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Abstract

This study is concerned with ‘successful communication’ in ‘English as a lingua franca’. As a qualitative study, it wants to contribute to the empirical basis that is still needed for ELF research. The core of this diploma thesis is the description and exemplification of three linguistic strategies that were identified as contributing to various aspects of politeness and common ground. The data used for this purpose was recorded in a large international company with a subsidiary in Austria (for reasons of confidentiality the company and all related names and projects have been replaced by pseudonyms or removed). The recordings comprise the final exams of an international business school that consisted of several simulated sales calls and business meetings.

Chapter 2 provides a concise overview of some important concepts: English as a lingua franca, ELF in the business world, Business English and Exam Language. Chapter 3 presents all the information necessary about the mini-corpus used for the present diploma thesis as well as on transcription conventions and methodology. Chapter 4 contains the theoretical background knowledge relevant to the data analysis. After a detailed description of the notion of ‘successful communication’ the theoretical backdrop for the subsequent data analysis is given: definitions of politeness and common ground and concise information on pronoun use, particular lexical markers of common ground and specialised vocabulary. Chapters 5, 6 and 7 finally present the core of the study: the data analysis. I examine how the use of the pronoun *we*, the use of particular linguistic markers and the use of specialised vocabulary contribute to the negotiation of common ground, the presupposing or strengthening of shared knowledge and the creation of a positive atmosphere in the conversation in general. The examination is illustrated with many examples from my mini-corpus and some cautious generalisations and conclusions are drawn. Finally chapter 8 provides some implications for teaching Business English and chapter 9 summarises the main findings of the study.
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1. Introduction

Over the last decades English has become the language of globalisation with speakers of various levels all over the world (cf. Gnutzmann & Intemann 2005). As a ‘global language’ (cf. Crystal 2005) or ‘lingua franca’ English does not belong exclusively to the native speakers anymore but those who speak English as a second or foreign language influence the development of the language as well. Particularly the number of speakers of ‘English as a foreign language’ (EFL) has grown immensely in recent years and the demand for English is still increasing. As a result it can be stated that the majority of English conversations happens between non-native speakers or speakers of ‘English as a lingua franca’ (ELF) (cf.: Gnutzmann 2005). These developments have led to a shift in perspective in linguistic research. It is argued that ELF speakers may influence the language development in a way that is quite different from the developments in native speaker English. However, up to now there has only been little empirical evidence for such a development (cf. Gnutzmann & Intemann 2005) and the need for large-scale research and a broad empirical basis on ELF has been emphasised by many researchers (e.g.: Firth 1996; Seidlhofer 2001). Several studies relying on ELF data (Firth 1996; Seidlhofer 2001; Pitzl 2004; Strasser 2004 could be mentioned as examples) have already been published. The present diploma thesis also works with ELF data and it is my aim to contribute to the empirical basis that is still needed for further ELF research.

The present study focuses on several linguistic strategies that are identified as contributing to the negotiation of common ground, the presupposing or strengthening of shared knowledge or the creation of a positive atmosphere within the interactions. These strategies are not associated with the negotiation of common ground at first sight but a close analysis of my transcripts made clear that they are used for various interpersonal purposes by the speakers in the conversations. The following strategies are analysed:

- the use of the pronoun *we*
- the use of specific linguistic features used to negotiate common ground with the conversation partner (e.g.: you know, nice to meet you, etc.)
- the use of specialised vocabulary

The main purpose of this study is to illustrate how the speakers successfully use these strategies to negotiate common ground, presuppose and strengthen shared knowledge and create a positive atmosphere within the conversations. They manage to establish a sense of
‘groupness’ (Poncini 2004) by using these subtle linguistic strategies. In contrast to some other studies of ELF talk the focus of this diploma thesis will not be on problems and miscommunication but on features of successful ELF communication.

The data for this diploma thesis was recorded in a large international company with a subsidiary in Austria (for reasons of confidentiality the company and all related names and projects will be replaced by pseudonyms or removed). Although it was really difficult to gain access to spoken business data, I finally recorded several hours of conversations. The present study focuses on a series of final exams from an international business school. The employees of the company where I did my recordings had to do some training concerning business skills and in the final exams the examinees had to go through simulated sales calls, business meetings, etc. From the description of my recordings it becomes clear that they cannot simply be classified ‘business discourse’ but two different but related levels have to be considered in the analysis: On the one hand I recorded exams (i.e. conversations in an educational setting) but on the other hand the interactions can be described as (albeit simulated) business meetings. This two-fold nature of my data always has to be taken into account because it is likely that it influences all levels of analysis and description (e.g.: speaker relationships, power structures, negotiation of common ground, etc.).

As a starting point, chapter 2 provides a concise overview of some important concepts: English as a lingua franca, ELF in the business world, Business English and Exam Language.

Chapter 3 provides information necessary on the mini-corpus used for the present diploma thesis: After some problems of gaining access to business data have been addressed the process of data collection is described in detail. The data description once again emphasises the two-fold nature of the data. Further information is provided on the structure of the conversations, the speakers, as well as on speaker roles and identities. Finally there are some remarks on issues of transcription as well as on the methodology used in this study.

Chapter 4 presents the theoretical background knowledge relevant to the data analysis. First the problems in finding a research topic are pointed out. Afterwards the term ‘success’ is discussed in detail. As this study focuses on ‘successful lingua franca communication’ it seems to be important to define the notion of ‘success’ or ‘successful
(ELF) communication’. Finally definitions of politeness and of common ground are given as well as some information on the areas of investigation used in this study (pronoun use, particular linguistic markers of common ground, specialised vocabulary).

Chapters 5, 6 and 7 present the core of the study: the data analysis. I examine how the use of the pronoun *we*, the use of particular linguistic markers and the use of specialised vocabulary contribute to the negotiation of common ground, the presupposing or strengthening of shared knowledge and the creation of a positive atmosphere in the conversation in general. The examination is illustrated with many examples from my mini-corpus and some cautious generalisations and conclusions are drawn.

Finally some implications for teaching Business English are given. As I am a future English teacher it is very important for me to include some conclusions for teaching that could be drawn from my examination. Chapter 9 presents the overall conclusion to my diploma thesis where the main findings are once again summarised.

As a conclusion it has to be emphasised that although analysing spoken discourse is a complex undertaking and it took me quite a while to finish this diploma thesis, it was a really interesting project. I hope that the present study contributes – at least a little – to the empirical basis needed for ELF research.
2. **English as a Lingua Franca, Business English, Exam Language**

2.1. **English as a lingua franca – Some General Comments**

English as a lingua franca, English as a global language, English as an international language, English as a world language, English as a medium of intercultural communication – this is only a small sample of terms which are used interchangeably by various linguists and which describe the special development of English during the last decades.

Today English is used in many areas: It is the language of the sciences and one of the major languages of the European Union. ELF also plays an important part in business and workplace discourse, either for international business or as a company language. In the private sphere almost every one of us has to have some command of English to participate in popular youth culture, entertainment, mass media, the internet, and advertising. English is on the rise as a truly international language.

Nevertheless a global language does not have its status only because of the large number of speakers. There are many more factors which contribute to the rise of an international language. According to Crystal (2005: 9)

>a language does not become a global language because of its intrinsic structural properties, or because of the size of its vocabulary, or because it has been a vehicle of a great literature in the past, or because it was once associated with a great culture or religion

(Crystal 2005: 9)

These are motivations for people to learn a language but there is one major reason for a language to achieve a global status: the power of its people. English was at the right place at the right time and took its ground.

My diploma thesis is intended to be a small contribution to the empirical basis which is still needed for further and more detailed ELF research. I decided to focus on ELF in the business world and my next chapters will shed some light on this concept.

2.2. **ELF in the Business World**

Truchot (2002) observes that

>it is paradoxical that so little is known about language in the workplace, even though this is the most common motivation factor for learning English.

(Truchot 2002: 20)
One of the most important fields of ELF usage is the ever-growing area of international or global economy. This is also one of the most important motivations for people to learn English as a second language. Today it is important for every business person to have some command of English to be able to participate in international or global business (Gnutzmann & Intemann 2005: 21).

Vollstedt (2002: 87 – 107) identifies two main reasons for the increasing importance of ELF in business communication: On the one hand English is on the rise in many areas of communication, especially in the fields of science and business, and this development also influences the communication in large companies. On the other hand there are decisive “changes of company organisation, innovations in communication and information technologies, the influence of corporate culture, power structures and legislative regulations” (Vollstedt 2002: 91). These factors have contributed to the rise of ELF in business communication and Vollstedt (2002) suggests that this development will continue in the coming years.

In international business English is not only used as a device for cross-cultural communication between people with different mother tongues but it is also more and more used as a so-called company language. Truchot (2002) cites Hollqvist’s (1984) description of a company language: “[…] its use was required for all forms of written and oral communication involving persons of different linguistic origins, at least at the firms’ head offices” (Holloqvist 1984 quoted in Truchot 2002: 12). A look at today’s situation shows that the speakers of ELF in business contexts do not necessarily have to have “different linguistic origins” (Holloqvist 1984 quoted in Truchot 2002: 12) because there are various ways of approaching the notion of ‘company language’ and sometimes even people with a common mother tongue are obliged to have a conversation in English.

As a conclusion it can be said that ELF is the dominant language for international or global business, not only for cross-cultural communication or interactions with representatives from different companies, but also for communication within a company, even between people with common mother tongues.
2.2.1. Business Discourse vs. Casual Conversation

Business communication appears in many different forms and it is not easy to find a clear definition of what counts as business discourse and what as casual conversation. Two short extracts from my own data will illustrate some of the problems:

**Extract 1:**

437  S1: so nervous?  
438  S7: what?  
439  S1: nervous?  
440  S7: mmmm (not but) i'm tired little bit little bit tired with the: with the heat (.) like  
441  tough <1> tough </1> (. the hot weather  
442  S1: <1> aha </1>  
443  S7: i'll take it off okay? {takes off his jacket}  
444  S1: yeah (.) feel free (4) i imagine how you feel because i was in your role (.) six  
445  years ago so  
446  S7: aha:  
447  S1: i did it (.) six years ago so <2> <un> xxx xxx </un> </2>  
448  S7: <2> <un> xxx xxx </un> </2> i feel good but a little bit tired with e:r more  
449  like e:r e:r from the point of e:r (.) from the point of e:r quite emotional  
450  S1: aha  
451  S7: emotional things  
452  S1: yeah (.) (however you'll) manage it (.) you will manage it  
(MD II / Conversation 2)

**Extract 2:**

921  S4: er (.) we have a price problem (.) i received your proposal (.) fifteen million (.)  
922  big sum of money (.) so:: (.) i (.) also had to ask competitors (.) for proposal (.)  
923  and they are about thirty percent cheaper than [org1]  
924  S11: thirty percent?  
925  S4: THIRTY percent (.) i <7> mean i tell </7> you because we know you we  
926  know you and and you know (.) i would like (.) to work with [org1] because i  
927  know [org1] and (know [last name1]) but er we have to do something with the  
928  price (.) i have no: chance to: argue thirty percent (.) price <8> (.) difference </8>  
929  S11: <7> oh really </7> <8> and actually </8> have you (.) compared these  
930  solution proposals (.) any differences any ideas what [org1] may be (.) better <un>  
931  x xx </un> one <9> er what is the idea </9>  
932  S4: <9> hh maybe (.) maybe you could maybe you t- </9> you could g-give me a  
933  short summary where you see your advantages of your proposal because i  
934  understood you prepared the proposal with your colleagues and and hh i mean  
935  from first (.) view they a:re comparable (.) all the proposals are comparable (.) yah  
936  (.) they are just cheaper (.) yah they <1> have </1> cheaper rates for:er the  
937  project manager (.) er they have (.) cheaper rates for the application developers  
938  yah so: it's really a problem yah maybe i should talk to the partner to [last  
939  name1] and and make pressure on the price if i could help you yah (.) you need to  
940  do something  
(MD II / Conversation 3)
At first sight extract 1 looks like a rather casual and personal conversation. S1 asks S7 whether he is nervous and S7 starts talking of “emotional things”. There is no obvious indication that this is a part of business discourse. However, the conversation takes place in an office and the two speakers represent business partners at the beginning of a meeting. Smalltalk like this is often found in the opening or closing phases of business conversations and it depends on the definition of ‘business discourse’ whether these sequences are included or excluded. (cf.: Drew & Heritage 1992) Extract 2 can easily be recognised as part of a business conversation. There are many indicators such as lexical items, e.g. “price problem / competitors / project manager” and many more. It seems clear to the reader that this sequence is part of a business meeting and the topic is a serious price problem. It can therefore be concluded that in a definition of ‘business discourse’ the context is very important part. According to the various possible definitions of context there will also be various definitions of business discourse (Koester 2006: 11 – 16). However, I do not want to go into too much detail here but rather try to list some distinctive features of business discourse.

Drew and Heritage (1992) include business discourse into their concept of ‘institutional talk’. According to them a universally accepted definition of institutional talk does not exist (Drew & Heritage 1992: 21). However, they provide a description of the term and offer some family resemblances to distinguish institutional talk from ordinary conversation. They identify three major distinguishing features:

1) Institutional talk is **goal-oriented** (my emphasis), i.e. it “involves an orientation by at least one of the participants to some core goal, task or identity […] conventionally associated with the institution in question” (Drew & Heritage 1992: 22).

2) Institutional talk is governed by “**special and particular constraints** on what one or both of the participants will treat as allowable contributions to the business at hand” (Drew & Heritage 1992: 22 – my emphasis).

3) Institutional talk is associated with “**inferential frameworks** and procedures that are particular to specific institutional contexts” (Drew & Heritage 1992: 22 – my emphasis).

According to Drew and Heritage (1992) these three features should be found in almost every example of institutional talk and they will be further explained as follows: According
to Koester (2006: 4) the goal orientation of ‘workplace discourse’, as she calls it, manifests itself for example in the recurrence of particular types of discursive activity which are typically associated with particular workplace practices (e.g.: instruction-giving, decision-making, briefing). Business discourse is also more rigidly structured than casual conversation. Business discourse is governed by special constraints which instruct the speakers what can be said or done and which gives the conversation a “distinctly ‘formal’ character” (Drew & Heritage 1992: 23). These constraints are often also manifested in the lexical choice of the speakers (e.g.: use of technical or professional jargon, etc.). The particular inferential frameworks of specific workplace contexts can, according to Koester (2006: 4, 5), be reflected in turn design and adjacency pair structure, for example.

Another way of distinguishing business discourse from ordinary conversations is the fact that it is often asymmetrical (cf.: Heritage 1997). This asymmetry can be established through a difference in knowledge or hierarchy. When engaged in any kind of workplace discourse people take on particular institutional or professional roles (e.g.: manager – employee, teacher – student, etc.). These roles are often linked to certain discursive rights or obligations (e.g.: posing questions, giving commands, etc.). However, these roles are not fixed and stable, but actively created during the conversation. One person can also have multiple identities. According to Greatbatch and Dingwall (1998) there is the distinction between social identities (e.g.: man, woman, manager, teacher) and discourse identities (e.g.: speaker – addressee, questioner – answerer) and during any kind of conversation the speaker takes on both identities in various degrees. When analysing talk, discourse identities are usually more important than social identities. (Koester 2006: 5, 6)

2.2.2. Business Discourse vs. Institutional Discourse

A further distinction can be made between business discourse and institutional discourse. Poncini (2004: 49 – 52) distinguishes business discourse from institutional discourse by using two main criteria that have been outlined by Bargiela-Chiappini and Nickerson (1999: 1, 2):

1) Institutional discourse is often characterised as interaction between a professional and a lay person. Business discourse, in contrast, does not usually include a lay person but can be described as involving “individuals who interact for business
purposes and whose main work focuses on business” (Poncini 2004: 50 referring to Bargiela-Chiappini & Nickerson 1999).

2) Furthermore, business discourse is characterised by “the existence of a superordinate business objective in the organization” (Poncini 2004: 51). These business organisations are normally profit-oriented and therefore “discourse takes on importance not only for communicative success but also for the actual “survival” of the organization” (Poncini 2004: 51).

2.2.3. What is “Business English”?  
The growing importance of English, especially ELF, as a tool for communication in international business has already been discussed. The kind of English used in such environments is called Business English. Although Business English courses are offered in many language schools all over the world, research in this area has so far often been neglected (Ellis & Johnson 1994: 3). Therefore it can be said that

Business English is not a neatly-defined category of special English. The term is used to cover a variety of Englishes, some of which are very specific, and some very general.
(Ellis & Johnson 1994: 10)

However, it is possible to identify several criteria and characteristics to distinguish Business English from other kinds of English:

Ellis and Johnson (1994) argue that Business English belongs to the context of English for Specific Purposes (ESP) because

it shares the important elements of needs analysis, syllabus design, course design, and materials selection and development which are common to all fields of ESP. As with other varieties of ESP, Business English implies the definition of a specific language corpus and emphasis on particular kinds of communication in a specific context.
(Ellis & Johnson 1994: 3)

This definition makes clear that the term Business English tends to be used primarily in teaching contexts. According to Ozvalda (2003: 73) a main defining feature of Business English is its difference from the larger concept of ESP. Unlike other areas of ESP, Business English is characterised by a mixture of specific content (related to a certain job or field of industry) and general content (related to the general ability to interact more effectively – in business contexts) (Ellis & Johnson 1994: 3). This view is also supported by Donna (2000: 2).
Business English is very much oriented towards the specific needs of the user (cf.: Frendo 2005, Ellis & Johnson 1994, Donna 2000). The speaker of Business English uses the language as a tool to achieve certain (business) goals. According to Ellis and Johnson (1997) the language of business therefore has several particular characteristics: The first important feature of Business English is a “sense of purpose” (Ellis & Johnson 1994: 7 – my emphasis).

Language is used to achieve an end, and its successful use is seen in terms of a successful outcome to the business transaction or event. (Ellis & Johnson 1994: 7)

Furthermore the language of business always bears a certain kind of risk as mistakes or misunderstandings could pose a considerable threat to the success of the company. Business English is predominantly transactional, i.e. used for “getting what you want and persuading others to agree with the course of action you propose” (Ellis & Johnson 1994: 7, 8). Finally it can be described as objective rather than subjective or personal (ibid.). The second important characteristic of Business English is the “social aspect” (Ellis & Johnson 1994: 8 – my emphasis). Although international business people often do not know each other and are pressed for time, they have to manage to create a positive atmosphere within the conversation in a rather short time. Therefore, according to Ellis and Johnson (1994: 8) “[s]ocial contacts are often highly ritualized”. The speakers use formulaic language and adopt a style that is “polite but also short and direct” (ibid.). They manage to “build a good relationship while avoiding over-familiarity” (ibid.). The third and last characteristic of Business English is “clear communication” (Ellis & Johnson 1994: 9 – my emphasis). As business people use language as a tool to achieve certain (business) goals, they usually want to minimise the risk of misunderstanding and have “a preference for clear, logical thought emphasized by the kinds of words that indicate the logical process (for example, ‘as a result’, ‘for this reason’, ‘in order to’)” (Ellis & Johnson 1994: 9). Their style is often concise and characterised by the need to save time. According to Ellis and Johnson (1994) these three aspects are characteristic of the language of business. In my opinion, although they appropriately describe Business English, they are not unique to this kind of interaction but appear in all kinds of conversations. It can be concluded that it is rather difficult to find a proper definition or characterisation of Business English.
According to Ellis and Johnson (1994: 9) *Business English* can be described as a kind of ELF as

[p]eople around the world conduct business meetings in English even though English may be a foreign language to all those present. The language that they use will be neither as rich in vocabulary and expression, nor as culture-bound, as that used by native speakers, but will be based on a core of the most useful and basic structures and vocabulary.

(Ellis & Johnson 1994: 9)

As *Business English* will be used for international business as well as for internal company affairs (also in non-English-speaking countries) it will predominantly be used as a common language by speakers in various professional contexts.

To conclude, it can be summarised that *Business English* emerged as a special kind of English used for business purposes during the last years. There is a great interest in *Business English* courses all over the world. Nevertheless there is no universally accepted definition of *Business English* and a lot of research still has to be done.

### 2.3. Characteristics of Exam Language

Although a lot of literature on language testing (cf.: Milanovic & Saville 1996; Milanovic & Weir 2004) and testing and assessment in general can be found, it is rather difficult to find relevant studies on the characteristics of exam language.

In my opinion one of the most important distinguishing features of the discourse in exam situations is that the speakers in those situations have specific roles: on the one hand there is an examiner and on the other hand there is an examinee. Various functions are attributed to these roles. Furthermore these roles are linked to certain rights and obligations within the interaction.

The examiner definitely is in a position of power or control within an exam situation because s/he has the right to assess / evaluate the examinee’s utterances. This position of power or dominance is manifested in examiner talk via certain strategies: The examiner controls the topical development as well as the exam structure in general “through such features […] as topic nomination, topic abandonment, propositional reformulation and expansion of an interviewee’s utterances” (Berwick & Ross 1996: 35). In my opinion examiner talk can be further characterised by the right to pose questions and to correct the other speaker.
The examinee generally is in a weaker position in an exam situation as s/he is the person to be assessed and s/he therefore has to be rather careful in his / her expression. In my opinion examinee talk can be characterised by giving answers / explanations / descriptions, using self-correction, expressing deference in various ways, and using vague language.

The language of exam situations could therefore be classified as a kind of ‘institutional talk’ (cf.: Drew & Heritage 1992): The interaction is usually goal-oriented and underlies particular constraints. The speaker relations are asymmetrical (the examiner has more power than the examinee) and the speakers represent particular roles within the conversations, which are linked to certain discursive rights and obligations. Exam talk can therefore be classified as a particular type of ‘institutional talk’ within an educational context.

Exam discourse has many similarities with what was described as ELF business talk in the previous chapters. In business discourse speakers also enact particular professional roles (e.g.: that of a manager, an employee, a secretary, etc.) and this professional identities are displayed in talk by using various linguistic strategies. Although there are many symmetrical conversations in business contexts (e.g.: between two employees of a company), asymmetrical speaker relationships are particularly common in these interactions. These asymmetries are similar to those observed between the examiner and the examinee in exam talk and the speakers use equal linguistic strategies to enact them in the conversation. It is clearly shown that exam talk and business discourse have many features in common. Both kinds of interactions can be described as belonging to the field of ‘institutional talk’ (Drew & Heritage 1992): business discourse takes place in a business context whereas exam discourse occurs in an educational context.

For my diploma thesis I recorded ten final exams from an international business school (more information on the data and recordings is given in chapter 3). As these conversations were exams involving and examinee and an examiner, they can be classified as exam discourse. However, the exams simulated business meetings between a customer and a sales person, which developed quite naturally (i.e. displaying the same features as ‘real’ business meetings) and can therefore be classified as business discourse. My data therefore consist of exams which are simulations of business meetings and this dichotomy influences all aspects of my study.
3. **Data & Methodology**

### 3.1. Problems in Accessing Business Data

Before actually describing the data used for this diploma thesis another important issue has to be discussed: the problems and difficulties in gaining access to real business data. These problems have been pointed out by many researchers and linguists and also Poncini (2004: 68 – 70) devotes a whole chapter to them. She quotes from an article by Harris and Bargiela-Chiappini (1997: 13) that

> a serious inhibiting factor in the growth of business discourse research has been and continues to be the question of access to data. To a greater extent than for most other ‘institutions’, time, perseverance, personal contacts and luck are useful, if not indispensable, prerequisites if the researcher approaching a large business organisation with the intention of ‘gathering data’ is to meet with success.

(Harris & Bargiela-Chiappini 1997:13 quoted in Poncini 2004: 69)

According to Bargiela-Chiappini and Harris (1995: 531) access to spoken business data proves even more difficult than to written data. Meetings, telephone conversations, presentations or other types of business communication often address sensitive issues that should only be known inside the company. Large international business organisations have to be very careful concerning issues of confidentiality and ‘outsiders’ are not allowed to participate in meetings – let alone record them.

Once access to business data is gained there are other factors besides concerns about confidentiality that can cause further difficulties. Poncini (2004: 69) mentions that business people often have tight schedules and usually do not have a lot of time for researchers and analysts. For example, it was not possible for Bargiela-Chiappini and Harris (1995: 535) to accomplish planned post-meeting interviews because of the tight schedules of the participants.

These problems have far-reaching implications for research methodology. The analyst has to be very flexible and the data recorded should be supplemented with contextual information so as to gain a greater understanding of the whole business situation. According to Poncini

> [t]he researcher’s role in negotiating contact and developing the relationship with the business firm is thus an important factor in the research process, […].

(Poncini 2004: 69, 70)

Until I finally had the chance to record business data I had to face most of these problems myself. When I started working for my diploma thesis I decided to focus on business
communication for two reasons: out of a personal interest in this topic because I attended a “Höhere Lehranstalt für wirtschaftliche Berufe”\(^1\) and because my supervisor encouraged me to follow this interest. Unfortunately I did not have any personal contacts in international business but I thought that maybe my former school could help me and I was not at all prepared for how problematic it actually was to gain access to business data.

It took me about half a year until I could finally do the first recordings. I contacted almost every large and well-known company with a subsidiary in Vienna but I only got negative replies. Most of the rejections were because of confidentiality issues. It was particularly frustrating when one company agreed to let me do recordings in internal meetings and after an informal agreement kept me waiting more than a month and finally refused without giving any reasons. After some more time I decided to use some other contacts I had. I am working in a Viennese dancing school as a dancing teacher and I lead my own courses there. Upon approval by my boss I presented my research project to my courses and asked for their help. The participants of my dancing lessons usually establish a good and often personal relationship with me as a course leader and many of them offered to help me. Over the following weeks and months I had the chance to build contacts in different companies and finally I did recordings in five different firms. I recorded a total of about fourteen hours of business conversations. The companies were international business organisations with subsidiaries in or close to Vienna and I recorded different kinds of business conversations, e.g. telephone conferences, internal company meetings and the final exams of an international business school. I do not want to go into too much detail about the circumstances of the individual recording sessions here but some more information on the data I actually used for my diploma thesis can be found in the following sections.

3.2. The Data
When I started the preparations for my diploma thesis and finally did my recordings, I did not have a fixed research question prepared in advance. I knew that I wanted to do some investigation in the field of business communication in ELF but I did not have any clearly defined aims. This might not be the conventional approach for researchers but it definitely provides some advantages. As Cameron puts it:

\(^1\) a kind of Commercial College
If researchers have too many preconceptions about what they are going to find, the danger is that they will not attend closely enough to the subtleties of talk in a specific situation. (Cameron 2002: 22)

Another reason for defining the research question only after doing the recordings is that you never know what you will get. You cannot decide to have a look at, for example, self- and other-repair when you do not know whether there will be instances of it in your data.

In most organisations, where I did my data collection, it was only possible to do recordings once and my mini-corpus is therefore quite heterogeneous. I had different types of conversations, different speakers with various (linguistic) backgrounds; the tapes differed in quality and length. It was very difficult to find similarities and common features that could be analysed from a linguistic point of view. After listening closely and doing a first analysis (only based on personal interests, things that where striking at first sight and common sense) of all the tapes I decided to limit myself to a set of recordings I did in one large company.

3.2.1. ‘The Company’

In May 2007 I had the opportunity to do three days of recordings in a large international company which also has a subsidiary in Vienna (Austria). It is important to clarify that as I am working with business data, all the names (including the name of the company itself) and other details are made anonymous or replaced by pseudonyms\(^2\) in the transcriptions as well as in my text and the analysis. For a better understanding and fuller picture of the data recorded it should only be said that the company is engaged in the business of information-handling. Almost all the products the company develops, produces and sells are designed to record, process, communicate, store, and retrieve information. Today the company is at the forefront of a worldwide industry and a pioneer in information technology. However, the recordings did not take place in the company building but in a hotel in Lower Austria. The company has a close relationship with an international business school (the name of which will not be revealed either). Young or new employees of the company have to go through training of business skills in this school. The company wants to make sure that every employee has the knowledge and abilities to support the firm’s business. The

---

\(^{2}\) The following pseudonyms will be used from now on:
‘the company’ – denoting the company where I did my recordings
international business school – denoting the business school where I recorded the final exams
international business school furthermore provides them with a consistent sales methodology. All classes are held in English and after Graduation Class the employees have the possibility to start a sales career at the company. I had the opportunity to record some parts of a Graduation Class of this international business school. The final exams were held in a hotel in a small town in Lower Austria (more about the setting and the recording situation will be given later on in this chapter).

3.2.2. Collecting Data

A total of eleven conversations was recorded (recorded time: 5 hours, 47 minutes, 14 seconds) on three days (May 21\textsuperscript{st}, 22\textsuperscript{nd} and 23\textsuperscript{rd} 2007). The first recording presents the welcome speech and explanation of the final exams by the leaders of the international business school. Nine conversations are so-called sales calls, which are the actual exams and one conversation is a sales manager meeting (a special exam situation). Further information about the recorded data will be found in the next chapter ‘Data Description’.

For my recordings I used a mini-disc player and a microphone which was placed on a table in front of or between the speakers so it could easily be seen by everybody. The recordings were made with all the speakers’ consent. They were organised with an employee of ‘the company’ who then made further arrangements with the leaders of the international business school. When I arrived at the hotel for the first time I was invited to participate in the welcome session, which consisted of a general introduction by the leaders of the international business school for the examiners from ‘the company’. In the course of this meeting I also had the chance to introduce myself and my project a little bit. I told the meeting participants that I wanted to do recordings for my diploma thesis and that I would like to analyse ‘International English for Business Purposes’. I explained that I would analyse the conversations I recorded from a linguistic point of view but I did not have a clear research question to tell them. In my opinion it was advantageous that I could not tell them any clear research objective because as Cameron (2002: 22) puts it “there is a chance that the knowledge will affect their behaviour in such a way as to frustrate your [the researcher’s] goals”. However, I made clear what would happen to the material and that every detail that could provide information about the company, the school or any person recorded would be removed or replaced by pseudonyms. All the examiners agreed to be recorded during their exams. The examiners introduced me and my project to their
examinees and they all agreed to be recorded. Unfortunately I did not have the possibility to ask all the examinees for their permission.

3.2.3. The Setting

Most of the recordings took place in ordinary hotel rooms (except for the first conversation, which was situated in a conference room in the hotel). The beds had been pushed to one side and a table was placed in the middle of the room to make it look like an office. I was present all the time but I tried to stay in the background (However, I was not always successful as some examiners addressed me personally and I had to respond.). The following sketch gives an impression of the seating arrangement and the speakers’ positions (It should, however, be kept in mind that different rooms were used and so the seating arrangement varied from recording to recording.):

3.2.4. The Role of the Researcher

Although I did not participate in the conversations and remained silent, I was still present in the room. Furthermore the microphone was placed on the table between the two speakers and was therefore clearly recognisable for all. This might have led to the so-called “observer’s paradox” which was observed by Labov (Labov 1972: xvii; Labov 1978: 209). The phenomenon described by this term means that researchers want to observe natural communication or behaviour but because people know that they are being observed they
do not act naturally anymore. Many social researchers have elaborated on this topic but there is no real way around it (Labov 1972: xviii). One suggestion was not to tell the people that they are being recorded. However, this raises serious ethical questions (for a discussion of ethical problems see Cameron 2002: 22 – 25 or Johnstone 2000: 39 – 57). So because of ethical reasons and because recording business data is always an even more delicate matter due to confidentiality issues I decided to ask for my speakers’ consent, make clear what was going to happen with the data and answer all questions that might arise. The fact that I was present while the recording took place does not mean that my data is actually biased because there are several factors that can reduce the effects of the observer’s paradox (Labov 1978: 209, 210), for example, to establish a positive relationship between the researcher and the speakers (Milroy 1987: 60 - 64). During the three days when I did my recordings, I think that I managed to build such a positive relationship with the examiners as well as with the examinees. In the breaks I had the chance to talk to both groups informally and they were really friendly and very interested in what I was doing. They asked me many questions concerning my studies and my diploma thesis and they were happy to give me more information about their jobs, ‘the company’ and the exams they were doing but also on their personal (linguistic and professional) backgrounds. It was particularly interesting to talk to the examinees during the breaks and one of them even asked me to send him my diploma thesis via e-mail. As the examinees were about my age I had the impression that they did not see me as a researcher but rather as a member of their group. During the exams they only seemed to be aware of the microphone and the researcher for the first few minutes but then it appeared to me that they did not think of these things anymore. Several factors might have contributed to this:

1. the exam situation which needed all their concentration (they did not have time to focus on anything else)
2. the positive relationship with me as the researcher (or simply a young woman of their age)
3. the natural development of the conversation as a simulated business meeting (i.e. the exam situation was not foregrounded all the time)

From the side of the examiners I never had the impression that they felt inhibited or disturbed by the microphone or me as a researcher. During the exams they hardly took any
notice of me. I tried to encourage this as much as possible by staying in the background and not participating in the conversations (only two times was I invited to say something in the feedback sessions). However, most of the time I was silent, took notes and observed the whole situation. As a result, I think that my data is as natural as it could have possibly been in this situation.

3.3. Data Description
The data examined are, as was already mentioned before, a collection of final exams from an international business school. A total of eleven conversations was collected which consist of nine final exams, a sales manager meeting and the introductory meeting by the leaders of the international business school and the examiners.

3.3.1. The Introductory Meeting
The introductory meeting is, of course, the first recording. It is an example of a group discussion but there are long stretches of monologic talk particularly by one of the leaders of the international business school (S3). He introduces their school and the final exams that take place the following days and he explains the organisation and administrative details for the examiners. His speeches are interrupted by questions of the examiners and sometimes by side-sequences of the other school leader.

In sum, the introductory meeting has seven participants. Two of them are the leaders of the international business school. They are representatives of their school and explain the training as well as the exam procedure to the examiners. The examiners are employees of ‘the company’ who have not necessarily attended the international business school themselves, i.e. they do not know very much about the procedure of the exams or about their role in it. Therefore the leaders of the international business school have to explain the whole process to them. More information on the speakers can be found in chapter 3.5.

Fortunately I was invited to participate in this introductory meeting and was able to record it because it also helped me to understand the procedure of the following exams. The American leader of the international business school (S3) explained what their training was about: Their students are trained in business skills and get to know new models and theories so that they acquire the knowledge how to conduct an effective sales call and
thereby how to successfully sell the products of ‘the company’. They study these skills with the help of various case studies that give them the opportunity to get to know different functions and processes within the professional routine of a sales person.

Finally the introductory meeting was also used to talk about administrative things like, for example, which examiner would be in which room, which scenario (or case study) they had to deal with, the timetable for the examinations and also for the breaks, etc. Finally I also had the possibility to introduce my project briefly and afterwards the examiners went to their ‘offices’ (or hotel rooms) and the examinations started.

3.3.2. The Sales Call

The actual exams are the so-called ‘sales calls’, i.e. during the exam situation a ‘real’ sales call or meeting is simulated. These calls are conducted between a customer from a fictitious costumer company and a sales person of ‘the company’. The customer also impersonates the examiner and the sales person is the examinee (more information on the two-fold nature of my data will be found in chapter 3.3.4.). The sales person has to sell a product of ‘the company’ to the customer. In some sales calls the examinees are confronted with different problems (e.g.: a price problem – the customer found a different company that offers the same product much cheaper) which are part of the various scenarios. In other sales calls they have to sell their products to a reluctant customer and promote the advantages of ‘the company’. The simulated meetings develop quite naturally and display characteristics very similar to ‘real’ sales calls.

The sales calls have a predominantly dialogic structure because they take place between an examiner (= customer) and an examinee (= sales person). However, two or three observers watch these sales calls. The observers are examinees themselves and whenever they have no examination they have to watch another sales call. Although they are hardly involved in the conversations, it sometimes happens that they are addressed by the examinee during the exams. Most of these instances include cases of code-switching when the examinee addresses the observers in their Russian mother tongue to ask them for support.

The sales calls take between 15 and 30 minutes each and are followed by feedback sessions, which are not part of my transcripts but which are recorded nevertheless. During these feedback sessions the calls are evaluated and the observers participate in this process.
The examiner usually first asks the observers to give their comments and afterwards adds his own feedback. Several times I was invited to give my own comments too but I was not very happy about it as it endangered the recording situation when my being there and the microphone were in the focus of the participants’ attention. Finally the examinees got their grade – it should be mentioned at this point that all the examinees passed their final exams.

### 3.3.3. The Sales Manager Meeting

The sales manager meeting is a particular kind of final exam. It is a group discussion between one examiner and five examinees. No observers are present during the sales manager meeting. However, this conversation is predominantly shaped by a dialogic structure nevertheless because most of the time only two people are involved in the interaction.

The examiner in this case takes on the role of a CEO (Chief Executive Officer) of ‘the company’. The examinees represent sales persons from ‘the company’ who have to report their results and achievements to a superior. They have to justify their work (e.g.: various projects, sold products, money matters) in front of the CEO.

The sales manager meeting lasts about forty minutes and it is also followed by a feedback session. The examinees are asked to comment on their own and their fellows’ performance and finally the examiner provides his feedback.

### 3.3.4. Business Context vs. Exam Situation

It should be explicitly pointed out that my data have an inherently two-fold nature: They represent exam discourse (on the one hand) which simulates business meetings (on the other hand). This two-fold nature should be kept in mind during the analysis and also influences the data description as well as the examination itself. The analyst has to work with two different but nevertheless related contexts: a business context and an exam context. Both kinds of discourse belong to the broad category of ‘institutional talk’ (cf. Drew & Heritage 1992) and therefore display many similarities. The following data description illustrates these similarities by only occasionally referring to the dichotomy between exam situation and (simulated) business discourse:

The recorded talk is predominantly interactive but sometimes interrupted by longer stretches of monologic speech. The recorded data are non-scripted and naturally occurring,
i.e. “talk that would have happened anyway, whether or not a researcher was around to record it” (Cameron 2002: 20). However, it does not belong to the field of “ordinary talk”, i.e. “what happens in casual contexts with family and friends” (ibid.) but it is an example of “institutional talk”, which can be defined as “what we do when we interact as, or with, professionals, as in teacher-student and doctor-patient interactions” (ibid.). The recordings do not consist of professional-lay-interactions but rather two professionals (most of the time a sales person and a customer) talk to each other.

The setting of the conversations is predominantly professional but also partly educational. As the corpus consists of the final exams of an international business school, this has to be regarded as an educational setting. However, the overall context is a professional one, i.e. that of business meetings, sales calls or a sales manager meeting. Concerning the functions of the conversations, it can be said that they are predominantly transactional (i.e. primarily exchanging information) but also partly interactional / relational (cf. Koester 2006) (i.e. primarily enacting social relationships) because social bonding and establishing a positive relationship and atmosphere with the communication partner is always part of the interactions. The participant roles in my collection of data were mostly positional, which means that the speakers talked to each other through their specific professional roles (e.g.: examiner, examinee, sales person, economist, customer, CEO, etc.). The participant relationships were quite varied. Some seemed to be acquainted but others did not know each other or only had seen their conversation partner once, which means that they did not know each other before the interaction. With regard to the power relationships among the participants, it can be stated that they were mostly asymmetrical (e.g.: examiner – examinee, leaders of the international sales school – examiners from the company, sales person – customer, sales persons – CEO, etc.) which means that one participant was definitely more powerful than the other. All the conversations are held in English and in most of them this language is used as a lingua franca – a contact language to facilitate communication between non-native speakers of English. In the first recording, however, there are two native speakers of English (one American and one British) involved but as native speakers of English are included in my definition of ELF this does not pose a considerable problem. However, the majority of speakers have a non-native linguistic background and in my analysis I will focus on the conversations where English is used as a lingua franca.
As a conclusion to this chapter I would like to add some comments concerning the ‘naturalness’ of my data: Like any conversation, my data too are shaped by the context within which they occur but as Cameron (2002: 20) states “[i]nstitutional talk is perfectly ‘natural’” and I would claim the same for my recordings here. The participants are located in the specific and given context of an exam situation but the conversations develop quite appropriately and in my opinion similar to ‘ordinary’ business meetings.

If you accept that all talk is shaped by its context, then arguably it does not make sense to take one context as more ‘basic’ than another, nor to consider some kinds of talk as more ‘ordinary’ than others. The distinctive discourse found in, say, a classroom or a law court is, in that context, ordinary. It would be decidedly out of the ordinary if participants in courtroom discourse started behaving as if they were chatting to friends around the kitchen table.

[...] In sum, I am suggesting that discourse analysts should be cautious about privileging any particular kind of data as axiomatically the most desirable kind of data, and cautious also in our assumptions about what makes talk ‘natural’ or ‘ordinary’.

(Cameron 2002: 21, 22)

Following Cameron’s assumptions it becomes clear that my recordings can be regarded as examples of naturally occurring conversations and as interesting data for linguistic analysis.

3.4. The Structure of the Conversations

The nine final exams of the international business school and the sales manager meeting will be the focus of my analysis. They are organised according to a similar structure, which will be dealt with in this chapter. The exams imitate real-life business meetings between a sales person of the company and a customer. The meetings are, of course, pre-planned and follow the three-phase structure of business meetings that was identified by Holmes and Stubbe (2003: 65): an opening or introductory section is followed by the central development section, which again is followed by the closing section. Furthermore, the opening phase can be preceded by so-called ‘prebeginning activities’ (Cuff & Sharrock 1985: 155) preparing the participants for the actual meeting.

Using the three-phase structure suggested by Holmes and Stubbe (2003: 65) as a starting point, I developed a more detailed structure for the meetings on my recordings. As all the examinees should have similar exams the structure was very much comparable and a general outline of this structure will be given in the table below:
Pre-Opening | Small talk before the actual exam / meeting.
--- | ---
Opening Phase | Greeting and introduction of participants.
Introduction | Introduction of the topic, the reasons for the meeting, identification of problems or tasks.
Discussion / Problem Phase | Discussion of topics – negotiations
Agreement Phase | Finding an agreement (or not)
Arrangement Phase | Arranging things for the future (how to move on, future meetings, etc.)
Summary Phase | Summary of the main points of the meeting
Closing Phase | Leave-taking and saying thanks for the meeting
Post-Closing | Feedback session and discussion of the exam

3.4.1. Pre-Opening Phase

The pre-opening phase I identified can be compared to the prebeginning activities described by Cuff and Sharrock (1985: 155). When the examinee enters the room, the examiner does not immediately start the exam but there is some preparatory small talk. The main topics of these sequences usually concern the state of mind of the examinees, a personal introduction of the speakers or the introduction of the exam scenario which is exemplified in the following extract from my data:

**Preparatory Small Talk**

**Extract 3:**

437  S1: so nervous?
438  S7: what?
439  S1: nervous?
440  S7: mmmm (not but) i’m tired little bit little bit tired with the: with the heat () like
441  tough <1> tough </1> () the hot weather
442  S1: <1> aha </1>
443  S7: i’ll take it off okay? {takes off his jacket}
444  S1: yeah () feel free (4) i imagine how you feel because i was in your role () six
445  years ago so
446  S7: ah:
447  S1: i did it () six years ago so <2> <un> xxx xxx </un> </2>
448  S7: <2> <un> xxx xxx </un> </2> i feel good but a little bit tired with e:r more
449  like e:r e:r from the point of e:r () from the point of e:r quite emotional
This conversation occurs immediately after the examinee entered the room. The examiner starts some ‘relational talk’ (see Koester 2006) which could also be defined as ‘phatic communion’: “small talk at the beginning or end of transactional encounters” (Koester 2006: 55). The underlined passages clearly show that the function of this sequence is relational as there are many adjectives connected to a person’s emotional condition (e.g.: nervous, tired, good, emotional). Furthermore the examiner engages in social bonding with the examinee when he says: “I imagine how you feel because I was in your role six years ago”. He clearly tries to identify with the other speaker and to make him feel more comfortable. Finally he says: “you will manage it” and therefore shows that he has a positive attitude towards the following meeting / exam.

3.4.2. Opening Phase

Immediately after the examinee knocked on the door the opening phase of the meeting starts. This phase, by my definition, would only be composed of the greeting, some initial small talk and the introduction of the people whenever necessary, i.e. when they did not know each other before the meeting. A typical example of this phase is given in extract 4 below:

Extract 4:

1379 S6: come in
1380 S14: hello mister [S6]
1381 S6: hi [S14]
1382 S14: how are you?
1383 S6: fine thank you (.) <4> <un> xxx </un> </4>
1384 S14: <4> thank you so much </4> (3) it's h-hot to-today
1385 S6: yeah absolutely

In this opening the speakers know each other, which can be seen in the greeting when they mention each other’s names. There is some very short and formulaic small talk but then the examinee leads over to the next part of the meeting and therefore starts the transactional and more formal part of the meeting.
3.4.3. Introduction

He introduces the topic and the purpose of the meeting:

**Extract 5:**

1386 S14: well e:rm (. ) er the reason e:r why i’rn here (. ) er you know that you called
1387 me (. ) er our (. ) proposal of x-series and er <un> xx </un> er e:r the (kiosks)
1388 o-of the (. ) so er what (. ) will be my question to you is er (. ) er just e:r what
1389 proposal do you have from [org6] […]
(MD III Conversation 4)

This phase corresponds to the opening or introductory section defined by Holmes and Stubbe (2003: 65) when “participants typically agreed on their agenda or identified the problem to be solved”.

3.4.4. Main Part: Discussion / Problem Phase, Agreement Phase, Arrangement Phase

The introduction of the topic or purpose for the meeting then leads over to the main part of the conversation which, in my opinion, consists of several sub-sections: the discussion / problem phase, an (optional) agreement phase, an arrangement phase and a summary phase. These phases constitute the main part of the meeting but they should not be taken as a fixed and stable system but rather as some stages which could be arranged and re-arranged quite flexibly. Sometimes one of the phases might be left out (e.g.: the participants might not come to an agreement) whereas another phase might be repeated (e.g.: when several topics / problems are discussed during one meeting). Usually some arrangements for further action or future meetings are made whether an agreement was found or not, as can be seen in the following extract:

**Arrangement Phase**

**Extract 6:**

3646 S30: i would say you you tomorrow you present <4> er </4> you you (. ) e:r (. )
3647 possible solution and then er we shall discuss this decide with fost- e:r er (. ) <5>
3648 [last name6] </5> yah
3649 S31: <4> mhm </4> (. ) <5> aha </5> (. ) mhm mhm mhm
3650 S30: i am supporting you to to a-arrange this meeting with [last name9]
(MD VI Conversation 8)
Several next steps are discussed in this short extract. The sales person is required to prepare a presentation for another representative of the customer company and the client will support another meeting with a decision maker of his firm.

3.4.5. Summary Phase

A summary given by the examinee brings the meeting to an end and illustrates what has been discussed during the meeting and what will happen next:

Extract 7:

S31: that's all for now (. ) okay let me make some summary (. ) so e:r (. ) as i understood you correctly e:r (. ) tomorrow we are going to make a presentation for mister [last name9] (. ) and e:r (. ) we could (. ) tell (. ) that e:r we have er s: er erm (. ) er we get your support (. ) in the project of e:r ([name15]) (. ) and that we could say that (. ) you're (. ) ready to go with [org1] in this project (MD VI / Conversation 8)

The summary then usually is the transition to the last two phases: the closing and the post-closing phase.

3.4.6. Closing and Post-Closing Phase

The closing consists of the leave-taking and usually some formulaic phrases which “serve the purpose of maintaining the relationship beyond the individual conversation” (Meierkord 1998: no pagination).

Extract 8:

S31: okay e:r mister [S30/last] (. ) thank you very much <6> have a good time thank you for the meeting </6>
S30: <6> thank you (. ) nice to meet you </6>
S31: good bye
(MD VI Conversation 8)

This constitutes the end of the actual meeting and afterwards what I called the post-closing phase starts. This is a feedback session which includes the examiner, the examinees as well as the observers. The whole meeting is discussed, positive and negative features are pointed out to the examinee and finally a grade is given by the examiner.

This structure of the meetings should be taken as a general outline but it is certainly not a fixed system that can be relied on. The recorded meetings are, like any other ‘natural’ conversation, constantly negotiated and re-arranged and the sequence as well as the individual parts might be changed and re-structured. However, the structure should be seen
as a helpful device for a close analysis of the meetings and as a guideline to be followed when reading through the transcripts.

3.5. The Speakers

The speakers on the recordings can be divided into two main groups: the examiners and the examinees. The two leaders of the international business school form yet another group. As they are native speakers of English, they will be taken into consideration for comparative purposes whenever it seems appropriate or interesting. Yet another group of speakers are the observers who were present during the exams, but they hardly appear in my transcriptions and therefore are negligible as a group in this chapter.

The speakers are numbered in the order of their appearance in the conversations. Whenever a speaker was present in several conversations the same number was used. However, sometimes it was not possible to clarify whether it was the first time a speaker appeared on the recordings or not (this was particularly true for the observers but also partly for the examinees) and so whenever it was not clear, they were assigned consecutive numbers. A list of all speakers including detailed information about them can be found in the appendix.

The examiners were all sales people employed by the company where I did my recordings. Within the exams they represented customers from fictitious customer companies. This group is composed of seven examiners with different linguistic and personal backgrounds. Their mother tongues are Croatian, German, Russian, and Turkish and they all are quite competent speakers of English. There was only one woman in this group. One of the examiners held exams in Russian and therefore I did not record these conversations – he is only part of the introductory meeting. All the examiners were between thirty and fifty years old and had been working for ‘the company’ for some time. As was pointed out in the introductory meeting, only one of them went through that international business school and the others did not have any experience with the school or as examiners.

The examinees were a group of young Russian people working for the Russian subsidiary of ‘the company’ where I did my recordings. They had to go through the international business school to be able to start a career as sales people and they took their final exams when I did my data collection. Within the exams they represented sales people
from ‘the company’ who had to sell their products. The nine final exams I recorded were
done by eight men and one woman. The sales manager meeting was composed of three
men and two women. They all seemed to be between twenty and thirty years old and had
been working for the company only for a couple of months. Obviously, their mother
tongue was Russian and they had various levels of competence in English.

3.6. An Examination of Speaker Roles / Identities in my Data
The conversations analysed cannot simply be classified as exam situations or business
discourse. Within the context of an exam situation a business meeting is imitated. These
simulations display many similarities with ‘real’ business meetings and are therefore
assumed to be particularly typical examples of business interaction. They involve different
speaker identities and roles which will be examined in more detail in this chapter.

The speakers in my mini-corpus display different roles and identities and they
certainly have asymmetrical relationships towards each other (e.g.: examiner vs.
examinee). To illustrate the different speaker roles and identities a little bit I would like to
refer to the following extract from my own data:

Extract 9:

2597  S24: okay (. ) then (1) into the roles [S25] which means your manager is not
2598  speaking russian unfortunately
2599  S25: okay
2600  [...] 2601  S24: <3> so what have you got for me? <</3>
2610  SX-m: please (. ) hand in <4> the agenda </4>
2611  S24: <4> how are </4> things going on
2612  SX-m: okay here are <5> the agenda </5>
2613  SX-m: <5> that's the agenda </5>
2614  SX-m: this is the (. ) that's the proposed agenda
2615  S24: proposed (. ) i want to have some clear numbers and figures and <6> <soft>
2616  <un> xxx <</un> <soft> </6>
2617  SX-m: <6> sure thing you er </6> (2)
2618  S26: e:r first of all let's submit our pipeline report
2619  S24: okay
2620  S26: and we'll talk about the: (. ) this quarter achievements <7> so that's </7> for
2621  you
2622  S24: <7> okay </7> (. ) thanks
(MD V / Conversation 7)
Discourse Identities

Discourse identities are “intrinsic to talk-in-interaction” (Greatbatch & Dingwall 1998: 121) and examples are ‘speaker – hearer’, ‘questioner – answerer’ or ‘inviter – invitee’. They are constructed on a moment to moment basis in interaction. The discourse identities in this extract are constantly changing and they have to be re-arranged and negotiated on a moment to moment basis. For example, S24 positions himself as the speaker in line 2609 and the others as recipients because he says something and the others are supposed to listen. He can also be identified as the questioner and the others as the possible answerers. While two examinees in particular are engaged in the talk with the examiner, the others can be classified overhearers because they are not directly involved in the interaction at that moment. However, there are no “non-aligned recipients” as Greatbatch and Dingwall (1998: 123) call it because the examiner addresses his question to all the people in the room and the silent examinees simply leave the answer to their colleagues. While in the first few lines of the extract S24 is clearly positioned as the dominant speaker and the others as listeners or recipients this relationship is turned around in line 2618. S26 establishes himself as the speaker and also as the leader of the conversation when he determines the agenda for the meeting. S24 becomes a listener and a follower of the settled agenda which is fixed by his agreement. It can already be seen in this short extract that discourse identities also influence the larger social identities as well as the power structures within a conversation. Whereas S24 clearly is in control of the conversation in the beginning (by means of asking questions and determining the direction of the interaction) S26 takes over control when he determines the agenda of their meeting. However, it was not a forceful takeover of power but rather S24 let S26 take over control after line 2615 when he says “proposed (.) i want to have some clear numbers and figures”. He somehow encourages or even forces S26 to take a firm stand and take over power. This behaviour can be explained with the help of social or situational identities in the interaction.
Situational Identities

Of course, there is not only one way of analysing the short extract shown above. As Holmes, Stubbe & Vine (1999: 353) argue in their article “any particular utterance may be analysed as contributing to the construction of more than one aspect of an individual’s identity” and the analysis of the present extract should just exemplify some dominant features. Referring to Zimmerman’s (1998: 90 – 95) classification system of speaker identities the situational identities would be determined by the situation. However, in this case two overlapping situations or contexts can be found. On the one hand it is an exam situation involving an examiner and an examinee. On the other hand it is a business situation involving a manager and four sales people. Although speaker roles or identities do not have to be obvious, in this case they are even made explicit by a speaker. When S24 says “into the roles” he makes explicit that change from examiner – examinee to manager – sales people (i.e.: the change from the exam situation to the simulated business meeting). From that moment on the speaker roles are established and it is clear that the conversation has to be held in English because the manager does not speak any Russian. Although the speaker roles are made explicit, the exam situation still influences the situational identities and therefore the whole interaction.

Power Relations

Investigation into workplace interactions or institutional talk has shown that these kinds of conversations often involve a certain asymmetry regarding the speaker relationships (cf. Koester 2006; Drew & Heritage 1992; Heritage 1997). This is also connected with the concept of power in business interactions. Certain institutional roles can be linked to particular discursive rights like for example controlling interactions, changing topics, asking questions, and so on (Koester 2006: 5). Power structures become obvious during the whole extract shown above. Holmes, Stubbe & Vine (1999: 351 – 385) made some decisive contributions to research into power and politeness strategies in institutional interactions. They argue that

[w]orkplace interactions are seldom neutral in terms of power. Any analysis which focuses on the construction of professional identity in this context is therefore also inevitably concerned with the ways in which power and solidarity are enacted through discourse.

(Holmes, Stubbe & Vine 1999: 354)
Power can be ‘done’ in different ways in conversations. It can be made explicit by so-called ‘on record’ strategies (Holmes, Stubbe & Vine 1999: 357) or hidden by politeness strategies. In any case a lot of ‘facework’ (Roberts & Sarangi 1999: 230) is involved in workplace interactions because power relations have to be enacted on a daily basis without threatening another person’s face. It is important that power relations are clear to get things done in a company as was also shown by Holmes, Stubbe and Vine (1999: 364 – 373). Going back to the extract that is used for the present analysis of speaker identities in my corpus it can be said that power structures and asymmetrical speaker relationships already become clear in this very short part of a conversation. Already in the first sentence of the extract S24 establishes himself as the person in charge when he signals the beginning of the meeting. Furthermore he also indicates the roles (which are made explicit as adopted identities) for the participants and this can be seen as explicitly “doing power” (Holmes, Stubbe & Vine 1999: 357). I left out some lines of the actual conversation in this extract because they only consist of some short utterances which cannot be assigned to any particular speaker and which precede the beginning of the meeting. The sales manager meeting then starts with a question by the examiner / manager. Determined by the situation S24 has a twofold position of power. On the one hand he is the examiner, which makes him more powerful than the examinees and on the other hand he enacts the role of the manager who is in charge of the sales people. He therefore uses very clear, obvious and explicit power strategies in the beginning of the meeting. The first sign of his control is already that he has the power to actually start the meeting. However, he starts with an open question which leaves some space for the examinees / sales people to react. They hand in their prepared agenda but one of the examinees uses a rather careful formulation when he says “the proposed agenda”. This could be seen as an example of epistemological caution, which is described by Heritage (1997: 177) as a method by which “professionals avoid committing themselves to taking firm positions”. The sales guy does not want to take a firm position but rather leave the agenda open for discussion. This leaves the power with the manager who can still make changes and arrange the meeting according to his own agenda. However, S24 does not accept this cautious behaviour but rather challenges the examinees with his direct exercising of power when he says “proposed (.) i want to have some clear numbers and figures”. This utterance has to be interpreted according to his role as the examiner. He demands a firm position, some self-confidence and a well-prepared
agenda from the examinees and encourages them to take over control regarding topic management and following the agenda. As a manager he would maybe have reacted in a less explicit way and would have just asked what they would propose as an agenda for the meeting. S26 reacts quite well, when he claims the ground and establishes the topics for the meeting. According to Holmes, Stubbe & Vine (1999: 358 – 359) “setting the agenda” is “one strategy for asserting control of the meeting or “doing power’”” (ibid.: 358). It is therefore very interesting that the obviously more powerful speaker leaves this important task to less powerful participants. In my opinion this can be explained with the exam situation where it is the task of the examinees to be well-prepared for the meeting. Nevertheless it has to be said that this setting of the agenda gives some power to the examinees because they can control the topics and therefore the structure of the meeting. This discussion of a very short extract from a longer meeting shows, that a lot of insights can be gained from an examination of speaker roles and identities and that they decisively shape the structure of a conversation. Every discussion of natural conversation should therefore take speaker roles and identities into account.

Finally it must be said that a great deal of caution should be exercised in analysing speaker roles and identities. As Holmes, Stubbe & Vine argue in their article generalisations must be treated with caution. The discourse which characterises any interaction will reflect not only the particular relationships involved, in terms of social distance or solidarity, and relative power or potential influence in the organisation; it will also reflect the particular goals of the interaction, and the relative roles of each participant in relation to these goals. Moreover, features of the discourse will reflect the dynamic and responsive nature of interaction. In the course of a single interaction, participants may orient to a number of different identities and goals, either simultaneously or at different points in time.

(Holmes, Stubbe & Vine 1999: 378)

Analysts and researchers can never look into people’s minds and so they cannot be sure about their roles, identifications and goals. Therefore it is important to treat results from such analyses with caution and only make careful generalisations.

3.7. Issues of Transcription

The focus of the analysis will be on the nine final exams of the graduation class. Therefore it was not necessary to transcribe all the six hours of my recordings but I limited myself to the exam conversations plus the introductory meeting. The feedback sessions were not
transcribed. These transcriptions make a total of about 100 pages for 4 hours, 14 minutes and 18 seconds of recordings. This mini-corpus will form the basis for my analysis.

Many different transcription systems are used by different researchers (for an overview of different conventions see Cameron 2002: 26 – 40) but I decided to work according to the VOICE transcription conventions (for details on the transcription conventions please consult the VOICE Homepage). VOICE (i.e. the Vienna-Oxford International Corpus of English) is a project directed by Barbara Seidlhofer at the University of Vienna, which is funded by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF) and was supported by Oxford University Press. Its final aim is

to open the way for a large-scale and in-depth linguistic description of this most common contemporary use of English by providing a corpus of spoken ELF interactions which will be accessible to linguistic researchers all over the world. (VOICE-Homepage – original emphasis)

Unfortunately my data will not form a part of the VOICE corpus but nevertheless the members of the VOICE team were really supportive and helped me with my transcriptions. The transcriptions were produced with the help of Voicescribe, which is a programme designed by Stefan Majewski, a member of the VOICE team. This editor is intended to “facilitate the task of creating and correcting transcripts for inclusion in the Vienna Oxford International Corpus of English” (Voicescribe Help) and in my opinion it is a really useful tool for making transcriptions. However, it should be noted here that all transcription is to be considered as “somewhat partial […] and inaccurate […]” (Cameron 2002: 40). Cameron points out that even accomplished researchers sometimes change or adapt their transcripts

because when they listened to the tapes again, they noticed mistakes and omissions in their old transcriptions.
(Cameron 2002: 39)

Although I listened to my recordings many times, I am sure that a lot of changes and additions could still be made, but for the purpose of my analysis I think the transcripts are appropriate.

Furthermore I would like to point out that the quality of my recordings is very varied. Although I used modern technical facilities it was not always possible to make good recordings. Due to the hot weather in May 2007 when I did my data collection many examiners opened the windows of their hotel rooms and whenever a car passed below the window the conversation was almost inaudible. Further distractions like speakers’ movements or their skimming through papers affected the quality of my recordings.
Therefore I sometimes had to omit passages or parts of sentences because they could not be heard or understood. This is also indicated in the transcripts according to the VOICE Transcription Conventions.

The full transcripts can be found in appendix 2 of my diploma thesis. Whenever extracts are used in my analysis the line numbers correspond to those in the full transcriptions. As all names, abbreviations, projects and organisations had to be removed, numbered pseudonyms\(^3\) are used in the transcripts as well as in the extracts.

### 3.8. Methodology

The aim of the present study is to analyse and describe in detail a mini-corpus of conversations belonging to the category of simulated business discourse. In Cameron’s words, the aim of linguists analysing spoken language is

> to make explicit what normally gets taken for granted; it is also to show what talking accomplishes in people’s lives and in society at large.

(Cameron 2002: 7)

Conversation Analysis (hereafter CA) seems to be a particularly useful methodology for the analysis of spoken interactions, business / exam discourse and also ELF talk. It adopted the belief in the orderliness of talk and is therefore particularly interested in the structure of conversations and how order is constructed and maintained. It is worthwhile at this point to quote a longer definition of CA given in the introductory chapter to four volumes on CA by Drew and Heritage:

> Conversation analysis is a field of study concerned with the norms, practices and competences underlying the organization of social interaction. […] It is concerned with all forms of spoken interaction including not only everyday conversations between friends and acquaintances, but also interactions in medical, educational, mass media and socio-legal contexts, ‘monologic’ interactions such as lecturing or speech-making, and technologically complex interactions such as web-based multiparty communication. […] CA starts from the perspective that […] the details of conduct in interaction are highly organized and orderly and, indeed, that the specificities of meaning and understanding in interaction would be impossible without this orderliness.

(Drew & Heritage 2006: xxii)

---

\(^3\) org - organisations (including the company where I did my recordings)  
name - projects, abbreviations (of projects)  
first name, last name - people who do not appear as speakers in the transcripts
Conversation analysts act on the assumption that when people interact with each other they do not only talk but they actually “do” something (Drew & Heritage 2006: XXII – original emphasis).

When people talk with one another, they are not merely communicating thoughts, information or knowledge. […] People construct, establish, reproduce, and negotiate their identities, roles, and relationships in conversational interaction. (Drew & Heritage 2006: xxii)

The aim of conversation analysts is “to uncover the practices, patterns, and generally the methods through which participants perform and interpret social action” (Drew & Heritage 2006: xxii). However, as Drew and Heritage point out, there are no clear descriptions of CA methodology (or rather methodologies). Nevertheless some general principles can be identified:

Firstly, CA is very ‘data centred’ (Cameron 2002: 87). CA data consist of “video or audio recordings of naturally occurring interactions, between people going about their ‘normal’ business” (Drew & Heritage 2006: xxviii). It is the study of “talk-in-interaction” (ibid.) and besides the study of ordinary conversations there are also studies of institutional talk as well as workplace studies. These audio or video data collections are then transcribed according to a transcription system (Drew & Heritage 2006: xxix) and these transcripts allow the analyst to pay attention to fine details of talk which would go unnoticed without a written representation. However, it should be obvious that “transcriptions cannot represent the recordings in their full detail” (ten Have 2004: no pagination) and they always have to be selective.

As a second point it has to be stated that CA is action-focused. Its goal is to identify the patterns, practices or devices which underlie meaning and action – that is, through which we interact and communicate in meaningful, accountable ways with one another. (Drew & Heritage 2006: xxix – original emphasis)

Drew and Heritage identify four underlying characteristics which are the focus or most CA research: turn taking; turn design or construction; sequence, and sequence organization and action. The basic techniques to gain new insights in these fields are observation and description.

It has already been mentioned that CA is not only interested in so-called ordinary conversations but also in institutional and workplace talk. However, these types of talk are mostly described in comparative analyses. Ordinary conversation has been defined as the
“predominant medium of interaction in the social world” (Drew & Heritage 2006: xxx) or to quote the famous words by Schegloff: “conversation is the ‘primordial scene’ of social life” (ibid.: xxxi). It can be described as the “most fundamental form of talk-in-interaction” (ibid.) and all other kinds of talk are compared to it. All kinds of institutional or workplace discourse are seen as derivative of the ordinary and the main goal is a contrastive analysis. As has already been mentioned in the chapter on data description Cameron challenges this view and argues that all talk is shaped by its context and therefore no kind of discourse should be privileged over another (Cameron 2002: 21, 22).

CA can be described as “an essentially qualitative method of analysis” (Drew & Heritage 2006: xxxii). However, it also makes use of a kind of ‘informal’ quantitative method. Terms like ‘overwhelmingly’, ‘generally’, ‘commonly’ or ‘frequently’ are used to describe frequencies identified with the help of qualitative methods. It can be concluded that quantitative as well as qualitative methods are used in CA (Drew & Heritage 2006: xxxii).

The techniques of CA have commonly been applied to sets of native speaker data. Non-native speaker conversations and lingua franca data have long been neglected by researchers. In Firth’s words:

Although foreign-language, or lingua-franca, interactions are an extremely common, even quotidian, occurrence in manifold settings throughout the world – and particularly English lingua franca interactions – such interactions have been overlooked by conversation analysts […].

(Firth 1996: 240 – original emphasis)

In an influential article Firth argues that the methodology of CA can be applied to lingua franca data and that non-native speaker conversations can be seen as naturally occurring ordinary conversations. He uses a corpus of audio-recorded data from two Danish international trading companies to exemplify how CA methods can be applied to lingua franca talk. A very important point he makes is his definition of a ‘lingua franca speaker’:

[T]he term ‘lingua franca’ attempts to conceptualize the participant simply as a language user whose real-world interactions are deserving of unprejudiced description, rather […] than as person conceived a priori to be the possessor of incomplete or deficient communicative competence, putatively striving for the ‘target’ competence of an idealized ‘native speaker’.

(Firth 1996: 241 – original emphases)

Similar to Cameron’s (2002: 21, 22) argumentation, it can be argued that ELF talk is shaped by the context of non-native speakers but otherwise it is completely natural and
Firth explains that the ‘interactional work’ (Firth 1996: 242) done in ELF interactions has the aim

to furnish the talk with a ‘normal’ and ‘ordinary’ appearance in the face of sometimes ‘abnormal’ and ‘extraordinary’ linguistic behaviour.
(Firth 1996: 242 – original emphases)

So it should be the aim of conversation analysts to observe and describe lingua franca talk in an ‘unprejudiced’ way. It can be concluded that CA methodology is perfectly applicable to lingua franca data but the primary focus should be shifted away from the ELF speaker’s perceived lack of competence, possible misunderstandings and communication breakdowns to a qualitative description of features of ELF interactions (cf. Poncini 2004).

The present work aims at an unprejudiced, detailed, qualitative description of ELF data from a business context. The primary focus of the analysis is a corpus of transcriptions of recorded ELF interactions. However, contextual information will be used whenever it seems appropriate or necessary. As I collected my own data it would seem to be obvious that all aspects of my observation (whether discourse, business or context related) will influence my analysis. Although this diploma thesis is intended to be predominantly descriptive in character I will of course draw some conclusions from my observations.
4. **Theoretical Background**

4.1. **Research Questions**

As was already mentioned before, the present study was not commenced with a fixed research question in mind but rather using a “bottom-up” approach. The analyst had a look at the conversations with minimal preconceptions and only afterwards tried to define some interesting research goals. However, it was not easy to find a system of classification or overall objective including all the features identified in the recorded conversations. These problems were also described by Poncini (2004: 62 – 64), who states that “a key problem [with her study] concerned how to classify features [she identified in an initial examination]”.

I decided to focus on one particularly interesting phenomenon in the conversations: I will focus on three different features in the conversations (two discourse strategies and one lexical strategy) that somehow contributed to the negotiation of common ground, the presupposing or strengthening of shared knowledge or the creation of a positive atmosphere within the interactions. These features are not typically associated with politeness strategies or methods of negotiating common ground but nevertheless I noticed that they were used strategically by the speakers for various interpersonal purposes within the conversations. The following features will be examined:

- the use of the pronoun *we*
- the use of specific linguistic features used to negotiate common ground with the conversation partner (e.g.: you know, nice to meet you, etc.)
- the use of specialised vocabulary

This framework eventually seemed to be suitable for the present study because it allowed including all the dominant features of interest and it was within the scope of a diploma thesis. Instead of focusing on one single interesting feature of the conversations I decided to give a broader picture of the meetings I recorded. However, many more interesting observations could be made and individual features could be analysed in more detail. This in fact opens up the way for further research in this area but would go beyond the scope of this study.
4.2. Successful (ELF) Communication vs. Miscommunication

A lot of research into ELF communication has already been done but many studies up to now have focused on cultural differences and miscommunication. As Poncini (2004: 19) points out: “[R]esearchers seem to expect miscommunication in encounters between people from different cultural and linguistic backgrounds […]” and therefore focus on “identifying problems in intercultural business settings” or lingua franca interactions in general. However, a certain degree of caution should be exercised in describing cultural differences as the primary sources of miscommunication in non-native-speaker / non-native-speaker discourse. This might lead to the creation and perpetration of national stereotypes (Poncini 2004: 18) and puts certain limits on the study. Communication failures or breakdowns can also occur in native-speaker / native-speaker interactions and are by no means unique to lingua franca talk. Finally, “even if some difficulties occur, the communication can ultimately succeed in achieving social and task-related goals” (Poncini 2004: 20). It can be said that although it is sometimes justified to look at breakdowns in communication, focusing on miscommunication in intercultural settings is limiting because this approach assumes intercultural interactions are problematic and consequently tends to ignore factors possibly contributing to successful intercultural communication. […] In today’s business world, however, it can be pointed out that despite differences in their national cultures and competence in using English, many interactants from different cultures successfully establish, maintain or enhance their business relationships. (Poncini 2004: 20, 21)

It was therefore claimed by Firth (1996: 237) that participants in lingua franca interactions “do interactional and discursive work to imbue talk with an orderly and ‘normal’ appearance, in the face of extraordinary, deviant, and sometimes ‘abnormal’ linguistic behaviour” (original emphasis). This view is supported by Poncini (2004: 21 – 24), who states that it is important to do more research into the factors that contribute to successful intercultural (business) communication. The interactants use various strategies to make the communication ‘normal’ and successful and there should be more investigation into how these strategies create orderliness in lingua franca talk. Furthermore business interactions are mostly guided by a certain goal- or task-orientation and it has been shown that practical goals can still be achieved even though communication failures occurred during the interaction. According to Lim (1997 quoted in Poncini 2004: 22) successful business
interaction depends more on the “attitudes the participants bring into the encounter”. Poncini supports this statement with a quotation by Johnstone given in Lim (1997) which says that

problems [in intercultural communication] like this are not simply the result of intercultural differences. At root, I think, they are the result of failures of goodwill, the will to adapt and understand elements of both intracultural strategies.
(Lim 1997 quoted in Poncini 2004: 22)

Clearly, then, it would be interesting to do some research into how a positive and co-operative atmosphere is created and maintained and which strategies are used to achieve such an atmosphere.

Before actually starting the main analysis, some preliminary questions have to be answered. In the following sections an attempt will be made to define the term ‘success’ because it has been used by many researchers but rarely been defined so far.

4.2.1. The Notion of Success

I would like to start my approach to a definition of successful communication with a general definition of the term success. According to the PONS Cambridge International Dictionary of English “success is the achieving of desired results” (Procter 1995: 1454). This definition is a very good starting point and it will form the basis for the following observations.

As a next step I would like to deal with the notions of ‘successful communication’ or ‘success in communication’. The expressions ‘successful communication’ and ‘success in communication’ seem to be some kind of catchphrases and everybody wants to communicate successfully. Nevertheless there is, as to my knowledge, no clear definition of ‘successful communication’. Meierkord published two articles (1998 and 2000) using the term ‘successful’ in the title. However, she does not explain or clarify what she considers to be successful communication. There are several other linguists who use the phrase ‘successful communication’ (e.g.: Poncini 2004) but there is no clear definition.

In my opinion successful communication can be defined from different points of view depending on which level of the communication is analysed. On the one hand the conversation as a whole could be looked at and on the other hand only individual speech acts could be analysed.
4.2.1.1. Success in Individual Speech Acts

The term speech act is used to denote a basic sequence of talk like “greeting”, ‘apologizing’, ‘insulting’, ‘asking / answering a question’” (Cameron 2002: 56) in this chapter. On the level of individual speech acts and keeping in mind the definition of success as “achieving desired results” (Procter 1995: 1454) it can be said that a speech act is successful when it is understood by the listener/s and / or when the listener/s is/are able to react appropriately. Conversation analysts are concerned with this level of conversations when they look at the sequential structure of interactions. Their findings about patterns and structures in talk are “validated through the examination of others’ responses” (Drew & Heritage 2006: xxiv). By my definition of success this would mean that a question was successful when the other participant is able to give any kind of answer. An example from my own data illustrates this point:

**Extract 10:**

1085 S4: [...] er do you have some references?
1086 if you say you have experience you must have some references
1087 S11: of course (.) we have many references from <6> our customers </6>
(MD II / Conversation 3)

In this extract S4 poses a question and S11 is able to answer it. The speech act is well-formed and from its linguistic form recognisable as a question and the hearer reacts appropriately. It can therefore be defined as a successful communication on the level of the individual speech act. However, there is a difference between communicative success (from a purely linguistic point of view) and task- or intention-related success (from a personal / professional / social / etc. point of view). From a linguistic point of view a question is successful when the hearer answers it – no matter whether it is the answer the speaker intended to hear. Linguistic success and task-related success are therefore not the same.

Success in individual speech acts furthermore depends on the so-called ‘felicity conditions’ (cf. Searle 1994). Searle (1994) further develops Austin’s work on ‘infelicities’ (1986) and defines a set of conditions that he considers necessary for the success of any speech act. He provides the “semantical rules for the use of the illocutionary force indicating device” (Searle 1994: 62) of a promise, i.e. those of the verb ‘to promise’.

These ‘felicity conditions’ can be used for any kind of speech act and according to Searle (1994) they are necessary prerequisites for the success of communicative events.
The speakers have to apply these rules to their speech acts to be able to communicate successfully:

**Extract 11:**

1280  S11: <8> so er </8> from my side (.) i will send you customer references <9> er
1281  </9> i guess in (1) two days
1282  S4: <9> yah </9> (.). okay
(MD II / Conversation 3)

In the extract above the speaker has to fulfil several conditions to ensure the success of his utterance: He has to have the power or position within ‘the company’ to be able to send customer references. If he is a secretary in ‘the company’ he will not have the competence to send those references. Furthermore he has to be sincere about this promise. If he just says it but does not send the requested information in “two days”, the speech act will have to be interpreted as unsuccessful. It can therefore be argued that an utterance has to fulfil Searle’s (1994) ‘felicity conditions’ to be successful.

4.2.1.2. **Success in the Whole Communication**

The general definition of success as “achieving desired results” (Procter 1995: 1454) guides my observations regarding success in the conversation as a whole. Although this level of my definition does not matter in linguistic analysis, it will be described very briefly so that a full picture of the notion of ‘successful communication’ can be provided. Communication usually has some kind of goal or intention. Koester (2006: 26) distinguishes between ‘transactional’ and ‘relational’ goals. Transactional goals are those “that have to do with accomplishing a task or outcome” (ibid.) and relational goals are those “that guide the way in which people relate to and present themselves to one another” (ibid.). Depending on the type of communication different goals are fore-grounded. Casual talk between friends, family and relatives is usually guided by relational goals whereas business or exam discourse is more likely to be concerned with transactional goals. A conversation can therefore be defined as successful when the goals of the speakers were achieved. However, as Koester (2006: 26) emphasises, speakers do most often not have a “clear, unitary goal” (ibid.) but they usually have “multiple goals” (ibid. – original emphasis) in interaction. Nevertheless in different types of discourse or even in different phases of conversations one particular goal is dominant (Koester 2006: 26). For the researcher it can be very difficult to identify the speaker goals at work during the
conversations. Each speaker can have a variety of different transactional and relational goals which are more or less important during the conversation. The speakers might also have different goals and not find a common solution. Research in conversational goals therefore very often has to be supported by interviews with the participants because looking at the interaction itself might not be enough.

Analysing success on the level of the whole conversation in my data it is important to take into account that the business meetings are only simulated in the context of exam situations. Foregrounding the exam situation it can be assumed that the main goal (at least for the examinees) was to pass the exam. Therefore it can be stated that all the conversations were successful because all the participants indeed passed the exams. Concerning the business goals within the interactions it can be said that the speakers did not always reach everything they (presumably) planned (e.g.: when the customer only agreed to think about the project without actually signing a contract or buying anything immediately). However, almost all examinees managed to arrange something for the future (e.g.: another meeting, signing of a contract, selling a product or solution, etc.). Extract 12 very nicely illustrates this:

**Extract 12:**

S30: i would say you you tomorrow you present <4> er </4> you you (. ) e: r (. )
S31: possible solution and then er we shall discuss this decide with fost- e: r er (. ) <5>
[last name6] </5> yah
S31: <4> mhm </4> (. ) <5> aha </5> (. ) mhm mhm mhm
S30: i am supporting you to to a-arrange this meeting with [last name9]
S31: okay (. ) okay (. ) thank you very much mister [S30/last] (. ) i'm very
appreciate you (. ) about it (. ) and (. ) yes (. ) okay
(MD VI / Conversation 8)

In this extract S30 summarises what has been discussed during their meeting and what is going to happen next. S31 is supposed to give a presentation of the IT-solution he suggested and then there will be another meeting with a representative of the customer company where the final decision will be made. This extract illustrates that the conversation was successful with regard to business goals in so far as the participants agreed on taking further actions together.

The analysis of conversational goals is very difficult because analysts cannot look into their speakers’ minds and therefore do not know their goals for sure. So they cannot say for certain whether the goals were reached or not. All that can be done is to have a look at signs in interactions whether the conversation was successful or not.
4.2.1.3. Politeness and Success

A last factor influencing communicative success will be discussed very briefly: politeness. Politeness and face-work help to create a positive and co-operative atmosphere and this contributes to the achievement of desired results (according to the general definition of success). A positive and co-operative atmosphere makes the participants feel good, shared as well as individual goals will be achieved much more easily and social relationships can be maintained and strengthened. Many researchers have already dealt with politeness phenomena and face-work (cf. Holmes & Stubbe 2003; Watts, Ide & Ehlich 2005b; Brown & Levinson 1987) but I do not want to go into detail here because it will be the focus of the main analysis in this diploma thesis.

4.3. Definitions of Politeness

The identified strategies of claiming common ground, presupposing shared knowledge and creating a positive conversation atmosphere belong to a vast area of research and can be subsumed under the heading “politeness”. A major problem in working with the notion of politeness is the fact that there is no real definition of this concept. In his introductory chapter to a collection of articles on politeness Watts (2005: xv - xix) elaborates on that issue. One set of definitions sees politeness primarily as a means of avoiding frictions or problems in communication. However, this still does not make clear what politeness really is. Leech (1980), for example, defines it as “strategic conflict avoidance” (quoted in Watts 2005: xv) but does not go into detail about what those strategies are. These definitions support Brown and Levinson’s (1987) view of politeness as “rational behaviour aimed at the strategic softening (or mitigation) of face-threatening acts” (Watts 2005: xv). Another set of definitions regards politeness “as behaviour which promotes such positive interactional qualities as “mutual comfort” and “rapport”” (Watts 2005: xvi). Watts (2005) criticises that none of these definitions include the possibility that politeness could also be used to exert power, which is also an important aspect of the concept. Furthermore, all the descriptions remain on a fairly vague level and do not go into much detail. A further point of criticism is concerned with the English term politeness because on the one hand it is an English word used in everyday language and on the other hand it is a scientific term which makes it difficult to tell the two meanings or concepts apart (Watts 2005: xvii). Another
selection of definitions rejects the idea of politeness as something stable consisting of a set of strategies used to avoid communication problems. They rather consider politeness as a dynamic concept, always open to adaptation and change in any group, in any age, and, indeed, at any moment of time. It is not a socio-anthropological given which can simply be applied to the analysis of social interaction, but actually arises out of that interaction. (Watts, Ide & Ehlich 2005a: 11)

In my opinion politeness cannot be limited to just one of these descriptions but somehow incorporates aspects of all of them. By my definition politeness is a dynamic concept necessary in all societies where people want to communicate and live together peacefully. It has two basic functions: A positive function which aims at building rapport, mutual understanding, common ground and a positive atmosphere and a negative function used to avoid or mitigate frictions or problems in conversations. These functions are realised through certain linguistic strategies (some of which are described in the practical analysis of my diploma thesis). Furthermore I would argue that the abstract concept of politeness is somehow universal and necessary in all societies of the world but that the strategies and manifestations of this concept can be quite varied in different (linguistic) communities. The present study aims at describing some of these strategies in a business / exam context.

4.4. Definitions of Common Ground

In Brown and Levinson’s (1987: 101 – 103) terms claiming common ground is part of positive politeness. Positive politeness is defined as “redress directed to the addressee’s positive face” (Brown & Levinson 1987: 101), i.e. to his / her desire that his / her wants should be attractive for other people too. This redress is done by conveying that the addressee’s wants are at least partly desirable for the speaker, which brings them closer together. Positive politeness strategies are often rather general and not aimed directly at softening a particular FTA. Typically the speaker praises the addressee, acknowledges his / her wants or expresses similarity. An element of exaggeration is often part of such expressions of positive politeness. According to Brown and Levinson (1987: 102) the strategies of positive politeness can be divided into two large categories: the strategies of claiming common ground and the strategies of conveying that the speaker and the addressee are co-operators.
There is no acknowledged or agreed on theory for the term *common ground* and by having a look at the literature it will easily be noticed that some kind of confusion (Lee 2001) seems to dominate the discussion. Many terms are used interchangeably or in a different sense by various authors and therefore it is rather difficult to work with this concept. Sometimes, common ground is simply equated with mutual knowledge (Lee 2001: 39) but that is not the end of the story. To find a usable definition for the notion of common ground we have to take one step back and start with the description of some other important terms: “belief, knowledge, mutual, shared and common” (Lee 2001: 23). The terms belief and knowledge are often used interchangeably in the literature on common ground but there is one big difference: “the speaker’s subjective evaluation of his / her certainty of the information held” (Lee 2001: 24), i.e. a speaker *knows* something when he / she is really certain that it is true and he / she *believes* something when he / she does not quite know whether it is true or not. The two terms should therefore not be equated. Furthermore the notions of ‘shared knowledge’, ‘common knowledge’ and ‘mutual knowledge’ are also often used synonymously in the literature. Lee (2001: 24 – 26) suggests the following distinction:

*Common* (or *background*) knowledge is that information which members of a particular community assume to be held common by virtue of the fact they have very similar background or up-bringing.

(Lee 2001: 24 – original emphasis)

*Shared knowledge* comes into existence during an interaction, when the interactants negotiate their common knowledge necessary for future communication. Finally there is *mutual knowledge* which can be defined as “the type of knowledge which two (or more) persons hold to be common with 100% certainty” (Lee 2001: 25). According to Lee (2001) these three concepts should be held apart by researchers to reduce the confusion in the literature. Jucker and Smith (1996) cite Sperber and Wilson’s definition of mutual knowledge, which is quite different. They argue that

interlocutors can never have any certainty about each other’s knowledge and beliefs. Mutual knowledge, according to Sperber and Wilson, must be certain, or else it does not exist; and since it can never be certain, it can never exist.

(Sperber & Wilson 1986; quoted in Jucker and Smith 1996: 2)

According to Sperber and Wilson people can only have assumptions about other people’s assumptions. Jucker and Smith (1996) adopt this view in their article which also affects their rather broad definition of knowledge as a “set of assumptions entertained by an
interlocutor” (Jucker & Smith 1996: 2) regardless whether these assumptions are strong or weak. One further notion is that of shared belief which is defined according to the prior descriptions of the terms ‘shared’ and ‘belief’ as a belief which is held to be true [...] as a result of a prior discussion and interaction with another individual regarding the same belief.

(Lee 2001: 25)

These terms and concepts are necessary pre-conditions for a definition of common ground and different suggestions can be found in the literature.

In his article Lee uses the notion of common ground “as a larger umbrella term to refer to all the knowledge / beliefs which an individual holds to be mutual / shared with another individual” (Lee 2001: 27). He includes mutual knowledge as well as shared beliefs in his definition. Jucker and Smith (1996) apply the term “to refer to those assumptions which are entertained by both partners in a conversation and which they assume to be so shared” (Jucker & Smith 1996: 2). They argue that these assumptions are easier to infer in some cases than in others, which sometimes makes it difficult for the analyst. Many researchers equate the term with related concepts like those defined above “in order to facilitate their respective preference of use and expedience of argumentation” (Lee 2001: 39). It is also used as a larger umbrella or all-inclusive term for combinations of related concepts. Clark (1996), for example, claims that “[t]wo people’s common ground is, in effect, the sum of their mutual, common, or joint knowledge, beliefs, and suppositions” (quoted in Lee 2001: 40). Lee (2001: 40, 41) therefore argues that there is a lack of precision in all the definitions of common ground and that this might be caused by the fundamental confusion of the terms described above. He complains that “anything which has a vague sense of ‘something being held in common’ is considered common ground” (Lee 2001: 41). He suggests his own model for a definition:

We remain to be convinced that ‘common ground’, if used as an all-embracing term, can be conceptualised in terms of progressive steps of attainment.

(Lee 2001: 41)

He proposes a three-step model for common ground: The first category is called established common ground, which is defined as “those beliefs / knowledge that have been established as shared as a result of interaction” (Lee 2001: 41). Mutual knowledge is not included in this concept because 100% certainty is not believed to be possible. The second category is called assumed common ground, i.e.
the beliefs and knowledge which are, strictly speaking, not part of the common
ground since they have not been established during the discourse but are part of the
assumed background information arising from similar community membership.
(Lee 2001: 42)

This kind of background knowledge is not inferred by the interactants from the discourse
itself but from other sources outside the interaction. The third category is called as though
common ground. Sometimes new information is brought into the conversation and treated
as though it were part of the interactants’ common ground. If it is then accepted as such,
this is a way of introducing shared knowledge and including it in the concept of common
ground. I think that this is a very useful model. However, I will also provide my own views
of this concept.

In my opinion common ground is an abstract concept which exists in some way or
another in every interaction. It is composed of the common, shared and mutual knowledge
and beliefs of the interactants which create a background for the conversation which can
be built on. Furthermore it is governed by the participants’ desire to create a sense of
‘groupness’ (Poncini 2004) in any communication. These aspects are realised via certain
linguistic strategies in any kind of interaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Ground in Interactions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>common, shared and mutual knowledge &amp; beliefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>desire to belong to a certain group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>linguistic strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>common, shared and mutual knowledge &amp; beliefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>desire to belong to a certain group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>linguistic strategies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This definition will be used in the present diploma thesis and it will be the starting point
for the analysis. However, it has to be adapted to the particular lingua franca and business /
exam context of my study. According to Lee’s (2001: 24) definition of common
knowledge the interactants should have a similar cultural background or up-bringing which
is not the case in my data. The participants come from very different cultures and we do
not have any knowledge about their up-bringing but any similarity cannot be assumed.
However, in my particular business / exam context I would define common knowledge as

---

4 For my definition I would like to work with Lee’s (2001: 23 – 27) previously mentioned definitions of
common / shared / mutual / knowledge and belief.
the lowest common denominator which unifies the interactants, i.e. the business / exam context of their meetings. The shared knowledge / belief consists of those pieces of information which are negotiated during the interaction. Concerning the definition of mutual knowledge I agree with Lee (2001) that 100% certainty about another person’s knowledge or beliefs is not possible and therefore I would exclude mutual knowledge from my definition of common ground for this study. However, I would like to include another important factor, i.e. the interactants’ desire to belong to a certain group or to create a sense of in-group membership. They use certain linguistic strategies and expressions to create such a sense of ‘groupness’ (Poncini 2004) and some of these strategies will be described in the current study.

4.5. Areas of Investigation

In my data I identified three dominant strategies used by the speakers that contributed to common ground:

1) The use of the pronoun ‘we’

This personal pronoun was very often used as an ‘inclusive we’ that was aimed at creating a sense of ‘groupness’ (Poncini 2004) and doing something together as a community.

2) The use of particular linguistic markers

The interactants used certain discourse markers and phrases to raise, assert and presuppose common ground with their co-participants.

3) The use of specialised vocabulary

Professional vocabulary of different sorts was used as a marker of in-group membership. The interactants positioned themselves within a certain speech community and strengthened their sense of belonging together. The next chapters will provide the theoretical backdrop on these areas of investigation before the empirical analysis is actually started.

4.5.1. Pronoun Use

Pronoun use was identified as an important strategy of establishing common ground, presupposing shared knowledge and thereby creating a positive conversation atmosphere in this study. A great deal of work has already been done in this field by various linguists. A
classic article was written by Brown and Gilman (1960: 302 – 335). They dealt with the pronouns of address in various languages and justified their work by claiming that

[t]he interesting thing about such pronouns is their close association with two dimensions fundamental to the analysis of all social life – the dimensions of power and solidarity.
(Brown & Gilman 1960: 303)

Using the Latin pronouns of address, i.e. *tu* and *vos*, as a starting point, the two linguists analysed the development of singular and plural address forms over time in different Indo-European languages (i.e. predominantly in English, French, Italian, Spanish and German). They distinguished two important factors for pronoun use: the power semantic and the solidarity semantic (cf. Brown & Gilman 1960). The term *semantics* is defined as the covariation between the pronoun used and the objective relationship existing between speaker and addressee.
(Brown & Gilman 1960: 303)

By power semantic the authors mean that one person may have power over another and thereby have the right to be addressed with a plural form. Power is defined as

a relationship between at least two persons, and it is nonreciprocal in the sense that both cannot have power in the same area of behaviour.
(Brown & Gilman 1960: 306)

According to Brown and Gilman “plurality is a very old and ubiquitous metaphor for power” (1960: 306) and therefore it seems logical to address a powerful person with a plural pronoun. Conversely it can be assumed that a more powerful person has the right to address a less powerful person by using a singular form.

Another factor affecting the choice of pronouns of address is called solidarity semantic. The term solidarity describes symmetrical relationships between speakers as opposed to the term power, which described asymmetrical relationships. According to Brown and Gilman (1960) a plural address form is more likely as solidarity declines. Conversely a singular address form is most probable between people with very symmetrical relationships or a high degree of solidarity.

These claims where tested against reality by the linguists using a questionnaire comparing the pronoun use in French, Italian and German. However, I will not describe their findings in detail because of limitations of space.

Although my diploma thesis is not concerned with pronouns of address but rather with the use of the first person pronoun *we*, Brown and Gilman’s article was really insightful. The analysis of the use of *we* showed that plurality is still an acknowledged and
frequently used metaphor for power. The speakers enforced or underlined their opinion by using the first person plural form as a kind of self-address. On some occasions they used the *we*-form as a power gaining device. On other occasions they used the first person plural pronoun as a solidarity building device when they emphasised their in-group-membership and their symmetrical relationships. However, a detailed description of my findings will be deferred to chapter 6.

Another interesting work on pronoun use was written by Poncini (2004). In her study she claims that “[a]n examination of pronouns is useful because it can yield important insights into the way individuals use language in professional situations and the effects of their language use” (Poncini 2004: 86). She analyses the use of the pronouns ‘we, you and I’ in her corpus of business meetings and compares different speakers. She mainly focuses on the first person plural pronoun *we* and tries to determine the referents for each use of it. Her concept of ‘referents’ can be compared to Brown and Gilman’s ‘semantics’. Whereas they deal with the “covariation between the pronoun used and the objective relationship existing between speaker and addressee”, Poncini analyses the covariation between the pronoun used and the person or group of people alluded to by using this form. Therefore she devises a framework or classification system which should help to point out the different possible referents for *we*. Poncini argues that pronouns are strategically utilised by speakers to negotiate between their individual or group identity “and the alignments that participants take up with respect to themselves and others” (Poncini 2004: 85).

Bargiela-Chiappini and Harris (1997) devote a whole chapter to “Nouns, pronouns and shifting identities” (Bargiela-Chiappini & Harris 1997: 156 – 182). They analyse in some detail why speakers choose certain pronouns or address forms and how these selections influence notions of power and solidarity or the corporate context. They closely examine pronoun use in Italian and British formal and informal business meetings and develop a framework which helps to classify the certain pronominal choices and which will be dealt with in a later part of this chapter.

Zupnik (1994) concentrates on the use of person deixis in political discourse. She does not so much occupy herself with the referents of the first person plural pronoun but she works with the concept of ‘discourse spaces’ as a framework for pronoun use in political speeches. A ‘discourse space’ is “the domain of reality focused on in any stretch
of discourse” (Zupnik 1994: 342) and according to Zupnik speakers move in and out of these spaces during interactions. They do so using various linguistic strategies like for example the application of certain personal pronouns. She continues to argue that these strategies can have persuasive functions in political discourse. She distinguishes two main solidarity-building functions relevant for persuasive discourse: Firstly the mitigation of face-threatening acts and secondly the internalisation of the speaker’s cultural model. These functions and strategies are exemplified in the case of political speeches.

Another work on pronominal choice in political discourse was written by De Fina (1995). She analyses two political speeches delivered in English and Spanish and examines closely the pronoun use of the speakers. Drew and Heritage (1992) devote a part of their article to the so-called ‘institutional’ or ‘corporate we’. This kind of ‘self-referring we’ is used “to invoke an institutional over a personal identity, thereby indicating that they are speaking as representatives, or on behalf, of an organization” (Drew & Heritage 1992: 30). Brown and Levinson (1987) list the use of the first person plural pronoun under strategies of positive politeness and Jucker and Smith (1996) analyse the application of personal pronouns as an implicit means of negotiating common ground. This short summary clearly shows the importance of a detailed analysis of pronoun use in interaction.

4.5.2. Pragmatic Expressions of Common Ground
The analysis of the transcripts from my mini-corpus showed that the speakers used a variety of expressions and phrases which were aimed at establishing common ground, creating or presupposing shared knowledge or evoking a positive atmosphere in the conversation. These expressions ranged from rather short phrases like ‘you know’ or ‘of course’ to full sentences like ‘I see your point.’ or ‘Is it okay to you?’ . They frequently occurred in the conversations and seemed to fulfil various strategic purposes. However, as a listing of these expressions was quite heterogeneous, it was rather difficult to categorize them or to find a system of classification under which they could be subsumed. The following chapter will illustrate the problems in classifying these expressions, illustrate a possible categorisation and finally suggest a solution.

One possible system of classification was to include these expressions into the class of discourse markers. Some of the expressions identified in the transcripts have been discussed as discourse markers in the literature (e.g. ‘you know’ has been discussed by
Schiffrin 1987 and by Müller 2005). However, most of them have not been discussed in
detail before and therefore it seemed to be necessary to have a closer look at the
conceptualisation of discourse markers to find out whether the expressions identified in my
mini-corpus could be included into this category or not. Most linguists dealing with
discourse markers point out that these are not a “unified phenomenon” (Siepmann 2005:
36) because depending on the linguistic approach taken the included markers range from
individual words to phrases and sentence-like fragments.

A similar situation prevails concerning definitions of discourse markers. As
Brinton puts it, “[t]he definitions of pragmatic particles found in the literature seem to bear
little resemblance to one another” (Brinton 1996: 30). Schiffrin (1987), who wrote a classic
work on discourse markers, defines them rather vaguely as “sequentially dependent
elements which bracket units of talk” (Schiffrin 1987: 31 – original emphasis). Fraser
(1988, 1990, 1996) differentiates between ‘pragmatic markers’ on the one hand and
‘discourse markers’ on the other hand. He defines them as follows:

[P]ragmatic Markers, taken to be separate and distinct from the propositional
content of the sentence, are the linguistically encoded clues which signal the
speaker’s potential communicative intentions.
(Fraser 1996: 168)

According to Fraser (1996: 186) discourse markers are a sub-group of ‘pragmatic
markers’. They are defined as “expression[s] which signal[.].] the relationship of the basic
message to the foregoing discourse” (Fraser 1996: 186).

The definitions so far have concentrated on the textual functions of discourse
markers. Siepmann, however, suggests a rather open definition of discourse markers as

linguistic expressions of varying length which carry pragmatic and / or
propositional meaning, occur in both speech and writing, and facilitate rather than
disrupt discourse.
(Siepmann 2005: 43)

Other linguists did not focus on textual functions of discourse markers but explicitly
foregrounded other aspects like, for example, conversational continuity. Other definitions
emphasise the interactive or interpersonal functions of discourse markers (Brinton 1996:
31).

The second set of definitions seems to be much more appropriate for a
classification of the expressions identified in my mini-corpus as they were used to establish
common ground and increase shared knowledge among the conversationalists. However,
before actually making a decision for an appropriate cover term, some further aspects will have to be considered. Consulting the literature on *discourse markers* leaves the analyst with a quite heterogeneous list of characteristics and properties of these lexical items. Brinton (1996: 33 – 35), who prefers the term pragmatic markers, summarises some of these broad characteristics in his study:

- Pragmatic markers are predominantly a feature of *oral* rather than of written discourse. [...] However, it has been pointed out that pragmatic markers are not restricted to oral discourse [...].
- Pragmatic markers appear with **high frequency in oral discourse** [...].
- Pragmatic markers are “**short**” items [...].
- Pragmatic markers occur either outside the syntactic structure or loosely attached to it and hence have **no clear grammatical function**. [...]  
- Pragmatic markers seem to be **optional** rather than obligatory features. [...]  
- Pragmatic markers are **marginal forms**. [...]  

(Brinton 1996: 33 – 35 – emphases added)

Functions of *discourse markers* can be broadly distinguished into two sub-groups: textual and interpersonal functions. Textual functions can be illustrated as follows:

- initiating or closing discourse  
- serving as fillers or delaying tactics  
- marking boundaries in discourse  
- repairing one’s own or others’ discourse  

(cf. Brinton 1996: 37)

Interpersonal functions can be exemplified as follows:

- [...] to express a response or a reaction to the preceding discourse or attitude towards the following discourse, including also “back-channel” signals of understanding and continued attention spoken while another speaker is having his or her turn and perhaps “hedges” expressing speaker tentativeness [...]  
- [...] to effect cooperation, sharing, or intimacy between speaker and hearer, including confirming shared assumptions, checking or expressing understanding, requesting confirmation, expressing deference, or saving face (politeness).  

(Brinton 1996: 37, 38)

According to Biber et al. (1999) an important function of *discourse markers* is to signal an “interactive relationship between speaker, hearer, and message” (Biber 1999 quoted in Müller 2005: 9). Müller (2005) quotes Jucker and Smith, who describe *discourse markers* as “negotiating strategies of the common ground between speaker and hearer” (Müller 2005: 9).

Comparing this summary of definitions, characteristics and functions of *discourse markers* and the expressions identified in the transcripts it can be said that there are some
agreements as well as some disagreements. The expressions in the transcripts occur in oral discourse but they could also be used in written texts. Lexical items of various length were identified which are not necessarily marginal forms. They do have grammatical functions and are not always optional. Items of various lengths are included in the list starting out with short phrases, to sentence fragments or even short sentences. Concerning functions it can be stated that interpersonal elements prevail and textual functions are of minor importance. Consequently the umbrella term discourse marker does not seem to be appropriate.

The analyst would rather prefer the term Pragmatic Expression of Common Ground (PEoCG). This categorisation is similar to that used by Fetzer and Fischer, who deal with “Lexical Markers of Common Grounds” (Fetzer & Fischer 2007). They provide the following explanation for their concept:

All of the linguistic units in a discourse contribute to the shared understandings that are achieved in the discourse, and therefore to the common ground that participants maintain. However, some units such as deictic expressions seem to function more saliently in the processes by which participants coordinate their talk to accomplish joint activities. While most lexical items are structured in utterances that contribute propositional content to the common ground, some forms foreground additional presuppositions, attitudes, expectations, or relations that are otherwise tacit in the speech events. For example, greetings and terms of address such as “yo, dude!” reflect social relations and attitudes between speaker and recipient. Other forms seem to function primarily in strategies designed to ensure that understandings have been successfully achieved, […]. These expressions can be called lexical markers of common ground.
(Fetzer & Fischer 2007: 17)

For the purpose of this diploma thesis the categorisation as Pragmatic Expression of Common Ground has various advantages: The term pragmatic clarifies that these expressions have various pragmatic functions whereas the term expression is less restrictive than marker and allows a number of items to be included (i.e. short items as well as sentence fragments). The specification of Common Ground illustrates the foregrounding of interpersonal functions, i.e. textual functions will not be examined and the analyst will focus on interpersonal elements like, for example, the establishing of common ground, increasing of shared knowledge and creating a positive atmosphere in the conversation. Thus the expressions identified in the transcripts will be analysed as Pragmatic Expressions of Common Ground.
4.5.3. *Specialised Vocabulary*

The importance of professional vocabulary has been discussed by many linguists and researchers and a short summary of these findings will now be provided. Poncini (2004) devotes a whole chapter to the question of how specialised lexis contributes to the nature of the group in her recorded business meetings. She describes three main functions of specialised vocabulary in the meetings:

1. It “contributes to common ground and shared knowledge” (Poncini 2004: 147).
2. It “reflects and construes the interactants’ business activity and their own role in relation to it” (Poncini 2004: 147).
3. Finally it shows the “multifaceted nature of the business activity” (Poncini 2004: 147).

These functions are illustrated by means of extracts from her recorded data. Her definition of ‘specialised lexis’ is a rather broad one. She does not only include those expressions that are strictly speaking professional or technical jargon but adopts a more comprehensive view that includes general or everyday terms used in a special context. She argues that lexical items that are not necessarily technical (e.g. the term ‘customer’) can be specialised in the context of a particular event (e.g.: In my data the term ‘customer’ often refers to a particular person or company and therefore defines the business context of the meeting and pre-supposes shared knowledge with the addressee.). Poncini explains that “they [specialised lexical items] play a role in identifying frames and the ‘aboutness’ of the task at hand” (Poncini 2004: 150). She goes on to declare that

> the use of specialized lexis by interactants reflects and construes their business activity. It can allow participants to lay claim to certain kinds of expertise and to evoke their professional identity and roles, which are in turn linked to the character of the group. Lexical items such as *product, price* and *promotion*, which in a marketing context take on a specialized meaning, are thus specialized within the context of the meetings and index shared, common ground.

(Poncini 2004: 150 – original emphasis)

This view is also supported by Zupnik (1994) who claims that specialised vocabulary can be used to indicate different discourse spaces. A ‘discourse space’ can be compared to the concepts of frames or worlds. In her article Zupnik (1994) identifies three different discourse spaces and illustrates how they can be located by looking at specialised lexis. For example, she demonstrates that the term “viewers” indicates the “panel discourse space” (Zupnik 1994: 345) as it refers to “the participant role of the show’s television
audience” (Zupnik 1994: 345). Poncini’s (2004) argument that specialised lexis does not necessarily have to be of a technical nature is thereby supported.

Furthermore, lexical choice can also be described as an important factor for explicit or implicit ways of claiming common ground as demonstrated by Jucker and Smith (1996). In their article they illustrate different (implicit or explicit) strategies of enhancing common ground with fellow conversationalists. Although this article deals with private conversations, its principles can also be applied to business interactions. Speakers rely on common ground and shared knowledge to establish or decode referring expressions in interactions. They do not only need the appropriate script in their minds (e.g.: the script of a stay at a restaurant or the script of a business meeting or sales call) but also the relevant in-group terminology to find the appropriate referent for an expression. It can be concluded that every speaker has to be familiar with certain kinds of in-group terminology and technical jargon to participate successfully in a business interaction. This shared knowledge enhances common ground, facilitates in-group interactions and prevents communication breakdowns.

Martin (1986) illustrates that technical or specialised vocabulary does not only have professional functions but can also contribute to interpersonal relations. He argues that a high concentration of a particular kind of lexis evokes a certain kind of tenor within the conversation that influences the relationships within the interaction. He claims that the “use of technical and specialized lexis can thus be an important aspect of evoking group membership or identity as well as distancing” (Martin 1986 quoted in Poncini 2004: 149).

Brown and Levinson (1987) define specialised lexis as a strategy of claiming common ground. Their fourth strategy of positive politeness is called “Use in-group identity markers” (Brown & Levinson 1987: 107). The researchers claim that there are many ways to convey in-group membership or claim common ground with other conversationalists. Using specialised lexis is one of them and Brown and Levinson isolated four main strategies: the use of particular in-group address forms, the use of in-group language or dialect, the use of jargon or slang and the use of contraction and ellipsis (Brown & Levinson 1987: 107 – 112). The allusion to in-group shared knowledge and the use of in-group terminology contribute to common ground and a positive conversation atmosphere.
Drew and Heritage (1992) emphasise the importance of lexical choice in business interactions. They claim that the use of specialised or technical vocabulary is one strategy “through which speakers evoke and orient to the institutional context of their talk” (Drew & Heritage 1992: 29). It expresses claims to shared, technical knowledge and professional identities.
5. “We need to find some arguments…” – The Pronoun we as a Strategy of Negotiating Common Ground

Pronoun use was identified as a strategic device used by speakers to achieve certain goals. The following analysis will show how the speakers in my mini-corpus use the first person plural pronoun we to presuppose shared interests or responsibilities, increase the sense of ‘groupness’ (Poncini 2004) and establish common ground.

5.1. Categorising the First Person Plural Pronoun

The present study is concerned with strategies of claiming common ground, creating a positive atmosphere and presupposing shared knowledge. The use of the pronoun we will be examined from this point of view. As a starting point it was necessary to find an appropriate framework whereby the different applications of we could be classified. Two very interesting systems of classification were used as a starting point for devising my own framework: Poncini (2004) analyses a corpus of business meetings from a company and one chapter is also devoted to pronominal choice of the speakers. In her examination she highlights the notion of ambiguity “by illustrating the complexity in determining referents for we” (Poncini 2004: 85 – original emphasis). Referents, according to Poncini (2004), are the person or the group of people pointed to by using the first person plural pronoun. She claims that it is not always easy to identify a referent for the first person plural pronoun and referents often change within one sentence.

This was also the case in my data: Only in the minority of instances of we-usage could a precise referent be assigned according to linguistic signals, as is illustrated in the extract below:

**Extract 13:**

659   S1: […] <3> but we are talking right now about costs in this year […]

(MD II / Conversation 2)

In this utterance it is obvious that the examiner uses the plural self-reference we to denote the speaker plus the addressee (i.e. examiner + examinee according to category 4 in my framework). The words “talking right now” are the linguistic clue for this observation. “Right now” only includes the people present at the very moment and the verb “talking” further limits the referents to those people involved in the conversation at the moment (i.e. it excludes to observers) and therefore the two speakers present are included in this we-
usage. However, in most cases it was not as easy to assign a referent for the first person plural pronoun.

The majority of uses had to be classified as vague, i.e. “with more than two possible interpretations” (Poncini 2004: 99). The following extract, which is taken from the same conversation as extract 13, nicely illustrates this:

**Extract 14:**

S7: time is money (.) mmh (.) i don't know (.) we need to: to find it out who who
will pay it (.) e:r (.) we can (.) i no- i don't know whether the terms of this enter-
price-licence-agreement include the education of the people (.) maybe it's already
included maybe it's in benefit (.) or maybe it's like a <un> xx </un> that we need
to solve
(MD II / Conversation 2)

The occurrences of *we* in this utterance are much less clear and it is much more difficult to assign a referent to them. When the examinee says “we need to: to find it out”, “we can” and “we need to solve”, it is not clear whether the *we*-forms refer to the speaker plus his team, the speaker plus his company, the speaker plus the addressee, the speaker plus team and the addressee plus team or the speaker plus company and the addressee plus company. There are no linguistic clues which signal a preference for any particular interpretation. However, from the business context of the meetings it can be assumed that ‘speaker plus addressee’ or ‘speaker plus team and addressee plus team’ are the most likely interpretations. The speaker wants to signal shared responsibility and a sense of belonging to a group and therefore he uses a plural self-reference. Nevertheless, the analyst can never be a hundred percent sure whether the assigned referent is correct and these interpretations have to be classified as vague.

These instances of vagueness are not only open to interpretation for the analyst but for the addressees as well. They can choose to hear the message as they like – including or excluding themselves. Thus the use of the first person plural pronoun *we* can be seen as a (consciously or unconsciously used) strategic device of the speaker to create solidarity, a sense of ‘groupness’ (Poncini 2004) and a positive conversation atmosphere (Poncini 2004: 99).

According to Poncini (2004: 87) the choice of pronouns also affects the interactional context, i.e. pronouns are context-constraining (Poncini 2004: 87). Pronoun choice is not determined by the setting but a speaker always has to choose between a self-
referring I- or we-form and thereby actively construes the context. This will be exemplified in the extract below:

**Extract 15:**

683  S7: time is money (.) mmh (.) i don't know (.) we need to: to find it out who who
684  will pay it (.) e:r (.) we can (.) i no- i don't know whether the terms of this enter-
685  price-licence-agreement include the education of the people (.i) maybe it's already
686  included maybe it's in benefit (.) or maybe it's like a <un> xx </un> that we need
687  to solve
(MD II / Conversation 2)

In the extract above the speakers are talking about the necessity of finding a common solution for a business problem. Instead of using the singular forms “I need to find out”, “I can” and “I need to solve”, the speaker decides to use a plural self-reference. On the one hand he thereby strengthens the group identity of the conversationalists but on the other hand he also influences the context of the situation. He implies that there is a common problem which has to be solved by the whole group. There is no single person who has all the responsibility. All these facts are construed by the use of the first person plural pronoun. The utterance would have a rather different form, if the speaker used a self-referring I. This extract therefore supports Poncini’s claim that pronominal choice is context-construing.

Poncini (2004) develops a classification system which divides the applications of the first person plural pronoun according to their referents, i.e. she categorises all the occurrences of we in her data according to their referents in the real world. The following graphic representation will illustrate Poncini’s concept of ‘referents’ (Poncini 2004):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible ‘Referents’ for WE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e.g.:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the speaker + the addressee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the speaker + his team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the speaker + his company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the speaker + team + the addressee + team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the speaker + company + the addressee + company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the speaker + present members of his company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the speaker + present + non-present members of his company</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The classification of all occurrences of we in her data according to their referents in the real world was the first step in Poncini’s analysis of pronominal choice in business meetings.
The starting point for the development of her framework was a close analysis of her business data. This detailed examination led to the following broad distinction:

1. The use of *we* can be inclusive, exclusive or ambiguous.
2. In some cases the referents are present at the meeting and in other cases they are not present. (Poncini 2004: 99)

The strategic use of *we-inclusive* clearly has a solidarity-building function as the participants feel included and incorporated in the group. Pronoun use therefore contributes to common ground (Poncini 2004).

A similar framework was developed by Bargiela-Chiappini and Harris (1997). They analyse Italian and British business meetings and they also deal with pronoun use of different speakers. The analysis focuses on the first person singular and plural pronouns ‘*I* and *we*’ because the authors claim that these are “most closely linked with both social and tactical identity” (Bargiela-Chiappini & Harris 1997: 175). The researchers are interested in occurrences of identity shifting from individual to collective or corporate identity. They also try to identify different communities within the company by looking at linguistic strategies (consciously or unconsciously) used by the speakers to build, strengthen and maintain these groups.

In order to develop a classification system for the pronoun use in my own mini-corpus, the transcribed data extracts were closely examined. Every occurrence of *we* in the interactions was considered, counted and a possible referent was assigned to it. The full framework considering all the uses of *we* in all the conversations can be found in Appendix 5. The classification system below will only enlist those categories that will be used for the subsequent analysis. The twofold nature (business meeting vs. exam situation) of my data will have to be taken into account when looking at the framework. Before a referent could be assigned to each occurrence of *we*, the identity of the speaker had to be clarified (i.e. whether he / she spoke as an examinee or as a sales person or respectively as an examiner or a customer). Some categories of my framework therefore deal with examiners and examinees and others with sales people and customers. In the extracts given below, the first person plural pronoun will be underlined for the purpose of identification:
A System of Classification
Assigning Referents to all Occurrences of WE in the Corpus

1. we refers to: members of ‘the company’ present (only relevant in the Sales Manager Meeting as this is the only time when more members of ‘the company’ were present / the observers are not taken into account as members of ‘the company’ in this category)

   Extract 16:
   2725   S24: so to the people (.) to whom have you talked so far
   2726   S26: er (.) we have talked to everybody here (.) and not (.) once (.) <un> xx </un>
   2727   not doing once
   (MD V / Conversation 7)

2. we refers to: sales persons of ‘the company’ / sales person + team (present or not present / this category refers to the group of sales people working at the company regardless of their presence at the meeting)

   Extract 17:
   739   S1: okay (.) yah (.) <7> you have to feed them (.) that's true (.) </7>
   740   S7: <7> you (.) yeah (.) yeah (.) </7> we have to feed them <8> </@> anyway
   741   </@> </8>
   742   S1: <8> @@ @@ @ </8>
   743   S7: and we (.) and we want you to feed us a little bit
   744   SS: @@ @@ @@
   (MD II / Conversation 2)

3. we refers to: customer + team (the customer + his non-present team)

   Extract 18:
   1058  S4: <7> yah but it (.) it's it's believe me </7> i would like to do the deal with
   1059  [org1] but we have those proposals on the table and they are (.) from competitors
   1060  (.) which (.) i have to take serious yah […]
   (MD II / Conversation 3)

4. we refers to: the sales person of ‘the company’ + the customer (= the examinee + the examiner / both are present)

   Extract 19:
   1099  S11: mhm (.) so i guess it will be great er (.) first (of to) send by email <9> and of
   1100  </9> course we discuss er our next meeting
   (MD II / Conversation 3)
5. *we* refers to: the sales person of ‘the company’ + team and the customer + team
   (sales person and customer are present whereas the teams are not present)

**Extract 20:**
1275 S4: <6> mhm </6> (. ) yah (. ) look i board meeting is begin of next week (. ) and
1276 there we want to: e:r find a common decision (. ) and i will <7> present it </7> (. )
1277 at the board meeting a:nd e:r then i hope *we'll* get the decision
(MD II / Conversation 3)

6. *we* refers to: ‘the company’ as a whole plus the customer company as a whole

**Extract 21:**
2457 S22: which means we share the risk (. )
2458 S20: yes of <3> course </3> (. ) <4> w- </4> (. )
(MD IV / Conversation 6)

7. *we* refers to: ‘the company’ as a whole or all the employees of ‘the company’ as well as to the customer company as a whole or all the employees of the customer company (= “institutional” (Drew & Heritage 1992) or “corporate” (Bargiela-Chiappini & Harris 1997) we)

**Extract 22:**
1470 S14: so e:r why i'm asked (. ) e:r the reason is that er in er [org1] in our company
1471 in [org1] we have er such structure which is called [name7] (. ) e:r did you ever
1472 heard something about?
(MD III / Conversation 4)

**Extract 23:**
2363 S22: <6> sure (. ) because </6> we; seem to be a rich bank and [org1] of course is
2364 interested in business </7> (with us) </7>
(MD IV / Conversation 6)

These categories will form the basis for the following close analysis.

**5.2. Three Main Uses of *we* Contributing to Common Ground**

The following examination will concentrate on three main findings by using the framework devised above. The recorded speakers predominantly use inclusive *we*-forms as a – conscious or subconscious – strategy of establishing common ground, strengthening in-group-membership and creating a collaborative conversation atmosphere. The following
three chapters will deal in some detail with the main findings of the study concerning the use of the pronoun *we*. Using the framework for a classification of the pronoun *we* according to its referents proposed in chapter 5.1, as a basis, three main *we*-usages as solidarity building strategies could be identified:

- uniting two companies in a perceived group
- creating a sense of ‘groupness’ (Poncini 2004) within one company
- us of ‘institutional we’

5.2.1. **Uniting TWO COMPANIES: WE refers to the speaker + the addressee (+ their teams)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team (not present)</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Team (not present)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(not present)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>(not present)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The illustration\(^5\) above shows that one important referent for *we* identified in the data was: speaker (plus team) + addressee (plus team) (corresponding to categories 4 and 5 from my framework). Although these conversationalists do not form a group in reality, i.e. they belong to two different companies and therefore have contrasting interests; the speaker creates the illusion of ‘groupness’ (Poncini 2004). This strategy strengthens common ground and so the first section will examine the use of *we* to unite the sales person of ‘the company’ and his / her conversational partner, i.e. a customer, a project manager, etc. (both are actually present at the meeting) into one group – the attempt to build solidarity and an

---

\(^5\) The white circles represent 'the company': the large circle represents the speaker (= the examinee) the smaller circles represent the team

The black circles represent the customer company: the large circle represents the speaker (= the examiner) the smaller circles represent the team
atmosphere of shared responsibility. In many cases the analyst cannot be quite sure whether we just designates the sales person and the customer or whether the corresponding teams (who are not present at the meeting) are included as well. Thus the notion of vagueness has to be taken into account and illustrated in more detail.

5.2.1.1. “We will discuss…”: Focusing on Shared Interests
Some speakers in my mini-corpus continually refer to the process of discussing issues and talking to each other and thereby stress the common nature of the decision making process. In Conversation 3, for example, the participants agree on some further steps that have to be taken:

Extract 24:

1097  S4: yah yah (.) but you KNOW the solution you're proposing so: i need a: (.) for
1098  sure i need a reference :r (.) for a similar solution
1099  S11: mhm (.) so i guess it will be great er (.) first (of to) send by email <9> and of
1100  </9> course we discuss er our next meeting
(MD II / Conversation 3)

In the extract above the customer (S4) asks for some references from other clients and the sales person of ‘the company’ (S11) gives a positive reply. He uses the adjective “great” as a description for his next action (i.e. sending some references via email) and afterwards he suggests a next meeting with further discussions. By using the discourse marker “of course” he presupposes agreement, i.e. he states that there should be another meeting and does not leave it open for discussion. His use of the first person plural pronoun in this context seems to be the logical choice. Instead of saying “You and I have to discuss our next meeting”, which would have stressed the fact that the two conversationalists have different backgrounds and work for different companies (with opposing interests in some areas), or even saying “I would like to discuss our next meeting with you”, which would have put the speaker into a weaker position as he is the person in need of a next meeting and he has something left to discuss, he preferred to make use of the first person plural pronoun as a reference to both company representatives. The referents for this we are obviously easy to assign: the phrase “our next meeting” is the linguistic marker that the same persons should meet again and therefore the sales person and the customer are meant in this case. By strategically using the first person plural pronoun the representative of ‘the company’ stresses the collective nature of the decision making process as well as the
shared interests of the two companies by explicitly presupposing a next meeting of the same two people.

Another similar case will be given to illustrate the argument that the first person plural pronoun is used strategically to unite speakers from two different companies into one group and to signal a focus on shared interests of the conversationalists:

**Extract 25:**

4327 S38: and er (.) *we* of course can e:r discuss this contractually
4328 S24: mhm
(MD VII / Conversation 10)

The sales person of ‘the company’ (S38) again uses an inclusive form of *we* to stress the collective nature of the decision making process. The two of them can “contractually” discuss their solutions. Instead of saying “*You* and *I* can discuss this contractually”, which would foreground the differences between the conversationalists; the speaker decided to use the first person plural pronoun as a self-reference and thereby to concentrate on the common interests of the two company representatives. The discourse marker “of course” further intensifies the notion of common ground that is invoked here because it presupposes not only that the customer has some knowledge of this possibility but also his willingness to make use of it. A little bit later on in the conversation the sales person once again uses an inclusive *we* to stress in-group-membership and shared point of view:

**Extract 26:**

4407 S38: <8> yes </8> (.) <9> yes it </9> (.) <1> mhm mhm mhm </1> (.) <2> yeah (.) and </2> (.) <3> we see </3> (.) the picture the same (.) like a big (.) whole solution
(MD VII / Conversation 10)

He stresses their agreement by explicitly referring to their shared point of view. By highlighting this shared opinion or viewpoint he strengthens their collective identity and sense of belonging to a common group. He also builds common ground because if they have a common point of view, they have something to refer to – something that facilitates communication.
5.2.1.2. “We really have to do something”: Creating an Atmosphere of Shared Responsibility

The, in my opinion, most important function of this kind of inclusive *we* is the attempt to create an atmosphere of shared responsibility. The speaker pretends that the next actions are of equal importance for each participant of the meeting and both are equally responsible for taking further steps. There are many examples of such uses in my data: In Conversation 10 the customer (S24) uses an inclusive *we*-form when he is talking about the things that still have to be done.

**Extract 27:**

4199 S24: *<i>e:r to to</i> (.) to change couple of things because you know there is the threat of a take- *<i>&lt;7&gt;</i>*-over *<i>&lt;/7&gt;</i> *<i>e:r</i> (.) share price there is a couple of issues that *we* really have to do (.) [org9] is (.) probably not gonna wait (.) for ages to to really get into action and try to to (.) do some kind of *<i>&lt;8&gt;</i>* takeover *&lt;un&gt; x &lt;/un&gt; &lt;/8&gt;* or whatever they're not gonna wait for two years (.) and watch us (.) building up some kind of of defense or def- taking some defensive match- measures (.) right

4203 S38: *<i>mhm</i> (.) *<i>mhm mhm</i> (.) yes* (MD VII / Conversation 10)

Instead of explicitly referring to the person who has to do some further steps the customer stays rather vague in this paragraph. By using *we* he creates a context of shared responsibility, i.e. the representatives of both companies have to do something and they both are responsible for the success of the project. For the customer, who is the examiner as well, this use of an inclusive *we* can be interpreted as a politeness strategy because he avoids saying “YOU really have to do something”. Instead of such an explicit demand, he includes himself in the act. This strategy is also described by Brown and Levinson (1987: 104, 119) in their strategies of claiming common ground (positive politeness strategy 1 and 7). Furthermore it can also be described as a strategy of creating a shared group, which contributes to a positive conversational atmosphere as well as to common ground. This is further supported by the discourse marker “you know” which also pre-supposes shared knowledge and therefore strengthens common ground. The speaker remains relatively vague about the things that actually have to be done. He only refers to them as “a couple of issues”. This vagueness can be interpreted as another strategy of claiming common ground as it is assumed that the addressee knows what has to be done.
In Conversation 4 it is once again the customer (S6) who uses the inclusive *we*:

**Extract 28:**

1398  S6: it's a nightmare being five percent more expensive
1399  S14: er <6> well </6>
1400  S6: <6> so i </6> (...) i really hope that you can explain it to me (. ) and *we've* (. ) *we*
1401  will find whatever solution but you know i cannot sign it when you're so
1402  expensive
(MD III / Conversation 4)

‘The company’ is more expensive than another firm who offers a similar proposal. The meeting has the purpose of resolving this problem because the customer should not go to the competitor but rather stay with ‘the company’. Although this is clearly ‘the company’s’ problem (because the customer could simply sign the cheaper proposal), the customer uses an inclusive reference when he is talking about finding a solution. He does not threaten the sales person by saying “YOU have to find a solution or you will lose us as a client” but he uses a positive politeness strategy, i.e. an inclusive *we*, “although it is only H [the addressee] who is really being referred to” (Brown & Levinson 1987: 119). Nevertheless, he implicitly indicates the seriousness of the situation through other linguistic strategies: the expression “nightmare” points out the severity of the situation; the intensifier “really” demonstrates the urgency of the issue and the discourse marker “you know” is connected to the shared knowledge of the consequences. Furthermore this extract nicely illustrates the shifting between collective and individual identity. The speaker uses *I* and *you* twice and these pronouns stress the difference between the speaker, who does not know what the addressee could do but who has the power to go to the competitor, and the addressee, who has to explain the issue to the customer and who has to find a solution. Only one sentence displays the inclusive *we* which signals willingness to negotiate. The first person plural pronoun is repeated due to a false start and an interpretation of this restart will further illuminate this sequence. The customer starts by saying “we’ve”, which might very likely be completed as “we’ve got to find a solution”. However, he corrects himself and reformulates his utterance to “we WILL find whatever solution”, which is much more positive and once again presupposes an agreement.
5.2.1.3. *We* or *I*? Strategic Pronominal Choice – Shifting Identities and Vague Uses

The following extracts illustrate how the speakers made strategic decisions for and against particular pronouns to achieve certain ends. Although the conversationalists tried to linguistically unite the two companies into one homogeneous group, they sometimes varied their pronominal choices. In some cases they used the first person singular form *I* whereas in other cases they preferred the first person plural form *we*. Interestingly enough, they sometimes shifted between a plural and a singular self-reference within a single utterance. This finding is in agreement with Drew and Heritage’s (1992: 63) statement that “the choice between a self-referring *I* or *we* is not ‘determined’ by the setting”; both options are given to the speaker, “who can achieve a variety of actions and communicational outcomes by selecting between them” (original emphasis). The following extracts will illustrate the shifting from singular to plural self-reference.

Another aspect of the analysis of pronominal choice will be demonstrated with the examples below: the importance of vagueness in the interpretations of pronoun use. In many cases the referents for a *we*-form cannot be properly assigned, i.e. there is more than one possible interpretation. These cases have to be classified as vague and some examples will be given in the extracts below.

An interesting example can be found in Conversation 5:

**Extract 29:**

1915  S1: so you mean (a little bit of) help of those guys which are responsible for com-  
1916 competitive studies (1) we may achieve something  
1917 S17: yes of course (. ) this <3> is a </3> prel- (. ) preliminary picture <4> (. ) i </4>  
1918 think we can e:r (. ) i-i can er contact with our (upper) software architectures  
1919 S1: <3> okay </3> (. ) <4> okay </4> (. ) okay  
(MD III / Conversation 5)

The sales person’s (S17 = the examinee) utterance is preceded by a comment from the customer (S1 = the examiner), which contains an inclusive *we*. Before that the sales person explains some strategies for achieving good solutions for their problem, which is referred to by the phrase “you mean” in the customer’s utterance. The customer then uses an inclusive *we* as a strategy of claiming common ground and pretending shared responsibility. He implies that both parties, i.e. representatives of both companies, have to work together to achieve positive results. The sales person of ‘the company’ agrees with this view and when he illustrates the next steps that should be taken, he first echoes the
inclusive *we*-form he heard from the customer. However, he stops and starts again, this
time using a self-referring *I*-form. He clarifies that he is the responsible person who should
take the next step. One possible explanation for this phenomenon is the less powerful
position of the sales person: in the business context he is the one who has to provide a
solution and to please the customer but in the exam situation he is the examinee who is in a
weaker position because he needs to pass the exam. Maybe the examinee / sales person did
not consider it appropriate to include the examiner / customer into the next actions. The
customer, who is in a more powerful position, had the right to do so but the sales person
does not have the right to include the customer into the things that have to be done.
Therefore this sequence is an example for a strategic shift from a plural to a singular self-
reference.

Yet another example of a shift between a plural and a singular self-reference can be
found in Conversation 2:

**Extract 30:**

678  S1: (who would pay this?)
679  S7: e:r (.) for what?
680  S1: this education
681  S7: for this education?
682  S1: yep (.) it's (.) time and time is money
683  S7: time is money (.) mmh (.) i don't know (.) we need to: to find it out who who
684  will pay it (.) e:r (.) we can (.) i no- i don't know whether the terms of this enter-
685  price licence agreement include the education of the people (.) maybe it's already
686  included maybe it's in benefit (.) or maybe it's like a <un> xx </un> that we need
687  to solve
(MD II / Conversation 2)

The sales person of ‘the company’ (S7 = examinee) has just suggested a new software
system to the customer (S1 = examiner) but as the employees would have to be re-educated
for this new system, the customer still has some doubts. He wants to know who would pay
for the education of his employees but the sales person does not know that. The following
utterance by the sales person is really interesting. He uses self-referring *I* when he admits
that he does not know who would pay for the education of the employees but he switches
to inclusive *we* when he talks about the next steps that should be taken. Although he
suggested the new software system, he has to convince the customer and he does not know
an answer to the current question, he leaves open who will eventually resolve the problem.
By using an inclusive *we*-form he creates an atmosphere of shared responsibility and
common ground. He unites the two representatives of different companies into one group
and conveys that they are in the same boat. This example somehow contradicts my previous findings because in the present extract a sales person, i.e. an examinee, uses inclusive *we*-forms to include the customer, i.e. the examiner, into the next actions. However, my explanation may still hold because there are a lot of factors to be taken into account: the situational context, the personality of the speakers, the preceding conversation, etc.

Furthermore it should be noticed that this discussed form of inclusive *we* is somehow vague. At first sight one might interpret the *we* as denoting the sales person of ‘the company’ and the customer, i.e. as uniting the two companies into one group with shared interests. However, there are some other possible interpretations: the *we* could refer to
- the sales person and his team
- the sales person and his team + the customer and his team

This vagueness would be another argument for the sales person to use an inclusive *we*-form. The addressee can choose to be included or not and the speaker cannot be charged in any way.

One last example of inclusive *we* uniting two companies to create shared responsibility for further actions will be given. The shifting self-references and the vagueness that can be involved in such a usage will also be demonstrated once again:

**Extract 31:**

1058 S4: <7> yah but it (.) it's it's believe me </7> i would like to do the deal with 1059 [org1] but we have those proposals on the table and they are (.) from competitors 1060 (.) which (.) i have to take serious yah so i <8> have </8> this price on the table so 1061 we need to find some arguments how we can (.) compensate this difference in 1062 price
(MD II / Conversation 3)

The topic of this conversation is once again a serious price problem. ‘The company’s’ proposal is too expensive and the customer has a cheaper version from a competitor on the table. Now they have to find a solution for this problem. In extract 31 the customer argues that she would like to work with ‘the company’ but that they have to do something about the price. This extract once again nicely illustrates shifting identities or shifts between plural and singular self-references within a relatively short utterance. In the beginning the customer (S4 = examiner) adopts a personal stance with a self-referring *I* but soon she shifts to an inclusive *we*, which refers to herself and her team. This is a very strategic
application because by using the inclusive *we*-form she presents herself in a positive way:

She explains that she would like to work with ‘the company’ (which is stressed by the phrase “believe me”) but external circumstances force her to take the competitor into account (the responsibility to her company and her team). She then shifts back to her individual identity but finally she uses inclusive *we*-forms referring to herself and the sales person (= the examinee), i.e. these *we*-usages unite the two companies into one group with shared interests and responsibilities. This extract therefore nicely illustrates how the referents or meanings of *we* can vary within one rather short utterance. The speaker strategically uses different forms of self-reference to achieve several communicative outcomes. Similarly Poncini claims

> that in shifting in and out of frames, and in particular shifting between individual and collective identity, company speakers contribute in different ways to building relations among meeting participants. In doing so, speakers create or draw on common ground, and they position themselves, the company, [...] and related actors in a network of relationships involving not only the roles of the company [...], but also those of related actors not necessarily present at the meetings.
>(Poncini 2004: 115)

The referents can be inferred from the context as well as from linguistic markers (if they “need to find some arguments” it is likely that the people present at the meeting are meant). On the one hand the singular self-references concentrate on the personal element whereas on the other hand the inclusive *we*-forms emphasise the common decision making process, the notion of shared responsibility and of common ground. Brown and Levinson’s (1987) politeness strategies could be applied here once more. The speaker includes herself into the act although actually the main part of the responsibility for action lies on the addressee.

A little bit later in the same conversation there is one more example of inclusive *we* that will be used to illustrate how the two different companies are united into one group with shared interests and responsibilities but also the concept of vagueness:

**Extract 32:**

1249 S11: <1> so what's your </1> deadlines for phase one or maybe whole solution
1250 S4: i think we could live with those two months yah but e:::r i: need to get the
1251 goal decision from: <clears throat> the cfo and then from the ceo (.) a:nd er you
1252 know *we* have to somehow compensate those thirty percent price discount yah (.)
1253 i cannot argue this yah if you say you can give me (.) i don't know ten percent (.)
1254 *we* have to compensate the twenty percent price (.) difference yah
1255 S11: mhm
S4: so: we need really good arguments (.) yah (.) but i mean maybe with those references erm [name7] (.) yah <clicks tongue twice> i will (.) i will (.) you will send me email (.) and and yah we'll have a meeting with [name7] (.) i mean i will present it to the cfo and then let's see </2> mhm </2> (.). that's comfortable for you and for us too (.). mhm
(S11 = examinee) and the customer (S4 = examiner), i.e. uniting representatives of two companies with contrasting interests into one homogeneous group. The referents can be assigned due to the analyst’s knowledge of the business context as well as some linguistic markers (e.g.: “good arguments”). The inclusive we in line 1258 is preceded by the other personal pronouns I and you. These are finally merged into an inclusive we. Another hint is the reference to another meeting which implies that the same people will be involved. These uses once again convey shared responsibility, a sense of belonging to one and the same group and of common ground. Although the companies have opposing interests in reality, the representatives’ pronominal choice pretends a sense of ‘groupness’ (Poncini 2004). The case is much less clear-cut with the we-usages in lines 1252 and 1254. There are no obvious linguistic markers and the context is rather vague too. There is more than one possible referent for each of the we-forms:
- the customer and her team
- the customer and her company (corporate we)
- the customer and her team + the sales person and his team
- the customer and her company + the sales person and his company
This vagueness is relevant for the addressee because most likely he cannot assign a clear referent either. He can therefore choose to be included or not. It is no clear allocation of responsibility but he can take some responsibility if he wants to.

Such cases of vagueness are very frequent in my mini-corpus. Many instances of inclusive we could have more than one possible referent but there is not enough contextual or linguistic evidence to help assign a referent beyond the level of intuition (cf. Zupnik 1994: 363). This vagueness can be interpreted as a strategic device by the speaker because the addressees might not be able to assign precise referents as well but they can choose to include themselves or not.
As a conclusion to this first point of analysis it can be said that pronominal choice can definitely be regarded as a strategy of claiming common ground. Inclusive *we*-forms can be used to signal and emphasise shared interests, to share responsibility, develop a sense of ‘groupness’ (Poncini 2004), and create common ground. This chapter illustrated that speakers in my mini-corpus used **inclusive *we*-forms to integrate representatives of two different companies with opposing interests into one homogeneous group.** It has been illustrated that conversationalists used a plural self-reference to emphasise shared interests between the two companies as well as to pretend shared responsibilities. Although in many cases only one party was responsible for certain actions to be taken, the plural self-reference implied that both parties shared these responsibilities. This strategy strengthened the sense of ‘groupness’ (Poncini 2004) during the meetings and thereby the conversation atmosphere was improved. Furthermore it was shown that a speaker has the choice between a plural and a singular self-reference. This choice is often used strategically by conversationalists to achieve certain communicative goals. Finally it was also illustrated how many occurrences of *we* had to be classified as ‘vague’, i.e. with more than one possible interpretation. This vagueness can be seen as a strategic device as well because the interlocutors can choose to hear themselves as being included or excluded. On the one hand this strategy strengthens the sense of ‘groupness’ (Poncini 2004) when the participants see themselves as included in the community, on the other hand definitive statements regarding responsibilities are avoided. Finally it can be stated that an important aspect of pronominal choice in my data was the creation of groups where they did not actually exist in reality: between two companies with differing interests.
5.2.2. Within ONE COMPANY: WE refers to the speaker + his / her team
(present at the meeting)

The illustration\(^6\) above shows that we was also used to strengthen the sense of community within one company (this finding is related to category 1 of my framework). It is exemplified in the Sales Manager Meeting in Conversation 7. Only employees of ‘the company’ are present and they constantly refer to themselves as a group or entity by applying a plural self-reference. This strategic use of the first person plural pronoun as a self-reference instead of a singular I-self-reference strengthens their sense of ‘groupness’ (Poncini 2004) and this process will be illustrated as a second point of analysis.

According to Rounds (1987)

[A] large number of we occurrences may be sufficient to create “a perceptual atmosphere of consensuality, regardless of pronoun choice in any one particular instance”.

(Rounds 1987 quoted in Poncini 2004: 104 – original emphasis)

The Sales Manager Meeting provides examples of this phenomenon. Conversation 7 shows a high density of we occurrences. We is the dominant personal pronoun and other pronouns like I and you hardly occur. This quantitative analysis confirms Rounds’ theory because in listening to the conversation or reading the transcript, the analyst notices the development of a collective identity and a collaborative atmosphere. Some examples from my data illustrate this point:

\(^6\) The white circles represent members of ‘the company’.
**Extract 33:**

In this extract one of the sales persons of ‘the company’ (S26 = examinee) is talking about the next steps that have to be taken to finish a project. He is talking about expectations, opinions and further actions and he only uses the first person plural pronoun as a reference to his collective identity. Thus he emphasises the sense of ‘groupness’ (Poncini 2004) that should prevail in the meeting. The things that still have to be done will be done by the group with shared responsibility and in total agreement. They expect the same things for the future and they have a common viewpoint regarding their previous achievements. Through the high number of we-usages in this utterance the addressees feel involved and acknowledged. In-group membership is stressed and this not only contributes to common ground but also enhances the positive atmosphere of the conversation.

This we-form is not only used by the sales people but also by the project manager, who is in charge of the meeting:

**Extract 34:**

This section of the conversation deals with ‘the company’s’ financial achievements for the quarter and the project manager asks whether these can be doubled in the current quarter. He asks his question using an inclusive we instead of a more direct you. Thereby he stresses their collective identity and shared responsibility. The utterance can also be interpreted in terms of Brown and Levinson’s politeness theory. One of their strategies of positive politeness (Strategy Number 7) has been mentioned before as merging “the ‘I’ and the ‘you’ into an inclusive ‘we’, although it is only H [the addressee] who is really being referred to” (Brown & Levinson 1987: 119). The analyst claims that it is in the interest of the project manager to maintain a positive working and conversation atmosphere and therefore he has to strengthen the collective identity of his team. By including himself into
the team he furthermore emphasises the egalitarian nature of the group. He does not stress
his position of power but rather his identity as a member of their group.

At the end of the meeting the main points are summarised, some agreements are
stressed and some further actions are planned. Another extract will illustrate the high
density of *we*-usages in this part of the conversation:

**Extract 35:**

3282  S26: so *we* (. ) *we* know the main points (8)
3283  S24: so (. ) are you gonna convince mister [last name9]
3284  S26: sure
3285  S24: how (3)
3286  S26: *we* know *we* know the benefits (. ) *we* know (. ) the main points (. )
3287  S24: mhm
3288  S26: *we* er (. ) will know (. ) what is he aware of the inf- what information
3289  does he have (. ) er a:nd (. ) *we* gonna do our best (. ) <soft> er (. ) on this project
3290  </soft>
3291  S24: er will you have some other meetings before *we* (meet (. ) meet to see you)
3292  S26: yes
3293  S24: who're you gonna talk to
3294  S26: *we* gotta talk to:
3295  S28: mister [last name3] (. )
(MDV / Conversation 7)

At the end of the meeting it is important to stress the sense of ‘groupness’ (Poncini 2004)
and shared responsibility very clearly once again because when the participants leave to
take their next steps they should feel as members of a larger entity. Furthermore in this
extract the objective is to emphasise how successful the meeting was and how many
agreements could be found. One of the sales persons (S26) permanently repeats the phrase
“*we know*” when he tries to bring the meeting to a conclusion. Thus he indicates the shared
knowledge, shared responsibility and shared opinion of the group. The verb “*know*” further
enhances this strategy as it can be described as a rather strong expression (in contrast to
“think, guess, believe”, for example). When he talks about future actions he uses the
inclusive *we*-form as well and thereby incorporates his colleagues. He speaks as a
representative of the group of sales people but he also divides the responsibility for further
actions among them. The project manager uses an inclusive *we* when he proposes another
meeting with the same participants. He once again includes himself into the group and
thereby stresses the collective nature and collaborative atmosphere of their meeting.

As a conclusion to this chapter it can be said that another important usage of
inclusive *we* is to **strengthen the sense of in-group-membership within one company.**
The Sales Manager Meeting in Conversation 7 includes employees of ‘the company’ only and therefore it is a good example for the use of the first person plural pronoun to develop and maintain a sense of ‘groupness’ (Poncini 2004) among the employees of a company. The high density of inclusive *we*-forms used by the sales people as well as by their manager proves this theory. The first person plural pronoun is used in this context to create, maintain and strengthen a collective identity, a collaborative and positive atmosphere and to share responsibility among the participants.

5.2.3. **INSTITUTIONAL “WE”: WE refers to the speaker + a larger community**

(not necessarily present at the meeting)

The illustrations above show how the first person plural pronoun can be used to demonstrate in-group-membership with larger communities, i.e. with whole companies or project teams (corresponding to categories 2, 3, 6 and 7 in my framework). These groups or institutions were not necessarily present at the meetings. This *we*-form is called

---

7 The white figures represent ‘the company’: the large white circles represent the speaker, the smaller circles represent the project team, the square represents ‘the company’.

The black figures represent the customer company: the large black circles represent the speaker, the smaller circles represent the project team, the square represents the customer company.
“institutional we” (Drew & Heritage 1992) or “corporate we” (Bargiela-Chiappini & Harris 1997).

The following categories can be summarised under the heading “institutional we” (Drew & Heritage 1992) and will be the structuring principles for the following chapters:

- sales persons of ‘the company’ / sales person + team
- customer + team
- corporate we: referring to ‘the company’ or the customer company
- corporate we: referring to both companies
- vague uses of these categories

The categories on the one hand strengthen the collective identity and the relations of the individual and the company and on the other hand they represent a boundary between the groups, i.e. between the two companies. For reasons of space this topic will only be illustrated briefly by using some short examples.

5.2.3.1. We referring to speaker + team

The speakers – the sales persons (= examinees) as well as the customers (= examiners) – use inclusive we-forms to emphasise that their statements and opinions are backed up by a larger community. This community could be a project team or even the whole company. The following extracts in this chapter illustrate how speakers linguistically bond with their teams:

**Extract 36:**

4626 S41: yah (.) okay (.) e:r so er (.) so we are (.) working out (.) the project (.) step by step er (.) it is phased (.) e:r at er we are (.) already negotiating (.) about providing hardware (.) e:r for these (.) making capsules (.) so like (.) e:r (.) hardware: e (2)
4627 hardware support of these (.) we're already (.) designing software (.) so we're like
4628 (. ) we're absolutely er capable of doing it and what like (.) what would you like us to tell you what numbers or what e:r (.) or the process of doing it (.) <9> mhm
4630 (MD VII / Conversation 11)

In this extract the sales person (S41 = examinee) is talking about the process of developing a project. From the business context it can be assumed that he does not do all the work alone. The logical referents for the inclusive we-forms are the speaker + his team. He refers to his collective identity within his company and by doing so shares responsibility with other employees. It could be argued that he establishes common ground with people who are not actually present at the meeting. Furthermore this use of inclusive we can be
interpreted as a strategy of gaining power. He emphasises that he does not stand alone but that there is a group behind him who supports his credibility and gives him a more powerful position in the meeting.

Not only the sales persons (= examinees) use inclusive we-forms to bond with their teams but also the customers (= examiners) use this strategy:

**Extract 37:**

2017  S1: <4> first </4> we start start to build it with it-department
2018  S17: mhm
2019  S1: and when we finalise it then it was the procurement department for (.)
2020  contracts et cetera et cetera for negotiations but (.) basically they have a central procurement department
(MD III / Conversation 5)

He is talking about the things that still have to be done and refers to himself and his team by using an inclusive we. He delimits his team from the other company and foregrounds the collective identity within his group. Another time there is even a linguistic marker that makes it possible to have a great deal of security about the referent of the we-form:

**Extract 38:**

953  S4: <4> and </4> and you know i have to convince my people internally e:r that
954  w- i should do it with you so (.) you have to tell me why i should do it w- do it
955  with [org1] (.) <5> yah </5>
(MD II / Conversation 3)

As the speaker first refers to “my people”, which could be interpreted as “my team”, it seems to be logical to identify the following we as denoting the customer and her team. However, she does not complete her utterance but leaves the inclusive we unfinished. She restarts by using the self-referring I, which is rather interesting. It seems to point out that she is in charge of the project, i.e. that she has a great deal of responsibility. However, “her people” clearly have a voice in the matter and therefore she has to convince them to work with ‘the company’. The self-referring I form signals that she has a personal preference for ‘the company’. By using I she sets herself apart from her group and voices her personal opinion. This becomes even more explicit by the false start with the inclusive we.

5.2.3.2. We referring to speaker + company

Another possibility of referring to the collective or corporate identity in a meeting is to use the so-called ‘institutional’ or ‘corporate’ we. Drew and Heritage (1992: 30, 31) describe it like this:
Speakers use the self-referring *we* to invoke an institutional over a personal identity, thereby indicating that they are speaking as representatives, or on behalf, of an organization.

(Drew & Heritage 1992: 30 – original emphasis)

By using an institutional *we* the speaker avoids “being personally responsible” (Drew & Heritage 1992: 31) and evokes a group identity that gives him or her encouragement from the background. Bargiela-Chiappini and Harris refer to this concept as “corporate *we*” (Bargiela-Chiappini & Harris 1997). In contrast to the inclusive *we*-forms used to unite the speaker with a particular group of people, the ‘institutional’ *we* (Drew & Heritage 1992) links the conversationalist to a whole organisation or institution. In my data the institutional or corporate *we* is used by the sales people as well as the customers. Some examples can be seen in the following extracts:

**Extract 39:**

| 3537 | S31: well (.) okay that's great (.) so a- in this case erm er (.) e:r mister [S30/last] er |
| 3538 | i'd like to say that er we: er (.) as you could see er we also have the same er |
| 3539 | estimation as (.) yours (.) and er our company is ready to (.) provide you er the |
| 3540 | whole solution (.) e:r (.) from the first stage (.) whi- which include proof of |
| 3541 | concept and rollout (.) and also e:r we are ready to go with you (.) further with this |
| 3542 | project (.) and erm (.) now i'm very glad that we have approximately the same |
| 3543 | figures |
| (MD VI / Conversation 8) |

In this utterance the institutional *we* can be definitely identified because of the linguistic context. The speaker first refers to “our company” and therefore it can be inferred that the following *we* is an instance of institutional *we*. The speaker identifies with the company as a whole and adopts a corporate identity. Uses of institutional *we* cannot always be so easily and precisely identified but with some background knowledge inferences can be made:

**Extract 40:**

| 4714 | S30: need some er business figures <1> to (.) to <un> xxx </un> </1> <2> do- |
| 4715 | </2> doing a (.) *we* are in a good shape now |
| (MD VII / Conversation 11) |

This use of an institutional *we* by a customer can be identified with some knowledge of the business context of the meetings. The speaker first refers to “business figures” and afterwards states that “*we* are in a good shape now”. It is quite obvious that he does not refer to a group of people but rather to his company as a whole. He, however, speaks on behalf of his company, i.e. as a representative.
5.2.3.3. Vague Uses of “Institutional We”

Cases of institutional *we* are not always as obvious and clear-cut as the examples in the previous chapter. A great deal of uncertainty is related to the interpretation of such instances of inclusive *we*. There are many occurrences of inclusive *we*-forms where the analyst cannot be sure whether they refer to the speaker + his / her team or to the speaker + his company as a whole. These vague uses, i.e. with more than two possible referents, are probably also ambiguous to the addressees and it is left unresolved whether the whole company or only the team of the speaker is involved. Two more extracts will illustrate such vague uses of inclusive *we*:

**Extract 41:**

1359  S14: er well (. ) e:r (1) er (. ) the industry is banking <un> x xxxx </un> bank a
1360  major bank in (. ) in our region (. ) e:r it has been (ex-expansion) product (. ) e:r
1361  about er competing network business process and so on (. ) er t-to expand it around
1362  the world er (2) e:r well just (1) well it’s a: the bank is er our (. ) a-a-already
1363  mainframe (. ) user (. ) er what (. ) er the deal is t hat er (. ) we’re proposing system x
1364  (. ) and er the (. ) er (bank offscreens) (. ) e:r to to the bank and er the main in- issue
1365  is that (. ) e:r we have a: (. ) they have a proposal (. ) from combat which is cheaper
1366  than ours
(MD III / Conversation 4)

**Extract 42:**

987  S4: <7> with </7> (. ) with some of them we worked yah but in smaller projects
988  not in such big projects yah so: (. ) i mean look
(MD II / Conversation 3)

The two extracts above illustrate instances of *we*-usages where the referents could not be clearly assigned. There are no linguistic and only very vague contextual markers, which make it hard to assign a referent with some certainty. However, the number of possible referents can be limited by exclusion of unlikely combinations. From the context of the utterances it can be inferred that the speakers only talk about one of the companies, i.e. categories 4 and 5 of my framework can be excluded. This analysis of exclusion nevertheless leaves the analyst with more than one logical interpretation. In both extracts two explanations could be justified: speaker + his / her team or speaker + his / her company (i.e. institutional *we*). In Zupnik’s terms this could be defined as “limited vagueness” (Zupnik 1994: 365), i.e. a case where “at least one of the relevant ROLES can be identified” (Zupnik 1994: 365). Many such instances or more or less vague uses of *we*-forms – probably even the majority of cases – can be found in my mini-corpus. As was already mentioned before, this vagueness can also have a strategic function for the speaker.
The addressees might choose to include themselves or not and this contributes to the development of a collaborative and positive atmosphere and to common ground.

5.3. Conclusions

This chapter examined the strategic functions of the first person plural pronoun in claiming common ground among meeting participants. Extracts from my mini-corpus illustrated a number of possible uses of inclusive *we*-forms. Referring to the framework developed by Poncini (2004) a system of classification for the different applications of inclusive *we*-forms was designed. Some of the categories in this framework were chosen for detailed analysis and the following conclusions can be drawn: The pronoun *we* seems to be a resource for every speaker to establish common ground, create a collaborative and positive conversation atmosphere and evoke the illusion of shared knowledge, opinions and hopes. Three main applications of inclusive *we* were prominent in my data:

1. **Uniting TWO COMPANIES**: *WE* refers to the speaker + the addressee (+ their teams)
   Inclusive *we* is used to create a community between the speaker and the addressee plus their teams. These groups did not always exist in reality because of conflicting points of view (e.g.: problems with prices or projects) but the inclusive *we*-forms created the illusion of one alliance and therefore strengthened common ground.

2. **Within ONE COMPANY**: *WE* refers to the speaker + his / her team (present at the meeting)
   Inclusive *we* is used to strengthen the sense of community or ‘groupness’ (Poncini 2004) within one company whether it was the firm of the sales person or the customer. The bonds within the team were tightened and used to support the individual speakers. These uses of inclusive *we* established common ground within the group and created a collaborative atmosphere of shared knowledge and opinion.

3. **INSTITUTIONAL “WE”**: *WE* refers to the speaker + a larger community (a project team or even the whole company) (not necessarily present at the meeting)
   Inclusive *we* is used to demonstrate in-group membership with larger communities, i.e. with the companies or project teams. These people were not necessarily present at the meeting. The inclusive *we*-forms were used to evoke collective / corporate
speaker identities which should support their position in the meeting. The speaker conveys to his / her addressees that he / she is not alone with his / her opinions and claims common ground with people not actually present at the meeting. Finally I would like to stress that the examples used can only be samples and I had to choose only a small number for my close analysis. Many more examples could be given in each category but I had to restrict myself for reasons of space and time.
6. “As you know…” – Pragmatic Expressions of Common Ground

It has already been mentioned that the speakers in the mini-corpus used a number of strategies to increase common ground. They used particular expressions to presuppose, signal or create common ground and it has already been argued that the term *Pragmatic Expressions of Common Ground* will be used to categorise these utterances.

A similar observation was made by Poncini (2004), who gives several examples of phrases that increase common ground in her data. An exemplification of such utterances is given below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>318</td>
<td>E of course we have (+) some necessity in our domestic (. ) in our Italian market (. ) because (+) Alta start to be somebody in Italy (+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319</td>
<td>and of course we have to follow (. ) some- some (+) some (+) channel (+) like ski (. ) like sport (. ) like cycling (+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320</td>
<td>[...]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


[...] In addition, by repeating *of course* (units 318 and 319), he signals his expectation that the distributors will understand the situation, thus presupposing their agreement.

(Poncini 2004: 133 – original emphasis)

In the example above Poncini (2004) shows that certain phrases are used by the speakers to negotiate common ground. She does not classify these expressions but only describes them in the course of her argumentation. She claims that the speakers consciously and strategically use these expressions to strengthen the sense of ‘groupness’ (Poncini 2004) and presuppose agreement from their fellow conversationalists.

Similar expressions where identified in the mini-corpus that was used for this diploma thesis. They were termed *Pragmatic Expressions of Common Ground (PEoCG)* and the next chapters will illustrate how these expressions contributed to common ground, shared knowledge and a positive atmosphere in the conversation.

6.1. Three Uses of Pragmatic Expressions of Common Ground

In order to develop a classification system that allows *pragmatic expressions of common ground* to be categorised and then analysed in detail, the following three categories are suggested:

- the speaker presupposes common ground
- the speaker signals his / her understanding
• the speaker creates common ground

These categories classify the expressions according to their main aims in the conversation, i.e. according to the ends the speaker wants to achieve by using these expressions. A full list of \textit{PEoCGs} can be found in the appendix. These three categories will guide the following examination.

\textbf{6.1.1. The speaker \textit{PRESUPPOSES} common ground or understanding from the addressee}

The expressions belonging to this category are used by the speaker to \textbf{presuppose} common ground, understanding or even agreement from the addressee. However, the speaker cannot be sure whether these things (common ground, understanding, agreement) really exist (this insecurity is illustrated by the question mark in the figure). By using the expressions summarised in this category the speaker at the same time presupposes and creates common ground. In case it does not exist, the addressee gets important information without being offended and common ground is thereby increased.

An illustration of this phenomenon will be found in the following extract:

\textbf{Extract 43:}

\begin{verbatim}
4026 S24: <3> er </3> that (.) er (.) since he has been announced and [org1] knows that
4027 that e:r you didn't meet with him (.) because (.) \underline{you know} that this [name11]
4028 project is a real critical one for a couple of people now he's newly involved into
4029 <4> that (family) </4> (.) especially (.) because of this experience with [name12]
4030 inevitable and and all that stuff so you got a little bit (1) <5> yah (.) he: didn't
4031 </5> really see (.) see fully the point (.) okay
(MD VII / Conversation 10)
\end{verbatim}

In this extract the customer (S24 = the examiner) criticises that the sales person of ‘the company’ ignored an important member of the project team, i.e. he “didn’t meet with him”. As this team member has only recently come to the group, a meeting has not been
scheduled for him. However, as he is now involved in this critical project and also has a lot of experience in this area, he was offended by not being involved into the meetings. These facts are brought up in a very polite way by S24, who presupposes shared opinions and agreement by using the phrase “you know” in line 4027. By using the PErCG “you know” the speaker implies that the addressee already has the following information, i.e. he already knows it. In case he does not know it, the information is given as a kind of summary of shared knowledge and the addressee is not offended by being overtly instructed. Consequently the speaker uses the PErCG “you know” to show that he presupposes that the following information is already part of the conversationalists’ common ground. At the same time he creates common ground without offending the addressee if he did not already know these things.

The sequence you know will be used to illustrate the use of PErCGs to presuppose common ground in my data. It was included into the range of Pragmatic Expressions of Common Ground for the purposes of this study. However, it has been described by various linguists as a ‘discourse marker’. Although it was decided that the umbrella term ‘discourse marker’ was not appropriate for all the expressions included in the analysis in this chapter, some of the theories and findings for you know as a discourse marker will be given as an introduction to the following examination. According to Müller “the discourse marker you know is one of the most versatile and notoriously difficult to describe” (2005: 147 – original emphasis). About thirty functions are assigned to this phrase in the research literature and many of them could be identified in my data.

6.1.1.1. You know… - PRESUPPOSING Common Ground
Quantitative Considerations
You know is by far the PErCG that is most often used by the speakers in the transcripts. Almost half of the applications of you know are found in the utterances of a single native speaker, i.e. the American leader of the international business school. The other half of the applications is distributed among the other (non-native speaker) conversationalists.
Positions of you know within the Utterances

You know in the mini-corpus not only has different functions but also different positions within the sentences. In some cases it is an optional part of the sentence, in other cases you know forms a constituent of the sentence and in yet some other cases it is described as ‘independent’ as it forms a short sentence of its own. In some instances it is not possible to decide whether the sequence is optional or a constituent of the sentence because either both options seem logical or the context of the utterance cannot be understood. A quantitative analysis shows that the native speakers almost only uses you know as a discourse marker, i.e. as an optional element in the utterance. In the extract below the American native speaker uses the sequence you know to mark a false start and the following repair. The speaker starts a sentence, inserts you know and continues with a different structure:

Extract 44:

S3: […] i say (. ) give me one or two things that you er
100 observed that was positive about er [name1]’s call i-i want them to-to stick really
101 more to the positive of the call and leave the you know what would be better if for
102 me as the as the facilitator as the er as the calltaker […]
(MD I / Conversation 1)

Non-native speakers show much more variation in their use of you know. Although they also use the sequence as a discourse marker in the majority of cases, they also apply it as a sentence constituent or as an independent item. The following extracts will exemplify the different categories:

Extract 45:

S14: well e:rm (. ) er the reason e:r why i’m here (. ) er you know that you called
1386 me about e:r our (. ) proposal of x-series
(MD III / Conversation 4)

In the extract above the speaker uses you know as a discourse marker, i.e. as an optional part in the sentence. The whole utterance is interspersed with hesitation markers (pauses, e:rm, er, e:r) until finally the speaker uses you know as a further marker of hesitation. He seems not to be sure what he wants to say and uses you know as a marker of content search. Finally he remembers what he wants to say and continues his utterance.

Extract 46:

S29: <9> which </9> room?
2702 S24: trainer room which is next to the toilet (. ) if you (1) you know where the
2703 toilets are on the second floor?
(MD V / Conversation 7)
This extract illustrates an application of *you know* as a sentence constituent, i.e. it could not be left out. A German translation could be: “Wissen Sie, wo die Toiletten im zweiten Stock sind?”. Nevertheless, this instance of *you know* can also be interpreted as a *PEoCG* as it also fulfils some communicative functions. On the one hand the speaker presupposes shared knowledge because he uses “you know” instead of “do you know” which would be an explicit question. On the other hand, by using rising intonation and thereby signalling that the utterance is a question he implies that he is not sure whether the information is indeed shared. The *you know* in this utterance can therefore be interpreted as marking presupposed shared knowledge.

**Extract 47:**

1430  S6: <8> mhm (.) yah but you know </8> [S14] i don't want to get into a (.)
1431  technical detail discussion cos we had this in the last months (.) *you know*
1432  S14: okay

(MD III / Conversation 4)

In this extract *you know* (only the instance in the box will be discussed) is classified as an independent part of the utterance. It is optional because it could be omitted but it does not seem to be a discourse marker. As it forms the end of the utterance it can be described as an independent part, i.e. a short sentence of its own. It can be translated into German as “Wissen Sie?” with a rising intonation or “Sie wissen schon!” with a falling intonation. The sequence in that situation indicates presumed shared knowledge as well as an appeal for understanding from the speaker.

**The Functions of You Know**

As a next point the functions of *you know* in my mini-corpus will be analysed. Müller’s (2005: 157 – 189) list of functions of *you know* will be used as a point of reference in this chapter. Many of the functions she identified in her data could also be found in my mini-corpus. However, in some cases it was necessary to include further categories to be able to describe and specify the functions of *you know* in my data. It has already been explained that the sequence is used as a discourse marker and as a sentence constituent. The speakers want to reach certain ends by using this strategy and the main goals of native and non-native speakers will be discussed below:
Functions of *You Know* predominantly used by the ELF Speakers in my Mini-Corpus

The following paragraphs will deal with functions of *you know* in non-native (ELF) speaker utterances. It has already been discussed that non-native speakers not only use *you know* as discourse markers but very often also as sentence constituents. Nevertheless these applications of *you know* have various interpersonal functions. The most important categories will be discussed below:

Interestingly enough, non-native speakers most often use *you know* in its literal function, i.e. emphasising that something is or should be known to the listener, thereby presupposing shared knowledge. According to Müller

*you know* served to make sure that the hearer was able to access this knowledge at this particular moment because it was critical to understanding the ongoing narrative or to understanding the point the speaker was making.

(Müller 2005: 178 – original emphasis)

The sequence *you know* is used as an optional element and as a sentence constituent to signal shared knowledge. Two extracts will illustrate this:

**Extract 48:**

2156  
S1: we have to (. ) to be ( . ) very very precise and everything [you know]  
(MD III / Conversation 5)

In the extract above the sequence *you know* is optional because it could be omitted and the sentence would still be meaningful. However, by using *you know* the speaker emphasises that what he just said should be known to the hearer. In case the information was not actually known to the listener, it is given in the utterance and attention is drawn to it by the sequence *you know*.

**Extract 49:**

1089  
S4: <6> okay </6> (. ) <7> okay </7> (. ) <8> [you know] this is important yah (. ) i 1090 mean er </8>  
(MD II / Conversation 3)

In the context of this extract *you know* has to be interpreted as a sentence constituent. A German translation could be “Sie wissen, dass es wichtig ist”. Although it is a fix part of the utterance it also serves interpersonal functions. It emphasises that “the hearer had (or should have) the relevant knowledge” (Müller 2005: 178) that something is important. *You know* emphasising shared knowledge was the most frequent function in non-native speaker talk.
The second largest category of *you know* in non-native speaker utterances is *you know**introducing explanations*. This category is already very important in native speaker talk and it is very often used by non-native speakers, too.

**Extract 50:**

966  S4: *<8> mmm you mean financing options </8>* (. ) yah i mean this could be
967  interesting but it's not the main issue *<9> you know </9>* the main <9> issue </9> er i have
968  (. ) a very high price thirty percent higher than the price of competition (. ) yah? (. )
(MD II / Conversation 3)

The customer (S4 = examiner) in the extract above is talking about the “main issue”. However, she seems to be unsure whether her addressee actually knows what the “main issue” is. Therefore she uses *you know* to introduce an explanation. The sequence calls the attention of the hearer and clarifies that the following information should be known to the addressee. In case it is not, an explanation will follow. According to Müller *you know* thereby helps “to structure the contents of what is being said” (Müller 2005: 165). The non-native speakers in my mini-corpus use this category even more often than the native speakers. One possible explanation could be that non-native speakers stick to a rather restricted set of functions of *you know* (predominantly emphasising or presupposing shared knowledge and introducing explanations). Native speakers display more variety and are able to apply *you know* in a greater range of functions with only subtle differences (e.g.: introducing explanations, introducing exemplifications or “imagine the scene”). Non-native speakers do not seem to be able to use these subtle differences and rather preferred to apply *you know* with its literal meaning, i.e. signalling shared or presumed shared knowledge.

Finally it will be briefly mentioned that the non-native speakers also used *you know* as a discourse marker with various textual functions (e.g.: marking lexical or content search, marking false start and repair and marking hesitation). The most important category in this area was *marking hesitation*:

**Extract 51:**

1119  S4: okay (. ) okay this would be interesting (. ) if you jus- just could mail me (. )
1120  some references and then i could choose and meet one of those guys *you know* it's
1121  <5> (2) yah? (. ) </5>
(MD II / Conversation 3)

In the extract above the customer (S4 = examiner) asks for some references from the sales person. However, at the end of the sentence she hesitates because she does not know how
to continue her utterance. She tries to hide her hesitation by using the sequence *you know*. Thereby she tries to avoid a longer pause. However, even after the application of *you know* she does not know how to continue her utterance and a rather long pause of approximately two seconds follows. She then adds “yah” with a rising intonation to invite the addressee to respond. In the transcripts there are several other cases where speakers use *you know* together with pauses and other hesitation markers to bridge the time they need to think of what to say next.

Functions of *You Know* predominantly used by the Native Speakers in my Mini-Corpus

The native speaker in my mini-corpus most often uses *you know* as a discourse marker, i.e. as an optional element in the utterance. Various functions could be assigned to these applications but for the purpose of this diploma thesis I will concentrate on the interpersonal goals that should be reached. Most often he used *you know* to introduce explanations:

**Extract 52:**

81 S3: then you go through a process of (.) erm (.) providing feedback going through  
82 a a a debrief there's a lot of different ways to to do a a debrief of a of a call s- [you]  
83 know so whatever you are (.) you you're comfortable without tell you what i do  
84 you don't have to do it (.) this way but […]  
(MD I / Conversation 1)

In the extract above the American leader of the international business school explains the course of the examinations and clarifies that the examiners are supposed to give feedback to the examinees. This process of providing feedback is called a “debrief”. He uses the term twice but then hesitates. He interrupts his sentence in the middle of a word “s-”, inserts *you know* and continues with the same word “so”. The sequence *you know* therefore can be interpreted as calling the hearers’ attention to the following explanation. The speaker then explains what he usually does during a debrief session and thereby provides a definition of the term “debrief” as well as some instructions of what the feedback should look like. The extract provides a rather typical example of *you know* introducing an explanation as it is described by Müller:

[T]ypically, the speaker mentions something, a concept or an idea, or gives his / her opinion, and then decides that s/he has to express it in different (and perhaps more) words to make it plain what s/he meant.”

(Müller 2005: 166)
Müller claims that *you know* introducing an explanation “warns the listener that the next words are particularly important” and that it “introduces more specific or clarifying information” (Müller 2005: 165). Interestingly enough, in her data introducing an explanation is the most frequent category of *you know*. The same is true for the native speaker in my mini-corpus. The American leader of the international business school most frequently uses *you know* to introduce explanations.

The second largest category of *you know* in my transcripts is described by Müller as “imagine the scene” (Müller 2005: 171 – 175). With this function of *you know* the speaker “tries to involve the hearer in some way” (Müller 2005: 171) and the listener is then required to respond. *You know* in this cases could be “paraphrased as ‘you can imagine the scene, can’t you?’, ‘I’m sure you can imagine the scene’, or ‘Please imagine the scene!’”, depending on the intonation contour” (Müller 2005: 171). It is really interesting that this category is the second largest in Müller’s data. Similarly “imagine the scene” was the most often used function after introducing an explanation by the native speaker in my mini-corpus. The extract below will illustrate this important function:

**Extract 53:**

44 S3: [...] and and
45 each call (.) will last about foury-five minutes (.) and let me tell you how (.) how
46 that process works (.) the the actual call itself where the student [you know] knocks
47 on your your door comes in an-and plays the role of the [org1] seller (.) that will
48 last twenty minutes [...]

(MD I / Conversation 1)

In the extract the American leader of the international business school illustrates the course of the exams. After referring to the “actual call itself”, the speaker inserts *you know* and afterwards illustrates the scene in greater detail. *You know* therefore can be paraphrased as “I’m sure you can imagine the scene” or “Please imagine the scene!” (cf. Müller 2005: 171). This function of *you know* forms the second largest category in my mini-corpus.

Two more functions of equal importance will be discussed in the following paragraphs: exemplification and approximation. In the transcripts used for this diploma thesis *you know* was very often used to introduce exemplifications:

**Extract 54:**

160 S3: [...] a six let's
161 go to the other (.) end of the scale six is the worst call i mean the worst grade you
162 could get the worst call you could do (.) erm as it says down here they basically
163 would have done some harm (.) you know something offensive er a a major
Infraction of business contact guidelines, you know, they er they they hit the the
the the er
S4: customer <9> @@ @@@@ @ @@ <9>
S3: <9> the customer </9> you know <1> they </1> xxxxxx </un> on the desk
</1>
S2: <1> (the exe- the executive right) </1>
S4: <1> @@@</1>
S3: you know they did something illegal you know in in the call something
something that you know the next call [org1] would have to bring in the lawyers
or or <2> managers to </2> to fix or t- <3> or to correct </3> so yah so tha- that
would be that would be did harm

In this extract the American leader of the international business school explains the grading
system for the exams. The extract starts with the clarification of what a six, i.e. the worst
grade, would be. The first application of you know (underlined) is used to introduce an
explanation. The speaker first explains that the examinee “would have done some harm” to
get a six but after the insertion of you know he further describes what this harm might be.
He specifies that the examinee would have to do “something offensive er a a major
infraction of business contact guidelines”. Afterwards he illustrates his explanation by
giving a variety of (rather amusing) examples of what such infractions could look like. He
introduces the examples by using you know, thereby calling the listeners’ attention to the
following part of his utterance. The function ‘you know introducing exemplifications’
forms the third largest category in native speaker talk.

Another category of equal importance in native speaker utterances was ‘you know
marking approximation’:

Extract 55:

S3: [...] what we're (.) doing i:s a kind o:f er you know giving
them the final okay that they're (.) ready to go out and and carry the [org1] back
and be (uncalled) and be [org1] sales sales representative in (.) you know
numerous functions that they would er overalls that they would have within [org1]
sales

In the extract above two instances of you know marking approximation can be found. The
American leader of the international business school explains what their organisation is
doing but obviously he does not find a precise formulation. He gives a rather lengthy and
vague description of what the business school is actually doing. Since he “is aware of the
fact that these were not the exact words, [he] places you know in front of” the description
(Müller 2005: 163 – original emphasis). Additionally, he marks his imprecision by using “a kind of” and various hesitation markers (er, lengthening of vowels). Further down in the extract he wants to exemplify the functions the graduates of their school can take in the organisation. However, he seems to search for the right words and indicates the lacking precision in his following utterance by applying you know. Other markers of imprecision are the adjective “numerous”, which indicates that the speaker cannot think of a particular example, as well as the use of a pause before you know, which shows that the speaker needs some time to think about what he should say next. Thus you know indicates that “the linguistic expression is only an approximation of what would have been the most appropriate or correct expression” (Müller 2005: 162). Marking approximation was another frequent function of you know in native speaker talk.

It should only briefly be mentioned that you know as a discourse marker also has many textual functions like marking lexical or content search, marking false start and repair, marking reformulation and marking hesitation. The native speaker very skilfully uses these functions of you know, which will be exemplified in the case of a reformulation:

**Extract 56:**

123 S3: <6> from </6> from everybody they they've been doing this for you know this
124 is the fourth class now (.) that they have er have done there since [S2] has passed
125 this out
(MD I / Conversation 1)

The American leader of the international business school explains that there have already been four classes for the students. He starts with a sentence but then interrupts himself by using you know. He continues with a different formulation obviously expressing a similar content. This is not really a case of a false start because there was no wrong structure or vocabulary involved. The speaker simply decides to use a different formulation in mid-sentence and makes a new start.

As a conclusion it can be said that in the previous chapters you know was identified as the most frequently used PEOCG in the mini-corpus. Although it has been described as a discourse marker by various linguists, the classification as a PEOCG was found to be more appropriate as many instances of you know in the data could not be described as discourse markers but nevertheless fulfilled various textual or interpersonal functions within the conversations.
A comparison of native (American) and non-native (ELF) speaker talk proved particularly useful for this examination. It immediately attracted the researcher’s attention that almost half of all uses of you know occurred in the utterances of a single native speaker – the American leader of the international business school. The other applications of the sequence were divided among all the non-native speakers in all the conversations. Interestingly enough, Müller has a very similar outcome in her study. She claims that “[o]n average, the Americans used discourse marker you know more than five times as much as the Germans” (Müller 2005: 190 – original emphasis). A more detailed analysis showed that whereas the native speaker almost only used you know as a discourse marker, the non-native speakers applied it in a variety of situations (as discourse markers, as optional elements, as independent elements or as sentence constituents). The American native speaker used you know for a variety of functions, e.g.: introducing explanations, “imagine the scene”, introducing exemplifications or marking approximation. The non-native speakers predominantly used you know with its literal meaning, i.e. emphasising that something is or should be known to the addressee and thereby presupposing or signalling shared knowledge. The second largest category in non-native speaker talk was introducing explanations. Some non-native speakers also managed to apply you know with various textual functions (e.g.: marking hesitation or repair). As a conclusion it can be said that non-native speakers did not frequently use you know as a discourse marker and in a large number of cases remained with the literal meaning of the sequence.

6.1.2. The speaker SIGNALS his / her understanding or agreement.

The expressions in this category are used by the speaker to signal his / her understanding or agreement to the addressee. The speakers make use of two strategies to show their understanding or agreement: On the one hand they explicitly refer to their own state of knowledge and on the other hand they summarise what the other speaker has already said. By explicitly signalling his / her understanding or agreement to the addressee, the speaker
managed to increase common ground and to contribute to the positive atmosphere within the conversation.

6.1.1.2. Referring explicitly to the speaker’s state of knowledge
In this sub-group the speakers explicitly refer to their actual state of knowledge. They signal their understanding or agreement. Most of the expressions comprise the first person singular pronoun I:

**Extract 57:**

4032 S38: <4> mhm mhm </4> (.) <5> yes understand </5> (.) from my side i want to
4033 say that <6> we er </6> really respect er mister [last name8] and er (.)
4034 understand that <7> he is a very very very good </7> er specialist i (.) sent him e:r
4035 many information
(MD VII / Conversation 10)

In the extract above the sales person (S38 = examinee) explicitly mentions that he understands the situation. The second usage of “I understand” is even followed by a specification of what it is exactly that is understood. Thereby the speaker emphasises and explicitly draws the listeners’ attention to the fact that he understood what has previously been said and common ground is thus enhanced. A typical situation of signalled understanding or agreement in the conversation could look like this: The speaker provides some information. This information is taken in by the listener who then responds with the sequence “I understand”. He thereby explicitly signals that he understood the speaker and that the speaker was successful in increasing common ground. Furthermore it also contributes to a positive atmosphere in the conversation as it is made obvious for the fellow conversationalist whether the information was taken up or not.

Another extract illustrates a situation where the speaker not only signals understanding but even explicit agreement with the other conversationalist:

**Extract 58:**

3342 S24: <2> okay </2> (. ) the news are okay agree with that the news are okay
(MD V / Conversation 7)

The customer (S24 = examiner) uses the first person singular pronoun and the verb “agree” to make explicit his approval for what has just been said by the examinee. This strategy of making one’s opinion really transparent for the listener has various advantages within a business meeting. As this phrase is really specific, no differing interpretations are possible. The speaker says that he agrees and therefore it is most likely that he actually does agree.
He thereby clarifies that he understood what has just been said by the other speaker and that he has a positive opinion about it. The speakers can now proceed their talk with some certainty on their shared knowledge or common ground and the positive atmosphere of the conversation is enhanced. With regard to the exam situation it should be noticed that the agreement is made explicit by the examiner in this extract. He thereby encourages the examinee to continue and provides positive feedback. The phrase “I agree” also contains further information that could be paraphrased as “Go on, what you said up to now was good, just continue your talk”.

6.1.1.3. Summarising what the other speaker said

Another way of signalling understanding or agreement is to summarise what has already been said by the other speaker. Thereby it becomes clear that the speaker understood what had been explained before and s/he has the possibility to voice his / her agreement.

Extract 59:

1915 S1: so [you mean] (a little bit of) help of those guys which are responsible for com-
1916 petitive studies (1) we may achieve something
1917 S17: yes of course (.)
(MD III / Conversation 5)

Summarising or clarifying what the other speaker has already said is another strategy of signalling understanding or agreement. The phrases used in this category very often include the second person singular pronoun you. In the extract above the customer (S1 = examiner) uses the phrase “you mean” to summarise what the sales person (S17 = examinee) has just said. At the same time the speaker clarifies whether he understood the examinee correctly. The sales person responds with the back-channel “yes of course” and thereby acknowledges that the customer understood what he meant. This strategy of summarising what a speaker said not only increases common ground but also shared knowledge and thereby provides a good basis for the ongoing conversation.

In another sales call the sales person explicitly summarises what has been discussed before:

Extract 60:

3641 S31: that’s all for now (.) okay let me make some summary (.) so e:r (.) as
3642 understood you corre-
3643 [presentation for mister [last name9] (.) and e:r (. ) we could (. ) tell (. ) that e: r we
have er s:- er erm (. ) er we get your support (. ) in the project of e:r ([name15]) (. )
and that we could say that (. ) you're (. ) ready to go with [org1] in this project
S30: i would say you you tomorrow you present <4> er </4> you you (. ) e:r (. )
possible solution and then er we shall discuss this decide with fost- e:r er (. ) <5>
[last name6] </5> yah
S31: <4> mhm </4> (. ) <5> aha </5> (. ) mhm mhm mhm
S30: i am supporting you to to a-arrange this meeting with [last name9]
S31: okay (. ) okay (. ) thank you very much mister [S30/last] (. ) i'm very
appreciate you (. ) about it (. )
(MD VI / Conversation 8)
The extract above very nicely illustrates how conversationalists use particular expressions and strategies to create a positive atmosphere in the conversation. The sales person of ‘the company’ (S31 = examinee) announces that he is going to make a summary of their meeting. It is very likely that he learnt to do that in the classes of the international business school. A summary at the end of a business meeting has various purposes: it recapitulates all the things that were discussed, it makes clear which problems have been solved and which are still left open for further meetings, it summarises outcomes and further actions and by expressing these things verbally they are clarified for all the members of the business meeting. In lines 3641 and 3642 S31 uses the phrase “as I understood you correctly” to summarise what has already been said by the other meeting participant. This phrase has several meta-messages: On the one hand it implicitly asks “did I understand you correctly” and also awaits a response by the addressee and on the other hand it expresses respect for the hearer implying that the speaker was listening very carefully before. As a politeness strategy this expression has various functions: The speaker avoids asking explicitly whether he understood his fellow conversationalist correctly but nevertheless he is able to clarify the achievements of the meeting in a rather diplomatic way. Furthermore he creates a positive atmosphere in the conversation. The customer (S30) reacts by suggesting a further meeting with another representative of the customer company which he also would support. By offering his support he contributes to the positive and friendly atmosphere in the conversation. The sales person of ‘the company’ (S31) finally expresses his gratitude in several phrases (underlined). By calling his fellow conversationalist by his name the speaker expresses his respect and further increases the positive atmosphere in the conversation. Addressing other people (especially customers) by the proper names is an important politeness strategy in business areas. The customer gets the impression that he is known and also cared for personally and that the sales person has a particular interest in
providing a proper solution for the customer’s needs. Finally S31 expresses his sympathy for S30 in lines 3651 and 3652. Although the utterance is grammatically incorrect, it is understood by the addressee and does not cause any communication problems. However, by expressing his appreciation for the customer the sales person further increases the positive atmosphere within the communication.

With the help of the short extract above it could be demonstrated that speakers use a variety of politeness strategy to create or increase a positive atmosphere in the conversation. They want to build shared knowledge and express respect for their fellow conversationalists and they use various linguistic strategies to do so.

In this section it was illustrated that the speakers in my mini-corpus use various phrases and expressions to signal their understanding or agreement within the meetings. On the one hand they use phrases including the first person singular pronoun like “I know, I understand, I see, etc.” to show their understanding for particular issues. On the other hand they use expressions including the second person singular pronoun like “you mean, as you told, as I understand you correctly, etc.” to summarise what has already been said by the other speaker. By using such expressions they signal their understanding by being able to summarise but at the same time they implicitly ask whether they understood correctly what the other speaker meant. These strategies are very important in business meetings as they help participants to keep an overview on the achievements made during the discussion. Furthermore they are important politeness strategies that help create a positive atmosphere in the conversation.
6.1.3. The speaker creates common ground, understanding or shared knowledge.

The expressions in this category are used by the speaker to actively create (or at least offer to create) common ground, understanding or shared knowledge between conversationalists. Various strategies were identified as fitting into this category:

- posing questions
- referring to what has already been said
- offering help or more information
- explicitly demanding understanding / agreement
- explaining things
- demanding information from the other speaker
- referring to the other person by using a proper name
- using ritualised phrases like greetings, farewells, please and thanks, etc.

These phrases usually are sentence constituents or even short full sentences and can be described as ‘explicit politeness strategies’ as they are used consciously by the speakers (mainly by the non-native speakers in the mini-corpus) to achieve certain politeness goals within the conversation (e.g.: creating a positive atmosphere in the meeting, enhancing common ground, increasing understanding between the conversationalists). The numerous expressions used for this purpose have been divided into several sub-groups which will be exemplified in the chapters below with extracts from my mini-corpus.
6.1.3.1. offering help or more information

**Extract 61:**

S17: okay (.) so is everything e:r connect with software i: f- (. ) can do it for sure
2200 (. ) hh and er if i have som:e (. ) questions som:e (. ) pr- some troubles with that er
2201 can i (. ) connect with you? (. ) <8> <un> xx </un> </8>
2202 S1: <8> of course </8> (. ) i’m here
2203 S17: if i need some more figures and so on
2204 S1: of course (. ) [I’m ready and willing to help you]
2205 S17: okay (. ) so: (. ) as i see (. ) […]

(MD III / Conversation 5)

The extract above is taken from the end of a sales call. The sales person of ‘the company’ (S17 = examinee) asks whether he can go to the customer (S1 = examiner) if he has any questions or needs more information. The customer interrupts S17 with the back-channel response “of course” and starts a sentence but he again is interrupted by the sales person, who further specifies what kind of information he might need in the future (“some more figures”). S1 finally replies “I’m ready and willing to help you” which is a really strong politeness strategy. Instead of just saying “yes, if you need some figures, you can ask me” or “yes, I can give you the figures you need” or “yes, you can contact me”, the speaker uses the really positive formulation “I’m **ready and willing** to help you”. This implies that he not only has the relevant information but that he is also willing to share it. He conveys to the sales person that any further questions are not a burden for him but that he would be glad to be able to help. The phrase can therefore be interpreted as a consciously applied politeness strategy used to create a positive atmosphere in the conversation. The speaker expresses a positive attitude towards the sales person, ‘the company’ and the meeting. Utterances like the one illustrated in the extract above are very important in the business meetings in my mini-corpus as they build or create a positive atmosphere and help the conversationalists to have confidence within the meetings.

6.1.3.2. explicitly demanding understanding / agreement

**Extract 62:**

S24: <1> e:r (. ) i mean (. ) i mean </1> the thing is (. ) [I just want you to]
4379 understand if you make any decisions with [first name3] [last <2> name3] (for
4380 <2> the supporter and get) (. ) the commitment for for running one of the projects
4381 with you
4382 S38: <2> mhm </2> (. ) mhm
The customer (S24 = examiner) in the extract above explains that the projects they are about to run are really critical and any decisions that will be made have to be thought through very carefully. However, the speaker does not only state his opinion but he explicitly demands understanding from the addressee (S38 = examinee) by using the phrase “I just want you to understand”. Instead of saying “I would like you to understand” or “if you just could understand”, the speaker uses the stronger expression “I just **want** you to understand”. Although the verb “want” is hedged by “just” it is still a rather strong expression. The customer does not ask the sales person of ‘the company’ to understand – he explicitly wants his understanding. A little bit later in the same conversation the customer repeats his demand: “I want you really to understand”. He adds the intensifier “really” to emphasise the importance of the issue being explained. By using these expressions the speaker explicitly wants to increase common ground. He wants his addressee to understand the situation and thereby construes shared knowledge as he explains the situation. However, he does not only give his explanation but expects some response from the hearer when he states that he wants him to understand. The addressee reacts by giving a back-channel response “okay”. Thereby he signals his understanding and the speaker can assume that his strategy of increasing common ground and understanding was successful.

### 6.1.3.3. referring to the other person by using a proper name

According to Condon & Čech (2007) greetings and terms of address “reflect social relations and attitudes between speaker and recipient” (Condon & Čech 2007: 17). They call these expressions and other similar ones “lexical markers of common ground” (ibid.) which is a very similar term to the one that is used in this diploma thesis *Pragmatic Expressions of Common Ground*. Similar to Condon & Čech I am of the opinion that terms of address (e.g. addressing meeting participants with their proper names) are one sort of creating or increasing common ground in its broadest sense. It has already been argued earlier in this chapter that addressing people (and especially customers) with their proper
names conveys a feeling of importance to them. They get the impression that they are personally known and cared for and that they are important not only as faceless representatives of their company but also as individuals. Therefore addressing meeting participants (especially customers) with their proper names can be described as an important politeness strategy in business meetings. The extract below illustrates a series of utterances where the customer (S30 = examiner) is addressed with his proper name by the sales person of ‘the company’ (S31 = examinee):

**Extract 63:**

3537 S31: well (. ) okay that's great (. ) so a- in this case erm er (. ) e:r mister [S30/last] er
3538 i'd like to say that er we: er (. ) as you could see er we also have the same er estimation as (. ) yours (. ) and er our company is ready to (. ) provide you er the whole solution (. )
3539 [...] S31: and in this case mister [S30/last] could you tell me this (. ) way of er (. ) e:r design this project er (. ) ho-how it's g:oing on (. ) ho-how it will be (. ) could you [...] tell me please [...]
3548 S31: and in this case mister [S30/last] could you tell me this (. ) way of er (. ) e:r design this project er (. ) ho-how it's g:oing on (. ) ho-how it will be (. ) could you [...] tell me please [...]
3550 S31: <9> yes </9> (. ) okay (. ) okay (. ) yes (. ) of course (. ) e:r and er (. ) mister [S30/last] e:r of course so: we: we are going we are ready to make a presentation [...] S31: for mister [last name9] (. )
3555 [...] S31: e:r (1) well er mister [S30/last] e:rm (. ) as we: er er discussed it before (. ) of course [org1] has e:r (. ) e:r (. ) er experience in this (. ) job er in this case er (. ) and er we already made such er project in er different er firms and er (. ) e::r (MD VI / Conversation 8)

The extract above illustrates a sequence of utterances taken from a sales call. The utterances occurred in a rather short time and can be used to demonstrate how the sales person of ‘the company’ addresses the customer with his proper name many times. It has already been argued that this kind of addressing customers has various politeness functions in a business meeting. By using the proper name of his addressee the speaker shows that he personally knows and also respects him. The speaker signals that he does not only talk to any representative of the customer company but to a particular individual and that he sets a high value on his understanding and agreement. In the first part of the extract the term of address is followed by an explanation (underlined). The speaker makes clear that the two companies have the same figures, i.e. they agree in the main points and ‘the company’ is ready to provide the whole solution. Common ground and shared knowledge are thereby increased and the agreement is emphasised explicitly. In the second part of the extract the
speaker asks the customer for more information (underlined). By using the personal address form he signals that S30 not only has the power to provide the information like any other representative of the customer company but that it is important that this particular person is willing to help. By asking for more information the speaker explicitly wants to strengthen common ground and shared knowledge whereas by using the addressee’s proper name he also enhances the positive atmosphere in the conversation. In the third part of the extract the speaker refers to the addressee by using his proper name and adds an achievement that was reached during the meeting (underlined). Once again he consciously strengthens common ground by pointing out what has already been clarified or decided on. In the fourth and last part of the extract the speaker uses the proper name address form to refer to something that has been discussed before. He thereby draws on already existing common ground and shared knowledge and emphasises that it has not been discussed with anybody but with that particular speaker present at the moment.

With the help of the extract above it was possible to show how a speaker used a particular term of address (i.e. the addressee’s proper name) to reach certain politeness goals. First and foremost he created and strengthened the positive atmosphere in the conversation by conveying to the hearer that he is personally known and cared for. Furthermore the speaker was able to draw on common ground and shared knowledge and thereby to reach his business goals (e.g.: giving a presentation).

6.1.3.4. using ritualised phrases like greetings, farewells, please, thanks, etc.

Extract 64:

2265 S20: good morning mister [last name1]
2266 S2: good morning
2267 S20: glad to see you again
2268 S2: yes (. ) take a seat please (. ) <1> how have you been </1>
2269 S20: <1> thank you very much </1> (. ) very good
2270 S2: mhm
2271 S20: erm i e:r (. ) received a (. ) message from you (. ) […]

(MD IV / Conversation 6)
According to Condon & Čech (2007) greetings can be subsumed under the heading “Lexical Markers of Common Ground” and in my diploma thesis I included the group of ‘ritualised phrases’ (greetings, farewells, please & thanks) into the category of Pragmatic Expressions of Common Ground. The extracts above nicely illustrate how the speakers used greetings “good morning” or “good bye” and other ritualised phrases like “glad to see you again” and “it was nice to meet you” to strengthen the positive atmosphere in the conversation. By starting and closing the meetings with these expressions they emphasise their positive attitude towards each other. Instead of just starting the sales calls with the something like “I wanted to see you because…” or “we had to arrange this meeting because…” and closing them with “that’s all, good bye” or just “okay then, bye”, the speakers exchange civilities to show respect and sympathy for each other. These expressions therefore actively create a positive atmosphere in the conversations.

The last category of PEoCGs comprises a series of utterances used by the speakers to actively and explicitly create a positive atmosphere in the conversations. The relevant expressions can be divided into sub-groups and some of these have been exemplified with extracts from my mini-corpus. It could be demonstrated that the speakers used certain linguistic strategies (e.g.: addressing their fellow conversationalists with their proper names, using ritualised phrases as openings and closings for the meetings) to increase the positive atmosphere in the conversations and strengthen common ground. These strategies also helped them to reach their business goals.

6.2. Conclusions

This chapter examined how the speakers in the mini-corpus used particular utterances and phrases to reach certain politeness goals. The expressions were subsumed under the heading Pragmatic Expressions of Common Ground (PEoCG) and further divided into three sub-groups. The three categories of Pragmatic Expressions of Common Ground explained above are just one possibility of classifying them. Other categories could be
found but for the purpose of the present study the three classes illustrated above seem to be most appropriate. However, it should be mentioned that the expressions listed within the single categories can have various functions in different contexts. A single expression could, for example, on the one hand signal agreement and on the other hand create common ground. The classification of the expressions was made according to the identified main usage within the context of the business meetings (or exam situations). A full list of *Pragmatic Expressions of Common Ground* identified in my mini-corpus can be found in the appendix.

1. **The speaker presupposes common ground or understanding from the addressee**

   One group of expressions was used by the speaker to presuppose common ground, shared knowledge or understanding, i.e. s/he could not be sure whether these conditions actually existed. Phrases like “you know” conveyed to the hearer that s/he actually should know. However, in many cases the relevant phrases were only used to direct the addressee’s attention to the following explanation, exemplification or illustration. “You know” was the most frequently used sequence in this category and therefore it was examined in a longer chapter. Native and non-native speaker uses were compared. Non-native speakers often used “you know” as a sentence constituent in its literal function and the main function was to presuppose, emphasise or illustrate shared knowledge.

2. **The speaker signals his understanding / agreement**

   The second category of *Pragmatic Expressions of Common Ground* was described as comprising utterances that signal the speaker’s understanding or agreement. A large number of these expressions included the first person singular pronoun *I* (e.g.: “I understand”, “I see”, “I agree”). Another sub-group of expressions summarised what has already been said by the other speaker. These expressions were used to signal understanding or agreement and therefore contributed to the positive atmosphere in the conversation and to the building of common ground.

3. **The speaker creates common ground / understanding / a positive atmosphere in the conversation**

   A third category of *Pragmatic Expressions of Common Ground* was used to actively create a positive atmosphere in the conversation. The large variety of
expressions in this category could be divided into several sub-groups again. Using extracts from the mini-corpus once again it could be shown how the speakers used a range of expressions to create a polite and positive atmosphere within the business meetings.

As a conclusion it can be said that the speakers in my mini-corpus used a variety of *PEoCGs* to achieve numerous politeness goals. The American native speaker more often used optional elements (discourse markers) with several functions to increase common ground. The ELF speakers preferred to use sentence fragments or even full sentences with similar functions.

Interestingly enough, these *PEoCGs* were used by the examiners and the examinees alike. Both groups wanted to increase the positive atmosphere within the conversations.

Finally it can be claimed that *PEoCGs* are an important politeness strategy in those simulated business meetings.
7. Specialised Vocabulary as a Means of Developing ‘Groupness’

So far the analysis has concentrated on the discourse level. The final analysis chapter, however, will focus on lexis or more specifically on professional vocabulary. Specialised vocabulary is a necessary precondition for successful business discourse. Members of a particular group (company or organisation) come together in business meetings and they use a particular kind of jargon (technical or professional) to position themselves as members of that group. Although there are hardly any alternatives to the use of specialised vocabulary in business contexts, it is still an important aspect of business communication and fulfils various functions: It leads to a certain kind of ‘professional tenor’ within the interactions, it helps the interactants to claim in-group-membership, it builds and strengthens shared knowledge and increases common ground. Therefore the present chapter will deal with specialised vocabulary in business / exam discourse. It is claimed that specialised lexis is a strategic resource for the speaker used to claim in-group membership and to implicitly or explicitly draw on shared knowledge. This claim will be justified by means of several examples from my mini-corpus which will illustrate a couple of occurrences of professional vocabulary in my data.

7.1. A Definition of Specialised Vocabulary

For the examination of specialised vocabulary in the present study it was necessary to define what it actually is. Poncini’s (2004) definition does not only include technical expressions but also “lexical items related to topics or issues discussed at the meeting but not normally considered technical or specialized” (Poncini 2004: 151) as well as business-related expressions that belong to general English. Thus Poncini works with a rather broad definition of specialised vocabulary not limited to technical and professional jargon but comprising a large number of terms related to the business context.

This rather broad definition was taken up as a framework for the analysis of specialised vocabulary in the present diploma thesis. Specialised vocabulary could therefore be defined as a group of particular expressions not limited to the area of technical or professional jargon but comprising a range of lexical items related to the business context of the meetings. For the purpose of this diploma thesis the category of specialised vocabulary will be composed of technical and professional vocabulary, particular expressions related to the business or exam context of the meeting and business-related
terms in general English. Poncini points out that it is “necessary to look at long stretches of
data and not just short extracts when examining specialized lexis” (Poncini 2004: 151) and
therefore I had a close look at all my transcripts. In a process of detailed analysis all the
lexical items of a more specialised nature were collected. Afterwards it was possible to
divide these expressions into seven sub-groups of specialised lexis:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1) (General) Business, Sales and Finance / IT</strong></td>
<td>(General) Business, Sales&lt;br&gt;Customer / Clients / Business work / Sales / Meeting / competitors&lt;br&gt;Enterprise licence agreement / Company / Business issues / <strong>Finance and IT</strong>&lt;br&gt;Financial services / Bank / Accounts / Retail bank / Operational costs / Investment / Money / Reduce costs / Financing conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2) Products, Projects and People (General)</strong></td>
<td>Product / Project / Proposal / Colleagues / Contact point / Project application development / Project phases / Project management / Consultant / Salesman / User / Product selling /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4) Proper Names of other persons: Employees of ‘the company’, customers, managers, etc. or job descriptions</strong></td>
<td>Proper Names of Persons&lt;br&gt;[name1] / [last name1] / [last name10] / [name2] / [name3] / [name4] / [first name2] [last name2] / [first name3] [last name3] / Job descriptions&lt;br&gt;Sales specialist / Account manager / CEO / CIO / CFO / Project manager / Application developers / Key account manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5) IT-related</strong></td>
<td>IT-site / Mainframe / P-series / Software / Hardware / Database /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6) ‘International lexis’ (i.e. “lexis related to the international character of the company and its activities” (Poncini 2004: 152))</strong></td>
<td>Proper Names&lt;br&gt;Vienna / Moscow / Russia / Europe / Austria / USA / Croatia&lt;br&gt;Related Terms&lt;br&gt;Around the world / European standard / European market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7) Exam situation</strong></td>
<td>Sales call / Case studies / Graduation classes / Morning calls / Afternoon calls / Presentation / Calls / Students / Test / Assess / Observe / Feedback / Debrief / Teach point / Observers /</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table above summarises my framework and illustrates each sub-group with a concise list of examples from my mini-corpus. Another table comprising the full list of used lexical items for each category can be found in the appendix. It should be pointed out, however, that this system of classification can only give a rough division of lexical items into more or less broad groups. Some terms would fit into more than one category and were only charted once. This degree of inaccuracy has to be kept in mind while looking at this framework for specialised vocabulary in the business / exam situations in this study.

7.2. Three Points of Interest Concerning Specialised Vocabulary

The following detailed qualitative analysis will be based on three main questions:

1. How does specialised lexis contribute to common ground? How is it used by speakers? These questions will be dealt with using quantitative considerations as well as a close analysis of extracts from my mini-corpus. It will be shown that specialised vocabulary is a resource for speakers in business / exam contexts to negotiate common ground, enhance and maintain shared knowledge and create a sense of ‘groupness’ (Poncini 2004).

2. The second point of analysis will deal with the introduction of (perceived) new specialised lexical items. How does the speaker introduce a term when he does not know whether the addressee is familiar with it? Which (explicit or implicit) strategies are applied to avoid FTAs and to maintain common ground within the meeting?

3. A final point of analysis will concern some problematic aspects of the use of specialised lexis. The use of particular terms can be seen to lead to confusion, communication problems or even breakdowns. How these problems are handled in the meetings will be illustrated as a last topic.

All these questions or points of analysis will be illustrated with examples from my mini-corpus but again I would like to stress that the extracts can only give a rough overview. There are many more examples of the use of specialised lexis in my data and I can only give a small selection in this diploma thesis. However, these well-chosen extracts will hopefully support my main argument that specialised lexis is an important strategy of claiming common ground in a business / exam context.
7.2.1. Specialised Vocabulary as a Strategy of Creating, Maintaining or Presupposing Common Ground

It can be stated that the concentration of specialised vocabulary is really high in all the meetings recorded. This high density leads to the creation of a certain kind of tenor within the conversations, i.e. the tenor of a business meeting or the tenor of an exam situation. The large amount of specialised lexical items therefore suffices to create a sense of ‘groupness’ (Poncini 2004) within the interactions. Most of the time the conversationalists presuppose shared knowledge, i.e. they assume that their addressee is familiar with technical or specialised expressions and knows what he / she is talking about. Furthermore the speakers make a claim for their expert knowledge and professional identity. These assumptions will be illustrated in the extracts in the following chapters.

7.2.1.1. Negotiating and Adjusting Common Ground

The first two extracts are taken from Conversation 1, i.e. from the introductory meeting comprising the leaders of the international business school and the examiners. This meeting shows a high density of vocabulary belonging to Category 7 in my framework, i.e. expressions related to the exam situation. The leaders of the school explain to the examiners (most of them do this job for the first time) how the exams will be handled and what they will have to do. Furthermore some specialised terms – those terms which are specialised in the context of these particular business exams – have to be clarified.

CREATING Common Ground

The first extract is taken from the very beginning of my recordings where the first leader of the international business school (S3) starts his explanations of what the exams will be like in the upcoming days. For better readability all examples of specialised lexis will be in grey shadows:

**Extract 66:**

```
S3: [] graduation classes is really composed of two different parts kind of the the morning calls which are the case study (.and then the afternoon calls which is what we are doing here er th-this afternoon er let me start with the with the morning and I'll be brief about that (.and then the morning is a er ts a two week case study (.from from beginning day one a week ago today they started er all the way through thursday of this week (.and they work on a er er particular case (.particular customer (.called [org2] bank so it's in financial services it's a banking customer and they're working in in teams er calling on various customers and
```
clients within the bank to identify opportunities move (.) move the opportunities
forward close some business work on political (.) er issues (.) er build
relationships er (sow [org1] value) now everything that we would expect them
to do (.) and and so there's a a theme that you know (.) from call to call from
(.,) day to day the the case progresses and and moves moves forward hh so there's
lot of continuity in the case study through the through the two weeks and I'll finish
that (.) er Thursday morning with a presentation to an [org1] executive in (.) in
vienna and I'll wrap up the the case study

(MD I / Conversation 1)

The speaker does not presuppose shared knowledge in this case because he knows that his
dressees have never worked as examiners in such business exams before and therefore it
is unlikely that they know what exactly awaits them. However, S3 does not risk offending
his audience by asking explicit questions (e.g.: “Do you know what ‘graduation class’
means?”) but he rather starts his explanation right away and thereby creates common
ground. This strategy allows him to illustrate all the things necessary for the upcoming
exams without doing FTAs or offending his hearers. Interestingly enough, although S3
with his explanation does not presuppose common ground from his addressees, he uses the
sequence “you know” (underlined in the extract). This expression is normally used by a
speaker to explicitly presuppose common ground and shared knowledge with the hearers.
Although the speaker is about to explain the procedure and thereby makes clear that he
does not expect them to know everything about it, he signals the possibility that one of the
speakers knows something about the examinations by using the sequence “you know”. He
thereby includes the examiners into the group of possible “insiders” and reduces the
distance between the leaders of the international business school and the examiners. His
explanation shows a high concentration of specialised vocabulary. Although there are no
particularly technical terms the utterance is full of expressions that are specialised in the
context of the introductory session. This high concentration evokes the particular tenor of
an exam / school situation and also positions the participants in certain roles. The speaker
defines himself as the person in charge because he has the knowledge and he is able to
explain the situation to the others. Analysing the extract above two main findings can be
pointed out: On the one hand the speaker presupposes shared knowledge with his
addressees concerning the specialised lexis he uses, i.e. he assumes that the audience
knows what he means by “customer, presentation, [org1] executive, case study, etc.” and
he presumes that they know that he is talking about the fictitious scenarios used in the
exam situations. On the other hand he cannot presuppose common ground and shared
knowledge concerning the course of the ‘sales calls’ and therefore he gives a detailed explanation. In my opinion this extract illustrates very nicely how a speaker “increases common ground without the risk of offending hearers” (Poncini 2004: 155).

**PRESUPPOSING Common Ground**

The last example from Conversation 1 is taken from the end of the meeting. Administrative things are clarified, i.e. which examinees, which rooms and which scenarios the examiners should get:

**Extract 67:**

385 S2: the reason we asked you to come <4> (here are one) exactly to check </4> that you have got the right call and that cause we changed yours because of (.)
387 erm (.) <5> yeah </5> (.) <6> okay </6>
388 S3: yeah so <5> [S4] </5> you're doing D1
389 S4: D1 <6> yah </6>
390 SX-m: yeah
391 S2: fine
392 S3: okay and [S6] you're doing D2 (.) <7> and </7>
393 SX-m: <7> (D3) </7>
394 S3: [S5] you're doing
395 SX-m: D3 <8> okay yeah </8>
396 S3: <8> D: D3 </8> and </8> (.) D4 okay <9> erm </9>
397 S2: <9> D3 </9>
398 S1: <9> the location </9> is where
399 S2: <1> right </1>
400 S4: rooms yah

(MD I / Conversation 1)

An outsider would not understand the content of this conversation. The abbreviations “D1, D2, D3 and D4” cannot be resolved without some insider knowledge. Having some contextual information it can be inferred that these abbreviations refer to the different exam scenarios that will form the content of the exam situations. However, it is not clear what these scenarios are or consist of. The knowledge of these issues is definitely presupposed by the speakers. S3, the leader of the international business school, starts assigning scenarios to examiners without explaining what they are. He assumes that the examiners know what he is talking about and that they can apply their knowledge later on in the exam situations. This assumption seems to be confirmed by the examiners in two ways: Nobody asks for clarification and they signal their agreement and understanding by continuous back-channelling (underlined in the extract). The conversationalists rely on common ground and shared knowledge to make their conversation successful.
As a conclusion to the two extracts from the introductory meeting in Conversation 1 it can be said that they nicely illustrated different stages of presupposing shared knowledge: In extract 66 the speaker did not presuppose shared knowledge but rather explained the procedure of the exam situations and thereby increased common ground. Extract 67 demonstrates the obvious presupposition of shared knowledge because the abbreviations are not explained to the addressees. The examiners confirmed their common ground by using back-channels and thereby signalled agreement and understanding.

### 7.2.2. Introduction of (Perceived) New Specialised Lexical Items

On some occasions in my data one of the speakers used a specialised lexical item that was new or unknown to the addressee. Interestingly enough, such new specialised vocabulary was only introduced by the examiners, which could be linked to their more powerful role in the interactions. How the introduction of new specialised lexical items was successfully handled will be shown in the next few extracts from my mini-corpus (The relevant items of specialised lexis will once again be made prominent by using grey shadows.).

#### 7.2.2.1. Implicit Introduction of (Perceived) New Specialised Vocabulary

**Extract 68:**

2823 S24: <6> i mean </6> is it about the **feasibility** (.) is it about (.) knowing er
2824 whether it makes sense anyway doing that <7> or what </7> you expect from (.)
2825 from that
(MDV / Conversation 7)

The examiner (S24 = customer) uses the term “feasibility” in this extract. At first sight this is not marked as a new specialised lexical item but when he goes on, he defines the term (underlined in the extract). Thereby he signals that he is not sure whether the addressee is familiar with the term. However, he does not risk doing an FTA or offending the examinee / sales person and so he paraphrases the expression right after he first used it. There are two possible explanations why the examiner could think that the examinee does not understand the term “feasibility”. First it could be that this term is specialised in the context of a business meeting and the addressee is not familiar with this type of specialised jargon. However, it is even more likely that the examiner’s assumption is based on the ELF context of their interaction. English is not their mother tongue and therefore it is likely that more specialised terms are not known to all the participants. To prevent an unpleasant
situation the speaker clarifies the meaning of the term right after he used it. By using this strategy he avoids offending his addressee, builds common ground and increases shared knowledge. The addressee now has the possibility to incorporate the (maybe) new expression into his knowledge and how this is done is illustrated in the next extract:

**Extract 69:**

2950 S28: er so: the [org2] (.) erm (.) er requested investigation on the technology feasibility of this project (.) and er we (.) er (.) e:r (.) we've made a report for them (MD V / Conversation 7)

Extract 69 is taken from a later sequence of the same conversation. The examinee (S28 = sales person) obviously incorporated the term “feasibility” into his active vocabulary and already uses it in this utterance. As Poncini puts it: “[N]ew terminology becomes part of in-group language or ‘expert terminology’” (Poncini 2004: 170). It is thereby shown that he understood the term, i.e. either he already knew the term before the meeting, or the examiner’s explanation was successful.

7.2.2.2. Explicit Introduction of (Perceived) New Specialised Vocabulary

The following extract finally illustrates the use of an explicit strategy of introducing (perceived) new specialised items:

**Extract 70:**

3720 S30: <6> so </6> why should i <un> xx </un> [org1] rather than (.) a specialist er NICHE (.) supplier you know what a NICHE (.) supplier means
3721 S35: mhm (.) yah
(MD VI / Conversation 9)

The same examiner (S30 = customer) uses the specialised lexical item “niche supplier” in another sales call using the same scenario to challenge the examinee to provide reasons why ‘the company’ should do the project. This time the examiner uses a more explicit strategy of creating shared knowledge with his fellow conversationalist. He obviously does not know whether the examinee (S35 = sales person) is familiar with the expression but instead of providing an explanation he explicitly asks his addressee. This strategy contains a certain amount of risk for the addressee. If the examinee is not familiar with the term, he has to admit it and this can pose a threat to his face. As he is already in a weaker position due to the context of an exam situation, such an FTA could really undermine his standing in the meeting. However, in extract 72 everything works out well when the examinee clarifies that he knows what a “niche supplier” is. The extract above illustrates an explicit
strategy of introducing (perceived) new specialised items. Although this kind of strategy contains a certain amount of risk it can be successful as is shown in the present example.

This chapter illustrates some strategies used by different speakers to introduce new specialised lexical items into the business meeting. In all the examples the speakers cannot be a hundred percent sure whether the specialised terms were known to the addressees or not. Their assumptions can be based on the specific business context of the meetings or on the ELF context of the interactions. The examiners (who were the only ones to introduce perceived new lexical items) use different strategies to cope with these situations. They either implicitly introduce the perceived new piece of vocabulary by adding an explanation or they explicitly ask the addressee whether he is familiar with the particular expression or not. The speakers try to avoid FTAs or offences to the addressee and in the examples above they are successful. They manage to negotiate common ground and shared knowledge with their fellow conversationalists and thereby contribute to the positive atmosphere during the meetings.

7.2.3. Problems and Confusion due to Specialised Vocabulary

Misunderstandings and communication problems can be part of any conversation and they can have different sources. In my data there are some instances of problematic talk due to specialised lexis. It is argued that these cases of confusion are not only due to the specialised nature of the business exams but also because of the ELF background of the interactions. The speakers do not share common mother tongues but they use English as a lingua franca and this might lead to certain communication problems which will be discussed in the extracts below. (The problematic specialised lexical items will be made prominent by using grey shadows; other areas of interest will be underlined.).

7.2.3.1. “feasible” & “credibility” – Problems and Confusion Arising from the ELF (or Business) Context

The following extract nicely illustrates various communication problems and confusions with different sources and resolutions:

**Extract 71:**

3686 \( S30: \) yah i would like to ask your ([S35]) you you read my er (...) estimates and so
3687 on do you think e:r (...) is it feasible this (...) this project (...) these figures what i told
3688 er this (...) concept is this feasible
S35: yes it's er (. ) in my opinion from e:r (. ) opinion from [org1] is er feasible (. )
S36: appropriate
S35: appropriate with er (. ) [org1] view of er (. ) current er situation (. ) so (. ) as
you remember we discussed on our (. ) last meeting if you about (. ) our view and
er (. ) our expectation from this project (. ) as you (. ) remember (. ) <3> yes </3>
S30: <3> yes </3>
S35: so actual is (. ) really (. ) <L1ru> xxxxxxxx </L1ru>
S36: so actual is (. ) really (. ) visible
S30: feasible yes?
S35: feasible yeah
S30: how (. ) does [org1] have (. ) credibility (. ) in this area (3)
S35: er (. ) what do (. ) what do you mean by credibility (. ) just
S30: i mean (. ) can we trust that [org1] e:r (. ) ha- e:r has er (. ) experience and er
can (. ) help us in in this (. ) [name15] project
S35: of course (. ) we work together and er (. ) work on this project bana-
[name15] (. ) so (. ) we (1) now (1) first of all have a real experience (. ) in this
(MD VI / Conversation 9)

The topic of this sales call is once again a project that should be done by ‘the company’ for
the customer company. In the extract above the customer (S30 = examiner) wants to know
whether the project is “feasible” for ‘the company’ and whether they have “credibility” in
this area. Several communication problems or confusions arise in this sequence and many
different strategies are applied to resolve them:

When the examiner / customer asks the sales person (S35 = examinee) whether the
project is “feasible”, this specialised lexical item does not seem to be a problem. The
addressee reacts appropriately and is able to provide an answer. However, when he tries to
paraphrase the term “feasible”, he does not know the correct English expression. In his
confusion he utters the Russian word and an observer (S36) helps him out and provides the
English version “appropriate”. In this sequence it seems to be clear that the confusion
arises from the lingua franca context of the meeting. English is not the mother tongue of
the participants and they do not always find the correct terms as fast as necessary. The
speaker uses a number of hesitation devices (i.e. pauses and hesitation markers like “er,
erm:"”) which give him time to search for the correct lexical item. However, when he does
not find it, he uses his mother tongue and by doing so explicitly demands help from his
colleagues (the Russian observers). When S36 helps him out, the examinee / sales person
repeats the correct term “appropriate” and continues his explanation.

The next problematic sequence appears when the examinee / sales person
pronounces the term “feasible” in the wrong way, namely as “visible”. However, this
mispronunciation only causes a minor interruption. Instead of threatening the examinee’s
face by referring explicitly to his mistake, the examiner / customer just repeats the expression with the correct pronunciation. By using this strategy he clarifies that he understood the term correctly without focusing on the speaker’s mistake. The examinee reacts by repeating the lexical item once more in the right version, thereby confirming that he understood him correctly.

Right after this problem is solved, the next confusion can be spotted. When the examiner / customer asks whether ‘the company’ has “credibility” in the area of such projects, the examinee / sales person does not answer the question at first. A longer pause of about three seconds is followed by an explicit request for clarification. Obviously the examinee / sales person used the pause to think about the problematic specialised lexical item but could not decode it correctly. As he is still in an exam situation, which means that he is supposed to give good answers to the examiner’s questions, he explicitly asks the examiner to provide an explanation in line 3700. This could be seen as an FTA to his own face as he has to admit that he does not understand the speaker. However, in the context of the exam situation it seems to be the appropriate strategy to prevent further communication problems and to be able to answer the question. The examiner / customer provides an explanation without offending the examinee / sales person. Finally the examinee / sales person is able to answer the question. He starts his response with the discourse marker “of course”, which can be interpreted as a mitigating device as if he would say: “thank you for your explanation – I already thought that you meant it like that”. In this case it cannot be known whether the examinee / sales person did not understand the term because of his Russian mother tongue, i.e. because he does not understand the English expression, or whether he did not understand the term in the specialised business context. This question has to be left open for further interpretation.

Extract 71 shows a high density of communication problems with different sources and resolutions and finally the communication can proceed smoothly and without further problems. It is therefore argued that even if misunderstandings or confusions occur in business / exam talk, they can be resolved in a positive way and without causing serious problems or communication breakdowns.
7.3. Conclusion
This chapter examined the use of specialised vocabulary in a business / exam context. It was argued that professional lexis contributes to common ground, shared knowledge and a positive conversation atmosphere and this argument was illustrated with a series of extracts from my mini-corpus. Three main questions were identified for the detailed analysis and the following conclusions can be drawn:

1. The use of specialised vocabulary in various ways contributes to the notion of common ground in business / exam contexts. A high density of specialised lexical items was shown to create a particular tenor (i.e. the tenor of a business meeting, the tenor of an exam situation, etc.) and thereby it enforced the sense of community among the participants. On some occasions shared knowledge was explicitly presupposed and on other occasions it was enhanced or enforced by providing explanations or introducing new specialised items, which was also the second research topic.

2. Sometimes it became necessary to introduce new specialised lexical items. However, it was not always clear whether the expression was really new and this influenced the relevant strategies. The ELF context of the interactions also influenced the introduction of new specialised terms because the speaker could not be sure whether the addressee was unfamiliar with the specialised meaning of the term or with the English expression itself. Different strategies (implicit or explicit) were used by the speakers to introduce perceived new specialised lexical items. These strategies then contributed to the creation of common ground and shared knowledge and thereby strengthened the sense of ‘groupness’ (Poncini 2004) and the positive conversation atmosphere within the meetings.

3. Finally it was observed that specialised vocabulary could lead to confusion and communication problems and different strategies were used to resolve these situations. All the problems were resolved in a positive way and the conversations could proceed smoothly and without major interruptions.

As a conclusion it is argued that although there is hardly any alternative for the use of more or less specialised business vocabulary in business meetings, it nevertheless fulfils various functions within the conversations. The examination showed that specialised lexis was used to presuppose or create common ground and shared knowledge, to evoke a particular
‘business tenor’ within the meetings and position the participants in relation to each other within the business context. Although the specialised terms also led to confusion and communication problems, they constitute an important factor in business conversations and should be the topic of further investigation.
8. Implications for Teaching Business English

As my future profession will be that of an ELT practitioner it is appropriate to conclude my diploma thesis with some implications that my analysis of ELF business / exam conversations could have for teaching Business English. How should Business English be taught? What should be focused on in training business people? How should intercultural competence be included in the teaching of Business English? Two main implications for teaching Business English are identified in the present study:

8.1. Foci in Teaching English for Business Purposes

English for Business Purposes belongs to the vast field of ESP (i.e. English for Specific Purposes). Although there is a large amount of literature on this topic (cf.: Kennedy & Bolitho 1984; Hutchinson & Waters 1987; Dudley-Evans & St John 2001; Robinson 1991; Williams, Swales & Kirkman 1984), it is rather difficult to find a definition for the concept of ESP. Hutchinson and Waters (1987: 5 – 15) do not provide a definition of the concept at all but instead give a description of the origins and developments in ESP. According to Kennedy and Bolitho (1984: 3) “ESP has its basis in an investigation of the purposes of the learner and the set of communicative needs arising from those purposes”. A much more detailed definition is provided by Dudley-Evans and St John (2001). Their explanation comprises two sets of characteristics and will be quoted in the following paragraphs:

1. Absolute characteristics:
   - ESP is designed to meet specific needs of the learner;
   - ESP makes use of the underlying methodology and activities of the disciplines it serves;
     ESP is centred on the language (grammar, lexis, register), skills, discourse and genres appropriate to these activities.

2. Variable characteristics:
   - ESP may be related to or designed for specific disciplines;
   - ESP may use, in specific teaching situations, a different methodology from that of general English;
   - ESP is likely to be designed for adult learners, either at a tertiary level institution or in a professional work situation. It could, however, be used for learners at secondary school level;
   - ESP is generally designed for intermediate or advanced students. Most ESP courses assume basic knowledge of the language system, but it can be used with beginners.

(Dudley-Evans & St John 2001: 4, 5 – original emphasis)
ESP is usually divided into two main areas: English for Academic Purposes (EAP) and English for Occupational Purposes (EOP) (cf.: Dudley-Evans & St John 2001: 5 – 7; Kennedy & Bolitho 1984: 4). EOP is designed for learners who “need to use English as part of their work or profession” (Kennedy & Bolitho 1984: 4). English for Business Purposes (EBP) forms a large and important category within EOP (sometimes it is also described as a separate category because of its growing importance) (Dudley-Evans & St John 2001: 7). Today it is important for every business person to have some command of English to be able to participate in international or global business (Gnutzmann & Intemann 2005: 21). Thus, EBP is a very fast growing field of English Language Teaching (ELT) where a lot of research has already been done and according to my examination of ELF business / exam conversations some approaches should be reconsidered as follows:

8.1.1. **Vocabulary vs. Discourse Competence**

Teaching English for Business Purposes very often has a strong focus on lexis and structures. There are many course and practice books on business or professional vocabulary and technical jargon (cf.: Mascull 2002) and on specialised topics like for example telephoning, having meetings, writing business reports, etc. (cf.: Comfort, Revell & Stott 1984; Naterop & Revell 2004). However, discourse competences are often neglected. In my opinion it is important to raise the learner’s awareness for the subtleties of language usage. Learning professional vocabulary and prefabricated chunks of language like ‘Could you possibly…?’, ‘Do you mind my asking if…?’ or ‘If it’s alright with you…?’ (Dudley-Evans & St John 2001: 69) by heart is just one end of the scale. These phrases and lexical items can be helpful at the beginning of the learning process to gain some confidence and to be able to utter those prefabricated chunks in stressful situations. However, it is important that speakers of Business English are able to use particular discourse strategies to show politeness, negotiate common ground and strengthen the sense of ‘groupness’ (Poncini 2004) within the interactions. Such discourse strategies are exemplified in the present study with examinations of the subtle meanings of the first person plural pronoun *we* in business meetings and the use of what was defined as *Pragmatic Expressions of Common Ground* to strengthen the positive atmosphere within a meeting. These and other similar areas are often neglected or described as impossible to teach (cf. Müller 2005) in Business English courses but some more attention should be
drawn to them as they are important strategies of negotiating common ground and thereby also of reaching professional goals in business meetings.

8.1.2. ‘Soft Skills’: Negotiating Common Ground in Business Interactions

Another important area of business communication that is very often neglected is the importance of socialising or the strengthening of interpersonal relationships. According to Koester (2006: 162) “the relational dimension of language is an extremely important aspect of spoken interaction, even in business communication”. Poncini points out that learners should

be made aware of the importance of opportunities to socialize as a way to build common ground, which in turn facilitates communication and paves the way towards achieving common [business] goals.

(Poncini 2004: 296 – my insertion in brackets)

The present diploma thesis shows how different linguistic strategies are employed to create a positive atmosphere within the interactions. These strategies also fulfil various other purposes: the speakers negotiate common ground, create shared knowledge and convey their feelings of sympathy and good-will to their fellow conversationalists. They use subtle ways of relating to the other meeting participants as strategic devices within the meetings and these certainly contribute to the achievements of business goals. Although some Business English training books already deal with socialising and small talk (cf.: Frendo 2005) the presence of interpersonal aspects in every business interaction has not yet been widely acknowledged. Even in cases where speakers do not actually have small talk they very often express respect or sympathy for each other, evoke their in-group-membership or strengthen common ground. These aspects of business communication should be addressed in EBP courses and the students’ awareness for these strategies should be increased.

8.2. English as a Vehicle for International Business Communication

According to Dudley-Evans and St John (2001: 53) “English has become the international language of business” and

most English-medium communications in business are non-native speaker to non-native speaker (NNS – NNS), and the English they use is International English, not that of native speakers (NS) of English-medium countries such as the UK and Australia.

(Dudley-Evans & St John 2001: 53)
This view is supported by many other researchers like, for example, by Poncini, who claims that “training needs to give attention to multicultural business settings and the use of English as a common language” (Poncini 2004: 295). Meierkord and Knapp summarise the opinion of various linguists when they argue that “most learners of English will employ the language mainly for communication with other non-native speakers” (Meierkord & Knapp 2002: 20, 21).

Nevertheless, English Language Teaching (henceforth ELT) still very much orients towards a native speaker model or a concept called “Standard English” (cf. Gnutzmann 2005, Seidlhofer 2001 & 2004). These approaches to ELT are viewed as problematic or doubtful by many researchers and nowadays theoreticians as well as practitioners are looking for a new model for teaching English as a second language. An influential idea is that if English is “used as a lingua franca, it should be taught as such” (Meierkord & Knapp 2002: 21). This again is problematic as there are no clearly defined characteristics of English as a lingua franca at the moment. However, some linguists claim that “a further codification or standardization of English as a lingua franca is possible” (Meierkord & Knapp 2002: 21). Among them are Crystal (2005), who suggests that English should become a global language as ‘World Standard English’, Jenkins (2001), who deals with universal pronunciation rules for an international English and Seidlhofer (2000 – quoted in Meierkord & Knapp 2002: 22), who describes the lexico-grammatical features of ELF. Nevertheless the codification of ELF is still a very young project and “there is no thoroughly described – let alone institutionalised – variety of ELF as yet and so it is not possible to teach and learn it” (Gnutzmann & Intemann 2005: 21). However, Burger (2000 – quoted in Meierkord & Knapp 2002: 22) provides some interesting suggestions concerning changes in ELT:

revision of the native speaker as a model for English language teaching, acceptance of hybrid learner varieties, dominance of communicativity over correctness, increased coverage of second language varieties of English, inclusion of non-native varieties in listening training, stressing intelligibility of pronunciation over native speaker acceptance, train negotiation of meaning, raise intercultural awareness.

(Meierkord & Knapp 2002: 22)

In my opinion these suggestions are really interesting and valuable because they provide a rough overview on the issues that are of importance in teaching English as a second language for non-native speaker – non-native speaker communication. According to Beneke (1991 – quoted in Gnutzmann 2005: 116) “80 % of interactions in which
English is used as a foreign or second language happen without the presence of native speakers”. International business is on the rise and business people not only have to be able to communicate in English within their company but also with representatives from other companies in a global context. Therefore I agree with Dudley-Evans and St John’s statement that

[i]nternational English is about effective communication and, as one of our course participants put it, ‘I’m not a native speaker. I don’t want people to forget that. We come from different cultures and ways of thinking; if my language sounds too good, people won’t remember that.’ NNSs want to communicate effectively, but not necessarily like NSs; and NSs of standard English also need to learn to use International English.
(Dudley-Evans & St John 2001: 54 – my emphasis)

This could also be observed in my data. The different non-native speakers display a characteristic pronunciation but although they not always manage to communicate accurately (according to native speaker standards), they nevertheless are able to communicate effectively. In all the transcripts only minor disruptions could be located but although several hours of data were analysed, no actual communication breakdown could be found. Instances of inaccuracy are in most cases ignored like in the extracts below:

**Extract 72:**

3976 S38: and er (.) probably i- (.) and erm (.) one of the bigger (.) advantages of this (.)
3977 solution is that e:r in the future (.) if you are interesting in (.) implementing
3978 there another solution or another project it er will be er (.) it will be easier (.) you
3979 can do it er easily and without e:r <8> any </8> any problems
3980 S24: <8> mhm </8> (.)
(MD VII / Conversation 10)

**Extract 73:**

1854 S1: er (.) i don’t know the <pvc> strait </pvc> number but we can ask
1855 my colleagues <un> xxxx </un> number <5> so we </5> can ask them for (.) for
1856 exact number of <6> of p-</6> series and licences they have
1857 S17: <5> mhm </5> aha <6> okay (.)
(MD III / Conversation 5)

The extracts above show minor grammatical or pronunciation problems but these do not hinder successful communication. The speakers just continue their talk (probably they do not even notice their mistakes) and the addressees ignore them (or do not notice them either). As long as the speakers are able to understand each other they tolerate “hybrid learner varieties” (Meierkord & Knapp 2002: 22) and non-native pronunciation. Therefore Dudley-Evans and
St John’s claim is supported that in EBP “the primary concern is to communicate effectively, not necessarily totally accurately” (Dudley-Evans & St John 2001: 73).

In my opinion it is important that in teaching English as a foreign or second language the students’ awareness is raised that very likely they will in most cases communicate with other non-native speakers of English. As long as there are no agreed upon characteristics and features of ELF as a particular variety of English, it is important that “training materials […] [move] beyond interactions between members of two cultures, especially when one of them is English-speaking” (Poncini 2004: 295). Native speaker English should not be accepted as the only possible standard for teaching English as a foreign language and several accents as well as non-native varieties should be integrated into the ELT classroom. This is especially true for the teaching of Business English with regard to the globalisation of the economy.
9. Conclusion

The main purpose of this diploma thesis was the description of successful ELF business / exam talk. The particular focus was set on interpersonal features, i.e. on the negotiation of common ground, the presupposing or strengthening of shared knowledge and the creation of a positive atmosphere within the conversations in general. After a first examination of the transcripts and recordings based on common sense and personal interests three features were identified as particularly interesting:

- the use of the pronoun *we*
- the use of specific linguistic features used to negotiate common ground with the conversation partner (e.g.: you know, nice to meet you, etc.)
- the use of specialised vocabulary

These features are not associated with interpersonal functions at first sight but nevertheless I noticed that they were used strategically by the speakers for various interpersonal purposes within the conversations. They managed to establish a sense of ‘groupness’ (Poncini 2004) by using these subtle linguistic strategies. According to Poncini (2004: 19) many researchers up to now focused on problematic aspects, instances of miscommunication or even communication breakdown in ELF interactions. However, one of the main findings in my diploma thesis was that almost no major communicative problems and definitely no communication breakdowns occurred in the recorded conversations. The speakers showed a remarkable ability and willingness to tolerate anomalous usage and marked linguistic behaviour, even in the face of what appears […] to be usage that is at times acutely opaque.

(Firth 1996: 247)

In my diploma thesis, it was therefore the primary aim to focus on successful lingua franca interactions and identify strategies that contributed to success within the interactions.

Adding to the complexity of the examination the two-fold nature of my data always had to be considered: On the one hand my recordings consisted of exam situations and on the other hand they could be classified as business discourse (as the exams comprised simulated sales calls and business meetings). From the beginning, the conversations developed quite naturally and displayed many similarities to ‘real business meetings’. Nevertheless, this two-fold nature of the data influenced the structure of the conversations, speaker roles and identities and power structures. These important factors always had to be kept in mind and added to the complexity of the analysis process. However, in some cases it was found that the two levels had very similar characteristics: Concerning power relations, for example, it could be illustrated that they were similar on the exam as well as on the business level of the
interactions. In the exam situation the examiner definitely had more power than the examinee as s/he was the person to evaluate and assess the other participant. In the business meetings the examiners mostly represented customers of ‘the company’ (except once when the examiner represented the CEO of ‘the company’). The examinees represented sales people from ‘the company’. The customers could definitely be regarded as the more powerful ones in the sales calls as they had the possibility to go to another provider whereas the sales people need to sell their products to the customers. Therefore, with regard to power relations within the conversations it can be said that they were similar on both levels. Nevertheless, the two-fold nature of the data always had to be considered and integrated into the examination.

As was already mentioned before the focus of this study was on interpersonal functions of three particular identified features: Using many extracts from my transcripts as illustrations and exemplifications I was able to show how the use of the pronoun *we*, the use of particular linguistic markers (which I termed *Pragmatic Expressions of Common Ground*) and the use of specialised vocabulary contributed to the negotiation of common ground, the presupposing or strengthening of shared knowledge and the creation of a positive atmosphere in the conversations in general.

The speakers successfully used the first person plural pronoun *we* to create an imaginary group uniting the two companies (the customer company and ‘the company’). They conveyed an atmosphere of shared interests and shared responsibility and thereby evoked the collaborative nature of the interactions. Furthermore they used *we* to build and strengthen the sense of ‘groupness’ (Poncini 2004) within ‘the company’. This usage was exemplified within the sales manager meeting where only members of ‘the company’ were present. Participants’ *we*-usages emphasised the individual’s in-group-membership as well as the shared interests, responsibilities and knowledge of the team within ‘the company’. Finally the first person plural pronoun was used to back up the opinion of a single speaker with the consent of the whole company. This usage was called ‘institutional *we*’ (cf. Drew & Heritage 1992) and it demonstrated in-group-membership with larger communities as well as it evoked a collective / corporate speaker identity.

A range of particular expressions was identified as actively contributing to the positive and collaborative atmosphere within the conversations. After some initial problems in categorisation these expressions were labelled *Pragmatic Expressions of Common Ground*. These were used by the speakers to presuppose or create common ground, shared knowledge or agreement as well as to signal understanding or agreement. It was shown that the native speaker of American English (one of the leaders of the international business school)
predominantly used discourse markers to fulfil various pragmatic functions. The non-native (or ELF) speakers of English more often used phrases or expressions, that were sentence constituents, or even short sentences to fulfil particular pragmatic functions. These Pragmatic Expressions of Common Ground were identified as important features within the conversations as they particularly contributed to the cooperative atmosphere (cf. Meierkord 2000; Firth 1996) within the interactions.

Concerning specialised vocabulary it has to be stressed that a very broad definition is used in this diploma thesis. Not only technical and professional jargon was included but also general business terms like, for example, project, account, sales, bank, etc. It was illustrated that this kind of vocabulary contributed to the sense of community within the meetings as it created a certain kind of tenor (that of a business situation) within the interactions. Furthermore it was used to create, enhance and presuppose shared knowledge, to evoke a professional identity and to make a claim for expert knowledge. A brief examination of the introduction of (perceived) new specialised lexical items as well as of some problems that could arise from the use of specialised vocabulary showed that although these particular lexical items could also cause problems all of them could be resolved and the interactions could proceed smoothly and without major interruptions.

As I am a future English teacher I wanted to include some implications for teaching Business English. It was argued that teaching Business English (or English for Specific Purposes in general) often has a strong focus on vocabulary and pre-given structures. Although specialised vocabulary certainly is important in Business English, more emphasis should also be given to discourse competences. Furthermore the development of ‘soft skills’ like socialising and strengthening interpersonal relationships should be dealt with in training contexts. In my opinion it is important to raise the students’ awareness for the subtleties of language and to expose them to realistic language within the classroom. Finally the growing importance of English as a lingua franca, i.e. as a tool for international communication between non-native speakers of English, should be foregrounded. Although “[t]here is no thoroughly described – let alone institutionalised – variety of ELF as yet and so it is not possible to teach and learn it” (Gnutzmann & Intemann 2005: 21), it should be integrated in every language classroom and in Business English classes in particular.

As a conclusion it can be said that this diploma thesis wanted to concentrate on successful ELF interactions in a business / exam context and that it hopefully contributes to the empirical basis that is still needed for further ELF research.
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11.1. Appendix 1: List of Abbreviations

[org…] → organisations (including the company where I did my recordings)

[name…] → projects, abbreviations (of projects)

[first name…]
[last name…] → people who do not appear as speakers in the transcripts
11.2. Appendix 2: Full Transcriptions

MD I / Conversation 1

recording duration: 00:24:36
date of event: 2007-05-21
person id: S1 age: 40+ sex: male langKnowledge: L1 Croatian (Croatia) position: examiner [org1]
person id: S2 age: 35+ sex: male langKnowledge: L1 English (Great Britain) position: leader of [org3]
person id: S3 age: 40+ sex: male langKnowledge: L1 English (America) position: leader of [org3]
person id: S4 age: 30+ sex: female langKnowledge: L1 German (Austria) position: examiner [org1]
person id: S5 age: 35+ sex: male langKnowledge: L1 Russian (Russia) position: examiner [org1]
person id: S6 age: 35+ sex: male langKnowledge: L1 German (Austria) position: examiner [org1]
person id: S7 age: 25 sex: female langKnowledge: L1 German (Austria) position: researcher

setting: in a hotel

1 <beg MD I Conversation 1_00:00:47>
S3: --- three previous classes where we take them through and a number of selling skills and theories and you know give them the structure of how to: how to conduct a sales call and they've had opportunities to practice in all these classes along the way doing numerous smaller case studies leading up to this final class which basically you know what we're doing is a kind of giving them the final okay that they're ready to go out and and carry the [org1] back and be sales representatives in [org1] numerous functions that they would er overalls that they would have within [org1] sales

hh erm graduation classes is really composed of two different parts kind of the the morning calls which are the case study and then the afternoon calls which is what what we are doing here th-this afternoon er let me start with the with the morning and I'll be brief about that the morning is a two week case study from from beginning day one a week ago today they started all the way through thursday of this week they work on a particular case particular customer called [org2] bank so it's in financial services it's a banking customer and they're working in teams calling on various customers and clients within the bank to identify opportunities move move the opportunities forward close some business work on political issues er build relationships er (sow [org1] value) now everything that we would expect them to do and so there's a theme that you know from call to call from day to day the the case progresses and and moves moves forward hh so there's a lot of continuity in the case study through the two weeks and I'll finish that er thursday morning with a presentation to an executive in vienna and I'll wrap up the the case study now what we're hear today er is what we call the afternoon visiting manager (.) calls we er er ask to er your assistance and and others before you that have you know come in to take calls for an afternoon and help us assess the students on their readiness er to be in sales (.) these calls have nothing to do with the case study (.) they're stand alone different scenarious
different calls (.) that they would get (.) er everyday (.) and er (.) it's just an-
other way of of testing their ability to (.) take a scenario (.) do some (.) some
research (.) the call (.) conduct an effective call (.) er with with someone
who they haven't seen before or haven't they haven't called on before so just gives
them another er er opportunity to to work on their skills and for us to (.) to test
and assess their (.) their skills as as well because one of the things that we will ask
you to do is er evaluate (.) the the student and give them a grade on on their calls
and I'll go through that er in in a few in a few minutes that whole grade er scenario
the er the structure of the afternoon and I [S2] is going to (burn off) more (.) of of
the schedules I guess we didn't have enough of those but the calls will start at at
two o'clock (.) and e:r (.) there'll there'll be you'll you'll either have three or four
most of you have four calls and one of you will have three calls (.) erm (.) and and
each call (.) will last about forty-five minutes ( .) and let me tell you how (.) how
that process works (.) the the actual call itself where the student you know knocks
on your your door comes in an-and plays the role of the [org1] seller (.) that will
last twenty minutes (.) maybe twenty-five minutes at the very very most (.) er the
student or the seller should be responsible for (.) monitoring the time keeping
track of of time and they've been told they have about twenty minutes on your
calendar (.). erm if they start going a lot longer for some reason (.) we need to stop
them yes
S1: who is going to track the time? is it is it our responsibility?
S3: er well
S1: do i have to end it or is somebody erm kind of moderating it and say well
S3: No, it it erm i-i-it ultimately is you th-th-that some of themselves should be
monitoring and in about twenty minutes should be wrapping up the call but if you
you know see or notice that it's you know twenty-five minutes or so you you
should stop it by just saying oh (.) I have another meeting I have an airplane to
catch or or whatever (.) an-an-and stop the call (.). erm if you would like (.) you
you do have the option of er there'll be others in the room that will observe (.) you
can ask one of them (.) to you know watch the time and say if if this goes (.) you
know twenty minutes let let me know but (.) but ult imately the seller should be
that but you would stop the call if they (.) continue to: er to go to long
okay (.) so you can see we're we're on er visiting manager <un> xxxxx </un> e:r
monday today and e:r it has which which call that you are signed except [S5] and
[S1] you know have switched <@> calls </@> dfour and d-three and er below
that it it tells you the names of the student (.) who will see you (.) who will call on
you at a particular time so [S4] at at two o'clock [name1] will will call on you now
there'll be (.) three others that will be with [name1] you don't have their names up
here but th-they are down here at the bottom (.) er so you you you
S4: er this is team then (.) or what
S3: er if you see A <1> A A you'll be team A </1>
S4: <1> A Team A yah okay </1>
S3: so you have [name1] [name2] <2> [name3] and [name4] (.). they will they will
all (.) all be there </2> but [name1] will be the one who'll who will conduct the
call er with you at at two o'clock
S4: <2> yah yah okay </2> <3> mhm </3>
S3: and (.) after they they finished their call again twenty twenty-five minutes
S4: mhm
S3: then you go through a process of (.) erm (.) providing feedback going through a a a debrief there's a lot of different ways to do a a debrief of a of a call s- you know so whatever you are (.) you you're comfortable without tell you what i do you don't have to do it (.) this way but i i once the call stops i usually ask the the seller what were your objectives (.) for the call what did you want to accomplish (.) er in in this call and there'll er tell me a little bit about that and i also go through er and ask them what did you want me as the customer to take away from this call (.) what is it you wanted me to (.) either know or feel or feel differently about [org1] as a result of this call (.) and see if they have an objective for the customer (.) if they don't have a good objective for the customer that's always a very good teach point (.) with them
S4: <4> mhm </4>
S3: <4> that </4> you know how you know if the call was successful unless you accomplish something with the customer (.) and what did you want to accomplish with the with the customer (.) okay? erm then i usually ask them well based on those objectives (.) what did you like wh-what did you what felt right about the call? what did you like? what went well in the call? and er (.) then likewise i say (.) was there anything you'd like to change or do differently something you didn't like (.) a-a-about about the call (.) then i normally go to the observers (.) in the room and with the observers i say (.) give me one or two things that you er observed that was positive about er [name1]'s call i-i want them to-to stick really more to the positive of the call and leave the you know what would be better if for me as the as the facilitator as the er as the calltaker (.) erm so i-i let them (.) say a few things and then i give them my: my thoughts and my comments and the reason i do it that way is is because it also gives me an opportunity to jot a few things down not (does it base on) what they're saying but as they're talking i-i write some of my comments down on the on the call sheet do we have do we have
S2: <5> yes yeah yeah there are some </5> 108
S3: <5> some <un> xxxx </un> sheets so we can okay thank you </5>
erm (.) an then (that leads me up) to write some things down and then i give them my my feedback (.) and in my feedback consists of of both you know here are some things that (.) that i thought you did well (.) in in the call (.) but here are some things that i think if you had done or you know think about doing it differently (.) it would have made the call even stronger or even even better (.) a-an-and that's how i do that the debrief erm others (.) you know I've seen others after the call send everybody out of the room and they c- write their comments and then bring everybody back and have the discussion th-there's numerous ways whatever (.) whatever you feel comfortable doing i i will tell you that (.) it's very (.) natural and all the students are very comfortable about hearing the feedback and comments for each other (.) and even seeing and knowing what th-the grades are
S4: <6> mhm </6>
S3: <6> from </6> from everybody they they've been doing this for you know this is the fourth class now (.) that they have er have done there since [S2] has passed this out
[S2] can i have that other
S2: yeah sure
S3: other copy this is the (.) er assessment form or the grading sheet that
we'll we'll need you to to fill out (.) on each student. each student or each seller
will bring this to you in the call so they'll have filled out their name and the
information on on the top
couple of things we need you to do one (.). sign it and-and put today's date (.) er the
written comments any comments that you like to write about er for the student
(they will) get a copy of this so (.). you know write comments that er (.) er
you know they can look at later and and kind of understand o-or make sense in
terms of (.) you know (.). opening was was weak or you know need
need such and such you know ask more questions about (.). this to quantify or
qualify (.). you know tho-those types of of things can o-o r things that they did well
you can you can write in in the comment (.). comment box then we need to give
them an overall (.) grade and there's (.) six options here one through (.). one
through six erm let me start with one (.). one is the best grade one is an excellent
description about the call you know it says er excellent every way could not be
better
S2: well
S3: every call could could be better
SS: <7> @@ @ <7>
S3: <7> in some in some <7> way even if [S2] did it i think
S2: <8> @@ @ <8>
S3: <8> we could probably find <8> some- <@> -thing that <@> that c- that
could be better i i don't know but erm i i always try to think about it from the
standpoint of you know just based on where they're at in their training (.) right
now certainly they're not going to perform like a (.). six seven year veteran er
doing doing sales calls but you know if if they they do a nice job of call
structure it's logical it makes sense (.). they've er made you feel good as the
customer you think that they're here to to to help you they provide (.). some plan to
move forward some some next step that makes makes sense (.). erm an-and you
know you you can't think of a whole lot of er-things to: to talk to them about that
might have bettered the call then it might be a one (.) erm we have had a few not
many i-it c- it can happen (.). erm so that would be that would be a one a six let's
go to the other (.). end of the scale six is the worst call i mean the worst grade you
could get the worst call you could do (.). erm as it says down here they basically
would have done some harm (.). you know something offensive er a a major
infraction of business contact guidelines you know they er they they hit the the the
er
S4: customer <9> @@ @@ @@ <9>
S3: <9> the customer <9> you know <1> they <un> xxxxx <un> on the desk
S4: <1> (the exe- the executive right) </1>
S2: <1> (the exe- the executive right) </1>
S4: <1> @@ @ </1>
S3: you know they they did something illegal you know in in the call something
something that you know the next call [org1] would have to bring in the lawyers
or or <2> managers to <2> to fix or t- <3> or to correct <3> so yah so tha- that
would be that would be did harm
SX-m: <2> @@ @ </2>
S2: <3> very expensive </3>
S3: and then we have a lot of (.) you know xx </un> we have fourth four
grades in in the middle so let me let me try to divide these in in half. one two and
three (.) are passing grades. so one of the first things you might wanna look at is
okay was was this (.) acceptable to would this be passing (.) erm </un> xxxxx
what does passing mean? well passing you know in from the standpoint
that you you might look at this. did they do an acceptable job? that okay if they if
they did this call with the customer (.) it would be okay (1) you know then if that's
the case then it might be a three (.) something a little bit better where they (.) got
you a little more excited you know moved move the opportunity a little bit further
(.) got you <4> to agree to </4> you know some some major a-agreement or
accomplishment
SX-m: <4> <clears throat> </4>
S3: in the call then that might be a t- a two (.) okay (.) erm
S2: erm something also (1) where i be thinking about giving (.) if i'm looking at
giving a two (.) would i like this person to be working on my <5> team (.) yah (.)
would i employ this person </5>
S3: <5> team yah mhm yah </5>
S4: <5> mhm (2) mhm </5>
S2: that's a great thing about grad class as well it's a great camp for you guys to
find good <6> talent for the future okay it's @@ @@@ i can see you're gonna thinking
there yah @@ @ </6>
S5: <6> @@@@@@@@@ </6>
S2: so yeah (.) would you like this person on your team?
S3: so is yeah (.) would you like this person on your team?
S2: so is it is it passing is it is it not passing (.) and that kind of tells you is it a one
two or three or a four five or o-o-or six. so i-i always ask the calltakers to look at
it from two standpoints (.) one is the customer (.) naturally (.) how did they make
you feel as the as the customer? did they (.) did they provide you some value? did
they (.) did they enhance your thinking? did they move move your (.) opportunity
your buying process forward or some (.) in in this call and erm tha-that's one way
to think of it to look at it. the other way to look at it is if you are an [org1]
manager (.) (along and the) call (.) you know how did they do in representing [org1]'s (.) er interests
and your interest as the sales manager for your (.) for your team (.) so you can
look at it er from from that standpoint.
There's also a lot of (.) words here on the left hand side these these are [org1] sales
competencies (.) and what what this sheet allows you to do (.) is erm (.) er either a
as-assess them (what is) a strength area or (.) an area for improvement now
when i ask you to check each one of these boxes because each each one of these
sales competencies won't (.) come up (.) and won't they won't need to demonstrate
those (.) in each call (.) but there might be two or three (.) so: what i would ask
you to do is you know maybe check two (.) three at the most (.) in each of the
columns that might be applicable (.) and some of them you know could be very
easy such as (.) erm you know managed time effectively and drove the call (.)
represented positive ref- a respectful attitude and appearance so i mean so-ome of
them are (.) are erm you know pretty pretty easy to to assess (.) er yes or (.) or no
(.) okay? so (2) we we need you to: you know give each student a grade (.) and
and hopefully let them know (.) what the what the grade is (.) er after each call (.)
now (.) if some of you doing this for the first time you may (.) be (.). unsure as to
to how to grade that that first call
S4: mhm
S3: and if and if that's the case and you want to: (.) take all of the calls (.) and then
do some sort of a a comparison be-between them at the end that that's fine (.) we
just need to make sure that we tell the students at the end or w-what we'll ask you
do is bring (.) bring these sheets back to [S2] and myself and we'll be in here (.)
and if you haven't given a student a grade let us know and then we'll we'll tell
them (.) what their grade is as well but just let them know in the call that (.) you
either going to to think about it or you want to to look at some other calls (.)
before you grade it (.) now i i d- i don't say that in terms that you're going to
compare all four of them and say well the the one that did the best call is gonna
get a one
S4: mhm
S3: and the next is a two and then a three and then a four (.) that that's not what
what i (.) i'm i'm hoping you you'll do (.) but what i'm hoping you do is (.) you
might (.) see the first call and (you go) <ono> mmm </ono> <squeaks> it was a
pretty good call and they did a pretty nice pretty nice job (.) and erm you know i
might consider giving them a a two or or whatever erm well the next person
comes in and they do even better (.) and you go well that wasn't really a one (1) i
mean it wasn't excellent but it was certainly better than the two so hoh maybe
that first one was a three and this one is a two it just gives you some basis (.) <7>
(it's all) </7>
S4: <7> mhm </7>
S3: so (.). you you have some words here as to as to what these grades mean (.).
erm if you if you feel like you need to to wait and grade them at the end that's
that's fine we can we can do that (.) but er at the end of the day we'll we'll tell we
need to tell what their what their grade is erm (2) so there's (.). er (.). we we'll have
the first two calls (.) first ones at two o'clock and the next ones at two forty-five (.)
and then er there'll be a break at three thirty (.). fifteen minute (.). break there's
coffee (.). o-out here there's a coffee machine they'll have some er pastries and (.).
soda er not soda <clicks his fingers> e:rm
S2: <8> there's water there and juice yeah </8>
S3: <8> juice and water </8> (1) so you can you can come back down here to the
second floor and have a break the students will as well (.) and then the third (.)
call will start at at three forty-five (.) last one at at four thirty (.) and then once
you're through with all (.) the the whole call set (.) if you come back here in the
room talk to [S2] and myself bring us the the call grades (.) er we don't need to go
through (.) blow by blow every- everything in the call (.) but just a a couple of
things that we'd be interested in would be (.) erm you know were there any major
concerns (.) with with any any of the student anybody that did a call (.) for you
was th- are there any major concerns that that you have hh about this this
individual hh or (of course) anything that you thought they did very very well
(.) that er you know you would like to to tell us and we'll e:r you know c- we'll
pass that along to the student as as well we just would like to know your your feedback
S4: mhm
S3: a-about each one
S2: how many of you have done [org3]?
S3: er
S2: one (.) two?
S3: he has done it (.) no you you have or have not? <9> have you? <un> xx <\un>
as a student (.) as a student (.) yeah (.) oh (.) okay <\9>
S2: <9> <un> xxx <\un> yeah yeah (.) as a student yeah yeah yeah yeah (1) okay
S3: er just to tell you a little bit something about the the people you have got (.) they're all (.) fresh out of university (1) some of them have worked for maybe:
before a couple of <un> xx <\un> at [org1] (.) we've been teaching them OVER
the last eight months (.) [S3] and myself went to moscow and we gave three
courses (.) so they (.) are very good at the core model (1) yeah and i've (.). given
you these just in case you wanna keep them on your desk just to remind
yourselves about them (1) erm so they they should be following the core model
and whether you recognize it you know as a customer you probably won't
recognize it just felt that it was really structured and it went really well but you
know <door bangs; lots of background noises> especially [S1] you're probably
looking out for <1> certain things here <1/1>
S1: <1> @@@ </1>
S2: erm the objection handling models are used there (.) e::rm (.) so so that's what
they've been taught (1) erm (.) what they're doing with us in the morning is
they're doing a case study which goes on everyday for nine days <2> and then
S3: <2> (i i told i've told them yeah) <un> xxxx <\un> </2>
S4: <2> we (we already) (1) yah </2> i have a question (which is) concerning the
introduction (.) e::r when a student comes in (.) should we:: say hi i'm [S4] [S4/last] i'm sales manager in vienna or: how
should we: s-
S2: you can you can (.). you can have a chat with them before
S4: <3> okay </3>
S2: <3> i mean </3> they might even want to ask YOU something they might
come in and say LOOK this is my brief i've read it (.) now i'm going to assume
that i actually met you before or i'm going to assume that i <4> know your
colleague (.). is this okay with you [S4]? and you'll say yes that's fine (1) okay
S4: <4> okay okay okay okay okay </4>
S3: <4> yah yah yah </4> yah one of the things i always (.). i i do is ask them
you know (.). any questions (.). about the brief (.). any assumptions (.). that you want
to want to <5> make </5> and <un> xx </un> any discussion that we need to to
S4: <5> okay </5> (1) <6> mhm </6> (1)
SX-m: <un> xxxx </un> <soft>
S4: yeah
S3: a-an-and normal- normally there's not they they just (several) ah yah here's the brief and we'll we'll just go with it
S2: yeah
S3: @@ @<7> but but but they can </7> but it's nice to introduce (some) self <8> and let them introduce just to just to kind of break the ice a little bit a-and <7> and then a-and then </7>
S2: <7> and it's nice </7> (1) <8> just (.) yeah (2) relax THEM a bit </8>
S4: <7> just </7> xx </un> @@ @ @<7> </7> (4) <8> yah (.) a little bit (1) yah </8>
S2: they are more nervous than you @@ @
S4: <9> @@ @@@ @@@ </9>
S2: <9> i think so yah i think so so mhm </9>
S3: but then when when the call starts (.) you know you'll be sitting at the table (.) an-and these r-r-rooms you know bedrooms up-upstairs that you know they've taken the bed all pushed to the side and have a table in there (.) erm (.) have them you know get up from the table and take all their stuff with them like they're entering (.) the customer's office and (.) they don't have to go all the way outside just have a knock on
S4: yeah
S3: onto the walls and and just start the call from from from they're in-inside the inside the room
S4: mhm
S3: but it should be like they're you know coming into the office not have their stuff already spread out on the <1> on the table</1>
S4: <1> yeah </1> (.) everything prepared <2> @@ okay </2>
S3: <2> everything prepared right </2> they they wouldn't do that in in a in a customer scenario
S4: <2> okay </2>
S3: okay (1) erm (3) so again you'll have (.). the seller and then (.) you know (.). two or three others in the room (.). e:r (.). some of the ca:lls i i didn't say anything about er (.). er the re- the recorder here if you want to you know <3> a bit more than i do <4> so </4> @@ </3>
S2: <3> oh yes o:kay so </3> [S7] is a student at vienna university (.)
S3: @
S2: perhaps you'd like to tell us what you do? <4> @ </4> you told </4> me <5> but it's </5> </@
S3: <4> @ @ </4>
S7: <5> yes </5> (1) i would like very much (.). so my name is [S7] [S7/last] and i'm a student from u- uni- {mobile rings} -versity of vienna
S4: (it's not mine)
S3: <6> @@ </6>
S7: <6> i'm studying (.) </6> english and history to become a teacher and at the moment i'm writing my diploma thesis hh at the department of linguistics (.) a:nd yah my topic is international english for business matters and therefore i would like to record the conversations today and afterwards i'll analyze them from a linguistic point of view so (.) erm i'm not sure what the topic will be exactly because i'll have to have a look at the data afterwards but possible da- er er topics would be (.) like pronunciation (.) of non-native speakers or er politeness in (.) in er sales calls or (.) yah things like that (.) but i'm not sure what i'm (.) erm writing
about (...) finally (...) yah and so i hope that you agree with the recording today and
yah <soft> it will work out <7> well </7> <soft>
S2: <7> to- </7> totally anonymous
S3: yah
SS: <8> @@@@ </8>
S7: <8> yes (...) of course (...) of course </8>
S3: <8> have you told the sellers? </8> <9> have you told them? </9>
S2: <9> e::rm </9> no i'm gonna well no i yah i mentioned to <1> (a couple)
<un> xx </un> this morning (...) erm </1>
S3: <1> did you mention it (...) okay </1>
S5: (especially the russian ones)
S2: well with yours <2> yours w- yours won't be recorded </2>
S3: <2> you won't be recorded </2>
SS: <2> @@@@ </2>
S7: @@
S2: <un> xxxxxxxxxxx </un> erm (..) <3> so (..) </3>
S5: <3> why not? </3>
S7: <4> tja (1) (i don't speak russian) @ @ </4>
S2: the reason we asked you to come <4> (here are one) exactly to check </4>
that you have got the right call and that cause we changed yours because of (..)
erm (...) <5> yeah </5> <6> okay </6>
S3: yeah so <5> [S4] </5> you're doing D1
S4: D1 <6> yah </6>
SX-m: yeah
S2: fine
S3: okay and [S6] you're doing D2 (...) <7> a:nd </7>
SX-m: <7> (D3) </7>
S3: [S5] you're doing
SX-m: D3 <8> okay yeah </8>
S3: <8> D: D3 and </8> (...) D4 okay <9> erm </9>
S2: <8> D3 </8>
S1: <9> the location </9> is where
S2: <1> right </1>
S4: rooms yah
S3: <1> yes there </1> (...) [S4] this is the key to <2> your </2> your room <3>
upstairs it's up on the fourth floor (...) four oh one </3>
S2: <2> two corridors </2>
S4: <3> okay (...) thanks (...) fourth floor </3> (2) <4> four oh </4>
S3: erm a::nd let's see [S6] <4> you're </4> you're right next door in four oh two
(...) that room should already be open (...) but i i'll go up there and check (...) and [S5]
and [S1] you're on the third floor three eleven and three twelve (...) [S5] i've got the key to three eleven cause i've got my laptop in there but i'll (...) <un> xxx </un> go
take it out before we start and then i just leave the key in the door and leave the
door open so that will be open and i think three twelve is open (...) as as well right
now (...) okay (...) any questions about and i saw you need to do more study but any
questions about (you) the scenario (...) <5> and all (...) every- everything okay </5>
SS: <5> no </5>
S4: no (...) <6> it's very clear @ @ @ @ </6>
S3: okay (.) <6> okay (.) good (.) </6> very good (.) alright (.) then if er (.) you all
er don't have any other questions we: er will <un> xx xx </un> here you go to
your rooms if you: if you like or stay here either way (.) a:nd er <clicks tongue>
we thank you very much
SS: <7> @@@@@@@ </7>
S3: <7> hope you have hope you have a we hope hope you have a fun time </7>
SX-m: for sure
S3: hope you have a fun time with the with the students i think you will
S1: <un> xxxx </un> whether they will have
S4: <8> yeah (.) after the calls </8>
S3: <8> after the calls </8>
SS: <8> @@@@@<8> </8>
SX-m: <L1de> gehen wir rauf in das offene zimmer? { do we go upstairs to the
open room?} </L1de>
S4: yah (.) <9> mhm </9>
SX-m: <L1de> <9> schauen wir einmal </9> <un> xxxxxx </un> {let's have a
look} </L1de>
S3: do you know which room you're going to? or did <1> [S2] </1> did [S2] okay
[S2] <un> xxxx </un>
S7: <1> no no </1>
<end MD I Conversation 1_00:24:22>
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S1: so nervous?
S7: what?
S1: nervous?
S7: mmmm (not but) i'm tired little bit little bit tired with the: with the heat (.) like
tough <1> tough </1> (.) the hot weather
S1: <1> aha </1>
S7: i'll take it off okay? {takes off his jacket}
S1: yeah (.) feel free (4) i imagine how you feel because i was in your role (.) six
years ago so
S7: ah:
S1: i did it (.) six years ago so <2> <un> xxx xxx </un> </2>
S7: <2> <un> xxx xxx </un> </2> i feel good but a little bit tired with e:r more
like e:r e:r from the point of e:r (.) from the point of e:r quite emotional
S1: aha
S7: emotional things
S1: yeah (.) (however you'll) manage it (.) you will manage it (.) okay (.) how long
(are you) at [org1]?
S7: e::r i am (.) with [org1] since e::r (.) august two thousand and six (.) <un> xx
</un> not long ago
S1: and doing what?
S7: e::r (.) doing (.) i'm selling system x
S1: <3> aha okay </3>
S7: <3> in russia </3> (.) [name17] market
S1: in [name17]
S7: yeah
S1: so have you <un> xxx </un> (.) for <un> xx </un> serious for [name17] and
for the rest of the council?
S7: e::r i've (.) i have [name17] dot com for the different <4> accounts there </4>
(.) and someone (who told you) and someone banking so different (.) but i mean
(.) really not familiar with [name5] and all the things so (the way)
S1: <4> aha (.) okay </4>
S1: (that's right) (.) but you're selling?
S7: yeah i'm selling i'm not safety (ss) i'm a:: sales specialist
S1: a:h okay okay (.) but nevertheless (you know) big <un> xxx </un> to safe you
if you know to sell computers then you <5> know </5> to sell shoes <6> so (it
was) </6> what @ so feel free (.) <7> uh </7>
S7: <5> yeah <5> (. ) <6> of course <6> yah okay <7> so <7> (. ) e: r (. ) i’ve
arranged e: r the: the meeting with you
S1: <8> okay <8>
S7: <8> er <8> because you’re er client executive for three years
S1: okay
S7: i could very
S1: so please <9> just <9> just read for the rest of the <1> group yah <1> (. )
S7: <9> yah <9> (. ) <1> aha <1> (. ) okay
S1: just <2> to understand <2>
S7: <2> e: r <2> i’m calling er internally the [org1] client executive (. ) it is a:
retail bank (. ) er [org5] is a major retail bank and a longstanding [org1] customers
(1) e: r [org5] er spend er seventy million er per year: with [org1] (. ) they have
their central it-site with that serious main frames running [name5] and distribute
the (p-series servers) running [name6] (. ) e: r they’re key customers of <un> x
</un> on [org1] (. ) er [org5] are under pressure from competitors (. ) er the
operational costs are higher than other retail banks (. ) e: r you’re responsible for
software sales to banking customers (. ) er [org5] is major retail bank in your
territory (. ) e: r we’re investigating two opportunities one of them to <un> x
</un> of [org5] and <un> xxx </un> [un] [name5] (. ) environment and the second
one er is er a opportunity for (an enter-) price e: r licence agreement (. ) now: (. ) i
have twenty minutes @@ and the client executive has been with [org1] for
eighteen years and with si-[org5] for three years (. ) the managers are a team of
five (poor respect) <un> xxx </un> excellent relationship with (deep layers) at
[org5]
S1: okay (. ) and there is one <un> xxx </un> i’m with [org1] for twelve years not
for they- for eighteen but <un> x </un> but me personally <3> @@@ @@@@ <3>
</3>
S7: <3> okay (. ) okay (. ) <3> okay (. ) so er (. ) i have decided to arrange this
meeting e: r because e: r i’m the new (. ) er new member of the team (. ) e: r come to
vienna recently <4> e: r <4>
S1: <4> okay <4>
S7: and already participated in ib and <un> xxx </un>
S1: okay
S7: and and met the guy from the company [org5]
S1: okay
S7: from the [org5] bank (. ) a: nd he was interested in our (1) database e: r
solutions
S1: mhm
S7: e: r so as far as i know you’re (. ) doing a great job (at this account) selling
seventy million for one account is a g-great thing
S1: yeah it happens
S7: yeah (. ) yah so e: r (1) like i wanted e: r (1) to check er whether the
opportunities e: r (. ) that (. ) i’ve just mentioned are real with e:: r with [org5] and er
(1) like (. ) explore your (. ) like personal goals what you do with this company
what are the (. ) business issues (. ) and then to decide on common strategy (. ) e: r to
decide whether the help of a: [name5] division is needed at your work (. ) with
[org5] (. ) so what what what can you say about like the situation at the count now
about the <5> (have their count) <5>
S1: <5> well (.) </5> when you're mentioning [name5] (i would like) (.) i think
that (they are satisfied) right now with (re-<6>quirement</6>) they have currently
(<.)
S7: <6> mhm </6> (.) mhm
S1: and they (are running currently)
S7: yah
S1: as you may already know they do run a: [name5] (on z-) series
S7: yes i know
S1: and they have [name6] (installed as a distributor) (1) <7> yah </7>
S7: <7> mhm </7>
S1: data base system on p-series (.). <8> yah </8>
S7: <8> mhm </8>
S1: and (.) i would (.) i (.) i may (.) say that they are quite satisfied with with such
environment
S7: mhm
S1: with performance they have okay (.) there are always some (.) some space for
<9> improvements </9>
S7: <9> mhm </9> <4> <1> yah </1>
S1: <1> but </1> (let's say) so they are they are they are satisfied and (they're)
<2> say </2> i'm satisfied too
S7: <2> mhm </2> <4> yah-yeah
S1: i'm earning a lot of revenue from (.) either from e:r from <3> stream </3>
revenue (work services revenue) especially the [name6] so: (.) no this is running
yah?
S7: <3> mhm </3> <4> mhm </4> okay (.) nice (.) and e:r does it e:r correspond
to you:r er plan for you:r incentives? <5> e:r </5>
S1: <5> yah yah </5> yah yah
S7: so you fulfil it?
S1: <6> yah </6>
S7: <6> but </6> (.) erm would you like to blow them?
S1: yah why not?
S5: @@
S1: if they will go i will go (.) for sure
S7: yah and go to: (.) south africa and stop before
S1: (you're not the one (.)
S7: @@
S1: (you're not the one)
S7: @@ okay so: e:r <7> what </7>
S1: <un> <7> xx </7> xxx <un>
S7: er (.) about what? about going to south afri<8>-ca </8>?
S1: <8> yah </8> (.)
S7: @@
S1: what's behind?
S7: it would be nice (.) e:r no i i'm saying that like you will outperform and you
will be: er much more appreciated (.) than if you: like meet your (.) er just meet
your quarter and er <9> <un> xxx </un> </9>
S1: <9> yah it would </9> <un> xx </un> it would be nice because (.) right now
as far as you see opportunities right there (.) i would be right on the target o:r
slightly below the target yah (.) because okay so there are of course problems with (.) e:r with the hardware there are four four xxx
S7: <1> mhm /1/ (.). (2) okay /2/ (.). <3> mhm /3/ (.). <4> okay /4/
S1: i have to admit that i'm i'm (.) looking around (space for for)
S7: for improvement
S1: for improvement <5> of course /5>
S7: <5> mhm /5/ (.). and er i wanted like to: explore some business roles of the client (.). so i know that i need to: reduce the operation costs
S1: <6> okay /6>
S7: <6> and /6/ and what (.). do i have any (.). more information about this or about the status (of the count) what do i want to achieve the client [org5]
S1: as you may know er all tho- all those retail banks are competing among them<7>-selves /7/ you know
S7: <7> mhm /7/ (.). i know
S1: and they they have a request e:r to reduce the operation- operational costs e:r to reduce e:r number of contracts they have with the different companies (.). you know /8/ (.). let's say so to to operate more more efficient in a m-more efficient manner (.). <9> there's each /9/ and every tall company (.). right now we have on the <1> market /1/ on our market in our territory
S7: <8> mhm /8/ <9> okay /9/ (.). <1> mhm /1/ (.). and do you have some of the the tarj- targets e:r like e:r like numbers er which (were) they want to achieve with
S1: er right now the (.). i have to admit that they didn't mention any number (.).
S7: okay (.).
S1: in terms of <2> number /2/ (.).
S7: <2> i see /2/ (.). mhm
S1: but any kind of improvements er as we know all the (margins) they they have right now are rather tight but (turning) any improvements in terms of (i don't <3> know /3> ten to fifteen percent (.). degrees of their costs <4> right now /4/ i i believe (they will be) quite satisfied
S7: <3> mhm /3/ (.). <4> mhm /4/ (.). okay e:r (.). so e:rm (.). you said that they want to reduce the number of contracts (.). <5> e::r /5/ with (.). the suppliers <6> (or vendors) mhm /6/
S1: <5> yes /5/ (.). <6> (with suppliers) yah /6/
S7: e::r (.). so (.). they have for example at the moment er at least two contracts er for [org1] (.). e::r [name5] a:nd [name6] so
S1: yah okay
S7: and the er the one thing that we could achieve at this account (.). and that will be great er if they will e::r er mig-migrate from the (.). er from the (.). [name6] (.). on the p-series (.). to [name5] <7> e::r /7/ a:nd er at the same time to introduce a: inter-price-licence agreement with them (.). so they will have one single contract
S1: <7> okay /7/ (.). okay
S7: e::r with er [org1] (for all of their) infrastructure (.). e::r they will (.). er receive benefits of it (.). e::r <8> finan-<8>-cial benefits er er from the side of er like er having e::r (.). erm erm higher level of services
S1: <8> mhm /8/ (.). okay
S7: e:r first year of e:r er maintenance er for free as far as i know (. ) [name6]
doesn't have it ( . ) and er ( . ) so <9> there are </9> there are there are few bene-
benefits
S1: <9> okay </9> ( . )
S7: that they see from the point of view from [name5] point of view
S1: okay ( . )
S7: e:r that can be interesting for the customer <1> e:r </1>
S1: <1> yah but </1> ( . ) may i interrupt you ( . )
S7: <2> mhm </2>
S1: <2> this is </2> ( . ) this is on the the one side of the scale ( . ) positive things
S7: yeah ( . )
S1: but let's look on the negative <3> things </3> f-for the customer <4> yah </4>
S7: <3> okay </3> ( . ) <4> okay </4> ( . ) mhm
S1: you're thinking about selling them as far as i understood [name5] instead of
[name6] ( . ) so it's new investment ( . ) for them
S7: e:r
S3: am i right?
S7: yeah ( . ) <5> mhm </5>
S1: <5> on the other </5> hand ( . ) right now they have a skilled people ( . ) <6> for
[name6] </6> distributed [name6] on p-series <un> xx </un>
S7: <6> uhu </6> yah ( . ) and that cost them a lot of money
S1: of course it cost them a lot of money on the other hand they will have to
educate those people
S7: uhu
S1: for [name5] ( . ) <7> so </7> you have ( . ) as a first investment the <un> xx
S7: stop or ( . ) (do they) want educate ( . ) on [name5] they will
have to find people around
S7: mhm
S1: experienced ones ( . ) so: ( . ) how to (prove) this ( . ) to the customer ( . ) <9> if i
were <un> x xxx </un> up to them </9>
S7: <9> e:r </9> ok ( . ) yah ( . ) <9> er of course er er i don't know (whether to: be)
( . ) er like the final ( . ) thing but a- as i see it at the moment what what <un> <1>
S1: <1> uhu </1> ( . ) <8> uhu </8>
S4: <8> on the other </8> hand you have investment ( . ) when ( . ) in education ( .
S7: mhm ( . )
S1: for <un> xx </un> stop or ( . ) (do they) want educate ( . ) on [name5] they will
have to find people around
S4: <9> mhm
S1: experienced ones ( . ) so: ( . ) how to (prove) this ( . ) to the customer ( . ) <9> if i
were <un> x xxx </un> up to them </9>
S7: <9> e:r </9> ok ( . ) yah ( . ) <9> er of course er er i don't know (whether to: be)
( . ) er like the final ( . ) thing but a- as i see it at the moment what what <un> <1>
S1: <1> uhu </1> ( . ) <8> uhu </8>
S1: it's a (round ton) <3> but we are talking right now about costs in this year
S7: <3> yeah </3> yah ( . ) exactly ( . ) uh ( . ) yah </3> e:r the great thing that they
already have [name5] ( . ) because they can extend their licence ( . ) e:r to the: ( .
S7: those distributed service ( . ) er <4> ser-</4> servers it's <5> one thing </5> it will
be cheaper than buying them (.) to buying for example new [name5] things (.)

because they like to extend the the contract

S1: <4> okay </4> (.) <5> mhm </5> (.) okay

S7: er so agai- an-d (.) er (.) for example now they are (.) limited (.) in some

things in some functions

S1: <6> okay </6>

S7: <6> and if </6> they will go for e:r (enter-) price-licence-agreement they will

er receive er three er new versions of [name5]

S1: okay

S7: e:r the second thing about the people (.) er er the (.) [name5] is much more
easier to manage er than [name6] (.) [name6] is er like er (.) less userfriendly than

[name5] (.) er we can er make two options (.) either to prepare er the guys for

[name5] (.) e:r (.) like educate them (.) or er <un> xx </un> guys that er run

[name5] <un> xxxxx </un> or manage all the (.) er [name5] e:r (.) locations

S1: (who would pay this?)

S7: e:r (.) for what?

S1: this education

S1: for this education?

S7: time is money (.) mmh (.) i don't know (.) we need to: to find it out who who

will pay it (.) e:r (.) we can (.) i no- i don't know whether the terms of this enter-

price-licence-agreement include the education of the people (.) maybe it's already

included maybe it's in benefit (.) or maybe it's like a <un> xx </un> that we need
to solve

S1: did you check it for the educational department?

S7: e:r (.) not yet (.) not yet so it's our first meeting e:r (.) li- a lot of things we will

(.) will be hard to manage (.) but i will mark it (.) like er the things that i need to

do

S1: okay

S7: er so er (.) like from the business from the business point of view (.) er (.)

there are er there are business benefits (.) so because they want to reduce the

operational costs

S1: okay

S7: e:r one of the things that they can reduce it's like the transaction costs

S1: okay

S7: e:r and er (.) this can be achieved er through: improved er (.) er search

performance (.) of our (.) [name5] product (.) because like (.) unlike [name6] (.)
e:r it has some features (.) that can be transferred into business benefits

S1: okay

S7: for example it's very important for a retail bank to have a: good er security

system (.) to secure their data

S1: <7> yes </7>

S7: <7> because </7> it's their like main competence (.) and if the data is stolen

for example it will be a (.) very (.) like (.) like a disaster (.) yah

S1: <8> okay </8>

S7: <8> and </8> er the thing here is that [name6] er has er (.) x-mail (.)
capabilities and re-relation (.) <9> re-relative capabilities </9> and they are in
different databases
S1: <9> okay (. ) mhm <9> (. ) mhm
S7: and so the x-mail part is harder to manage er harder to administrate and has
lower security than this one (. ) and in [org1] [name5] they have both in one (. ) and
it's managed and secured like the (. ) e:r relative base
S1: okay
S7: so it's (. ) one of the business benefits (. ) e:r (. ) oh (. ) i've told (. ) two (. ) yeah
S1: no no it's okay
S7: together (. ) <1> so: </1>
S1: <1> <un> xxx </un> </1> let let me ask you some <2>-thing </2>
S7: <2> mhm </2>
S1: even if we go with this change (. )
S7: mhm (. ) yah (. )
S1: [name6] to [name5]
S7: yah
S1: what's in there for me?
S7: e:r (. ) you can throw the scope (. ) in er in this account (. ) <3> isn't it </3>
S1: <3> i have </3> i have a <un> <4> xx </4> xxx </un> right now from
[org6] services
S7: <4> yah </4> (.) yah (. ) <5> e:r okay </5>
S1: <5> if you go </5> with [name5] then i will (. ) <6> you won't have it anymore
</6>
S7: <6> you (. ) mhm (. ) </6> so you can maybe have revenue from selling [org1] services
S1: okay
S7: e:r so we can (. ) like (. ) consider (. ) i-in the future (. ) to make up a project (. )
and you will receive revenue not from our competitors (. ) but from our fellow
colleagues (. ) so
S1: okay (. ) yah (. ) <7> you have to feed them (. ) that's true (. ) </7>
S7: <7> you (. ) yeah (. ) yeah (. ) </7> we have to feed them <8> @ </8> anyway
</8>
S1: <8> @@@@ </8>
S7: and we (. ) and we want you to feed us a little bit
SS: @@@@ @@@ @
S7: so it's it's normal thing so: i: i guess like (. ) <9> yah (. ) yah (. ) </9> yah
S1: you've mentioned <9> enter-price-licence-agreement (. ) yah </9> (1) e::r (1)
can we take it somehow with fi-financing (. ) with [name7]?
S7: of course
S1: of course
S7: yeah
S1: but (. ) let's say so (if you take it with financing)
S7: <1> okay </1>
S1: <1> on the other </1> hand we will (. ) make life a little bit easier for the
customer (. ) let's say so if you put it (. ) financing for three years
S7: mhm
S1: yah
S7: yah (. ) <2> will get splitted (. ) </2>
S1: <2> it will make it <un> xxxx </un> </2> yah (. )
S7: mhm (. ) and they <3> </3>
S1: <3> (it will be a little bit) <3> (.) <4> okay so it will be a little bit easier for
customer to pay off yah? <4> (1)
S7: <4> yah (.) yah <4> (.) yah
S1: e::r (.) pa pa pa it's okay but then again my revenue is splitted (.) haeh?
S7: no (.) your revenue is not splitted
S1: <5> a:nd why? <5>
S7: <5> because as as <5> far as i know (.) i worked (.) tightly (.) with [name7] er in moscow and i know (.) that i worked for system x
S1: okay
S7: recently and they made such kind of thing (.) so for example we're selling a:
complete project (.) for hardware software and services (.) and [name7] finances
all of them (.) and (.) the fact is that [name7] fi- (.) er like revenue (.) for example
in leasing scheme o:r <6> some <6>
S1: <6> okay <6>
S7: goes (.) er to er to departments (.) as soon as the contract is signed
S1: mhm
S7: so [name7] (.) pays to other departments
S1: <7> okay <7> <8> okay <8>
S7: <7> they pay <7> (.) to sales people <8> they pay <8> to departments (.) er
and the customer is beginning to use the capabilities at the moment
S1: okay
S7: so (.) like (.) using [name7] in this case (.) is one of (.) can be one of the best
solutions
S1: you want to say that i'll i will (save) all the revenue for this year (.) (or the)
<9> transaction <9>
S7: <9> yes <9>
S1: a:h (1) sounds interesting (1) you see (.) no (1) er look
S7: mhm
S1: <sighs> then make a business case out of it (.) i think it will be the best
S7: mhm
S1: e:r (.) <un> xx <un> it (.) make the (cooperation) with [name7]
S7: <1> mhm <1>
S1: <1> mhm <1> (1) er of course we said you have to find out with educational
department
S7: mhm
S1: how they will fit in this <2> (.) let's <2> let's call it transaction
S7: <2> mhm <2> (1) mhm (2) mhm
S1: okay customer will have (1) customer will have (1) let's say so less contracts
or will have only one supplier
S7: <3> yes <3>
S1: <3> that's true <3>
S7: yes
S1: what else do we have for him?
S7: e:r what else do we have? e:r (.) so <4> e:r (.) yeah (.) <4> yeah
S1: <4> put yourself in his shoes <4>
S7: e:r (.) he: it will be a-a surprise for him
S1: <5> why? <5>
S7: but <5> i think <5> er <6> <un> xxx <un> <6>
S7: <7> yeah we need to: </7> to make like positive (.) posi-<7> </7> positive surprise
for him (.) so er i understand that maybe these things are not enough at the m- at
the moment to:
S1: <8> okay </8>
S7: <8> to per- </8> -suade him (.) but er er so it's our first meeting
S1: <9> okay </9>
S7: <9> and i can </9> like go deeper into e:r into details
S1: <1> okay </1>
S7: <1> dig </1> deeper get er er (.) more information
S1: mhm
S7: and we will find e-er the way to <un> xxx </un> to: to these (.) e:r concrete
business case
S1: okay
S7: e:r (.) so e:r like (.) my (.) my next (.) actions will be (.) like (.) you have er
good contacts with er people (who a:re at the account)
S1: okay
S7: e:r (. and (. whether we will have business benefits (. <2> for them e:r </2>
we'll calculate something for example (. e:r some prelma- preliminary thing
things (. er you can go to them (.) er talk to them whether it's e:r (.) like possible
or not (.) they will give their bless (. e:r and we er take my technical (.) guys
S1: <2> mhm (. mhm </2> okay
S7: e:r and go to the: technical guys and there will (. we will talk e::r about it (.)
so (how about)
S1: it sound sounds okay <3> but </3> before before we go (.) to the customer
<4> (. with </4> those all those idea i would say so (. e:r you will come to me
with this business case
S7: <3> mhm </3> (. <4> yeah </4> (. yeah
S1: because i have huge experience with them <5> and </5> (. i know their pains
S7: <5> yeah </5> (. yeah (.) and it's very important (1)
S1: a:nd
S7: for me to <6> know them </6>
S1: <6> to- yeah </6> (. together we'll make (. fine-tuning of that- of that
business <7> case </7> and go together to them yah?
S7: <7> mhm </7> (. yah okay
S1: and hopefully we'll make it
S7: yeah
S1: haeh?
S7: yes
S1: sounds okay for you?
S7: okay
S1: fine find those things with-with edu- <8> -cational </un> xx </un> everything
with [name7] </8>
S7: <8> yah (. mhm (. mhm </8> and maybe i'll need some additional
information <9> for you from you mhm </9>
S1: <9> from yah from my colleagues </9> you will get number of licences
S7: <1> mhm </1>
S1: <1> number </1> of service et cetera et cetera <2> what's </2> needed <3> and </3>
S7: <2> yeah </2> (.) <3> software configurations </3> (.) <4> from p-series
S1: <4> yes exactly </4> (.) yeah (.) <5> and </5> (.) let's go for it
S7: <5> mhm </5> (.) okay (.)
S1: too
S7: nice to meet you
S1: nice to meet you too
{SS applause}
@end MD II / Conversation 2_00:19:42
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<beg MD II / Conversation 3_00:26:50> 869
S4: the microphone
S11: so let's start (. ) <6> are you ready? </6>
S4: <6> okay </6> (. ) e:r you want <7> to: tell </7 > me some: assumptions or
maybe do some briefing for your colleagues <8> because i understood you won't
know the case <8>
S11: <7> ah yes </7> <8> (okay first of all) mhm </8> (right surely)
S4: @
S11: (the: ceo) i'm responsible for the customer (industry is) distribution (. ) e:r (. )
the er (our) (. ) (i-series) customers (. ) er but unfortunately (when i thought) is
unrial- unreliable and (. ) old technology currently (. ) er [org4] is the name of the
cust- <9> -omer </9> (. ) (have heard of) <un> xxxx </un> application which
<un> xx </un> the key <un> xxxxx </un> and that cannot be the <un> xx </un>
S13: <9> mhm </9> (. ) mhm
S11: e:r (. ) the system will er and we (. ) er with our business partner which names
<un> xxx </un> provide er to our customer solution (. ) that can er (. ) er provide er
the [org4] of the account manager to sell additional <un> xxx </un> <1> special
<un> xx </un> (. ) <1> er roots and so and so really really good benefits for the
customer (. ) the owner of the initiative is a ceo (. ) who is also the (approval) the
cio is leading the project
S4: <1> i just close the door </1>
S13: mhm
S11: er (. ) <un> xxx </un> our business partner will build on the <un> x </un>
distribution application to (accomodate) for [org4] requirements so customer
requirements (. ) er the initial estimate for <un> xx </un> solution is er fifteen
millio- million dollars (. ) so er (. ) i have received a call from my ceo (. ) our (. )
[org1] sponsor (. ) who tells e:r that e:r (1) er she has been er pressured by: cfo (. )
er to obtain competitors er quotations <2> er for (observation) </2> to [org1]
<un> xx xx </un> quotation is too high and competitors are seriously
(undercutting) our price (. ) so many many issues <un> xx </un> so
S4: <2> <un> xx </un> @ @ </2> (. ) a lot of information okay so: we hav:e
twenty minutes time (. ) <3> for the </3> call itself and then we will do about
twenty twenty-five minutes debriefing together
S13: <2> @ @ </2>
S11: <3> yes </3> mhm of course
S4: SX-m: <un> xx </un>
S4: okay? great so
S11: good bye
S4: you start (.) knocking @@@
{S11 knocks on the door}
S4: come in (1) just take a seat down (.) i just have to finish the call yah okay (.)
fine so hi (.) nice to meet you
S11: good day
S4: <4> hi </4>
S11: <4> my </4> name is [S11] [S11/last] i'm from [org1] <5> as (.) as you
remember (.) yes? <5>
S4: <5> i KNOW you i know you i know you i know you @@@ <5>
S11: <5> so (.) you've got <5> my visit card er business card and so on great
S4: i called you to come here <6> bec- </6> -ause we have real:ly an issue
S11: <6> yeah </6> (.) let me make some notes
S4: yah for sure for sure
S11: mhm (3)
S4: er (.) we have a price problem (.) i received your proposal (.) fifteen million (.)
big sum of money (.) so:: (.) i (.) also had to ask competitors (.) for proposal (.)
and they are about thirty percent cheaper than [org1]
S11: thirty percent?
S4: THIRTY percent (.) i <7> mean i tell </7> you because we know you we
know you and and you know (.) i would like (.) to work with [org1] because i
know [org1] and (know [last name1]) but er we have to do something with the
price (.) i have no: chance to: argue thirty percent (.) price <8> </8> difference
S11: oh really <7> <8> and actually <8> have you (.) compared these
solution proposals (.) any differences any ideas what [org1] may be (.) better <un>
x xx </un> one <9> er what is the idea </9>
S4: <9> hh maybe (.) maybe you could maybe you t- </9> you could g-give me a
short summary where you see your advantages of your proposal because i
understood you prepared the proposal with your colleagues and and hh i mean
from first (.) view they a:re comparable (.) all the proposals are comparable (.) yah
(.) they are just cheaper (.) yah they <1> have </1> cheaper rates for er the
project manager (.) er they have (.) cheaper rates for the application developers
yah so: it's it's really a problem yah maybe i should talk to the partner to [last
name1] and and make pressure on the price if i could help you yah (.) you need to
do something
S11: <1> mhm </1> (.). so actually (.) i i didn't see n- er didn't see er competitive
(2) e:r offering yes (.) so
S4: yah you cannot see it i mean i cannot show it to you (.) i'm (.) <2> in big shit
if i @ @ </2>
S11: <2> yes yes i see k- and an- </2> and let you: (.) just er clarify and er (.) give
me some (.) i don't know comparison of the er er what's er the think about er
competitive er proposal (.) is it really (.) equal or maybe some real <3>
differences </3>
S4: <3> i mean (.) </3> they promise the same things as you yah? (.) they promise
er to do it in the same time frame it's cheaper (.) e:r they propose me: developers
they propose me project managers yah (.) so it's very comparable for me (.) yah
S11: <4> so </4>
S4: <4> and </4> and you know i have to convince my people internally e:r that  
- i should do it with you so () you have to tell me why i should do it w- do it  
- with [org1] () <5> yah </5>  
S11: <5> so </5> actually as you know er this solution () e:r should work on ()  
current [org1] i-series series () <6> so () so </6>  
S4: <6> yah: you know </6> i-series is a very common platform and and  
everybody we have a lot of partners from i-series yah  
S11: so () they can work e:r with er i-series er <7> background </7>  
S4: <7> yah () yah yah </7> () so i said it's really comparable (1) yah they have  
the same () as they write the same skills at a lower price haeh? so you should  
work on your price yah  
S11: mhm mhm () er maybe you are interested in in lease () (but) payments er ()  
quarter by quarter so <8> () split (your sum) () yes financing yes </8>  
S4: <8> mmm you mean financing options </8> () yah i mean this could be  
interesting but it's not the main issue you know the main <9> issue </9> er i have  
() a very high price thirty percent higher than the price of competition () yah? ()  
<1> and </1> i have the same risks e:r as i see () from now i have the same time  
frame so (1) your financing () i mean it's interesting if you have some good  
financing conditions but <2> (we are a big company) </2>  
S11: <9> because </9> () <1> x </1> () <2> (because we) we really (really) </2>  
could discuss about er (we may) we should surprised (.) really thirty percent  
discount (.) i really couldn't believe in this discount it's a really huge amount of  
money <3> () so it's it's (.) <3/2> it's about five million dollars (2) and er () i i  
think it's (.) and i guess it's (.) a really (_) <un> xx </un> it's <4> impossible </4>  
S4: <3> yah () that's my problem </3> () <4> mhm </4>  
S11: so we can er talk about five percent discount but then but () <5> really </5>  
() thirty or ()  
S4: <5> mhm </5> () mhm  
S11: really (_) thirty percent is a really huge amount (_) <6> so </6>  
S4: yah <6> yah </6> i know that's the problem yah  
S11: i think it's really obviously comparable differences er between our solution  
and another solution (_) maybe (_) and: (_) er (_) do they have er a- a business  
partner and er actually have you er have you ever worked with er (_) this  
competitor (_) actually i don't know (_) his name (_) his <7> name </7>  
S4: <7> with </7> () with some of them we worked yah but in smaller projects  
not in such big projects yah so: (_) i mean look (_) what is important for me yah i  
mean (_) it's important for me to have ONE company (_) yah (_) which i can  
contact (_) where i have when i have problems yah <8> i have </8> ONE contact  
point yah (_) i mean is this including your proposal?  
S11: <8> great </8> () great () really it's good because er  
S4: mhm  
S11: er you you have currently our (_) customer (_) i-series yes i-series customer  
() and er we can er (_) and we offer you (_) a great your current er (_) hardware  
and software application <9> i mean </9> ()  
S4: <9> mhm </9> () mhm  
S11: er to (_) develop and provide your customers really advantages er (_)  
S4: mhm  
S11: that er your competitors couldn't provide
S4: yah (.) yah (.) yah but (.) who is my contact point then is it you or is it [last name1] or or who is it in your proposal because this was not really clear for me
S11: really? <1> (is it?)</1>
S4: <1> mhm </1>
S11: ah let me: just e:r
S4: okay
S11: clarify it for <2> you </2>
S4: <2> yah </2>
S11: er your first contact is [org1] (.) <3> is me (.) so </3> (.) so if you (.) this (.) this phone number (.) so <4> you can </4> (.) call me directly
S4: <3> okay (.) okay </3> (.) <4> mhm </4> (.) mhm
S11: and er i will <un> xx </un> <un> un </un> of any <5> issues </5> with hardware
S4: <5> mhm </5> (.) <6> mhm </6> (.) mhm (.)
S11: any troubles
S4: yah yah (.) this i understand but (.) i mean if if i mean the project yah and and <7> </7> th-there will be issues er in this project there are always issues in project (.) believe me (.) and e:r is this also you i can contact i mean you are a sales guy you cannot be project manager whom can i is there a project manager who has the overall responsibility also for the [last name1] <8> er </8>
S11: <7> yes </7>
S11: yeah <8> sure </8> (.) i (.) i’m the first step i’m the first <un> x </un> to [org1] because i am account manager (.)
S4: okay (.)
S11: who account then for ([org4] <9> solutions) yes </9> (.) so you can (.) call me
S4: <9> okay (.) okay </9> <1> okay (.) so i can contact you: if (.) mhm (.) mhm (2) </1>
S11: <1> always and (.) so and i will link you to really </1> useful and needable people (.)
S4: mhm (.) okay (.) so i can contact you (.) okay (.) okay (.) <2> so: </2> okay (.)
S11: <2> of course </2>
S4: so this could be a good point to have on:e er contact person: (.) for the whole project yah (.) but i’m i’m afraid you will (.) you will not sell anything else (.) if you are here the project manager but but okay
S11: <3> @ @ </3>
S4: <3> it's </3> it's okay for me yah (.) e:r what about e:r other (.) do you have other arguments how we can compensate this (high p-) i understood you could give me: what? (.) ten percent discount so we (.) have around twenty percent (.)
S4: <4> erm </4>
S11: <4> did we talk about this? </4>
S4: to you you you just mentioned <fast> i think </fast> you mentioned ten percent (.) or was it five? i don't remember
S11: aha
S4: @ @ @
S11: i i remember (.) er you (talked) e:r (.) actually when i talked about it e:r (1) i talked that er (.) five percent discount ten percent discount
S4: okay
S11: er (. ) between er for example (. ) er not discount differences between our
proposal <5> an: and er </5> competitive proposal this really (1) real yes
S4: <5> mhm </5> mhm
S11: in our competitive (wall) but (1) for equal (. ) equal solution (. ) thirty percent
discounts it's (. ) difference i mean difference
S4: difference <6> yah mhm </6>
S11: <6> between </6> the proposal it's really (1) i- in- dis- im-possible (1)
S4: yah (. )
S11: <7> (cause) it should be differences REAL </7>
S4: <7> yah but it (. ) it's believe me </7> i would like to do the deal with
[org1] but we have those proposals on the table and they are (. ) from competitors
(.) which (. ) i have to take serious yah so i <8> have </8> this price on the table so
we need to find some arguments how we can (. ) compensate this difference in
price
S11: <8> mhm </8> (. ) so (. ) let me a-ask again (. ) is this proposal from
competitor (. ) face and meet your all requirements (. ) which you have
S4: i think <9> so </9> so <9>
S11: <9> one </9> one one two three and s- <1> and so </1>
S4: <1> i think so (. ) </1> yeah it it looks like i mean you know it's a written
proposal and and (. ) but from: first e: r from first <2> look (. ) i: </2>
S11: <2> any guarantee from his side </2> (. ) from his side
S4: do i get guarantees from [org1]?
S11: haeh?
S4: do i get guarantees from [org1]?
S11: er i talk about er guarantee that's er they really meet their requirements <3>
S4: <3> mhm </3> (.) mhm (. ) yah do i get some from [org1]?
S11: in my proposal we have first of all (. ) upgrade of hardware and so on
S4: okay
S11: and really er (. ) our solution can meet your er (. ) requirements (. ) <4> that
S4: <4> could be <un> xx xxx xx </un> and (. ) er so on (. )
S11: <4> mhm </4> mhm
S4: <4> so if s- really want (. ) we have really (. ) much e: xperience <5> in this area
S4: in-most in distribution sector and so on</5>
S4: <5> yah (. ) ah okay (. ) yeah (. ) yah </5> (. ) er do you have some references?
S4: if you say you have experience you must have some references
S11: of course (. ) we have many references from <6> our customers </6> (. )
S4: success story and so on (. ) </7> but er </7> (. ) </8> you see of course </8>
S4: <6> okay </6> (. ) </7> okay </7> (. ) </8> you know this is important yah (. ) i
mean er </8>
S11: <8> i could </8> send you by email
S4: okay (. ) yah
S11: but i should know er criteria of er (. ) because it's real [org1] has a lot of er
references an: d (. ) in distribution sector
S4: mhm (. )
S11: real (. ) a lot
S4: yah yah (.) but you KNOW the solution you're proposing so: i need a: (.) for
sure i need a reference e:r (.) for a similar solution
S11: mhm (.) so i guess it will be great er (.) first (of to) send by email <9> and of
</9> course we discuss er our next meeting
S4: <9> okay </9> (.) mhm (.) yeah do they also have the chance to: (.) have a: (.)
to meet one of those reference customers?
S11: sorry
S4: do i also have a chance (.) to meet one of those reference customers?
S11: actually why not?
S4: yah? <1> okay (.) it's possible </1>
S11: <1> we will (.) we can </1> discuss it
S4: okay
S11: maybe not every customers our customers in distribution sector (.) say (.)
ookay it's (.) really good idea (.) but i think it's it's not a problem (.) <2> er we we
should (.) we we can discuss it </2> (.) <3> mhm </3>
S4: <2> aha (.) okay (.) because (.) i understood </2> (.) i understood if it's a <3>
reference </3> customer
S11: yes
S4: an <4> official (.) </4> then he has to: (.) e:r be willing to meet (.)
S11: <4> exactly </4> (.) yes
S4: another customer so it should be possible you're saying
S11: it's possible
S4: okay (.) okay this would be interesting (.) if you jus- just could mail me (.)
some references and then i could choose and meet one of those guys you know it's
<i> <5> (2) yah? (.) </5>
S11: <5> i think it's really (good) </5>
S4: <5> you can </5> manage that?
S11: haeh?
S4: you could manage that?
S11: <6> yes (.) yes </6> (.) <7> (any other) </7>
S4: <6> okay (.) </6> okay (1) okay <7> that's </7> that's a good point you know
because (.) i mean (.) e:r this would mean i: reduce risk (.) yah if i can prove that
you are really experienced <8> and </8> and er that i (.) have some references and
i can talk to customers
S11: <8> mhm </8> (.) mhm
S4: which have experience with [org1] or maybe also with [last name1] (.) <9>
yah (.) </9> would be even better (.) yah? (.) okay this could be a good point er do
you (.) do you have some other ideas how we could erm (.). compensate this price
difference?
S11: <9> mhm </9> (.) actually in our <un> x </un> er (.) as you know a-and as
you mentioned you're interested in in leasing or this (.) <1> payment </1>
S4: <1> hh okay </1> (.) yah (.) so financing <2> (.) proposal </2>
S11: <2> we have e:r </2> (.) our department [name7]
S4: okay (.) <3> mhm </3>
S11: finance <3> a:nd </3> we can provide you (1) a leasing (.) a long term
scheme <4> of of </4> your payments (.)
S4: <4> mhm </4> (.) mhm
S11: so by quarters or by months you can choose and i differ by capabilities of [org1]
S4: mhm <5> mhm <6> mhm mhm yah yah <6> i mean this would be interesting for my cfo because you know cfos always like to talk about financing and it will be interesting if you could come up with some proposal
S11: <7> mhm <7> mhm okay i guess i can and i will arrange the meeting with him and discuss these capabilities
S4: ok- ay <8>
S11: <8> is it okay to you?
S4: yah <9> yah <9> er a meeting with your name guy
S11: <9> mhm <9> mhm:
S4: mhm mhm and mhm okay yah it this this could be interesting yah mhm
S11: <5> mhm <5> yah then i mean i i've been reading your proposal and i mean it's really er complex and and big project it's er always complex if you have er if you have a development project application development project
S11: mhm
S4: er maybe we could somehow reduce the risk in splitting the project in different steps or project phases or something like this do you have an idea how we could
S11: sorry what does really complex mean?
S4: er complex means er <clicks tongue> that er it's a project with a lot of er rock items yah? and er complex mean it's a project with a lot of er rock items yah? (.) not easy to oversee everybody will be happy you: as a (. ) supplier and me: as a customer (. ) so: how can we reduce this i call it complexity <4> yah it's <4> yah? <4>
S11: <2> mhm <2> <3> so actually hm? <3> so actually it's a really big (combis-) comprehensive solution and we should realize it step by step and er we will provide project management of the and actually (our guys) people from [last name1] will er be really involved in this project
S11: <5> yah yah <5> yah <5> mhm mhm <6> mhm <7> mhm <7>
S11: <7> and <7> first of all (will come) phase one so we should analyze your current real your current environment current infrastructure in all your depots
S4: <8> mhm <8> <9> mhm <9> <9> mhm
S11: and er really show final er proposal no be- because actually you know it's not final proposal you have seen
S4: mhm
S11: and er in order to really to find out and er know er final proposal from [org1] you should er dig deeper and er proposal <1> from <1> [org1] (.)
analyze your current it-infrastructure (.<2> your </2> c-current capabilities and
your (. current challenges <3> (. yes? </3>
S4: <1> mhm </1> (. <2> mhm </2> (. <3> mhm </3> (. so what is what is
then result of phase one i understand it's analysis phase a:nd after that phase
one (. we will have a clear picture o:n what we need to: develop or what's the
S11: yes
S4: okay (. okay
S11: really yes
S4: okay (. so: (. would it then be possible (. e:r also to change maybe from (.)
[org1] (. to the other competitor (. after phase one (. or or (. is this not
possible?
S11: mhm (. so er (. you (. ask me <4> er (. is it </4>
S4: <4> mhm (. because you said it's </4> just to to find out the status and
analyze what we need (. er er what we: need to have what kind of solution we
need
S11: so really life is changing
S4: <5> yah </5>
S11: <5> er </5> changing and er (. er (. in my point of view er we should
analyze your current situation as er i talk <6> to you </6> (. and er (. i guess it
will be in two months (. a:nd er (. er after that we're going to provide er (. full
(. real (. picture of your current situation and step by steps of upgrading your
systems (. and (2) first of all (we) sign er the contract (. of first (. phase
S4: <6> mhm </6> (. okay
S11: and actual it's really your choice (1) to (. choose [org1] or not (. but actual
from my side (i go with) [org1] (.)
S4: yah yah (.)
S11: <7> <un> xxxx </un> </7>
S4: <7> i mean now </7> (.) yah let me (. but (. again which i di- i didn't get that
(.) is it now possible to change aft- for example i di- i didn't get that
S11: <8> yes </8>
S4: <8> i will </8> do it with [org1] (. and after phase one is fishid (. finished
and there are results on the table (. can i then (. change (. the partner can i then
go to the competitor
S11: i think it's not a problem
S4: okay (. so this because this could be also an argument so then
S11: <9> because </9>
S4: <9> if i'm </9> if i'm flexible e:r to change partner because after phase one (.)
i will get better proposals i think
S11: it's your choice because
S4: <1> okay </1>
S11: <1> actually </1> (. er we sign a contract (. during for example two months
S4: mhm
S11: and analyze your current situation and er (. providing (. really consultant
<2> and ana- </2> -lysis er <un> xxxx </un> <3> in the </3> <un> x </un> er in
er (. forward steps (. and er (. after this an-analysis (. we (. put this (. report
on the table (. and <4> (. it's </4> your choice (. cho- (. choice to
S4: <2> mhm </2> (. <3> mhm </3> (. <4> okay </4>
S4: to choose <5> the co- </5>
S11: <5> to choose </5>
S4: yah (@) <6> @@ </6> <7> choice to choose </7> (.) okay
S11: <6> yah </6> <7> @@ @@ @@ </7> exactly
S4: o:kay (.) mhm (.) okay this sounds better yeah so (.) maybe <clears throat>
this could help me to <slow> convince <slow> er the cfo (.) hh e::rm (.) okay (.)
what about the ti:me fra:me you mentioned the phase one will take (.) <8> two
months </8>
S11: <8> three months </8> yes it's approximately (.) <9> so estimation </9>
S4: okay <9> because this is </9> also important for us because time is critical (1)
<1> for us </1>
S11: <1> so what's your </1> deadlines for phase one or maybe whole solution
S4: i think we could live with those two months yah but e::r i: need to get the
goal decision from: <clears throat> the cfo and then from the ceo (.) a:nd er you
know we have to somehow compensate those thirty percent price discount yah (.)
i cannot argue this yah if you say you can give me (.) i don't know ten percent (.)
we have to compensate the twenty percent price (.) difference yah
S11: mhm
S4: so: we need really good arguments (.) yah (.) but i mean maybe with those
references e::r [name7] (.) yah <clicks tongue twice> i will (.) i will (.) you will
send me email (.) and and yah we'll have a meeting with [name7] (.) i mean i will
present it to the cfo and then <2> let's see </2>
S11: <2> mhm </2> (.) that's comfortable for you and for us too (.) <3> mhm</3>
S4: yah (.) <3> let's </3> see what he will say (.) yah (.) okay (.) e:r so: just
because i'm: a little bit in a hurry <4> e:r just to </4> to summarize (.) you: e:r
will send me an email about er refer- <5> -ence customers: </5> success stories
and i can choose (.) you will arrange a meeting for me with the [name7] guy
concerning (.) e:r [name7] proposal
S11: <4> (you said it mhm) </4>
S4: but i'm not i'm (.) in fact i'm not the finance guy but okay (.) let's do it (.) a:nd
<er (.) you will think a little bit about the price we need to do something i hope i:
(.) if you could have this ready at end of this week i would go begin of next week
(.) and meet the cfo and i will (.) discuss it with him
S11: and let me er <6> qualify </6> (.) what's the deadline to: (1) sign a contract
with
S4: <6> mhm </6> (.) look i board meeting is begin of next week (.) and
there we want to: e:r find a common decision (.) and i will <7> present it </7> (.)
at the board meeting a:nd e:r then i hope we'll get the decision
S11: <7> board yeah </7>
S4: so we a:re we don't have too much time (.) <8> yah </8>
S11: <8> so er </8> from my side (.) i will send you customer references <9> er
<9> i guess in (1) two days
S4: <9> yah </9> (.) okay (.) it would be great if you could maybe talk before
<1> next week </1> to one of (.) one of the customers
S11: <1> i talk with cfo </1> (.) mhm
S4: e:r and yah i need to have this meeting with [name7] guy (.). e:r also this week and yah (.). maybe we could (.). work something for me and and maybe: (.). do a short presentation which i could use in the board meeting

S11: actually why not erm: what medium can you provide?

S4: yah (.). <2> <un> xxx</un> </2> (.)

S11: <2> presentation </2> of our solution (.).

S4: yah (.). <3> yah (.). yah </3>

S11: <3> and er maybe </3> (.) some guy- some people from europe (.). our business partner

S4: yah

S11: (will will) arrange and (.)

S4: okay (.). okay (.). yah (.). okay (.). <4> i leave it (.). up to you </4>

S11: <4> (with your part) of this presentation </4>

S4: whomsoever you you need to to (.). provide me (.). er these information (.). for the board meeting because (.). begin of next week in the board meeting there will be a decision

S11: mhm (.). and what's the time? (.). for this board meeting is it er

S4: it's er next week o:n i think tuesday

S11: tuesday (.). ok- <5> -ay mhm</5>

S4: <5> mhm </5> (4)

S11: so of course e:r (.). we can (.). call to you and er (.). just er qualify a time and: so on (.). <6> mhm </6>

S4: okay (.). let's do it like this <6> yah </6> (.) yah (.). i have to leave now i'm: (.).

S11: <7> sorry but </7> xxxx </un> </7>

S4: <7> mhm </7> (4)

S11: because actually (.). in a month or in e:r june (.). we will have er (.). [org1] event er which calls {looks at his papers} (2) oh (.). i find out it (.). er (.). [org1] innovation in distribution so we ('re glad) to invite you (.). as a ceo of er [org4]

S4: mhm

S11: a:nd er (.). actually (.). er it would be great er to see (.). you (.). in this meeting and discuss some (.). our current project and some (.). <8> <un> xx</un> </8>

S4: er that's really <8> nice </8> (.). that's really nice (.). @@@@ @@@ @ (.). great yah i (.). thanks i hope (.). i i will have the time (.). e:r to participate yah

S11: thank you <9> (thank you good bye) it's nice to meet you (.). see you </9>

S4: <9> (it's a nice id-) yah (.). good bye (.). bye (.). nice (.). to meet you </9> (.)

S11: bye (.). so:

{SS applause}

<end MD II Conversation 3_00:52:30>

{following feedback session is not transcribed}
MD III / Conversation 4
Date of Event: 2007-05-21
recording duration: 00:59:27
person id: S6 age: 35+ sex: male langKnowledge: L1 German (Austria) position: examiner
person id: S14 age: 25+ sex: male langKnowledge: L1 Russian (Russia) position: examinee
person id: S15 age: 25+ sex: female langKnowledge: L1 Russian (Russia) position: observer
person id: S16 age: 25+ sex: male langKnowledge: L1 Russian (Russia) position: observer
setting: in a hotel

1326 <beg MD III Conversation 4_00:00:00>>
1327 S6: a brief introduction of m- my person so that you know who i am (.) i'm
1328 working for [org1] austria (.) for about sixteen years (.) and er (.) i'm (.)
1329 responsible for the mainframe business and for the: (.) system-i business in austria
1330 () so i'm an stg guy hardware seller (2) and erm (3) well i'm i'm a salesman you
1331 know i sold almost everything th-the customer (.) wants or th-the the company
1332 offers (.) er (.) where do you come from? what what what's the what's the
1333 place where you are working?
1334 S14: well er i'm working in: [org1] russia e:r software group
1335 S6: <1> okay </1>
1336 S14: <1> er </1> financial services (.) e:r work with er enterprise banks right now
1337 i'm working e:r for (1) about (.) four projects (.) <fast> they're </fast> all with the
1338 (saving) bank of russian federation
1339 S6: mhm
1340 S14: it's one of the (.) our (.) st- (.) huge banks which (.) i believe right now (.) i-i-
1341 i-it makes the ma- th-th-th-the most (.) pro- profit from e:r (.) from all the banks
1342 that we have just (.) something like that
1343 S6: so you're not in the brand organization you're in the (sector) organization
1344 S14: e:r in the soft- software group e:r
1345 S6: software group okay
1346 S14: software group (.) financial services er and in the rights sector
1347 S6: okay (.) i see (.) and you?
1348 S15: i work in a (business partner) organization (.) though i: authorized e:r
1349 partners er to: (tender) (.) so that is
1350 S6: okay (.) and you?
1351 S16: and i'm from system x
1352 S6: you're from system x (.) <2> yah (.) you just told me @@@ ok okay </2>
1353 S16: <2> yeah (.) yah (.) yah </2>
1354 S6: okay (.) so why don't we kick it off? you're calling me (.) erm (4) <3> do </3>
1355 you have any question concerning the scenario and the story
1356 S14: <3> <un> x </un> </3> well i: will be the best that i'm that i will just er tell
1357 my colleagues about the scenario (and all that they’ve heard of more)
1358 S6: as you like (.) feel free
1359 S14: er well (.) e:r (1) er (.) the industry is banking <un> x xxxx </un> bank a
1360 major bank in (.) in our region (.) e:r it has been (ex-expansion) product (.) e:r
1361 about er competing network business process and so on (.) er t-to expand it around
1362 the world er (2) e:r well just (1) well it's a: the bank is er our (.) a-a-already
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mainframe (. ) user (. ) er what (. ) er the deal is that er (. ) we're proposing system x
(.) and er the (. ) er (bank offscreens) (. ) e:r to to the bank and er the main in- issue
is that (. ) e:r we have a: (. ) they have a proposal (. ) from combat which is cheaper
than ours
S6: mhm
S14: er well e:r a-as i understood from the case (. ) you're the cio
S6: yes
S14: and you're er (. ) er will <un> xx </un> to the [org1] e:r you e:r <un> xxxx
<un> of [org1] but [org6] is cheaper (. ) and er the end is here that you: er you call
me about this e:r this (. ) er issue and er (. ) er that is that er cfo ex- er expect er to
see (a three) <un> xx </un> case (. ) and so it's er the question about financing and
so on
S6: okay (. ) so let's knock on the door
S14: yah
S6: or wherever you <@> wanted to knock </@>
{S14 gets up and knocks on the door}
S6: come in
S14: hello mister [S6]
S6: hi [S14]
S14: how are you?
S6: fine thank you (. ) <4> <un> xxx </un> </4>
S14: <4> thank you so much </4> (3) it's h-hot to-today
S6: <5> well that's very </5> easy (. ) you know (. )
and i was really ready to sign but you know i when i learned that you are five
percent more expensive hh i understood very quickly that i have a problem: (. )
explaining that to my cfo (. ) because five percent (. ) is a huge amount
S14: yah i know that (. ) @ i just
S6: you know that our project has a dimension of ten to fifty million dollars (1) so
five percent is (. ) now (3)
S14: oh yah
S6: it's a nightmare being five percent more expensive
S14: er <6> well </6>
S6: <6> so i </6> (. ) i really hope that you can explain it to me (. ) and we've (. ) we
will find whatever solution but you know i cannot sign it when you're so
expensive
S14: okay e:rm (. ) well er and er you s- you have our proposal say proposal yeah?
S6: yes
S14: and you have that proposal of [org6] and e:r
S6: i have a third one as well
S14: <7> oh </7>
S6: <7> they </7> are even more cheaper yah
S14: <@> and </@> from (. ) from who?
S6: well s-some local guy you know

S14: er well er so and e:r (. ) u-u-u of course i kn ow that er (. ) as you're c- e:r (. )
CEO have you just compared (. ) compared er our proposals (. ) in order to (. ) e:r
to see the technical side
S6: yah absolutely i compared them and my team told me you know it's absolutely
equal (. ) deliverable same amount of services and same quality of products and hh
that leaves us with a difference of five percent
S14: okay so er (. )
S6: <clears throat>
S14: er the maintenance and the: total costs of ownership of the (. ) d-d-two (. ) e:r
two proposals are the same
S6: absolutely the same
S14: absolutely the same yes hh so er what er can i s:ay about the (. ) erm well
maybe a little bit of thing that er (. ) er you know that e:r (. ) our system x e:r (. ) are
just a kind of a unique service (. ) and er (. ) er i-i-it's about the total cost of
ownership that you er the the the maintenance is included and er (. ) e:r it's a quite
a flexible service er i believe it maybe i d- i don't know the (complexities) or not
( .) er that they: er (. ) they can spread their sources on from er one server to the
other (. ) and er to: er (may may) to use them er more e-effective that you like to (. )
er from (. ) e:r <8> to to use them on different applications and </8>
S6: <8> mhm (. ) yah but you know </8> [S14] i don't want to get into a (.)
technical detail discussion cos we had this in the last months (. ) you know
S14: okay
S6: we sat together with all the teams and and and and i heard thousands of
specialists from your country (. ) really (. ) i was flying to us and and er visiting
labs and i understand your technology
S14: you you were in the us?
S6: yes (.) but the point is (.) at the very end of the day (. ) you are five percent too
expensive
S14: okay and er what from financial side e:r (. ) i know that your (. ) cfo (. ) e:r
expects three year cost case in the (. ) er in this deal yah?
S6: yah absolutely and [org6] is able to match this business case you know they
can show me a breakeven (. ) after thirty-six months (1) and (.) at this very
moment when i take your figures and i take the same business case (2) it takes (. )
did you calculate it?
S14: yes of course
S6: forty-five months (1) and that's not a good story
S14: well e:r (. ) well a-a-as you know we cal-calculated er (. ) next year as it will
be (. ) more profitable but (. ) let's (. ) go er if you like it let's go to the financial (. )
side of the case (. ) so e:r (. ) er i-i i know that e:r (. ) f:rom your cfo it's er (. ) you you
have a really er big project right now that are running in your bank
S6: yah absolutely that's the biggest one we ever did you know and we're very
anxious that it fails
S14: well it's very good you know it's <9> er (. ) we'll we'll we'll (. ) we'll '</9>
S6: <9> no it's not good that i'm anxious you know @ @ @ @ '</9>
S14: you know it's very good from the side of a bank (. ) (and they're just) you're
expanding (. ) <1> you're (. ) </1> </2> so am i </2>
S6: <1> yah absolutely yah </1> (. ) </2> business is </2> exploding
S14: @ @ (.) so er i know that er from this side you: have to: (.) you need er a
great amoun- (.) amount of money (investments on the on the only other projects)
and so on (.) am i right?
S6: yeah absolutely (.) and you know you have to understand that our cfo (.) is a
very (1) tricky guy because (.) he does not want to spend any money (.) when he
does not see any benefit (.) at the same time (.) so the point is (.) when i take your
offer (.) i have two challenges (.) the first challenge is (.) you are five percent
more expensive (.) and the second challenge is (.) that i have to really pay a
HUGE amount of money (.) and i do not get ANY benefit because the project
takes SIX to twelve months (1) to show any benefit to our company (1) so i give
you my money and don't get anything for a year (1) and this is (.) absolutely
disaster when i have to talk about it with the cfo
S14: so e:r why i'm asked (.) e:r the reason is that er in er [org1] in our company
in [org1] we have er such structure which is called [name7] (.) e:r did you ever
heard something about?
S6: yah of course yah (.) that's a that's a kind of bank right? <3> <un> xx </un>
</3>
S14: <3> yah </3> yah a b- a b- a bank (.) that's a kind of (.) special bank (.) a
bank e::r for our customers (.) and fo- maybe for [org1] itself (.) something like
that (.) so er what (.) e:r what e:r i see in this situation (.) that er currently (.) er we
would help (.) er that e:r we can er offer you a: proposal (.) and er to give you s-a
d- a d- a a deal with ib- with our [name7] (.) so (.) i know that you're running a
really er big project er in your er bank right now and you: (.) you need to have a a
great amount of er money for that <4> and i: i know i </4>
S6: <4> and does it become cheaper </4> when i use [name7]
S14: e:r well i: believe it (.) it's not about e:r (.) something like er cash benefit (.)
it's the benefit that er your cfo e:r d- well do not have a (.) such a kind of lack of
e:r y::ah lack of money lack o- lack of i-i-investments in these e:r in this big
project
S6: yah but would you tell me is it (.) becoming even more expensive because i
have to pay some interest to your company (.) [name7] or what- whatever is it's
name (.) so the point is (.) i'm a bank
S14: yah
S6: and i did not lease (.) anything (.) up to now because (.) nobody has (.) so
much cheap money than me (1) so i can hardly imagine that you have cheaper
money
S14: i i understand you
S6: yah
S14: yah (.) i i-i understand you correctly er and e:r what i er what (.) i i just want
to say er to say that er (.) of course you have a: e:r well a i i do- i don't er (.)
really a finance guy so i i don't work for [name7] e::r (.) well er a:s er wha-what i
know that here we have a very very special offers for the er for our customers (.)
because er i-it's not about the (.) it's it's not about the [name7] making money it's
e:r the structure is about e:r helping i-[org1] to (.) do the business (.) <5> and </5>
S6: (let me go what is it <5> for me) </5> (.) where's my benefit <6> (to the
[name7]) </6>
S14: <6> well er </6> the most benefit for you that er you said you have er maybe
the ch- the cheapest credits and for you to be suitable but (.) e:r i i don't think that
may- may- may- maybe <un> xxxx </un> but e:r (.) you have running a great
project right now and e:r (.) er fo- for bank right now is is very er (.) important (.)
to have e:r really e:r great er to have a really great mon- er real- real- really big su-
sum of money in e:r actually today (.) e:r you you have to: e:r w- e:r you you need
( .) for your <un> xx </un> <7> e:r </7> that is working ( .) for the other
projects and so on
S6: <7> mhm </7>
S14: so (.) what [org1] can can help you we just er can split ( .) payments ( .) for
you and e:r right now ( .) er you can spend your money for ( .) some other projects
that will ( .) er ( .) er that will give you a r- a r- a: return of investments more ( .) e:r
( .) er in in initial time
S6: yah that's basically a good idea i tell you what i want i want to have a kind of
payment window ( .) i want to have ( .) six to twelve months ( .) at the beginning of
the project ( .) where i pay nothing
S14: okay
S6: and afterwards when ( .) the benefits (1) of our project ( .) are going to
materialize i want to start paying ( .) is that possible?
S14: well ( .) er ( .) i believe th- th- er that yes but i i i repeat that i i'm not financial
guy so i i need to discuss it for for with er ( .) our [name7] guys and e:r o- o- i i told
you that we are o-o-o-our our our company [org1] is very flexible to our clients so
( .) er what ( .) er right now what can i help is just to ( .) e:r write down all your
expectations ( .) and er to: speak about with it with e:r our i- er [name7] ( .) i
believe that we'll do something with that ( .) so e:r as i understand you right you
have er you: ( .) want e:r ( .) er something like a six to: ( .) twelve month financial
window ( .) that you pay nothing and just when er investments will return you just
( .) start to pay
S6: yah absolutely yah ( .)
S14: e-er either <8> w- </8>
S6: <8> would </8> would that be a kind of capital lease or operating lease?
S14: (actually i don't know) ( .) i i i just e:r ( .) need to: ( .) er abou- about that i i
believe that we need another conversation with our ( .) [name7] guy so that you
<9> can </9>
S6: <9> mhm </9> (. ok i see
S14: e-er well to: ( .) e:r whether you c- you have a conversation in the same
language you know ( .) cos e:r very hard to know the the software stuff ( .) hh well
er have you ( .) er do you have any other expect- expectations from ( .) this deal but
e:r except this financial wi-window?
S6: well actually i expect ( .) that you offer me ( .) something which is price
competitive to [org6] and the other vender ( .) so at least you have to show ( .) these
five percent which you are at the moment more expensive ( .) and (1) the second
thing ( .) you need to show us that you are ( .) as flexible with installments ( .) as it
is necessary ( .) to keep the investment and the benefit in balance
S14: w-what? just repeat ( .) unders-
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1555  (recording failed because of a low battery after 15:22)
MD III / Conversation 5
Date of Event: 2007-05-21
recording duration: 00:59:27
person id: S1 age: 40+ sex: male langKnowledge: Croatian (Croatia) position: examiner
person id: S17 age: 25+ sex: female langKnowledge: Russian (Russia) position: examinee
person id: S18 age: 25+ sex: male langKnowledge: Russian (Russia) position: observer
person id: S19 age: 25+ sex: male langKnowledge: Russian (Russia) position: observer
setting: in a hotel

1556  <beg MD III Conversation 5_00:15:25>
1557  S1: so [S17]
1558  S17: mhm?
1559  S1: how long are you with [org1]?
1560  S17: e:rm nine ni:ne months
1561  S1: nine months and? doing?
1562  S17: hh (i’m engaged) with er (lotus) product selling (.) <1> (for the) </1>
1563  software group
1564  S1: <1> aha </1> (.) and?
1565  S17: and?
1566  S1: how it goes?
1567  S17: oh
1568  S1: satisfied?
1569  S17: it’s a: lit- a little bit difficult for me cos i am not an hh it er (1)
1570  S1: <2> (background) (.) yah okay (.) </2>
1571  S17: <2> person yes </2>
1572  S1: what's your background? <3> education? </3>
1573  S17: <3> hh i'm </3> i'm economist
1574  S1: aha okay
1575  S17: so but i- it's er i-i make some progress
1576  S1: <4> that sounds </4>
1577  S17: <4> and i </4> do my best to:
1578  S1: super (.) that's <5> most important yah </5>
1579  S17: <5> (please </5> the seriousness)
1580  S1: super (.) super (.) yah (.) and (.) about me (.) i'm (.) key account manager in
1581  croatia
1582  S17: mhm
1583  S1: responsible for two big (aspired) companies in the country (.) and i'm with
1584  [org1] for (.) twelve years (.) (horrible) (.) started (.) with (.) pc group (brg at a
1585  times) (.) seven (pieces) actually i was responsible for distributors in the country
1586  and then i moved (.) five years after that i moved to sales yah
1587  S17: mhm
1588  S1: so first first years i was responsible for [name17] accounts (.) and e:r (.) then i
1589  moved to (.) to key accounts yah (.) i (do face to face) there's face to face
1590  salesman (1) a:nd (.) about that chair (.) i did it (.) five (.) six years ago (.) i was
1591  sitting (also) in that chair
1592  S17: <6> mhm </6>
1593  S1: <6> so i know how you feel </6> are you a
1594  bit nervous? </6>
S1: tired (.) (fed up with) everything?
S17: @@@
S1: @ @ (. ) i wa-
S17: <8> n::ot yet @@@@ @@@</8>
S1: <8> no- (.) not yet @@@@ @@@</8>
S17: i have the presentation with (thursday)
S1: yah i know (.) i know
S17: mhm
S1: actually (wednesday evening) will will be the toughest one
S17: mhm
S1: preparation the presentation yah
S17: yes
S1: for thursday (.) yah (1) i recall that yah (1) we started (.) i think with
preparation of this presentation somewhere around (.) two or three in the
afternoon (.) and then we (talked to) (.) four o'clock in the morning
S17: <9> @@@@@ </9>
S1: <9> @@@ </9> (.) disaster
S17: (nervous)
S1: okay (.) what are you <1> going to (let)? </1>
SX-m: <1> is it worth it? </1>
S1: well (.) as i'm still (.) key account manager <2> @@@@ </2> (.) as i'm not
still not fired <3> @@@@@ </3>
SX-m: <2> @@@@@ </2>
S17: <3> @@@@@ </3>
S1: no it (.) it (.) really works (.) really works (.) yah
S17: and what are (your er) mean er [name17] account (.) <4> how much </4>
S1: <4> i started </4> with er
S17: @ <3> @ @@</3>
S1: no it (.) it (.) really works (.) really works (.) yah
S17: and what are (your er) mean er [name17] account (.) <4> how much </4>
S1: <4> i started </4> with er
S17: <9> @@@@@ </9>
S1: <9> @@@ </9>
S17: mhm
S1: small country
S17: mhm
S1: clears throat> so what i'm saying the [name17] (.) means really small (.)
small and medium business company (.) businesses yah?
S17: so it's a: (.) a er (.) er what are the biggest accounts in (.) <5> your country?
S17: <5>
S1: <5> <un> xxxxx </un> <5> first (our (.) government) institutions like
ministry for (.) different ministries (.) banks
S17: mhm
S1: most of the banks are actual- (.) were actually sold to s- were SOLD to foreign
banks (.) so they're the biggest relation or the biggest (.) customers and then (.)
there are several private companies but ei- either production companies or retail
companies (.) that's it yah (.) but (.) production mainly in e:r food production yah
S17: mhm
SX-m: so only (what's) the situation on the market in croatia (.) (so what) position
S17: <org1> have <un> x </un> <5>
S1: it's hard to say right now if you are talking about venders then it's standard it's hb and yes

S1: in terms of inter-platform it's hb definitely and yes (struggling) with venders not venders but local (sellers) companies

S17: (sn- actual-) haeh? (sm- actual-)

SX-m: (and what about the software? (and what about the software?)

S1: you know from your situation it's standard yes driving with [name8] of course and they are number one yah? they're selling their solutions or collaboration staff like ice cream i'm used to say yah? ah hello there (we're from [name8] now we have something to okay)

S17: mhm

S1: that's it yah?

S17: @@

S1: and for us we have to fight for it

S17: <8> (okay) <8>

S1: right now i'm i'm fighting with with [name8] within one of those my customers hh we're trying to switch [name8] exsan- exchange to [name8] to [name9]

S17: mhm

S1: how is it going? <9>

S1: a:h quite okay decision should be made next two months (1) for first step will be something like e- eight thousand licences so we'll see

S17: mhm

S1: let's work something

S17: okay

S1: let's work something

S17: yes @ <1> @@@ <1>

S1: @ @ @ @ @ <1> <2> er <2> <2>

S17: <2> (what is) <2> my <2>

S1: uhu <2> okay

S17: relationship

S1: okay

S17: so <.

S1: <un> xx <3> x xxx <</un> <3>

S17: <3> (why i'm here) <3>

S1: yah?

S17: i'm attending the [org1] er first client executive we're working with [org5] customer a-and this is a retail bank i he's operating the central it site on that series on [name5] and er s- er some p-series service running

S17: [name6] er the situation on the market is er (very difficult) and the customer has high (operational) costs. so: i have two objectives for this meeting the first one to move er to discuss er how we can remove [name6] from [org5] to and er (sales to distribute it to) [name5] and the second is to discuss about enter-price-licence-agreement so: i think we can start

S1: mhm <4> you are already in

S17: a:h okay <5> @ @ @ <5>
S1: <5> @@@@ </5> 1690
S19: lucky person 1691
S1: yah <clears throat> 1692
S17: hm 1693
S1: <6> @@@ </6> 1694
S17: <6> @ </6> @@ 1695
SX-m: <6> xxx </6> 1696
S17: erm 1697
S1: hi [S17] 1698
S17: hello 1699
S1: how are you doing? 1700
S17: hello [S1] i i i’m okay thank you how (. ) how about (. ) your weekends 1701
S1: hm: (. ) quite okay playing golf around (. ) i cannot complain yah (. ) <7> yah 1702
</7> 1703
S17: hm <7> super </7> 1704
S1: outside on the fresh air ( . ) on the sun ( . ) so ( . ) it’s quite okay ( . ) yah 1705
S17: er super 1706
S1: hi [S17] 1707
S17: yah 1708
S1: and er i-i’m here to discuss some issues (which are coming to) with [org5] 1709
S1: issues? we have some issues with them 1710
S17: we have some- ( . ) something to discuss ( . ) so i’m <8> here </8> for that 1711
S1: <8> yah? </8> 1712
S17: so er how much time do we have for that 1713
S1: let’s say so twenty twenty-five minutes 1714
S17: er okay 1715
S1: depending what what you have to talk to me yah 1716
S17: yes ( . ) er er i know that you’re with [org1] for ( . ) eighteen ( . ) years ( . ) 1717
S1: <9> yah </9> yes </9> 1718
S17: <9> a:nd </9> er you’re engaged with this customer for three years already 1719
S1: yah ( . ) 1720
S17: <1> a:nd </1> er ( . ) i’m here to ( . ) e:r f:- maybe to help er you: to find out 1721
maybe some new opportunities to discuss current opportunities ( . ) which you have 1722
with this e- client ( . ) and er e:r ( . ) to got to know overall what er how is the 1723
business going over there 1724
S1: okay 1725
S17: what are the challenges and so on 1726
S1: (fine with me) 1727
S17: so 1728
S1: i’m espe- especially interested in those new opportunities 1729
S17: o:h i @@@ @ @ hh super so e:rm you know i’m a new ( . ) a new person ( . ) e:r 1730
with this account and er i would kind kind of ask you to: tell me som:e detai:ls 1731
which are connected with this client ( . ) just to meet er just to know it better for me 1732
S1: okay ( . ) so ( . ) they are ( . ) i would say i may say our traditional customer ( . ) 1733
traditional in terms they are for ( . ) long time with us 1734
S17: mhm 1735
S1: on our hardware platforms ( . ) on servers meaning z-series 1736
S17: mhm
S1: meaning (.) p-series they have some x-series servers around (.) the company
right now it's (.) <un> xxx </un> part so (.) we can forget about it (.) we are
selling also some sort of for instance what's maybe for you interesting is (.) that
we have (. ) [name5] on z-series <2> installed </2>
S17: <2> yah </2>
S1: we have (. ) bought the [name6] p-series but (.) nevertheless bloody or not but
we are (bloating) some money out of it (.) in terms of services (.) and basically
that's it (.) they are quite satisfied with us and (.) what i'm really interested in that
( .) hh we continue with this relationship (build a new) relationship with them
S17: mhm
S1: that (.) we: continue to be their (.) trusted and preferred partner (.) that's the
most important thing for me ( .) and for the moment we are collecting quite
enough revenue ( .) out of ( .) out of that
S17: mhm ( .) e: r (. ) [S1] what e: r what er by the way er what ( .) what i'm
interested in (.) i know that you sell s:oftware (underware) and <3> consulting
<</3> (what else) ( .) what er ( .) maybe what <4> i i -i know your </4>
responsibilities <5> but i'd </5> like to memory your ( .) er what issues are you
interested in (1) you know i'm responsible <6> for the </6> software ( .)
S1: <3> okay </3> (.) <5> okay </5> (.) <6> okay </6> (.) mhm ( .)
SX-m: <4> <coughs> </4>
S17: sales so ( .) what er what about <7> y- </7>
S1: <7> cur- </7>-rently e: r (1) the biggest issue actually the biggest problem i
have it with with them is: (2) i'm i'm actually wondering w:hether i will make my
quarter or not ( .) e:rm ( .) part of the revenue we are (quoting) from ( .) er software
licences [name5] ( .) we are collecting revenue from ( .) services ( .) <8> (made on)
<</8> [name6] ( ) and for this year we unfortunately ( .) can forget about revenue
from hardware ( .) <9> they </9> did significant ( .) purchases during the last year
( .) they spend a lot of money in our hardware ( .) and for this year ( .) unfortunately
they will spend almost nothing (1) <1> a: nd </1>
S17: <8> mhm </8> (.) <9> mhm </9> (.) <1> on hardw are? </1>
S1: <8> mhm </8> (.) <9> mhm </9> (.) <1> on hardware? </1>
S17: <8> mhm </8> (.) <9> mhm </9> (.) <1> on hardware? </1>
S1: <8> mhm </8> (.) <9> mhm </9> (.) <1> on hardware? </1>
S17: mhm
S1: a: nd that's actually ( .) that's my problem i have a gap ( .) and i FOR the
moment i'm still looking around how to close this gap
S17: <8> mhm </8> (.) <9> mhm </9> (.) <1> on hardware? </1>
S1: yah ( .)
S17: mhm
S17: <2> overall </2>
S1: <2> overall </2>
S17: <2> overall </2>
S1: <2> overall </2> as i'm responsible for each and every ( .) CENT coming out of
that customer <3> so: </3> ( .) i'm looking for each and every cent i can collect
<4> out of </4> them yah? (nevertheless) it's hardware and it's services it's
software or whatever ( .) financing whatever
S17: <3> mhm </3> (.) <4> mhm </4> (.) mhm ( .) okay ( .) so: let's e: r let me
help you may- maybe help you to give some ideas how how we can ( .) e: r reduce
this gap er to make a quota ( .) so ( .) <5> i </5>
S1: <5> i </5> 'm all ears
S17: haeh?
S1: i'm ALL EARS <makes signs (2)>
S17: a:h okay @@@@ so: (. ) er let's start with the customer needs er current projects er comparison to act (. ) i as as far as <6> i know </6>
S1: <6> okay </6>
S17: they have to: reduce operational costs
S1: <7> yes </7>
S17: <7> as </7> as it is very difficult er situation on the market
S1: mhm <8> that's true </8>
S17: <8> there's a </8> competitive pressure so (. ) er what do you know about (. )
S1: w-well e:r as you as you told they are heavily e::r (. ) pressured (. ) by their by by competition
S17: S17: hm
S1: er they HAVE to (. ) and they are looking (. ) for ways how to perform it e::r to reduce (. ) the operational costs (. ) they have bunch of venders and they are looking out to reduce number of venders (. ) of course th-those bunch of venders are (. ) connected to operational cost the more venders you have then you have (. ) bigger bigger cost <9> of op- </9> -eration meaning (. ) you have to (. ) to take care about each and every contact about each and every <1> vender </1> if something (goes wrong) you have to to contact (. ) bunch of people (. ) you have to have a lot of (. ) skilled people for different platforms meaning automatical a lot of <2> cost for </2> (. ) for education et cetera et cetera so that's that's the primary (word)
S17: <9> mhm </9> (. ) <1> yah </1> (. ) <2> mhm </2> (. ) okay so wh:ich are the venders
S1: different kind of venders for instance let's sa- <un> xx </un> about (database) platforms they have [name5] and [name6]
S17: S17: mhm
S1: yah? they have <un> xx </un> they have <un> xxxxxxxxx xx </un> services we are doing services [name6] is doing <un> xx </un> the service there are several (. ) different (. ) private companies (. ) local venders (. ) so that that's the (. ) problem (. ) for instance they have to have educated people for [name5] they have to have <3> edu- </3> -cated people for for [name6]
S17: <3> mhm </3> (. ) by the way why did they (. ) choose e:r (. ) this way (. ) to: (. ) connecting the (the infrastructure) different er venders (. ) <4> and why <un> xxx <un> [name6] </4>
S1: <4> why? er that's (. ) <4> actually that happened before i i took over there (. ) er but as far as i know that's responsibility to o- of other colleagues (. ) nstg p-series (. ) t (. ) <5> which </5> actually forced (. ) er [name6] as distributor database on p-series
S17: <5> mhm </5> (. ) mhm
S1: yah? that's (. ) <6> that was the idea </6> (. ) e:r (. ) our (clienting) at that time (. ) was focused on (. ) having that platform (. ) o:r databases consolidated meaning db having [name5] (. )
S17: <6> <coughs> </6> (. ) mhm
S1: on both services z-series and p- hh p-series platform but (. ) right now we have [name6] (. ) and we have to (read a bit)
S17: e:r what a:re the customers thoughts about that
S1: (look) everything was fine and it's okay with them (.) of course they have a
bigger cost we have to manage it (.) but (1) <7> that's it </7>
S17: <7> e:r </7> have have you made some proposal (.) about (.) o-ono-on-
[name6] a:nd er no have you made a (.) [name5] proposal for the customer al- <8>
-old ready or not not </8> hh
S1: <8> no (.) no no no no </8> there there's </9> no reason for the moment
for that because
S17: <9> so er </9> (3) <1> yes </1>
S1: <1> we </1> are collecting services revenue out of [name6] and (.) i can live
with it
S17: mhm (.) so i: (.) i spent er some time (.) fo:r (.) thinking what we can do for
the customer and draw a picture (1) {takes out a piece of paper} <2> e:rm </2>
S1: <2> okay </2>
S17: here it is {shows the drawing to S1} er this is the current situation (.) er the
current (it er) it infrastructure (who is) connected with er (.) database
S1: okay
S17: so: (.) i (know this (.) central it site) is operating on z-series <3> er </3>
S1: <3> okay </3>
S17: with [name5] and (.) s:ome (.) some some number of p-series with [name6]
S1: <4> okay </4>
S17: <4> do you </4> know the amount of this p-series
S1: er (.) i don't know the <pvc> strait </pvc> number but we can ask
my colleagues <un> xxxx </un> number <5> so we </5> can ask them for (.) for
exact number of <6> of p- </6> series and licences they have
S17: <5> mhm </5> (.) <6> aha </6> (.) okay (.) 1857
S1: hm
S17: okay (.) so what i assume (.) that thei:er er i assume that their central it site
can be (.) operating on (.) on er e:r (.) z-series and p-series service (.) with (.)
[name5] (.) e:r (.) as database (.) e:r f- (.) what are the advantages of that?
S1: <7> mhm </7>
S17: <7> how c- </7> how can we explain to the customer? (.) e:r he can to
reduce the total cost of ownership of his (.) infrastructure (.) and that is the issue
(.) e:r (.) that is how: the customer can: (.) reduce e:r <pvc> (itsegrational)
{itsegrational} </pvc> costs (1) so (2)
S1: (now tell me) (.) how can we reduce his operational cost (.) (free)
S17: er if he has er the database from er (.) from one (.) vender
S1: mhm
S17: so: he needs e:rm (.) m- er f::rom one <pvc> point on tiew {point of
view} <pvc> er (.) he will get er (.) more er (.) g-g-good prices
S1: okay
S17: from from us
S1: <8> as always (.) okay </8>
S17: <8> so that was the benefit e:r </8> that was the benefit for the customer (.)
secondly e:rm (.) they can (.) er reduce training costs (.) er to to erm (.) their staff
(.) how to (.) manage these e:r (.) er databases and so on (.) nowadays they spend
a lo- er they e-er (.) s:pend a lot of time (.) for er (.) learning their staff on
different e:r (.) venders
S1: <9> okay </9>
S17: <9> <un> xx </un> <9> [name6] [name5] and so on (.) <1> so </1> 1881
S1: <1> but if </1> you go with this one (.) of course they will have to educate
1882 this people which (are all educated for [name6]) they have to learr- (.) re-educate
1883 them (.) to [name5] (.) correct?
1884 S17: correct (.) but they have already the [name5] people (.) so it will be much
1885 easier for them and in the longterm er perspective they (.) can cut their costs on
1886 that
1887 S1: i see your point yah okay
1888 S17: sorry? (1)
1889 S1: if you go to them yah? (.) and propose to them that (.) let's say <un> xxxxxx
1890 S17: mhm
1891 S1: <2> may i ask you something? </2>
1892 S17: ye:s of course
1893 S1: initially (.) er how can we prove their initial investment exchanging [name6]
1894 to [name5]
1895 S17: so e:r (.) this is the (.) first thing (.) er (.) <2> some you you </2>
1896 S1: <2> may i ask you something? </2>
1897 S17: ye:s of course
1898 S1: initially (.) er how can we prove their initial investment exchanging [name6]
1899 to [name5]
1900 S1: how will you prove that (.) they will have to m ake initial investment (.)
1901 exchange [name6] platform
1902 S17: mhm
1903 S1: to [name5] (.) to mugr- m- migrate (.) all the data from [name6] to [name5]
1904 S17: i think we can e:rm (.) ask our colleagues i think we have special we can
1905 have some er special programmes er for migrating from (.) e:r (.) er the
1906 competitive er (.) platforms (.) for [org1] platforms
1907 S1: okay
1908 S17: er (.) i know that in software there are some trade-ups (.) which er which
1909 help to (.) er (1) to: get the customer on (.) on the side of [org1]
1910 S1: okay
1911 S17: and er i think that is the issue it's very: it's very it (.) that that issue will be
1912 very useful for us (3)
1913 S1: okay (3)
1914 S17: so
1915 S1: so you mean (a little bit of) help of those guys which are responsible for com-
1916 competitive studies (1) we may achieve something
1917 S17: yes of course (.) this <3> is a <3> prel- (.) preliminary picture <4> (.) i </4>
1918 think we can e:r (.) i-i can er contact with our (upper) software architectures
1919 S1: <3> okay <3> <4> okay <4> (.) okay
1920 S17: as well as erm (.) with people which er which responsible for e:r the (stuff)
1921 of trade-ups
1922 S1: okay
1923 S17: er to propose the customer the better solution from [org1]
1924 S1: okay (2) okay it's it's for the customer (.)
1925 S17: <5> yes </5> (.)
1926 S1: <5> but </5> what's in there for me?
1927 S17: the e:r for you e:r y-y-you can get er for your quota all these er (.) all these
1928 licences (.) so (.) you can (.) er first of all we can (.) e-er by the way we can (.) er
talk to the customer and find out whether he needs the additional investigation of the IT infrastructure
S1: okay

S17: so if it happens that customer needs it, you can gain the consultancy services you can get something for a quarter from the consultancy services. i have it already here (4)

S17: er this is (now the) situation (7) er have you made the consultancy for this customer
S1: <6> i have it already here (4) 1932
S17: er this is (now the) situation (7) 1933
S1: <7> (yeah) but i i'm (still collecting) this revenue out of here 1934
S17: so you mean that er [name6] is currently implemented on p-series
S1: yah and then (collecting) money from services for [name6] haeh?
S17: er it's very interesting thing hh have you made er the consultancy for this customer
S1: mhm
S17: and (what are they saying)?
S1: yah they they're right now satisfied with this solution and me too because i'm collecting this money
S17: what did [org1] say about that
S1: fine we're collecting money if you tried to sell this one before without success
S17: mhm
S1: now they have the situation we're getting as much money as possible out of that we didn't forget this one
S17: mhm
S1: we're collecting services money (1) but okay if you go for this one what will i get for it i will lose this revenue get only once this one
S17: <8> and? 1956
S17: <8> mhm </8> 1957
S1: what next
S17: <9> mhm </9> 1958
S1: what next
S17: er first of all if they don't need any consultancies so er we can connect er if the customer needs the
to them they'll buy it it's up to you and me
S17: mhm
S1: but what kind of xxx
S17: er what kind of IT-infrastructure in the whole
S1: <2> exact - <2> tly yah yah yah
S17: <un> xx </un>
S1: yah
S17: and as to that project exactly you get their er you can get money from additional licences of [name5] <3> <4> hh
S17: <3> okay </3> <4> okay
S1: and maybe the customer will need some more er hardware (1)
S1: okay
S17: so that's it
S1: mhm (1)
S17: maybe (.) e:r the customer will decide e:r (.) to get (how) [name7] services
S1: mhm mhm <5> mhm </5>
S17: <5> so: </5> this is er just an opportunity (.) <6> you can discuss (with the
customer) </6>
S1: <6> okay (.) er just a just a small opportunity yah but </6>
S17: @@@ <7> <@> yes </@> </7>
S1: <7> okay </7> (.) okay
S17: so e:rm </8> so </8>
S1: <8> and </8> (.) don't you think (.) maybe (.) abOUT providing them (.) kind
of licence agreement? (.) for consolidation of <9> all the </9> licences they (.)
(release) (.) that case (.)
S17: <9> mhm </9> (.) mhm
S1: (you know) (.) this case and thi-this one (.) haeh? (.) maybe this will be also
(.) kind of selling point for them
S17: you mean the price-licence-agreement or what
S1: ya:h
S17: haeh?
S1: yah
S17: so e:rm (.) that that that is the: (.) second point i'd like to discuss with <1>
you </1>
S1: <1> okay </1> (.) fine
S17: so e:r how is it going nowadays er they: buy: er (.) by the way (.) h:ow many
S1: they have (1) three main branch offices (1) and then i think fifteen or twenty
at least (.) but (i have to re-) check it (.) yah (1)
S17: fifty? (.) <2> fifty </2> (.) <3> aha </3>
S1: <2> fifteen </2> (.) fifteen or twenty (.) <3> three main </3> and fifteen or
twenty (.) additional (poor) (.) plus then have (1) i don't know how many retail
offices (1) two hundreds of something like this yah
S17: a:nd (.) will departments er make purchases (.) from [org1] and e:r (.)
(overall (.) who who are) responsible for the booking and (.) every department
buys er by its own
S1: <fast> (i don't know now) </fast> they hav- they have a central department
and a pr- central procurement department of course we- we: (.) where we start
hh to talk with them about any kind of opportune- opportunis- -tity
S17: OPPORTUNITIES (.)
S17: <4> hm </4>
S1: <4> first </4> we start start to build it with it-department
S17: mhm
S1: and when we finalise it then it was the procurement department fo:r (.)
contracts et cetera et cetera for negotiations but (.) basically they have a central
procurement department
S17: mhm (.) super and er (.) e:r <5> how is the </5>
S1: <5> and don't for- </5> -get e:r i play (.) play golf with [name10] so
S17: you (.) sorry <6> (you do) </6>
S1: <6> i PLAY </6> golf with [name10]
S17: a:h (.) <un> xxx </un> the customer
S1: yah
S17: so you have good relationships (.) (so <7> you think) </7>
S1: <7> in golf </7> yah
S17: yah?
S1: yah (.) <8> i i </8> i must not beat him yah (.) <9> @@ dur- during golf
S17: <8> so i think </8> <9> @@ @@ @@ @@ @ </9> (.) so [org1] i think er
can have (.) perfect positions er b- by the south er <1> <un> xx </un> (.) @ </1>
S1: <1> (internally) (.) it's </1> it's a situation yah
S17: so a:nd e:r (.) how is the (.) licence a-a-agreement e:r issue is e:r (.)
nowadays in this company (.) <2> how </2> do they vie (.) <3> <un> xxx </un>
S1: <3>
S17: <2> or </2> (.) <3> a-a-as i as i </3> told you they have a (. ) several venders
and different (.) platforms let's say so (.) <4> cooperation </4> platform database
S1: <5> platform </5> et cetera et cetera it's not only <un> xxx </un> they have
several (.) different contracts (.) with all those venders (.) including [org1] now (.)
and <6> that's </6> (.) that's painful for them
S17: <4> it's a <un> xx </un> </4> <5> mhm </5> <6> mhm </6> (.) mhm
S1: <7> mhm </7> <8> </8>
S17: each and every time that they have to renew those contracts they have to
renegotiate again which <7> <un> xx </un> </7> (.) which <un> xx </un> (.)
each and every <un> xxx xxx </un> (.) of negotiation
S17: so if we offer er the customer enter-price-licence-agreement
S1: mhm
S17: er what he can get er first of all he will get er (.) er the <un> xxx </un>
discount option
S1: <8> okay </8>
S17: <8> so </8> i he-e-er the the customer can buy different products (.) <9>
and <9>
S1: <9> but th- </9> but the bigger the discount we gave to them (.) the less
money we collect (.)
S17: yeah
S1: <1> so we have (to be careful with this) </1> (.) <2> @ @@ </2>
S17: <1> it's not about (.) </1> <@@> yeah <@@> <2> @@@ @ may- maybe yes
S17: <2> e:r they think about maybe some (.) e:r (.) political issue (.) er to er i-i mean
(.) that the customer (.) with the customer will completely (.) support er [org1] er
will buy only [org1] products (.) it's the:
S1: <un> xxxxxxxxx </un> <3> okay? </3>
S17: <3> @@ @@ @@ </3> @ (.) so a:nd er the second that e::r (.) if the customer
buys more
S17: <1>
S1: mhm
S17: it's er it's it's okay that er the vender provides him (.) with a ( .) good discount
S1: <4> okay </4>
S17: <4> to to s- </4> to (relead) er the customer to buy more and more
S1: okay but enterprise enterprise licence agreement will last let's say so
for three years yah?
S17: sorry?
S1: ENTERPRISE LICENCE AGREEMENT will last will be contracted
{a mobile phone rings}
SX-m: xx xx
S17: @ @ @
{SX-m turns the mobile phone off}
S17: sorry once more (2) @
S1: it's your task to blame him
S17: mhm
S1: afterwards
S17: mhm
S1: so this agreement will last for three years yah will be signed for three
years let's say so usually
S17: so you have discussed this alright okay okay
S1: no no i-it usually when we sign enterprise licence agreement it it lasts for three years
hm? and we charge cu- customer on monthly basis
S17: yah
S1: so that means that our revenue yours revenue and my revenue
S17: mhm
S1: will be divided
S17: mhm
S1: into twenty-six portions
S17: mhm
S1: we won't collect revenue immediately this year but in twenty-six
portions and i'm interested very interested to have all that revenue
right now
S17: e:r you know i have the same interest so so:
S1: okay so
S17: <@> (i got a quarter too) and e:r what do you think what we can
do with that
S1: i don't know tell me don't you think maybe about [name7]
S17: <8> may- <8> i-i: <clicks tongue>
S1: <9> about financing options
S17: <9> i didn't think about this issue but e:r i think we can ask for
[name7] and er maybe they: er they (1) <1> xxxx
S1: er i heard i heard <un> xxx <un> divided let's say so in twenty-six annual
S17: <2> mhm <2> mhm
S1: <clears throat> rates get that money as one contract
S17: mhm
S1: and [name7] is taking care about collecting money so check it (1)
S17: okay
S1: and if it (. ) if it works on that way (. ) i'm for it
S17: so okay e:r will will will the customer e:r (. ) agree with that (. ) er
S1: of course (. ) they're (. ) they're a bank (. ) and they're (selling) the money (1) if
(. ) if can (. ) if they can('t) (. ) postpone (. ) their costs
S17: mhm
S1: for thirty-six months (. ) they will have more money to sell (. ) meaning (doing)
more money (. ) so
S17: yah (1) correct (1) it's a <3> good idea </3>
S1: <3> at least you're </3> economist (. ) you know how banks operate yah?
S17: yah @ @ (. ) hh so: [S1] e:r what e:r (. ) is there o-one of the main er issues
i would like to find out er e:r (. ) who (. ) i-i know that you're running f- e:r five
persons (. ) <4> <un> xxx </un> </4> of five persons and (. ) hh e:rm (. ) who who
do conduct these er project er which is connected with software <5> <un> xx
</un> </5>
S1: <4> okay </4> <5> e:r </5> it will be supervised by me but i will (. ) g-
give you the name of dedicated person for that one
S17: okay (. ) and er (. ) er (1) i (. ) i (. ) as we agreed (. ) we can (. ) involve [name7]
in these
S1: we HAVE TO
S17: yes we have to (. ) erm (. ) maybe we have to involve our software
architectures as well and [name7]
S1: for sure
S17: yes er (. ) who else
S1: who else e:r (. ) do we have (. ) any kind of experience (. ) in exch- (. ) within the
( .) (other) company (. ) in exchanging (. ) [name6] (. ) with [name5] (. ) within <6>
services department </6>
S17: <6> i'm sure that </6> we do (. ) <7> i'm sure we have (. ) okay okay </7>
S1: <7> check it (. ) check it please (. ) if we </7> miss
S17: mhm
S1: or make mistake (1) in this exchange
S17: mhm
S1: as a first ceo will kill me
S17: <@> o:h </@>
S1: and second one (. ) we can forget that customer forever
S17: mhm
S1: we have to (. ) to be (. ) very very precise and everything you know
S17: okay (. ) okay (. ) i'll check it a:nd find out whether we ca:n attend the er the
client <8> e:r and </8>
S1: <8> okay (. ) </8> er (. ) that's first one the second one e:r when you (. ) when
you check everything (. ) please come to me with business case (. ) meaning <un>
xxx </un> licences (. ) number <un> x </un> of service and everything
S17: mhm (. )
S1: and come to me with the figures
S17: e:r <9> where </9>
S1: <9> prove </9> (. ) prove to me (. ) this concept
S17: mhm
S1: sell it to me (.) with figures (.) wi- (.) as idea (.) i agree with you (1) so you
have to come to me (.) with (.) comparison between current costs (.) you will get it
from (.) our colleagues
S17: mhm <1> mhm </1>
S1: <1> between </1> current situation <pvc> future situation {future situation}
</pvc> (.) and (.) this year (.) five years (1) okay (.) for the customer (.) <2> we
have to sell </2>
S17: <2> do you think </2> that is the: (.) issue of our consultants then
S1: mhm (.) we have to sell it to them (.) they won't buy it (.) if they won't see (.)
money in it (1) not only okay we will (.). you will have only one vender <3> (.).
of
</3> database (.) but (.) show me the money
S17: <3> erm </3> (1) [S1] don't you think that we (.) have to (.) sell (.) just the
idea to the customer (.) and er some calculation so everything which is confi- er
connected with figures that <4> is then our consultant's issue </4>
S1: <4> <un> xx </un> okay they (.) <4> (they have got) a bank (1) they're just
looking for money (.) as i'm looking for the money (.) there is my quarter (.) and
you are looking for your quarter (.) <5> and they are working </5>
S17: <5> (because our) consul- </5> -tance is not free of charge
S1: of course they are not (.) of course they are not
S17: <6> yah </6>
S1: <6> you </6> will put on the paper all the costs (1) cost of licences (.). cost of
consultancy
S17: mhm
S1: cost of (.). labour
S17: mhm
S1: yah? (.) and (.). cost of (.). licences for five years (.). yah? <7> okay? </7>
S17: <7> mhm </7>
S1: and of course including their (.). enterprise-licence-agreement (.). with this (.).
and (.). we (including) [name7] (.). because we have to have this revenue (.). for this
year
S17: mhm
S1: okay
S17: okay (.) so is everything e:r connect with software i: f- (.). can do it for sure
hh and er if i have some (.). questions some:e (.). pr- some troubles with that er
can i (.) connect with you? (.) <8> <un> xx </un> </8>
S1: <8> of course </8> (.). i'm here
S17: if i need some more figures and so on
S1: of course (.). i'm ready and willing to help you
S17: okay (.) so: (.) as i see (.). erm (2) e:r w-what about (.). maybe some new
opportunities wh:at er how do you see the client can develop in: a:. short-
term period (3)
S1: hm (.) they will do (.) they are forced to have (.). (spare location)
S17: <soft> <un> x </un> </soft>
S1: SPARE LOCATION
S17: mhm
S1: meaning if this one fails (.). (for whatever) reason (.). flooding (.). earthquake (.).
fire whatever
S1: the other location will take over all the jobs everything initially it does (they think about that solution)
S17: so if
S1: it's a (basic) to (European standard which forces them to bear it)
S17: if in this solution we'll succeed
S1: mhm
S17: so what other opportunities do you see by this customer
S1: as i told you
S17: this is (only) why?
S1: <2> yah (business continuity)
S17: aha
S1: a spare location (new data center) with complete new infrastructure new series new networking
S17: (so) firstly we can to end up with this solution
S1: of course
S17: so okay so er i said that i've just er everything i: wanted
S1: <4> okay
S17: if you have some questions for me er i will be happy to answer it
S1: for the moment no just with those er what we agreed
S17: <5> okay
S1: <5> namely this business case
S17: okay so then then we will discuss how to proceed on but definitely i think there is potential in this
S17: okay so i find some references er references on (migration) from [name6] to [name5] and er make an appointment with [name7] and find out how we can er (boot) xx (you know) in this quota
S1: <7> mhm mhm <7> <8> mhm <8>
S17: <8> so for the customer e: no @
S1: na okay
S17: (is that) er
S1: aha okay (ok) ok so thank you
S1: thank you too this was a nice idea
S17: <2> let's er
S1: <2> i'll take for your corporate in the future
S17: okay yes thank you very much @
S17: thank you bye
S17: @@ @
SS applause
<end MD III Conversation 5_00:49:10>
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2261 <beg MD IV Conversation 6_00:00:03>
2262 S20: let's start
2263 S2: yah
2264 {S20 knocks on the door}
2265 S20: good morning mister [last name1]
2266 S2: good morning
2267 S20: glad to see you again
2268 S2: yes (. ) take a seat please (. ) <1> how have you been </1>
2269 S20: <1> thank you very much </1> (. ) very good
2270 S2: mhm
2271 S20: erm i e:r (. ) received a (. ) message from you (. ) and your (. ) want to: arrange
2272 the meeting that's why i'm here i <2> want </2> (. ) to know what's happening
2273 S2: <2> right </2> (. ) aha
2274 S20: and er (. ) probably (. ) you have some questions
2275 S2: erm (. ) yeah i've looked at the [name7] proposals they look very interesting
2276 a::nd (3) my questions really are concerning the investment case
2277 S20: <3> mhm </3>
2278 S2: <3> a:nd </3> the amount of money which [org2] is looking to invest
2279 S20: <4> mhm </4>
2280 S2: <4> you know </4> as procurement that's a very important issue for me (. )
2281 S20: mhm
2282 S2: er i thought that you could maybe shed some more light on (. ) on what's
2283 happening
2284 S20: mhm (. ) okay that's er (always big brother's) investments e:r what project do
2285 you mean
2286 S2: [name11]?
2287 S20: mhm is this e:r as i e:r understand [name11] consists of three phase
2288 S2: yah
2289 S20: er e:r (. ) the f- the f- two of them is er already closed
2290 S2: yah
2291 S20: it's was (. ) detailed analysis phase one and det- ana- in more deeper analysis
2292 your databases
2293 S2: aha
S20: they thought i have it with me (1) just (.) let me (.) one moment {searches for some papers (8)} it's er (.) all about our (.) second recommendation here (1) the: costs about ten and (fifty) (.) million

S2: yah

S20: total total cost (.) and e:r oh erm (.) (you're all) interesting in e:r (.) investment from ou:r (.) finance er consultancy from <5> our </5> and check something (.) <6> i'll be </6> back in a minute <7> okay? </7>

S20: <6> <6> mhm </6> <7> <7> okay </7>

[S2 leaves the room]

[S22 enters the room] (7)

SX-m: (who has got everything)

SX-m: haeh?

SX-m: (crazy) (3)

SX-m:  <clears throat>

S22: (but more important)

S2: {from outside} are they (3)

S22: hello

SX-m: hm

SX-m: mhm

S22: have you seen [first name2] [last name2]?

S20: yes (.) he is (.) out

S22: my name is [S22] [S22/last] (1) i am cfo (and) who are you?

S20: (we are from) [org1] i am account manager from [org1] (.)

S22: <8> account manager of [org1] </8>

S20: <8> (nice) (.) nice (.) </8> nice to meet you

AHA: (.) what is account manager

S20: it is e:r (.) like a (one point) for entering in a big company (.) so i just er provide all necessary information regarding all products that [org1] have

S22: aha

S20: and e:r (.) and sell (.) in the in the industry (.) and (1) we are e:r (.) and i am like person responsible for (.) all projects that we already have and probably will have

S22: so you are now quite engaged in in our company

S20: yes (.) abso- you're absolutely right

S22: that's interesting because i just wanted to ask [S2] one thing (.) er (.) i: just have here (2) a bill o:f [org7] concerning [name11]

S20: mhm

S22: and i also found a one hundred thousand (.) dollar

S20: mhm

S22: er invoice of [org1] [name11]

S20: mhm

S22: so apparently (.) we're paying to two companies for the same thing

S20: @@ (.) and er e:r (.) actually what is the: erm: [org7] proposal

S22: not proposal they c- they: charged me: some services (.) consultancy services

S20: (and what) (.) with the services it wa- it was (.) what is <9> the services </9>

S22: <9> er e::r </9> er i am NOT here to discuss what [org7] is doing

S20: <1> mhm </1>
S22: <1> but </1> i just wonder (.) what [org1] is doing in [name11] when [org7]

is working on [name11]

S20: yah as i (.) as i know (.) from e:r (.) er mister (.) er [last name3] he is a (.)

(and mister [last name4]) (.) that e:r for today as they are e:r they are (.) totally

responsible for project (.) [name11] (.) <2> <un> xxx </un> </2>

S22: <2> great (.) </2> but i just asked you why are [org1] and [org7] doing the

same thing

S20: actually: i i don't know tha- why [org7] do do (.) something because we: <3>

e:r </3>

S22: <3> but </3> what is [org1] doing

S20: (where) provide you er our (.) er business services (.) business services

regarding i mean (.) e:r (.) this big project [name11] (.) <4> it's it's </4>

S22: <4> look i </4> i have a few minutes time (.) tell me more about what what

[org1] is doing

S20: okay okay (.) we are (.) start from er e:r the (.) analysis e:r (.) from data

analysis of er your customer information about your customer (.) it was the <pvc>

forst </pvc> (.) first phase (.) then other phase which is already closed er too (.)

was e:r <5> er </5>

S22: <5> so </5> you're getting more and more business from us

S20: @@ @@ @ (@) yeah and we are very interesting to: (.) to do <6> (insurance)

with you </6>

S22: <6> sure (.) because </6> we: seem to be a rich bank and [org1] of course is

interested in business <7> (with us) </7>

S20: <7> the n- <7> e:r (.) of course er [org1] company which e:r (.) o-of course

wants to be at profit but you are (.) our one of the oldest (.) customer that's why

we are really interesting to: (.) e:r (.) to (.) b:uild a good relationship between us

(.) (and what will be clear) and e:r (.) business in case win to win (.) when you

win er (.) the (look at) the right solution then you: er then you get a profit and

money (.) @@ @@ @@@ @@ and when we </@> er (.) of course er (.) (it's) interesting

(in doing) business with you

S22: sure

S20: we have also er for today er (.) fo-for your understanding (.) in the area of

[name11] we have a (.) two </un> xx </un> three phases (.) <8> e:r </8>

S22: <8> and </8> all of them signed already?

S20: no (.) only two of this

S22: two of them <9> signed </9> (.) <1> okay (.) i'm listening </1>

S20: <9> yes </9> signed </9> (.) <1> it's a (.) </1> e:r first phase i:s and the second phase

they're (.) a little bit linked e:r </2> between </2> each other

S20: <2> aha </2>

S20: and er (.) all of this is about er data analysis (.) as i already said (.) analysis i

mean (.) the information about your customers (.) for providing them (.) er

necessary marketing information (.) fo:r attracting new (.) and e:r erm (.) er trying

to focus (.) on the right AUdience (.) and make e:r erm: th-the right decision

regarding cross-selling solutions (.) <3> (so do you you:) </3> hear about it <4>

(and) </4>

S22: <3> so (.) aha </3> (.) <4> which </4> means it will allow BETTER

targeted marketing

S20: yes
S22: er is that business case showing that this money is well invested?
S20: yes we have several reports regarding this projects and i: er (was led by a) by a pleasure send you this information if (it's interesting) for you if you're (already) interesting
S22: aha aha
S20: there are some er specialists from marketing specialists from technical specialists business specialists
S22: <7> aha <7>
S20: we er for today we want to build e:r team which will consist of your specialists and our specialists and they work in a close collaboration who're understanding that we are going the right way
S22: let me just say after having spoken with [last name3] and [last name4] i understand that you are starting somehow [name12] project is that correct
S20: mhm the third phase is all about er er building the effective and productive [name12] system
S22: uhu
S20: in- side the company but e:r before we start what does it cost all that
S22: <2> what </2> does it cost
S20: puh we: i have reports and we er we think about er ten to: fifteen million dollars during the two or three years
S22: <3> xxx </3> mhm
S20: but er for giving you the right figures
S22: uhu
S20: where e:r we have to make all this er previous reports
S22: <4> mhm </4> <5> mhm </5>
S20: under- -stand the situation and understand the right figures <6> (that's) </6>
S22: <6> I: </6> heard (. that (. a lot of [name12] projects (1) have a high risk of failure
S22: er we invest a lot at the beginning you just said ten to fifteen million
S20: mhm
S22: e- (. experience shows if you start with fifteen at the end it's twenty?
S20: mhm
S22: because projects usually need more money
S20: <7> yes </7>
S22: <7> and </7> take a longer time?
S20: @ life is changing yes
S22: <8> yah (. ) yah (. so (. er (. that's a high risk
S20: of course
S22: if you pay at the beginning and you never know what will be outcome afterward
S20: mhm
S22: e:r (.) what do you think is the are the most important things to look at (.)  
from our (.) er management side  
S20: yes of course i understand the high (.) risk of this big project (.) that's why it  
will b- it will be interesting (.) to like a finance person (.) for you to know but  
we have a: financial (.) different financial services (.) like e:r credit (.) e:r leasing  
a:nd some (.) another one (.) and e:r we can er split this sum (.) and er we can (.)  
schedule e:r (.) the project (.) and e:r you you will pay (.) only fo:r (.) for example  
( .) for one part of this big project understand the results  
S22: mhm (.)  
S20: and er making a decision regarding (.)  
S22: hah  
S20: continue (.9) <un> xxxx </un> </9>  
S22: do i under- </9> -stand correctly we could link our success with  
payment (.) which means if we have the <un> xxx </un>  
S22: mhm  
S22: that somebody is calculating (.) we you (.) e-er (.) 1> we </1> pay on- we  
pay only when: we get the return and we 2> don't get the </2> return we don't  
pay (.)  
S20: <1> (return) </1> (.9) <2> yes of course </2> (.9) yes of course (.)  
S22: which means we share the risk (.)  
S20: yes of <3> course </3> (.) 4> w- </4> (.)  
S22: 3> if </3> [org1] fails (.) er (.) 4> we </4> don't have to pay  
S20: of course (.) and we ha- we can contractually discuss it (.) with our legal  
department and finance persons (.) and e:r [org1] is e:r er ready to: e:r (.) discuss  
this point (.) 5> under- </5> standing your risks  
S22: 5> mhm </5> (.) mhm (.) so a real e:r shared risk (1)  
S20: mhm (1)  
S22: contract (.)  
S20: shared risk 6> yeah probably </6>  
S22: 6> i xx </6> speak with our lawyer on that i do f- </7> like that  
S22: mhm  
S20: 7> or course </7> (.) of course 8> (and some time) </8>  
S22: 8> what what else </8> should we look wha- on what else should we look  
at (.) yah pe- and plus (penalty 9> that's good) yah? </9>  
S20: 9> yes (.) yes </9>  
S22: what else should we look at (.) because (.) i don't want not to pay (and 1>  
that) </1> you understand me correctly (.) i want to get (.) that we get to results  
S20: 1> mhm </1> (.) mhm (.) yes </un> xxx </un>  
S22: we have to (.) to focus (.) to get results  
S20: er fo- (.) for example will it be interesting to: (.) as i already said split all this  
project and schedule (.) this big project (.) and er (.) er calculate e:r (.) ca- ca-  
efficiency of return of investment (.) in 2> each stage (.) in e- (.) </2> in each  
stage  
S22: 2> on e- (.) but e- k- er </2> (.) </3> sorry (.) sorry </3>  
S20: 3> </3> mhm </3>  
S22: e:r (.) my experts and i (.) know that you can prove everything with a  
spreadsheet (.)  
S20: mhm
S22: so (. ) er y:- (. ) i'm sure that [org1] is also able to provide good spreadsheets
data take place
S20: mhm
S22: but how can you make that these (. ) calculated (. ) returns (. ) REALLY (. )
S20: yes of course <5> i <</5>
S22: <5> i <</5> have nothing if you say (. ) on the spreadsheets it says i i ge- i
invest (. ) ten or fifteen million and i get the return of twenty thirty or forty?
S20: aha
S22: and at the end (. ) i don't get it
S20: of <6> course (there's a: (. ) i:) </6>
S22: <6> what then (. ) what </6> should we from the beginning look at
S20: er fr- from the beginning we can er e:r (. ) m-m-make some er (. ) e:r (. )
prerequisites e:r er analysis we make a: (. ) e:r (. ) (good team which) consists of
your specialists and our specialists (. ) e:r calculate some <un> xx- </un> -ory
figures and (. ) er (. ) er (. ) make the f- only first phase (. ) of this big project and
understand (. ) how is it going
S22: mhm
S20: understands a e:r the risks of this project (. ) at the first phase you are <7>
S20: <un> xxxx </un> <</7>
S22: <7> are the risks <</7> specific for our company or are <8> some risks <</8>
(. ) to (pick and foot) such a type of project
S20: <8> yes (. ) yes <</8> (. ) i just want to say that e:r er this er first phase of this
project (. ) <9> yah </9>
S22: <9> yah </9>
S20: er for example e:r (. ) spending at this two months (. ) you can clarify (. ) is it
okay to work [org1] or you (. ) OR you want to disengage (. ) and continue to doing
business <1> with <un> xxxx </un> (. ) @@ @ <</1>
S22: <1> i-i i (. ) like that you show me (. ) how </1> we can get out without
payment <un> xxxx </un> end a contract (. ) but (. ) my (. ) first aim is (. ) we want
to get results
S20: yes of course
S22: so (. ) i <2> (. ) er maybe <</2> when we see (later) an- another time you tell
me how we can get (. ) good results
S20: <2> i understand we </2> (. ) okay
S22: it was a pleasure seeing you (. )
S20: @@
S22: bye bye
S20: nice to meet you (. ) bye bye
S22: and er when you see [last name2] (. ) er i would like to see him (. ) because we
have to look at <3> the: (. ) <3> the invoice <4> (. ) yah? </4>
S20: <3> of course </3> (. ) <4> of course </4> (. ) and (probably) i send you some
figures (. )
S22: okay
S20: okay
S20: we: may: (. ) <5> (okay) </5>
S22: <5> i look </5> forward to that (. )
S20: okay
S22: yah?
S20: bye bye
S22: may:be e:r (.) when i sometime it would be great
S20: <6> mhm </6>
S22: <6> er </6> (.) i (.) it was an interesting discussion maybe we can (.)
S20: arrange a meeting
S22: yah
S20: yes of course
S22: <un> x x x </un>
{S2 enters the room}
S2: a:h hi [S22] i've been looking for you
S22: okay
{S22 and S2 leave the room together}
{conversation between observers and examinee - very low voices}
S21: <un> xxxxxxx </un>
S20: yah but cfo
SX-m: hm (.) (right) cfo?
S20: no
SX-m: a:h you <un> xxxxxxx </un>
S20: mhm
S20: speak in english
SX-m: oh yes
S20: it was cfo (.) (it was right) <un> xxxx </un> our (.) services and (.) er i just
(.). want him to understand that we e:r (.) really provide the best expertise in the
industry and (.) i can (.) er guarantee (.) the lower risk (.) we got in this project
S21: so we exchange (each <7> other) </7>
S20: <7> we (.) we're </7> in the meeting at the next week (.) we: (.) send him
some figures (.) e:r (point right) (.) and start to: e:r speak about it (.) because of (.)
the (.) huge numbers (.) here (.) ten or fifteen million (.) i-it's too much (.) and of
course cfo e:r (.) involved (.) in the decision project (.) and (.) that's why we're (.)
we have (.) we have to speak not only with [last name2] and of course with him (.)
S21: mhm
S20: this (i understand) the situation he is (.) he will be one of the key decision
leader and the benefit- not benefit holder but approver (3)
S20: <coughs>
SX-m: <un> xxx </un>
S20: <coughs> (.) funny s- (.) funny script
SX-m: <@> yeah </@>
S20: (they go in and out and) (7)
S21: tricky @ @
S20: haeh?
S21: <@> tricky or? </@>
S20: a little bit
S21: @ @ @ (34) <soft> <un> xxxxxxxxx </un> </soft> (2)
S20: mister [last name4] (.) and with (.) (cih) cfo (2)
S21: <soft> <un> xxx </un> </soft> (2)
2582  {S22 enters the room}
2583  S22: okay (2) this was an interesting call yah? (.)
2584  S20: very
2585  S22: <8> [last name2] will not come back he is busy </8>
2586  S20: funny script
2587  SX-m: <8> @ (.) @ </8> (.) yes
2588  S22: so (. ) this was a planned thing
2589  {start of the feedback session}
2590  <end MD IV Conversation 6_00:14:35>
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2591 <beg MD V Conversation 7_00:00:02>
2592 [Sales Manager Meeting]
2593 SX-f: the relationship of they
2594 S24: good (.) okay (.) you might switch to english (1) are you guys ready?
2595 {a lot of background noise and parallel conversations in soft voices}
2596 SX-m: yeah
2597 S24: okay (.) then (1) into the roles [S25] which means your manager is not
2598 speaking russian unfortunately
2599 S25: okay
2600 S24: only a little bit
2601 SX-m: <un> x x <1> x </un> russian </1>
2602 SX-f: <1> @@ </1>
2603 S24: good (1) (pro victim) (.) welcome <2> back </2>
2604 SX-m: <2> yes </2> (.) okay (.) here is the (.) validation sheet
2605 S24: thank you
2606 SX-m: okay
2607 SX-m: <3> {several speakers talk at the same time - no single phrase identifiable}
2608 </3>
2609 S24: <3> so what have you got for me? </3>
2610 SX-m: please (.) hand in <4> the agenda </4>
2611 S24: <4> HOW are </4> things going on
2612 SX-m: okay here are <5> the agenda </5>
2613 SX-m: <5> that's the agenda </5>
2614 SX-m: this is the (.) that's the proposed agenda
2615 S24: proposed (.) i want to have some clear numbers and figures and <6> <soft>
2616 <un> xxx </un> <soft> </6>
2617 SX-m: <6> sure thing you er </6> (2)
2618 S26: e r first of all let's submit our pipeline report
2619 S24: okay
2620 S26: and we'll talk about the: (.) this quarter achievements <7> so that's </7> for
2621 you
Okay, thanks.

I will describe you a little bit about this quarter achievements.

Okay.

So first of all we are making quite a big amount of project in (org2).

We have a closed quarter; something about branch transformation.

Mhm.

We have made er point three point one million dollars. Also we are working on.

That's the thing that had to be closed anyway in the first quarter right?

They signed the contract for it.

Yeah, good.

And also, the inevitable it-consolidation in the consolidation of it on their.

We have made the alignment report for them, and also we have signed the inevitable it consolidation.

We also looked for something amount two point a million dollars.

It er data analysis of er this advisor project where is that.

Oh that's the project that we've done last time for the passengers.

Okay, good.

Just a number of articles for the hundred key for the.

Okay.

In this project and also we are working with data analysis for [name12] implementation.

[...] in this project and also we are working with data analysis for [name12] implementation.

Implementing a ([name12] implementation) and we have signed the zero point one million dollars for such elements so er such point we have made er five point er five million dollars for our pool.
2670  S25: total
2671  SX-m: total
2672  SX-m: yah (4)
2673  S24: okay?
2674  SX-m: okay
2675  S24: e:r (.) can we double that in that quarter?
2676  SX-m: can what
2677  SS: can we double
2678  S26: no
2679  S24: <5> no? </5>
2680  SS: <5> @@ </5> @@
2681  S24: triple?
2682  SS: @@
2683  SX-m: we will try (.) our best
2684  SX-26: let's set an half and (.) the rest <un> xxxx </un> then we make it
2685  SX-m: (don't make a share to me)
2686  S26: @@ (.) okay (.) anyway (.) e:r (.) concerning (.) current projects (.)
2687  SX-24: sure
2688  S26: er here is the company chart (.) <6> a:nd </6>
2689  S24: <6> e:r </6> finally i missed that last time < 7> again (.) you know </7>
2690  finally <8> <un> xx </un> </8>
2691  S26: <7> yeah sure that </7>
2692  <8> {telephone rings} </8>
2693  S24: e:r who's talking to you hm (.) maybe that's something important (.) <on
2694  phone> [S24/last]? (4) no (3) team t yah (9) team t (.) </on phone>
2695  SX-m: c
2696  S24: <on phone> okay (2) does that (1) does that belong to the (.) to you? </on
2697  phone>
2698  SS: we no we're not <un> xx </un>
2699  S24: <on phone> okay (.) no (.) does not (4) okay [first name5] (.) yah (.) okay
2700  <on phone> (2) [S29] (.) can i (.) ask you to run down to the (.) (trainer's) room
2701  (.) to put it <9> down </9>
2702  S29: <9> which </9> room?
2703  S24: trainer room which is next to the toilet (.) if you (1) you know where the
2704  toilets are on the second floor?
2705  S29: second floor (.) <1> yah (.) and then </1>
2706  S24: second <1> floor and next </1> to the toilets i:s the trainer room
2707  SX-m: <un> xxxx </un>
2708  S29: a:h (.) okay
2709  S24: okay (.) thank you
2710  {S29 leaves the room}
2711  SX-26: is (.) is the cgm coming
2712  S24: not at the moment
2713  S26: @@ good (.) well (.) okay (.) let's go back to to to the current situation (.)
2714  there's the company chart (.) e:r (.) let me just tell you the <un> xxx </un> (is the
2715  [first name9] [last name9]) is the (.) ceo
2716  S24: yah
S26: e:r (. ) here are the five main figures six (. ) is the: (. ) e:r (. ) [first name3] [last name3] (. ) will be (. ) er products and marketing? (. ) [first name4] [last name4] will be banking? (. ) e:r [first name6] [last name6] will be (. ) branches
S24: mhm
S26: e:r (. ) [first name7] [last name7] (. ) is doing (. ) i:s (. ) acting as a ceo
S24: okay
S26: right now (. ) and [first name8] [last name8] the: (. ) i- director in a <un> xx xx </un> company (. ) the <un> xx xx </un> company
S24: so to the people (. ) to whom have you talked so far
S26: er (. ) we have talked to everybody here (. ) and not (. ) once (. ) <un> xx xx </un> not doing once
S24: so also (. ) to the resources <9> and <un> xx </un> </9>
S26: <9> no no no no no </9> (.) the the the colored (.)
S24: <9> <clears throat> </9>
S26: <5> <clears throat> </5>
S24: <5> okay (. ) yah (. ) okay (. ) okay </4> okay
S26: e:r (. ) (1) coming back to the projects (. ) <5> r-right now </5> we have (. ) (er that's (. ) that's another sheet of paper (. ) yah)
S24: <5> <clears throat> </5>
S26: i spended half of (. ) half of the (. ) evening drawing this (. ) so
S24: i'm sorry for you (. )
S26: @@@
S24: if that took you half an evening (. ) okay
S26: @ @ @ <@> (you know) (. ) i'm a handicapped guy so @ @ </@>
S24: obviously
S26: <clears throat> okay (. ) so we got one big project in the company it's <6> called <6> [name11] <7> one <7> customer one bank (. ) er (. ) it consists of (. ) three logically linked projects
S24: <6> okay </6> (. ) <7> yeah </7> (. ) mhm
S26: first of all is (. ) the crm project
S24: okay
S26: it's the long-term project it's without (. ) e:r (. ) it (. ) it faces all the issues that (. ) that they have in the company right now (. ) so (. ) <un> xx x </un> know their customers very well and deal (. ) with the <un> xxxxx </un> (. ) and also deal with the portfolio of the products they're offering so they could (. ) they could erm (. ) diversify them (. ) and er (. ) they do (fox groups) (. ) the the [name12] that's a global project (. ) we also have two side project but they are (. ) logical very linked to it (. ) it's the [name13] project (. ) [name13] project (. ) er (. ) it's done by (. ) mister [last name6]?
S24: mhm
S26: it's his idea? (. ) and the [name14] project (. ) by mister [last name4]
S24: what's [name14]
S26: [name14] is (leonard store (. ) [name15]) project
S24: mhm
S26: (all (. ) world) [name13] <8> <un> xxx xx </un> </8>
SX-m: <8> xxx </un> (.) tell you about (.) </8> real

S24: <9> okay (.) and you will tell me more about these projects (.) these are the
three (.) projects <9>

S26: <9> and so (.) yes (.) i'll tell you more (.) just (.) i'm giving the (.) the
overview of (.) of this (.) yeah (.) <9> three main projects

S24: <9> okay (.) good

S26: e:r (.) if we go back to the schedule (.) that's (.) we have (.) just (.) o-our (.)
our plan for (.) for for for the year (.) it's (.) we've done the branch information (.)
(alignment) report and inevitable consolida- <1> -tion </1>

S24: <1> (there) </1>

S26: the that's that's two projects that were already finished (.) e:r (.) in red you
see the the [name11] project (.) it consists of three (alleys) <un> xx </un>

[name12] (.) [name13] (.) and [name15] (.) right now (.) er i'm gonna talk about (.)
the [name12] part (.) so (.) first of all (.) we already (.) erm (.) did the data analysis
(.) and it's booked (.) alrea- it's already booked (.) now we have (.) next step is
doing <un> xxx x </un> money and plc (.) it's real (what we all see) for (.) for the
[name12] implementation where we get a:ll the (.) (entail) requirements (.) and er
(.) that's where we can (.) er after we f- can understand the: whole project (.) the:
the plc will take (1) e:r will take three months (.) so that that's (.) that's for q-two
and (position they) for [name12] moves to p-three

S24: mhm (.) okay

S26: but still (.) the [name12] project is in stage four (.) e:r and (.) the estimated
revenue (.) is about (.) twelve million for three years (.) right now

S24: mhm

S26: i can talk a-a-any detailed figures (.) well (.) m: (.) before the: (.) (the plc and
then)

S24: mhm

S26: e:r so (.) <un> xxxx </un> we have the detailed analysis for p- (.) [name13]
(.) and [name13] are a lot (.) and we have been (.) the (.) [name15] plc you see (.)
a:nd (.) the (.) the project roll out
S26: e:r [S26] is <2> tal- (.) will tell about it </2>
S27: <2> <un> xx </un> (.) </2> (i will talk) a:little bit about plc and [name13]
project so (.) i just wanna remind you that this project the m- er (.) [org2]
requirement in the (.) to improve (world of) the customers a:nd to (.) encourage
the sellers of <un> x </un> based e:r (.) offerings

S24: <3> mhm <3>

S27: <3> er </3> (.) and er (.) y- they want to provide e:r (.) er the opportunity
for the customer to: er (.) learn by themselves er (.) in a <un> x </un> (.) so and er
er we talked er (.) <un> xx </un> person and a (.) key decision leader (.) in this
project is er mister (.) er [last name6]

S24: mhm

S27: <3> er </3> (.) and er (.) y- they want to provide e:r (.) er the opportunity
for the customer to: er (.) learn by themselves er (.) in a <un> x </un> (.) so and er
er we talked er (.) <un> xx </un> person and a (.) key decision leader (.) in this
project is er mister (.) er [last name6]

S24: mhm

S27: the detail analysis
S24: is there a (running of the voice) are they:
S27: yeah (.) they is gone
S24: they're going on
S27: <4> yes <4>
S24: <4> (that wa-) <4> (. ) when is that (. ) finished
S27: er (. ) it will takes four weeks <5> <un> xxx xx <un> </5>
S24: <5> four weeks (.) from now on or (.) no (.) <5> okay (.) er what what is
the: the: e:r (. ) (are you) wh- (.) why are you doing this (. ) this analysis (. ) what's
the reason for that
S27: <6> it's <6>
S24: <6> i mean <6> is it about (. ) is it about (. ) knowing er
whether it makes sense anyway doing that <7> or what <7> you expect from (. )
from that
S27: <7> <clears throat> </7> (.) it's to (. ) to show the customer e:r (. ) the value
and benefits <8> of this <8> project so (. ) and to (. ) reduce the risks (. ) of this
pro- to show them that (. ) they really need to: (. ) go (in the next steps for that)
S24: <8> mhm <8> (. ) okay
S26: a-actually for the customer it is (. ) to understand (. ) right (. ) what (. ) the the
main focus group is
S24: <9> mhm </9>
{S29 enters the room}
S26: what which (.) er which target for the <un> xx <un> this project e:r (. ) face
to from the project (. ) in i- in details (. ) and (could) we get an overview (. ) and
there we can really interested in that numbers <1> cos (. ) <1> in the preliminary
data analysis for [name12] (. ) (can have) lots of (. ) facts <2> that <2> (. ) can have
shocked the customer (. ) so (. ) e:r (. ) they're really into this now
S24: <1> mhm <1> (. ) <2> yah <2> (. ) okay (. ) so (that) will be: (. ) the results
will be available in a:
S26: in <3> four weeks <3>
S24: <3> four weeks <3> (. ) okay
S27: so and er we: er (. ) assume (. ) er (. ) we expect to: er get (the other faces) with
the customers and we expect to get about (. ) four point er thirty-five million e:r (. )
from this whole project
S26: in two years
S27: in two years (2)
S24: how many? four point <4> thirty-five <4>
S27: <4> yah (. ) <4> i (. ) i don't include th- <5> -e: e:r <5> the cost for teaching
the staff <6> or (it-) <6> service er that (. ) should they er take after the
S24: <5> okay <5> (. ) <6> okay <6> (. ) when:: (2) when <un> xx <un> <7> is
there is there <7> any possible decision made for <8> for <8> <9> that <9>
project
S25: <7> i think i think
S26: <8> yah <8>
S27: <9> yah <9>
S26: it's q-two
S24: q-two
S26: yah (. ) <1> i- i- it's <1> q-two
S24: <1> <un> xxxx </un> </1> (.) okay (.) depending on the: (.) on the analysis

S26: <2> yah </2> (.) well actually (.) that (.) that (.) that will be a (.) a real

S24: <3> mhmm (.) okay (.) </3> okay (.) so they have the budget for that (.)

S26: yes (.)

S24: <4> who's </4> (.) who's (.) who's providing the budget actually is that done
by the: (.) by the various (.) er vice presidents or or responsible (.) characters there
or has it <5> e::r </5> (.) i don't know who else <soft> (is involved into that) </soft>

S26: <5> yes </5> (.) e:r (.) that's done by the vice president it's (.) e:r (.) mister
[ last name3]? (.) and mister [ last name6]

S24: <soft> yah okay </soft> (.) so how does the decision process look like in in
in [org2] (.) is there something like an established or or clear (.) decision making
process when it comes to projects like this?

S26: no (.) it's not

S27: it's er it's er

S24: i mean who's decides that okay you think the the needs analysis report for
that you finished that one that's obviously the baby of of [ first name6] [ last
name6] he wants to do that because he thinks it's important okay go (.) e:r the
question is only what happens once (.) they decide they wanna do it (.) i mean is
he the one er (.) to decide (.) is there anybody else who will in (.) into the position
S27: yes so er (.) i think er (.) he needs to: (.) also talk with the ceo about this
project

S27: <6> yah </6> (.) no (.) no (.) no <6> (.) (yeah no (.) projects) (.) and er
S28: cio (.) as well (.) he's a <7> <un> xx </un> </7>

S24: <7> cio <un> xx </un> </7> <un>

S27: yes

S24: <8> <un> xx </un> <un> </un> <un> </un> <un> ok</un>

S28: <8> yes (.) yah </8>

S24: okay

S27: <9> look he is </9> (.) he is in the same line

S26: and [(first name3] [last name3]) he is also (2) <soft> (you can (.) <9> one of
them) </soft> <9>

S24: <9> look he is </9> (.) he is in the same line

S26: <1> <un> xxxx </un> </1> (.) okay (.) <un> </un> <un> </un> <un> </un> <un> </un>

S24: <1> like </1> [first name6] [last name6]

S26: yes (.) (well) (.) right now the (.) the current situation is that (.) that (.) you
know they (.) they have a (.) very big <un> x</un>

S24: okay

S26: er they <un> xx </un> <un> </un> (to make in their fine base)
S26: and they really don't know the customers and which (. ) er (. ) which (. ) like
(. ) which product they should (. ) (get er get so: (. ) to get) which (. ) er customer
groups (. ) so when we talk about th- the big [name12] (base)
S24: <2> mhm </2>
S26: <2> (hoping) </2> that this projects are very linked together
S24: okay
S26: without [name12] these projects are use- (. ) useless
S24: okay (. ) and erm
S26: er the (. ) the <3> the </3>
S24: <3> peo- </3> -ple from [org2] see it the same way or <4> is that is that our
view (1) er they see it (. ) they understand it </4>
S26: <4> yes (1) yes that that's that's that's ( .) </4> that's their view too because
our reports actually show that the [name13] would b:ring of ( .) a lot lots of
benefits (. ) <5> as you see </5>
S24: <5> was that </5> was that report shared with with (. ) everybody <6> within
</6> the company or was that only: (. )
S26: <6> yes </6> yes
S24: i don't know shared to the people who were (. ) clearly (. ) resonsible for (. )
this- this project
S26: this report was shared with everybody who's (. ) who's (. ) or might be even
involved (. )
S24: okay
S26: so (. ) everybody knows about it
S24: okay (. ) yah
S27: this was (. ) that's it for this (. ) project (. ) so maybe something we wanna (1)
S24: <7> (any questions about </7> this project) (2)
S26: <7> (any questions about) </7>
S24: okay wha- (. ) what do they expect do we have any numbers what they expect
from this this <8> this projects </8>
S26: <8> yes (. ) </8> we have the (relevant) numbers
S28: <8> yes </8>
S24: mhm
S26: do you want it now or (1)
S24: yah you c- you c- you can (. ) <9> just </9> give me a clear ov- you know
that you don't have to go into detail but that <1> you </1> generally have a much
S26: <un> xxx </un>
S24: <9> yeah </9> (. ) <1> o- </1> (.) e:r okay (. ) er (. ) let's (. ) then do that
way [S28] will talk about (. ) [name14] project and by (. ) i now find the figures
S26: <2> okay? </2>
S24: <2> okay </2>
S28: okay e:r ([name15] is a third part of) [name11] project
S24: okay
S28: er so: the [org2] (. ) erm (. ) er requested investigation on the technology
feasibility of this project (. ) and er we (. ) er (. ) e:r (. ) we've made a report for them
(. ) so we're expecting that the proof of concept er e:r of win win (1) <L1ru> xxxxx
S24: <L1ru>
SS: <un> xxx </un>
S28: offered e:rm (.) in the next meeting with [last name4] (. ) he:'s e:r ( .) he:'s er
2956 c- he he conducts this project ( .) hh e:r the er ( .) sum of this project er is about er
c:e:rm is two hundred and dollars
2958 S24: mhm
2959 S28: and er the rollout was estimated as one hundred
2960 S24: mhm
2961 S28: so ( .) we're expecting ( proof concepts) in the: second quarter and er the
2962 rollout is a: ( good one)
2963 S24: mhm (3) <3> i'v:e </3> ( .) seen here <4> ( .) the resp- <4> -onsible for that
2964 project i:s
2965 S26: <3> er </3> (. ) <4> yeah okay </4>
2966 SS: <5> mister [last name4] </5>
2967 S24: <5> mister [last name4] </5>
2968 S3: and mister [last name3] (. ) as you see ( .) is a role in the [name12] (. ) <6>
2969 project </6>
2970 S24: <6> yeah </6> to okay ( .)
2971 S26: yah
2972 S24: okay a:nd ( .) ( seems that you) they need to prove that or (1) or ( .) anybody
2973 else (. ) so probably it will be the ceo who -ell ( .) will er pr- er involve into that
2974 project again
2975 S26: well mist- ( .) in in in [name11] pro- <7> ject </7>
2976 S24: <7> yah </7>
2977 S26: involved (. ) people involved is they (. ) mister [last name9]
2978 S24: yah
2979 S26: mister [last name3]
2980 S24: yah
2981 S26: a:nd in: ( .) hm well (. ) definitely cio he's an approver <8> like </8> he has to
2982 prove that the: the the project fits into the country infrastructure (. ) and then (. ) we
2983 get (. ) ru- (. ) [last name4] and fran-
2984 S24: <8> mhm </8>
2985 S27: <soft> [first name8] [last name8] is responsible for technical </soft>
2986 S26: yah and m- [first name8] [last name8] (. ) as you see here he is responsible
2987 for the technical parts of this (. ) [name12] (. ) well (. ) anyway he's he is an
2988 evaluator and (. ) e:rm the: (. ) mister (. ) [first name7] [last name7] has to sign it
2989 S24: mhm
2990 S26: but he (. ) he evaluates the (. ) the option
2991 S24: okay so erm (1) so you walked into these projects <9> it is </9> now [first
2992 name4] [last name4] you said
2993 S26: <9> yah </9> ( .) yes
2994 S24: so he is gonna sign that because it's his project
2995 S26: yes
2996 S24: <1> and [first name7] [last name7] </1> needs a (legal) (. ) [first name7] <2>
2997 [last name7] </2> needs to <un> xx </un> that too?
2998 S26: <1> <un> xxxx </un> </1> (. ) <2> yah </2> (. ) er yes he needs to sign (. )
2999 like he is not the prover
3000 S24: <3> okay </3>
3001 S26: <3> er ev- </3> -erything <4> finished </4>
3002 S24: <4> [first name9] </4> [last name9] too
S26: yah [first name9] [last name9] yes
S24: er we need a lot of signatures for <5> this pro- </5> -ject haeh?
S26: <5> yah </5> (.) yah (.) we'll (.) but (.) er (.) for (.) [first name8] [last name8]
(.) we gained (.) additional agreement (.) for (.) from from like they they support
(.[org1] way
S24: <6> aha </6> (.)
S26: <6> and </6> the the way [org1] proposes <7> ( .) e:r </7> (.) tomorrow we'll
have (.) series of meetings and we accept what we're (.) expecting (.) from their (.)
their condition agreements of every (.) e:r every (.) every man involved in the
project (.) every person involved (.) so: (.) when it comes to the presentation to the
(. [first name9] [last name9] (. we might say that (.) we have their (.) er (.)
conditional agreement on (.) on the part (.) that (.) er each of them are (.)
responsible for (.) so (.) there will be lots of benefit
S24: <7> mhm </7>
S26: e:r (.) coming back to to the benefits (.) if we're talking about the [name13]
project here (.) it's about (.) twelve million (.) in three years (.) total benefits
S24: mhm
S26: e:r (.) it's about in (.) in benefits (.) and they (.) think that's (.) that (.) it would
be about (.) thirty-five million (.) in savings (.) we we were talking about the <un>
xxxxx <un> (.) e:r i-
S24: you said twelve million in three years
S26: yah
S24: e:rm
S26: well (.) that was the estimation before the <un> xxx <un> (analysis) i: really
think that this number will will be (.) increased (1) after (.) <8> cos </8>
S24: <8> it's </8> only [name13]
S26: <8> yah </8> <9> <un> xx </un> <9> /7/>
S24: <9> and what about <9> the numbers for this [name11] plan <1> (.) which
seems </1> (.) which (.) used to be the first one (on that one)
S26: <1> e:r once </1> (.) i think that (.) that we will get the exact numbers after
the (data) <un> xx <un> (.) cos right now (.) they: expecting (.) the benefits in (.)
in twelve point hundred million (.) but (.) tha-that was the numbers based on the:
(. on (.) on the wrong figures that they had (.) the customer base (.) so we're
expecting the: (.) the reviewed numbers from (.) from the data <un> xx xxxx
<un> (.) e:r coming back to [name14] project quickly: (.) they expect about fifty
million within three years (.) benefits (1)
S24: revenue
S26: benefits (1) so (3) e:r (.) in the last meeting you asked us (that) (.) only
competition (.) about the project prioritation (.) on this picture you will see that (.)
in q-two they have only one project (.) [name13]
S24: what about this (.) this [name11]
S26: well (.) they (re renting) [name11] it's it's big (.) you know (.) the the whole
consists of (.) three part [name12] (.) [name13] <2> [name14] </2>
S24: <2> it consists </2> now of three parts (.) but that used to be: er (.) as far as i
remember from the last meeting that used to be very different
S26: no (.) <3> i-it </3>
S24: <3> as far as </3> i remember [name11] used to be one one one particular
project or
S26: no (. ) no (. ) it i- (. ) it is three (. ) er (. ) we told you that that they (. ) projects are logically linked
S24: yah yah
S26: so (. ) a-as you see here (. ) we- they got long-term projects here ([name12] implementation)
S24: mhm
S26: and they got short-term (. ) [name13]
S24: okay
S26: alright (. ) about the [name14] project (. ) we're gonna talk to mister [last name4] about that (. ) but i'm sure that i-if <un> xxxxx </un> ([name12] implementation) but anyway (. ) in q-two we ge- we expect the deal (. ) [name13] (. ) [name13] project style (. ) before [name12] i believe (. ) so we we got the prioritation from him
S24: mhm
S26: and it's clear that (. ) erm they are in (. ) in a bad situation (. ) really (. ) there is a crisis in the company (. ) they're expecting takeover (. ) so (. ) they really have to find the money and the ways to: to sell these projects (. ) they they got (. ) v-ver-very good <un> xxx </un> reasons (to have) <4> <un> <4> <un> <4> <un> <4>
S24: <4> o:h which </4> which i definitely see the the (. ) important point that i i (. ) i don't really get is if you say that er the only (. ) position that they will start on working is the [name13] (. ) rollout and q-three
S26: yah
S24: what about the [name12] (implementation)
S26: they get the the (data <5> money) </5>
S24: <5> yah </5> (.) so that will be (an inter q-three) problem
S26: <6> what </6> this (. )
S24: <6> okay </6> (. ) yah (. )
S26: no
S24: no no the (. ) the [name12] (implementation) will be <7> <un> x </un> <7>
S26: <7> yeah </7> it must (. ) because (. ) it takes three months (. ) one quarter
S24: okay (. ) good (. ) no no that (. ) what i'm thinking about is (. ) e:r (. ) you said a bad situation because of the: the threat of the takeover and so on (. ) e:r but if there is a threat of takeover (. ) and that usually also has to do with the share prices and all the other things (. ) e:r (3) they can't wait forever to to to start real working and get (benefits from the) project <un> xxx </un> if they wait too long (. ) i mean (. ) that threat becomes real
S26: yah
S24: so (. ) the thing is what are THEY gonna do: i:n (. ) in the short-term (. ) in order to really (2) <8> take </8> some some defensive measures e:r (they're gonna) <un> xx </un> (. ) (take all the <9> threat) </9> so (. ) <1> yah </1>
S26: <8> take </8> (. ) <9> yah </9> (. ) yah (. ) first of all the use (the [name13] thing (. ) you know <1> it's </1> [name13] it's about (. ) er the the the (.) chaos conductors in in every bank (. ) first of all the deployment of such project (. ) who expect to be covered in (. ) by the newspapers (. ) in the magazines in the news so (. ) everybody knows that (. ) and the first thing that would raise the share prices is know when the company is in crisis and (selling now before it's killed) <un>
S24: <xxxxxxx </un> (. ) that means they're expanding (. ) and er growing and (. ) that would positively (. ) er be (. ) erm: (. ) <2> <un> xxxxxx </un> </2>
S24: <2> okay but for </2> expanding it they would probably need that [name12] that big problem lacks that they have) <4> in </4> in in (. [org2] not knowing exactly (who the customers are) but they're doing (all to find information lacks out) (. e:r so (. we got this kind of preliminary thing for <5> for </5> preliminary data analysis <6> that </6> would (. help them (. e:r achieve some results that they would definitely get from [name12] but (. like (. two quarters (. before (. so so these are the: these matters that they're (. performing they're doing these actions to to (. to: e:r (. to really become <un> xxxx </un> (prices)

S26: <3> yeah sure </3> (.) <4> yah </4> (. <5> </5> and <5> (. and because they cannot de- e::r deploit [name12] (. just (. once (. they are doing this (. preliminary data analysis <6> that </6> would (. help them (. e:r achieve some results that they would definitely get from [name12] but (. like (. two quarters (. before (. so so these are the: these matters that they're (. performing they're doing these actions to to (. to: e:r (. to really become <un> xxxx </un> (prices)

S26: <3> yeah sure </3> (.) <4> yah </4> (. <5> </5> and <5> (. and because they cannot de- e::r deploit [name12] (. just (. once (. they are doing this (. preliminary data analysis <6> that </6> would (. help them (. e:r achieve some results that they would definitely get from [name12] but (. like (. two quarters (. before (. so so these are the: these matters that they're (. performing they're doing these actions to to (. to: e:r (. to really become <un> xxxx </un> (prices)

SX-m: hm

S24: [S25] has been very quiet so far?

S25: er i agree with <8> e:r my </8> team (. <9> er (that will count) </9>

SX-28: <8> @@ </8>

S24: <9> oh good you that (will count on) </9> a team problem

S25: they have a: they have a: (summary now right here the data analysis) we can work with such results in the (. [name13] (. file (. so they: won't have to:

implement probably <un> xxx </un> (-sistant) (. to have an ability to work (. with [name13] project (. so they can launch and (. (therefore (. therefore the negotiation)

S24: are there already priorities inside (. inside [org2] (1) regarding these projects (. i mean okay what what we see here is obviously that things are starting parallel but but (. with different speed (. but are there any i- (. i usually my experience tells me that er if you talk of several (vice presidents) several executives within a company (. er usually end up with some kind of conflict cos everybody thinks that their project is the most important one

S26: <1> yeah </1>

S24: <1> that's </1> also a matter of you know (. image reputation e:r (. climbing up the ladder

S26: yeah

S24: <1> that's </1> also a matter of you know (. image reputation e:r (. climbing up the ladder

S26: yeah
S26: we proposed the next meeting <3> @@@ </3>
S27: yah <3> @@@ </3>
S28: <3> @@@ </3>
S24: are you gonna have it?
S27: er (. ) <un> xx </un> (. ) no
S24: okay (. ) okay erm: (. ) you said you haven’t met the: the ceo mister <4> [last name9] </4> (. ) yet (. ) do we have any idea what his view of:: (. ) of all these projects is (1) i mean is he up to date is he keeping that u- is he keeping (. ) or is he kept up up to date from his his managers (about what's what's going on)
SX-m: <4> yah </4>
S28: we planned to meet er with mister [last name3] er he has very good relationships with the ceo mister [last name9]
S24: mhm
S28: so i will (. ) (i just will) find it out
S24: mhm (2) what is the most important thing for mister [last name9] for the next (. ) i don't know couple of months (. ) three months let's say (. ) what do you think is the most important thing
S28: to increase the share price
S24: and avoid a takeover
S28: okay
S24: good so YOU: planned to have some kind of (. ) conversation or (. ) presentation of <5> <un> xxxxx </un> </5>
S28: <5> yah </5>
S24: erm: (. ) who's gonna take you (. ) there (. ) i mean who’s gonna (. ) open the door to to (. ) mister [last name9] for you
S26: <6> mister [last name3] </6>
S27: mister [last name3]
S24: okay and is he ready to support [org1] there with mister [last name9] (. ) is he ready to: unlock the door
SX-27: well we're (. ) <7> we're </7> we're <7>
S24: <7> did you </7> ask him
SX-26: no (. ) not yet (. )
SX-m: (are you rea-)
SX-26: we're gonna do <8> it just </8>
S24: <8> and what </8> is your impression is he supportive to [org2]? (. ) getting you to: to the supporter plus (. ) regarding all these projects
S27: well i'm she- (. ) i’m sure that he is e:r listen <un> xx xx xx </un> with the consultant <un> xxx </un> (already) (. ) <9> have done </9> (. ) so because (. ) he kind of opened (. ) opened hi- his eyes on the situation (. ) a:nd
S24: <9> mhm </9>
S26: <un> x </un> <un> shocked him</un>
S27: and he is the that he is gonna (. ) talked with the c:eo (. ) as soon as possible to (. ) show him the situation
S24: okay
but our report so and and i think that will help us to meet er s-
mister [last name9] er soon (2)
okay er let's assume you meet mister [last name9] er what are you
gonna do then (1) what are your finds <un> xxx <un>
we're planning to talk about (1) of (1) of what's going on in the
company?
S26: his agent
okay er let's assume you meet mister [last name9] er what are you
gonna do then (1) what are your finds <un> xxx <un>
S26: we're planning to talk about (1) of (1) of what's going on in the
company?
SX-m: his agent
okay er let's assume you meet mister [last name9] er what are you
gonna do then (1) what are your finds <un> xxx <un>
S26: we're planning to talk about (1) of (1) of what's going on in the
company?
SX-m: his agent
okay er let's assume you meet mister [last name9] er what are you
gonna do then (1) what are your finds <un> xxx <un>
S26: we're planning to talk about (1) of (1) of what's going on in the
company?
S24: mhm
S26: e:r mister
why
S26: er because the: information that he shared with [org8] he got him to the company and to: his internal competition so: he really doesn't like that they they shared the: the personal confidential information
S26: erm but (.) so that we er have very good relations with mister so we gained (conditional women) that is very pleased to work with [org1] likes our approach er moreover there are several competitions in each (. ) phases of the project S26: mhm
S26: none of the competitors is able to deliver the whole project (. )
we have e:r complemented [name12] for inevitable and we have an internal reference with [first name8] [last name8] he is very pleased about that and (inclu- welcomes) us to talk to [first name7] [last name7] a:n: to to-to (. ) to the ceo (. ) and to give (. ) to submit his reference so now (. ) we got an agent reference after the consolidation is done (. ) some part of the [name12] will be (. ) running in (. ) in z-series (. ) anyway (. ) <2> so </2>
S24: <9> mhm </9> (<1> mhm </1>) <2> so </2> that's <un> x </un> the the the other company <3> <un> xxxx </un> </3>
S26: <3> yeah that that </3> (. )
S24: with it doesn't help (. ) help help <4> with their (. ) with their [name12] issues be- -cause that's that's [org2] and that's inevit- -able <6> -
e:r customers having information
S26: <4> <clears throat> </4> (. ) <5> what </5> (. ) <6> yah </6> (. ) well actually that wo- (. ) won't help them but (. ) e:r the it's already implemented (. ) e:r and (. ) [org2] is (. ) sure to provide the (. ) consolidation of data?
S24: mhm
S26: and fast consolidation
S24: mhm
S26: they c- they're short in time (. ) they cannot (. ) fail in each of these projects (. ) each of this project's failure will (.) er (. ) actually result in: the decline of market share (. )
S24: mhm
S26: they're already in: in takeover (. ) of positions so (. ) a- any further decline will (. ) make it possible (. ) true (4)
S24: mhm
S26: so we (. ) we know the main points (8)
S24: so (. ) are you gonna convince mister [last name9]
S26: sure
S24: how (3)
S26: we know we know the benefits (. ) we know (. ) the main points (. )
S24: mhm
S26: we er(.) will know(.) what is he aware of the information
we have(.) we gonna do our best(.) er(.) on this project
</soft>
S24: er will you have some other meetings before we (meet(.) meet to see you)
S26: yes
S24: who're you gonna talk to
S26: we gotta talk to:
S28: mister [last name3].
S26: [last name3].
S28: mister <7> [last name4] </7>
S26: <7> [last name4] </7> (.). and mister [last name6]
S28: <8> <un> xxx </un> </8> what are you thinking (.). what's your opinion
(1)
S24: i mean pf (4) i'm not sure (.). i mean y-y-you talked to the people but i'm not
sure if (.). i consider there is a threat of the ta- possible takeover there (.). hanging
like damo- (.). damocles' sword or (.). over your head (.). er (.). if i look at that
chart and plans and what you have told me (.). i mean those things are more like
midterm longterm plans in terms of (.). receiving benefits and (coming) <un> x
</un> and getting more and more (.). i don't know (.). services to the customers (.).er (.). all the time) (.) these plans (.). i mean that means that there is quite some
time (.). valuable time passing by (.). er for for (.). i mean a (.). threat (.). still being
being (.). on the table (.) so i'll (.). i mean pf (.). you know the question is whether
they have some some real (.). clear short-term plans to to to do something about
the: the takeover
S26: <un> xxx </un> what short-term is
S24: a month (.). maximum
SX-m: month
SX-m: yeah
SX-m: running fast
S24: which means i mean (.). okay (.). starting on the rollout for this [name13]
project is one thing
S23: mhm
S24: but er only then the rollout goes into (.). (it will start) (.). probably q-two (.).
but that will move into q-three (.). so er (.). i don't think that we will be on: (.).
m:ilions of benefits (.). substantial benefits coming in the <un> xx </un> (the
next) quarter (.). that's that's quite short term (.). and that (.). only given (1) that
nothing goes wrong and everything is okay and everything works out as planned
S26: well (.). that would give him time for (.). you know (.). er to avoid takeover (.)
like <9> they they would stop in</9>
S24: <9> <un> xxxxxxx </un> </9> a lot of time so that's that's what i'm just
thinking about
S26: yes and there's (of course) the [name14] project
S24: but also THAT is starting in in er (. ) q-two
S26: well (. ) actually have a (plc) in one bank
S24: okay
S26: so (. ) the benefits may al- already come (. ) be coming from here
S24: one bank i mean just <1> (spread what's loose) </1>
S26: <1> okay (. ) (with the the) </1> news (. ) no way (. ) the <2> news </2>
S24: <2> okay </2> (. ) the news are okay i agree with that the news are okay
probably that's gonna square another market (. ) e:r stock exchange (. ) newspaper
whatever (. ) the question is is that enough (. ) because if if (. ) i mean THESE
NEWS will probably also go out to the: (. ) to the company <un> xxxxxx </un>
S26: the: the (. ) who who gave the takeover <3> <un> x </un>? </3>
S24: <3> [org9] </3>
S26: [org9] (. ) okay and the news probably will spread out also to that company
( . ) so what they will do it they will not sit around and just wait until e:e:r (. ) [org2]
is strong enough (. ) er to to to really fight off that (. ) that that table (. ) so they
gonna (. ) try to do something (. ) that's (. ) that's what i mean i mean they need to
do something very very fast (1) both of them (. ) if [org9] waits for half a year
whatever there can be too late for them because the share prices are going up it
could be WAY too expensive to take over [org2] again (. ) erm <clears throat> (. )
that's that's actually (running) <un> xxxxx </un> (. ) (what are there there) (. ) all
of these issues <un> xxxxxx </un>
S26: okay (. ) so what do you recommend then
S24: e:rm (2) my recommendation is (. ) e:r (. ) i mean i think it makes sense to to
talk with those people (. ) er my recommendation is apart from i don't know
whatever your plans are in in fixing things or: getting (. ) things done for the next
quarter with with with the (. ) responsible vice president (. ) is really when he talks
then to you and double check (. ) e:r (2) to clarify that point (. ) with the threat of
the takeover and so on (. ) whether they (. ) took that into consideration and and (1)
e:r (. ) what their their view of that situation is (at the moment) (. ) i mean the good
thing (. ) good thing for us is on the other side they need to t- take some action (. )
and they need to take it very fast (. )
S26: mhm
S24: which means they they can't wait for a <un> xxx </un> making decisions in
half a year or whatever (. ) they didn't even have time for for (. ) (i think) (. )
negotiating (. ) very long time on a current contracts like some <4> other </4>
customer (would do) (. ) they didn't have the time for that (. ) so: erm that's a good
news but the bad news is (. ) yah (. ) are they aware of that and if they are (3)
S26: <4> yah </4>
S24: <soft> are you can you can try to share that information with (. ) or they share
that information with </soft> YOU (1) okay
S24: i mean (. ) it's a criticial issue obviously as you (. ) as (. ) as you said that there
is there is <un> xxx xxx </un> threat (. ) not only because of the takeover but (. )
also for some other reasons obviously (. ) if you look at the past of [org2] (. ) er (. )
<un> xxx </un> but lost point <un> xx </un> and (perhaps) this (. ) significant
decline in in (. ) customer satisfaction and (wherever you) and whatever (. ) so (. )
you need to do something anyway (. ) now i would just just (. ) er discuss that issue
also very (. ) briefly with with the responsible (. ) vice preside:nts and just see okay
how (do you see) what the (. ) measures are what the facts are in short term (. )
because they need that (5) that's that's (.) my view of that (.) and (.) yah (.) what
you DEFinitely should also find out beca- (. ) er (.) i feel it not hundred percent
clear here (.) er is (.) what is really to sign of persons for the the (.) different
projects (. ) er-er (.) what you gave me as as kind of an assumption that those
people working together (and everything) (. ) but but (.) i mean if they have to (. )
act fast and very flexible on the project (. ) and you need four or five signatures for
each of these projects <un> x </un> there one big one maybe (. ) nevertheless i
<un> xxx </un> to ceo and then go obviously to cfo and then you have to go to
the person responsible for the project and [first name7] [last name7] (. ) as the the
acting cio has to be invo:led and then (. ) when we talk about [name11] then also
[first name8] [last name8] is coming an evaluator (.) so that could (. ) slow down
the whole thing (.) how do they make the decision then (. ) okay (. ) <5> <un> xx
<un> </5>

S26: <5> how do </5> they make the decision at [org1]
SS: <un> xxxxx xxx </un>
S24: <un> xxxx </un> (takeover at the moment) am i right (. ) so (. ) the thing is
we have the time to: i'm not saying that it's ideal (.) but but we have the time to: to
S26: okay (. ) all double checking
S24: to deal that the double checking has the <6> position </6> what is the sign of
process there
S26: <6> okay </6> (. ) mhm (.) good
S24: i mean (.) could be that it's exactly like they said but that sounds really very
very complicated that need to (. ) <un> xxx xx </un> talk to (. ) to those (three)
people to get any kind of (. ) agreement (. ) or any kind of commitment you
probably need to talk to five people at the same time (.) and you know (.) i mean
that takes a lot of time (.) on the one side (.) and in that time the passers-by we
meet (.) during that process (.) er (.) little (.) funny sexy little things can pop up
again (.) from one of the: (.) people involved (.) and that then slows down the
whole thing (.) we don't want to have it because i wanna see money for q-two (.)
for q-one was was quite okay (. ) but if there is really threat (. ) i mean if there is
really need to do things then then (.) probably there should be (a lot more and)
<un> x </un> threat (.) okay? (.) (the second things they can't afford) (.) <un>
xxxxxx xxxx </un> complex (2) okay? (.) good (.) any questions from your side
(2) <clears throat>
S26: no questions
S24: okay (1) any any support any any (. ) (anything that you) (.) from your side
(6) well (. ) okay (. ) good (.) okay (. ) looks like (. ) e:r (. ) i think you're (. ) moving
(2) keep them moving
S26: okay
S24: okay? (.) good s- e:r yah (. ) just update me on the things going on and s- er if
there is there is (.) anything popping up <un> xxxxx </un> and so on (.) e<r (. )
yah (. ) talk to the people (. ) (i advise you) to (. ) (get a clear picture) <un> xxxxxxx
<un> and would be (. ) (as we said it's a good) <un> xxxxx xxxx </un> (. ) okay?
SX-m: well
S24: good (. ) good luck with your meetings with the people and especially if you
(. ) have a chance to meet (. ) the ceo then (. ) arran- hey (. ) you'd better really think
about how to rock that person (.) off the chair (1) and usually i mean the thing is
as you know you don't have a lot of time from the ceo.
okay?
S28: mhm
S24: so make it short make it (worth being there) make it sexy well
SX-m: okay
S24: good okay we're done okay thanks a lot
{SS applause}
<end MD V Conversation 7_00:43:55>
{subsequent feedback session is not transcribed}
<beg MD VI Conversation 8_00:00:02>

{first 3 - 4 minutes are not recorded because of technical problems}

3444 S31: first year you: (.) er will already kept e:r the first e:r (.) benefit (.) it will be
3445 not so big only (.) thirty (car) (.) only thirty thousand dollars but it's the first (.)
3446 and er also in the next of the (.) er er (.) in the end of the (.) second year you will
3447 get seven point six million (.)<soft> seven point six </soft> million (.) and in the
3448 e- end of the third year (.) you will get er twenty-eight (.) point (.) fifty-eight
3449 S30: yah
3450 S31: yeah so er (1) is it correct with your assumption
3451 S30: yes (.) yes i think e:r e:r er (.) especially [last name9] will be interested very
3452 much to: (.) get such (.) such kind of er (.) graphs
3453 S31: mhm
3454 S30: figures (.) because er (.) (ideal) (.) all in in pressure but tell me is this (.) this
3455 project is it feasible? (.) c- er er if you read (.) you think we should go ahead with
3456 it (2)
3457 S31: well e:r (2) yeah the figures that show us er (.) er that our investment and e:r
3458 (.) also er (.) the <pvc> benets-er-fits {benefits} </pvc> that you (.) come from
3459 this project is (.) really (.) high (.) and in this case e:r (.) i would say that (.) yeah
3460 this (.) project is very prof- profitable (.) e:r in case of your (.) e:r er as- er er (.)
3461 in case of your assumption (.) in case of your figures
3462 S30: yah
3463 S31: and e:r yeah it's it's very serious project because e:r at the end of: e:r this
3464 project you will get e:r about twenty-nine millions of (.) erm: benefits (.) and
3465 this is great e:r
3466 S30: yes
3467 S31: in points
3468 S30: does [org1] have cre- <pvc> credidability {credibility} </pvc> in this area
3469 S31: e:r sorry (.) cre- <1> -dibility </1>
3470 S30: <1> e:r </1> cre- (.) ye-yes (.) er (.) credibility yes does [org1] have c-
3471 -credibility in this area
3472 S31: e:r wha-what do you mean about f-financial <2> or </2>
3473 S30: <2> about </2> ([name15] type) er (.) e:r (.) projects
3474 S31: a:h (.) well yeah okay e:r in-in this case er i would like to show you er our
3475 internal information about this project (.) that our specialists er costs er (.) this er
3476 figures (.) and er also: e:r (.) final that e:r (.) we are ready to: e:r make (.) er this
3477 e:r (.) project and especially (.) e:r (.) m- the- such kind of (.) (chaos) cos that you
know (boot him [name15]) and there are two levels of it (.) that is er (.) cover all your points that you put (.) of er requirements in our previous meeting and also er (.) er i (.) just look (.) why should i use [org1] rather than not using a a specialist (.) a specialist niche providers of this banking business

S31: a:hh okay (.) the question is clear for me and er in this case i'd like to say that er [org1] is er going to provide you the whole solution and er (.) er we could give you old <pvc> old {all the} <pvc> old {all the} er (.)

S30: old?

S31: oh all (.) all (.) all (.)

S30: all sorry yah (.) okay (.)

S31: you shouldn't er (.) er who will do this who is going to: responsible for hardware who is going to responsible for software for indication

S30: every <un> x- </un> -ance er which we discussed before er (.) and er (.) er in this case i would like to show you the figures er (.) er er our specialists come (.) er in this er points er (.) that er as you mentioned before proof of concept is one thing er (.) and we got (.) two hundred case (.) for this so for the (demo-) er (.)

S31: er (.) er (.) er (.) er (.) er er (.) er (.) er (.) er (.) er (.) er (.) er (.) er (.) er (.)

S30: <5> this </5> is a (.) the calculation is (.) is for two months so you are saying you will need more money yah?

S31: <soft> e:rm assumption that proof of concept that you would like to be in (.)

S30: understood this means proof of concept er (.) the money (.) is based on two months er (.)

S31: mhm mhm

S30: so what you are saying [org1] er (.) cannot do in in two months but in three months

S31: well (.) in this case i just er (.) would like to focus your attention on this figures that er (.) e:r (.) yah now we have a figures now we have a (.) it's just a (.) an estimate er (.) it's not the final figures so er (.) er finally we could make it in (.) e:r (.) i i could say that (.) if th- er (.) i should er (.) er (.)

S31: i er (.) and maybe we can agree to the er agreements that it's possible to do in two months er (.) but (.) er (.)

S30: okay

S31: but er (.) i think it's possible but er the questions is (.) it's important for you to make proof of concept (.) in two months (1) <6> is that </6>
S30: <6> is that what </6> (. ) what i (. ) i estimated that it (be) need o- only two
months i think three months for a proof of concept is (. ) too much
S31: and (. ) why do you think so
S30: yah because er er er i don't want to play around er with er three months
with er er proof of concept i would like to (. ) get (. ) the results as soon as possible
in in a real-life e: r situation i'm not (. ) er making proof of concepts to prove that er
(. ) your solution looks
S31: mhm (2) well (. ) in this case e: r (. ) hm what what er er in what do you
think of er (. ) e: r (. ) i will spoke with e: r (. ) my colleagues to solve this problem
but e: r it was er erm (. ) (will be) possible that e: r (. ) we ask you to invest e: r (. )
maybe <7> s:- </7> some more (. )
S30: <7> okay </7> (. ) fine
S31: well (. ) okay that's great (. ) so a- in this case erm er (. ) e: r mister [S30/last] er
i'd like to say that er we: er (. ) as you could see er we also have the same er
estimation as (. ) yours (. ) and er our company is ready to (. ) provide you er the
whole solution (. ) e: r (. ) from the first stage (. ) whi- which include proof of
concept and rollout (. ) and also e: r we are ready to go with you (. ) further with this
project (. ) and erm (. ) now i'm very glad that we have approximately the same
figures
S30: okay (. ) so er e: r (1) i think are going to er (. ) decide soon and i will let you
know er (. ) when and how (. ) we are going to start
S31: okay (. ) and <8> in this </8>
S30: <8> and if </8> (. ) with [org1] yah
S31: and in this case mister [S30/last] could you tell me this (. ) way of er (. ) e: r
design this project er (. ) ho-how it's g:oin on (. ) ho-how it will be (. ) could you
tell me please
S30: i think e: r (. ) you should present this figures to to (. ) [last name9] <9> and
and <9> and er (. ) (get) his approval if er (. ) he likes it that er (. ) we can move on
S31: <9> yes </9> (. ) okay (. ) okay (. ) yes (. ) of course (. ) e: r and er (. ) mister
[S30/last] e: r of course so: we: we are going we are ready to make a presentation
(. ) for mister [last name9] (. ) and er in in this case er (. ) i will be very glad to know
your opinion (. ) e: r about er (. ) [org1] and this project because when we are
going to present it (. ) er we er will be (. ) very glad to (. ) say to mister [last name9]
that mister [S30/last] has (. ) er (. ) agreed to go with [org1] (. ) through this project
S30: yah i (. ) i don't know whether the (. ) [org1] has experience in this kind of job
S31: e: r (1) well er mister [S30/last] e: rm (. ) as we: er er discussed it before (. ) of
course [org1] has e: r (. ) e: r (. ) er experience in this (. ) job er in this case er (. ) and
er we already made such er project in er different er firms and er (. ) e: r
S30: do you have any references?
S31: yes and i i i think we: sent it to you by email (. ) <1> erm </1>
S30: <1> yes </1> (. ) in ([org1]) yah?
S31: yes
S30: <2> good </2>
S31: <2> yes </2> e: r: and there was some (. ) e: r (. ) general informations that
[S30/last] <3> (can give) </3>
S30: <3> okay </3> (. )
S30: tell me what is the situation of the e:r (. ) e: r (1) consolidation project

S31: e: r

S30: the (. ) inevitable it consolidation (. ) where do we stand now

S31: e: r (. ) yes of course (. ) er in this case er y:::- do you mean the er (. ) e: r (. )

consolidation of it infrastruc- <4> -ture? </4>

S30: <4> yes y e <4> (. ) yah

S31: yeah of course er we already erm (. ) e: r er go through this project we make a:

a: (. ) a: a signed er with mister [first name8] [last name8] agreed with him (. ) er er

the project (. ) e: r (. ) er we: decided to operate e: r

S30: so it is closed yes?

S31: yes (. ) <5> yes </5>

S30: i mean <5> from </5> (. it is er (. ) er go ing on

S31: yes it is closed and <6> the </6> (. ) we solve all er (. ) (in the)

S30: <6> mhm </6> (. ) what er what data analysis er (. ) (do they)

S31: yah er (. ) in this case er well some (. ) we make some e: r (. ) consulting (. ) er

in data analysis (. ) we: (cut) e: r er the figures and present e: r (. ) them (. ) to: (. ) <7>

yah </7>

S30: to me (. ) yah i <7> know </7> that but i i (. ) i a- approved er (. ) three

hundred thousand to (. ) to make further data analysis er

S31: yah (. ) that's great

S30: is it (. ) is it gre- (. ) i- (. ) has already been it started?

S31: e: r (. ) yes (. ) yes we start this project (. ) and we start to: er further a- <pvc>

analys {analysis} </pvc> of your (. ) customer (. ) a- as you remember er we

focused on the two main groups

S30: yes

S31: a:nd er we start to: (. ) continue (. ) to analyze them (. ) <8> er <8>

S30: <8> and </8> i would like to see th- er er i would like that the ceo (. ) sees the

(. ) e: r results erm ideas er (. ) from this project

S31: e: r do (. ) do you mean [first name7] [last name7]

S30: CEO

S31: a: h (. ) mhm mhm mhm (. ) mister [last name9] <9> (i know) </9>

S30: <9> yes </9> (. )

S31: mhm (. )

S30: yah

S31: i also would like to see these figures about the (. ) final (. ) analysis of (. )

S30: yes

S31: data

S30: mhm

S31: yes (. ) of course e: r (. ) e: r (. ) mister [S30/last] (. ) we: also put these er figures

in our presentation (. ) and er maybe in this case you would also tell me w-what

else mister [last name9] would like to see in (. ) the presentation

S30: <un> xxx </un> mister [last name9] is interested about some business

numbers

S31: mhm (1)

S30: for er (. ) the shareholders because he has a meeting (. ) soon after (. ) e: r er

next month so he has to (. ) present some (. ) business figures (. ) to show (. ) to

show the shareholders that er the company is (. ) now in (. ) in a good e: r (. )
progress an- an- and they have a solid positive actions to er gain back the er sharehol- share values
and they have a solid positive actions to er gain back the er sharehol- share values
S31: mhm (1) mhm (.). yes (.). okay the information e:r financial information for
her- shareholders
S30: i said business er <1> er </1> numbers
S31: <1> mhm </1> (.). yeah business numbers (.). and e:r m-
maybe something else
S30: that's all i mean if e:r (1) e:r (3) if i e:r (.). y-you can tell me that you can
provide such a good er (.). business figures maybe i i a-arrange a (.). er you to
present er (.). to see you er tomorrow
S30: okay (.). yes e:r (.). e:r i think we are ready (.). e:r to present e:r such figures (.)
of course to mister [last name9] (.). er we: had a lot of meetings so with er all your
colleagues (.). er with a lot (.). of vice presidents in your company (.). and now
we've collect (.). i think er (.). the main d- er important information
S30: yes
S31: to pr- e:r (.). to make (.). and to present the: the (.). presentation (.). to mister
[last name9]
S30: <2> okay </2>
S31: <2> yes </2> (.). we are ready (.). and e:r mister [S30/last] do you have any
other <3> (impressions) </3>
S30: <3> that's all er </3> for now
S31: that's all for now (.). okay let me make some summary (.). so e:r (.). as i
understood you correcc- e:r (.). correctly e:r (.). tomorrow we are going to make a
presentation for mister [last name9] (.). and e:r (.). we could (.). tell (.). that e:r we
have er s:- er erm (.). er we get your support (.). in the project of e:r ([name15]) (.)
and that we could say that (.). you're (.). ready to go with [org1] in this project
S30: i would say you you tomorrow you present <4> er </4> you you (.). e:r (.)
possible solution and then er we shall discuss this decide with fost- e:r er (.). <5>
S30: <5> aha </5> (.) mhm mhm mhm mhm
S31: <4> mhmm </4> (.). <5> aha </5> (.). mhmm mhmm mhmm
S30: i am supporting you to to a-arrange this meeting with [last name9]
S31: okay (.). okay (.). thank you very much mister [S30/last] (.). i'm very
appreciate you (.). about it (.). and (.). yes (.). okay (.). we put er the erm er analysis
e:r of the f-final erm (.). figures about data analysis (.). e:r we put their business
drop figures (.). er for (.). er shareholders (.). and err (.). erm also to: e:r show him the (.)
err the whole situation e:r (.). that is going on with the (.). each product (.). oh each
(.). project
S30: okay (.). good
S31: er something else
S30: that's all <un> x</un>
S31: okay e:r mister [S30/last] (.). thank you very much <6> have a good time
thank you for the meeting </6>
S30: <6> thank you (.). nice to meet you </6>
S31: good bye
S31: SS applause
<end MD VI Conversation 8_00:15:15>
(gap 00:11:17) {feedback session, no transcription}
MD VI / Conversation 9
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recording duration: 00:47:59

person id: S30 age: 45+ sex: male langKnowledge: L1 Turkish (Cyprus) L2 German (Austria - with accent) position: examiner

person id: S35 age: 25+ sex: male langKnowledge: L1 Russian (Russia) position: examinee

person id: S36 age: 25+ sex: male langKnowledge: L1 Russian (Russia) position: observer

person id: S37 age: 25+ sex: male langKnowledge: L1 Russian (Russia) position: observer
setting: in a hotel

S30: so (1) we need now a (.) a silent audience oka y

S35: good day mister [S30/last]

S30: good morning welcome (.)<1> have a seat </1>

S35: <1> how are you </1>

S30: thank you (.)<2> (i was a) </2> (.)yah?

S35: <2> <un> xx </un> </2> (.).i find it really (.).work is (.) er good and now (.).

and er (.).really our specialist er (.).er (.).continue an- analyzing you:r situation er

(.).and (.).so on (.).so (.).actually i received er (.).your mail (.).er from you about

your expectation (.).about your <un> xxx </un> offer (.).which er benefits and

cost er will be (.).regarding er project er [name15] (.).as we are talking about you

(.).so (.).may (4) so and and now (.).today i would like to (.).discuss (.).er this er

. .your view of er (.).er [name15] project and er (.).our view and er (.).discussed it

with you (.).so actually (.).this er (1) this summary from (.).your expectation of er

[name15] (.).so (.).e::r (.) blue line is a benefits and er (.).grey line is a cost (.).so

(.).let's (.).what er (.).you er seeing here (.).so it's (.).summary from (.).your letter

(.).so and actually (.).er (3) hm hm hm (7) actually what do you think about er

<un> xxxxxx </un> (.).what er on (.).based on er from this ex- (.).expectation

S30: yah i would like to ask your ([S35]) you read my er (.).estimates and so

on do you think e:r (.).is it feasible this (.).this project (.).these figures what i told

er this (.).concept is this feasible

S35: yes it's er (.).in my opinion from e:r (.).opinion from [org1] is er feasible (.).

it's (.).er really (.).erm: (.) <L1ru> xxxxxxx <L1ru>

S36: appropriate

S35: appropriate with er (.).[org1] view of er (.).current er situation (.).so (.).as

you remember we discussed on our (.).last meeting if you about (.).our view and

er (.).our expectation from this project (.).as you (.).remember (.).<3> yes </3>

S30: <3> yes </3>

S35: so actual is (.).really (.).visible

S30: feasible yes?

S35: feasible yeah

S30: how (.).does [org1] have (.).credibility (.).in this area (3)

S35: er (.).what do (.).what do you mean by credibility (.).just

S30: i mean (.).can we trust that [org1] e:r (.).ha- e:r has er (.).experience and er

can (.).help us in in this (.)[name15] project
S30: how do you () prove me that you have experience in this area
S35: er so actually did you received er () from my side er customer references
S30: yah yah a:h yah: i remember now i received <4> it </4> yes
S35: <4> yah </4> () so () for example e:r about (v-serie) () so () and () of
S30: <6> so </6> why should i <un> xx </un> [org1] rather than () a specialist er
S35: er NICHE () supplier you know what a NICHE () supplier means
S30: mhm () yah
S30: you know
S35: <7> why </7> should er () er i <un> xx </un> [org1] () against () a NICHE
S35: supplier () who could do the job better maybe because
S35: because actually you know that er [name15] is a part of a really () a big er
S35: project [name11] () so which you consist er from [name15] <8> and [name13]
S35: project as you know () <8> which er i- initiative of: [first name6] <9> [last
S30: <9> () and er () actually [org1] er () knew er this er () huge really ().
S35: huge and and large big project () er as a part () <1> from </1> () really () is
S30: <8> aha () aha () aha aha </8> () <9> aha aha </9> () <1> mhm </1>
SX-m: just a second please (2)
S35: er () first of all it's er () [name13] and [name15] so () [name13] and
S35: [name15] projects
S30: <2> yah </2>
S35: <2> and er </2> () this er also () er () based on and really closely linked
S30: with (our) [name12] <3> [name12] () </3> so () [org1] view is er () we us ()
S35: [name15] project is a part of er this really common solution e:r () which () we
S30: provide you () and er () er () this er () really one part of () and one aspects of
S35: credibility and er () [org1] can er and () do it provide er () whole solution from
S30: (.) all the pictures
S30: <3> aha () aha aha </3> () mhm
S35: and er () actually () what do you think is it er () now () what's the () part is
S35: it er () what's the pri-ority of er () [name15] project er () in this case () is it er
S35: () is it crucial () for () er first er run () er [name15] project and er ()
S35: after that er () [name13] project () what's the vision er () let me just clarify and
understand YOUR <4> position </4>
S30: <4> what's </4> [name15] (. ) is a very critical project for [last name9]
mister [last name9] ceo who (. ) e:r (. ) has a meeting er (. ) with the shareholder
soon and has to show some business figures about <5> the </5> <5> let </5> me make some notes
S30: yah (1) how to e:r er (3) what actions and er er we are taking to (. ) e:r
increase the prices of our shares again (. ) so i think (. ) er i believe that [name15] er
(. ) er is [name15] is is is (. ) should be number one priority for for [last name9]
S35: mhm (. ) actually if er (. ) er we er (. ) we are discussing about benefits and a
cost regarding this project [name15] (. ) we can e:r see here that er (. ) you have (. )
really (. ) money (. ) er from (. ) your your investments (. ) and really (. ) er (. ) er (. )
tue- a first year (. ) as you can see here so (. ) breakeven is er (. ) between er (. ) er is
in (. ) three or four quarter of er (. ) first year (1) yes
S30: yes (. ) okay (. ) yeah
S35: so it's really good er in- <6> -vestments </6> er really (. ) <7> (return on investments) </7>
S30: <6> okay </6> (. ) <7> so you think that that is that </7> could be a good
project for us er
S35: yes:
S30: to er er it is a good (. ) feasible (reliable) project yes
S35: and i i really understood it's a really (. ) er prioritized project er (. ) in (. ) erm
(who got a car in a project) in a company
S30: o:kay (. ) i think e:r ceo should e:r e:r (. ) know about these figures er (. ) this
business figures
S35: mhm mhm (. ) so er (. ) er can i e:r (. ) and (. ) er could you (. ) support and
could i (. ) mention about (. ) your vision (. ) your point of view (. ) e:r (. ) e:r (. ) er
when i meet e:r (. ) and er discuss with er (. ) [first name9] [last name9] (. ) the <8> ceo of company </8>
S30: <8> you (. ) you want </8> you want to meet with [last name9]? i am happy to hear it okay
S35: yes because er (. ) er (. ) actually (. ) this er (. ) project (. ) er (. ) it's really in the
current position of [org2] it's a crucial to (. ) increase er (. ) er position first of all
improve position of [org2] (in environment) because (. ) really a lot of com-
competitors er (. ) in a: banking your competitors i mean and er (. ) actually (. ) to
increase shares and so on (. ) a-as (. ) as i hope you: understand me (. ) so (. ) er and
this project er (. ) is three (. ) really main project [name13] [name15] and [name12]
(. ) first of all it's (. ) about <9> a lot of money (. ) and really crucial </9>
S30: <9> yah (. ) the (. ) <un> xx </un> they (. ) <9> yeah yes i-i-i i got it (. ) wha-
what about the consolidation project how (. ) where does it stand (. ) now (. ) the it
infrastructure consolidation of inevitable
S35: this success really: going on
S30: yes (. )
S35: really
S30: er with (. ) with whom
S35: er it's e:r (. ) mister [last name8] <1> responsible for this mhm </1>
S30: <1> [last name8] okay good </1> i am happy to hear it okay
S35: we really started working there
S30: what about the data analysis
S35: er data analysis er currently is e:r (. ) on (. ) phase (. ) two
S30: <2> yes </2>
S35: <2> so </2> (.) we (.) as we (.) discussed on previous meeting <3> if you (.)
S30: <3> yes (.) yes (.) yes </3>
S35: currently (.) on (.) today (.) i have not report final report of this <4> phase
S30: <4> yah (.) yah </4> (.) yah (.) i think this er (.) e:r (.) fou- (.) o-outcome of
this this figures also would be very interesting (.) <5> that </5> ceo know (.)
S35: er (.) really current and er (.) really (.) real (.) figures (.) regarding this project
S30: okai (. ) <6> good </6>
S35: it's really <6> impor- </6> -tant for you
S30: fine
S35: so and er (.) let me (.) repeat my (.) question
S30: mhm
S35: er (1) er (1) can you and (.) do y- (.) would you support (.) us [org1] view of (.)
this (.) er project and (.) as a part of this project (.) [name15] project (.) now (1) to
(1) mister [last name9]
S30: i will a::s (.) arrange a meeting yes i will arrange a meeting for you with e:r
(.) [last name9] tomorrow
S35: thank you
S30: to yah you can present your e:r er findings to him (.) and er specially some
business num- (.) numbers because as i told you (.) he needs (.) good business
numbers to show to our e:r shareholders in the (.) meeting which is coming soon
(2) okay?
S35: really thank you (.) really thank you it will be great to meet <7> e:r </7>
S30: <7> okay </7> (.) okay
S35: of this er project and current situation (.) so and (.) er let me er (1) er first of
all er summarize and clarify (.) so as i understand from your company (.)
[name15] project is most important (.) in current situation
S30: yes from my perspective it <8> this is </8> the (.) the the most important
S35: <9> one </9>
S35: <8> yah </8> (.) <9> and </9> (.) actually what do you think about
[13] project (.) it's a (.) <1> <un> xxx </un> </1>
S30: <1> did did </1> did you discuss with e:r [last name6] (.) <2> about it </2>
S35: <2> yeah we </2> (.) we discussed and er he said it's a really (.) er (.)
important too project <3> (.) but i want to: </3> (.) really (.)
S35: <3> yes yah yah </3>
S35: identify and understand er (.) <4> importance </4> of this
S30: <4> i see </4> (.) i see [name13] project e:r er some sort of a (.) er (this
could help e:r me) in [name15] (.) <5> to: </5> (.) to get e:r the (.) the: (.) people
who do not know the financial er transactions to (.) to learn er and operate them so
it is a (.) i think i- (.) a part of (.) er some projects er (.) could support the projects
but i don't think that (.) er i mean e:r compared to [name15] er (.) e:r (.) is such a
(.) a critical project you know
S35: <5> mhm </5> (.) mhm (.) so <6> actually </6>
S30: <6> or </6> [name11]
S35: mhm (. ) so actually do you think er (. ) that er [name13] project also (. ) er (. )
really close er (. ) to [name15] project <7> and (it </7> opens the portage our) <8>
actually </8>
S30: <7> yeah </7> <8> yes </8> yah that's what i am thinking yes
S35: mhm (. ) so (. ) we can (. ) maybe running er (. ) all of these project at the same
time (. ) yes?
S30: e:r (. ) yah is it possible i <9> mean how </9> how does it er (. ) e:r do we
have enough er it resources to run er er (. ) parallel to (. ) the <1> e:r </1> (. ) to the
(. ) (branch)
S35: <9> mhm </9> <1> mhm </1> (. ) er actually (. ) [S30] we have a meeting
with er (. ) we will have a meeting e:r with er (. ) mister [last name7] and er (. )
actually (. ) i <2> would (. ) i would </2>
S30: <2> we can (. ) discuss yes yes (. ) yes yes (. ) yes (. ) fine (. ) okay </2>
S35: <2> i would discuss about (. ) first of all it resources e:r (. ) regarding this
project </2>
S30: very good very good
S35: so actually (. ) i think that's all i want to: (. ) ask and er (. ) e:r (. ) and (. ) tell
you (. ) and m- actually (. ) from your side (. ) do you have any questions
S30: whether (. ) i mean er er (. ) of course it's good (. ) to ask which er projects are
important but i think (. ) er e:r when you present these things to the ceo you should
er (. ) make sure that you are <un> x (. ) xxxx <un> and the projects that er (. )
you are e:r (. ) invo- i- (.) you: (.) are involved <3> er </3>
S35: <3> mhm </3>
S30: er in our company (. ) e:r (. ) with (. ) some really (. ) good business numbers (. )
for the shareholders
S35: yea:h
S30: okay?
S35: (but is that) not only from it side <un> xx <un> business hand of course to
S35: <4> of course </4> (of course) </4>
S30: <4> of course </4> (. ) yes (. ) <5> yes </5>
S35: <5> mhm </5> (. ) <6> so ac- </6> -tual thank you for your time
S30: <6> okay </6> (. ) thank you (. )
S35: it was nice to meet you
S30: okay (. ) good bye
S35: thank you for your support and bye
{SS applause}
S30: okay (.) good bye
{following feedback session is not recorded 00:06:33}
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<beg MD VII Conversation 10_00:00:02> 3885 S24: russian rock'n'roll
3887 SX-m: @@
3888 SX-m: <1> russian roll </1>
3889 SX-m: <1> xxx </1>
3890 S24: russian roll
3891 SX-m: russian roll
3892 SX-m: okay
3893 SX-38: should we start
3894 S24: mhm
3895 {S38 knocks on the door}
3896 S38: good afternoon [S24/last] one <2> more time </2>
3897 S24: <2> a:h </2> good morning
3898 S38: glad to see you again
3899 S24: glad to see you again have a seat please
3900 S38: thank you very much
3901 S24: so (. ) you're back again
3902 S38: yes (. ) and e:r (. ) i'd like er to (back) a little bit to (. ) our coming business
3903 S24: okay
3904 S38: and er our reports e:r which were (. ) already discussed with mister [last name3] and mister [last name4]
3905 S24: okay
3906 S38: for but <3> for so- </3>
3907 S38: name11 project or
3908 S24: <3> about </3> [name11] project or
3909 S38: not only
3910 S24: not only okay
3911 S38: and er (. ) that's why er i'm here i want to: er (. ) explain e:r er the whole picture that we have (. ) e:r a-at the company
3912 S24: okay
3913 S38: so erm-m first of all e:r (. ) as i understand the situation [name11] (. ) big initiative includes several projects (. ) one of them is er [name13] (. ) e:r er er (. ) miste:r er [last name6] is responsible for it (. ) and it's all about er new er info kiosks er which er we are going to put in whol- in all branches (. ) and realize a cross-selling initiative (. ) for attracting more customers and so on (. ) e:r then other one is er [name15] (. ) e:r (. ) as i understand when we: er met with er mister [last name3] it's one of the (. ) er (. ) crucial initiative (. ) e:r for you e:r for your business because of er (. ) it e:r (. ) allows you to: (. ) accept er (. ) e:r many problems in the
future and the increase of the cost of your share (.) shares (.) <4> er
S24: <4> that </4> 's the cooperation with cle- with [last name10]
S38: yes
S24: yah (.) okay
S38: actually (.) and it's all about some er e:r small (.) e-e:r (stars) and e:r (o-on
the whole) <5> stores with shares </5>
S24: <5> i heard about that- i </5> heard about that <6> so: </6> <7> okay
S38: <7>
S38: <6> yes </6> (.) and the final one is a [name12] implementation <7> and so
S24: <7> a:a:nd er all about the: it includes (.) <8> so e:r </8> (.) er for today er we
make er [S24] e:r a-a-as you know (.) we: do analysis with mister [last
name8]
S24: <8> mhm </8> (.) mhm
S38: about consolidation (.) and this is (.) in the past
S24: yah (.)
S38: er for today we make er two phases of e:r er-d-m data analysis (.) e:r er n- f-
now we are make the f- the second phase (.). and it's e:r (.). e:r er already e:r (.). al-
already done (.). but a-actually e:r f-for today i have no the results (.). er probably
in th- in a week
S24: okay
S38: i will have (.). e:r so er (.). i would like to start (.) and er i: have a (.). a many
( .) a really good news for you
S24: you do
S38: a:h yea:h <9> and for you it's just a </9>
S24: <9> now finally i </9> get some good news
S38: @ @ @ @ @
S24: haven't heard any good news for a long time
S38: i want to believe in it @@@ (.). but it's really good news
S24: okay i believe you
S38: e:r (.). so i (.). i'd like to start from the beginning
S24: yah
S38: e:r from the <un> xxxx </un> we're doing e:r we e:r gained the support of
mister [last name3] to arrange the meeting er with er mister [last name9] for
tomorrow
S24: yah
S38: and it's e:r erm really crucial for me and the st- e::r erm und- er explain you
all our er explain o-our vision (.). explain all project that we have here (.). and ask
your support (.). if you: e:r but er (.). before (.). e:r the support i'd like to explain it
and answer all questions as you have probably
S24: mhm
S38: of course (.). so (.). first of all (.). let me (.). thank you (.). let me see you (.). e:r
(.) it's the phy-physical infrastructure (.). <1> it's </1> it's just a co-concept- <2>
(.) conceptual vision </2>
S24: <1> mhm </1> <2> is is that (.). i-is </2> that e::r (.). architecture that that
you that you show me here is that (.). only: (.). focused on the [name11] project
S38: <3> not (. ) no not only <3> (. ) no (. ) no (. ) it's er in- <4> -clude the <4> (. )
many different <5> things yeah <5> (. ) and the infrastructure when i said about
physical infrastructure soft- <6> -ware in- <6> -rastructure (. ) it's er not only (. )
supposed [name11] project (. ) <7> it's <7> /7> also e:r supports er the current
infrastructure (. ) which you already have
S24: <4> general <4> (. ) <5> okay <5> /5> (. ) <6> mhm <6> /6> (. ) <7> yah <7> /
okay
S38: and er (. ) probably i- (. ) and erm (. ) one of the big er (. ) advantages of this (. )
solution is that e:r in the future (. ) if you are interesting in er (. ) implementing
there another solution or another project it er will be er (. ) it will be easier (. ) you
can do it er easily and without e:r <8> a-any <8> any problems
S24: <8> mhm <8> /. ) and that (. ) infrastructure supports all the projects
going on
S38: yes (. ) <9> yes <9>
S24: because the thing is if <9> i'm <9> looking at the [name13] pr- e:r project
S38: mhm
S24: <4> mhm (. )
S24: (. ) e::r it it it (1) (only) just simply seems to me that er the requirements are
pretty much the same that we need for the other project so we have to look at the
same data (. ) the same kind of services and whatever
S38: mhm
S24: <8> mhm <8> /. )
S24: (. ) e::r which again means that (. ) er (. ) i mean the more projects are depending
on the infrastructure behind <1> that (. ) <1> that also means a higher risk for us
(. ) to run all those projects without any kind of problems whatever i'm i'm not
even i'm i'm i'm already talk about running those things i'm not even talk- looking
at at the whole implement- <2> -ation <2> and changing whatever
S38: <1> yes of course <1> (. ) <2> mhm <2> (. ) mhm
S24: which IS a very very critical issue
S38: mhm
S24: <8> mhm <8> /
S24: <3> okay (. ) before we go into that detail here (. ) e:r (. ) [name11]
S38: <3> mhm <3>
S24: <3> right <3> (. ) is one of the most critical things (. ) e::r you probably heard
that (. ) er [first name8] [last name8] (. ) has been announced to to: more or less
work very closely with e::r <4> [first name3] <4> /4> [last name3] <5> as a <5>
technical (. ) advisor a <6> technical supporter (. ) <6> on that project (. ) er since
[first name8] [last name8] has been announced (. ) the the supporter (. ) er have
y- have you talked to him since then
S38: <4> technical <4> (. ) <5> mhm <5> (. ) <6> mhm mhm mhm <6> (. ) e::r
we- (. ) after (. ) er this e::r new announced er i have no met with him
S24: why not
S38: e::r pf (. ) because of er (. ) erm: (. ) i think that it was very useful f- e::r will it
will be very useful to meet with him (. ) but er
S24: i definitely i agree with that
S38: e::r @@@@ (. ) er okay (we- er well) but e::r that's why i'm here (. )
S24: yah
S38: and probably er <7> you (probably some) <7>
S24: <7> now i appreciate <7> that you wanna talk er i mean these those things
are important you know (. ) the reason why i'm asking you (. ) <8> i mean <8>
S38: <8> mhm <8>
S24: it was quite a little bit of a trappy question because i know that you haven't talked to him i just had recently er i think it was yesterday afternoon i had a short chat with with [first name8] [last name8] on the <9> phone about a couple of things a:nd by the way and er (.). we talked about also [org1] and whatever i told him that i'm gonna have a meeting today.

S38: <9> mhm </9> (.). mhm

S24: with you (.). a:nd (.). he was (.). to be honest he was a little bit (.). how can i say that (.). <1> a little bit </1> unhappy <2> <clears throat> </2>

S38: <1> confused </1> (.). <2> @@ @@ @@ </2> (.). <3> @ </3>

S24: <3> er </3> that (.). er (.). since he has been announced and [org1] knows that that e:r you didn't meet with him (.). because (.). you know that this [name11] inevitable and and all that stuff so you got a little bit (.). <5> yah </5> (.). he: didn't <5> really see </5> see fully the point (.). okay

S38: <4> mhm mhm </4> (.). <5> yes i understand </5> (.). from my side i want to understand that <7> he is a very very very good </7> er specialist i (.). sent him e:r many information

S24: <6> yah </6> (.). <7> maybe you should tell him </7> (.). yah

S38: er but er un-unfortunately i'm only one person er for (.).

S24: yeah (.). <9> yah aha </9> (.).

S38: biggest bank <9> and i'm a <9> <un> xxx </un> (.). that's why i-i understand that er it's really crucial to meet with him and discuss anything but it's <1> impo- </1> -ssible for- u-unfortunately (.). e:r of course (send <2> him) <2>

S24: <1> mhm </1> (.). <2> my my </2> my suggestions is that maybe nevertheless e:r maybe today you can send him a short mail <3> (which is just ex-) <un> xxxxxxx </un> <3> i i'm i'm no- (.). i'm not saying that you should get down on your knees and <4> <un> xxxxxx </un> (.). ashes over my head and i'm very sorry and very desperate and [org1] is a very bad company and (.). i was a bad boy <4> i'm not saying that but just maybe (.). you just tell him the things that S38: <3> of course (.). for sure (.). for sure <3> (.). <4> mhm @@ @@ @@ (.).

S24: i-i it no (.). you know it (.). he was respons- responsi- <5> -bility and </5> (.). and he: (.). i think he would have appreciated just just having a short chat with you completely pissed off but (.)

S38: okay

S24: i-i-it no (.). you know it (.). he was respons- responsi- <5> -bility and </5> (.).

S38: <5> mhm mhm </5> (.). anyway (.).

S24: give him your information (.). <6> okay </6>

S38: <6> tha- </6> (.). thank you very much for <7> this </7>

S24: <7> (no i'm) </7> just telling you so you can do something about it (.). okay (.). good (.). so let's come back to that one <8> (.). <un> xxxxxxx </un> <8>.

S38: <8> yes </8> (.). e:r for <8> erm </8> (.). make this big project of course we need a (.). erm (.). er (.). take under our attention a lot of e:r (.). small details (.)

S24: mhm

S38: not only small (.).
S24: yah
S38: and er-er first of all er (.) we look at er physical infrastructure (.) and er we
also er make some problem (.) progress in this area er when er upgrade z-series (.)
when e:r er make some analysis about the <9> about </9> what we: (.) erm erm er
((). make analysis and er (.) attract consultancy (.) e:r er c- e:r regarding er (.) data
(centre) consolidation understand the infrastructure (.) so e:r er after this (.) er
we're going a little bit up
S24: <9> mhm </9> (.) mhm
S38: there (.) platform services (.) okay (.) operation systems (.) we know that you
are (.) our er mainframe customer (.) i know that you are er er really er er good
use er that you are (.) er (.) use y- e:r very good <un> xx </un> (.) platforms (.)
and e:r (.) many others that's why it's also (black and blue) there (.) no:w integrate
services it's all about er (.) integration not (.) only er in the software level (.) but
also in the hardware (.) we: er (.) as you (.) probably remember we m-m-m-er
mentioned it in our previous (.) when we speak about er simplifying all (.) <1>
system </1> hardware software
S24: <1> mhm </1> (. .) yeah
S38: a:nd er
S24: but that doesn't mean that we we f- (.) on- in the future fully (.) rely (.) only
on z-series (.) i mean you know that we
S38: no
S24: <un> x </un> of of of <2> service </2>
S38: <2> yes of course </2> (. .) <3> yes </3>
S24: <3> (we're </3> driving) definitely not [org1]
S38: mhm <4> mhm </4>
S24: <4> e:r </4> (.) a lot of them still have still have (.) (quite high) value in the
books
S38: mhm
S24: e:r so i mean we're not gonna throw them away (.) because <5> <un> xx
S38: <5> <un> </5>
S38: <5> yes of course </5> (.) yah (.) it's
S24: so er (.) the the er (.) infrastructure the architecture that you say here with the
operating systems and with everything (.)
S38: mhmm (.) <6> it's the oldest </6> (.) <7> yes </7> (.) <8> yes </8>
S24: does that also support this this <6> model supplier </6> (.) <7> envi- </7> -
ronment that <8> we've </8> had (.) <9> okay </9>
S38: a- a- act- <9> -ually </9> the life is not so easy @@ (.) and probably
sometimes we: faced er (.) e:r some problems e:r in er implementation (.) then
other (.) but e:r (.) our services a:nd er [org1] er we're also ready to: provide you
(.) some specialists and help and we decide these problems
S24: good
S38: er (.) but (.) when we and (.) er the (.) on top (.) of this er (.) concept e:r (.) i
can find business solutions
S24: yah
S38: there are (.) as i already said (.) three critical er projects
S24: mhmm
S38: as <un> xx </un> e-er but n-e:r <un> xx </un> and probably there another
system (.) probably it's your choice <1> because of er </1>
S24: <1> (and of course) </1> [name12]
S38: [name12] (. let's talk of [name12] (. [name12]
S24: i mean i understand why [org1] is putting <un> xx </un> in there because
S24: then it's <un> xxxx </un> </2>
S38: <2> @@@@@ (. because we use it (. of course (. e:r the person </2>
S24: <2> you're using it within </2> [org1] (. <3> that's all <un> xxx </un> </3>
S38: <3> e:r <un> xx </un> system (. yes (. yes </3>
S24: <3> how does it </3> work
S38: e:r (. very good and er (i go-)
S24: is it well accepted by the people
S38: erm (. of course many man- many e:r s-some e:r of my colleagues said that
S24: it's er not completely er e:r all of their needs
S24: mhm
S38: but er i use it during er about three years probably and er i put all my
information there it's very (. e:rm (. for me (. it's a critical instrument (. it's a
critical tool in my business (. sometimes i can e:rm (. copy all this information
and put it in the (net) area
S24: mhm
S38: er for <4> for my (sake) for my <un> xxx </un> </4>
S24: <4> i mean it's it's just </4> it's it's (. as you said it's just a tool (. i mean the
thing is a tool is always as good as the people who use it
S38: mhm <5> mhm</5>
S24: <5> if it's </5> a misuse there's anything else and then (there probably keep)
<un> xxxxx </un> but we're actually thinking about really using this a- as a tool
S38: mhm
S24: gathering keeping updating (. using the information that we have about it
<un> xxx </un>
S38: yes (. yes (. i think (. no a-actually i think it's a very good instrument very
good tool (. perfect and e:r
S24: you have to say that you're working <6> with it </6>
S38: <6> @@@@@ @@@ </6> @@@ (. yes of course (. and er (. er go a little going a
little bit forward i can er (. show you (. <@> our good news (. as i already
mentioned </@> (. it's all about er
S24: it's getting better
S38: @@ @@@ (@) cost (. it's all about cost reduction (. e:r (. </7> our estimation
<7>
S24: okay (. before we (. i <7> mean cost reduction </7> is important you know
<8> that we </8> have (due to (. made quite some considerable savings here in it
<8>
S38: <8> mhm </8> ()</8>
S24: er on the other side that's also one of the challenges that i have to face here or
we in it have to face is that we need to make savings on the one side
S38: mhm
S24: (about) the costs and the other side there is <un> xxxxx </un> (. we need
to make some considerable changes in the it infrastructure and (always) <un> xx
<un> the business strategy and so on so that's quite (. it's not easy to match those
things to balance them out (. but erm (1) yah what what i wanted (. if we can go
back to <9> this one </9>
S38: yes of course
S24: er you said that this supports all the projects going on right
S38: yes
S24: er where from your point of view or the point of view if we talk about (breaking on) this project changing the infrastructure behind that er applications hardware upgrades whatever it is consolidation er where do you see the biggest risks for for [org2] actually in in this whole turn-around of the companies and we're not only talking about the the business strategies but we're talking about the where where do you see from your (1) experience reference whatever -er may be risks that we really need to address and then take care of them
S38: mhm (.) mhm (.) mhm yes er of course and from my points of view and from my experience previous experience in a different company i think that er the main point from my side er i think it's a physical infrastructure there
S24: mhm
S38: if some things go wrong er at this level
S24: yah
S38: er it's er of course and er (.) if we have er the really a infrastructure there
S24: yah
S38: and er er if we have the really a infrastructure there
S24: yah
S38: i think it's er a really good background and we and our risk in the future will be low and will be less
S24: ho- how can we reduce okay when you say this is is the most critical part from YOUR side i definitely agree on that hh i mean i also see a couple of issues on the on the other side we really have to do here
S38: yes (.6) of course
S24: any suggestions how we can reduce that risk
S38: er (.1) of course
S24: i mean you know how important that is we're not only talking about we don't have (.)
S38: mhm
S24: a trinity (.)
S38: mhm mhm
S24: er to to (.1) to change couple of things because you know there is the threat of a take- over e:er (.1) share price there is a couple of issues that we really have to do (.2) is (.1) probably not gonna wait (.1) for ages to to really get into action and try to to: (.1) do some kind of takeover x or whatever they're not gonna wait for two years and watch us building up some kind of defense or def- taking some defensive match- measures right
S38: mhm (.8) mhm mhm (.8) yes
S24: so: (.1) one of the things apart from that that this is quite critical and and some of the things are quite complex cost-intensive work-intensive e:er there is
one thing i see (. ) we need to (loose) very very fast so we don't have a lot of time

for that

S38: mhm (. ) <9> (so here) </9>
S24: so (1) <9> ho-how </9> can we (. ) can we make sure that once we start let's
assume we start (breaking on) a project like this with [org1]
S38: mhm
S24: e:r (. ) how can we make sure that everything goes really smooth (. ) because
we don't have time for any kind of big problems issues delays (. ) fai- <1> -lures
</1> (. ) whatever it is how are we gonna (. ) handle that
S38: <1> mhm </1> (. ) yah i understand and e:r er (. ) [org1] approach (. ) e:r in
this situation when we are trying to make a (. ) big solution really big solution
implemented (. ) er it's er to split all projects into: e:r smaller parts
S24: okay
S38: and e:r erm after (. ) completing (. ) one of these parts for example first parts
(. ) we can er understand e:r what benefits do we have (. ) what er (. ) erm (. ) goes
wrong and what what goes in the right way (. ) and er (. ) these benefits which we
(. ) just let me (. ) show you
[S38 looks for some paper]
S24: you need some need some paper
S38: yes (2)
S24: (of course) (. ) take mine
S38: thank you (2) o:h it's (on demand) [org1]
S24: (it's on demand) yeah somebody left <2> somebody </2> <un> xx </un> left
it <un> xxx </un>
S38: <2> @@@ </2> (. ) e:r <3> okay er </3>
S24: <3> i think </3> it was twenty years ago
S38: probably (. ) @@@@ (. ) probably this is one big solution (. ) (whereas) (. ) we
split it into e:r some e:r parts
S24: yah (. ) okay
S38: simple part probably it will be step one
S24: mhm
S38: e:r (. ) outcome of the step will (. ) er benefits
S24: mhm
S38: and some conclusions (. ) yah (1) er regarding e:r er erm: the implementation
and this big solution (. ) as a results if er we're go er we will go in the right way (. )
we can (. ) (reverse) these benefits (. ) there (1)
S24: <4> mhm </4>
S38: <4> in step </4> two (1)
S24: in terms of (. ) you're talking about money
S38: yes
S24: yah (. ) okay
S38: and er (. ) <5> not on- not only money probably </5> er er but er er also our
experience and <6> our </6> and your person and (. ) er when we can do all
of these steps and so on (. ) as you understand
S24: <5> <un> xxxxxx </un> </5> (.) <6> okay </6> (. ) mhm
S38: these benefits will go there
S24: mhm
S38: these benefits will go there (. ) we can <7> analyze it </7>
S24: <7> will (.). will </7> [org1] sign an (.). a project manager for for (.). that
project
S38: yes
S24: from [org1] side (.).
S38: yes of course
S24: e:r (.). is it guaranteed that that project manager will stay for the whole
project
S38: er this project manager
S24: yah
S38: e:rm (.). we are really interesting in it but e:r (.). it's a b- e:rm (1) i can
guarantee it because of er (.). prob- <8> -ably so </8>
S24: <8> you cannot </8> (.). <9> you </9> cannot guarantee it
S38: <9> er </9> er <9> (.). e:r (.). actually because of erm (.). er @ life is changing <1>
S24: er something er (.). er bad could happen with the person (.). i mean
S24: <1> yah </1> (.). no okay i'm not talking about things like that person has a
accident gets <2> ill </2> or whatever not talking about those things but i i know
from other colleagues in other companies <3> that </3> sometimes what happens
(1) er they: work with (your) with a company
S38: <2> mhm </2> (1). <3> mhm </3> (1). mhm
S24: they s- that company signs a project manager for that project which should
last something about half a year (.). couple of months or whatever (.). and then
suddenly after two months e:r the company comes back to them and says e:r we're
very sorry you get a new project manager but we need that person (.). the
background is very often that a bigger and more important customer who is
spending more money (.). is getting that project manager
S38: <4> mhm </4>
S24: <4> and you </4> get (.). and (.). i mean that's not a thing that that e:r is
definitely not acceptable for [org2] so i think if we we e:r (.). i mean you getting a
commitment that we gonna pay money for that and we gonna choose [org1] <5>
and <5> work with [org1] on that (.). what we expect in return is that that person
definitely stays (.). <6> bec- </6> -ause we don't have the time to to let's say have
a project manager disappears after three months (.). and then we have to get
somebody new in <7> and <un> xxxxxxx <un> </7> get (.). get in touch with the
people (.). <8> <un> x </un> </8> it and whatever (.). that that's the issue if that
person gets sick or has an accident <9> or breaks <9> his leg or whatever (.).
that's a different story i'm not <1> talking about that (.). (okay </1> but) i'm talking
about real (.). business things that (.). you're NOT moving that person to another
<2> customer <un> xxx </un> </2> (.). <3> that's </3> something that i REALLY
want to have from [org1] as a commitment
S38: <5> mhm </5> (1). <6> yes </6> (1). <7> mhm mhm mhm </7> (.). <8> mhm
S38: <8> (.). <9> of course </9> (.). <1> mhm mhm mhm </1> (.). <2> yes yes </2> (.).
S38: <3> er </3> (.). yes but let's er clarify these <4> concerns </4> (.). a little bit
S24: <4> okay </4>
S38: <4> er </4> (.). why are you afraid of er that er only one person in the whole world (.).
can make (.). his job (.). good (.). @
S24: <4> er </4> i'm not saying that (.). i'm not saying that (.). er i mean i i (.). i'm pretty sure
that [org1] got a couple of people (.). who are capable of doing that job (.). having
good skills background experience whatever (.). but i'm talking about as let's say
we we (.) going through step one <5> everything's fine we we're </5> starting
with step two (.) and somewhere in the middle of step two (.) and you know (.)
what i said before (.) TIME (.) IS (.) CRITICAL for us (.) <6> it's </6> not the
only critical thing but it's it's one of them (.) now in the middle of step <7> two
somewhere er for whatever reason and it's not health or some (.) unforeseen
pf (.) happenings (.) er that person is not working for us anymore and we get a
new project man- <8> -ager </8> (.) that person (.) needs to get acquainted with
all what has been done <9> before (.) </9> that takes time (.) that <1> person </1>
needs to: to know our people i have to talk whi- er (.) to to that person again we
<2> will have a couple of meetings </2> we will spend time and that <3> means
</3> (.) there WILL be a delay (.) THAT'S what i am talking about i'm not saying
that [org1] only has one person <4> (on board) </4> who is capable of doing it
S38: <5> mhm (.) mhm </5> (.) <6> yes </6> (.) <7> mhm </7> (.) <8> mhm
</8> (.) <9> yes of course of course </9> (.) <1> yes </1> (.) <2> mhm (.) mhmm
</2> (.) <3> yes </3> (.) <4> mhm </4> (.) yeah i understand you very good <5>
and er <5> (.)
S24: <5> so how are </5> we gonna solve that (.) <6> yah </6>
S38: and er (.) i am faced with this problem in the pre- <6> -vious </6> (.) and er
our approach er in this situation is er to make er (.) a schedule (.) of our project a
schedule of: each (.) step (.) and <7> er </7> (.) when we understand that one
person er couldn't be (.) er erm: continue this project (.) we immediately give
you (.) the another one and schedule e:r (.) give you a guarantee
S24: <7> yah </7> (.) mhmm
S38: and er (.) we of course can e:r discuss this contractually
S24: mhmm
S38: er when somethings go wrong (under) each step (.) you can e:rm (.) e:r (.) so
[org1] has a some (.) e::rm (.) probably it (.) in in the worst way i mean (.) it e:r
will be a penalty <8> </8> for </8> example yes
S38: <8> mhmm </8>
S38: but er (.) i know that er (.) e:r (.) for this project it's more critical for you to
make it (.) and to make it very good (.) and that's why we are (.) gonna (.) discuss
it and probably provide you and er (.) e:r put it in our contract that we er provide
you (.) e:r several e:r pro-project managers which start work there
S24: mhmm
S38: and e:r (.) gain er and have all information (.) from this step from this step
and if (.) something goes wrong with (.) one person there (.) then other one
continued (.) to do it work (.) and not only this person from our side i think it will
be waited to make a (.) common team (.) between your specialists and our
specialists is it okay
S24: that's okay
S38: great (.) and e:r (.)
S24: good (.) okay so what what (.) are we gonna do next and what are (.) what
are your next plans your next steps
S38: e:r (.) as i already said we are going to meet with e:r mister [first name9]
[last name9] for tomorrow (.)
S24: <9> okay </9>
S38: <9> i: </9> e:rm (.) e:rm (.) just wanna ask you your support (.) and e:r i- do
do you like the solution in general
S24: I like it yeah.
S38: <1> yah and </1>
S24: <1> i mean </1> we have to look at the solution itself and all the the issues
and all the specifications and details and and the <2> programmes and the (.) the
whole <2> management implementation and everything we have to look at that in
detail
S38: <2> mhm mhm mhm </2> <3> mhm </3>
S24: <3> cos </3> we haven't talked about that yet (.) but generally m- pf (.) yah
okay (.) er (.) <4> i mean (there are many details) that (.) have to be discussed
</4> (.) but generally the idea is (er (.) erm is okay i think) (.) <5> so (.)
what do you </5> want me to do now
S38: <4> there are many details (.) i understand (.) of course </4> (.) thank
you very much <5> glad to hear it </5> (.) e:r probably e:r is it possible to: e:r
invite you: for: tomorrow meeting (.) <6> and </6> <7> mhm </7>
S24: <6> e:r </6> i don't know whether i have time <7> but </7> (.) e:r (.) what i
CAN do
S38: <8> mhm </8>
S24: <8> is </8> (.) erm (.) that i tell [first name3] [last name3] for example that
i'm gonna give him a call and say okay well (.) what i think about this this
approach and (.)
S38: <9> mhm </9>  @@@@ </9> (.)
S24: my opinion <clears throat> (.) a:nd that's not gonna be negative let's put it
<9> this way </9>
S38: okay what shall i do er more what e:r how i get [org1] er can (.) (bring to
value) (.) accept this (.) for you (.) <1> probably some additional information
</1>
S24: <1> e:r (.) i mean (.) i mean </1> the thing is (.) i just want you to
understand if you make any decisions with [first name3] [last <2> name3] (for
</2> the supporter and get) (.) the commitment for for running one of the projects
with you
S38: <2> mhm </2> <3> mhm </3>
S24: er i want you really to understand how critical these projects are (.) a:nd (.)
that (.) e:r i mean working about (.) we we're talking about a couple of things here
okay
S38: okay
S24: so what whatever is gonna happen you have to understand wha- that (.)
whatever the business needs are
S38: mhm
S24: we need to have the right infrastructure behind it <3> take </3> that into
consideration what i don't need is (.) we start working on a project [name11] or
[name13] or whatever <4> (.) it's </4> very critical a:nd then everybody is
working and then focused and hoping for the best outcomes benefits and so on
S38: <3> yes </3> <4> mhm </4> <5> mhm </5>
S24: and suddenly from one day to the other i get a phone call from [first name3]
[last name3] saying hey (.) what the hell <5> is going on </5> with the i- <6> -t:
y- </6> -ou said it's gonna work it's not working (.) we got problems here it might
have delays of of a month or whatever (.) that's what i don't want (.) to have (.)
okay so (.) i just want you to keep that in mind and and whatever you gonna do (.) as i said more or less in the first meeting

[org1]'s approach (.) a- also on the business side (.) but also keep in mind (1) the big picture which i appreciate in the individual projects (.) because they're not islands (.) they're just ONE (.) <2> big thing (.) /2> we're talking about a continent not (.) <3> (islands) </3> S38: <8> yes (.) <9> yes it </9> (.) <1> mhm mhm mhm </1> (.) <2> yeah (.). and </2> (.). <3> we see </3> (.) the picture the same (.) like a big (.) whole solution <4> and </4> (.) even more (.) one good news (.)
S24: <4> well </4> (.) yeah
S38: <8> er for today's e:r final the: champion league (.) (have you got) the champions i know that you are crazy about football
S24: e:r <un> xxx </un> over there have time for that (.) <5> <un> xxx </un>
S38: @@@ (.) <5> but what is your (prognose) </5> (.) who will win
S24: er i don't know who's gonna win i really hope for the english team
S38: @@ @ <6> yah (i'm into) </6>
S24: <6> hey since milan </6> kicked out (.). manchester
S38: @@ @ @ (.) yah
S24: they're not a choice for ME <7> anymore </7>
S38: <7> it's a little <7> stress for me <8> too </8>
S24: <8> as </8> as much i'll (.) as MUCH (.) as i like the italians and food and every- <9> thing but in football </9> (.) i'm going british <1> (.). <un> xxx </un>
S24: <1>
S38: <9> mhm mhm mhm </9> (.) <1> absolutely yah </1> (.). so let's see
S24: yah let's see
S38: thank you very much
S24: good (.) thanks a lot
{SS applause}
<end MD VII Conversation 10_00:24:33>

(gap 00:09:29) {feedback session, no transcription}
<beg MD VII Conversation 11_00:33:04>
4433  S41: i'm i'm i'm er main (.) like (.)
4435  S30: person yes (.) <1> yes yes </1> (.)
4436  S41: person (.) <1> here so </1> (.) i guess we can start
4437  S30: did er (.) did you (.) all give me calls (.) because (.) this is your (.) second or 
4438  third time with me
4439  S42: <2> no it's his first </2> time with
4440  SX-m: <2> no it's the first time (.) </2> <3> really (.) yes </3>
4441  S30: <3> first time (.) no: </3>
4442  SX-m: we had yesterday
4443  S30: yes
4444  SX-m: and that's (.) like i haven't er called on you
4445  S42: like [S30/last]
4446  S30: <4> like normal (.) aha (.) </4> that was an er (.) er (.) unnormal situation
4447  S41: <4> like [S30/last] (.) yah yah </4> (.). maybe a little bit
4448  S30: okay (.) <5> so </5>
4449  S41: <5> (but </5> in the end <6> it will be okay) </6>
4450  S30: <6> let's see if unnor- </6> -mal situation was what let's see (.) if in normal
4451  c-circumstances (.) you can do so good calls yah?
4452  S41: i don't so really understand what you're talking about </@> @ @ @
4453  S30: i said (.) yesterday
4454  S41: mhm
4455  S30: it was an unnormal situation <7> and you did a good job (.) i wi- i will see
4456  now if in a normal situation if you still you can do a good job (.) okay (.) good
4457  </7>
4458  S41: <7> yeah (.) okay (.) mhm (.) mhm (.) yah (.) yah (.) </7> i believe (.) so (.)
4459  check (.) check one more thing whether i have in my <un> x </un> all the
4460  necessary (.) all the necessary papers
4461  S30: you fill this also (.) <soft> (this one) </soft>
4462  S41: yah i <8> fill </8>
4463  S30: <8> oh no </8> (.) don't <un> xxx </un>
4464  S41: on what
4465  S30: i don't know (.) is it all all filled
4466  S41: (a:h advisor) yeah yeah yeah (2) forgot (.) yeah (.) so now it's (.) now it's (.)
4467  we can start
S30: i am not your advisor (.) <9> <un> xxx </un> </9>
S41: a:h <9> [first name11] </9> (.) o:h i thought that it's like
S30: minus one (.) already (.) no no (i mean <1> no) (.) </1> (they after ten
days if you don't know) <2> <un> xxx </un> </2>
S42: <1> @@ @ </1>
S41: <1> really </1>
SX-m: <2> <un> xxxx </un> </2> three (.) it will be two (.) so
S30: yah (.) i i joke (.) no no (i will not wait) (.) but er (.) if i had a bad day i
would (.) make the i i could <un> xxx </un> (1) okay
S41: so (.) like (.) one one (.) one second please (2)
S30: good (1)
SX-41: <clears throat> (.) cos i need very importan t things (.) to discuss with you
(.)
S30: okay (.)
S41: <3> and it's (.) <3>
S30: <3> let's see (.) if you have (.) important t hings (.) to
S41: <sighing> yeah <sighing> (.) where's the: (2) <whispering> o:h shit o:h sh-
o:h sh- <whispering> (3) er (1) where's the paper with (2) ok- okay (.) i have this
(1) but still i don't (.) i have yours and i don't have mine (.) someone to get (.)
[S42]
S42: yah
S41: do you have e:r (.) the copy of er (.) the letter of er mister [S30/last] with you
(.)
S42: <4> yah </4> (.) <5> no </5>
S41: <4> give </4> it to me please (.) yah thank you (.) so that's (.) (exact- <5> ly)
S42: <5> (.) what i needed (2)
SX-m: start (1)
S41: and e:r (2)
SX-30: okay (1)
SX-m: just fine (.) everybody <un> x </un> we can start
S41 knocks on the door
S30: come in please
S41: yah (.) <6> hello </6> (.) mister [S30/last] (.) it's me again
S30: <6> good morning </6> (.) nice to see <7> you again have a seat (.) please
S42: <7> (.) <8> yah </8>
S41: <7> yah (.) yah thank you <7> (.) <8> yes </8> (.) so (.) like (.) i guess it
will be our (.) like last meeting (.) e:r (.) be- before the meeting with er (.) ceo
with mister [last name9] (.) e:r so (.) the last time we met he men- you: me- (.) he
mentioned that we can (.) like e:r (.) we will me- to meet with him (.) and er (.) i
wanted (.) er to discuss <9> a few things </9>
S30: <9> have you reco- </9> -gnized now i have a young and beautiful secretary
S41: yeah
S30: yah
S41: will: write down our conversation for both of us (.) <1> for </1> (.) for our
win (.) you and me be- <2> -cause </2> we will have it all (.) <3> <un> xxx x
<aun> <3> (.) <4> good </4> (.) it's very good (.) so like (.) er
S30: <1> yah </1> (.) <2> yah </2> (.) <3> a win-win yah </3> (.) <4> okay
</4>
</4>
S41: the first thing i: would like to discuss that we: had (. ) two meetings today (. ) already (. ) e:r with mister [last name7] (. )
S30: yes
S41: a:nd er with mister [last name4]
S30: yes
S41: e:r so we're (. ) like (. ) have support of mister [last name4] to go ahead with the: [name12] project to the ceo
S30: yeah
S41: we show that we are capabl:e <5> of </5> doing this (. )
S30: <5> yah </5> (.) yah
S41: and er we also er (. ) er have (. ) some issues e:r (. ) of mister (. ) [last name7]
S42: (. ) con- <6> -cern- </6> -ing it infrastructure (. ) <7> and </7> er we like (. )
S41: conditional agree we will provide this (. ) like you will (.) in the future support us
S42: (. ) <8> e:r </8> (.) yah and er (. ) so (. ) er (. )
S30: <6> yah </6> (.) <7> yah </7> (.) <8> yes </8> (.) by the way tell <9> me
S41: <9> what is the: status of the consolidation er project
S42: S41: <9> yah </9> (.) er consolidation of inevitable and er [org2]
S30: yes yes
S41: yah so they will already e::r (. ) purchased (. ) an operate of z-series
S30: <1> yah </1>
S41: <1> and </1> now they are in (. ) in the process of <2> migrate the data </2>
S30: <2> who are they </2> (.) who are they
S41: er they er miste:r e:r (.) mister [last name7] (.)
S30: yah (. )
S41: and it department (. )
S30: yes
S41: they are now together with mister [last name8] migrating the: <3> <un> x
S30: <3> <un> </3>
S41: <4> it's (.) it's </4> going on successfully (. )
S30: <4> who are they </4> (.) o:kay (.) fine
S41: <7> a:nd </7> (.) they are in the (. ) middle of second phase
S30: <7> yah </7> (.) o:kay (. ) fine
S41: so: e:r like (. ) with mister [last name4] (. ) we discussed the [name12]
S42: implementaion (. ) our approach e:r he found it e:r (.) suitable (. ) e:r (. ) so (. ) like
S43: (. ) in this (. ) think he supports (. ) and the thing i really want to discuss is your letter
S44: okay
S41: and e:r (. ) e:r (. ) to discuss that er our (. ) specialists provide us e:r the (. )
estimation (. ) of this project (. ) and the funniest thing that (. ) they e:r (. ) like (. ) y-
S45: you (. ) as an independent person (. ) of [org1] have the same numbers (. ) <8> <un>
S46: xxxx <un> </8>
S41: <8> -a (. ) okay </8> i see
S42: S41: so (. ) this is (. ) like (. ) was (. ) some kind of (. ) (recent) surprise so like your
S43: estimation (. ) is similar to (. ) <9> ours </9>
S44: S30: <9> mhmm </9> (. ) so you think this is a feasible this project is feasible
S41: what do you mean by feasible (.)<1> i don't erm (.)<1> what</1> what does it mean
S30: <1> feasible</1> er</1> (.)<1> er
S42: <L1ru> xxxx</L1ru> {explains the term feasible}
S41: a:h (.)<1> okay</1> so (.)<1> yah</1> we think it's (.)<2> feasible</2> mhm</2>
S30: <2> yes</2> aha aha</2> okay (.)<2> erm</2>
S41: so i (.)<1> i had some (.)<1> minor questions</1>
S30: yes (.)<3> yes</3> yah</3>
S41: er to you (.)<3> so</3> er please er like (.)<1> i've</1> got from this review
S41: <4> like</4> you had some (.)<1> e:r benefits</1> <5> and</5> i have like er (.)<1> er
S30: one of the questions that i want to dis-<6> -cuss</6> </6> is this one so you estimated that you will (.)<1> e:r close some e:r branches</1> (2)
S30: <4> mhm</4> <5> yah</5> <6> yes</6>
S41: so according to these so like (.)<3> you said</3> twenty-five [name15] (.)<3> running</3>
S30: <4> yah</4> <5> yes</5> <6> yes</6>
S41: you can close five branches (.)<1> for year one</1> already (.)<1> am i am i right</1>
S30: just a minute (.)
S41: mhm
S30: year one twenty-five</7> [name15] running</7>
S41: <7> [name15] running</7> (.)<1> divided by five</1>
S30: five yes (.)
S41: yah (.)
S30: yes (.)<8> okay</8>
S41: <8> uhu</8> <8> so first year you close five branches and then you close twenty branches next year (.)<1> because</1> one hundred</9> and
S30: <9> (is that right)</9> <9> you</9> divide five a year
S41: yah (.)
S30: yes (.)
S41: yeah so it's like cost reduction i see you like the your benefits on this (.)<1> is</1>
S30: this it (.)<1> like for me to understand the whole situation because i will need to go with numbers (.)<1> to show these numbers to: the (.)<1> er ceo</1> so</1> like (.)
S41: we have (.)<1> the same approach to this and that's very important</1> (.)<1> and</1>
S30: <2> er</2> like</1> (1)
S30: <1> yes yes yes yes yes (.)<1> yes</1> (.)<2> yah</2> mhm</2>
S41: like maybe you had some (.)<1> other things to discuss with me</1> (.)<3> erm</3>
S30: (.)<4> mhm</4></4>
S41: then</3> i would like</4> to</4> to</4> (.)<1> to know er th-</1> for this
[15]
S41: mhm
S30: does [org1] have e:r enough (.)<1> credibility</1>
S41: mhm
S30: in this area
S41: in this area (.)<1> what kind of cr-</1> so whether we are capable to: <5> (.)<1> to make this project</1>
S30: <5> yes (.)<1> yes yes yes</1>
S41: e:r (.)<1> i think that e:r</1> absolutely i could (.)<1> could say that (.)<1> we are (.)<1> so (.)<1> let (.)<1> let rest (.)<1> like</1> do it (let's unreal it (.)<1> so at first we need er (.)<1> we already are working on the: (.)[name13] (.)<1> software (.)<1> so let's let's er (.)<1> show it
(.) on the drawing to be like <un> xx </un> so er like we discussed
with mister [last name4]

S30: yah
S41: and er he've mentioned it er er it's a very good thing er that we
have this [name13] on the web and on these er kiosks er and the thing how we see it like er for this project and er your customer er er
comes up to this kiosk in a store er puts in his <6> <un> x </un> mhm </6>
S30: <6> so i don't am i </6> don't want to to get the the technical det- er capab-
<7> -ilities </7> of in a technical sense
S41: <7> mhm </7> </7> mhm
S30: how can be sure that what you are saying
S41: mhm (.)
S30: why should i use [org1] for this project er instead of a: (.)
S41: somebody else
S30: a spec- specialist niche vender you know niche vender <1> who has a (.) only does these jobs so <2> they they have the best er of the bi- technology and er yah <3> [org1] is too general you know <4> they do <4> this this this <5> this but </5> i (assure) me (.), the gen- the more general you are (.)
S41: <1> aha </1> <2> okay </2> <3> mhm </3> <4> i see </4> <5> aha </5> mhm
S30: the less quality comes out (1)
S41: er (1) okay i (.), i understand your feelings (.), er (.), i see that er it's really important (.), that's (.), the thing is like (.), when you're (.), er (.), for example (.), if you will do this project er do a: (.), some firm that is specializing on it (.), er you will have only just (.), a small part of this project from one company er the: (.), second part of the project from another company for example some does
device some does software some does l- (.), something else and maybe the third does project management for example (.), and you have like four or three venders (.), and you need to (.), you you will (.), need to (.), like (.), lot of efforts (.), to make this all things work together (.), and if you will go with [org1] (.), [org1] will be the prime contractor (.), the only point of entry (.), you will call me (.), or project manager (.), and we are (.), doing all these things (.), we will go er (.), and we will use er (.), er other (.), venders that are specializing in some things that we are not really good in it
S30: but i don't mind to work hard if if i- the end of the day (.), <6> er </6> i get a better deal for company (.), for my comp- <7> -any but i </7> don't mind <8> (to call) </8> different things is is my job so (.), i mean er (.),
S41: <6> mhm </6> (.) <7> yes i see that but </7> (.) <8> mhm </8> (.) aha: (.)
S30: if i know that er (.)
S41: mhm (.)
S30: a niche provider can (.) pro- (bring) us <9> e:r </9> (.) best of the technology then <1> then </1> (.) i don't mind to call to several people you know
S41: (. more <2> <un> xxx </un> </2>)
S41: <9> mhm </9> <1> yah </1> (.) <2> i see and </2> (. how can you manage the risk on that situation
S30: now how will [org1] manage the risk
S41: so we have best of bre- (.) project management (.) the project will be phased (.) like for example (.) e:r (.) we will divide (.) the project in several parts (.) <un>
x <un> phase one phase two phase three phase four (.) and (.) we will have (.) check points (.) e:r (.) in which we (.) we can say (.) this part (.) is complete (.) it is under (.) budget (.) under resources (.) and under (.) e:r <3> <un> xx </un> <un>
S30: <3> but this is a </3> general e:r (.) project management er thing this is not a specific for [org1]
S41: and er like for example we're working a lot already in your company
S30: yeah
S41: so we (.) we have er (.) er knowledges (.) about er (.) all of your (.) it infrastructure issues e:r like business issues (.) so (.) it will (.) take time for other companies er to get into this business and (.) we are already (.) i- in the middle of it (we <4> know the situation) </4>
S30: what does this </4> mean to me (.) <5> i mean what er </5>
S41: <5> this ad-additional </5> cost done waste (. ) you want to implement (.)
S30: yah
S41: do you (.) so that the: (.) all the preliminary phase (.) so (.) e:r (.) er (.) er (.) like (.) proof of concept (.) yeah (.) in two months (.) do you believe that (.) if you will go to: some third party at the moment (.) and they will come out to you (.)
S30: <4> some </4> or the (.) earlier we can (.) <7> <un> xxxxx </un> we can get er </7> (.)
S41: <7> yah (.) yah (.) yah <7> because like (.) like (.)
S30: yah
S41: er (.) mister [S30/last] (.) er really from (.) i've read (.) throughoutly you:r (.) your letter (.) and your (1) y- as soon as you get all these (.) things fast (.) you will e:r (.) like receive (.) you're soon (.) your want as i (.) as far as i understood (.) is to (.) make the project running as soon as possible (.) and also you need to (.) e:r postpone (.) the payments on this (.) so for example you you were writing in your mail (.) that you need to (.) make it after year one
S30: yes
S41: yeah (. . .) so (. . .) like (. . .) who who else could er provide you (. . .) e:r (. . .) the
financial services (. . .) on the same conditions as we did for other projects (. . .) and (. . .)
so (. . .) i- if you do this (. . .) you'll become to (. . .) gain benefits earlier
S30: these business figures e:r are very important to [org2] <8> e:r <8> because
we have a (. . .) a sh- a a a after a short er while the meeting with the shareholders so
<9> i think <9> e:r the ceo should (. . .)
S41: <8> yeah <8> (. . .) <9> yes <9> (. . .) mhm (. . .)
S30: need some er business figures <1> to (. . .) to <un> xxx </un> </1> <2> do-
<2> doing a (. . .) we are in a good shape now
S41: <1> some general numbers </1> (. . .) <2> yah </2> (. . .) yah (. . .) i see and er (. . .)
you also (. . .) written that er (. . .) the (. . .) alliance (. . .) with (. . .) [last name10] on this
project (. . .) will (. . .) get your shares (. . .) price <3> er higher (. . .) yeah (. . .) yeah so (. . .) let
<3> (. . .) as soon as we will do it you will (. . .) you will receive benefits
S30: <3> yes of course (. . .) that's why) this project is very important yes </3>
S41: some of them are immediate e:r most of them are longterm (. . .) so anyway
it's like strategical (. . .) er decision for you <4> for your company </4> (. . .) i (. . .)
clearly understand it (. . .) and e:r like we are doing doing our best to: (. . .) to support it
(. . .) er from our side (. . .) and e:r (. . .) if you have (. . .) some more issues i would like to
address them as soon <5> as possible </5>
S30: <4> mhm mhm </4> <5> what is </5> the status of the (. . .) data analysis
project
S41: data analysis (. . .) so we f- we f- (. . .) finished the first phase (. . .) and (. . .) you (. . .)
made all agreement on the: (. . .) like (. . .) that you want to go with further analysis (. . .)
S30: mhm mhm
S41: but we still don't receive er the (. . .) er the (. . .) signed contract of you (. . .) so (. . .)
we are ready to start it (. . .) <6> immediately </6> so the work is already doing
because i think it <7> <un> xx </un> </7> (. . .) yah (. . .) so we need (. . .) we need e:r like
mhm (. . .) okay we need to (. . .) mhm </7>
S30: <6> okay </6> (. . .) <7> okay (. . .) okay (. . .) good (. . .) okay (. . .) a- yes </7>
S41: are there any (. . .) any more (. . .) er questions (. . .) something else that you want to
cover (1)
S30: okay just a minute
S41: mhm (8)
S30: yah so this th- er results of the data analysis er er are very (. . .) er important
also <8> for </8> for our ceo (. . .) <9> yes (. . .) er yes yes </9> (. . .) <1> so er </1> (. . .)
<2> yes </2>
S41: <8> mhm </8> (. . .) for our ceo <9> so we need to show them </9> (. . .) <1>
after (. . .) thank you </1> for advice </2> we </2> will take it into account (. . .)
S30: so:
S41: yah you see this anyway
S30: haeh?
S41: you see it anyway (. . .) <3> so (. . .) mhm </3>
S30: <3> yes okay </3> (. . .) yes yes (. . .) okay
S41: so and (. . .) like (. . .) in the end (. . .) like (. . .) if you have (. . .) some more issues to
discuss (. . .) <4> e:r </4>
S30: <4> what </4> was the status of this (. . .) [name13] project
S41: er [name13] (. ) er (. ) is now er (. ) in the status of er (. ) er (. ) like we made (. ) analysis (. ) which showed (. ) that er we are already (. ) that we can (. ) like (. )
handle this project
S30: yes
S41: and this is (. ) and (. ) it is feasible (. ) and er (. ) we need er to sign (. ) like the second part (. ) er to the: (. ) pilot (. ) pilot project (. ) so it's not not (. ) already signed (. ) so that's the we we completed phase one (. ) and now the we will need the <5> <un> xxxx </un> </5>
S30: <5> with whom </5> are you working for p- <6> [name13] </6>
S41: <6> [name13] </6> (. ) with mister [last name6]
S30: i think it should be (constant) for [name15] also like i <7> discussed it (. )
yah <7>
S41: <7> yes i know (. ) yeah and that's <7> (. ) the thing that i wanted (. ) like to (. ) for you (. ) to er (. ) to see clearly (. ) yah that (. ) [name13] (. ) goes throughout (. ) all of the projects of (. ) [org2] as well (. ) so (. ) at first (. ) it's the [name13] by itself (. ) the second (. ) is (. ) that (. ) this interface will be used on the web (. ) so in the banking solution (. ) and the third thing that it will be used in [name15]
S30: <8> mhm </8>
S41: <8> so </8> <8> </8> (.) er (. ) this this interface will be very customer centric (. ) and the thing that i wanted like to show you not the hardware example (. ) like because when (. ) the customer will enter (. ) the terminal in the bank of [last name10] (. ) er (. ) er (. ) the (1) [name12] (. ) will know it (. ) and er like you will get (. ) all the information in it (. ) and from the (. ) side of the customer (. ) he will be very pleased (. ) to see that er interface (. ) er (. ) knows him (. ) <9> so like <9>
S30: <9> (if this <9> data) this er
S41: yah
S30: er also er we can this [name15] pro- <1> -ject </1> (. ) er can it cope with the extra workload
S41: <1> mhm </1> (. ) what?
S30: er er our it resources (. ) i mean can can we (. ) er (. ) do they have enough er (.) capacity to (. ) parallel to what they are doing (. ) to work with er:er (. ) with us
S41: er we've discussed it with er mister [last name7] (. ) today (. ) and <2> er</2> the (. ) in general (. ) er (. ) erm (. ) we need to address (. ) this issue (. ) and (. ) as soon as we get the business support (. ) for: for the further (. ) things (. ) we will meet with mister [last name8] (. ) who is responsible for technical implementation of (. ) [name12] (. ) he will the technical director of project (. ) er (. ) we will (. ) show (. ) er (. ) like (. ) after business supports it (. ) we will meet with them and er (. ) will decide on further actions (. ) but (. ) er (. ) and at the moment (. ) e:r we see that (. ) er (. ) the (. ) work load (. ) on the: (. ) er (. ) on the (. ) it infrastructure will be (. ) e:r (. ) sufficient (. ) er and i (. ) we can handle it (. ) e:r (. ) during the project implementation further <3> steps (. ) </3> because now we are like in the (. ) very beginning (. ) we decided on some business things (. ) and as soon as we will get (. ) deeper and deeper (. ) we will solve this issue (. ) so it's not er (. ) like thing to doubt (. )
S30: <2> yah </2> (. ) <3> mhm mhm </3> (. ) do you do you have any: e:r (. ) experience with e:r (. ) er as [org1] with [name13] (. ) type er (. ) <4> with applications er </4>
S41: <4> with [name13]? </4> (. ) yah we have a great experience because er we
have (. ) same type of concept (. ) working in our company so (. ) in our everyday
life (. ) so it's a portal (. ) so (. ) for example (. ) theoretically (. ) yah i (. ) i (. ) from
any pc (. ) i can come to er (. ) our network and will see the portal (. ) which will (1)
show me all the things i need for my job (. ) so it's like user-friendly (. ) very
customer centric i can (. ) e:r (. ) tailor it to me (. ) so (. ) it's working in a three (. )
hundred and thirty (. ) thousand (. ) people company (. ) everyone uses it's interface
for five years and <5> like </5>
S30: <5> so </5> in [org1] er (. ) you're internally working
S41: er (. ) we are internally working and s- and we are constantly selling this type
of solutions (. ) to our customers
S30: [name13] solutions
S41: they are (. ) they have (. ) e:r (. ) same (. ) e:r (. ) same things (. ) it's not [name13]
[name13] is (. ) we are working it (. ) exactly for you (. ) but it uses (. ) like (. ) for
example you have (. ) e:r (a constructor level) (. ) a:nd you can view different
things (. ) of it (. ) so this (. ) technology (. ) is (. ) much the same as a constructor (. )
and we know how to do it (. ) er fast (. ) e:r because we have some prerequisites (. )
for it
S30: are there any banks who are using it or we will be the first (. ) first one
S41: yah in russia there are (. ) e:r (. ) there are (. ) banks (. ) that using it (. ) er they
(. ) it's a retail bank (. ) alpha bank (. ) they have the same type of solution (. ) so
they use the interface (. ) er in their (eight im) (. ) mach- <6> -ines (. ) </6> but
furthermore we will go (. ) a little bit (. ) even more deeper in your case because the
technology a little bit changed and we have now more possibilities to do more
customer centric solutions (. )
S30: <6> mhm mhm </6> (. ) yah
S41: they are successful (. ) in this (. ) they implemented [name12] (. ) they use the
benefits of it (. ) and the bank er the bank is growing in our country significantly
S30: <7> mhm </7>
S41: <7> and even </7> has er (. ) some (. ) divisions outside of russia in usa some
in europe (. ) switzerland (. ) so that's that's like <8> it </8>
S30: <8> okay </8>
S41: so we (. ) <9> we </9> can also show it to: ceo
S30: <9> <un> x </un> </9> (. ) yes
S41: that we have references on implemented <1> <un> xx </un> </1>
S30: <1> aha you </1> can show the ceo so i think it will be important to (. ) the
ceo is e-er knows what you are doing here <2> and </2> what kind of <3>
business </3> yah
S41: <2> yah </2> (. ) <3> yah </3> (. ) okay (. ) so any more (. ) questions (. ) <4>
so </4>
S30: no that's <4> all </4> fo-for the time being from my side
S41: yah (. ) that's (. ) like (. ) e:r (. ) i would like (. ) e:r (. ) to (. ) like (. ) the main (. )
one or the main issues so (. ) would you support us (. ) e:r with mister [last name9]
(. ) so from your side from the side of e:r (. ) e:r <un> xx </un> marketing
S30: y- (. ) yah i think if you can er (. ) provide e:r him with er (. ) probational er (. )
overview of the (. ) main (. ) projects and and some business <5> er </5> (. ) er
numbers
S41: <5> mhm </5> (. ) of course
S30: that he can use e:r (.) as (.) to prove that we are doing er very good
S41: mhm (.) mhm (.)
S30: in his er (.) shareholder's meeting then i think i-i support you
S41: mhm (.) okay (.) so (.) er mister [S30/last] (.) i'm very (.) was very
pleased to meet you today (.) i guess like we will have (.)
S30: (.) what do you mean er for you to support what what what (.)
do you want me to do (.)
S41: (.) support like (.) yah (.) for example if like mister (.) Mister
name9] (.) will come up to you (.) and say so (.) do you like (.) believe in [org1]
(.) do they do (.) the real job (.) do they have concept and (.) know the what's
happening in the company
S30: do you want to meet with him?
S41: we want to meet with him (.) yah can you help us with that (.) to arrange the
meeting
S30: yes i can help you yes
S41: and would you like to participate as well
S30: of course if er if i am er sponsoring you <1> i: <1/1> will be there also
S41: <1> yah <1/1> (.) okay so (.) looking forward (.) for this meeting <2> so (.)
S30: (.)
S41: will (.) t- tell me when we can (.) arrange this (.) so
S30: yah it should be tomorrow then
S41: tomorrow
S30: mhm
S41: tomorrow on the (.) eighteenth of (.) april
S30: yes
S41: yah (.) okay thank you <3> very much nice to see you <3>
S30: <3> thank you (.) good bye <3>
S41: bye
S30: so
{SS applause}
<end MD VII Conversation 11_00:56:24>
{following feedback session is not transcribed_00_04:30}
11.3. Appendix 3: The Speakers of my Recordings

The Leaders of the International Business School

**Speaker 2:**
Sex: male  
*First Language:* English (Great Britain - Wales)  
Age: ~ 35  
*Position:* a leader of the international business school and an examiner

**Speaker 3:**
Sex: male  
*First Language:* English (USA)  
Age: ~ 40  
*Position:* a leader of the international business school

The Examiners

**Speaker 1:**
Sex: male  
*First Language:* Croatian (Croatia)  
Age: ~ 40  
*Position:* examiner

**Speaker 4:**
Sex: female  
*First Language:* German (Austria)  
Age: ~ 30  
*Position:* examiner

**Speaker 5:**
Sex: male  
*First Language:* Russian (Russia)  
Age: ~ 30 - 35  
*Position:* Russian examiner

**Speaker 6:**
Sex: male  
*First Language:* German (Austria)  
Age: ~ 35  
*Position:* examiner

**Speaker 22:**
Sex: male  
*First Language:* German (Austria)  
Age: ~ 50  
*Position:* examiner
**Speaker 24:**
*Sex:* male  
*First Language:* German (Austria)  
*Age:* ~ 35  
*Position:* examiner

**Speaker 30:**
*Sex:* male  
*First Language:* Turkish (Cyprus) Second Language: German (with accent)  
*Age:* ~ 45  
*Position:* examiner

**The Examinees**

**Speaker 7:**
*Sex:* male  
*First Language:* Russian (Russia)  
*Age:* ~ 25  
*Position:* examinee

**Speaker 11:**
*Sex:* male  
*First Language:* Russian (Russia)  
*Age:* ~ 25  
*Position:* examinee

**Speaker 14:**
*Sex:* male  
*First Language:* Russian (Russia)  
*Age:* ~ 25  
*Position:* examinee

**Speaker 17:**
*Sex:* female  
*First Language:* Russian (Russia)  
*Age:* ~ 25  
*Position:* examinee

**Speaker 20:**
*Sex:* male  
*First Language:* Russian (Russia)  
*Age:* ~ 25  
*Position:* examinee
Speaker 25:
Sex: male
First Language: Russian (Russia)
Age: ~ 25
Position: examinee

Speaker 26:
Sex: male
First Language: Russian (Russia)
Age: ~ 25
Position: examinee

Speaker 27:
Sex: male
First Language: Russian (Russia)
Age: ~ 25
Position: examinee

Speaker 28:
Sex: female
First Language: Russian (Russia)
Age: ~ 25
Position: examinee

Speaker 29:
Sex: female
First Language: Russian (Russia)
Age: ~ 25
Position: examinee

Speaker 31:
Sex: male
First Language: Russian (Russia)
Age: ~ 25
Position: examinee

Speaker 35:
Sex: male
First Language: Russian (Russia)
Age: ~ 25
Position: examinee

Speaker 38:
Sex: male
First Language: Russian (Russia)
Age: ~ 25
Position: examinee
**Speaker 41:**
- **Sex:** male
- **First Language:** Russian (Russia)
- **Age:** ~ 25
- **Position:** examinee

**The Observers**

**Speaker 8:**
- **Sex:** male
- **First Language:** Russian (Russia)
- **Age:** ~ 25
- **Position:** observer

**Speaker 9:**
- **Sex:** female
- **First Language:** Russian (Russia)
- **Age:** ~ 25
- **Position:** observer

**Speaker 10:**
- **Sex:** male
- **First Language:** Russian (Russia)
- **Age:** ~ 25
- **Position:** observer

**Speaker 12:**
- **Sex:** male
- **First Language:** Russian (Russia)
- **Age:** ~ 25
- **Position:** observer

**Speaker 13:**
- **Sex:** male
- **First Language:** Russian (Russia)
- **Age:** ~ 25
- **Position:** observer

**Speaker 15:**
- **Sex:** female
- **First Language:** Russian (Russia)
- **Age:** ~ 25
- **Position:** observer
Speaker 16:
Sex: male
First Language: Russian (Russia)
Age: ~ 25
Position: observer

Speaker 18:
Sex: male
First Language: Russian (Russia)
Age: ~ 25
Position: observer

Speaker 19:
Sex: male
First Language: Russian (Russia)
Age: ~ 25
Position: observer

Speaker 21:
Sex: male
First Language: Russian (Russia)
Age: ~ 25
Position: observer

Speaker 23:
Sex: male
First Language: Russian (Russia)
Age: ~ 25
Position: observer

Speaker 32:
Sex: male
First Language: Russian (Russia)
Age: ~ 25
Position: observer

Speaker 33:
Sex: male
First Language: Russian (Russia)
Age: ~ 25
Position: observer

Speaker 34:
Sex: male
First Language: Russian (Russia)
Age: ~ 25
Position: observer
| Speaker 36: | Sex: male |
| First Language: Russian (Russia) | Age: ~ 25 |
| Position: observer |

| Speaker 37: | Sex: male |
| First Language: Russian (Russia) | Age: ~ 25 |
| Position: observer |

| Speaker 39: | Sex: male |
| First Language: Russian (Russia) | Age: ~ 25 |
| Position: observer |

| Speaker 40: | Sex: male |
| First Language: Russian (Russia) | Age: ~ 25 |
| Position: observer |

| Speaker 42: | Sex: female |
| First Language: Russian (Russia) | Age: ~ 25 |
| Position: observer |

| Speaker 43: | Sex: male |
| First Language: Russian (Russia) | Age: ~ 25 |
| Position: observer |

| Speaker 44: | Sex: male |
| First Language: Russian (Russia) | Age: ~ 25 |
| Position: observer |
11.4. Appendix 4: The Topics of the Conversations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Speakers</th>
<th>Topics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Leaders of the international business school Examiners</td>
<td>Introduction to the international business school and explanation of sales calls Administrative stuff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Examinee = sales person Examiner = client executive at the company</td>
<td>Negotiations with a major retail bank Problem: high operational costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Examinee = sales person (distribution sector) Examiner = customer</td>
<td>A serious price problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Examinee = sales person Examiner = customer (a bank)</td>
<td>Financing of projects / banking Price problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Examinee = sales person (software selling) Examiner = customer (a retail bank)</td>
<td>High operational costs Change from one (software) system to another Enter-price-licence agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Examinee = sales person (account manager) Examiner 1 = customer Examiner 2 = cfo</td>
<td>Payment to two companies for the same thing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Examinees = sales persons Examiner = sales manager</td>
<td>A sales manager meeting: discussion of current projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Examinee = sales person Examiner = customer</td>
<td>Project development (feasibility, credibility, financing, planning)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Examinee = sales person Examiner = customer</td>
<td>Project development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Examinee = sales person Examiner = customer (a bank)</td>
<td>Project development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Examinee = sales person Examiner = customer</td>
<td>Project development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11.5. **Appendix 5: Classifying the Pronoun we**

**A System of Classification**

**Assigning Referents to all Occurrences of WE in the Corpus**

8. *we* refers to: members of ‘the company’ present (only relevant in the Sales Manager Meeting as this is the only time when more members of ‘the company’ were present / the observers are not taken into account as members of ‘the company’ in this category)

**Extract:**

2725  S24: so to the people (.) to whom have you talked so far
2726  S26: er (.) *we* have talked to everybody here (.) and not (.) once (.) <un> xx </un>
2727  not doing once
(MD V / Conversation 7)

9. *we* refers to: sales persons of ‘the company’ / sales person + team (present or not present / this category refers to the group of sales people working at the company regardless of their presence at the meeting)

**Extract:**

739  S1: okay (.) yah (.) <7> you have to feed them (.) that's true (.) </7>
740  S7: <7> you (.) yeah (.) yeah (.) </7> *we* have to feed them <8> <@> anyway
741  </@> </8>
742  S1: <8> @@@ </8>
743  S7: and *we* (.) and *we* want you to feed us a little bit
744  SS: @@@@@
(MD II / Conversation 2)

10. *we* refers to: customer + team (the customer + his non-present team)

**Extract:**

1058  S4: <7> yah but it (.) it's it's believe me </7> i would like to do the deal with
1059  [org1] but *we* have those proposals on the table and they are (.) from competitors
1060  (.) which (.) i have to take serious yah […]
(MD II / Conversation 3)
11. *we* refers to: the sales person of ‘the company’ + the customer (= the examinee + the examiner / both are present)

**Extract:**

1099 S11: mhm (.) so i guess it will be great er (.) first (of to) send by email <9> and of
1100 </9> course we discuss er our next meeting
(MD II / Conversation 3)

12. *we* refers to: the sales person of ‘the company’ + team and the customer + team
(sales person and customer are present whereas the teams are not present)

**Extract:**

1275 S4: <6> mhm </6> (.) yah (.) look i board meeting i s begin of next week (.) and
1276 there we want to: e:r find a common decision (.) and i will <7> present it </7> (.)
1277 at the board meeting a:nd e:r then i hope we'll get the decision
(MD II / Conversation 3)

13. *we* refers to: examinee + observers (present)

**Extract:**

2316 S22: my name is [S22] [S22/last] (1) i am cfo (and) who are you?
2317 S20: (we are from) [org1] i am account manager from [org1] (.)
(MD IV / Conversation 6)
7. *we* refers to: examiner in the role of an examinee plus colleagues (this category only applies in conversation 5 where an examiner tells a story about his being an examinee and his use of *we* refers to him in the past as an examinee and his colleagues)

**Extract:**

1590 S1: [...] (1) and (.) about that chair (.) i did it (.) five (.) six years ago (.) i was
1591 sitting (also) in that chair
1592 S17: <6> <@> mhm </@> @@@@ @@@ @@@ <6>
1593 S1: <6> @@@ @@@ </6> so i know how you feel <7> @@ (.) </7> are you a
1594 bit nervous? </@
1595 S17: <7> @@@ @@@ </7> uhu
1596 [...] S17: i have the presentation with (thursday)
1601 S17: i have the presentation with (...) (thursday)
1602 S1: yah i know (.) i know
1603 [...] S1: yah i know (.) i know
1604 S1: for thursday (...) yah (1) i recall that yah (1) we started (.) i think with
1605 preparation of this presentation somewhere around (.) two or three in the
1606 afternoon (.) and then we (talked to) (.) four o'clock in the morning
(MD III / Conversation 5)

8. *we* refers to: ‘the company’ as a whole plus the customer company as a whole

**Extract:**

2457 S22: which means we share the risk (.)
2458 S20: yes of <3> course </3> (.) <4> w- </4> (.)
(MD IV / Conversation 6)

9. *we* refers to: the first and the second examiner (this category only applies in conversation 6)

**Extract:**

2526 S22: and er when you see [last name2] (.) er i would like to see him (.) because we
2527 have to look at <3> the: (.) </3> the invoice <4> (.) yah? </4>
(MD IV / Conversation 6)
10. *we* refers to: the examinees (this category applies in Conversation 11 where an examinee is talking about their group)

**Extract:**

4437  S30: did er (.) did you (.) all give me calls (.) because (.) this is your (.) second or third time with me
4439  S42: <2> no it's his first </2> time with
4440  SX-m: <2> no it's the first time (.) </2> <3> really (.) yes </3>
4441  S30: <3> first time (.) no: </3>
4442  SX-m: we had yesterday
4443  S30: yes

(MD VII / Conversation 11)

11. *we* refers to: the examiner + the examinee(s) (present – this category applies to the exam situation and to the speaker identities of examiner and examinee)

**Extract:**

4497  SX-m: just fine (.) everybody <un> x </un> we can start

(MD VII / Conversation 11)

12. *we* refers to: ‘the company’ as a whole or all the employees of ‘the company’ as well as to the customer company as a whole or all the employees of the customer company (= “institutional” (Drew & Heritage 1992) or “corporate” (Bargiela-Chiappini & Harris 1997) *we*)

**Extract:**

1470  S14: so e:r why i'm asked (.) e:r the reason is that er in er [org1] in our company
1471  in [org1] we have er such structure which is called [name7] (.) e:r did you ever heard something about?

(MD III / Conversation 4)

**Extract:**

2363  S22: <6> sure (.) because </6> we: seem to be a rich bank and [org1] of course is interested in business <7> (with us) </7>

(MD IV / Conversation 6)
## 11.6. Appendix 6: Pragmatic Expressions of Common Ground

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Pragmatic Expressions of Common Ground</strong></th>
<th><strong>The speaker PRESUPPOSES common ground or understanding from the addressee</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ You know&lt;br&gt;▪ Of course&lt;br&gt;▪ As you may already know / as you may know / as you know&lt;br&gt;▪ As we know&lt;br&gt;▪ As you (probably) remember, (yes?)&lt;br&gt;▪ You see / as you see (here) / as you could see&lt;br&gt;▪ You understand me correctly / as you could understand / as you understand&lt;br&gt;▪ Everybody knows that&lt;br&gt;▪ As we agreed&lt;br&gt;▪ as you can see here</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The speaker SIGNALS his understanding / agreement by …</strong></td>
<td>... explicitly referring to his state of knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ as I know / yes, I know / as far as I know / what I know&lt;br&gt;▪ As far as I understood / I completely understand / (this) I understand (you) / I (really) understood / as I understood / I understand you correctly / as I understand you right / as I understand / understand the situation / understand the right figures / understand the results / understanding your risks / understand your position / as I understood you correctly / we understand / for me to understand&lt;br&gt;▪ we know / we will know&lt;br&gt;▪ As I see / I see your point / I see&lt;br&gt;▪ I remember / as far as I remember&lt;br&gt;▪ So I know how you feel&lt;br&gt;▪ I agree&lt;br&gt;▪ The question is clear for me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>… by summarising / referring to what the other speaker said</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ You mentioned / as you mentioned (before)&lt;br&gt;▪ Just to understand / do I understand correctly / understand what I mean&lt;br&gt;▪ As you told / what you have told me / as I told you / as I already said / let me just say / as you said / as we said / as we discussed it before / on previous meeting / as I said&lt;br&gt;▪ (do) you mean / that means that …</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The speaker creates common ground / understanding / shared knowledge by …</td>
<td>... posing questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... referring to what has already been said</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... offering help or more information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... explicitly demanding understanding / agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... explaining things</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... demanding information from the other speaker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... referring to the other person by using a proper name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... using ritualised phrases like greetings, farewells, please, thanks, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Is it okay to you?
- what do you know
- Am I right?
- Don’t you think / what do you think of
- As I already mentioned
- for your understanding / for you to know
- Probably you have some questions / I will be happy to answer it
- I’m ready and willing to help you
- you have to understand / I (just) want you to understand / you have to understand
- I will be very glad to know your opinion
- So that you know (who I am)
- You will see
- just to know it better for me
- Mister [S30/last]
- Mister [S24/last]
- [S24]
- [S30/last]
- Please
- Thank you / thanks (a lot)
- Glad to see you again
- How have you been / how are you
- Nice to meet you / nice to see you (again)
- It was a pleasure seeing you
- Have a good time
- Have a seat
- Welcome
## 11.7. Appendix 7: Full List of Specialised Vocabulary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Applications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(General) Business, Sales and Finance / IT</td>
<td>(General) Business, Sales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Products, Projects and People (General)</td>
<td>Team / Product / production / Project / Proposal / Competitive proposal / Colleagues / Technology / Business partner / Leading / Distribution application / Offering / offers / Developers / Including your proposal / Contact point / Sales guy / Project application development / Reduce the risk / Project phases / Project management / Consultant / Report / Finance guy / STG-guy / Hardware seller / Salesman / Business partner organisation / Expansion product / Competing network business process / User / Labs / Product selling / Economist / Collaboration staff / Client executive / Partner / Distributor database / Staff / Trade-ups / Technical / Key decision leader / Benefit holder / Approver / prover / Advisor project / Director / Vice presidents / Technology / Executives / Operating systems / Net / Applications / Prime contractor / Technical implementation / Technical director / Constructor level / Constructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proper Names of other persons: Employees of ‘the company’, customers, managers, etc. or job descriptions</td>
<td>Proper Names of Persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job descriptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[org1] executive / [org1] seller / Visiting manager / Executive / Manager / [org1] sales manager / Safety ss / Sales specialist / Client executive / [org1] client executive / Account manager / CEO / CIO / CFO / Project manager / Application developers / Key account manager / Account manager / Key decision leader</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IT-related</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central IT-site / IT-site / Main frames / mainframe / P-series servers / p-series service / Software sales / Database / Z-series / Data base system / P-series / Hardware / Servers / User-friendly / Data / X-mail / Capabilities / Account / key account / System x / Software / Software configurations / I-series / Application / Platform / platform database / platform services / Software application / IT-infrastructure / IT-consolidation / inevitable IT-consolidation / consolidation of IT-infrastructure / Technology / Instalments / HB / Inter-platform / Series / Hardware platforms / X-series servers / PCs / Software architectures / IT-resources / IT-side / IT / Operation systems / Software level / IT-department / Web / Interface / Portal / Network</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>International</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proper Names</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vienna / Moscow / Russia / Russian Federation / Russian / South Africa / Europe / Austria / US / USA / Croatia / Switzerland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Related Terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Around the world / European standard / European market / Global project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exam situation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sales call / Case studies / Sales representative / Graduation classes / grad class / Morning calls / Afternoon calls / Presentation / Afternoon visiting manager calls / Calls / Students / Research / Conduct an effective call / Test / Assess / Call on / Evaluate / Observe / Feedback / Debrief / debriefing / Objectives / Teach point / Observers / Facilitator / Call-taker / Assessment form / Grading sheet / Passing grades / Passing / not passing / Sales competencies / Grade / To grade so. / University / Courses / Core model / Objection handling models / Sales manager / Brief / briefing / Customer’s office / Customer scenario / D1 / D2 / D3 / D4 / Case / Validation sheet / Team t</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11.8. Appendix 8: German Summary (Deutsche Zusammenfassung)


Die Kapitel 5, 6 und 7 schließlich sind das eigentliche Herzstück der Arbeit. Sie umfassen die Analysen der folgenden drei linguistischen Strategien in Hinblick auf ihren Beitrag zur Verhandlung von ‚common ground’, der Annahme oder Festigung gemeinsamen Wissens sowie der Herstellung einer positiven Kommunikationsatmosphäre im Allgemeinen: die Benützung des Personalpronomens we, der Gebrauch bestimmter sprachlicher Marker und der Einsatz spezialisierten Vokabulars. Diese drei Strategien

Schließlich werden einige Schlussfolgerungen für den Sprachunterricht (im Besonderen für ‚English for Specific Business Purposes‘ (ESBP)) gezogen. In der Conclusion werden alle Stränge der Arbeit noch einmal zusammengeführt und zu einem einheitlichen Abschluss gebracht.

11.9. Appendix 9: CV (Lebenslauf)

Kontaktinformationen

Vor- und Zuname: Petra Bohrn
Adresse: Schwaigergasse 37 / 8
A-1210 Wien
Telefonnummer: +43699 11 85 11 98
E-Mail-Adresse: petra.bohrn@chello.at

Persönliche Daten

Geburtsdatum: 14.10.1982
Geburtsort: Wien
Staatsbürgerschaft: Österreich
Familienstand: ledig

Aus- und Weiterbildung

Matura: Juni 2002 Schulabschluss mit Matura in der HLW3 Erdberg
Diplomarbeit: English as a Lingua Franca: Negotiating Common Ground in Business Interaction
Seit 2004 Geschichte Diplom an der Universität Wien (1. Studienabschnitt abgeschlossen)
Weiterbildung: 2003 – 2006 Ausbildung zur staatlich geprüften Tanzlehrerin beim VTÖ (Verband der Tanzlehrer Österreichs)
Ausbildungs-Tanzschule: Tanzschule Stanek, 1010 Wien
13.09.2006 Abschluss der Tanzlehrerausbildung mit Auszeichnung Staatlich „Geprüfte Tanzlehrerin“
**Berufserfahrung**

**Juli 1999**
Einmonatiges Schüler-Praktikum bei der BAWAG

**Juni – August 2000**
Zwölfwöchiges Pflichtpraktikum beim Konzern Service und Beratung
(Tätigkeiten: Küchenhilfstätigkeiten, Essensausgabe, einfache Kochtätigkeit) – Praktikum im Rahmen der Koch-Kellner-Ausbildung
an der HLW3 Erdberg

**Oktober 2000**
Anstellung als Samstagskraft auf Geringfügigenbasis im Verkauf bei Delka (Schuhhandels AG)
Kündigung nach dem Probemonat

**November 2000 – September 2001**
Anstellung als Samstagskraft auf Geringfügigenbasis im Verkauf bei Humanic (Leder & Schuh AG)

**Oktober 2001 – September 2007**
Freie Mitarbeiterin in der Tanzschule Stanek (Tätigkeit: Assistentin der Tanzlehrer, Kundenbetreuung, Verkauf, Beratung, Privatstunden)

**Juli 2001**
Ferienjob bei Humanic (Leder & Schuh AG)
(Tätigkeiten: Verkauf)

**August 2005**
Ferienjob bei Humanic (Leder & Schuh AG)
(Tätigkeiten: Verkauf)

**Seit Oktober 2007**
Angestellte „Geprüfte Tanzlehrerin“ in der Tanzschule Stanek
(Tätigkeiten: Leiten von Tanzkursen für Erwachsene und Jugendliche, Verkauf, Beratung, Büroarbeit und Administration, Privatstunden)

**Besondere Kenntnisse**

- Grundausbildung in Daten- und Textverarbeitung (3 Jahre Schulausbildung)
  - Microsoft Office, Internet
- Sprachen: Englisch, Französisch, Spanisch

**Persönliche Interessen**

- Literatur
- Gesellschaftstanz