

*Giving Advice in German and English Student Counseling:
A Conversation Analysis*

Masterarbeit

zur Erlangung des akademischen Grades Master of Arts (MA)

an der Karl-Franzens-Universität Graz

vorgelegt von Julia TAUCHER

am Institut für Anglistik

Begutachterin: Ao. Univ-Prof. Mag. Dr.phil. Hermine Penz

Graz, 2016

Ehrenwörtliche Erklärung

Ich erkläre ehrenwörtlich, dass ich die vorliegende Arbeit selbständig und ohne fremde Hilfe verfasst, andere als die angegebenen Quellen nicht benutzt und die den Quellen wörtlich oder inhaltlich entnommenen Stellen als solche kenntlich gemacht habe. Die Arbeit wurde bisher in gleicher oder ähnlicher Form keiner anderen inländischen oder ausländischen Prüfungsbehörde vorgelegt und auch noch nicht veröffentlicht. Die vorliegende Fassung entspricht der eingereichten elektronischen Version.

Datum

Unterschrift

To my mother.

Thank you.

List of Abbreviations

CA	Conversation Analysis
TCU	Turn Constructional Unit
TRP	Transition Relevant Place
FPP	First Pair Part
SPP	Second Pair Part
NTRI	Next-Turn Repair-Initiator
HV	Health Visitor
MCD	Membership Categorization Device
VOICE	Vienna-Oxford International Corpus of English

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
1. Conversation Analysis (CA).....	3
1.1. Turn-Taking.....	3
1.2. Adjacency Pairs	5
1.3. Preference.....	6
1.4. Sequence	6
1.5. Repair	7
2. Institutional Talk	8
2.1. Activity Types	9
3. Health Communication as a Form of Institutional Talk.....	12
3.1. Key Constituents of Doctor-Patient Communication	13
3.2. Problem Presentation in Doctor-Patient Communication.....	14
3.3. Characteristic Uses of And-Prefacing in Medical Encounters.....	16
3.3.1. Achieving Coherence Across Sequences	16
3.3.2. Agenda vs. Contingent Questions	17
3.3.3. Maintaining Orientation in the Course of Action.....	18
3.3.4. Sustaining and Re-Establishing Agendas	19
3.3.5. And-Prefacing as Strategic Device.....	19
4. Counseling as a Form of Institutional Talk.....	20
4.1. Key Constituents of Counseling	21
4.2. Counseling and its Institutional Context.....	22
4.2.1. Membership Categorization Devices.....	22
4.3. Divergences of Perspective in Counseling.....	23
4.3.1. Interactive, Emotional and Cognitive Aspects of Divergences.....	24
4.3.2. Constitutive Functions.....	24
4.3.3. Interactive Processing of Divergences of Perspective.....	25
4.4. The Importance of Expertise in Counseling	28
4.5. Narrative Processes in Academic Counseling.....	30
4.5.1. Sequential Organization Guided by the Recipient	31
4.5.2. Reconsidering the Role of the Story's Recipient in Counseling	32
4.5.3. Socializing Knowledge by Narrative Questioning	32
5. Giving Advice in Institutional Settings	33
5.1. Strategies of Giving Advice in Radio Advice Programs	33
5.1.1. Requesting Advice.....	33
5.1.2. The Role of Narration.....	34
5.1.3. The Role of Advice-Givers.....	35
5.2. Giving Advice in Health Communication	35
5.2.1. Patterns of Advice Giving	36

5.2.2.	The Initiation of Advice	37
5.2.3.	The Reception of Advice.....	38
6.	Data and Methodology	39
6.1.	Institutional Setting: 4students – Studien Info Service.....	39
6.2.	Transcription Conventions.....	40
7.	Analysis of German and English Student Counseling Encounters	40
7.1.	Categories of Analysis	42
7.2.	Advice-Giving Strategies in English Student Counseling.....	42
7.2.1.	Probing Strategies.....	43
7.2.2.	Disagreement as Indicator for Institutional Knowledge.....	46
7.2.3.	The Anticipation of Advice	46
7.2.4.	Contingent Questions	49
7.2.5.	Prescriptive Patterns of Advice-Giving.....	51
7.3.	Advice-Giving Strategies in German Student Counseling	55
7.3.1.	Probing Strategies.....	55
7.3.2.	And-Prefacing.....	57
7.3.3.	The Rejection of Advice.....	58
7.3.4.	The Significance of Silences	61
7.3.5.	Prescriptive Patterns of Advice-Giving.....	62
7.4.	Recipient-Guided Storytelling in English Student Counseling.....	64
7.4.1.	Contingent Questions	65
7.5.	Recipient-Guided Storytelling in German Student Counseling.....	65
7.5.1.	And-Prefaced Questions	66
7.6.	The Counselor’s Role in English Student Counseling	66
7.7.	The Counselor’s Role in German Student Counseling.....	67
8.	Conclusion	68
	Bibliography	70
	Appendix.....	72

Introduction

Giving advice to others is central to numerous fields, ranging from private to institutional settings. In an academic context, with the transition from school to university, young adults frequently encounter difficulties. They have to assimilate into a new environment, which is connected with acquiring new institutional knowledge. For many students, this new environment raises numerous questions. At the University of Graz, '4students – Studien Info Service' is the official counseling service for current and prospective students, which students can contact for advice. The data used for the analysis in this thesis was gathered at '4students – Studien Info Service'. Six counseling encounters were audiotaped in early 2015, of which two are analyzed in this thesis. Further information concerning data and methodology can be found in chapter 6.

The aim of this thesis is to gain profound understanding of student counseling as an institutional setting. In the empirical part of this thesis I investigate audiotaped student counseling encounters in German and English by using the approach of conversation analysis. The following aspects will be examined thoroughly in chapter 7: (1) the advice-giving strategies of the participants, (2) the influence of recipient-guided storytelling on giving advice, and (3) the role of the advice-giver in student counseling. Therefore, I pose the following three research questions:

1. Which advice-giving strategies are adopted by the participants in student counseling?
 - a. Do the strategies differ in English and German?
 - b. Are contingent questions used to give advice in student counseling?
2. How does recipient-guided storytelling influence giving advice?
3. What is the role of the advice-giver in student counseling?

To provide an answer these research questions, I present research conducted in the field of institutional talk. Conversation analysis (CA) is frequently used to investigate institutional talk, as CA aims at investigating the underlying processes of talk-in-interaction (cf. Hutchby and Wooffit 1998). Therefore, CA is adopted as the methodological approach. The basic components of conversation analysis are described in chapter 1, which are turn-taking, adjacency pairs, preference, sequence and repair. In chapter 2, institutional talk and activity types are closely examined. In chapters 3 and 4 I elaborate on two forms of institutional talk: health communication and counseling. Chapter 3 deals with health

communication, which has been widely researched over the past forty years. I draw on research concerning its key elements, the problem presentation phase, and and-prefacing. It bears significant similarities to counseling, particularly because giving advice is the central matter. With regard to counseling, I refer to research on German counseling, conducted by Nothdurft, Reitemeier and Schröder (1994). They focus on counseling and its institutional context, divergences of perspective and expertise. Furthermore, I discuss He's (1996) findings on recipient-guided storytelling in counseling. In chapter 5, strategies on giving advice are approached from the perspective of health communication as well as counseling.

1. Conversation Analysis (CA)

It is difficult to provide a simple definition of what conversation analysis is. Broadly speaking, conversation analysis examines talk in interaction. According to Hutchby and Wooffitt (1998), CA is the “systematic analysis of the talk produced in everyday situations of human interaction: *talk-in-interaction*” (Hutchby and Wooffitt 1998: 13). The most obvious feature of CA is its methodology, as it is based on transcriptions of actual talk that was audiotaped. Moreover, the recordings are ‘natural’ talk, which means that they were situated in a natural environment as far as possible. The aim of CA is to identify and analyze the underlying processes of talk-in-interaction, focusing on how these processes are generated from the perspective of the participants’ understanding of the situation. However, it has to be mentioned that talk-in-interaction is more than just talk meaning language, but the entire interactional organization of social activities. Most importantly, it is inseparably linked to the environment in which these utterances are produced (cf. Hutchby and Wooffitt 1998: 13-15).

1.1. Turn-Taking

Turn-taking is the underlying framework of conversation and the basic unit in conversation. It distributes the opportunities to participate in conversation. Moreover, it guarantees orderliness and coherence and is therefore required for any form of coordinated action in human interaction (cf. Sidnell 2010: 36-37).

Turn-taking tries to minimize gaps of no talking and overlapping talk. Therefore, the ideal form of organization is the One-at-a-Time Rule, which states that one party talks at a time. Nevertheless, exceptions in which overlapping talk occurs are necessary; if only one person at a time laughed in a larger group, it would seem odd. Nevertheless, the One-at-a-Time Rule still is considered to be predominant. In order to know when to speak, one can wait for completion of the first speaker. However, this would result in a gap between the speakers and would also require a signal for the other speaker to know if the turn was completed. There are systems that use a signal for the end of the turn, for example by the use of ‘over’ in radio communication (cf. Sidnell 2010:37-38).

There are more facts to turn-taking than one person speaking at a time.

- 1 Speaker-change recurs, or at least occurs.
- 2 Overwhelmingly, one party talks at a time.
- 3 Occurrences of more than one speaker at a time are common, but brief.
- 4 Transitions (from one turn to a next) with no gap and no overlap are common. Together with transitions characterized by a slight gap or slight overlap, they make up the vast majority of transitions.

- 5 Turn order is not fixed, but varies.
 - 6 Turn size is not fixed, but varies.
 - 7 Length of conversation is not specified in advance.
 - 8 What parties say is not specified in advance.
 - 9 Relative distribution of turns is not specified in advance.
 - 10 Number of parties can vary.
 - 11 Talk can be continuous or discontinuous.
 - 12 Turn-allocation techniques are obviously used. A current speaker may select a next speaker (as when he addresses a question to another party); or parties may self-select in starting to talk.
 - 13 Various “turn-constructural units” are employed; e.g., turns can be projectedly “one word long”, or they can be sentential in length.
 - 14 Repair mechanisms exist for dealing with turn-taking errors and violations; e.g. if two parties find themselves talking at the same time, one of them will stop prematurely, and thus repair the trouble.
- (Sidnell 2010:38-39)

However, there exist several contexts that do not adhere to some of these criteria. For example, in a classroom discussion, the speakers do not select themselves but the teacher sometimes decides who will speak. Another example is a formal speech, for which the order of speakers and length of the turn is decided. Overall, the turn-taking system is organized into locally managed and party-administered conversations, according to Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974). A conversation is locally managed if it only organizes the recent and next turn; it is party-administered if the participants themselves decide who speaks for how long (cf. Sidnell 2010:39).

Grammar and context play a decisive role when it comes to the definition of what a turn is. Grammar in a way constrains what counts as turn and what not, as they “are constructed out of a sharply delimited set of possible unit-types: single words, phrases, clauses and sentences” (Sidnell 2010:41). Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974) claimed that turns are constructed of units called **turn-constructural units** (TCU). One turn can consist of several TCUs. They influence which response is relevant next (cf. Sidnell 2010:39-42).

At the completion of each TCU, a transition to another speaker can occur. Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974) called these places a **transition relevant place** (TRP). Hearers carefully watch the syntactic, prosodic and pragmatic features of the current turn and decide when it begins, continues and ends. They therefore not only find points of completion but also project and anticipate them before they actually occur. A place for a possible speaker change is when a unit is possibly completed (cf. Sidnell 2010:42-43).

Regarding the distribution of turns, it can be said that speaker transition follows a set of rules according to which the participants orient themselves. A future speaker could be directly addressed to speak in the current turn, for example, by a question. The selected speaker should then speak at the first possible TRP. If no speaker is selected, any other

possible speaker may self-select him- or herself. If no one is selected and no party selects themselves, the current speaker can also continue at the next TRP (cf. Sidnell 2010: 43).

1.2. Adjacency Pairs

Adjacency pairs are an important constituent of conversations. They are a basic form of action sequencing. By asking a question, a slot is created, which requires an answer or another relevant response. Schegloff (1968) introduced the principle of conditional relevance, which means that the participants of a conversation use these adjacency pairs to construct orderly sequences of talk. Besides question and answer, there are other adjacency pairs, such as request and granting, offer and acceptance, greeting and greeting and complaint and remedy. They consist of two utterances and have four characteristics:

- 1 Adjacent.⁵
 - 2 Produced by different speakers
 - 3 Ordered as a first pair part (FPP) and second pair part (SPP)
 - 4 Typed, so that a particular first pair part provides for the relevance of a particular second pair part (or some delimited range of seconds; e.g. a complaint can receive a remedy, an expression of agreement, a denial as its second)
- (Sidnell 2010: 64)

Moreover, the parts of adjacency pairs are not only divided into first and second part but also into pair types. This means that a certain FPP type requires a specific SPP type to compose an adjacency pair. For example, it would be unusual to respond to “What’s your name?” with “7am in the morning”. Therefore, in a conversation, adjacency pairs are used as norm for participants. If the second pair part does not successfully answer the first pair part, the party can subsequently pursue, infer or report (cf. Sidnell 2010: 63-64).

Pursue means that the party repeats the action of the FPP. When there is no response to the pursuit of the action, the party can also break down the action into its components because the action may be too complex. A suitable example for pursuit and inference is a conversation between a mother and her child, as mentioned by Sidnell. The question “What’s the time?” could be too complex for the child to answer; Therefore, the mother could simplify the question, which is an example of inference. A party can also report an absent answer by speaking out loud that the question was not answered (cf. Sidnell 2010: 64-65).

Overall, adjacency pairs acknowledge the structure of understanding, which is constructed and maintained by the parties on a turn-by-turn basis. If a party responds to a FPP in an inappropriate way, the speaker of the FPP knows that the other party has misinterpreted the FPP. Therefore, the response to an FPP reveals the hearer’s interpretation and analysis of the utterance. The result of a misinterpretation of the FPP can be that the speaker initiates a

repair. Different forms of repair and its functions will be further discussed in chapter 1.5 of this thesis (cf. Sidnell 2010:65-67).

1.3. Preference

In the aforementioned SPPs of adjacency pairs, a certain response to the FPP is expected. For example, a request can be accepted or denied. However, they differ in type and one course of action is preferred over the other. Sidnell (2010) mentions the example of an invitation to a dinner, to which the preferred action is acceptance. Usually, the positive answer to the action is the preferred one in terms of talk, not in terms of personal preference. Two basic forms of preference can be distinguished in talk-in-interaction. Firstly, preference can be linked to the success of an action, which means that a recipient complies with a request. Secondly, preference can also relate to the design of turns. Speakers use preferred or dispreferred alternatives to design their turns (cf. Sidnell 2010: 77-78).

Preferred actions are usually directly performed without any delay, while dispreferred actions are performed with a delay and are performed as weak as possible. Thus, preference also reveals something about the structure of social relationships. It can be observed that in everyday interactions, agreement seems to be the preferred action, while disagreements are dispreferred. However, there exists one major exception, namely self-deprecations. In this case disagreement is the preferred action (cf. Hutchby and Wooffitt 1998: 43-47).

1.4. Sequence

Adjacency pairs can consist of more than two turns and can be expanded before the FPP, after the FPP or after the SPP. Pre-expansion therefore involves the expansion of the adjacency pair before the FPP. These pre-expansions relate to the type of adjacency pair that the speaker wishes to perform later on, for example, it could be a pre-invitation, a pre-announcement or a pre-request. The function of these pre-expansions is mostly to test whether the adjacency pair is going to be successful or not. Therefore, the recipients are offered the possibility to prevent the action in the first place and subsequently also prevent the dispreferred action. However, there are also other types of pre-expansions, such as the summons-answer sequence. It tests the precondition of the interaction and whether the recipient is available for talk. An example for a summons-answer sequence would be a child uttering 'Mummy' to check the mother's attention. Another form of pre-expansion is called pre-pre. A pre-pre is characterized by not performing the actual action but asking the recipient

whether he or she can recognize a person, object or place that is to be talked about (cf. Sidnell 2010: 95-103).

The second type of expansion is called insert expansion and occurs after the FPP. If an insert expansion is used, the two utterances of the adjacency pair are not adjacent. They can be divided into post-firsts and pre-seconds, depending on the interaction they address. The prevailing form of post-first insert expansion comprises a next-turn repair-initiator (NTRI) and the response to it. In pre-second insert expansions the party expects a problem in the SPP and therefore address a precondition for the SPP (cf. Sidnell 2010: 103-104). “In insertion sequences, then, the participants maintain an orientation to the relevance of the base sequence though suspending that activity to engage in some ancillary or subsidiary matter” (Sidnell 2010:104).

Finally, post-expansions can be divided into minimal and non-minimal types. Minimal post-expansions involve only one turn, an example for it would be ‘Oh’, which could occur after a SPP. The utterance ‘oh’ can be interpreted as information receipt. Contrasting ‘oh’ with ‘okay’ shows that the second one is rather marking that the action has been acknowledged and registered rather than only conveyed. Post-expansions can also be non-minimal and therefore involve a longer expansion. A sequence can be expanded by, for example, adding an assessment about the prior action (cf. Sidnell 2010: 104-108).

1.5. Repair

When participants face problems of hearing, speaking and understanding, they address and try to resolve them. This action is called repair and refers to the set of practices, which are used to clarify these issues. It can be initiated either by the speaker or the recipient. ‘Self’ and ‘other’ are terms used to describe by whom the repair is initiated and carried out. There exist four different forms of repair: Self-initiated self-repair, self-initiated other-repair, other-initiated self-repair and self-initiated other-repair (cf. Sidnell 2010: 110).

Moreover, repair seems to occur mainly in positions close to the source of trouble. The reason for this is linked to the structure of conversations, as it would lead to organizational difficulties when the participants had to recall the trouble source from several turns before. Likewise, not repairing the trouble right away could lead to confusion in the ongoing conversation. Therefore, the main function of repair is to maintain mutual orientation in talk-in-interaction (cf. Hutchby and Wooffitt 1998: 64-66).

It is noticeable that there seems to be a strong preference for self-repair over other-repair. Again, preference does not refer to a person's individual preferences but to the preferred behavior within a conversation. As a trouble source occurs within a TCU, the speaker has the first opportunity to initiate repair and actually repair the potential problem. Moreover, the next speaker often holds back on the next turn and creates a gap for the prior speaker to initiate repair (cf. Sidnell 2010: 113). Therefore, a "basic rule in conversation appears to be: correct only when required for understanding. Since other-correction entails a certain level of understanding, opportunities for its occurrence are rare" (Sidnell 2010: 113).

Another interesting aspect of repair is the function of question words to initiate repair. Class-specific question words, such as 'who', 'where' and 'when' can be used to initiate repair. 'What' is not a class-specific question word in other-repair because it does not identify a specific item (cf. Sidnell 2010: 124-125).

Conversation analysis has been widely used to study institutional talk. Ten Have (1999) mentions that conversation analysis emerged in the 1960s in California. Originating from the field of Sociology, CA developed into its own discipline with particular characteristics; transcripts became more precise to capture more details of talk-in-interaction, with its ultimate goal to unveil practices of people in interaction. Harvey Sacks, who is considered the 'father' of CA, conducted research on suicide calls and group therapy sessions that were audiotaped. The particular institutional setting of these conversations was not the main center of attention at the time; 'natural' conversation was more appropriate to analyze the functioning of conversational devices. Starting in the 1970s, researcher's interest in institutional settings grew again. They analyzed courtroom settings, business meetings and numerous other institution-based conversations to apply the afore gained 'theoretical' knowledge about conversational organization (cf. Ten Have 1999: 5-8). CA will be adopted as the methodological approach for the empirical part of this master's thesis for two main reasons: firstly, data was gathered in a particular institutional setting. Secondly, the research questions aim at enhancing the understanding of underlying conversational strategies. Therefore, an introduction into its main constituents was necessary; in particular adjacency pairs and preference will become relevant in the analysis of student counseling.

2. Institutional Talk

Talk is a crucial aspect of institutional settings, such as the workplace, educational settings or service-oriented settings. Therefore, studying institutional talk helps gaining

knowledge about social life. Moreover, talk in institutional settings is a central aspect of achieving the purpose of the institution. The characteristic feature of institutional talk is that there are specific speech exchange systems that participants can orient to (cf. Hutchby and Wooffitt 1998: 145-147). The empirical part of this thesis will investigate audiotaped conversations that took place in an institutional setting. For this reason, this chapter focuses on characteristics of institutional talk as well as activity types, which is connected to it.

We can see that the context in which the conversation takes place goes beyond the ‘container’ view of context, which does not take into consideration that the participants have active knowledge about the production of their behavior. There are two types of institutions that have been described so far: formal and non-formal types. Formal types of institutional settings are for example courtrooms, broadcast interviews but also job interviews, or classroom teaching. Non-formal types include task-oriented interactions that are less structured but still professional. Examples for non-formal institutional settings would be consultations, counseling sessions, service encounters in shops and many more (cf. Hutchby and Wooffitt 1998: 147-149).

The main difference between formal and non-formal types is that question-answer turn-taking is mainly used in the formal type. However, the non-formal type is more common in institutional settings and is characterized by a rather conversational style. There is no strict norm who of the participants asks the questions and gives the answers (cf. Hutchby and Wooffitt 1998: 155).

2.1. Activity Types

When exploring institutional talk, the underlying activity is a central issue. For this reason, it is necessary to outline the reasons for the participants’ behavior and, most importantly, speech within the activity.

Based on Wittgenstein’s *Philosophical Investigations* (1958), Levinson documents the interconnection of speech acts and speech activities. For better understanding, Levinson provided the following sample utterances, recorded during a basketball game:

- 1 Alright Peter.
 - 2 Here!
 - 3 Farewell people.
 - 4 C’mon Peter.
 - 5 Beautiful tip!
 - 6 Right over here.
- (Levinson 1992: 68)

To fully comprehend the utterances of this example, two things are required: firstly, the meaning of the words and secondly, utterances that typically occur during a basketball game. By assigning functions to the the utterances (e.g. signals to pass, applause), one counts on the meaning of the words to distinguish between the utterances and the potential roles these utterances may play within the game (cf. Levinson 1992: 67-68).

Levinson introduces the term activity type to label the before mentioned example. Although the terms ‘speech event’ and ‘episode’ are more or less equivalent to the concept of activity types, he highlights that activity type refers to any culturally recognized activity, regardless of speech. It refers to a fuzzy category, “whose focal members are goal-defined, socially constituted, bounded, events with *constraints* on participants, setting and so on [...]” (Levinson 1992: 69). He describes it as fuzzy category because it is unclear what is contained and to which extent; social events can be aligned on a gradient, which is formed by two polar types. At one pole there is a prepackaged activity, at the other an unscripted event. Style and formality change accordingly, depending on the position of the activity. As illustration, Levinson brings up the example that his colleagues call him ‘Steve’ in the common room but address him as ‘Dr. Levinson’ in a faculty meeting. This can be an index of change of activity. Additionally, he mentions the degree to which speech is an essential part of the activity. There are activities that are established by speech only (e.g. a telephone conversation, a lecture) and ones that are not. In those activities, talk is incidental or entirely missing (e.g. football game). In between, activities, such as grocery shopping or placing a bet, are aligned. For this dimension, however, the scale on which the activities are placed is non-linear. A special relationship between talk and activity can be observed in some cases, such as sports commentary or a cooking demonstration. Levinson uses the term ‘peculiarity of rituals’, which means that talk and activity relate and integrate in a multifaceted manner (cf. 1992: 68-70).

Concerning the activity, Levinson differentiates structure from style. He divides the elements of an activity’s structure into several subparts or episodes; for example, a seminar comprises a presentation and a discussion, but a court case consists of a case statement, cross-examinations, and so on. The subchapters include further elements, such as predetermined sequences due to convention and rules concerning the allocation of turns at speaking. Furthermore, there may be restrictions concerning the participants and their roles, on the time and place of the activity and other abstract structural constraints. Levinson proposes that these structural elements are rationally and functionally adapted to the activity’s goal, which consequently is the function of the activity for the members of society. His main research

interest is how the structural properties of an activity constrain verbal contributions. Therefore, to gain better understanding of activity types, it is necessary to define which contributions are allowed in an activity. For these purposes, Levinson introduces the concept of 'inferential schemata', which are linked to the structural properties of an activity. He elaborates on different approaches, amongst others also conversation analysis, for which inference plays an important role. In conversation analysis, the participants' utterances have to fulfill a certain function in a structural location. Consequently, the inferences are based on the structure of a conversation and the function of the utterance within it (cf. Levinson 1992: 70-75).

Regarding inference types that are linked to the structural organization of activities, Levinson mentions Grice's cooperative principle (CP) (1975) and how the maxims of the CP can be adjusted to the specific expectations of particular activities. Knowledge about making proper inferences is linked to Grice's maxims. However, Levinson defies the idea that all conversations are based on cooperation. He mentions examples in which people defend themselves, and states that cooperation beyond the minimum is not their main interest. Moreover, he proposes that a more complex statement of Grice's principles is necessary to allow various degrees of application of the maxims. In addition to this, Levinson suggests seeing Grice's maxims as descriptions of basic unmarked communication context, while special communication can be defined as marked. He states that basic unmarked communication context is of great importance for pragmatics, specifically for deixis and turn taking. Another issue related to inferences in the context of activity types is the relation between an activity's structure and its special inferences. Levinson advocates that alike the maxims, the structural properties raise strong expectations. Due to the strict constraint on contributions, the expectations are correspondingly strong concerning the functions of utterances and their accomplishments. For better understanding, Levinson again mentions the example of a basketball game, in which the utterances relate only to the game and have a limited set of functions, such as applause, directions, and signals to pass the ball. The utterances (e.g. 'Here!' or 'Peter over here') can be classified as signals to pass the ball to the speaker (cf. Levinson 1992: 75-79). "The inference from the elliptical expression to the instruction or request relies on the constraints on the functions that utterances should have within that activity" (Levinson 1992: 79).

In several activities, especially when seeking advice, questions play a crucial role. Levinson states that the nature of a question depends on the activity in which it is used. Among other aspects, he elaborates on the use of questions and how they derive from the

activity goals. To illustrate this, he refers to cross-examinations in court. Most dialogues consist of question-answer pairs, in which the examiner frequently asks facts that are already known (e.g. the age of a victim). The aim of the inquiry is to get a person to state an answer; in the case of a cross-examination, the questions should obtain answers from a witness to construct a 'natural' argument for the jury. In order to obtain the argument, people have to assert the questioner's intentions. This is achieved by assigning a role, or in other words, a class of intentions to the questioner. In essence, the drawn conclusions are based on knowledge of the activity type in which the talk occurs. Additionally, Levinson mentions that teaching situations are another activity type where questions serve a crucial function to impart knowledge and to gain the ability to organize it (cf. 1992: 80-93).

This brief introduction into institutional talk and activity types has shown that the goal of an activity is significant for the participants of a conversation. The following chapter will investigate health communication and counseling as forms of institutional talk, for which the goals of the activity are vital.

3. Health Communication as a Form of Institutional Talk

In the following chapter I will elaborate on different aspects related to giving advice in a wider sense, of which health communication is an important field. Previously, a lot of research has been conducted in the field of health communication. Similar to counseling, in health communication, the institutional setting shapes the way the conversation is perceived. Moreover, it prescribes a certain socio-cultural scheme, according to which the participants behave. Therefore, I will present research that can be used as basis for the analysis of student counseling encounters in chapter 7. To offer an answer to the research questions addressing the advice-giving strategies that are adopted by the participants, as well as the advice-givers role, I will present research that has been conducted in a similar area of doctor-patient communication. Particularly, I will consider key constituents of doctor-patient communication to emphasize the similarities between doctor-patient communication and counseling. Furthermore, I will consider the problem presentation phase, which is a crucial structural component of health communication and necessary for the following diagnosis and treatment, which can be compared to student counseling on a structural level. Moreover, I will concentrate on and-prefaced and contingent questions, as question-answer adjacency pairs play an important role in student counseling.

3.1. Key Constituents of Doctor-Patient Communication

Health communication as a form of institutional talk has been analyzed extensively. Starting in the late 1970s, the analysis of the doctor-patient relationship has received meticulous attention. When applying CA to doctor-patient communication, three main aspects can be examined: firstly, general interactional practices are maintained, even in this form of institutional talk. Secondly, people also hold up practices that effect specific actions (e.g. problem description, telling good/bad news) in health communication, which affect how interactional tasks are addressed by doctors and patients. Thirdly, interactional organization is influenced by self-other relations, such as the concept of the 'face' (Goffmann 1955) and politeness theory (Brown and Levinson 1987) (cf. Heritage and Maynard 2006: 1; 9-13).

The following three levels of analysis of primary care visits are discussed by Heritage and Maynard:

- (1) the overall structure of the primary care visit, (2) the sequence structures through which its particular component activities and tasks are realized, and (3) the designs of the individual turns at talk that make up those sequences. (Heritage and Maynard 2006: 13)

Generally, ordinary conversations have an overall structure, which is connected with specific activities, such as openings or closings. Within the body of a conversation, the topics may vary, while for medical visits, a particular internal shape can be observed. Heritage and Maynard (2006) present the overall structure of primary care visits as follows (Heritage and Maynard 2006: 14):

- I: Opening: Doctor and patient establish an interactional relationship.
- II: Presenting Complaint: The patient presents the problem/reason for the visit.
- III: Examination: The doctor conducts a verbal or physical examination or both.
- IV: Diagnosis: The doctor evaluates the patient condition.
- V: Treatment: The doctor (in consultation with the patient) details treatment or further investigation.
- VI: Closing: The consultation is terminated.

Doctors usually get familiar with this scheme in medical school, while patients learn the overall structure by experience. Analyzing the overall structure of primary care visits broadens the understanding about the visit's nature (cf. Heritage and Maynard 2006: 13-15).

For the second level of analysis, sequence organization, Heritage and Maynard (2006) state that through it, the tasks and activities necessary for the medical visit are accomplished. Moreover, it is the main instrument that is used to assign meaning to context-related utterances. It is also used to establish, maintain and manipulate interactional roles, as well as larger social and institutional identities (e.g. patient, doctor, male, Austrian, etc.) in ordinary

conversations and medical visits. Research suggests that doctors and patients consider ‘diagnosis’ and ‘treatment’ to be sequentially different. Patients tend to not overtly acknowledge their diagnosis; it is rather accepted due to the authority of the physician. However, it is also argued that ‘diagnosis’ is seen as predecessor of ‘treatment’, which is why patients suppress a response. In contrast, treatment proposals are frequently overtly acknowledged by the patients, therefore, a sequential difference of these actions can be assumed. The ‘treatment’ sequence is only finished when the patient accepts the doctor’s proposal, while diagnosis does not require the patient’s acceptance to move on. In addition to this, Heritage and Maynard (2006) comment on how physicians manipulate sequence structures and what they would like to achieve with it. For negative diagnoses, physicians often invite patients to describe their perspective of the medical problem before offering the professional conclusion. The aim of this is to achieve the patient’s agreement rather than confrontation (cf. Heritage and Maynard 2006: 15-17).

Sequences consist of turns, which is why turn design also requires attention in the CA of medical visits. As it is also further examined in the following subchapters, questions as well as confirmations and a vast number of other aspects can be analyzed to gather information about turn design and its function as ‘vehicle’ for handling problems (cf. Heritage and Maynard 2006: 17-19).

3.2. Problem Presentation in Doctor-Patient Communication

The main interest of Robinson and Heritage lies in the problem presentation phase, which is the second of six segments of the overall structure of medical visits. According to them, the problem presentation phase starts with the physician asking questions, such as “What can I do for you today?” (Robinson and Heritage 2005:481). Furthermore, this phase serves three key purposes. To begin with, it is important for patients to express their problems in their own words for its utter expressive value. Secondly, it improves their blood pressure and is a cause for visit satisfaction. Thirdly, it is also beneficial for the physician to find out about the patient’s concerns at an early stage because it can lead to a more accurate diagnosis and treatment (cf. Robinson and Heritage 2005:481).

However, research suggests that the problem presentation phase regularly remains incomplete due to physicians shifting abruptly to the information gathering or ‘examination’ phase. Robinson and Heritage aim at finding out whether or not problem presentation has an internal social-interactional organization. They argue that problem presentation is organized on a cultural and interactional level: On a cultural level, patients are aware of what

“constitutes ‘doctorable’ medical problems” (Robinson and Heritage 2005:482). Interactionally speaking, physicians as well as patients adhere to an institutionalized scheme of activities, namely opening, problem presentation, information gathering (or examination), diagnosis, treatment and closing. Robinson and Heritage conclude that problem presentation has a stable social organization because physicians can more or less precisely predict when the problem presentation phase ends and the information gathering begins (cf. 2005:482).

In addition to this, they comment on the importance of current symptoms. Physicians do not only pay attention to the content of patients’ problem presentation, they also consider the moment of completion. This moment usually arises towards the end of sentences; Physicians either show their attention by verbal and/or nonverbal behaviors, such as nodding, or use of backchannels like ‘mm, ‘hm’ or ‘okay’. This displays the understanding of the patients’ talk and results in encouraging or discouraging continuation. In the analysis, they mainly focus on the transition between the problem presentation and information gathering phase. They argue that this transition is negotiated in interaction and can sometimes lead to coordination problems, for example when patients present the problems extensively or physicians interrupt too soon (cf. 2005:482-3).

Robinson and Heritage analyzed data of 302 videotaped patients visits at primary-care physicians in the United States. They established that the problem presentation phase requires the presentation of current symptoms, for which they found seven forms of evidence:

- (1) Physicians’ opening questions often make reference to current symptoms;
 - (2) physicians and patients frequently treat responses that do not contain current symptoms as incomplete;
 - (3) physicians can treat patients’ arrivals at current symptoms as completing problem presentation;
 - (4) patients may treat physicians’ shifts into information gathering prior to the presentation of current symptoms as being premature/interruptive;
 - (5) when physicians do not shift into information gathering after the presentation of current symptoms, patients frequently display their orientation to having completed problem presentation;
 - (6) patients with more than one current symptom to present can be seen to prospectively orient to the possible-completion relevance of the first current symptom; and
 - (7) distributional trends.
- (Robinson and Heritage 2005: 483)

They concluded that previous research misjudged the rate of physicians interrupting patients’ presentations, as in 78% of the analyzed visits, the patients were not interrupted but successfully completed the problem presentation. Moreover, they discuss that those 22% of patients that could not present their current symptoms sufficiently, mostly derive from non-medical opening questions by the physicians. When being asked ‘How are you?’, patients are

uncertain whether to answer the question according to social norms (e.g. okay, fine) or head to the problem presentation phase in which they present their current symptoms. Therefore, Robinson and Heritage offer the solution to train physicians in using general opening questions, which allow the patient to directly shift to the problem presentation phase, such as ‘What can I do for you today?’, ‘How can I help’? Or ‘What’s going on?’. Another solution they propose is that physicians should wait until patients finish the presentation of current symptoms. Often patients use so-called ‘exit devices’ to indicate that they completed the presentation of their current symptoms. An example for an exit device would be ‘and that’s why I’m here today’. Related to this, physicians could also ask questions like ‘Are the other symptoms...?’ to ensure that the patients reached completion (cf. 2005:483-491).

3.3. Characteristic Uses of And-Prefacing in Medical Encounters

Questions play a fundamental role in turn design. With regard to this, Heritage and Sorjonen (1994) explore the use of ‘and’ in turn-initial positions in questions. In order to analyze this, they used data from taped interactions between nurses called “health visitors” and first-time mothers in Great Britain. They used routine question-answer sequences as well as data collected by the use of a “face sheet”. Face sheets are bureaucratic forms used to collect data, such as information concerning immunization consent (cf. Heritage and Sorjonen 1994: 1-3).

3.3.1. Achieving Coherence Across Sequences

In the analysis, Heritage and Sorjonen (1994) found out that and-prefacing is used to achieve coherence across a sequence of adjacency pairs. It is used as overarching structure or coordination of the question-answer adjacency pairs. Moreover, they further discuss the influence of the subordinate structure. They state that it is important to distinguish between sequence and course of action. Sequence deals with adjacency pairs and their expansion, while course of action describes the subordinate situation that is constituted by adjacency pairs. Furthermore, they introduce the term activity to describe the achieved work in the course of action. Heritage and Sorjonen argue that activity can be expressed through multiple sequences, performed by and-prefacing. They postulate that and-prefacing is used to (1) specify a previous question and (2) to connect a question to a previous one to its answer. As a consequence, they argue that and-prefacing is used to constitute and maintain the activity and thereby the larger course of action. In addition to this, they claim that sustaining the activity is agenda-based (cf. 1994: 3-6).

To gain a principal insight, Heritage and Sorjonen (1994) mention the characteristics of sequences in which and-prefacing occurs. To begin with, the question-answer adjacency pair was easy to answer for the mothers, which is why they are so-called 'no problem-responses'. Secondly, the following questions, posed by the nurse, also consider the response to be unproblematic. Thirdly, and-prefacing emphasizes the connection between previous and current question; at the same time it stands for moving forward in sequence. Additionally, as it marks that the prior answer is considered to be unproblematic for the speaker, they lead to the next unit. Lastly, and-prefacing can also highlight the fact that the previous and current question belong to the same overall agenda; its occurrence shows that there is a 'line' or routine, which is considered to be a socially constructed object. The line can also be seen as interactional object, which is maintained by the use of more and-prefaced questions. The mother accepts and understands this socially constructed routine by keeping her responses minimal, even when the questions could be answered in greater detail (cf. Heritage and Sorjonen 1994: 6-7).

Heritage and Sorjonen (1994) claim that although and-prefacing appears frequently, it is not obligatory. Their research shows that in some cases in which the nurses ask questions contained in the face sheet, and-prefacing is not used to establish a routine. In summary, the use of and-prefacing is a potential way to express a routine or agenda question within an activity (cf. 1994: 7)

3.3.2. Agenda vs. Contingent Questions

Complementary to agenda questions, contingent questions are used to address contingency of a previous answer. Heritage and Sorjonen (1994) therefore suggest that contingent questions are usually not and-prefaced. The observed contingent questions have the following defining characteristics: first of all, the mothers answer questions expressively (from their perspective) or indicatively (from the nurse's position), addressing unexpected difficulties arising from the previous question. These answers are often non-minimal and not aligned to the orientations of the question. Secondly, the follow-up question by the nurse then focuses content-wise on the previous answer, which is considered to be problematic. An illustration of this is mentioned in their paper. The nurse asks the mother a yes/no question for which she expects an unproblematic response.

- 1 HV: 1 → Your tail's alright.
- 2 (0.7)
- 3 M: Yes::s.
- 4 (-)
- 5 M: Lot more comfortable now.

6 (0.7)
7 HV: 2 → Did you have stitches.
8 M: I di:d Yeah.
9 (M): 'Mm:..
10 (2.1)
11 HV: And uh y- you're having salt ba:ths.
(Heritage and Sorjonen 1994: 8)

Despite the initial answer meeting these expectations, the answer is given considerably delayed. This indicates that the mother considers it to be problematic. Consequently, the mother addresses a previous problem (pain) to show that it is not completely resolved. In the example, the nurse's next statement focuses on the most likely reason for the mother's condition. This question is a contingent question because the mother could not foresee it. Moreover, as the example shows, it is not and-prefaced. As can be seen in lines 9-11, the nurse asks an and-prefaced question again after the mother's response matched her expectations. Evidence shows that contingent questions are involved in expanded sequences to deal with problematic previous answers. After clarifying the issue, the nurses regularly return to their routine, asking questions from the required face sheet and therefore use and-prefacing (cf. Heritage and Sorjonen 1994: 8-11).

3.3.3. Maintaining Orientation in the Course of Action

In addition to the use of and-prefacing as expression of agenda or routine, it can also be used to maintain orientation of a larger activity or course of action. In many cases, the nurses explicitly announce the activity, which is often followed by an explanation before the questioning starts. To illustrate this, Heritage and Sorjonen (1994) mention various examples.

1 HV: So this'll be her clinic ca:rd.
2 (1.0)
3 HV: (.hh) And on here we have a record (0.8) of how you
4 were in- (0.3) did you have a normal pregnancy:?
5 M: Yes.
6 (0.7)
7 HV: I'll ring no:rmal. And what about your delivery,
(Heritage and Sorjonen 1994: 13)

This example refers to the filling out the face sheet (card) as well as an action (ring). It can be observed that the activity of filling out a form corresponds to the routine questions contained in the form. It is stated that in several cases, the routine can be outlined quite precisely. They introduce an example from a call-in Cancer Information Service hotline in the United States. The advisor of this institution specifies that the advice-seeker will have to answer three questions. In addition to this, he or she adds that this is for the purposes of a survey. The second and third questions are both and-prefaced. Although the nurses from Heritage and

Sorjonen's data are not stating explicitly how many questions they pose related to the form, it is clear to the participants (cf. 1994: 11-14).

3.3.4. Sustaining and Re-Establishing Agendas

Another characteristic use of and-prefacing is sustaining and re-establishing agendas and activities. Heritage and Sorjonen (1994) state that post-expansion can be observed frequently. There are several types they describe: assessment, repair and brief topical elaboration.

(17) (4B1:11)
1 HV: 1→ An' di- did you have to have forceps or anything.
2 M: No:. Well I had an epidu:ral.
3 HV: Ri:[ght.
4 M: [No forceps.=
5 HV: =No forceps.=You (.) pushed her ou:t yourself.
6 M: Yeah([)
7 HV: [Lovely.
8 (2.1)
9 HV: 2→ And did she sta:y with you all the ti:me,
(Heritage and Sorjonen 1994: 15)

In the mentioned example, the nurse uses repair as type expansion. However, in all mentioned cases, and-prefacing is the tool used to resume the course of action and thus also the agenda. Furthermore, and-prefacing is actively involved in achieving the action; firstly, it adds to establishing the concept of departure from the initial action. Secondly, it emphasizes the main line of questioning (cf. 1994: 14-16).

The main business of the nurses when visiting first-time mothers is giving advice. At the same time, giving advice is an intervening activity, as Heritage and Sorjonen (1994) state. They mention an example in which a mother is advised on how to deal with the baby's wet cord. The question is posed in the context of a question on the face sheet about the baby's body. The advice-giving session is completed with the mother acknowledging the advice. After this the nurse uses an and-prefaced question which leads her back to the main inquiry concerning the baby's body (cf. 1994: 17-18).

3.3.5. And-Prefacing as Strategic Device

Another important issue is the use of and-prefacing as strategic device. They state that it is frequently used to end an interaction. It can be argued that it is consciously used to declare a question as member of a series and thereby end or normalize the problematic interaction, as can be seen in the example below.

(21)
 1 HV: Have you sort of examined her all over an',
 2 ()
 3 M: Mm:..
 4 HV: had a good look at her.
 5 (-)
 6 M: Ye:[:h.
 7 HV: 1 → [Is the co:rd ehm (1.0) dry now?
 8 M: Ye:s it's- (.) it weeps a little bit.
 9 HV: 2 → And what do you do[:.
 10 M: [(mYeah.)
 11 M: I've got some of those mediswa:bs [continues]
 (Heritage and Sorjonen 1994: 19)

This example focuses on the baby's cord, which is a common problem area of newborn babies. In line 9, the nurse uses and-prefacing after a problematic response by the mother to normalize the problematic situation and to assure the mother that this is a routine problem. In another example, they add that and-prefacing can also be used to normalize problematic issues that arise from previous questions (cf. Heritage and Sorjonen 1994: 19-21).

In conclusion, it has been shown that and-prefacing is used to demonstrate the routine 'nextness' of a question and to detoxify previous questions. Additionally, due to orientation to a routine or agenda, it can support its user in moving away from an undesired topic. It is frequently used to cover a problematic issue so that the other participant considers it to be part of a sequence of talk (cf. Heritage and Sorjonen 1994: 22).

4. Counseling as a Form of Institutional Talk

Nothdurft, Reitemaier and Schröder examine counseling as asymmetrical dialogues. They argue that counseling as a form of interaction requires common socio-cultural knowledge by the advice-giver and seeker. It does not necessarily entail active knowledge about interactional components but expectations for the performance of the other participant. This enables the participants to evaluate the interaction in terms of adequacy or inadequacy and leads to relevant, mutually accepted contributions (cf. Nothdurft, Reitemeier, Schröder 1994: 9).

In addition to this, they state that the asymmetry between advice-giver and seeker is the most important aspect of counseling. The extensive experience and knowledge of the advice-giver causes the advice-seeker to ask for help in the first place. Due to this, the advice-seeker gains a new perspective on the problem. It is the advice-giver's professional distance from the problem that stimulates the advice-seeker to gain distance, too. The professional environment raises the advice-seeker's hope to solve the problem and hands over responsibility to the advice-giver. Accordingly, the goal of finding a solution in the

counseling talk can be achieved. At the same time, however, this asymmetry may cause communicative problems between the advice-giver and seeker. The different backgrounds of the communicators may lead to misinterpretation or cause talk at cross purposes; because of the advice-giver's routine he or she may jump to conclusions and categorize problems, which is frustrating for the advice-seeker. Consequently, the asymmetrical situation is constitutive as well as disturbing for the communicative process (cf. Nothdurft, Reitemeier, Schröder 1994: 15-16).

4.1. Key Constituents of Counseling

Counseling is organized according to a socio-cultural scheme, which consists of different situations and is distributed among the participants. These situations are ordered according to a counseling-specific plot which the participants use as guideline towards their expectations. The participants, however, do not have to keep a sequential order of the plot. Nothdurft, Reitemaier and Schörder specify the following phases, of which the plot of counseling ideally consists in its sequential order: **(1) Initiation (2) Problem Presentation (3) Problem Development (4) Solution Development and Processing (5) Completion** (cf. Nothdurft, Reitemeier, Schröder 1994: 9-10).

In counseling sessions, the initiative situation is characterized by sequences, in which the participants identify themselves as advice-giver and seeker and assign authorities. To be precise, the advice-seeker establishes the fact that he or she requires assistance. Following the initiation phase, the problem presentation phase deals with the advice-seeker elaborating on his or her problem. The purpose of this phase is to describe, clarify and assess the difficulty to the advice-giver. To achieve this, the person seeking advice uses verbal forms of communication next to 'scenic presentation' as emphasis of the level of suffering and need for help. The advice-giver's role is reduced to activities that support the description of the problem and highlight disregarded aspects of the problem. Moreover, as already implied, the problem presentation phase also includes the explicit formulation of the advice-seeker's concern. By doing so, he or she requests the advice-giver to participate and to work towards a solution. Directly requesting advice has two interesting facets: firstly, the advice-seeker predetermined the content structurally; secondly, in a formal way, the advice-seeker thereby invites the advisor to participate in finding a solution for the proposed problem (cf. 1994:11).

4.2. Counseling and its Institutional Context

Reitemeier (1994) conducted research on counseling and its institutional context. He states that establishing the relationship plays a decisive role for successful counseling. However, it depends on several factors whether the counseling succeeds. In informally structured contexts, advice is frequently sought from acquaintances, such as friends, neighbors, and colleagues. Although this might be appropriate, it does not guarantee the expertise of the counselor; neither does it guarantee the counselor's commitment, which is why informal counseling is potentially problematic (cf. Reitemeier 1994: 230).

Different to informal counseling, formally organized counseling services take necessary precautions to overcome these problems. To do so, institutions prepare a knowledge base and take further organizational precautions, such as a fixed schedule for counseling at a specific location. Therefore, among other things, Reitemeier focuses on how an institutional context in the interactional relationship between advice-giver and seeker is established (cf. 1994: 231).

When analyzing action in institutional settings, the participants have to show awareness of their own identity. This is closely linked to membership categorization, which is further elaborated by Schegloff. For better understanding of counseling in its institutional context, a brief overview of Membership Categorization Devices (MCDs) follows, although it will not be included in this thesis' analysis of student counseling encounters (cf. 1994: 232-233).

4.2.1. Membership Categorization Devices

Schegloff provides insight into his understanding of membership categorization devices (MCDs) which were originally explored by Harvey Sacks (1972/2006). MCDs are an apparatus which comprises several resources and practices. It can be divided into two parts: first, a collection of categories and second, a set of rules, according to which the categories are used. The collection of categories is composed of groups, such as men, women, adults, pianists, vegans – to name only a few. A member of the society does not only belong to one of the mentioned categories; it is the collection of categories that constitutes interaction. Sample collections would be gender (male/female), religion (Catholic/Jew/Hindu/Muslim...), and nationality (French/Italian/Austrian...). Some categories can belong to more than one category, for example 'professor' can be part of the collection 'campus' (professor, student,

researcher,...) as well as ‘occupation’ (e.g. painter, musician, professor,...) (cf. Schegloff 2007: 462-463, 467-468).

Additionally, one MCD can consist of different collections of categories. An example for this would be ‘age’, for which cardinal numbers can be used or other categories like ‘baby’ or ‘teenager’. However, while cardinal numbers are rather objective, categories like ‘young(er)’ or ‘old(er)’ are not. Related to this, Schegloff explains **pn-adequacy**. It means that that categories within a collection can be applied to “any member of any uncharacterized, unrestricted undefined population” (Schegloff 2006:467). In other words, categories like sex or age are pn-adequate, as any human being can be categorized accordingly. Most importantly, in every language and/or culture, at least two pn-adequate categories exist. In addition to this, ‘team-type’ MCDs are devices of a collection that can be combined to a larger element. An example for this would be the MCD ‘family’, which consists of father, mother, daughter, son, and more. The categories contained in the collection can also be restricted, for example the MCD ‘soccer team’, can only have one goal keeper (cf. 2007: 467-468).

Related to this, Reitemeier (1994) states that even if the advice-seeker has no knowledge about the particular institutional processes, he or she is able to categorize them accordingly. Therefore, it is assumed for the interactional relationship between advice-giver and seeker that the advice-seeker can make use of institutionally predefined categories. The institutional context provides the participants with categorization options which allow them to identify each other as interactional partners (cf. Reitemeier 1994: 233-235; 257)

To sum up, one of the key findings of Reitemeier’s analysis is that institutional counseling is beneficial for the advice-seeker, as the advice-giver has expertise in a specific field and can draw on his or her experience. It is crucial for the functioning of any counseling service that the advice-giver considers the proposed solution from the advice-seeker, if one is stated. If not, the advice-giver runs the risk of overlooking the actual problem (cf. Reitemeier 1994: 258).

4.3. Divergences of Perspective in Counseling

Schröder suggests that divergences of perspective in counseling are constitutive and problematic at the same time. Perspective, he claims, can be defined as a particular perception or opinion on facts, events, objects, ideas and people; also the interpretation of concrete interactional situations and interactional partners and related activities count as perspective. Moreover, Schröder claims that numerous aspects add to the formation of perspectives, such as education, private and professional environment, a person’s biography and most

importantly the current mental and physical condition of the person. All of the above mentioned factors influence a person's actions - consciously and unconsciously (cf. Schröder 1994: 91-92).

However, the main focus does not lie on the impact of the participants' perspectives on the interaction; the main focus lies on the participants' different perspectives in the same situation. In order to investigate the mentioned divergences, Schröder distinguishes **structural** and **accidental divergences of perspective** (cf. 1994: 92-93).

4.3.1. Interactive, Emotional and Cognitive Aspects of Divergences

Accidental divergences of perspective are not constitutive for counseling, however, they are essential for the definition of differentiation criteria. Structural divergences are considered to be constitutive for counseling. Constitutive for counseling means that a lack of the specific divergence of perspective would change, end or prevent counseling. Moreover, Schröder introduces three aspects within accidental and structural divergences: **interactive**, **emotional** and **cognitive aspects**. To begin with, interactive aspects can be detected when the participants have different interactional participation tasks, which determine their perspective. Secondly, he states that contrasting attitudes and values are cognitive aspects of divergences of perspective. This is considered to be constitutive for counseling in many cases. However, when it comes to cognitive aspects, it is difficult to differentiate between structural and accidental divergences. It is often the case that cognitive, counseling-related issues are constitutive. Nevertheless, for each individual case one has to decide whether a lack of contrasting attitudes would change or end the counseling. If so, these cognitive aspects are structural divergences of perspective. Finally, emotional aspects in divergences of perspective are apparent whenever differences in emotional involvement can be detected. In many cases, differences in emotional involvement are constitutive for counseling (cf. Schröder 1994: 93-96).

4.3.2. Constitutive Functions

Furthermore, Schröder (1994) discusses the constitutive functions of **interactive**, **emotional** and **cognitive** divergences of perspective in greater detail. He states that concerning interactive divergences of perspective, knowledge about counseling as asymmetrical communication as well as its interactional accomplishment is constitutive. Furthermore, the subordination on a cognitive and/or emotional level of the advice-giver's and seeker's distance from the case plays a crucial role. Content-wise, this is seen in the

advice-seeker's direct affection, disorientation and authentic knowledge and experience of the case. Concerning the advice-giver, abstract case knowledge, solution know-how as well as a lack of affection can be observed. Cognitive divergences of perspective can already be noticed in the problem presentation phase; in this phase, in which the advice-seeker narrates the problem, the advice-giver already intervenes, for example by restating the problem or redefining the problem from his or her view and thereby obtains case knowledge. By doing so, he or she also integrates counseling-specific aspects into the problem definition. In the solution development and processing phase, these divergences are even more explicit; the dialectical relationship between advice-giver and seeker is established by enforcing, clarifying and restating possible solutions on the one side, as well as refusing and accepting the activity on the other side. Successful counseling therefore means at least partly taking on the advice-giver's perspective. When it comes to emotional divergences of perspective, it is often the case that the advice-seeker's concern is not on a cognitive level of disorientation but on an emotional level, which cannot be directly solved, only alleviated. Therefore, they are considered to be constitutive when the advice-giver acknowledges the advice-seeker's despair and dejection. Within the counseling sessions, the advice-giver often does so by expressing his or her understanding for the advice-giver's perspective in the problem definition phase (cf. Schröder 1994: 96-98).

4.3.3. Interactive Processing of Divergences of Perspective

In addition to the above-mentioned theory, Schröder (1994) presents factors that can be a threat to the course of conversation in counseling sessions: Degree of divergence, situational goal-orientation of the participants, context and condition of the situation, degree of commitment to situation/content, and the participants' presentation style. It has to be mentioned that external factors (e.g. participants' voice, appearance, mimics) may also cause interactional turbulences; however, they fall outside the scope of Schröder's research interest. Schröder mainly focuses on interactive turbulences that are caused by constitutive divergences of perspective in counseling (cf. Schröder 1994: 99-102).

Constitutive divergences of perspective in interactive processing can be reflected in various degrees. If two extremes meet (e.g. expert/inexpert), the parties' fundamentally different attitudes and values can cause problems in communication. Consequentially, this can lead to several outcomes; to begin with, a high degree of divergence can end the counseling session immediately. Besides ending the session, it is also possible that the participants seemingly cooperate and proceed with the action, although the actual counseling on the

content level never happens. Furthermore, the participants may talk at cross-purposes with numerous thematic breaks. In case of a strong institutional involvement, it can be the case that the advice-giver ‘prescribes’ a solution instead of giving advice. Depending on the subject of divergence, a similar interactive course of conversation can be detected. Another reason for interactive turbulences due to the degree of divergence can be the lack of divergence or only a minimal degree of it. If the advice-giver does not have the expected expertise, it can lead to problematic interaction or the end of the counseling (cf. Schröder 1994: 104-105).

Conversational strategies of the advice-giver and seeker are another important aspect when investigating interactional processing of divergences of perspective. Missing complementarity is an accidental divergence that occurs frequently and complicates the interactive processing of constitutive divergences. For example, if the advice-seeker presents his or her own possible solution, the complementary processing concept would include the advice-giver evaluating this solution (cf. Schröder 1994: 105-106).

The interaction can be perceived within a superordinate situational context, such as the mediation of a problem, and the approval or adjustment to life situations. These actions are not aspects of the interaction itself; they are functions assigned to the interactional tasks. However, it is possible that this superordinate context can influence the interactive processing of divergences of perspective. On the one side, incompatibility of the superordinate situational context can threaten the course of interaction. The incompatibility of the context is therefore an accidental divergence of perspective which can influence the processing of constitutive divergences. On the other side, considering a superordinate situational context can complicate the situation in the first place (cf. 1994: Schröder 107-108).

Furthermore, the degree of commitment contributes to interactive processing of divergences. The term commitment regards the degree of institutional-formal commitment as well as moral or ethical commitment. The concept of commitment in counseling thus can be defined as the degree, to which the participants are or feel institutionally or morally/ethically committed to initiate and accept counseling. In order to clarify this concept, Schröder (1994) presents sentences as samples for various degrees of commitment. From the advice-giver’s perspective, he exemplifies the following degrees of commitment (cf. Schröder 1994: 108-109):

- ‘I engage in counseling because it is part of an institutional procedure for which I am responsible.’

- ‘I engage in counseling because I work as a counselor in a private/public institution.’
- ‘I engage in counseling because I am dependent on the consequences of it (e.g. selling something, signing a contract, etc.).’
- ‘I engage in counseling because I feel ethically or morally committed to.’
- ‘I engage in counseling although I am neither institutionally nor personally committed to.’

With these examples, Schröder wants to illustrate how the degree of commitment influences the constitutional divergences of perspective. Consequently, different levels of situational pressure and distance exist, which influences the advice-seeker. Therefore, the advice-seekers’ sentences are presented as follows (cf. Schröder 1994: 110-111):

- ‘I engage in counseling to gain access to (material) resources, or to consume the service of this institution.’
- ‘I engage in counseling because it is a substantial part of a compulsory, institutionally-ordered program.’
- ‘I engage in counseling because I know that the counselor has to give advice and because I do not want to cause troubles.’
- ‘I urgently need to engage in counseling because I want to find a solution to my problem.’
- ‘I already found a solution to my problem but want the advice-giver to verify my solution.’

However, the participants do not have to show an equal degree of commitment on the content level in a compulsory counseling session. The degree of commitment concerning the content does not necessarily correspond to the situational one. To further illustrate this, Schröder provides a list of sample sentences. Selected examples from both advice-giver and seeker that can be relevant for this thesis are presented in the following list (cf. Schröder 1994: 110-111):

- ‘If I do not accept the proposed solution my future in this institution (e.g. school, university, workplace) is questionable.’
- ‘I already know what I want; when the advice-giver’s proposed solution does not meet my expectations, I can simply ignore it.’

- ‘I have to make a major (personal, financial, social, professional) decision very soon. I have to rely on the guidance and decision aid of a third person.’
- ‘I have to make a major decision in several years. I do need guidance and decision aid from another person, but for now I would like to keep my options open.’
- ‘I have to enforce this action by all means. I know that only by accepting this solution, the advice-seeker will suffer no consequences. I feel personally responsible for the advice-seeker.’
- ‘I am not obliged to the advice-seeker. I will not see him or her again. As I do not consider the problem to be severe at all, I do not mind if he or she accepts the proposed solution.’

The presentation styles of the participants can potentially threaten the course of interaction and thereby complicate the processing of constitutive divergences of perspective. Firstly, presentation styles are characteristic for interactive processes; moreover, analytically speaking, they are indicators for interactive processing in the first place. Nevertheless, this does not imply that presentation styles have no effect on the interaction at all, they can be the reason for turbulences. ‘It’s not what you say, it’s how you say it’ is a common saying instantly linked to presentation styles. Regarding counseling, Schröder defines presentation style as way participants choose to present, process, and interact (cf. Schröder 1994: 111-114).

4.4. The Importance of Expertise in Counseling

Expertise and trust are noteworthy aspects when analyzing counseling sessions. Nothdurft (1994) focuses on communicative activities, which participants perform when they consider the counselor to be an expert. He claims that the expertise of the counselor is determined at the beginning, during, and at the end of counseling. At the beginning of the encounter, when the interactional situation is determined, the advice-seeker usually decides whether the person is competent enough to solve the problem. It depends on the advice-seeker’s decision, whether the counseling fails or not. During the counseling, when the advice-giver and seeker jointly determine the problem, the advice-seeker again has to arrive at a conclusion about the advice-giver’s expertise. The advice-seeker has to examine whether the counselor’s suggestion derives from expertise that is relevant and favorable for solving the problem. The advice-seeker’s agreement is necessary to develop a potential solution, based on the advice-giver’s perspective. Finally, at the end of the conversation, ideally the advice-

seeker takes on the proposed solution. Then he or she has to decide whether the expected results were obtained. Moreover, the advice-seeker has to resolve if the recommendations arose from the counselor's expertise or from mere speculation. This decision constitutes the success of the counseling (cf. Nothdurft 1994: 184-186).

In the analytical part of this thesis, these aspects will be inspected with respect to student counseling encounters. Therefore, a closer examination of the positions, in which expertise and trust are determined, is necessary. To begin with, at the initial position of the conversation, the authority is established without explicitly addressing the advice-giver's expertise. In fact, also the distribution of roles is omitted frequently. The advice-seeker either presupposes the counselor's competence, or it is implicitly attributed in the problem presentation phase. The advice-seeker directly asking for advice can be seen as another form of implicitly attributing competence, as it suggests that the counselor is considered to be an expert in the field (cf. Nothdurft 1994: 186-190).

Concerning the problem definition phase, the advice-giver often uses this phase to limit his or her expertise. This limitation does not end the conversation due to a lack of expertise; on the contrary, the counseling continues based on the defined limitations. Research shows that this gap is filled by offering alternative actions. Overall, it can be said that during the problem definition phase, expertise is limited exclusively by the counselor to emphasize aspects he or she cannot deal with. These limitations do not influence the course of conversation negatively (cf. Nothdurft 1994: 190-192).

When the advice-seeker accepts the solution, the advice-giver's expertise is not explicitly stated. Although the advice-giver surely implicitly considers the counselor's expertise, it is never a part of the interaction. Two interactive phenomena are mentioned to be the reason for omitting statements concerning the counselor's expertise; firstly, the counselor proposes solutions, backed with reasons to facilitate approval. The counselor therefore anticipates potential questions by giving sound reasons. Secondly, if the advice-seeker rejects advice from the counselor, the expertise still remains. It is typical for the rejection of advice that the advice-seeker returns to the problem presentation phase and emphasizes different aspects of the problem that were not considered. As a result, it is not a lack of competency of the advice-giver but rather an unnoticed aspect that leads to the rejection of advice (cf. Nothdurft 1994: 192-194).

4.5. Narrative Processes in Academic Counseling

Agnes Weiyun He (1996) discusses in her paper recipient guided storytelling in academic counseling. It is particularly interesting for student counseling, as the research was conducted in the same institutional setting. He focuses on storytelling in academic counseling sessions, in which the recipient of the story forms and guides the story. The advice-seeker thereby narrates the story according to institutional objectives (cf. He 1996: 205).

The setting in which the academic counseling takes place is an American university. Academic counselors provide assistance for undergraduate issues (courses, majors, requirements). Additionally, they routinely assess students' degree progress. Academic counselors serve as "both institutional gatekeepers [...] and advocates of students' interests" (He 1996: 206). Counseling sessions with undergraduates are one-to-one and usually limited to 30 minutes. The counselor also has an appointment slip, indicating the student's name, identification number, status, major and the reason for the visit. Although the counselor knows the purpose of the student's visit, the student and the counselor define the problem in cooperation. Concerning data, He analyzes three different counseling encounters with three different counselors and students. The data was collected in the context of a larger research project related to academic counseling at an American university. He transcribed the videotaped counseling encounters according to the CA approach. The first encounter is concerned with a student applying for re-admission. The second advising session deals with "adding business emphasis" (He 1996: 209), which is similar to a minor. The third transcribed situation is about choosing a major (cf. He 1996: 206-212).

Storytelling is defined as socially organized, chronological narration of actions from one viewpoint. In interaction, a story means that the participants display orientation towards the narration itself. In syntax, a story consists of at least two clauses and a temporal disjuncture (cf. He 1996: 206).

Aspects relevant for the analysis of academic counseling were:

- (1) the sequential organization of the telling in the context of formulating and identifying academic problems
 - (2) the status of the story recipient in light of the sequential structure and the activity type
 - (3) the role of narrative questioning as a means of socializing institutional knowledge
- (He 1996: 206)

4.5.1. Sequential Organization Guided by the Recipient

Regarding the sequential organization, research has shown that stories are not told in blocks but consist of various segments, alternating between narrator and recipient. In counseling encounters, the main focus lies on solving problems, thus the emphasis lies on the formulation of problems across turns. In addition to this, storytelling is used to describe an ambiguous problem. These narratives are often lengthier, temporally ordered descriptions that are to characterize the problem and explain the problem in context. In the academic counseling encounters analyzed by He (1996), the advice-seeker summarizes the problem on the appointment slip, prior to the session. He discusses an example, in which a student further explains reasons for the dismissal from university. After the advice-giver and seeker agreed on the advice-seekers status, instead of moving on to the actual problem, the participants remain in the problem definition phase. Due to the insight gained into the advice-seeker's private background, the advice-giver can use his or her expertise to find alternative ways out of the student's problem. The advice-giver achieves this by framing the story, proffering details, negotiating facts, narrating and eliciting elaborations. The advice-seeker, however, although he or she is the main narrator of the problematic situation, benefits from the counselor's expertise concerning university rules and regulations. This guidance is realized by question-answer adjacency pairs, in which the advice-giver also controls content and order (cf. He 1996: 207-209).

In some counseling sessions, problems can arise during the regular assessment of information. When the advice-giver observes a potential problem, the advice-seeker can refuse to join the advice-giver in the construction of the problem and even challenge the counselor's expertise. He (1996) exemplifies how the advice-seeker rejects advice from the advice-giver. After the rejection, the advice-giver continues with another question, concerning the student's future plans. Establishing a connection with the advice-seeker's future goals allows the advice-giver to warn the student of potential negative results, when he or she does not accept the advice. In the example provided, the advice-seeker aligns with the advice-giver after the warning and the counselor restates the advice. The warning is issued by the use of a contingent question (cf. Heritage and Sorjonen 1994, see chapter 3.3), which is used by the advice-giver to emphasize that the previous response was considered to be problematic. The narrative inquiry of the advice-giver addresses a possible difficulty that is confirmed by the advice-seeker; subsequently, this legitimates the delivery of advice. The connection between past and future events is particularly important to convey institutional knowledge and to jointly conclude (cf. He 1996: 207-211).

4.5.2. Reconsidering the Role of the Story's Recipient in Counseling

Due to the before established facts that the advice-giver and seeker collaboratively compose the story, the line between the story-teller and recipient is blurred. Therefore, the role of the recipient could be reconsidered not only in terms of the story's sequential structure but also concerning the participants' activities. The story's overall objectives influence the use of sequences and questions. Besides the function of the advice-giver's question as FPP, they are necessary for the sequential position related to preceding and succeeding questions as well. In the examples mentioned by He, the counselors start the inquiry with more general concerns focusing on the advice-seeker's problems, and continue with questions specifying the events leading to the problem. "The sequence of questions serves as a means of emplotment to elicit a story meaningful to the university institution and to hopefully shape an argument in favor of the student counselee" (He 1996: 211). To establish a certain role of the question, the advice-giver employs strategies due to his or her institutional role and understanding of the counseling session as problem-solving activity. In another example, He illustrates how the counselor actively shapes the story as a recipient, although in this example, the advice-giver does not ask questions constantly. In this situation, the advice-giver co-constructs the problem formulation by cooperatively framing the request and using silences and continuers, and accepts responsibility for detecting the results of the advice-seeker's narrative. The overall agenda therefore is solving a problem; when problems are not obvious, the advice-giver asks for further stories to investigate them. In conclusion, the main role of the recipient of stories in academic counseling is co-constructing stories to clarify or discover the advice-seeker's problems. As many other professional counselors, academic counselors in the examples mentioned by He do not have access to events that lead to the advice-seekers problems, which is why the narration is of great importance. Due to this, the guidance through the advice-seeker's narration is necessary to gather relevant information, which is mainly achieved by asking questions and can also be considered as socialization activity (cf. He 1996: 211-213).

4.5.3. Socializing Knowledge by Narrative Questioning

As already briefly mentioned in this chapter, counseling is characterized by the asymmetry of power between the advice-giver and seeker. The advice-giver has a different level of knowledge concerning internal university-related rules and regulations, requirements and university policy. The counseling encounter therefore can be used by the student to socialize knowledge in order to increase academic success. In student counseling, the advice-

giver's expertise is delivered only through dialectic discourse with the advice-seeker. Advice-givers convey institutional knowledge by the use of questions and sequencing of questions, while advice-seekers learn what questions to ask, what information is significant and how much of it when, in this case, choosing a major or a course. Moreover, advice-seekers in academic counseling gain insight into information related to the institutional processes of a university, which is partly constructed by jointly recounting the story. Guided storytelling serves as medium for formulating and socializing expertise in this institutional context (cf. He 1996: 213).

5. Giving Advice in Institutional Settings

The previous chapters have shown that in counseling as well as in health communication, giving advice is a central part of the conversation. This section focuses particularly on giving advice in institutional settings from different approaches.

5.1. Strategies of Giving Advice in Radio Advice Programs

DeCapua and Dunham (1993) analyze advice giving strategies in American English. In their research, they mainly investigate call-in radio advice programs and compare them to natural conversation. Advice was defined for the purposes of their study as “opinions or counsel given by people who perceive themselves as knowledgeable, and/or who the advice-seeker may think are credible, trustworthy, and reliable” (DeCapua and Dunham 1993: 519). They state that if people need advice, they turn to people they consider to be experts (cf. DeCapua and Dunham 1993: 519-520).

For the analysis, they use a total of 10 telephone conversations, which were taped and transcribed between 1986-1988, and focused on two call-in radio advice programs. The results demonstrate that this particular form of giving advice has two phases: a **diagnostic** and **directive phase**. Most importantly, they emphasize the non-linear development of advising situations. Participants shift between the stages until the problem is identified and the advice-giver can suggest a solution (cf. 1993: 520-521).

5.1.1. Requesting Advice

The findings of the study by DeCapua and Dunham (1993) suggest that instead of the expected direct request for advice, vague requests are used frequently in radio call-in advice programs. They argue that advice-seekers think that by simply uttering the problem, the

advice-giver understands it as indirect request. Regarding the problem statement, usually the advice-seeker describes the problematic situation causing the call for advice. More complex matters require a longer outline of the problematic situation and negotiation of the problems. They also mention that before the advice-giver proposes a solution, a long clarification and exploration process can be observed. Moreover, advice-givers often reformulate what the advice-seeker stated, before being able to give advice. Related to this, research confirms the use of transitional topics that serve as connection to the actual problem. It is shown that the initial problem which causes the advice-seeker to call usually covers an underlying problem that is exposed in conversation (cf. 1993: 521-523).

5.1.2. The Role of Narration

Another significant finding is the role of narration. It is used by the narrator to recount a story in order to clarify the context and to define a situation. DeCapua and Dunham point out that the story is often only vaguely connected with the underlying problem, or not at all, for example when a caller gives reasons for calling. They also touch upon the fact that the advice-giver directs the advice-seeker's narration in a direction, which is connected with the already mentioned narrative processes in academic counseling (see chapter 4.5). Moreover, DeCapua and Dunham (1993) present the principal interaction strategies used by advice-seekers: explanation, elaboration and narration. These strategies are used to continue and develop the conversation. This is achieved by implementing the strategies into a series of turns in the conversation. They illustrate this with the example of the caller named Caddie, who experiences problems in her marriage. The radio program host's role is to uphold the conversation in a direction that allows him or her to give advice and to give verbal feedback to the advice-seeker. In addition to the strategies by advice-givers, the program's host adopts a variety of strategies before offering advice to the caller. To begin with, the host reformulates the problem as verification. As a result, the advice-seeker agrees with the restatement and adds a specific request as response to it. In this example the advice-giver decides to pause before responding and decides to define the extent of the underlying problem by engaging in probing strategies. They reveal the advice-seekers actual problem, which is stated after elaboration and narration to gradually reveal the issue (cf. 1993: 524-526). Therefore, narration and elaboration are direct results of the advice-giver's probing strategies: "restatement, focusing, clarification, and reassurance" (DeCapua and Dunham 1993: 526).

5.1.3. The Role of Advice-Givers

DeCapua and Dunham (1993) also discuss the role of advice-givers in counseling. They observe that whatever particular role the advice-giver serves, it influences the process of giving and seeking advice. In several cases, where the problem is unclear for the advice-seeker, the advice giving process consists of three phases: (1) determining the problem, (2) offering potential solutions, (3) defining prospective actions (if possible). Another role of the advice-giver is to give reassurance, particularly in radio advice programs. Often callers seek advice in the form of reassurance by presenting the problem alongside their suggested solution. In addition, the given advice is not always an instruction; it is rather a complex procedure in which advice-seekers find their own solution but also global advice for people in similar situations. Providing global advice serves two purposes. Firstly, it assures the caller that other people have comparable problems. Secondly, global advice should actually address the listeners with similar problems. Besides the aspect of helping people, radio advice programs should also entertain the listening audience. DeCapua and Dunham (1993) therefore conclude that the key goals of radio advice-givers are to solve problems, inform the listening audience, support callers in their decisions and advise listeners in similar situations (cf. DeCapua and Dunham 1993: 526-529).

5.2. Giving Advice in Health Communication

Heritage and Sefi (1992) discuss in their paper different aspects of the delivery and reception of advice in health services. They focus on the first meetings of first-time mothers and health visitors, which is supposed to be highly important for the mother-health visitor relationship. The data they use was collected by the health visitors themselves and counts a total of 4.5 hours, which contain more than seventy advice-giving sequences. Most importantly, the visits themselves are hidden from the public, as the health visitors visit the mothers and children at home. Robinson (1982: 24) argues that there are two models on which the knowledge of the health visitors builds on. Firstly, it is based on a clinical, problem-oriented approach. In the course of education, they are taught that the ideal way to win the clients' acceptance is to establish a good relationship with them. Secondly, there is the relationship-centered base. This method involves clients to self-identify negative health issues and as a result encourages them to work together with the health visitor. Heritage and Sefi, however, claim that there is no empirical data that actually assesses the influence of these models on the work of health visitors. Moreover, they claim that a large number of mothers consider the health visitor service to be a method of social control and surveillance

and consequently try to avoid contact with health visitors as much as possible (cf. Heritage and Sefi 1992: 359-363).

Regarding the characteristics of the first time visits of health visitors, it can be observed that although they differ in length and number of participants, they share several common features. The topics were mainly initiated and ended by the health visitors. Depending on whether a third party was present or not, they either began with questioning the mother's experience of birth or by admiring the baby and discussing suitable topics for the other participants. The health visitors had to fulfill three major bureaucratic tasks during their visit (cf. Heritage and Sefi 1992: 363-365).

(a) getting face-sheet data about the mother and baby for the records of the clinic to which mother and baby will be attached; (b) getting consent signatures for immunization injections for diphtheria, whooping cough, tetanus, polio, and measles; and (c) explaining clinic procedures and the various subsequent health checks that mothers and babies will go through in the ensuing months and years. (Heritage, Sefi 1992: 365)

These tasks also shape the course of the conversation between mothers and health visitors. However, in terms of giving advice, during the first visits, the mothers see the health visitors as “baby experts” rather than a person to connect with. They share problems related to the newborn baby and therefore can be considered as service encounters. The main problem for the mothers was that they saw their “knowledge, competence, and vigilance in baby care as an object of evaluation” (Heritage and Sefi 1992: 366) by the health visitors. This can be observed in the conversation by mothers' responses to minor comments of the HV. Heritage and Sefi conclude that especially during the first visits, it is challenging to give advice to the mothers because the request for advice would imply that the mother lacks competence concerning an issue. At the same time, the person receiving the request is in an authoritative position and the holder of the knowledge. The same is true for giving unrequested advice to the mothers (cf. Heritage and Sefi 1992: 365-368).

5.2.1. Patterns of Advice Giving

Heritage and Sefi (1992) defined advice giving as sequences in which the HV “describes, recommends, or otherwise forwards a preferred course of future action.” (Heritage and Sefi 1992: 368) The HVs were involved into normative activities, which they consider to be central to giving advice. They distinguish between four prescriptive patterns for giving advice. Firstly, by giving an **overt recommendation** to the mother, such as “I would recommend giving her a bath every day”. Secondly, the advice was given in the **imperative** form. An example for an imperative in this context would be: “No always be very quiet at

night”. Thirdly, the HVs often used **verbs of obligation** to express the advice: “And I think you should involve your husband as much as possible now”. Finally, they occasionally used **factual generalizations** to give advice to the mothers. They provide an example of a conversation regarding disposable diapers, which is countered by a generalization of the practice of other mothers. Generally, they pass on advice explicitly and authoritatively to demonstrate a high level of competence (cf. 1992: 368-369).

5.2.2. The Initiation of Advice

As already mentioned before, advice can either be initiated directly or indirectly by the mothers or by the HVs. Requesting advice makes subsequent advice appropriate for three main reasons. First, it presents the problem area for which the advice is necessary. Second, it shows the uncertainty of the requester within the problem area and why the issue is uncertain. Third, it legitimates the advice giving of, in this case, the HV. Question-answer sequences can be one type of mother-initiated request. Mothers preferred to show the HV that there was a certain level of competence in child-related activities. This was achieved by the use of closed questions. An example would be “Shall I let her tell me when she’s hungry?” rather than “How often should I feed her?”. However, doing so also bears the risk of rejection of the HV, which results in the denial of the mother’s competence. Summarizing, it can be said that in mother-initiated advice sequences, the problem area has already been established. The mothers could display their level of knowledge and ability to deal with the problems they needed advice for. It could be said that the requests for advice were rather requests for confirmation of their proposed actions, often established in the form of a closed question. Most importantly, the relevant context and display of competence happened in advance of the actual delivery of the request to emphasize the requester’s competence (cf. Heritage and Sefi 1992: 370-373).

Another form of mother-initiated advice was covertly describing an unexpected state of affairs to the HVs. Mothers or third parties treated the event as potentially problematic but expressed their uncertainty about the issue. The actually problematic issue or the nature of the problem are implicitly stated. It is the HVs job to judge whether the mother has a genuine problem and needs advice or whether it is a means of soliciting advice (cf. 1992: 373-377).

Advice can also be initiated by the HVs, which is the predominant form of advice giving, according to Heritage and Sefi. They state that HV-initiated advice is sometimes problematic because the problem itself and the alignment of the mother as recipient are not

clearly established. The HVs commonly initiate advice in the context of routine inquiries (cf. Heritage and Sefi 1992: 377).

These inquiry sequences may be arrayed on a continuum in terms of the degree to which a need for advice and its associated problem area are established prior to the initiation of advice giving. Within this continuum, the bulk of advice giving is initiated without an extended preparatory sequence. (Heritage and Sefi 1992: 389)

Most importantly, the HV defines herself as expert, contrary to the advice recipient who is noncompetent. HV-initiated advice is mostly initiated without the mother's need for advice being definitely established. Another characteristic of this form of advice giving is that the majority was initiated with little preparation. The preparation however, influences the reception of the advice given to the mother (cf. Heritage and Sefi 1992: 389).

5.2.3. The Reception of Advice

There are three main ways in which advice is received. To begin with, marked acknowledgement is one form of receiving advice. Mothers obviously acknowledge the advice and its informativeness. This form usually also conveys acceptance of the advice. A second form of receiving advice is unmarked acknowledgement. In this case mothers avoid acknowledging the advice as informative but do not overtly reject it. However, it represents a form that in a way ignores the advice given and thereby the rejection of it is implied. Finally, mothers can also receive advice by asserting knowledge or competence. Mothers assert that they already know and undertake the advised action. This form of receiving advice does not necessarily reject the advice but the recipients are in a way resistant to the advice and as a result also indicate that the advice is unnecessary (cf. Heritage and Sefi 1992: 391-409).

The study conducted by Heritage and Sefi (1992) is particularly interesting for the empirical part of this thesis. Health communication and student counseling both are forms of institutional talk, to which giving advice is a central aspect. Moreover, Heritage and Sefi (1992) also adopted CA as the methodology for their research, which allowed them to detect patterns of advice giving in health communication. The result of their study can be used as foundation for the analysis of student counseling; consequently, in the empirical part of this thesis I will use overt recommendation, imperatives, verbs of obligation and factual generalization as basic categories of analysis. Additionally, the reception of advice also contributes to establishing the category 'the rejection of advice' in the empirical part of this thesis.

6. Data and Methodology

The data collected for this study will be analyzed by applying the approach of conversation analysis. It builds on the transcription of two conversations, one in German and one in English. The taped sessions lasted for approximately 20-30 minutes. In the German counseling session, there was one advice-seeker and one advice-giver, while in the English counseling session two advice-seekers were present. The counseling sessions were taped with consent of the advice-seekers in early 2015.

On the basis of the categories discussed in the literary review, the following research questions and subquestions will be discussed:

1. Which advice-giving strategies are adopted by the participants in student counseling?
 - a. Do the strategies differ in English and German?
 - b. Are contingent questions used to give advice in student counseling?
2. How does recipient-guided storytelling influence giving advice?
3. What is the role of the advice-giver in student counseling?

6.1. Institutional Setting: 4students – Studien Info Service

At the University of Graz '4students – Studien Info Service' is in charge of providing information about degree programs and other study-related fields to Austrian and international people. The target group consists of prospective and current students of the University of Graz. 4students offer personal counseling services as well as counseling via e-mail, telephone and Skype throughout the student life cycle. Advice-seeking people can schedule an appointment in advance, which allows the counselors to prepare, if necessary. Moreover, it opens up the possibility of choosing the appropriate counselor for the problem. Prospective/Current students frequently have specific questions on a degree program, which is why it is useful to schedule a meeting. If one of the counselors is considered to be an expert for the required degree program, he or she is chosen as advice-giver. However, the counseling sessions are not limited in time and it is not obligatory to schedule a meeting. Especially before the admission period, prospective students drop in during the scheduled opening hours. The opening hours are from Monday until Friday from 9-12 a.m. and on Tuesdays and Thursdays additionally from 1-3 p.m.

Furthermore, the employees of 4students represent the University of Graz at national educational fairs and offer presentations at schools. As counselors, the university employs

three students from different fields who pass on their knowledge about study-related topics, internal structures and their experiences to the advice-seekers. Moreover, the counselors serve as intermediaries between the university's departments and institutions and advice-seeking people. It is often the case that counselors cannot directly contribute to solving the problem but can assist the current/prospective student in finding the appropriate person.

6.2. Transcription Conventions

The spelling and mark-up conventions of VOICE were adapted for the transcription of the student counseling sessions. The main reason for doing so was because VOICE focuses on English as lingua franca. In the English-speaking counseling session, both speakers are ELF speakers. However, to increase clarity and uniformity, the German counseling session was also transcribed according to the VOICE conventions. The mark-up conventions can be found in the appendix.

7. Analysis of German and English Student Counseling Encounters

Student counseling at the University of Graz is an informal type of institutional talk. There is no strict definition who of the participants asks questions and it resembles a rather informal conversational style. The key constituents of counseling (initiation, problem presentation, problem development, solution development and processing and closure) as mentioned in chapter 4.1, can also be detected. Furthermore, it can be observed that the advice-giver usually initiates the conversation by expressing a general introductory phrase (e.g. "How can I help you?"), similar to doctor-patient communication, as mentioned in chapter 3.2. Unlike health communication (see chapters 3 and 5.2), the advice-seekers in counseling encounters approach the institution voluntarily, while a health visitor, for example, visits first-time mothers on an obligatory basis. Therefore, requesting advice in student counseling does not imply a lack in competence. Although the advice-giver at '4students – Studien Info Service' holds institutional knowledge that is useful for the prospective or current student, the situation is mostly conversational and non-authoritative, and giving advice is frequently unproblematic.

As not every utterance of the counseling encounters can be addressed, I will provide a brief description of the participants and the course of action of each meeting. The advice-seeking student in the English encounter is a female international student from Serbia. During the conversation she mentions that she participated in the German preparatory course before, which is required for students without German language proficiency. To begin with, the

advice-seeking student needs advice for several problems. The fundamental problem turns out to be the lack of institutional knowledge. Therefore, the advice-giver has to explain basic university-related terms to the advice-seeker. At the beginning of the counseling, the student vaguely states that she is uncertain how to proceed after having paid the tuition fee. Emerging problems the advice-seeker encounters within the counseling are, for example, the university's information management system, the requirements for courses, the registration of entrance exams, and the curriculum. The advice-giver navigates the advice-seeking student through the meaning of relevant terms; however, as the advice-seeker is new to the system, the conversation is characterized by talking at cross-purposes and repetition. As mentioned by Schröder (1994: 99ff), divergences of perspective in interactive processing are constitutive for counseling (see chapter 4.3.3). When two extremes (expert/inexpert) meet, the conversation can become turbulent, which is the case in the English encounter. The advice-seeking student is highly confused and seems to lack institutional knowledge at a high level. This can be a reason for talking at cross-purposes, as stated by Schröder (cf. 1994: 104-105). Moreover, it has to be mentioned that the brother of the advice-seeking student also attends the counseling. At first, he is a passive participant until rather at the end of the counseling, he actively participates in the conversation. Once the brother becomes active, structural progress can be observed. Interestingly, the advice-seeker and her brother talk several times in their mother tongue (Serbian). It can be assumed that the brother further explained the terms to his advice-seeking sister, which contributes to the counseling's success. Furthermore, as the brother intervenes, the reason for the lack of institutional knowledge is revealed; the advice-seeker expected the Austrian educational system to be similar to the system in her home country Serbia. However, it turned out to be substantially different, which is why she seeks advice. At the end of the counseling, the advice-seeking student has acquired some institutional knowledge and, most importantly, gained confidence to accomplish the administrative tasks all students have to face.

The German counseling is ten minutes shorter than the English counseling, which may emphasize the troubled nature of the English encounter. Still, the German counseling is also characterized by a lack of institutional knowledge but on a different level. The advice-seeking student is an international student from Italy who applied for the master's degree in translation. He states that his initial concern is the enrollment process for international students. However, throughout the counseling other problems appear. Amongst others, he requires assistance in course registration on an advanced level. Additionally, the advice-giver discovers that the advice-seeking student has to make a different choice of languages, which is an issue which the counselor cannot figure out. In order to provide the advice-seeker with a

reliable solution the counselor refers the student to the head of the curricula committee, as in this regard the advice-giver's expertise is limited.

7.1. Categories of Analysis

In the following analysis I will use categories that were discussed in the literary review. Concerning the **advice-giving strategies** that are to be analyzed in student counseling, I will use the categories of 'prescriptive patterns' by Heritage and Sefi (1992: 368-369), 'probing strategies' as mentioned in DeCapua and Dunham (1993: 524ff), as well as contingent questions and and-prefaced questions by Heritage and Sorjonen (1994: 8ff). Furthermore, I will also include the categories 'disagreement as indicator for institutional knowledge', which is closely linked to the concept of preference in CA. Additionally, 'the anticipation of advice' as an additional category for English counseling has been detected. The category concerned with silences has also been mentioned by He (1996: 211-213) and should show the influence of silences on giving advice. 'The rejection of advice' is based on Heritage and Sorjonen (1994: 391ff), as they discuss the different ways of receiving advice. Two of the mentioned categories will be used for English as well as German student counseling to put emphasis on the similarities and differences. However, not all categories apply to both counseling encounters; the overlapping categories are 'probing strategies' and 'prescriptive patterns of advice-giving'. In English student counseling, additional categories of analysis will be 'disagreement', 'the anticipation of advice' and 'contingent questions'. For the analysis of German student counseling, 'and-prefacing', 'the rejection of advice' and 'the significance of silences' will be used.

With regard to **recipient-guided storytelling**, I will mainly adopt He's (1996) approach and survey the influence of contingent questions on storytelling. Furthermore, **the role of the advice-giver** will be analyzed along the lines of DeCapua and Dunham (1993: 526-529).

7.2. Advice-Giving Strategies in English Student Counseling

One of the central objectives of this thesis is to investigate the advice-giving strategies adopted by the advice-giver and seeker in the taped student counseling encounters. In the English student counseling, the counselor (S1) is female and the primary advice-seeker (S2) is female too. There is an additional participant (S3), who accompanies the advice-seeker. Basically, the main interest lies in the analysis of numerous expanded question-answer adjacency pairs to investigate the advice-giving strategies.

7.2.1. Probing Strategies

DeCapua and Dunham's research (1993, see chapter 5.1) demonstrates that advice-givers use probing strategies (restatement, focusing, clarification, reassurance) to reveal the actual problem of the advice-seeker. The advice-seeker responds to these probing strategies with the use of narration and elaboration. In the following analysis, I will present examples in which the advice-giver uses probing strategies and comment on the context as well as its consequences.

To begin with, it can be observed that at the beginning of the English encounter, the advice-seeker directly requests advice.

Example 1

- 275 S1: so (.) tell me. What do you want to know?
276 S2: uh (.) uh (.) I didn't have money to pay my semester (.) the first day
w-when I got the (.)
277 the (.) t-the thing (.)
278 S1: mhm?
279 S2: yeah (1) so I paid it yesterday?
280 S1: okay?
281 S2: and like (.) everyone tells me (.) I'm: an international student?
282 S1: mhm
283 S2: I was three semester here in Deutschkurs?
284 S1: okay
285 S2: and (.) ah (.) yeah I don't know what to do. I just (.) paid the thing
and I-I was supposed
286 to wait three days that it's activated (.)
287 S1: mhm
288 S2: and that (.) then I see (.) what should I do? (How it goes?)
289 S1: <coughs> okay. Um (.) so (.) you cannot register for courses
anymore because it's too late
290 that's what probably all the people wanted to tell you. hh (.) because in
(.) you wanna study
291 English, right?

Although the advice is directly requested (lines 285 and 288), the advice-giver has difficulties in grasping the underlying problem. The advice-seeker elaborates on the background situation rather than on the actual problem (e.g. lines 281, 283). Although the story is somehow connected with the problem the person seeks advice for, it is too vague for the counselor. Therefore, the counselor **restates the problem** ("cannot register for courses anymore because it's too late that's what probably all the people wanted to tell you [...]", lines 289-291). As mentioned in the description of the institutional setting, the counselors at '4students – Studien

Info Service' sometimes have prior knowledge about the problem or the subject people need advice for. In this case, the advice-seeker scheduled a meeting, so the counselor already knows for which degree program the advice-seeker is enrolled. Consequently, the advice-giver draws a conclusion based on her experience and addresses the most likely problem. The reformulation draws the advice-seeker's attention to a problem that is closely linked to not paying the tuition fee. In the following sequence, the advice-giver further elaborates on the suggested problem and explains in advance why this information is relevant. This is also related to the concept of expertise, as discussed in chapter 4.4. To sum up, this example demonstrates that by applying probing strategies, the advice-giver wants to elicit information from the advice-seeker.

In this particular counseling encounter, the advice-seeker requires a lot of information. After the first problem has been solved, further probing strategies can be observed.

Example 2

358 S2: so (.) I can do stuff?

359 S1: you can do stuff, you can do stuff. Hh you just cannot start regularly hh like on time with

360 all the courses that <5> you have to do. </5>

361 S2: <5>no no because </5> of the placement test.

362 S1: yeah.

This sequence emphasizes that the advice-seeker has acknowledged the counselor's previous advice and wants the advice-giver to **reassure** the gathered information. Also, by telling the advice-seeker "it doesn't really matter" (line 303), the advice-giver wants to reassure the student that the problem can be solved.

Furthermore, the advice-giver poses a **clarification question** to detect the actual problem (line 432).

Example 3

430 {Pause of 5 seconds}

431 S2: I don't understand anything.

432 S1: How did you expect it to be?

433 S2: I don't know (.) I expected that when I pay the thing I will get in three days (.) ah that

434 activated (.) and it will (.) be there (.) a-when and where should I go <9> and what </9>

The silence in line 430 may invite the advice-seeker to express her confusion, which subsequently leads to a clarification question by the counselor. The response, however, does not reveal the underlying problem, which is why a longer sequence of renegotiating the

situation follows (lines 435-477). However, when the third person interferes, the underlying problem becomes clearer.

Example 4

472 S1: No, you can take the lectures (.) I told you. You can do the lectures but you cannot take

473 the courses and the seminars. (1) which is not a problem you have to take the lectures 474 anyway. (.) at some point. So if you do them now you don't have to do them later. (.)

475 {S2 speaks with S3 in their native language. (Serbian) for approx. 30 seconds.}

476 S1: @

477 S3: Did you understand?

478 S2: (5) Barely.

Line 478 either points towards a language barrier, or a general lack of understanding of institutional schemata. Somewhat later, i.e. in lines 632 and 633, the advice-seeker explains that the reason for her lack of knowledge is that the procedure in her home country is completely different. Therefore, it can be argued that the lengthy negotiation and renegotiation is caused by this cultural misinterpretation. Moreover, the lengthy negotiation of the problem can derive from cognitive divergences of perspective. As Schröder (1994: 96-98) states, they are constitutive for counseling and the advice-seeker has to at least partly adopt the advice-giver's perspective to end the counseling successfully.

Example 5

632 S2: no one told us you know (.) that (.) because in my country (.) it doesn't goes anything

633 online (.)

634 S1: mhm

635 S2: n-nothing is online (.) you you walk to your uni and hh you become (.) no you get the

636 paper when you have classes and (.) what <24>you should do? </24>

637 S1:<24> mhm and then you just go there </24> mhm <@> no it's not like that </@>

638 S2 and S3: @@

639 S3: it's the easy way

640 S1: @@

641 S2: because of that for me (.) that's that's that's too (1)

<25>(hard)=</25>

642 S3: <25>=complicated</25>

Only by providing the advice-giver with the underlying reason for the advice-seeker's confusion and her problems can the counseling encounter move on to the final phase of the

counseling and achieve its ultimate goal. It is noteworthy that once the third person actively participates in the counseling, progress on the structural and content level can be observed.

7.2.2. Disagreement as Indicator for Institutional Knowledge

Concerning the basic constituents of CA, it can be observed that in the English counseling encounter, preference plays an important role. Frequently, the advice-seeking student negates a question posed as FPP by the advice-giver, which is actually the dispreferred action. Interestingly, the dispreferred action is not delayed, as mentioned in chapter 1.3. It could be argued that the advice-giver uses the dispreferred action as method of turn-design; the questions posed as FPPs by the advice-giver can be seen as an assessment tool of the advice-seeker's institutional knowledge. Instead of inferring, which means breaking down the FPP in its components and posing a less complex question, the advice-giver decides to explain the term in question to the advice-seeker. Therefore, it can be argued that before proffering advice, the advice-giver (1) wants to assess the knowledge of the advice-seeker, which is important to be able to (2) to convey the proper degree of institutional knowledge. This can be observed several times during the conversation, for example in lines 326-328 (example 9), when the advice-giver asks whether the student is aware of the curriculum. In this context, 'degree of institutional knowledge' refers to whether the advice-seeker has already acquired knowledge about the institution. The advice-giver occasionally asks if a subject (e.g. "Orientierungslehrveranstaltung [orientation class]", line 401, see below) sounds familiar, which the advice-seeker negates. If the advice-seeker negates the counselor's question, the advice-giver proceeds as indicated above, assuming very little prior knowledge. On the other hand, if the advice-seeker affirms the question, the advice-giver could assume a certain level of institutional knowledge.

7.2.3. The Anticipation of Advice

In addition to this, as the advice-seeker's initial problem triggered others, the participants shift in between the different phases of counseling, which can be seen in line 304 in which the advice-giver shifts into the solution development and processing phase. By emphasizing the word 'now', the advice-giver recommends taking this action (registration for lectures) to the advice-seeker.

Example 6

296 S2: m-m. <shakes head>

297 S1: okay. (.) that's the main problem because you have to take the placement test in order to

298 get into those courses. (.) so (.) y-you can't register for the courses now
because you didn't
299 take the placement test (.) it was (.) yesterday. Hh and (.) <louder> no
</louder> it was on
300 Monday @@.
301 S2: @@
302 S1:<@> today is Wednesday </@> uh (.) it was on Monday but you
can take it (.) this 303 placement test it doesn't really matter. You can take
the placement test at the beginning of
304 next semester hh what you can do **now** (.) hh is that you can register for
(.) um for <L1>
305 **Vorlesungen** </L1>, so for lectures. Hh this is possible but you cannot
take the courses, like
306 the language courses in English that are usually taken in the first
semester.
307 S2: mhm
308 S1: that's what probably people meant when they told you that you're
too late.

What is striking about this example is that the advice-giver expects the problem (not being able to register for courses) and therefore gives advice right away (registration for lectures instead of courses). This allows the the advice-giver to move on to other topics for which the student requires assistance. This can be observed in other situations as well, such as in example 7. This example deals with the curriculum, which the advice-seeker has never seen before. To avoid further confusion of the advice-seeker, the counselor explains potentially problematic terms right away.

Example 7

377 S1: so: um (.) here's (2) okay so there's a website called <coughs> um
(.) it's called the <L1>
378 **Studienportal** </L1> in German (.) hh I think it's also available in
English. (.) so you can go to
379 the Arts and Humanities Faculty and then you check English and
American Studies?
380 S2: moment I should <@> write that down</@>
381 S1: @@@
382 {S2 takes notes, S1 navigates website.}
383 S1: so the website is studien.uni-graz.at (4) and then you just look for
your degree program
384 English and American Studies (2) and here is the curriculum. (3) okay?
(.) so if you click on
385 this link.
386 S2: mhm

387 S1: the current curriculum is gonna be there, and it's in German, so (.)
you should actually
388 read through this. Not everything but there are very important
explanations concerning your
389 degree program in there. (.) hh so <coughs> (3) also like about jobs and
what you can do after
390 your degree program and so on <scrolling noise> (1) okay so (.) hh (3)
here is (1) um (2) all
391 the different <L1> module </L1> it's called module that you have to
finish until you finish
392 your degree program. so there is modul A, B and so on. And it says it's
180 ECTS until you
393 finish your degree program, right? So that's the basic stuff. (2) here is
um (.) the STEOP,
394 maybe you've heard of it?
395 S2: m-m.
396 S1: okay (.) hh uh so it's <@>(2) it's a phase </@> an orientation
phase for your bachelor's
397 degree, you have to um (.) finish all these lectures (.) and and courses
hh until (.) or otherwise
398 if you don't finish them you cannot go on with your degree program.
(1) very (.)
399 you know for a long time because it's you have to finish those before
you can start with more difficult
400 areas of your degree program. So that's probably the easiest way to
explain it. (5) and (.) yeah
401 (1) that's the main thing. You should register for the <L1>
Orientierungslehrveranstaltung
402 </L1> did you (.) um go to this one? No you didn't go to anything
<7>yet, right?</7>
403 S2: <7>no</7>
404 S1: You have to do all of that in (.) the (.) winter term hh (2) you have
to (.) like register for
405 that? <scrolling noise> umm there's also: a more complicated part of
your degree program
406 it's kind of complicated to explain. It's called <L1> **Fakultätsweiter
Teil des Basismoduls**
407 </L1> and you have to just finish these lectures (.) because they are part
of your (.) program.
408 And everyone on the (.) faculty of humanities (and arts) (.) has to do
those (.) lectures. So it's
409 (.) a-it's the same lectures for everyone on this faculty. You could still
do those. So you can
410 still register for those lectures. (1) okay?
411 S2: I don't know how the registration goes and

412 S1: okay there is a (.) um- I think we have a podcast (.) you can listen to
 (.) and (.) it will be
 413 explained how to (.) how to enroll for all the (.) or (.) how to register for
 all the courses. It's
 414 explained there. But I can show you (.) I can show you too but I guess
 (.) you still have to
 415 listen to it again at home (5).
 416 S2: <@>I don't know where to start</@>
 417 S1: @@@
 418 S2: @@
 419 S1: hh okay um (.) <scrolling noise> so at the end of the curriculum (2)
 you can find a so-
 420 called <L1> **Musterstudienablauf** </L1> (2) hh this is uh (.) like a
 schedule or like a timetable
 421 (.) which classes you have to take when in your <8>degree
 program</8> (.) okay?
 422 S2: <8>mhm</8>
 423 S1: so this is something you should (.) maybe print out and take a look
 at. So in the first
 424 semester you should do t-all of these classes. hh (1) you can only take
 lectures now, because
 425 placement test.(2) hh and you could still do the <L1> **Fakultätsweiter**
Teil des Basismoduls
 426 </L1> (.) the lectures I told you about before (1) yeah. So (.) you should
 simply check this (.)
 427 <L1> **Musterstudienablauf** </L1> so that you know what to do. Other.
 Nobody (.) you know
 428 all the other people don't know more than that. (2) so we all stick to
 this, actually. (5)
 429 S2: @@

7.2.4. Contingent Questions

According to Heritage and Sorjonen (1994: 8-11), contingent questions usually address a problematic subject that arises from a previous question, to which the addressee often reacts with an expressive answer. In example 8 the advice-giver uses a contingent question to address a seemingly problematic subject (the placement test) for the first time.

Example 8

292 S2: mhm
 293 S1: so, there is a certain um (.) like (.) timespan where you can register
 for all the classes. And
 294 this is mid-February until the end of February. (2) <whispers> oh it
 doesn't matter
 295 </whisper> (.) um. Did you already take the placement test? (2)

296 S2: m-m. <shakes head>
 297 S1: okay. (.) that's the main problem because you have to take the
 placement test in order to
 298 get into those courses. (.) so (.) y-you can't register for the courses now
 because you didn't
 299 take the placement test (.) it was (.) yesterday. Hh and (.) <louder> no
 </louder> it was on
 300 Monday @@.

“Did you already take the placement test?” (line 295) is considered to be a contingent question for three reasons. Firstly, it is not and-prefaced; in general, and-prefacing cannot be observed in this transcribed student counseling encounter at hand. A reason for this could be the fact that no obligatory data has to be collected, as in health visitor example. Secondly, the advice-giver cannot foresee the question. Thirdly, it touches upon a problematic subject. After the advice-seeker confirms the reformulation of the counselor (line 292), she explains how this is related to the problems the advice-seeker encounters. Therefore, the inquiry about the placement test raises awareness to the fact that the advice-giver has detected the underlying problem. Consequently, the advice-giver ensures her expertise to the advice-seeker by explaining the details. Moreover, the advice-giver defines the main problem explicitly (line 297), after the answer (line 296) was given.

Numerous other contingent questions can be found in the counseling encounter. For example, line 316 (“Did you already check the UNIGRAZonline?”), or line 326 (“Did you already take a look at the curriculum?”) again draw the advice-seeker’s attention to potential problems. Especially the inquiry about the curriculum is noteworthy, as Schörder’s research about divergences of perspective becomes relevant here. The advice-giver and seeker seem to show equal levels of commitment, which Schröder (1994: 108ff, see chapter 4.3) considers to be constitutive for counseling.

Example 9

326 S1: if you take a look at the curriculum. Did you already (.) take a look
 at the curriculum?
 327 S2: I-I (.) really don't know anything. Because of that I writed that on
 Facebook. I really need
 328 help with that.
 329 S1: okay so the cur-cur-curriculum is um (1) a document which
 contains information about hh
 330 your degree program, which is English and American Studies, right?
 But you already know (.)
 331 what (.) that you're interested in English and American Studies, right?
 332 S2: (1) what I know?
 333 S1: that you're interested (.) in that (.) degree program?

334 S2: yeah
 335 S1: so (.) hh it consists of um (.) Linguistics, Literature, language itself
 and Cultural Studies.
 336 So you always have to take classes from all the fields (.) to complete
 your degree. (.) right?
 337 Hh and all of these um (.) classes? that you have to take to finish your
 degree program are
 338 contained in the curriculum. This is why this is a <@>very important
 document </@> and
 339 you have to look at this as soon as possible. It's available online, so you
 will read through this
 340 and then you will see okay (.) I have to take (.) for example (.) the
 placement test before I can
 341 take all the other courses. Everything is explained in this document. (.)
 right?
 342 S2: (2) uh, oh dammit.
 343 S1: <@>it's not really a problem </@>(.) so you can still take your
 time (.) but the problem is
 344 when you have to pay tuition fees (.) you should (.) you know (.) use
 the semester because it's
 345 a lot of money, right?
 346 S2: yeah!

The counselor shows high commitment by pointing out that the advice-seeker should look at the curriculum immediately, which is followed by an extensive explanation and elaboration of the topic. After a two seconds pause, the advice-seeker acknowledges the advice, which proves the problematic nature of not knowing the document (line 342). These levels of commitment are spawned by the frequent use of contingent questions.

7.2.5. Prescriptive Patterns of Advice-Giving

As also mentioned by Heritage and Sefi (1992: 368-369), in health communication, prescriptive patterns of giving advice can be detected (see chapter 3.2). They are (1) overt recommendations (2) imperatives, (3) verbs of obligation, and (4) factual generalizations. In student counseling, these prescriptive patterns can be found as well.

First and foremost, in the transcribed English counseling encounter, the main focus of the counselor in advising is to provide institutional knowledge to the advice-seeker. Communicating institutional knowledge to the advice-seeker is the main goal of the activity, which is why a problematic situation is solved by laying out the institutional facts. This is mainly achieved by the advice-giver presenting these facts, which can be found repeatedly in the transcription. For example, in line 297, the counselor explains that taking a “placement

test” is required to take courses, which is the first new institutional insight the advice-seeker gains. Additionally, in lines 335-339, the counselor again explains an **institutional fact** (points that are contained in a curriculum), and combines it with a **verb of obligation** (have to, line 339) to prescribe a certain advice. The same can be observed in line 344, when the advice-giver states that the student “should use the semester” due to the already paid tuition fee. Furthermore, in lines 387 (“you should actually read through this”), 401 (“you should register for the Orientierungslehrveranstaltung”), 404 (“You have to do all of that”), 412 (“we have a podcast you can listen to”), 726 (“yeah you should do it”), to name only a few, verbs of obligation are expressed in similar situations.

In addition to this, **imperatives** are used several times by the advice-giver.

Example 10

737 S1: if you need any more help just contact me <@> okay?</@>

738 S2: <@> yeah you can be sure that I will </@>

739 S1: but try it yourself (.) because it's easier if you (.) find it out yourself
and then you know

740 memorize it (.) hh and then you know how it's done.

741 S2: I just need to know what <34>for the beginning and</34>

742 S1: <34> yeah </34> it's no problem

743 S2: later it goes

744 S1: Yeah it's no problem just let me know if you <@> need anything
else</@>

745 S2: <@>yeah I can breathe now</@>

746 S1: <@>Great</@>

As can be seen in line 739, the advice-giver uses the imperative form to prescribe a certain action. It can also be argued that the counselor uses imperatives to hand over responsibility to the advice-seeker. In this example, the advice-giver wants the student to practice course registration by herself. This has little to do with the already mentioned degree of commitment of the advice-giver; on the contrary, there are two reasons why the advice-giver hands over responsibility. Firstly, as there are only three counselors at this institution, it is hardly possible to personally instruct every advice-seeker in how to handle the course registration system extensively. Secondly, as is also explicitly stated by the advice-giver, practicing alone will make it easier for the advice-seeker to memorize the steps. Additionally, the institution also offers podcasts and instructions on its website which students can use to practice. At the end of the sequence, it can be seen that the advice-seeker asserts competence. This, as stated in chapter 5.2.3, is not a way of rejecting advice but seems to indicate that the given advice was unnecessary.

Finally, **overt recommendations** are used by the counselor to express a certain urgency.

Example 11

347 S1: so I would recommend um (.) starting with some lectures (.) I will
show you the 348 curriculum if you want, and then we can see (.) what you
can do now, right? So you can do

349 for example free electives? Hh so your degree program consists of um
(.) lectures that you

350 have to take. Obligatory. Hh and also some (.) courses (.) or lectures hh
(.) that are called free

351 electives (.) they are of your ch- (.) you know, things that interest you.
so if you want to take

352 you know (.) I don't know (.) history classes you can do so with these
free electives.

353 S2: to become more ECTS

354 S1: yes. (1) hh and you can do this for example. (.) so you don't lose
any (.) time (.) or money

355 within the semester. (.) okay?

In example 11, due to bureaucratic obstacles, the advice-seeker is unable to register for courses. In order to be allowed to register for courses of the degree program English and American Studies, students have to pass a so-called placement test, for which they have to register. Once they have passed the test students are allowed to enroll for compulsory courses within a certain registration period. However, students can register for lectures until the end of the grace period. As the counseling took place close towards the end of the grace period, the advice-giver had to express a certain urgency, which was achieved by the use of an overt recommendation. A similar situation can be found in example 12.

Example 12

446 S1: hh and until then you cannot register for the classes? so you will
still have to wait a

447 couple of days (.) and then I would recommend (.) um registering for
some lectures. And you

448 (.) you know (.) will print this out and check which lectures you can
take. And then just

449 register for them and do them. Okay? So that's the easiest way to do it
now. (2) because you (.)

450 can't do any other regular courses or (.) seminars. Because it's too late
now for this

451 semester. But in the beginning of next semester? You can still take the
placement test. And

452 you have to separately register for the placement test. (3) you should
maybe note down the

453 website with the (.) the institute (.) the department. <L1> Institut für
Anglistik</L1> so the

454 website is anglistik.uni-graz.at (13)

In example 12, the advice-giver makes an overt recommendation („I would recommend registering for some lectures“, line 447) in connection with the course registration. Before, the counselor has adopted different strategies to convey institutional knowledge to the student; consequently, the advice-giver tries to adopt this strategy as it clearly prescribes a certain action that is necessary for the student to solve the problem. In the following lines the advice-giver further elaborates on the actions that are required to solve the student's problem. The overt recommendation emphasizes that the advice-seeker immediately

has to take action. To sum up, also in example 12 an overt recommendation is used to express urgency and to prescribe a certain action.

7.3. Advice-Giving Strategies in German Student Counseling

In the German counseling encounter, the advice-giver (S1) is female, and the advice-seeker is an international student (S2) – there are no other participants present. The advice-seeker did not schedule a counseling, therefore, the counselor did not know what kind of advice the student was looking for. Generally, as in the English encounter, the sequentially ordered phases can be observed. These are initiation, problem presentation, problem development, solution development and processing as well as completion (cf. Nothdurft, Reitemeier, Schröder 1994: 9-10).

Slightly altered categories are used to analyze the advice-giving strategies in German student counseling. Regarding probing strategies, restatements could not be found in German counseling, which is why this subcategory is left out. Furthermore, as no contingent questions could be found, this category is also left out. Instead, and-prefacing, which has previously been mentioned in connection with contingent questions by Heritage and Sorjonen (1994: 8-11), is added. In addition to this, the data indicated that the rejection of advice contributed to giving advice overall, which is why this supplementary category is included in the analysis. Moreover, the data suggested that the use of silences also contributes to giving advice, which is why this additional category is examined. Finally, similar as in English student counseling, many prescriptive patterns of advice-giving could be detected when looking at the data. However, no imperative form could be found in the German encounter, which is why this subcategory is omitted.

7.3.1. Probing Strategies

In German student counseling, it can be noticed that the advice-giver often uses reassurance, focusing and clarification strategies, while restatements are hardly found. The adopted probing strategies are then followed by either narration or elaboration of the advice-seeker, which results in revealing underlying problems. For example, in lines 52-68 of example 13, the advice-giver **reassures** the student that course registration will be no problem, which leads to revealing another fundamental problem.

Example 13

52 S1: also an und fuer sich (3) hh musst (.) du= [*so generally speaking, you have to*]

53 S2: ich meine am ersten ich werde. ich habe gefragt und ich kann aeh
(bei der) uebersetzen

54 und dolmetschen. (.) machen und danach aehm (.) wird es ein (.) test
sein? und danach. 55 <3> ja </3>

*[I mean at first I will. I have asked and I can ah. Translation and
interpretation. And after there will be a test and yes.]*

56 S1: <3>genau.</3> also die anmeldung beginnt am (.) mittwoch. (.) also
in zwei tagen. hh (.)

[exactly. Well the registration starts on Wednesday, in two days.]

57 es ist jetzt aber nicht so schlimm. weil ahm (.) es wird nicht so viele leute
geben. (.) die 58 das machen. also ich DENKE (.) wenn du. wenn du in den
naechsten tagen. hh wenn du vielleicht

59 naechste woche (.) an eine antwort bekommst dann muesste es sich
trotzdem ausgehen. weil

60 du kannst dich bi:s (.) warte (.) (1) bis spaetestens (2)
sechszwanzigsten februar bewerben.

61 <4>AH ANMELDEN. entschuldigung.</4>

*[but it is not so bad because there won't be so many people who study this,
so I THINK if you, in the following days, if you maybe receive an answer
next week, you should have no problems with the registration. You can apply
until 26th February the latest – AH REGISTER, sorry.]*

62 S2: <4> okay und (heute)</4> [Okay and (today)]

63 S1: und heute ist der neunte. also das geht. normalerweise schon. also bis
64 sechszwanzigsten zweiten IDEALerweise solltest du eine antwort
haben. wenn du keine

65 hast hh dann kannst du immer noch ahm der professorin oder dem
professor eine e-mail 66 schreiben und sagen okay (.) ah (.) ich bin jetzt erst
zugelassen worden im unigrazonline (.)

67 zum studium eben (.) konnte mich nicht anmelden. koennten sie mich
vielleicht noch

68 anmelden?

*[and today is the 9th, so you will be fine – usually. Until 26th you ideally
have an answer if you don't, you can still write to the professor and say
okay I just got admitted to the degree and couldn't register via
UNIGRAZonline could you maybe enroll me for this class?]*

69 S2: jaja aber ich habe (.) aehm (.) das (feine) problem dass ich nicht weiß
(.) nicht weiß wo

70 (.) soll ich (.) aeh (.) mm (.) SCHAUEN wo sind und wann <5>sind
die.</5>

*[yes, but I have the problem that I don't know where should I look where
they are and when]*

71 S1: <5>ah okay. okay</5>

When the advice-giver reassured the student that he should not encounter difficulties, the advice-seeker mentions that he lacks knowledge about how to register for courses in the first

place, which also includes finding suitable courses. Consequently, the advice-giver can show the information management system to the student (see lines 94ff). Therefore, the advice-giver's reassurance contributed to solving one of the problems arising during the advising session. Besides, as already mentioned in the subchapter concerning and-prefacing, several agenda questions can be detected, which are used to clarify and focus on the actual problem.

7.3.2. And-Prefacing

At the beginning of the encounter, similar to the English one, the advice-giver initiates the situation, which is followed by a direct request for advice by the advice-seeker. This mainly serves as invitation to find a solution together with the counselor, as it is not precisely stated what about the registration is unclear.

Example 14

1 S1: okay...also um was würds gehn? [*okay...so what is at issue?*]

2 S2: (guten tag) <@>[*good day*]

3 S1: <@>

4 S2: ich wollte fragen. wegen der anmeldung. weil ich habe etwas nicht gut verstanden.

[*I wanted to ask about the registration. Because I didn't understand everything.*]

Interestingly, in this counseling encounter, the student proposes his own solution. However, the counselor ignores it, maybe because it seems to be incoherent, as the advice-seeker suggests it right at the beginning, or because the advice-giver requires further information. As stated by Reitemeier (1994: 230ff, see chapter 4.2), ignoring the advice-seeker's own solution may lead to overlooking the problem. However, in this situation, it seems as if the advice-giver follows a certain routine, as basic data is collected.

Example 15

13 S2: ich meine sie haben (.) nicht= [*I mean they did not*]

14 S1: =nicht geantwortet?= [*answer?*]

15 S2: ja. [*yes*]

16 S1: okay

17 S2: ich meine ich soll vielleicht (.) aeh (.) an uni graz online (.) aeh (.) mich anmelden?

[*I mean should I maybe register for unigrazonline?*]

18 S1: ahm (.) hast du? den antrag per post geschickt? oder hingbracht persoendlich?

[*ahm did you send the application by mail? Or did you hand it in personally?*]

19 S2: persoendlich. [*personally*]

20 S1: aha und wann war das zirka? [*alright and when did you approximately hand it in?*]

21 S2: (.) vor (.) zwei (.) das letzte dokument vor zwei wochen. aber die erste dokumenten 22 schon im dezember.

[*two weeks – the last document two weeks ago. But the first documents already in December*]

23 S1: okay. (.) und fuer ein masterstudium oder fuer ein bachelorstudium? [*Okay and for a master's or bachelor's degree?*]

24 S2: masterstudium.
[*master's degree*]

In line 17 of example 15, the advice-seeker proposes his own solution to register for UNIGRAZonline, the university's information management system, which the advice-giver ignores. Instead of addressing the registration, the counselor decides to ask a completely incoherent question. Nevertheless, the advice-seeker seems to acknowledge this shift and cooperates by answering the advice-giver's questions. This either shows that the advice-seeker trusts in the counselor's expertise, or he understands that in order to solve the problem, the advice-giver needs more information about the situation. In this context, and-prefacing can be observed. In lines 20 and 23, the advice-giver uses and-prefaced questions to gather general information about the student's status. The advice-seeker's short answers prove that the questions require 'no-problem-responses'. Furthermore, the use of and-prefaced questions constitutes the activity, as it is also stated by Heritage and Sorjonen (1994: 14-18, see chapter 3.3). The use of and-prefacing connects previous and current questions in the conversation and thereby moves the sequence forward.

7.3.3. The Rejection of Advice

Heritage and Sefi (1992: 391-409) mention three ways in which advice can be received. Firstly, advice can be **acknowledged**, which equals acceptance of the advice. Secondly, by **unmarked acknowledgement**, the advice is neither overtly accepted nor rejected. Nevertheless, ignoring the advice means implicitly rejecting it. Thirdly, **asserting knowledge** is another possible reception of advice. It is not necessarily a rejection but rather a resistance to advice, which also indicates that advice is considered to be unnecessary. An interesting aspect that can be observed in the German counseling encounter is that the advice-seeker rejected the advice-giver's advice at the beginning of the counseling. Once the basic facts were established, the counselor provided guidance for the first potential problem, probably because it is the most likely solution.

Example 16

25 S1: okay. an und fuer sich ist es so dass die bearbeitungszeit (.) vier bis acht wochen betragen [*okay, generally speaking, the processing time can range from 4-8 weeks*]

26 kann (.) das ist aber kein MUSS. also es koennte sein (.) dass du in naechster zeit schon eine

27 e-mail oder (.) einen brief bekommst (.) je nachdem. und dort steht dann drinnen wie du weiter vorgehen sollst.

[*can, this is only an approximate value. So it could be that in the near future, you will receive an e-mail or a letter. It depends. And in this letter you will be informed how to proceed.*]

28 (.) und wenn du dir unsicher bist ob alles (.) korrekt (.) ist (.) dann koenntest

29 du theoretisch (.) ah (.) in der studien- und pruefungsabteilung (.) dort wo dus abgegeben hast

[*and if you're unsure whether everything is correct, you could theoretically ask in the admission's office, where you handed the application in,*]

30 (.) ahm (.) bei [PERSON 1] oder [PERSON 2] (.) direkt nachfragen (.) ahm (.) ob das eben

31 angekommen ist oder ob irgendwas noch fehlt und wie langs noch dauert. weil wir haben

32 leider keine (.)<1>keine einsicht</1>

[*[PERSON 1], or [PERSON 2] directly whether your application has arrived and something is missing, and how long it is going to take.*]

[*Unfortunately, we cannot access this database.*]

33 S2: <1>jaja ich hab (.) ahm (.)</1> ich hab schon (.) gefragt= [*yes I have already asked*]

34 S1: =okay?

35 S2: aeh:m (.) danach kommt (.) sie haben mir (.) mich schon mir geantwortet dass ich (.) aeh

36 (.) schon (.) aeh (.) alles schon gegeben habe. schon.

[*ahm they have answered that I already handed in a complete application.*]

37 S1: okay

As can be read in example 16, the afore established facts concerning the student's status (example 15) are used to provide advice about the most likely issue. The suggestion was to ask the responsible people in the admission's office of the university about the arrival of the application and how to proceed. This leads to the concrete problem of the student. When the advice-giver tells him to simply wait, the advice-seeker states that he is scared that waiting will result in not being able to register for courses (see example 16). In this connection, the advice-giver again inquires about further details about the student's life, as this information is needed to find a solution for the problem of not being able to register for courses. The advice-seeker enrolled for the master's degree in translation, for which the advice-giver again needs

to know which languages the advice-seeker intends to choose. Although the advice-giver does not use and-prefacing to gather routine information (see lines 42-50, example 17), these adjacency pairs are characterized by short questions and answers. Therefore, it can be concluded that the initial rejection of advice was used to guide the advice-giver towards the concern of the student.

Example 17

40 S2: ja. ich muss nur warten aber ich hatte (.) ah (.) ein bisschen angst?
weil ich (.) soll aeh

41 schon (.) aeh ich glaube aeh (.) fuer (.) an den (.) ahm (.) kursen. mich
anmelden.

*[yes. I just have to wait but I was a little bit scared because I think I should
already register for courses.]*

42 S1: wa (.) was fuer ein masterstudium moechtest du machen?

[Which master's program do you want to study?]

43 S2: aeh uebersetzen. *[translation]*

44 S1: uebersetzen. es kann sein (1) warte mal (.) *[translation. It could be
that. Wait.]*

45 {S1 types on the computer}

46 S1: (2) sprachen? *[languages?]*

47 S2: aeh (.) deutsch und (.) aeh (.) bosnisch serbisch kroatisch.

[ah German and ah Bosnian, Serbian, Croatian.]

48 {S1 searches something online}

49 S1: (3) hm

50 S2: und aeh meine muttersprache ist italienisch.

[and ah my mother tongue is Italian.]

51 (5)

A reason for the rejection of advice can be the expertise of the advice-seeker. Throughout the conversation, as can be seen in example 18, the advice-giver touches upon potentially problematic topic areas (e.g. curriculum) which overlap with the English counseling session. Unlike the English encounter, the student in this conversation has to reject the most likely solution, which is the advice-seeker's lack of institutional knowledge. In the German counseling, the advice-seeker demonstrates great understanding, which requires a rejection of advice and leads to a re-negotiation of the problem.

Example 18

128 S1: also das muesste eigentlich gehen. jo. und ansonsten die (.) welche
kurse du wann machen

129 musst? findest du im originalstudienplan (2) {noises of clicking and
scrolling}

130 S2: ja das habe <15> ich </15>

131 S1: <15> das hast du schon gesehen? </15>

132 S2: ja aber (.) zum beispiel (.) ich habe ein paar fragen auch.

7.3.4. The Significance of Silences

Silences can be observed throughout the German student counseling encounter. Silences allow the advice-giver in this context to reflect upon the previous utterances, which can contribute to maintaining the conversation. This can be observed in example 17, when the counselor searches the information management system, which leads to silence. After three seconds, the advice-seeker utters that his mother tongue is Italian. It is an addition to the previous sequence, in which the advice-seeker requested detailed information about the degree program the student applied for. The silence was used by the advice-seeker to reconsider the sequence before, and then provided the counselor with information, which turns out to be a major piece of information, provoked by silence (see example 19, line 163ff).

Example 19

163 S1: beide. also es ist normalerweise so dass du immer von deiner muttersprache auf eine

164 andere sprache übersetzt. also in deinem fall waere das dann eben italienisch. wuerdest du als

165 muttersprache nehmen.=

[both. Usually, it ist he case that you translate from your mother tongue to another language. In your case this would be Italian what you would choose as mother tongue.]

166 S2:=ja= *[yes]*

167 S1:=und für deutsch. also bks muesstest du dann eigentlich gar nicht machen. außer du

168 moechtest zwei studien studieren. weil du kannst auf bks eben nur von deutsch als

169 muttersprache ausgehen. uebersetzen. das glaube ich wird ein bisschen schwierig oder waere

170 ein bisschen schwierig.

[and for German. So BKS you don't have to choose, unless you want to study two degree programs. Because you can translate into BKS only from German as mother tongue. Translate. Which could become a little difficult or is a little difficult]

This revealing fact directed the counseling in a direction that was not expected by any of the parties, as the advice-seeker's choice of study changes completely. It is the advice-giver's institutional expertise, combined with the advice-seeker's statement that leads to the change. Moreover, the counselor emphasizes her expertise by mentioning a similar case:

Example 20

179 S1: genau. dann haettest du einfach DIESES studium. das waere glaube ich auch passender.

180 das wuerde dir wahrscheinlich auch die curricula-kommissionsvorsitzende die [NAME DER

181 PERSON]? ah (.) sagen. das hat sie zu mir letztes mal gesagt als ich angerufen hab fuer jemand

182 anderen. (3) also du muesstest hier dann im ersten semester {scrolling noise} (1) wuerde es

[exactly. Then you simply choose this degree program. That'd be a better match I guess. The head of the curricula committee would recommend the same. She told me last time I called for somebody else....]

In another example, the advice-giver considers a one-second pause to be a request for further information.

Example 21

111 S2: ah okay. (1)

112 S1: also da ist einfach (.) das ist in zwei gruppen geteilt? die gruppe eins und die gruppe zwei

113 (.) und die haben unterschiedliche (.) zeiten. du musst eben schauen welche gruppe dir besser

114 passt und dann meldest du dich für eine gruppe an. aber das geht natuerlich NICHT. weil fuer

115 die anmeldung (.) das kannst du noch nicht machen.

[okay so it's simply divided into two groups, group 1 and group 2. They have different course times, you have to check which group fits your schedule and then you register for it. But you can't do it because you can't register yet]

In this situation, the advice-giver interprets the student's hesitation as lack of knowledge. Therefore, the counselor further explains the topic discussed before.

7.3.5. Prescriptive Patterns of Advice-Giving

Similar to the English encounter, the advice-giver uses (1) overt recommendations, (2) verbs of obligation and (3) factual generalization to give advice. No imperative can be found in the conversation; A reason for this could be that in German, imperatives are considered to be impolite and are therefore not often used to provide advice.

Example 22

172 S1: also ich wuerde dir empfehlen auf jedenfall dass du (.) dass du italienisch nimmst. Warte

173 (5) {typing noise} du haettest dann das masterstudium uebersetzen

DEUTSCH. weil du ja

174 deutsch als fremdsprache quasi hast.

[so, I would recommend choosing Italian, then you choose the master's degree translation GERMAN because German is your foreign language.]

175 S2: ja. *[yes]*

176 S1: italienisch ist deine muttersprache. (.) *[Italian is your mother tongue.]*

177 S2: genau. *[exactly]*

To begin with, one overt recommendation can be found in line 173 of the conversation. Earlier in the conversation, the advice-seeker mentioned his mother tongue (Italian), to which the advice-giver refers in this sequence. As the advice-seeker has to choose two languages for Translation Studies, the counselor recommends selecting Italian (mother tongue) and German as foreign language. Later (example 23, lines 179ff) the advice-giver supports the advice by mentioning a similar case and referring to the chair of the curricula committee.

Example 23

179 S1: genau. dann haettest du einfach DIESES studium. das waere glaube ich auch passender.

180 das wuerde dir wahrscheinlich auch die curriculakommissionsvorsitzende [NAME DER

181 PERSON]? ah (.) sagen. das hat sie zu mir letztes mal gesagt als ich angerufen hab fuer jemand

182 anderen. (3) also du muesstest hier dann im ersten semester {scrolling noise} (1) wuerde es

183 fuer dich nur terminologiemangement geben? (.) aber du koenntest ja auch aeh zum beispiel

184 freie wahlfaecher machen. (.) also die brauchst du sowieso auch. (.) zum beispiel hier vier ects

185 kannst du ja mehr machen. kannst du gleich acht ects machen. freie wahlfaecher.

[exactly. Then you'd only have THIS degree program. That would be better I think. Probably the chair of the curricula committee would also recommend [NAME OF PERSON] this to you. She told me this last time I called for someone else. So in the first term you'd have to choose terminology management. But you could also register for free electives, you need them anyway, for example here 4 ECTS, you can choose more, you can choose 8 ECTS for free elective subjects.]

Furthermore, the most prominent prescriptive pattern to give advice in this encounter is the use of **verbs of obligation**. For example, in line 59, the counselor elaborates on the registration deadline for courses and reassures the student that the deadline should be no problem (“müsste es sich trotzdem ausgehen”). Another example can be found in example 21

(line 115). The advice-giver states that the student cannot register yet (“das kannst du noch nicht machen”).

Finally, also ‘factual generalizations’ are used to provide advice. With respect to this encounter, I would suggest a different terminology, as the advice-giver does not necessarily present facts but **organizational procedures**. When the advice-seeking student asks for clarification concerning the choice of languages (example 24, lines 159-162), the counselor responds with presenting information on the general procedure (lines 163-165).

Example 24

159 S2: ich glaube ich soll (1) ahm (.) ich habe auch nicht eine andere ding
aeh nicht verstanden.

160 soll ich. von. aeh. also meine muttersprache ist italienisch. also meine
sprache A. ist italienisch.

161 so ich soll (.) au:f ahm (.) von (.) aehm (.) zum beispiel deutsch nach
italienisch?

162 (.) aeh uebersetzen? oder beide?

*[I think I should. I haven't understood another thing. Should I – my mother
tongue is Italian – so my language A is Italian? So should I, for example,
translate from German into Italian? Or both?]*

163 S1: beide. also es ist normalerweise so dass du immer von deiner
muttersprache auf eine

164 andere sprache übersetzt. also in deinem fall waere das dann eben
italienisch. wuerdest du als

165 muttersprache nehmen.=

*[Both. Usually, you always translate from your mother tongue into a foreign
language. In your situation you choose Italian as mother tongue.]*

It could be argued that the high degree of institutional knowledge of the advice-seeking student has an influence on the presentation of organizational procedures. As the student already knows basic institutional terms, the advice-giver has to emphasize her expertise by using the presentation of organizational procedures as strategy to provide advice.

7.4. Recipient-Guided Storytelling in English Student Counseling

To achieve the main goal of the counseling encounter, the advice-giver has to lead the conversation in a direction that allows gathering relevant information. He (1996: 211-213) stated that stories are spread over several segments and alternate between narrator and recipient. However, the narrator’s viewpoint is central to the story (see chapter 4.5).

7.4.1. Contingent Questions

In the English encounter, the advice-seeker narrates a story at the beginning of the counseling encounter. Over an expanded sequence (see example 1, lines 276-288), the advice-seeking student recounts that she had no money to pay the tuition fee on the first day she enrolled as student. However, the tuition fee was paid one day before the counseling took place. Furthermore, she states that she is an international student and participated in a preparatory German course for three semesters. Before directly requesting advice (“What should I do?” line 288), she adds that she was told to wait for three days to activate her students account. This story is not necessarily related to the field she seeks advice for, which is why the advice-giver poses a **contingent question** to elicit additional information. Therefore, contingent questions are used as device in storytelling to (1) raise awareness of potential problems and (2) to “socialize knowledge”, as stated by He (1996). When further investigating storytelling in student counseling, contingent questions also (3) serve a warning function. As can be seen in example 9, the advice-giver asks a contingent question concerning the curriculum (line 326). When the advice-seeker negates the question, the counselor starts explaining necessary terms, which culminates in a warning (lines 344-345). Although the advice-seeker did not necessarily reject the counselor’s advice, the advice-giver states a warning to emphasize the problematic nature of the issue. Overall, it can be said that the advice-giver mainly uses contingent questions to direct the sequential organization of the conversation.

Furthermore, the story’s structure shifts from the initiation phase to the problem presentation phase. The advice-giver then contributes to the development of the problem by asking contingent questions. However, due to the student’s lack of institutional knowledge, it is difficult to find a solution and therefore to enter the solution development and processing phase. The advice-giver and seeker frequently return to the problem development phase, as more and more problems arise due to the lack of institutional knowledge. Only when the advice-seeker’s brother enters the conversation the participants switch in the solution development and processing phase until completion is reached. Therefore, the advice-seeker’s lack of institutional knowledge also influences the development of the story’s structure.

7.5. Recipient-Guided Storytelling in German Student Counseling

Compared to the English advising session, the advice-giver guides the story in a different way. Mostly, and-prefaced questions are used to elicit basic information which is necessary to solve the student’s problem.

7.5.1. And-Prefaced Questions

Overall, it can be said that in the German counseling session consists of numerous stories, constructed throughout the encounter. The advice-giver and seeker jointly discover problems and successively handle them. The counselor guides the advice-seeker by posing questions that administer the course of action; However, contingent questions do not play a central role. Instead, at the beginning of the encounter, and-prefacing can be observed to gather basic information about the student. The counselor, therefore, guides the story rather by inquiring general information about the student, which can be related to the relatively high degree of institutional knowledge of the advice-seeker. The advice-seeker contributes to advancing the overall action particularly when advice is rejected, to be precise, when the most likely reason for the assumed problem is rejected. This can be observed in example 15, in which the advice-giver asks general facts about the student's status (lines 18-24) and then (lines 25-32) provides the most likely reason for the assumed problem. However, as the advice-seeking student rejects the advice in line 33ff, the advice-giver is able to determine the actual problem (course registration, lines 40-41). Instead of including contingent questions, and-prefaced questions are used to gather basic information about the advice-seeker, which then enables the advice-giver to make recommendations. In this sense the advice-giver frequently underestimates the advice-seeker's previous institutional knowledge, which leads to advice for basic problems. However, as the advice-seeker encounters 'more advanced' problems, the advice-seeker's rejection of advice actually guides the conversation in the direction of solving the problem.

Consequently, this also influences the story's structure. Once the initiation phase is over, the advice-giver directly enters the problem presentation phase (see example 14). The participants pass the problem development phase and start the solution development and processing phase. In this phase, the advice-giver states the most likely solution which is rejected by the advice-seeking student. Therefore, the participants renegotiate the problem in the problem development phase and are then able to enter the solution development and processing phase. As a result, the advice-giver guides the story by excluding possible answers and thereby renegotiating the problem. A reason for this can be the already mentioned high degree of institutional knowledge of the advice-seeking student.

7.6. The Counselor's Role in English Student Counseling

As stated by DeCapua and Dunham (1993: 526-529), the role of the advice-giver is to (1) determine the problem, (2) offer solutions, (3) define future actions and most importantly

(4) convey institutional knowledge. In the English encounter, it can be observed that the advice-giver is mainly concerned with the explanation of basic university-related terms and policies. However, it can be argued that the lack of institutional knowledge is the overall problem in the counseling encounters analyzed; to which degree the advice-seeking person lacks institutional knowledge is what has to be determined; This is performed by the use of question-answer adjacency pairs. Thus, often the solution is a mere explanation of terminology, as can be seen throughout the English counseling encounter. Yet, in the English encounter, the advice-giver refers to other people in the same institutional environment, which is another key task of the counselor.

Although the problems arise due to a lack of institutional knowledge, it is the major task of the advice-giver to investigate the problems the advice-seeker experiences. Advice-seekers often struggle with the definition of their problems because they lack institutional knowledge. Therefore, advice-givers can detect and label the problems once basic information is provided. However, as surveyed in the English counseling, the advice-giver has difficulties collecting basic information, as the student's lack of institutional knowledge is remarkable. This leads to expanded sequences of explanation, which results in (a) exposing more problem areas and (b) blurring the counselor's view for the essential problem.

7.7. The Counselor's Role in German Student Counseling

The roles of the advice-giver in German student counseling are the same as in English counseling. As can be observed throughout the German counseling, the advice-seeking student has already acquired institutional knowledge, which, on the one side, makes it easier to determine the underlying problems. This is shown in adjacency pairs, in which the advice-giver asks routine questions, as for example in lines 128-133 The advice-seeker does not need an explanation of terms ("Originalstudienplan [curriculum]"), therefore, the participants can proceed in resolving the problems. Moreover, the basic information needed to detect and solve the problem can be collected. Furthermore, another key role of the counselor is to refer to staff members in the same institutional environment. If the advice-giver's own expertise is limited due to institutional restrictions as in the German session (see example 16), the counselor can name staff members who deal with their problems and thereby guide the advice-seeking student to clarify the unresolved issue. On the other side, the previous institutional knowledge of the advice-seeking student in German student counseling can lead to a problematic situation. As conveying institutional knowledge is the main task of the advice-giver, it may challenge the counselor's expertise. In other words: the expertise of the

advice-giver can reach its limits when the advice-seeking student has a similar level of institutional knowledge.

8. Conclusion

This thesis aimed at broadening the understanding of student counseling as institutional setting. The analysis into advice-giving strategies in English and German student counseling, recipient-guided storytelling and the counselor's role has offered insights into the participants' strategies adopted in successful counseling encounters. The following conclusions can be drawn from the analysis.

In English student counseling, five strategies were used to give advice. Firstly, the advice-giver used probing strategies that were also mentioned in the theoretical part of this thesis. The key goal of **probing strategies** is to elicit further information from the advice-seeker in order to be able to proffer advice. Furthermore, **disagreement**, or the negation of a yes/no question, was observed as an indicator for a lack of institutional knowledge, which subsequently allowed the advice-giver to provide proper advice. Additionally, advice was given before a particular problem could be detected. It could be argued that the advice-giver adopted this strategy to avoid lengthy sequences to negotiate the problem. Next to anticipating advice, the advice-giver also included **contingent questions** to emphasize potential problems, to subsequently solve them. Finally, also **prescriptive patterns** were used to give advice. Interestingly, imperative forms were only used in the English encounter and only in the context of delegating responsibility to the advice-seeker.

Compared to the English encounter, in German counseling different advice-giving strategies were found. The counselor used **and-prefaced questions** instead of contingent questions, mainly to gather basic information about the student. Contingent questions were hardly found, which could be linked to the high degree of institutional knowledge of the advice-seeking student. Furthermore, advice was frequently **rejected** by the advice-giver, which also could relate to the student's previous knowledge about the university policy. However, rejecting the counselor's advice led to a successful renegotiation of the problem. Similar to the English encounter, **probing strategies** were included to reveal fundamental problems. The advice-seeker's previous institutional knowledge requires the advice-giver to use reassurance, focusing and clarification strategies rather than restating the problem to gather further information. In addition to this, **silences** contributed to maintain the conversation, as it provoked the advice-seeker to rethink the previous utterances which led to

unveil important information. Lastly, **prescriptive patterns** were used to offer advice as well. However, different than in English counseling, no imperative could be detected in the conversation. Instead, the advice-giver mostly used verbs of obligation to provide advice.

Concerning **recipient-guided storytelling**, in English student counseling the advice-giver mainly used contingent questions to guide the conversation. They were used to elicit more information from the advice-seeker, to convey institutional knowledge and to warn the advice-seeker from possible results, if the advice was rejected. As contrast, in German student counseling, hardly any contingent questions can be found. The advice-giver employed and-prefaced questions to guide the advice-seeker through the counseling. A reason for this could be the already high degree of institutional knowledge of the advice-seeking student.

Finally, it can be concluded that the counselor's role is to **determine arising problems, offer solutions, define future actions** and, most importantly, to **convey institutional knowledge**. Additionally, it is the advice-giver's task to determine the degree to which institutional knowledge already exists.

Findings have shown that the interaction between counselor and advice-seeker is diverse and unique. The advice-giver has to adapt quickly to the advice-seeker's previous knowledge in order to be able to provide relevant advice. Although turbulences may occur, the advice-giver has to pursue the overall goal of conveying instructional knowledge. Therefore, further research in this field is required, not only to enhance understanding of student counseling as institutional setting but also to assess the impact of advice-giving strategies on the advice-seekers. Moreover, the presented results are valuable for counselors to raise awareness of often unconscious, linguistic processes that may lead to irregularities or even problems in counseling encounters.

Bibliography

- Brown, Penelope and Stephen Levinson (1987/2010). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: CUP.
- DeCapua, Andrea and Joan Findlay Dunham (1993). "Strategies in the Discourse of Advice". In: *Journal of Pragmatics*. 20. Amsterdam: Elsevier. 519-531.
- Drew, Paul and John Heritage (1992). "Analyzing talk at work". In: *Talk at work: Interaction in institutional settings*. Drew Paul, Heritage John, Eds. Cambridge: CUP. 3-65.
- Grice, H. P. (1975). "Logic and Conversation". In: *Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Acts*. P. Cole and J. L. Morgan, Eds. New York: Academic Press. 41-58.
- Goffmann, Erving (1955). "On face work: an analysis of ritual elements in social interaction". In: *Psychiatry*. 18:3. Arlington: American Psychiatric Association Publishing. 213-231.
- He, Agnes Weiyun (1996). "Narrative Processes and Institutional Activities: Recipient Guided Storytelling in Academic Counseling Encounters". In: *Pragmatics*. 6:2. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing. 205-216.
- Heritage, John and Sue Sefi (1992). "Dilemmas of advice: aspects of the delivery and reception of advice in interactions between health visitors and first-time mothers." In: *Talk at work: Interaction in institutional settings*. Drew Paul, Heritage John, Eds. Cambridge: CUP. 359-417.
- Heritage, John and Marja-Leena Sorjonen (1994). "Constituting and Maintaining Activities across Sequences: And-Prefacing as a Feature of Question Design". In: *Language and Society*. 23:1. Cambridge: CUP. 1-29.
- Heritage, John and Douglas W. Maynard (2006). "Introduction: Analyzing interaction between doctors and patients in primary care encounters". In: *Communication in Medical Care: Interaction Between Primary Care Physicians and Patients*. John Heritage and Douglas W. Maynard, Eds. Cambridge: CUP. 1-21.
- Hutchby, Ian and Robin Wooffitt. (1998). *Conversation Analysis: Principles, Practices and Applications*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Levinson, Stephen C. (1992). "Activity Types and Language". In: *Talk at work: Interaction in institutional settings*. Paul Drew and John Heritage, Eds. Cambridge: CUP. 66-101.
- Nothdurft, Werner, Ulrich Reitemeier and Peter Schröder, Eds (1994). *Beratungsgespräche: Analyse asymmetrischer Dialoge*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.
- Nothdurft, Werner (1994). "Kompetenz und Vertrauen in Beratungsgesprächen". In: *Beratungsgespräche: Analyse asymmetrischer Dialoge*. Werner Nothdurft, Ulrich Reitemeier, Peter Schröder, Eds. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag. 184-227.

- Reitemeier, Ulrich (1994). "Beraten und institutioneller Kontext". In: *Beratungsgespräche: Analyse asymmetrischer Dialoge*. Werner Nothdurft, Ulrich Reitemeier, Peter Schröder, Eds. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag. 230-258.
- Robinson, Jane (1982). *Evaluation of Health Visiting*. Council for the Education and Training of Health Visitors.
- Robinson, Jeffrey D. and John Heritage (2005). "The structure of patients' presenting concerns: the completion relevance of current symptoms." In: *Social Science and Medicine*. 61. Amsterdam: Elsevier. 481-493.
- Sacks, Harvey, and Emanuel A. Schegloff and Gail Jefferson (1974). "A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation". In: *Language*. 50:4/1. Washington: Linguistic Society of America. 696-735.
- Sacks, Harvey (1972/2006). *Lectures on Conversation: Volumes I & II*. Gail Jefferson, Ed. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. (1968). "Sequencing in conversational openings". In: *American Anthropologist*. 70. American Anthropological Association. 1075-1095.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. (2007). "A tutorial on membership categorization". In: *Journal of Pragmatics*. 39. Amsterdam: Elsevier. 462-482.
- Schröder, Peter (1994). "Perspektivendivergenzen in Beratungsgesprächen". In: *Beratungsgespräche: Analyse asymmetrischer Dialoge*. Werner Nothdurft, Ulrich Reitemeier, Peter Schröder, Eds. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag. 90-182.
- Sidnell, Jack (2010). *Conversation Analysis: An Introduction*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Ten Have, Paul (1999). *Doing Conversation Analysis. A Practical Guide*. London: Sage.
- VOICE Project (2007). VOICE Transcription Conventions [2.1]. Online: http://www.univie.ac.at/voice/voice.php?page=transcription_general_information [Last Accessed: 01/10/2016]
- Wittgenstein, Ludwig (1958). *Philosophical Investigations*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Appendix

Transcription Conventions (cf. Voice Project 2007: Online)

S1: ... S2: ... S3: ...	Speaker-IDs
?	Rising intonation
.	Falling intonation
CAPITAL LETTERS	Emphasis
(.)	Short pause up to half a second
(1), (2), (3),...	Longer pause; number of seconds in parentheses
<1> utterance </1> <1> utterance 2 </1>	Overlaps are indicated by the use of numbered tags <1> </1>; overlapping talk is blue;
S1: other= S2: =continuation	“=” indicates that which speaker continues or completes a turn;
mo:re	A semicolon indicates a lengthened sound.
Mo::re	Exceptionally long sounds are indicated with a double-semicolon.
S1: I'd like t- t- t- to to go to the cinema.	All repetitions, self-interruptions and false starts are transcribed.
S1: @ S2: <@> Really? </@>	“@” is used to transcribe laughter; when the participants speak laughingly, <@> and </@> is used.
(uncertain)	Words in parenthesis cannot be clearly identified or were only understood in fragments.
<L1> Vorlesungen </L1> <LNde> Vorlesungen </LNde>	Utterances in German are indicated by the use of <LNde> </LNde> and the color red. If a speaker uses his/her mother tongue, it is

	indicated in red as <L1> </L1>
<p>Speaking Mode</p> <p><whispering> </whispering></p> <p><yawning> </yawning></p> <p>Speaker Noises</p> <p><coughs></p> <p><swallows></p>	<p>If the speaking mode notably differs from the ‘normal’ one, it is marked. Also speaker noises are marked. The list is an open one.</p>
S1: hh and then she said...	<p>“h” indicates notably breathing in or out; hh=relatively short; hhh=relatively long.</p>
<p>{S1 walks in}</p> <p>{S3 closes the door}</p>	<p>Contextual information is provided in curly brackets.</p>
<i>[translation of German utterances]</i>	<p>A translation of German utterances is provided in italics and square brackets.</p>

Transcription 1: 19:30 min.

S1 = female advisor

S2 = male international student from Italy

- 1 S1: okay...also um was würds gehn?
2 S2: (guten tag) <@>
3 S1: <@>
4 S2: ich wollte fragen. wegen der anmeldung. weil ich habe etwas nicht gut verstanden.
5 S1: okay?
6 S2: ich ich habe alle. (.) die dokumente schon aehm. abgegeben?=
7 S1: =ja
8 S2: ich habe alle (.) schon gemacht. aber ich weiß nicht (.) was soll ich jetzt tun.
9 S1: okay=
10 S2: ich meine sie haben (.) nicht=
11 S1: =nicht geantwortet?=
12 S2: ja.
13 S1: okay
14 S2: ich meine ich soll vielleicht (.) aeh (.) an uni graz online (.) aeh (.) mich anmelden?
15 S1: ahm (.) hast du? den antrag per post geschickt? oder hingbracht persoanlich?
16 S2: persoanlich.
17 S1: aha und wann war das zirka?
18 S2: (.) vor (.) zwei (.) das letzte dokument vor zwei wochen. aber die erste dokumenten schon
19 im dezember.
20 S1: okay. (.) und fuer ein masterstudium oder fuer ein bachelorstudium?
21 S2: masterstudium.
22 S1: okay. an und fuer sich ist es so dass die bearbeitungszeit (.) vier bis acht wochen betragen
23 kann (.) das ist aber kein MUSS. also es koennte sein (.) dass du in nächster zeit schon eine e-
24 mail oder (.) einen brief bekommst (.) je nachdem. und dort steht dann drinnen wie du weiter
25 vorgehen sollst. (.) und wenn du dir unsicher bist ob alles (.) korrekt (.) ist (.) dann könntest
26 du theoretisch (.) ah (.) in der studien- und pruefungsabteilung (.) dort wo dus abgegeben hast
27 (.) ahm (.) bei [PERSON 1] oder [PERSON 2] (.) direkt nachfragen (.) ahm (.) ob das eben
28 angekommen ist oder ob irgendwas noch fehlt und wie langs noch dauert. weil wir haben
29 leider keine (.)<1>keine einsicht</1>
30 S2: <1>jaja ich hab (.) ahm (.)</1> ich hab schon (.) gefragt=
31 S1: =okay?

35 S2: aeh:m (.) danach kommt (.) sie haben mir (.) mich schon mir geantwortet dass ich (.) aeh
36 (.) schon (.) aeh (.) alles schon gegeben habe. schon.

37 S1: okay

38 S2: ich <2>muss (.) nicht mehr</2>

39 S1: <2> du musst nur warten. </2>

40 S2: ja. ich muss nur warten aber ich hatte (.) ah (.) ein bisschen angst? weil ich (.) soll aeh
41 schon (.) aeh ich glaube aeh (.) fuer (.) an den (.) ahm (.) kursen. mich anmelden.

42 S1: wa (.) was fuer ein masterstudium moechtest du machen?

43 S2: aeh uebersetzen.

44 S1: uebersetzen. es kann sein (1) warte mal (.)

45 {S1 tippt am computer}

46 S1: (2) sprachen?

47 S2: aeh (.) deutsch und (.) aeh (.) bosnisch serbisch kroatisch.

48 {S1 searches something online}

49 S1: (3) hm

50 S2: und aeh meine muttersprache ist italienisch.

51 (5)

52 S1: also an und fuer sich (3) hh musst (.) du=

53 S2: ich meine am ersten ich werde. ich habe gefragt und ich kann aeh (bei der) uebersetzen
54 und dolmetschen. (.) machen und danach aehm (.) wird es ein (.) test sein? und danach. <3> ja
55 </3>

56 S1: <3>genau.</3> also die anmeldung beginnt am (.) mittwoch. (.) also in zwei tagen. hh (.)
57 es ist jetzt aber nicht so schlimm. weil ahm (.) es wird nicht so viele leute geben. (.) die das
58 machen. also ich DENKE (.) wenn du. wenn du in den naechsten tagen. hh wenn du vielleicht
59 naechste woche (.) an eine antwort bekommst dann muesste es sich trotzdem ausgehen. weil
60 du kannst dich bi:s (.) warte (.) (1) bis spaetestens (2) sechszwanzigsten februar bewerben.
61 <4>AH ANMELDEN. entschuldigung.</4>

62 S2: <4> okay und (heute)</4>

63 S1: und heute ist der neunte. also das geht. normalerweise schon. also bis
64 sechszwanzigsten zweiten IDEALerweise solltest du eine antwort haben. wenn du keine
65 hast hh dann kannst du immer noch ahm der professorin oder dem professor eine e-mail
66 schreiben und sagen okay (.) ah (.) ich bin jetzt erst zugelassen worden im unigrazonline (.)
67 zum studium eben (.) konnte mich nicht anmelden. koennten sie mich vielleicht noch
68 anmelden?

69 S2: jaja aber ich habe (.) aehm (.) das (feine) problem dass ich nicht weiß (.) nicht weiß wo (.)
70 soll ich (.) aeh (.) mm (.) SCHAUEN wo sind und wann <5> sind die. </5>
71 S1: <5> ah okay. okay </5>
72 S2: <@>
73 S1: <6> okay </6>
74 S2: <6> vorlesungen oder? </6>
75 S1: okay. okay. versteh schon.
76 S2: und ich habe versucht mich bei meinen? (verse) aeh? bei meinen selbst zu? aeh.=
77 S1: =anzumelden?
78 S2: ja aber=
79 S1: es geht nicht. nein. <7> du bist nicht zugelassen </7>
80 S2: <7> es geht. jaja. es geht? </7> aber es ist alles falsch und ich habe. ich meine ich soll
81 auch (.) das. loeschen. weil (.) aehm (.) ich habe (.) aehm (.) ich meine. ich konnte? etwas
82 machen aber ich konnte (.) nicht zum beispiel aeh (.) aeh (.) (2)
83 S1: ja?
84 S2: login? <8> loggen in? und aeh </8>
85 S1: <8> nein das geht nicht. ja? </8>
86 S2: ich konnte (.) nur etwas (.) aeh (.) <9> schreiben. suchen. </9>
87 S1: <9> suchen? </9>
88 S2: m:h
89 S1: genau. das kannst du aber sowieso also ich bin jetzt eingeloggt (.)
90 S2: ja
91 S1: du kannst unter studien (.) ah uebersetzen (.)
92 S2: ja aber ich kann. aber ich kann nicht das machen.
93 S1: das kannst du nicht? doch das kannst du schon. schau?
94 {S1 shows S2 the information management system of the university}
95 S2: kann ich schon?
96 S1: <10> (hier ist) </10>
97 S2: <10> jajaja genau </10>
98 S1: jetzt gehst du auf SUCHE. Studien. und uebersetz (.) en. hh und dann je nachdem ah (.)
99 auf welche sprache du uebersetzen willst. und nehmen wir zum beispiel (.) du hast gesagt
100 bosnisch <11> kroatisch serbisch? (.) </11>
101 S2: <11> ja </11>

102 S1: genau dann hast du hier die (.) die ganzen (.) VORLESUNGEN und (.) und (.) eben
103 KURSE und Seminare
104 S2: und aehm (.) zum beispiel wenn ich aeh (.) aeh (.) wenn ich die das datum (.) haben <12>
105 will?</12>
106 S1:<12> ja </12> ahm also du kannst nur die machen die im sommersemester angeboten
107 werden. also <13> die </13>
108 S2: <13> ja genau </13>
109 S1: die mit dem S da klickst du drauf (.) so. (1){noise of scrolling with the mouse}
110 und hier sind die Zeiten.
111 S2: ah okay. (1)
112 S1: also da ist einfach (.) das ist in zwei gruppen geteilt? die gruppe eins und die gruppe zwei
113 (.) und die haben unterschiedliche (.) zeiten. du musst eben schauen welche gruppe dir besser
114 passt und dann meldest du dich für eine gruppe an. aber das geht natuerlich NICHT. weil fuer
115 die anmeldung (.) das kannst du noch nicht machen.
116 S2: ja. ich sollte wenn ich nicht (.) aehm (.) bekomme? soll ich danach (.) aeh (.) dem
117 <14>professor?</14>
118 S1:<14> genau. genau. </14>
119 S2: schreiben?
120 S1: wenn du wirklich bis 26.02. (.) also das ist noch zwei wochen – wenn du bis dahin nichts
121 bekommen hast dann kannst du dem professor eine e-mail schreiben. also je nachdem hier C
122 Scheffner oder so. egal. {scrolling noise} ahm (.) eine e-mail schreiben und sagen (.) du
123 wartest noch und obs möglich wäre wenn es platz gibt im kurs dass sie dich im nachhinein
124 noch anmelden.
125 S2: okay.
126 S1: weil theoretisch is es möglich.
127 S2: so. jajaja.
128 S1: also das muesste eigentlich gehen. jo. und ansonsten die (.) welche kurse du wann machen
129 musst? findest du im originalstudienplan (2) {noises of clicking and scrolling}
130 S2: ja das habe <15> ich </15>
131 S1: <15> das hast du schon gesehen? </15>
132 S2: ja aber (.) zum beispiel (.) ich habe ein paar fragen auch.
133 S1: ja?
134 S2: ja. ich muss @
135 S1: ja mach nur.

136 {noise of scrolling} (6)

137 S2: zum beispiel. (.) soll ich (.) aeh (.) am ersten modul A machen? oder kann ich zum

138 beispiel aeh aeh von der modul B? anfangen.

139 S1: jein also das steht im musterstudienablauf? {noise of typing} (2) hier. das ist der

140 musterstudienablauf? da steht genau beschrieben (.) gegliedert nach semestern was du wann

141 machen sollst damit du in vier semestern fertig wirst.

142 S2: okay

143 S1: und da natuerlich (.) ahm wahrscheinlich musst du mit modul A anfangen,weil dort die

144 sprachpruefung drinnen ist.

145 S2: mh ja

146 S1: die du am ende des kurses bestehen musst. (3) also hier das waere <16> eben </16>

147 S2: <16>studierst du auch aeh?</16>

148 S1: <@>nein englisch. </@> nur englisch also anglistik. und (.) ahm (.) ja also das waere

149 eben fuer das erste semester alles was du machen musst. oder solltest. (.)

150 S2: ja. und (.) aeh (1) gibt es (.) aehm (.) die kurse (.) aeh (.) am aeh <17>sommer?</17>

151 S1: <17>im sommersemester?</17>nein wahrscheinlich nicht alle.

152 S2: nicht alle aber schon ein <18>paar?</18>

153 S1: <18> ein paar ja </18> (2) also es gibt hier im ersten semester die zwei im

154 sommersemester? also terminologiemangement und bks analyse und

155 uebersetzungstechniken. wo du dann aber von DEUTSCH auf bosnisch serbisch kroatisch

156 uebersetzt.

157 S2: ja ja.

158 S1: okay. ahm. (.) genau. und die zwei sachen gibts im sommersemester.

159 S2: ich glaube ich soll (1) ahm (.) ich habe auch nicht eine andere ding aeh nicht verstanden.

160 soll ich. von. aeh. also meine muttersprache ist italienisch. also meine sprache A. ist

161 italienisch. so ich soll (.) au:f ahm (.) von (.) aehm (.) zum beispiel deutsch nach italienisch?

162 (.) aeh uebersetzen? oder beide?

163 S1: beide. also es ist normalerweise so dass du immer von deiner muttersprache auf eine

164 andere sprache uebersetzt. also in deinem fall waere das dann eben italienisch. wuerdest du als

165 muttersprache nehmen.=

166 S2:=ja=

167 S1:=und für deutsch. also bks muesstest du dann eigentlich gar nicht machen. außer du

168 moechtest zwei studien studieren. weil du kannst auf bks eben nur von deutsch als

169 muttersprache ausgehen. uebersetzen. das glaube ich wird ein bisschen schwierig oder waere
170 ein bisschen schwierig.
171 S2: ja.
172 S1: also ich wuerde dir empfehlen auf jedenfall dass du (.) dass du italienisch nimmst. warte
173 (5) {typing noise} du haettest dann das masterstudium uebersetzen DEUTSCH. weil du ja
174 deutsch als fremdsprache quasi hast.
175 S2: ja.
176 S1: italienisch ist deine muttersprache. (.)
177 S2: genau.
178 (4)
179 S1: genau. dann haettest du einfach DIESES studium. das waere glaube ich auch passender.
180 das wuerde dir wahrscheinlich auch die curriculakommissionsvorsitzende [NAME DER
181 PERSON]? ah (.) sagen. das hat sie zu mir letztes mal gesagt als ich angerufen hab fuer
182 jemand anderen. (3) also du muesstest hier dann im ersten semester {scrolling noise} (1)
183 wuerde es fuer dich nur terminologiemanagement geben? (.) aber du koenntest ja auch aeh
184 zum beispiel freie wahlfaecher machen. (.) also die brauchst du sowieso auch. (.) zum beispiel
185 hier vier ects kannst du ja mehr machen. kannst du gleich acht ects machen. freie wahlfaecher.
186 S2: ja ja.
187 S1: das kannst du machen wie du moechtest. und den rest machst du dann im wintersemester.
188 S2: jaja. das aeh (.) is klar.
189 S1: mhm.
190 S2: aber ich habe (.) hm (.) hm. nicht gut verstanden?
191 S1: aha?
192 S2: zum beispiel (.) wenn ich aeh (.) aehm (2) was soll ich entscheiden aeh (.) mit frei.
193 S1: also du brauchst fuer <19>jedes studium </19>? freie wahlfaecher.
194 S2: <19>ja.</19>
195 S1: du kannst alles nehmen was dich interessiert? (1) also in dem fall brauchst du fuer dieses
196 studium 14 ects freie <20>wahlfaecher</20> bis zum ende. und du kannst machen was du
197 moechtest. wenn du sagst dich interessiert (.) ahm (.) bosnisch serbisch kroatisch? koenntest
198 du zum beispiel aus dem bosnisch serbisch kroatisch studium (.) etwas machen. im ausmaß
199 von 14 ects.
200 S2: <20>ja</20>
201 {phone rings}
202 S1: kleinen moment bitte.

203 S2: ja bitte bitte.
204 {S1 talks on the phone for 2min21sec}
205 S1: okay.
206 S2: und aeh (.) ja ich wollte noch fragen? (.) aehm (.) zum beispiel wenn ich aeh (2) noch
207 nicht weiß aeh welche (.) mh text (.) werde ich aeh am besten machen?
208 S1: mhm
209 S2: darf ich auch zwei? (.) mh (.) lass uns sagen zum beispiel aehm (.) vorlesung von
210 dolmetschen und vorlesung von <21>übersetzen. machen?</21>
211 S1: <21>ja sicher. </21>ja (.) sicher
212 S2: und aeh (.) ich habe mit aeh (.) eine professorin gesprochen (.) und sie hat mir gesagt dass
213 ich aeh (.) dass das text be:i: (.) mh (.) beim kurs aeh (.) aehm (.) dolmetschen technik und
214 uebersetzen technik (.) sein wird.
215 S1: mhm?
216 S2: aber (.) aeh (.) ich habe nicht das (.) gesehen (.) (3)
217 {scrolling noise}
218 S2: ich meine das aus soll aeh (2) das aeh (.) der erste kurs sein (.)
219 S1: ja. ja? du meinst ah warte mal. analyse und uebersetzungstechnik 1 ist nur der erste kurs
220 weil da die sprachpruefung stattfindet.
221 S2: genau.
222 S1: genau.
223 S2: und aeh (.) gibt es auch am (.) im sommersemester?
224 S1: ja
225 S2: ah okay.
226 S1: ich glaube schon. warte. {noise of clicking and scrolling} (3)
227 S1: also ich glaube schon (.) denke (.) steht das hier? (6) analyse und. (3) {noise of typing}
228 mhm. steht jetzt hier nicht drinnen komischerweise. ich weiß nicht warum.
229 S2: ah. kein problem. und schon freigeschaltet. (2) fremdsprache eins ist deutsch.
230 S1: ja genau
231 S2: aber muttersprache italienisch? (.)
232 S1: genau
233 S2: aber aus aehm (.) von serbokroatisch waehlen?
234 S1: nein das glaube ich nicht da muesstest du bei [NAME DER PERSON] nachfragen? die ist
235 sehr hilfsbereit was das betrifft {noise of scrolling} (1) warte.
236 {S1 writes down name of person}

237 ich schreib dir gleich mal ihre kontaktdaten auf?
238 S2: vielen dank. (30)
239 S2: ah ich habe? (.) aehm (.)
240 S1: mit ihr gesprochen?
241 S2: nicht gesprochen? (.) aber ich habe mit ihr aehm (.) <22> geschrieben </22>
242 S1: <22> geschrieben?</22>
243 S2: ja geschrieben.
244 S1: perfekt. sie kannst du <23>fragen</23>
245 S2: <23> ich kann </23> sie fragen wegen alles einfach zum beispiel aeh (1) darf ich? (10)
246 und? (.) aeh? hat sie (.) ein <24>buero</24> am institut?
247 S1: <24> ja.</24> hat sie. (.) warte. (1) und zwar? (2) sie haette morgen (.) von 9-12 (.)
248 sprechstunde. (2) da koenntest du hingehen? (4) und zwar ist sie im raum 1.084. (8)
249 merangasse 70 ist das. {clicking noise} also da. zu ihr wuerd ich auf jedenfall hingehen. (.) du
250 kannst sie zum beispiel eben fragen ob du bosnisch serbisch kroatisch und italienisch machen.
251 uebersetzen kannst. aber ich glaube nicht? bin mir aber nicht sicher. und den raum (.) den
252 findest du auch im unigrazonline. (.) unter suche raeume. (40) {typing} naja. okay offenbar
253 doch nicht? (.) warte. (3) also hier unter bedienstete findest du sie normalerweise auch? und
254 da kannst du dann draufklicken. und siehst dann auch wo die räume sind zumindest
255 ungefaehr.
256 S2: ja okay.
257 S1: aber das findest du bestimmt.
258 S2: ich werde fragen.
259 S1: am besten einfach fragen. genau. einfach zu ihr hingehen {noise of paper being scratched
260 off}. aber an und fuer sich wegen der bearbeitungszeit das kann halt noch eine woche dauern.
261 S2: okay kein problem.
262 S1: genau.
263 S2: vielen danke vielen danke.
264 S1: ja gerne
265 S2: du warst sehr nett
266 S1: <@>das ist schoen.
267 S2: ciao
268
269
270

271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304

Transcription 2: 32:37 min.
S1 = advisor, female, ESL-speaker
S2 = international student, female, ESL-speaker
S3= Brother of S2, international student, ESL-speaker

S1: so (.) tell me! What do you want to know?
S2: uh (.) uh (.) I didn't have money to pay my semester (.) the first day w-when I got the (.)
the (.) t-the thing (.)
S1: mhm?
S2: yeah (1) so I paid it yesterday?
S1: okay?
S2: and like (.) everyone tells me (.) I'm: an international student?
S1: mhm
S2: I was three semester here in Deutschkurs?
S1: okay
S2: and (.) ah (.) yeah I don't know what to do. I just (.) paid the thing and I-I was supposed
to wait three days that it's activated (.)
S1: mhm
S2: and that (.) then I see (.) what should I do? (How it goes?)
S1: <coughs> okay. Um (.) so (.) you cannot register for courses anymore because it's too late
that's what probably all the people wanted to tell you. hh (.) because in (.) you wanna study
English, right?
S2: mhm
S1: so, there is a certain um (.) like (.) timespan where you can register for all the classes. And
this is mid-February until the end of February. (2) <whispers> oh it doesn't matter
</whisper> (.) um. Did you already take the placement test? (2)
S2: m-m. <shakes head>
S1: okay. (.) that's the main problem because you have to take the placement test in order to
get into those courses. (.) so (.) y-you can't register for the courses now because you didn't
take the placement test (.) it was (.) yesterday. Hh and (.) <louder> no </louder> it was on
Monday @@.
S2: @@
S1:<@> today is Wednesday </@> uh (.) it was on Monday but you can take it (.) this
placement test it doesn't really matter. You can take the placement test at the beginning of
next semester hh what you can do **now** (.) hh is that you can register for (.) um for <L1>

305 **Vorlesungen** </L1>, so for lectures. Hh this is possible but you cannot take the courses, like
306 the language courses in English that are usually taken in the first semester.

307 S2: mhm

308 S1: that's what probably people meant when they told you that you're too late.

309 S2: (2) so (.) w-where should I start? <1> **What should I do?** </1>

310 S1: <1> **okay** </1>

311 S2: I really don't know. <2> **Anything.** </2> Anything. And I don't know anyone who study

312 S1: <2> **yeah? Okay** </2>

313 S2: English (.) so he can come (.) at <3> **my place** </3> or I can come at his place

314 S1: <3> **yeah** </3>

315 S2: that he (persuades) me and tells me in the internet and how it goes all the online stuff

316 S1: hh okay (.) did you already check the UNIGRAZonline?

317 S2: m-m

318 S1: so that's the system where you have to register for all the courses. (.) You know that,
319 right?

320 S2: yeah (.) no.

321 S1: okay I'll show you later hh um so (.) you have to pay the tuition fee, and now you can
322 register for those classes but only for the lectures because it's too late for the courses, right?
323 So. You can find out which courses and lectures and stuff you have to take in your degree
324 <4> **program?** </4>

325 S2: <4> **mhm** </4>

326 S1: if you take a look at the curriculum. Did you already (.) take a look at the curriculum?

327 S2: I-I (.) really don't know anything. Because of that I wrote that on Facebook. I really need
328 help with that.

329 S1: okay so the cur-cur-curriculum is um (1) a document which contains information about hh
330 your degree program, which is English and American Studies, right? But you already know (.)
331 what (.) that you're interested in English and American Studies, right?

332 S2: (1) what I know?

333 S1: that you're interested (.) in that (.) degree program?

334 S2: yeah

335 S1: so (.) hh it consists of um (.) Linguistics, Literature, language itself and Cultural Studies.
336 So you always have to take classes from all the fields (.) to complete your degree. (.) right?
337 Hh and all of these um (.) classes? that you have to take to finish your degree program are
338 contained in the curriculum. This is why this is a <@>very important document </@> and

339 you have to look at this as soon as possible. It's available online, so you will read through this
340 and then you will see okay (.) I have to take (.) for example (.) the placement test before I can
341 take all the other courses. Everything is explained in this document. (.) right?

342 S2: (2) uh, oh dammit.

343 S1: <@>it's not really a problem </@>(.) so you can still take your time (.) but the problem is
344 when you have to pay tuition fees (.) you should (.) you know (.) use the semester because it's
345 a lot of money, right?

346 S2: yeah!

347 S1: so I would recommend um (.) starting with some lectures (.) I will show you the
348 curriculum if you want, and then we can see (.) what you can do now, right? So you can do
349 for example free electives? Hh so your degree program consists of um (.) lectures that you
350 have to take. Obligatory. Hh and also some (.) courses (.) or lectures hh (.) that are called free
351 electives (.) they are of your ch- (.) you know, things that interest you. so if you want to take
352 you know (.) I don't know (.) history classes you can do so with these free electives.

353 S2: to become more ECTS

354 S1: yes. (1) hh and you can do this for example. (.) so you don't lose any (.) time (.) or money
355 within the semester. (.) okay?

356 S2: mhm

357 S1: I'm gonna get the iPad? (.) and then I'll show you what you can take, right?

358 S2: so (.) I can do stuff?

359 S1: you can do stuff, you can do stuff. Hh you just cannot start regularly hh like on time with
360 all the courses that <5> you have to do. </5>

361 S2: <5>no no because </5> of the placement test.

362 S1: yeah.

363 S2: why no one <6> tells that</6>

364 S1: <6> no, I know, you have to ask. </6>

365 S2: it's just important to pay, then nothing.

366 S1: mhm, well, it's difficult because we don't really have any (.) tutoring things for
367 international students (.) hh so there is us and there is the office (.) like the a-admissions
368 office (.) for international students but they only tell you about the registration and not about
369 the beginning of the degree program. So (.) I'm gonna get the iPad okay?

370 S2: mhm

371 {S1 leaves room for 10 seconds}

372 S1: okay so we don't have the iPad here so we have to go to the computer. (.) <@>sorry!
373 </@>
374 S2: @@@
375 S1: <@>so much walking </@>
376 S1 and S2 switch location. (6:30-6:50)
377 S1: so: um (.) here's (2) okay so there's a website called <coughs> um (.) it's called the <L1>
378 **Studienportal** </L1> in German (.) hh I think it's also available in English. (.) so you can go to
379 the Arts and Humanities Faculty and then you check English and American Studies?
380 S2: moment I should <@> write that down</@>
381 S1: @@@
382 {S2 takes notes, S1 navigates website.}
383 S1: so the website is studien.uni-graz.at (4) and then you just look for your degree program
384 English and American Studies (2) and here is the curriculum. (3) okay? (.) so if you click on
385 this link.
386 S2: mhm
387 S1: the current curriculum is gonna be there, and it's in German, so (.) you should actually
388 read through this. Not everything but there are very important explanations concerning your
389 degree program in there. (.) hh so <coughs> (3) also like about jobs and what you can do after
390 your degree program and so on <scrolling noise> (1) okay so (.) hh (3) here is (1) um (2) all
391 the different <L1> **module** </L1> it's called module that you have to finish until you finish
392 your degree program. so there is modul A, B and so on. And it says it's 180 ECTS until you
393 finish your degree program, right? So that's the basic stuff. (2) here is um (.) the STEOP,
394 maybe you've heard of it?
395 S2: m-m.
396 S1: okay (.) hh uh so it's <@>(2) it's a phase </@> an orientation phase for your bachelor's
397 degree, you have to um (.) finish all these lectures (.) and and courses hh until (.) or otherwise
398 if you don't finish them you cannot go on with your degree program. (1) very (.) you know
399 for a long time because it's you have to finish those before you can start with more difficult
400 areas of your degree program. So that's probably the easiest way to explain it. (5) and (.) yeah
401 (1) that's the main thing. You should register for the <L1> **Orientierungslehrveranstaltung**
402 </L1> did you (.) um go to this one? No you didn't go to anything <7>yet, right?</7>
403 S2: <7>no</7>
404 S1: You have to do all of that in (.) the (.) winter term hh (2) you have to (.) like register for
405 that? <scrolling noise> umm there's also: a more complicated part of your degree program

406 it's kind of complicated to explain. It's called <L1> Fakultätsweiter Teil des Basismoduls
407 </L1> and you have to just finish these lectures (.) because they are part of your (.) program.
408 And everyone on the (.) faculty of humanities (and arts) (.) has to do those (.) lectures. So it's
409 (.) a-it's the same lectures for everyone on this faculty. You could still do those. So you can
410 still register for those lectures. (1) okay?

411 S2: I don't know how the registration goes and

412 S1: okay there is a (.) um- I think we have a podcast (.) you can listen to (.) and (.) it will be
413 explained how to (.) how to enroll for all the (.) or (.) how to register for all the courses. It's
414 explained there. But I can show you (.) I can show you too but I guess (.) you still have to
415 listen to it again at home (5).

416 S2: <@>I don't know where to start</@>

417 S1: @@@

418 S2: @@

419 S1: hh okay um (.) <scrolling noise> so at the end of the curriculum (2) you can find a so-
420 called <L1> Musterstudienablauf </L1> (2) hh this is uh (.) like a schedule or like a timetable
421 (.) which classes you have to take when in your <8>degree program</8> (.) okay?

422 S2: <8>mhm</8>

423 S1: so this is something you should (.) maybe print out and take a look at. So in the first
424 semester you should do t-all of these classes. hh (1) you can only take lectures now, because
425 placement test.(2) hh and you could still do the <L1> Fakultätsweiter Teil des Basismoduls
426 </L1> (.) the lectures I told you about before (1) yeah. So (.) you should simply check this (.)
427 <L1> Musterstudienablauf </L1> so that you know what to do. Other. Nobody (.) you know
428 all the other people don't know more than that. (2) so we all stick to this, actually. (5)

429 S2: @@

430 {Pause of 5 seconds}

431 S2: I don't understand anything.

432 S1: How did you expect it to be?

433 S2: I don't know (.) I expected that when I pay the thing I will get in three days (.) ah that
434 activated (.) and it will (.) be there (.) a-when and where should I go <9> and what </9>

435 S1: <9><@>no, it's a university</@></9> it's like that on the <L1> Fachhochschule </L1>
436 like University of Applied Sciences (.) you don't have to (.) um register for all the classes
437 yourself? You have (.) you can choose freely what to do. (1) so it's not like that. So you have
438 to every semester you have to check which classes you would like to take (.) and then register
439 for those classes. (4)

440 S2: So should I wait now my three days (.) that they pass and then activate something.
441 S1: When did you pay the fee?
442 S2: Yesterday
443 S1: Yesterday okay. Hh So you will get an e-mail actually that says that you can now (.) um
444 register at the UNIGRAZonline?
445 S2: mhm
446 S1: hh and until then you cannot register for the classes? so you will still have to wait a
447 couple of days (.) and then I would recommend (.) um registering for some lectures. And you
448 (.) you know (.) will print this out and check which lectures you can take. And then just
449 register for them and do them. Okay? So that's the easiest way to do it now. (2) because you
450 (.) can't do any other regular courses or (.) seminars. Because it's too late now for this
451 semester. But in the beginning of next semester? You can still take the placement test. And
452 you have to separately register for the placement test. (3) you should maybe note down the
453 website with the (.) the institute (.) the department. <L1> Institut für Anglistik</L1> so the
454 website is anglistik.uni-graz.at (13)
455 S2: <whisper> it's so complicated</whisper>
456 S1: It seems to be complicated at first but if you do it once or twice it's (.) it's-it's fine. You
457 just get (.) you know (2) used to that.
458 S2: Yeah but I really need help for the first time.
459 S1: <@>mhm everyone needs</@>
460 S2: Because you can just pay the thing and just wait at home that something happens (.)
461 S1: no no. You now have to wait until (.) you get notice that you can register for the classes.
462 but otherwise (.) yeah (.) there's no other way, you know. (3) To do it now. (.) so if you look
463 at <L1> Studieren </L1> there is some information on the placement test here. (.) so it took
464 place yesterday (.) today is Tuesday? Yesterday. Hh um so the next placement test is
465 probably gonna be in September (.)
466 S2: Huh
467 S1: Yeah (.) and (.) <coughs> you have to register again in the UNIGRAZonline.
468 S2: (3) September?
469 S1: Yeah, September. (5) next semester.
470 Pause of approx. 5 seconds
471 S2: So you'll lose the semester.

472 S1: No, you can take the lectures (.) I told you. You can do the lectures but you cannot take
473 the courses and the seminars. (1) which is not a problem you have to take the lectures
474 anyway. (.) at some point. So if you do them now you don't have to do them later. (.)
475 {S2 speaks with S3 in their native language. (Serbian) for approx. 30 seconds.}

476 S1: @

477 S3: Did you understand?

478 S2: (5) Barely.

479 S1: Yeah it's-it seems to be very complicated but <10>it's okay</10>

480 S2: <10> it is</10>

481 S1: yeah it's for the first time it is but then it's gonna be okay.=

482 S2:=I done the <L1> Deutschkurs </L1> (1) it's something (.)=

483 S1:=difficult?

484 S2: <@>Yeah</@>

485 S1: <@>Yeah</@> <L1> Deutschkurs </L1> I'm sure the <L1> Deutschkurs </L1> was
486 difficult, too. But this is (.) compared to this (.) probably (.) if you didn't expect it to be that
487 complicated hh (.) it's overwhelming I guess yeah (.)

488 S2: mhm (5)

489 {S1, S2 and S3 laugh, then pause for approx. 5 seconds}

490 S1: so?

491 S2: so I should print this?

492 S1: Yeah print this, yeah (.) (2) It's gonna be pretty complicated to read through it all (.) but
493 you don't need everything, right? (.) you just need to see (.) which lectures and courses (.) you
494 should take in which semester. (.)

495 S2: mhm

496 S1: so that you know for yourself when and what to take. (2) and then you still have to
497 register for it in the information system.

498 {S3 speaks to S2 in native language for approx. 5 seconds}

499 S1: You have to give (.) like (.) type in your pincode here (.) hh once your (.) tuition fee=

500 S3:=We've done that

501 S1: You've done that already?

502 S2: mhm

503 S1: so the tuition fee should be (2)

504 S2: We had to (.) make this online=

505 S3:=she done it a year ago=

506 S2: =when I started with the (.) <L1> Deutschkurs </L1>
507 S1: ah yeah yeah, okay (.) so you have access to this.
508 S2+S3: yes
509 S1: okay. Hh um (.)
510 S3: Because of <L1> Studienbestätigung </LNde> and all these papers
511 S1: okay great hh (2) um (.) do you want to log in?
512 {S3 talks to S2 in their native language for approx. 20 seconds}
513 <typing noise>
514 {S2 logs into the online system.}
515 S3: <LNde> Studieren Anglistik </LNde>
516 S1: @
517 S3: and not speaking English. Uh Can I ask you a question?
518 S1: <@>sure.</@>
519 S3: Uh (.) I'm here to study Economy.
520 S1: Okay
521 S3: Can I change it?
522 S1: uh (.) are you already like (.)
523 S3: ah I'm in <LNde> Deutschkurs </LNde>
524 S1: ah you're taking the German preparatory course. Of course you can still change it I guess
525 (.) You had to (.) well if you (.) finish the German course (.) you still have to enroll for a
526 degree program (2) separately so you're not already enrolled for Business. And then you can
527 tell the ladies there that you wanna study English instead of Business Administration (.) once
528 you've finished the German course. (.) {addressing S2 now} okay so there is always very
529 important information (.) about um (.) you know (.) everything on the first site (.) and here is
530 your (.) like your business card. You're home screen (.) kind of, at UNIGRAZonline.
531 S2: mhm
532 S1: hh and here (.) you can find the (.) degree program you're registered for. Hh so. Okay it
533 says <L1> Studienphase begonnen </L1> which means that your tuition fee hasn't arrived
534 yet. (.) so it still takes a few days (.) and once you're (.) money is on the bank account of the
535 university (.) hh you can click on this link here (5) and there's all the (.) classes (.) you could
536 take. (.) okay? (4) <scrolling noise> so there's for example the (.) orientation day (.) and there
537 is English for Academic Purposes (.) the Introduction to English Linguistics (.) and so on.
538 Right? These are the classes that are mentioned in the curriculum. Okay? (5) um. That's
539 basically everything I can show you. (.) because (.) well (.) you have to decide yourself (.)

540 which classes or lectures you want to take now. (2) so for example (.) you cannot take those
541 because it's <L1> Proseminar </L1> it's a course, all too late.

542 S2: mhm so KS and PS I cannot take (.) so what can I take?

543 S1: mhm you can only take VO

544 S2: mhm

545 S1: VO that's <L1> Vorlesung </L1> that's lecture. You could <coughs> for example take
546 Forms of English (.) or you could take the linguistics (.) <L1> Vorlesung </L1> (.) linguistics
547 lecture, or you could um <scrolling noise> take here (.) the Survey (.) of (.) American and
548 English Literary History (.) or you could also take British Culture (.) American Culture (.) so
549 there's a lot of lectures you can take

550 S2: yeah that's good

551 S1: so no worries <11>you can still.</11>

552 S2: <11> <@>so it's not so negative</@></11>=

553 S1:=yeah. <12> and if you </12>

554 S3: <12>(unknown speech)</12>=

555 S1:=and if you want to register (.) um (.) for a lecture hh you click on this (.) you know
556 <13>W</13>

557 S2:<13>mhm</13>

558 S1: that's for <L1>Wintersemester</L1> hh and the S is for summer. So as we're now in the
559 summer term you always choose the s. okay?

560 S2: oh thank you yeah

561 S1: and there's American culture for example (.) then you click on it (.) then you can see who
562 does (.) the lecture and so on <scrolling noise> and these are only the degree programs that
563 need (.) to take this. Whatever (.) it's not necessary for you to know that? Um and here are the
564 (.) dates and times (.) for the lecture and also the place. So it's <L1> Hörsaal 06 02 </L1> (1)
565 okay? That's right over there in the <L1> Vorklinik </L1> (1) for example.

566 S2: I don't know that

567 S1: You don't have to know <14>that hh </14>you can click on this=

568 S2: <14>@@</14>

569 S1: okay? You can click on this and then it says <L1> Universitätsplatz 6</L1> okay? So you
570 know where to go

571 S2: ah great

572 S1: and you have to register or enroll for this lecture. It says <L1> Teilnahme Kriterien und
573 Anmeldung</L1> (.) okay?

574 S2: great

575 S1: <cough> (2)

576 S3: so you can choose between American English or?

577 S1: no you always take both

578 S3: ah okay

579 S1: you always take both. Of course you can choose yourself (1) what you prefer to speak but

580 you (.) get education from both fields (.) English and American (1)

581 S3: Because in high school we (.) we always learned about British English

582 S1: yeah we too we did that too but it's (.) at the University you can choose what you prefer.

583 S3: okay

584 S1: okay so (.) then you click on this right? (1) okay? And (.) as you don't have an active

585 degree program now you cannot (.) register for this lecture okay? (.) <15> but once=</15>

586 S2: <15>=because my (</15>

587 S1: because the tuition fee <16>is not on the (</16>

588 S3: <16>student account.</16>

589 S1: yeah and once it is you can click on register and then you're registered. <17> Okay?

590 </17> And that's it.

591 S2: <17>mhm</17>

592 S1: that's what you have to do for every (.) thing (.) you want to do.

593 S2: for every <18>day? Oh (now)</18>

594 S3: <18>(unclear utterance) yes</18>

595 S1: not-not for every day <19>just once=</19>

596 S2: <19>=no no day (.) or </19>

597 S1: what?

598 S2: not (.) not (.) day<20> as but</20>

599 S3: <20>for every lecture (unclear utterance)</20>

600 S2: yeah for every lecture

601 S1: for every lecture yeah mhm

602 S2: every lecture is (real)

603 S3: (unclear utterance) @

604 S2: @ (2) <LNDE> winter oder </LNDE>

605 S1: @

606 S2: that's the big thing I need

607 S1: <@> mhm </@> (.) hh so that's basically everything you need to know. So you can take
608 some lectures and you also have to take some free electives (.) you can (.) you know if you're
609 interested (.) in any other (1) field of study I don't know (.)
610 S2: I'm interested to (.) to make anything (.) because I don't (.) want the time (.) that it ends
611 that I paid for (1) <21> sit at home you know=</21>
612 S1: <21>=nothing yeah I know </21> hh so you can also take language classes if you like (.)
613 so w-what's your (.) mother tongue?
614 S2: m (.) <LNde> Muttersprache?</LNde>
615 S1: yeah
616 S2: <LNde> Bosnisch </LNde>
617 S1: okay so you could for example take a language class (2) in Bosnian
618 S2: really?
619 S1: yeah
620 S2: how it works?
621 S1: hh um (.) you just <scrolling noise>
622 S2: <22>this semester?=</22>
623 S1:<22>=no no </22>
624 S2: no?
625 S1: no for this semester it's (.) it's too late (.) but for next semester for example you could
626 take em.
627 S2: um so (.) I should (.) when I want to study some (.) when I want to do<23> classes </23>
628 (.) for the next semester (.) hh ah I should (.) like (.) a month (.) ah (.) before?
629 S1: <23>mhm</23>
630 S3: yes
631 S1: yeah it's always in September
632 S2: no one told us you know (.) that (.) because in my country (.) it doesn't goes anything
633 online (.)
634 S1: mhm
635 S2: n-nothing is online (.) you you walk to your uni and hh you become (.) no you get the
636 paper when you have classes and (.) what <24>you should do? </24>
637 S1:<24> mhm and then you just go there </24> mhm <@> no it's not like that </@>
638 S2 and S3: @@
639 S3: it's the easy way
640 S1: @@

641 S2: because of that for me (.) that's that's that's too (1) <25>(hard)=</25>
642 S3: <25>=complicated</25>
643 S1: complicated yeah I know it's (.) it's pretty complicated. Yeah. (1) um (.) okay so (1)
644 that's actually everything I can tell you now (.) so that's how you register for classes (.) and I
645 can also give you the link (3) <typing noise> for the podcasts (7) um wait a minute (5) um (3)
646 so here you can listen to a podcast (.) concerning the course registration. Okay? You can
647 listen to it.
648 S2: yeah
649 S3: is it in English?
650 S2: yeah
651 S1: yeah <26> it's in English</26>. English and German
652 S3: <26>that's good</26> (4)
653 S2: that's good for international student?
654 S1: yeah (.) should I write down the link?
655 S2: mhm great
656 S1: hh probably easier (5)
657 S3: ah left handed
658 S1: @@
659 S3: (5) we are rare @
660 S1: <@> yeah </@> (.) are you left-handed<@> too?</@>
661 S2: he tattoos with his left hand (5)
662 {S2 and S3 speak in their native language for approx. 5 seconds}
663 S1: okay so it's this one and then slash de slash podcasts plural
664 S2: plural
665 S1: mhm (2) yeah that's basically (.) everything about the course registration hh and you've
666 seen (.) the curriculum and you've (.) seen how to register for the courses so
667 S2: so they told me at the (.) <27>administration (.) </27>when you pay the thing (.) you have
668 to wait like three days=
669 S1: <27>mhm=</27>
670 S2: =that it's activated
671 S1: mhm
672 S2: so ah (1) for the (.) we need (.) the new <LNde>Studienkarte? Das da steht dass ich hier
673 bin Studentin</LNde>
674 S1: okay?

675 S2: because (.) in that way I can (.) I can buy the card for the (.) bus and (3)

676 S1: um well (.) once the tuition fee is on the (.) account bank account of the university (.) you

677 will be automatically (.) um (.) ah <L1> ordentliche Studierende </L1>

678 S2: yeah but we need that card

679 S1: do have the (.) UNIGRAZCard? (.) like the student's card (.)

680 S2: mhm

681 S1: you have that already?

682 S2: yeah

683 S1: okay (3) let me see (3) yeah but you just have to wait until the money's on the bank

684 account and then you can go (.) hh and um (.) actualize (.) um (.) to update (.) kind of update

685 it so that <28>the correct</28>

686 S2:<28> yeah you just</28>

687 S1: yeah so that the correct date is on=

688 S2:=I don't need another one?

689 S1: no. Usually not.

690 S2: And when I want to buy the card (.) or (.) cheaper?

691 S1: ah you mean (.) the (.) <29>the for the bus?=</29>

692 S2: <29>=yeah for the bus </29> mhm

693 S1: ah okay the public transport hh (.) yeah

694 S2: what should I (.) <30>show them?</30>

695 S1: <30>um (.) yeah you show them</30> the <L1> Studienbestätigung </L1> hh but that's

696 only possible if you (.) like (.) if the money's on the bank account.

697 S2: yeah that (I know)

698 S1: and otherwi:se (.) hh um (.) yeah (.) you have to print out (.) the hh it's like (.) um a

699 registration form (.) for the public transportation system and you (.) just hand that to them. Hh

700 and it says that you need (.) what you need on the form. (.) but and it's all in German.

701 S2: mhm sh that's not the problem but I just (.) thought I ask in English because for me it's (.)

702 S1: easier?

703 S2: yeah easier I can German (.) but (.) I really can't (.) go (beat) with it

704 S1: mhm I know what you mean yeah

705 S2: ugh

706 S3: they mix up

707 S1: yeah of course yeah. And (.) yeah you can find the (.) the registration form (.) for (.) uhm

708 public transportation (.) also here<31> <L1> Studienbestätigung </L1> </31>

709 S2: <31><LNde>Studienbestätigung</LNde></31> and um (.) for the lecture (.) it (.)
710 <LNde> das hat schon begonnen?</LNde>
711 S1: yeah it already (.) or (.) maybe it didn't start yet <scrolling noise> maybe next week (2)
712 let me check (2) for example (5) for example (.) here (.) British culture history and society (2)
713 it will start on Monday for example.
714 S2: mhm great.
715 S1: so it's not <32> so urgent=</32>
716 S2: <32>=I have time</32> so I can be there at Monday.
717 S1: yeah
718 S2: If I register for that?
719 S1: You don't necessarily need to register if (.) if the money is not on the bank account yet (.)
720 until Monday you can still go (.) because it's <33>it's open to public.</33>
721 S2: <33>mhm</33>
722 S1: there is open access to all (.) all lectures. But <louder> only </louder> lectures hh (2) no
723 other courses you can only go to lectures without registering.
724 S2: but when (.) when I get my (.) money is activated there? (1) I can:n (.) uh (.) I have to do
725 (.) the registration for every VO I should go. (1) that's why I (.) that's what you told me
726 S1: yeah you should do it but (.) if it (.) you can do it on Tuesday for example (.) hh it's no
727 problem (.) so if you do it on Tuesday and go there on Monday it's no problem. Okay?
728 S2: So I choose every V O
729 S1: mhm
730 S2: and I go to the details
731 S1: yeah
732 S2: and on (now there)
733 S1: yes
734 S2:<@>great</@>
735 S1: @
736 S3: <@>for the beginning</@>
737 S1: if you need any more help just contact me <@> okay?</@>
738 S2: <@> yeah you can be sure that I will </@>
739 S1: but try it yourself (.) because it's easier if you (.) find it out yourself and then you know
740 memorize it (.) hh and then you know how it's done.
741 S2: I just need to know what <34>for the beginning and</34>
742 S1: <34> yeah </34> it's no problem

743 S2: later it goes
744 S1: Yeah it's no problem just let me know if you <@> need anything else</@>
745 S2: <@>yeah I can breathe now</@>
746 S1: <@>Great</@>
747 S2: It's so hard damn
748 S1: I know yeah the beginning is always hard. I'm gonna log (.) log you out okay? So just that
749 you know. (5) okay? (3) so that's basically it right? (7) <coughs>
750 S2: thank you so much.
751 S1: <@>you're welcome</@>
752 S2: then yeah goodbye.