia er from from czechia et cetera (.) <6> traveling </6> west (.)
□159SX-f: <6><un> xx </un></6>
160S6: buying books (.) because that is something (.) i erm although i am living in SWITZERLand (.) i am confronted with TOO. (.) because when i looking for books in gender studies and queer studies et cetera? (.) they (.) are not aVAILABLE in switzer-

PRpan585: Panel discussion on preventing seizures in temporal lobe epilepsy
62S8: [...] during the latent and chronic phase the relative hyperactivity of the high loss of the <un> xx </un> (virus) (.) could be a f- key factor (.) for the initiation and maintenance of spontaneous seizures and some other structures may participate TOO like the (peripheral) cortex (.) [...]

PRQas18: Question-answer session on issues involved in the organization of bi- and multilingual universities
33S2: and IN our culture we don't think about that. what is the purpose of this exercise or this kind of exam. (.) it's er it's so (.) IMPLIED in us. and in norwegian stu<9>dents.</9> but not in foreign students. (.)
34SX-f: </soft> mhm </soft></9>
35S2: so WHAT is the aim here. WHAT is the purpose. (.) i think it's good for ourselves to focus on that. TOO. (1) hh (.). well my problem is that I have a (2) <to S1</to S1> (time is) (.) well erm my problem is that I have a (2) <to S1</to S1>

EDsed31: Seminar discussion about Austrian stereotypes and cultural differences in general
580S13: i think austrian are very polite people everywhere i went (.). in university in the street TOO (.). i mean everyone speaks polite very polite

EDwgd5: Working group discussion about organizing a presentation on a common for-

195S3: there's too many forces </7> against it </7>
196S6: <7> there are </7> TOO national interests in </8> it </8> so (.)

EDwgd241: Working group discussion about the advantages and disadvantages of different scenarios concerning the future of English in Europe
558S3: <3> the lan</3>guage is one of the tools er how you ar:e showing your ment-

559S1: <4></4> of course </soft></4>
560S1: <soft> of course </soft> (4)
561S2: it's TOO a loss of </un> xxx </un> literature and (.) i mean it's quite </5></un> xxxxxx </un></5>

LEcon229: Conversation between international students at a club
369S2: [...] [first name7] [last name7] is a: person who plays the: (.) plays this instru-

370S1: ah erm the guitar (.) no.
371S2: </soft> yeah </soft> (1) because in the north of sp- spain there is TOO er celts (.) culture. (1)

POwgd12: Working group discussion on administrative matters concerning joint degree programs in Europe
277S1: in that i would include your suggestion there about you know (1) erm who looks after the internal communication and (3) erm (1) who takes the lead (.) responsibility because that's (1) that's often (.) erm absolutely essential to have somebody erm (.) who is prepared to do the applicant (.) to (.) er making it it happen erm (10) {S1 takes notes (10)} and i think at that stage TOO you need to be clear about the funding that's available (1) to the: consortium (.)

PRpan1: Panel about the role of women in the Islamic world and the question of modernity
9S3: […] but if the RISE of islamic fundamentalism is ONE contradictory aspect (.) of this process of (.) modernization (.) erm and globalization in muslim countries so TOO has been the rise of feminism. (.) and in fact we have to understand (.) […]

EDsed362: Seminar discussion about suggestions for combating terrorism
261S17: […] erm NOW it almost appears as though (.) <spel> u s </spel> is acting (.) erm as em- (.) as an empire THEMSELVES and (.) ha- er er and is being erm imperial-istic (.) so (.) erm (.) we wanted to advise them on THAT (.) and then it would be and that the other part of that TOO was that (1) erm because they are SO (.) and then the other part of their (.) foundation was that […]

EDwgd305: Working group discussion about the presentation of a specific future scenario concerning the linguistic landscape of Europe
816S6: <4> so maybe mhm</4> mhm: hh so maybe he is (a) russian father living in: e:r (2) germany
817SX-2: @@ <5> @ </5> @ (.)
818SX-3: <5><soft> mhm </soft></5><5>/<5>
819S6: <un> x xx </un>
820SX-f: you have to <6> listen </6> to what you are
821S6: <6> @ @ </6>
822SS: <7> @ @ @ @ </7>
823S5: <7> it can be switzerland TOO </7> because e:r there <un> xxx xx xx </un>{S2 joins the parallel conversation} different languages too again so
and and important <1> to say is that <1> you can do COURSES on lingua franca TOO it's not only for children […]

POwd375: Working group discussion on the European youth pact and the job situation

and as well {background laughter ends} because of that what i said this morning is like (. ) you will succeed with the easiest one (.) but what's with the more difficult (.) the one who are the most in the shit (. )

193S9: @@ yeah yeah @@

194S3: you still leave them in the shit because they can't fit in (.) your objectives <7> TOO […]

POwd510: Working group discussion on youth participation and the role of NGO’s

erm (1) if i can ADD er in portugal we have already som:e er that's i i'm sure that happens in several other countries for instance in scotland it's happening <un> x x <un> (. ) and one project (up there) in germany TOO (.) and in (kongo) […]

POwd510: Working group discussion on youth participation and the role of NGO’s

erm (1) if i can ADD er in portugal we have already som:e er that's i i'm sure that happens in several other countries for instance in scotland it's happening <un> x x <un> (. ) and one project (up there) in germany too (.) and in (kongo) i KNOW that there are some projects (TOO) <un> x x <un> where ALL the YOUNG people between a certain er range of AGE (.) and not <un> x x x x x <un> (situation) (.) er from ALL schools (.) er they vote directly in <un> xxxx <un> in the (.) municipality youth council […]

PRpan225: Panel discussion about gender issues

her major field is women's and gender studies. (1) since (.) two thousand and five she is a member of the department for women and gender-related issues at the national union of students TOO (.) here at the university of vienna. (.) so PLEASE (.) your comments. (4) {soft speaker noises in the background, S2 adjusts microphone (3)}

**Interpersonal function**

EDcon496: Conversation between business students

yeah in between i'd be like <whispering> [first name10] </whispering> (. ) cos at night you're not allowed to speak actually so <whispering> [first name10] (.) [first name10] </whispering> he'd be like <whispering> what? </whispering> (.) <fast> i'd be like </fast> smile so i can see your <@> black <1> (ass) </1></@> cos he was black as the night @ @@ he'd be like <imitating> man fuck you you coconut picker you </imitating>

651S1: <1><soft> @@ </soft></1>

652S2: <soft> @@ </soft> (.)

653S2: <imitating> go back to your fucking island </imitating> (.) i'm like dude you're from an island <@> TOO <fast> what the fuck you talking about </fast><imitating> you're a PUssy hole </imitating> </@> (.) @ <2> @@ </2>

EDcon521: Conversation between students from Europe about working and studying in different European countries

<soft> yeah </soft> but (we) have those tests all the time and (.) for example (.) hh e:r (1) one test (is) e:r twenty per cent of the e<x4>xam </4><5><un> x </un></5>
EDCon521: Conversation between students from Europe about working and studying in
different European countries

EDInt330: Interview with architects and interior designers about the use of English in
Malta

EDSed31: Seminar discussion about Austrian stereotypes and cultural differences in
general
□210S19: i come er from [place2] TOO and i'm twenty-two years old hh () i study ()
foreign languages er () and er (1) this is my first time er in AUSTRIA () i've never
been here before (1) and (.) yeah <soft> @@ </soft><@> that's all </@>

EDint330: Interview with architects and interiour designers about the use of English in
Malta
□1256S3: but ANYway it's: () but now i would say: the italian is left a- aSIDE say ()
□1257S5: mhm:<2> i think TOO </2>

EDwgd5: Working group discussion about organizing a presentation on a common for-
eign policy for the European Union
□322S3: <10> i don't know if </10> she knew about it because she's the one that told
me that we're <un> xxxx </un>
□323SX-1: <10><soft><un> </soft><un></10>
□324S5: but i told her to- this morning ()
□325S5: hh =
□326S6: = yeah she told me TOO that she is <11> coming </11> er but i don't know
why ()

EDwgd5: Working group discussion about organizing a presentation on a common for-
eign policy for the European Union
□11S5: i don't know who: (1) who was obliged to do that
□12S3: <soft> i'm not sure </4></soft>
□13S5: <4> enlargement.</4> (1) okay and (.) a- any- anyway i can cover it TOO (.)
because <un> x </un> (.) it's my major

EDwgd5: Working group discussion about organizing a presentation on a common for-
eign policy for the European Union
□180S3: these are some possible implications (.) hh for the future of the <spel> e u</spel> er (1) and that (.) <2><un> xx </un></2>
□181S6: <2> like i </2><fast> i don't know </fast> have you been there? (1) on this
seminar when (1) doctor [last name2] was speaking?
□182S3: <soft> mhm </soft>
□183S6: yeah he mentioned <3> it </3> TOO (3)

EDsve452: Service encounter helping three international students with practical matters
□85S2: <LNger><spel><2> b w </2> z </spel></LNger> yeah
□86S3: you? (.)
□87S2: yeah. (.)
□88S3: you <3> TOO </3>
□89S2: <3> al</3>so yeah <LNspa><8> si </8> {yes} <LNspa>

EDwgd5: Working group discussion about organizing a presentation on a common for-
eign policy for the European Union
□419S5: that is why i work with [S6] on er (.) common foreign security <10> policy
</10>
□420S8: <10> mhm </10>
□421S6: you can help <1> me TOO </1>
□422S5: <1> security policy? </1>
□423S8: okay (.)
EDwgd241: Working group discussion about the advantages and disadvantages of different scenarios concerning the future of English in Europe

150S1: all right <1> and we thought that the best one <fast> would actually be <fast> ours
151S2: yeah me TOO =

EDwgd241: Working group discussion about the advantages and disadvantages of different scenarios concerning the future of English in Europe

1242S1: but you know <4> NO it's the <un> wrong way i think because where do these important papers come from (. ) <5> and and <6> britain and then we get a<7>GAIN </7> the culture <1> which <1> we <2> DO </2> not wanna have =
1243S5: yes <5>
1244S5: yes <6>
1245S4: yeah <6>
1246S5: th- the <1>
1248S5: yes <2>
1249S5: = the simplifi<3>cation </3>
1250S3: i agree with that i agree with that's a bad way to to make it ( . ) but you can make a lingua franca like this TOO. ( . ) so =

EDwsd242: Workshop discussion on the organization of a presentation

102S8: er i hope it is er erm (2) well. er we have this ( . ) so we have the: (2) three groups now the worst cas:e scenario group the best case scenario group and the presentation group which works out the recommendations and <7> the production?</7>
103S2: <7> but we have </7> to still decide who's gonna {loud background noise}
104S8: and yes erm i'm (coming) <8> to (that) </8> ( . )
105S2: <8> okay </8>
106S8: <soft> yeah </soft> er let's talk about that (. ) TOO ? thank you

EDwsd302: Workshop discussion on the five most important values for human life

452S18: i think (2) i I i (think we) incorporate them i think ( . ) that's all right
453S17: yeah me TOO.

EDwsd303: Workshop discussion on the definition of the term lingua franca

314S24: yeah i just thin- erm think about that er (. ) okay i agree we just yeah what is it but er should we think about (. ) OTHER languages because yes i <6> agree that the <6> other languages can be <7> a lingua </7> franca TOO but we are talking now about ENGLISH

EDwsd303: Workshop discussion on the definition of the term lingua franca

402S24: hm so erm he told about that that e:r we have a language but it's not an engli- it was: e:r your point of view <3> TOO </3> that it's in the some: kind of middle english. it's not so right and e:r the girls here told that (. )

EDwsd303: Workshop discussion on the definition of the term lingua franca

26S1: exactly i think that t- the girl who will enter if she can take a chair as well. ( . ) and sit there <soft> in a ( . ) kind of <un> x </un></soft> (3) was the coffee okay ( . )
EDwsd464: Workshop discussion about the organization of a student conference

1128S4: so (. ) maybe nine fifteen is the right time to start at nine thirty? (1)
1129S25: <soft> yeah </soft>
1130S12: <soft> yeah nine fifteen </soft>
1131S25: so they will be here
1132SX-m: <un> xx </un> know
1133S16: i think i think it's <un> xxx </un>{multiple parallel conversations start}
1134S12: [org2] websites
1135S6: aha @@@
1136S1: yah i think so TOO basically as you say they are (. ) i quite understand the conCERN of students getting lost in [place16] and not being able to speak fren<2>ch (and) </2><soft><un> xx </un></soft><3><loud> what i admire what i admire very much is this emergency thing there </loud></3>{parallel conversations fade out}
LEcon420: Conversation about sights in Scotland
667S2: yeah =
668S1: = o:h (.)
669S2: me TOO (.) i mean i <4> don't do </4> that but i know people <5> who: iron their </5>

LEcon45: Conversation among exchange students who are invited to celebrate pancake
day
158S4: @<6> it's really </6> funny </@>(2)
159S6: er is this your first round TOO? (.)
160SX-f: mhm

LEcon548: Conversation between family and visiting student before going out with
friends
693S1: we'll do (1) {S1 and S3 kiss goodbye}<1> nice </1> meeting you erm once again
694S3: <1> see you </1>
695S3: nice meeting you TOO (2) {microphone is moved around in bag} sorry i can't er try your pizza

LEcon60: Conversation among exchange students about their first experiences in Aust-
ria and various other topics
2S4: i'm (2) i'm wet from like (1)
3S5: yeah =
4S3: = yeah me <1> TOO </1>

LEcon60: Conversation among exchange students about their first experiences in Aust-
ria and various other topics
316SX-f: that makes me nervous <soft> @ @ </soft>
317S5: no in en<glish because @@<un> xxx xxx </un></@></1> @ @ @ =
318S4: <1><@><loud> that makes me nervous TOO </loud></@> @ @ @ </1>

LEcon60: Conversation among exchange students about their first experiences in Aust-
ria and various other topics
477S2: <6><@> yes i'm so hungry since you (have said) that </@></6>
478S1: like we pas<7>ed the pizza place </7><1> and it </1><imitating> smells </imitating> =
479S2: <to S5><7> you shouldn't have said that <soft> @ @ </soft></7></to S5>
480SX-f: <1><soft> nachos </soft></1>
481S4: = o:h <2><un> xxx </un></2> (.)
482S1: <2> but it's way back now </2>
483SX-f: <2> @ @ @ </2>
484SX-f: <soft> (what) </soft>
485S4: i'm hungry TOO i'm so i'm gonna get so drunk <3> now </3>
LEcon560: Conversation among exchange students about their first experiences in Aus-
tria and various other topics
☐ 750S4: = i think so (1)
☐ 751S5: <soft> i think so TOO </soft> (1)

LEcon560: Conversation among exchange students about their first experiences in Aus-
tria and various other topics
☐ 784S5: i really like pizza (.)
☐ 785S4: yah me TOO but <un> xx </un> yeah (well) i'm not sure how much food i'm
 gonna (.). like (.). get to make here? cos if we're always out at night i'll always be buying
stuff <9><un> xx </un></9>

LEcon560: Conversation among exchange students about their first experiences in Aus-
tria and various other topics
☐ 1419S1: (here's your money) <fast> and it's </fast> so weird because i think every
time they give you a different price (.).
☐ 1420S4: yeah i think so TOO? that was a: (.)

LEcon560: Conversation among exchange students about their first experiences in Aus-
tria and various other topics
☐ 1479S5: i had fun yesterday it was a great <1> night </1>
☐ 1480S4: <1> yeah </1> yeah yeah me TOO (.). when did you go <un> e:r
 home? (1)

LEcon560: Conversation among exchange students about their first experiences in Aus-
tria and various other topics
☐ 2036S1: = i would (like to) go <4> skiing in </4> november (.).
☐ 2037S5: <4> i w- i w- i </4>
☐ 2038S2: me TOO i <5> would </5> (.).

LEcon560: Conversation among exchange students about their first experiences in Aus-
tria and various other topics
☐ 2232S1: o:h like i have (.). like (.). so much shit for skiing god =
☐ 2233S2: = o:h me TOO <3> so </3> much (.).

LEcon562: Conversation among exchange students about various topics
☐ 36S2: <8> as long as </8> the <1> ALcohol doesn't </1> disappear
☐ 37S1: <1> i don't care </1>
☐ 38SS: @@@@<2> @@@@@@@@@@@@ </2> @@@@@ <3> @@@@@@@ </3>
☐ 39S6: <2> i'm pretty happy with the beer </2>
☐ 40S2: <3> that's a very good point TOO </3>

LEcon562: Conversation among exchange students about various topics
☐ 320S5: <fast> are you g- </fast> are you going t- (.). to do a german course? (.).
☐ 321S3: DEFinitely
☐ 322S7: <5> are you are you ALL going to do a german course </5> are you doing <6> 
 TOO </6> (.).
LEcon562: Conversation among exchange students about various topics

- 870S5: <2> o:h you </2> you DO know german <3> okay </3>
- 871S1: <3> i’ve had </3> i have had a long conversation (. ) in german today (1) so i HOPE i know german (1)
- 872S5: it’s incredibly complicated (.)
- 873S8: <4> yeah it is compli</4>cated (.)
- 874S1: <4> yeah i think it is </4>
- 875S8: <5> trust me </5>
- 876S5: <5> do you </5> so you know german <6> TOO </6>

LEcon562: Conversation among exchange students about various topics

- 1137S6: = that’s what i was saying TOO <2> i think </2><3> it's the same </3> i spend <4> so much money here </4> (.)

LEcon565: Conversation about what to eat for lunch

- 215S1: no i LIKE doing that. (. ) <10> ple</10>:ase
- 216S2: <10> (hm) </10>
- 217S2: i like TOO (2) hhh (4) {S1 starts typing (3)}

LEcon566: Conversation between a couple while having lunch

- 444S2: = hm yeah. (6) {S1 is tying} it's in my E:mail do you wanna (.)
- 445S1: <soft> yeah it's in my email TOO </soft>

LEcon566: Conversation between a couple while having lunch

- 574S1: they won the SECOND prize for this one? (.)
- 575S2: is it nice
- 576S1: yeah i like that TOO (4) {S2 seems to walk over to S1 (3)}

LEint554: Interview with participants of a scout camp about travel plans

- 151S4: <pvc> norawey {norway} <ipa> nɔːrəʊwɛɪ </ipa> </pvc> (.)
- 152S3: norway
- 153S2: <4> norway </4>
- 154S4: <4> norway </4>
- 155S1: <5> NORWAY </5>
- 156S3: <5> we will </5> be in norway <8> TOO </8>

PBmtg3: Business meeting at a food company

- 2266S1: <7> PER</7>SONALLY i like er the mister been er <1> very much </1>
- 2267S4: <1> yeah me </1> TOO but =

POcon543: Lunch conversation between professionals working in higher education
but couldn't you benefit from the project and erm

conversions project</soft>

 conversions project</soft>

 on: on the con- yeah in fact i'm part of that project TOO <1> but </1>

Meeting to discuss the proceedings of a planned workshop on joint degree programs

i think it would be <fast></10> better to have the sort of you know (11) academic (12) (initiative) (12)

on the con- yeah in fact i'm part of that project TOO </12> yeah

Meeting to discuss the proceedings of a planned workshop on joint degree programs

documentation? monitoring?

mhm</9>

yah. (.) so there's there's THAT TOO . (1) er (1) but maybe we don't <fast> i mean </fast> (2) <soft> maybe that's a bit of a </soft> (1)

Meeting to discuss and prepare the thematic organization of workshops on joint degree programs

and i'm very happy that (. ) er the xxx </un> seems to be thinking (. ) {sound of rustling paper ends}

yes we are we are very happy TOO </8>

Meeting on quality assurance issues in European higher education

months (1) i think it should be the latter (2) so that (. ) you know (3)

yes i think so TOO because just the matrix (ones) erm (.) (are) depends a bit on how (2) no (.) the way we SPOKE about it (.) won't answer all the questions (7) that (won't) </7> be (around) (.)

Working group discussion on joint degree programs in Europe

yes. that's it. huh?</3>

w- w- we i know that TOO yes […]

Working group discussion on joint degree programs in Europe

organizational relevant what is the (. ) finally (1) the aim (. ) and the purpose of the (.) [org2] ? (. )

very good (1) hh w- we put that down TOO because […]

Working group discussion about administrative questions with regard to establishing a joint European degree

the actual contracts should then have </2>

very very </16> very specific and very detailed.

yeah (. )

and <3> after that </3> (2)

i think so TOO </fast></3>
POwgd325: Working group discussion on the organization of joint degree programs in Europe

2496S3: i take option two. (.)
2497S14: me TOO

POwgd442: Working group discussion on dissemination strategies for a project in the media

618S3: hh and (.) in fact i kept (. ) sending (. ) emails <8> to </8> [S5] =
619S1: <8> me t- </8>
620S4: = m<9> hm </9>
621S1: <9> me </9> TOO (1)

PRcon599: Conversation about positions at universities in different countries

27S1: you're from germany right (. ) and what about you? (. )
28S6: from germany <7> TOO </7>

PRcon599: Conversation about positions at universities in different countries

27S1: you're from germany right (. ) and what about you? (. )
28S6: from germany <7> too </7>
29S1: <7> from </7> germany <1> TOO </1> (.)

PRcon599: Conversation about positions at universities in different countries

373S1: friday so s- you have some time (1) to (1) reLAX a little bit <soft> @@</soft> hh
374S5: sure =
375S1: = before your presentation
376S5: mhm? (. ) no problem =
377S1: = but good luck to you <6> TOO </6> <soft> @@ </soft></6>

PRint597: Interview about activities in Vienna, shopping and research

313S1: not but i SHOULDN't because yeah (1) whenever i start going <7> shopping </7> (. )
314S9: <7> @@ </7>
315S1: <1> i </1> BUY <2> and BUY </2><17> and i don't stop any more </17>
316S8: <1> hm </1>
317S8: <2><@> yeah </@></2>
318S9: <17> yeah me TOO so </17>

PRqas224: Question-answer session on gender issues

112S12: <3> and how they em</3>ploy these things in their practices (1) you start to understand that it's really NOT about purity. (1) it IS about (. ) the action it is about THEIR understanding, it is about THEIR (. ) agency (. ) which really comes the most important. and i could give hundreds of examples but (1) i don't know (1) <un> xx </un>
113S5: <4> @@@ @@@ </4>
114S4: <4> yeah yeah yeah me TOO @ @ </4>

EDwsd242: Workshop discussion on the organization of a presentation

122S8: (i've to say we- me TOO) <un> xxx </un> we were talking about the computers so i was (. ) wondering whether you can say something about that because =
PRpan225: Panel discussion about gender issues
☐ 176S1: in more deeply @@@ (.) thank you all i really enjoyed the conference i have to say it (.) it's such {parallel conversations in the background end} (.) an enormous and INteresting and inSPIRing input (.) and i THANK you all for TAking the challenge (.) not only dealing with FIFteen different NAtions (.) but also different disciplines (.) dif- ferent approaches (.) and i thought that it was a very very lively (.) erm and is- inspiring (.) conference (.) thank you TOO (.) for this really challenging final assum- assumption […]

Unclear
EDCon521: Conversation between students from Europe about working and studying in different European countries
☐ 1304S2: = then i get a bit scared because at least what we have (.) in: in our countries is (.) is that he is (.) closing the country (.) controlling the press (.) closing e:r the activi- ties of er (.) amnesty international and human rights watch and e:r (.)
☐ 1305S4: tha- that's what we are hear<3>ring </3> TOO but we still have to (.)

EDsed31: Seminar discussion about Austrian stereotypes and cultural differences in general
☐ 125S12: <smacks lips> (.) my name is [S12] and [S11] @> has </@> already said everything becau<1>se (.) hh i </1> come from [place2] TOO i study: foreign languages at the same university hh and i'm studying in linz (.)

EDsed31: Seminar discussion about Austrian stereotypes and cultural differences in general
☐ 161S15: erm well i'm [S15] [S15/last] (.) and i'm (1) i come from france too (.) so my: mother tongue is french (1) e:r (.) i (.) study in the:<un> xx </un> business school (1) and i'm here er for a year (1) (on) the <LNger><spe l> w u </LNger> {acronym for the vienna university of economics and business administration} </LNger> (.) erm: i'm in austria er it's the first time (.) i (come) in austria (1) erm: i'm here er (.) since er <pvc> mid-september </pvc> (.) and i want to discover more about the (.) austraian culture =
☐ 162S1: <soft> = hm = </soft>
☐ 163S15: = to behave well @@
☐ 164S1: @@ okay </@> @@ @@@ <soft><@> thanks </@> hh </soft> (.)
☐ 165S18: so sorry for my voice
☐ 166SS: @@ @ (.)
☐ 167S18: i come from italy TOO <clears throat>

EDCon496: Conversation between business students
☐ 364S2: we have a meeting at two thirty
☐ 365S1: oh YOU do yeah (.)
☐ 366S2: <6> you do </6>

EDCon521: Conversation between students from Europe about working and studying in different European countries
☐ 1586S4: <7> he's norwegian </7> you're not logical @
☐ 1587S2: <soft><un> xx </un> @@ </soft> (3)
☐ 1588S9: so see you:<un> x </un> (TOO) tomorrow
EDwgd241: Working group discussion about the advantages and disadvantages of different scenarios concerning the future of English in Europe

494S2: and depends where you put the (value) on we put it on diversity and <un> xxx (un) it's clear that we don't have same arguments but (.) if som:ebody (.) hh just (1) wants to get movement in europe hh wants to get (.) exchange whatever (and) wants to get business on it (.) if you put the point on there hh that's (.) an argument which is quite important <3> i mean </3> (.)

495S5: <3> YES </3>

496S5: <4> yes </4>

497S1: <4> yeah </4>

498S3: and economically <5> it could be good </5><6> TOO </6>

EDwgd241: Working group discussion about the advantages and disadvantages of different scenarios concerning the future of English in Europe

504S1: simplification is a good <1> word </1> =

505S5: <1> yes </1> =

506S4: = yeah (1)

507SX-f: <soft> mhm </soft>

508S4: we have to move to the other one <2><un> xx </un> (half past) </2>

509S5: <2> and for globali</2>zation globaliza</5>tion <3> is for me </3> simplification TOO

EDwgd5: Working group discussion about organizing a presentation on a common foreign policy for the European Union

361S3: can we meet (.) tomorrow like (1) in the evening? (.) <3> rather than </3>

362S6: <3> yeah </3><4> yah </4> me TOO yeah (.)

EDwgd241: Working group discussion about the advantages and disadvantages of different scenarios concerning the future of English in Europe

579S19: <9> translation into all the <un> xx </un> and <11> all the official </11> languages of europe </9>

580S5: <11> mhm </11>

581S3: e:r <fast> erm yes </fast> in this case i see more pluses TOO er than:<7> (in this) </7> (.)

EDwgd241: Working group discussion about the advantages and disadvantages of different scenarios concerning the future of English in Europe

660S19: yah russia is the main <5> problem for (the) (.) europe (.) (or) european union <5><6><snorts><6>

661SS: <5> @@ @@@ </5>

662S4: <6><@> i will </@><6><@> get you TOO </@> @@@ @@@ <1> @@@ </1>

EDwgd241: Working group discussion about the advantages and disadvantages of different scenarios concerning the future of English in Europe

1186S1: <3> i think </3> i: think like e:r (.) like er {parallel conversation between SX-f and S4 starts} (1) <fast> what about </fast> european media or (.) er great equation (of) more like (.) national {parallel conversation ends} (.) a spread of national or er: a spread of different languages in european media? something like that <4> so the </4> =

1187S4: <4> yeah </4> =
EDwgd241: Working group discussion about the advantages and disadvantages of different scenarios concerning the future of English in Europe

EDwgd241: Working group discussion about the advantages and disadvantages of different scenarios concerning the future of English in Europe

EDwgd497: Working group discussion about organizing a joint consultancy project

EDwsd304: Working group discussion on four different scenarios regarding the future of English in Europe

EDwsd499: Workshop discussion on issues related to students and citizenships
LEcon229: Conversation between international students at a club

211S3: so you have er <un> xx x </un> (4) (see you) er er i need a toilet (1) you know i am <un> xxx </un> today
212S2: you are TIRED .
213S3: yeah. (1) ooph erm (2)
214S2: <un> xxxx </un> (1)
215S3: haeh?
216S2: <un> xxxx </un> (1)
217S3: <15><un> xx </un></15> @@
218S2: yeah =
219S3: = or
220S2: <16> i love you TOO </16>

LEcon229: Conversation between international students at a club

345S2: from WHAT ?
346S1: from both?
347S2: <@> yeah of course </@> (1) i like <fast> i i i </fast> like illness or ILLness or (.)
348S1: <1><@> ILLness </@></1>
349S2: <1> ire- ireland </1> i like ireland TOO

LEcon420: Conversation about sights in Scotland

363S3: <@> ah that's your picture </@>
364SS: @ (2) {SS look at pictures}
365S3: these TOO (3)
366S1: e:r hm (3)
367S3: yeah from little (tom) (2) and overall (.) look (4) {SS look at pictures}<soft> yeah (.) that's it (.) that's was all </soft> =

LEcon420: Conversation about sights in Scotland

468S2: is <5> it </5> escape or? = {S2 points at the computer}
469S3: <5> sure </5>
470S3: = mhm (.) you can (never) use ex- (.) escape <6> TOO </6>
471S2: <6> now </6> what should i write huh? any suggestions?

LEcon548: Conversation between family and visiting student before going out with friends

737S3: o:h <8> great </8> i really like [first name3]
738S4: <8> @@ @ </8>
739S4: oh she really likes you TOO actually all my friends like her and my family likes you
LEcon560: Conversation among exchange students about their first experiences in Austria and various other topics
☐ 10951: yeah be<1>cause i- it's like (. ) for me it's a waste </1> of time? (. )
☐ 11054: <1> like how how (prepared) xx </un> </1>
☐ 11151: (TOO) because (. ) if i wanna drink my coffee e:r tea? (. ) i have to wait at least five ten minutes so it gets it's not (. ) <2> like </2> so <3> hot </3>

LEcon560: Conversation among exchange students about their first experiences in Austria and various other topics
☐ 15355: you were standing inside and i i walked outside a- at the (. ) between <2> eleven and qu- er qua- and a quarter </2><3> past eleven </3>
☐ 15451: <2><fast> o:h yeah yeah yeah yeah yeah </fast></2>
☐ 1555X-f: <3> with </3><un> xx </un> (and [first name6])
☐ 15651: yeah very good like
☐ 15755: yah =
☐ 15852: = so in uni campus TOO =

LEcon560: Conversation among exchange students about their first experiences in Austria and various other topics
☐ 37054: = well as long as they pay i can go get <6> drinks </6>
☐ 37153: <6> yeah </6><@> me TOO </@>

LEcon560: Conversation among exchange students about their first experiences in Austria and various other topics
☐ 158754: o:h i deleted i'm sorry <1><@> i'm sorry </@> @@ </1>
☐ 158855: <to S1><1> what's your num- (.) what's </1> your number </to S1> (. )<soft><un> xxx </un></soft>
☐ 158954: hey he me TOO (. )

LEcon560: Conversation among exchange students about their first experiences in Austria and various other topics
☐ 161551: er YOUR name was the first (. ) one i e:r remember because it's my brother has (. ) <3> the </3> same name =
☐ 161655: <3> a:h </3>
☐ 161755: = a:h okay (. )
☐ 161854: (o:h i) <4> (think) </4> (i'm) (. )
☐ 161951: <4> okay </4>
☐ 162054: you <5> got mine </5> TOO?

LEcon560: Conversation among exchange students about their first experiences in Austria and various other topics
(gap 00:00:30) {un; multiple parallel conversations}
☐ 18951: {parallel conversation between S2 and S3 starts (20)} a:h you TOO (. )

LEcon562: Conversation among exchange students about various topics
☐ 2155: and in the netherlands we <fast> drink it as well </fast> with l- with a lot of e:r (. )
☐ 2252: actually that beer <2> we </2> have has <3> a lot </3> of head TOO <4> huh yes </4> (.)
LEcon562: Conversation among exchange students about various topics
☐ 1371 S8: <1> uhu </1>
☐ 1372 S8: do you have funny numbers in in norwegian TOO?
☐ 1373 S1: <LNger> dreiund- e:r -zwanzig <1> bis </1> siebenundzwanzig {twenty-three to twenty-seven} </LNger> (1)

LEcon562: Conversation among exchange students about various topics
☐ 1426 S8: when it's your native tongue then then it's diff- it's (.) easy <6> @@ </6>
☐ 1427 S1: <6> yeah </6> then: i think it's easier for me TOO because (.) we have that thing in norway because we always heard our grandparents say (.) say the numbers like that (2) so it's easier to relate to (2) when you learn (.) <soft><un> xx </un></soft>{S1 and S8 join parallel conversation between S2, S3, S4, S5, and S6 about Dutch pronunciation}

LEcon562: Conversation among exchange students about various topics
☐ 1885 S2: = someone just told me and also i saw this movie about these guys who (1) two guys and a and a girl and they're all french obviously (.) <slow> they <un> x </un> they <slow> drove their car off a cliff and landed in a tree (.) and the whole movie takes place (.) these guys in a car on a tree (.) <1> it's a </1> comedy @@
☐ 1886 S5: <1><soft> yeah </soft></1>
☐ 1887 S7: <soft> cool </soft>
☐ 1888 S2: <2> it is </2>
☐ 1889 S5: <2> sounds </2> i don't know <3> @@ @ @ <3> (.)
☐ 1890 S2: <3> it's really:<3>
☐ 1891 S2: <4> (that was) </4> popular <5> @@ @ @ <5>
☐ 1892 S4: <4> but this </4>
☐ 1893 S4: <5> this last </5> one was also so good
☐ 1894 S7: yeah (1)
☐ 1895 S4: it was funny it was:6> everything </6>
☐ 1896 S3: <6> so you </6> speak french TOO or? (.)

LEcon575: Conversation while cooking dinner
☐ 12 S2: so you saw in the OFFERS before. (.) when you called me? (.)
☐ 13 S1: yeah (.)
☐ 14 S2: did you work late. TOO. (.)

PBmtg300: Business meeting at a forwarding agency with a sales representative of an airline
☐ 125 S2: <3> but </3> then you s- you see yourself on the television also and then they're gonna analyze (.) HOW you look WHY you look e:r like this and er er well (.)
☐ 126 S3: @@ i:<4> i think i did this </4>
☐ 127 S2: <4> that's that's STR</4>ANGE .
☐ 128 S1: yeah
☐ 129 S3: <soft> i did this TOO </soft>
PBmtg300: Business meeting at a forwarding agency with a sales representative of an airline

1369S1: = sure not. hh (.) yeah er better than to go to frankfurt. i mean frankfurt amsterdam is really tricky. okay we can catch up a little bit hh =

1370S2: = mhm =

1371S1: = the southern part in in frankfurt but erm (.). erm it's five hours down there to amsterdam</5>

1372S2: <7> well again again er </7> look we we need to see ourselves TOO if it's gonna HAPPEN like this (.) because well (.) we believe that we say okay the CATCHMENT area (.) we want to succeed

POmtg314: Meeting to discuss the proceedings of a planned workshop on joint degree programs

629S5: maybe under which steps

630SX-9: yes

631S4: which steps <10> take </10> yes it <11> it </11> it somehow s- somehow belongs there TOO

POmtg439: Meeting of project group discussing two past project events

837S2: = and it's at the weekend and <6> some</6> times older people <7> do </7> their shopping in the week <8> don't they cos </8> it's quieter

838S4: <6> yes </6>

839S3: <7> yes </7>

840S3: <8> it might be </8>

POmtg404: Meeting between representatives of European higher education quality assurance networks

430S1: sort of (.) bottom-UP process where we say (.) and it's interesting because e:r (1) i- i- (.) i was struck TOO when you set out last year by the sort of closed shop approach because you <1> might </1> have invited the hungarians <3> they were after all the the <@> oldest accredi</@></3><@>tation </@> but you <4> DIDN'T </4> (.)

POmtg541: Meeting on quality assurance issues in European higher education

1032S2: no but i mean there's no need to have it here. i think we should take it out. (.) i mean it has no consequence for the rest of the text (1) and then er let's see what happens (2)

1033S1: <2> so er </2>

1034S4: <2> well o</2>therwise if e:r (1) if if it reMAINS if this paragraph remains then e:r er just in case i have another remark TOO hh <reading_aloud> each organization or association may nominate one representative </reading_aloud> (.) to where? (2) <soft> may nomi<3>nate so </3></soft>

POmtg542: Meeting between professionals to discuss an internal document on higher education in Europe
16S1: so what do you think i mean of COURSE this needs a lo- s- quite a number of words but m- i made it like this just to have an idea as to whether you (1) could agree on the the basic division of labor.

17S2: er the receiver of the report should be the agency TOO. because m- basically <clears throat> (1) erm they are the: (1) the object of investigation so (1)

POwgd12: Working group discussion on administrative matters concerning joint degree programs in Europe

1186S1: er yes we i m- i mean that all TOO that that accommodation is you come back as {whispered parallel conversation starts} we said yesterday it's much easier if (1)

POwgd14: Working group discussion on joint degree programs in Europe

772S3: we have discussed er in some countries er the local MINISTRY er has to accept er develop er (1)

773S1: <soft> hm </soft>

774S1: <soft> hm </soft>

775S3: the the programs (1)

776S1: <soft> mhm </soft>

777S3: so we <1> have to </1>

778S1: <1> mhm </1>

779S3: <10> take care of this er this aspect </10> TOO (1)

POwgd26: Working group discussion about academic issues with regard to establishing a joint European degree

288S3: hh so in terms of er credits?

289S5: <4> o:r are you </4>

290S7: you mean xx xx xxxx (un)

291S3: in terms of credits?

292S2: that <5> TOO </5>

POwgd26: Working group discussion about academic issues with regard to establishing a joint European degree

291S3: in terms of credits?

292S2: that <5> TOO </5>

293S3: <5> o:r </5> o:r only with er scientific a:rea (1)

294S2: hh i think the credits will be in the structure TOO. (1)

POwgd26: Working group discussion about academic issues with regard to establishing a joint European degree

294S2: hh i think the credits will be in the structure too. (1)

295S5: yes

296S7: <6> yeah </6>

297S3: <6> in the structure TOO </7>

POwgd325: Working group discussion on the organization of joint degree programs in Europe

1257S3: <4> no it is a re- for us </4> it is a requirement <5> you can't er enter a <spel> p h d </spel> (1)

1258S14: <5> our's TOO </soft></5>
POwgd325: Working group discussion on the organization of joint degree programs in Europe
² 2461S1: @ <5><soft> he r </soft> that's a tricky one yes it is indeed <@> hh
</@> i put the question forward t- to my rector and he said (.)
² 2462SX-f: <5> that's a tricky one TOO </5>

POwgd449: Working group discussion on most important points in project planning
² 352S1: yeah (.) shall we shall we move to language learning because we still have to
cover that (.) and then (.) we've got six points for dissemination {S6 joins the group}
² 353S6: yeah (1)
² 354S5: language learning
² 355S6: me TOO

POwgd372: Workshop discussion about young people’s rights in the labor market
² 106S11: and er (1) normally (.) er xxxx </un> sector and in <un> x xxxx </un>
sector TOO

POwgd372: Workshop discussion about young people’s rights in the labor market
² 840S8: i think there was another point in er what YOU said <1> it was </1> the
(equal) pay (.)
² 841S1: <1> yeah </1>
² 842S8: for erm wo<2>men and men </2>
² 843S4: <2> yes yes that's (the fo-) </2> (force)
² 844SX-1: (sorry) <3> yeah </3>{S1 writes something down}
² 845SX-5: <3> yeah </3><4> yeah yeah </4>
² 846S8: <3> i think </3><4> important TOO </4>

PRcon534: conversation about the solution of functions in the Hartogs domain
² 75S2: and then to show that (.) the other one cannot be constructed pos- (.) cannot
possibly be constructed if one of them is (6) {very soft parallel conversation audible in
background (6)}
² 76S1: are there unique (centers) for property <spel> p </spel> are not <pvc> com-
pend? <ipa> kəmˈpɛnt </ipa> </pvc> (3) {parallel conversation audible in background
(3)} (well if)
² 77S2: <@> if you knew that would be great TOO </@> (2)

PRcon535: Conversation between mathematicians during coffee break
² 403S6: <9> mhm </9> (.) hh [LAST NAME14] is interested in this kind of problems
TOO right? (.)

PRcon536: Conversation between mathematicians about definition of strict pseudo-
convexity
² 116S7: <6> [last name4] [last name4] if you </6> want er (.)
² 117S6: <6> no </fast> i don't know i don't know i don't </fast></6>
² 118S7: so </7> i'm @@ registered here </@></7> (.)
² 119S6: </7> so i'm (.) so you think @ </7>
² 120SS: @@ @
² 121S6: so i <1> i should </1> ask [S8/last] TOO then (.)
PRpan1: Panel about the role of women in the Islamic world and the question of modernity
☐ 63S2: thank you. erm (1) [S3] e:r would you like to (1) address the first one? (.)
☐ 64S3: erm <clears throat> (.) i'll address the first one and i'll dress a couple of others
TOO. erm [...] 

PRpan252: Panel on the role of teaching Turkish in Belarus
☐ 85SX: <4> (is that a movie?) </4><5><un> xxxx </un></5>
☐ 86SS: <5> @@@@ </5>
☐ 87S1: <5> for me TOO </5> aha

PRqas407: Question-answer session on development of stock markets in Central and Eastern European countries
☐ 87S8: mhm (.) thank you (.)
☐ 88S3: <@> and </@> last (.) for the la- (into) the last of your <5> que</5>stion is actually in this direction TOO. (.)

EDwg497: Working group discussion about organizing a joint consultancy project
660S2: <2> it's not yeah it's not it's not useful </2> for the product but it's useful for the other courses? (.) i thought you can (2) you can use it? problem solving we will need that (3) we've saw w- we'll need a risk analysis? we work (toward er with the) <un> x x x </un> (forces) and the best analysis we now (this TOO is) what analysis as well (1) we didn't work with (.) all of these (.) <3> and it can be interesting </3> it's it's </8> only </3> fourteen pages (.)

EDwsd303: Workshop discussion on the definition of the term lingua franca
☐ 558S16: = i: i i ask er [S13] to to speak a little bit slower be<7>cause you speak TOO english not </7><1> a lingua franca </1>

LEcon560: Conversation among exchange students about their first experiences in Austria and various other topics
☐ 1412S4: yah i i think my language is more flat it's cos you TOO are more like sing-song (1) i don't know it's (1) {parallel conversation between S3 and S7 starts} it's <un> xx </un> (speed) (2) we've got like <imitating> what are you called?</imitating> (3) we we swallow some (1) yah we swallow something we've got a lot of e:r (1) stupid <LNger> buchstaben {letters of a word} </LNger>{parallel conversation between S3 and S7 ends}

PRpan225: Panel discussion about gender issues
☐ 176S1: […] and now (.) we have another KIND of canon waiting for us. i'm i'm really really i'm i'm (.) very very excited about THAT TOO (.) it's a a cappella (.) erm FEmale? (.) erm how you call it CHORus (.) whatever (.) which is waiting for us. (.) <loud> thank you </loud>
10.2 Abstract

This paper sets out to contribute to the research area of English as a *lingua franca* and endeavours to investigate a field which has already been explored in a native speaker context, but has been neglected in ELF so far. The empirical section, which serves as the basis for the corpus-based analysis of this study, elucidates the grammatical category of additive adverbials, discusses the grammatical implications of selecting the appropriate item for a given context and presents the prescriptive and descriptive Standard Modern English norm of the positioning of *too, also, as well, in addition, again, likewise, equally, similarly, moreover* and *furthermore*. The major objective of the descriptive section is to investigate the idiomatic usage of additive adverbials in spoken discourse as presented by the speakers recorded in the Vienna Oxford International Corpus of English (VOICE). The issues and points made are supported by examples and extracts drawn from detailed analysis of the corpus data. The findings are then compared to the spoken and written language observed in native speakers of American and British English as provided by studies of the Brown Corpus (BUC), the Lancaster-Oslo/Bergen Corpus (LOB), the London-Lund Corpus (LLC) and a corpus of fiction created by Fjelkestam-Nilsson (1983). Possible differences are accounted for thereafter. In addition, it will be investigated whether the ELF speaker’s sex is a factor that correlates with the usage and frequency of certain additive adverbials and a comparison between the results and native speaker usage will be made. The item *too* will then be investigated with regard to Halliday’s communicative functions, that is to say the interpersonal and the ideational, to find out whether there is a difference between the usage of females and males. The conclusion reflects upon the results and outcomes once again and discusses the possible pedagogical implications with regard to second and foreign language teaching.
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