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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this thesis was to reveal some of the behavioral characteristics of a specific type of laughter that I term "feigned laughter," and how it is used in the context of face-threatening-utterances (FTUs), or utterances that threaten the face needs of an individual.

Upon undertaking this topic, I reviewed recent social linguistic literature on the topics of teasing, laughing, and the politeness theory in order to better understand how laughter can be identified as well as how it may be used in the context of teasing. I discovered that little was said about the phenomenon of feigned laughter. The evidence presented in this study suggests some plausible aspects about the nature of feigned laughter. First, recipients of FTUs produce feigned laughter if they do not initially understand the humorous aspect of a FTU. Secondly, recipients may produce feigned laughter as a way to go along with a FTU, thereby preserving their own face needs and possibly that of the speaker. Third, recipients may use feigned laughter as a strategy to mitigate the negative implications that FTUs assign or it can try to put an end to a potential string of FTUs. Fourth, recipients may use
feigned laughter as a way to establish group solidarity, if they notice that those around them are laughing at a FTU.

The findings presented here shed some light on this relatively unexplored aspect of social linguistics. Further research must be done in order to reach a more comprehensive understanding of the social implications that feigned laughter has as well as how it is used in other modes of discourse such as joking and in casual conversation.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

Laughter is a linguistic phenomenon for which it is necessary to rely on cultural as well as interpersonal understanding in order to convey meaning (Edmonson, 1987). Laughter during a conversation can work either to establish intimacy (Jefferson, Sacks & Schegloff, 1987), or create tension between speaking participants, depending upon who initiates it (Glenn, 1995). According to Edmonson (1987), laughter is also individually patterned. In other words, people can often identify the laugh patterns of people they know fairly well.

Laughter is rich in pragmatic meaning, yet there has been little work done by linguists in this area. Research that has been done has focused mainly on how laughter can work to promote intimacy (Jefferson, Sacks & Schegloff, 1987), how it is used in talk about troubles (Jefferson, 1984) as well as how it is used in teasing (Drew, 1987; LeBlanc III, 1998). According to Jefferson, Schegloff and Sack's (1987) study on laughter, it is "a systematically produced, socially organized activity" (p. 152). This means that during spoken discourse, participants are
constantly monitoring or observing the speech patterns of others in order to judge when and how to place their utterances, such as when to laugh (Wolfson, 1989). For example, a recipient of a joke may wait until the joke teller begins laughing before he joins in laughing. The understanding of laughter as a systematic phenomenon was a ground breaking discovery, since it showed that laughter is not merely a "non-speech sound produced by co-participants to a conversation," which is randomly uttered during speech, but that it closely follows specific rules of discourse (Jefferson, Sacks & Schegloff, 1987, p. 152). Their study found that participants of discourse coordinate their conversational activities, such as talking, around laughter and view it as a relevant conversational activity rather than perceiving it as a disruptive speech sound (Jefferson, Sacks & Schegloff, 1987).

Since laughter is such a pragmatically complex phenomenon and is a relatively untouched subject, it is only fitting that more research should be done on this subject. This study is intended to generate a greater understanding as to why laughter is used in discourse. The impetus for this thesis came from a study I did on the behavioral characteristics of a specific type of laughter,
feigned laughter, and why it is used in the context of teasing. In this study (Lee, 1999), I noticed the occurrence of feigned laughter as distinct from spontaneous laughter. Although feigned laughter may at times resemble natural laughter in terms of its production, it is indeed different. One is spontaneous and the other is a controlled response produced primarily as a strategy for self-preservation.

According to Hutchby and Wooffitt (1998), participants of talk do not merely exchange information with each other, but are "seen as mutually orienting to, and collaborating in order to achieve, orderly and meaningful communication" (p. 1). It is this desire to "reveal the tacit, organized reasoning procedures which inform the production of naturally occurring talk" that serves as the impetus of conversation analysis (CA) (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998, p. 1). CA also tries to answer the question "what do we do when we talk" (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998, p. 1). In the same vein, this study will use CA in order to answer the question of "what do we do when we laugh?" Through CA, the social organization of talk can be revealed and in this way, we can see how laughter is an integral part of spoken
discourse that has many pragmatic functions; many of which do not even pertain to humor.

This study also hopes to illustrate that feigned laughter is not only a politeness strategy used amongst friends, but also as a self-preserving strategy in situations in which the participants are socially distant. In this way we will see how and why feigned laughter is used as a face saving strategy in situations that involve face-threatening-utterances (FTUs), or utterances that threaten the face needs of another individual. For the purpose of this study, I will only be examining how the recipient of the FTU uses feigned laughter. In the following section, the following key terms will be discussed: laughter, teases, and politeness theory, in order to better understand how and why feigned laughter is used in situations that involve FTUs.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction to Laughter

Laughter is commonly perceived as a motor reflex to a humorous stimulus. According to Edmonson (1987), the primary role of laughter is a mode of "social expression," whose "phonetic features appear to be organized expressly to enable an individual to vote audibly and identifiably in a group context, and thus make his feelings known in response to a certain range of situational cues" (p. 28).

Function of Laughter in Spoken Discourse

Laughter is a complex and systematic linguistic phenomenon that serves to direct and control spoken discourse. According to Stewart (1997), laughter is one type of non-speech sound that can occur simultaneously in speech and can "disrupt ongoing talk" (p. 7). According to Cox (1982), laughter can enter a conversation in one of three ways: 1) laughter can be initiated by the speaker, 2) laughter can be produced involuntarily by recipients, or 3) it can be picked up or initiated by overhearers.

In addition, Stewart (1997) notes that there are three types of responses to speaker laughter: 1) recipient
laughter: This involves accepting a "laugh invitation" (p. 7), 2) Recipient Silence: This can indicate that there is a misunderstanding by the hearer, which in turn may generate a continuation of laughter by the initial speaker, and 3) Recipient Non-laughing Speech: This occurs when the recipient declines the speaker's invitation to laugh. This may be perceived as a face-threatening-act (FTA), which is an action that may offend or go against another participant of speech, since it works to challenge what the speaker has said instead of agreeing with it.

Different Contexts in which Laughter is Used

In order to have an understanding of why laughter is an important phenomenon in spoken discourse, it is beneficial to have some knowledge of the main contexts in which laughter is used. Giles and Oxford (1970) note that "laughter principally occurs under seven mutually exclusive conditions: humorous, social, ignorance, anxiety, derision and apologetic laughter and the phenomenon of tickling" (sic) (p. 97).

According to Giles and Oxford (1970), humorous laughter, which will now be referred to as spontaneous laughter, is the most common type of laughter and is
produced as a behavioral response to humor when the respondent experiences something funny that is said, seen, heard or felt. It is also important to note that situation, timing, and tacit cultural understanding is imperative for humor, such as a joke, to result in spontaneous laughter (Chiaro, 1992). According to Chiaro (1992), "the concept of what people find funny appears to be surrounded by linguistic, geographical, diachronic, sociocultural and personal boundaries" (p. 5).

The second form of laughter, social laughter, is "a behavioral response that serves to integrate the individual within a particular social group" (Giles & Oxford, 1970, p.97). In other words, the individual may not necessarily perceive a situation as warranting humorous laughter (even though they may understand the humor in a given situation), but produces a laughter response. This may be done either as a response to other members in the group who are laughing, or because there are expectations in the group that require him to laugh. No matter what the reason may be, social laughter ultimately works to enhance group solidarity and is "intended to be friendly and a sign of being 'one of the gang.'" (sic) (p. 97)
Jefferson (1984) conducted a study on troubles talk in which she examined a collection of conversations in which people talked about their troubles. In her study she found laughter is almost never started by the troubles-recipient, but by the troubles-teller, in which case the recipient waits for cues, from the interlocutor, indicating when it is appropriate to laugh. This shows that the production of laughter can be a controlled response in order to establish and maintain social approval and cohesion.

The third type, ignorant laughter, is used as a behavioral response to "disguise ignorance" (Giles & Oxford, 1970, p. 97). Ignorant laughter functions on the principle of social laughter in that it works towards achieving "group acceptance or maintenance" (Giles & Oxford, 1970, p. 97). However, it is important to note that unlike social laughter, in which the respondent laughs due to social pressure, ignorant laughter is generated because of a respondent's failure to understand the humor in a given situation. The respondent, however, is able recognize cues that prompt him to laugh in order to avoid drawing unwanted attention (Giles & Oxford, 1970).

The fourth form is anxiety laughter, which can be perceived as "a behavioral response in terms of tension
release to specific anxiety-provoking situations" (Giles & Oxford, 1970, p. 97). Giles and Oxford (1970) state that anxiety laughter can be produced in two different situations. The first circumstance usually involves events of "impending doom" such as that of a narrow escape from death in which a survivor may laugh uneasily at the event (p. 97). The second circumstance involves a situation that is of a serious nature, such as a solemn funeral service. In both cases, laughter may be used in order to mitigate tension generated by the experience (Giles & Oxford, 1970).

The following is an example of anxiety laughter. This extract was taken from the TV game show "Weakest Link" in which the host of the show, "Subject H," summons the contestant, "Subject E," in order to ask her questions about herself (see Chapter Three for an explanation of the rules of the game). Throughout the game show, "Subject E" was ridiculed by "Subject H." Therefore, when "Subject H summoned her," in line 1, she produced a "brief aspirated laugh" (line 5) in order to mitigate the tension she generated within herself from fear of being ridiculed again.
Example #1 [Lee: Weakest Link, Data Set #15]

1 H \(\rightarrow\) E: LENA

2 (.4)

3 E ((Looks worried)) yes

4 (.2)

5 \(\rightarrow\) (fh) "hheh" (hf) ((Quickly reverts to a serious demeanor))

The next type, derision laughter, or laughter used in mockery, can take two distinct forms. The first form is prevalent in children, but not exclusive to children in which derision laughter is used as a "direct derogation towards an individual who has been involved in an unorthodox act or possesses an unusual physical or behavioral attribute" (Giles & Oxford, 1970, p. 98).

An example of this type of laughter is in the following extract. This extract was also taken from the TV game show "Weakest Link" in which the host of the show, "Subject H," asks the contestant, "Subject D," a question that he has to answer in order to continue playing the game (see Chapter Three for an explanation of the rules of the game). In line 7, "Subject D" is shown uttering the wrong answer in which he is corrected by the host in line 9.
This is soon followed with the audience laughing at his response in order to "make fun" of his mistake (lines 14, 16 & 17).

Example #2 [Lee: Weakest Link]

1  H  DAN
2    (.2)
3  >ACCORDING TO LEGEND (. ) WHO PROTESTED HIGH TAXES BY RIDING NAKED THROUGH THE STREETS OF COVENTRY<
4    (.6)
5  D  >BEN:JAMIN FRANKLIN?
6    (.3)
7  H  Lady Godiva
8    (.2)
9  ((Host turns to the next contestant to ask them a question)) BRI:AN
10    (.2)
11 Audience  >HA-HA-HA-HA-HA-HA-HA-HA- [HA-HA-HA-HA-HA-HA-HA-] [(fh) "hhheh" (hf)]
12 D  ((Continued laughter)) HA-HA-HA-Ha-ha-
13 Audience  >ha-ha-ha-ha-ha-
The next form of derision laughter comes at the end of a remark, which may be potentially face losing to the recipient. An example of this is chuckling at the end of a tease. The function of this act is that it serves as an "escape route." It also functions as a defense strategy in order to reduce the impact of a preceding assertion.

The sixth type of laughter is apologetic laughter. This type of laughter is a response following a verbal excuse or explanation for a misunderstood action. An example of this is a person laughing after he flatulates. Apologetic laughter can also accompany an "anticipatory excuse" for a succeeding action (Giles & Oxford, 1970, p. 98). Laughter in this case commonly occurs with expressions, such as "I never thought of it that way before" or "so that's where I put it," in a strategic attempt to mask the situation as humorous. The function of this type of laughter is similar to that of derision laughter; it serves to mitigate the force of seemingly unacceptable behavior as well as casts aside responsibility for foolish, or misunderstood behavior.

The final type of laughter is associated with the phenomenon of tickling. This type of laughter is primarily
linked to a spontaneous reflex when certain areas of the body are stimulated.

Production of Laughter

A unique aspect of laughter is that it can encode a wide range of messages some of which are "feigned or sincere, revealing and sometimes involuntary" based on the intensity of the laugh utterance (Edmonson, 1987, p. 28). In order to understand how laughter, and more specifically feigned laughter, can be identified, it is important to examine the production of laughter. In Edmonson's (1987) study on the production of laughter, he indicates that the central feature of laughter is the aspirated /h/. It is the repetition of this sound or the combination of this sound with other sounds that works to identify an utterance as laughter. He also states that laughter can come in one of three forms: laughing with the mouth closed /m/, half-open /n/, or fully open /h/. He notes that these sounds may also be accompanied by glottalization.

According to Edmonson (1987), laughter consonants may be accompanied by any vowel or by a vocalic nasal, /m/ or /n/, in which the vowels are usually pure rather than dipthongized, and is rarely altered within a laugh.
utterance (in the space of one breath). Although the consonant particles in laughter are not subject to change, the vowels are subject to "modulation of length, pitch, and stress" (p. 23). This shows that the production of laughter is more restrictive in nature than compared to spoken discourse.

An important key to understanding how laughter can be interpreted is through analyzing the intensity of the laugh utterance. Edmonson indicates that the intensity in laughter seems to be controlled by consonantal sound, duration, and loudness. However, he notes that "it appears to be the duration of the laugh utterance rather than the number of reiterations that signals intensity." Three laugh patterns that can be used in understanding and interpreting laughter are as follows (Edmonson, 1987):

1) Mild laughter - can be characterized by glottalization in which the /h/ morpheme can be depicted. It is usually monosyllabic in production and brief in duration and seems to imply little more than "attentive benevolence." An example of mild laughter is as follows: → he-he-
2) Real laughter - tends to lose the aspect of glottalization. It is prolonged, usually lasting more than one second, and therefore requires repetition.

3) Intense laughter - is composed of several sequential laugh utterances separated by gasping for breath.

This description of laughter is not intended to be inclusive; it is merely used as a basis to identify laughter as either being natural (spontaneous) or feigned (consciously controlled). For the purpose of this study, I have identified feigned laughter in the collected data based on Edmonson's description of what constitutes 'mild laughter.' Although not all feigned laughter may be produced as mild laughter, I have chosen to analyze mild laughter since it is easily identifiable.

Importance of Play

The concept of play is an important aspect of human behavior related to laughter that will now be discussed. The study of play began with Bateson's (1956) observation of the playing behavior of otters. In his study, he found that the actions that were used to signal an action as play
were very similar to the actions that signal combat. This study later branched into other fields of behavioral study (for example Huizinga, 1950; Loizos, 1967; Piaget, 1951), most of which dealt with the play of children and animals.

According to Groos (1901), play is a way for individuals to prepare for activities in life. He also documented that play, from a sociological perspective, can be used to create "stronger and more extended social organization," it can be used to establish group solidarity, and it can help an individual to assimilate more easily into a culture (p. 396).

Wolfson (1989) states that "conversational partners are constantly aware of each other's meaning partly on the basis of shared cultural knowledge and partly on that of a fine-tuned ability to read and react to even the most subtle verbal and nonverbal responses" (p. 61). This idea of participants monitoring one another for signals or cues can be further explained by Goffman's (1974) use of the term "key." A key is a "set of conventions" that are characteristic of a specific activity, and is transformed into an action patterned on this activity, but is understood by the participants to be something different. (Goffman, 1974, p. 43). An example of this is the act of
wrestling, which is based on fighting (a serious act), but is perceived by the participants thereof to be a form of play (a not so serious act). This concept expresses the importance of individuals having some mutual understanding about the activity that they are engaged in order to communicate successfully. An example of this is an individual letting his audience know that he is about to tell a joke so that they won't take his utterances seriously.

In terms of setting a "play frame," Bateson (1956 & 1972) indicates that play can only occur if the participants are capable of exchanging a metacommunicative signal that "this is play." The actions of play indicate actions of "not-play" by referring to those actions that they approximate or represent. An example of this is a tiger wrestling its trainer with its claws retracted in order to engage in an act of play, whereas if the tiger's claws were extended, it would be an indication that the tiger was attacking the trainer.

Bateson's (1972) study also suggests that play contains two unique features that differentiate it from "not play," or seriousness. First of all, during the course of play, messages that are exchanged are not meant
to be taken seriously. The second feature is that the "idea or thing which is denoted by the play message is non-existent" (LeBlanc III, 1998, p. 4). An example of this is a statement that is "untrue" from a serious frame of conversation, yet, if it perpetuates the play frame, it is perceived to be "true," at least temporarily.

Glenn and Knapp's (1987) study on play found that play serves a variety of social functions: play can be done for pleasure, problem solving, maintaining psychological and physical equilibrium, building cohesion in relationships and defining boundaries in relationships by testing what is and is not acceptable for the relationship to be successful. The following is a list of the seven main criteria for play as modified from Goffman's original criteria for play (Glenn & Knapp, 1987):

1) "The playful act is so performed that its ordinary function is not realized" (p. 63). What this means is that if a play frame is to be successful, the recipient of play must not perceive, lets say, a face threatening response such as an insult to be a serious assault against them.
2) "Some acts are exaggerated and made more expansive; the sequence pattern is neither followed faithfully nor completed fully, but is subject to starting and stopping, redoing, and blending with sequences from other routines; and repetition occurs" (p. 63). What this indicates about play is that it is not static in structure, but is continually changing and manipulating itself in order to maintain a frame of play.

3) "Participants must be freely willing to play, and can back out at any time" (p. 63). It should be noted that even though participants engaging in play can "back out" from play, problems may arise in certain situations such as a game that is governed by formal rules.

4) "Frequent role-switching can occur" (p. 63). Glenn and Knapp indicate that this phenomenon can either occur with an individual engaging in solitary interactive play, or with two participants exchanging roles with each other.

5) "Play seems independent of external needs and often goes longer than the activity it is patterned after" (p. 64). This criteria indicates that play,
unlike other activities is a way for individuals to achieve an optimal level of arousal, to relax when overstimulated, to provide a source of pleasure in order to enhance relationships, or serves as a way to resolve conflicts.

6) "Solitary play will usually give way to social play if the organism has the opportunity" (p. 64). Glenn and Knapp state that the transformation of solitary play to social play requires participants to acknowledge and accept the play signals for the play to be successful.

7) "Signs are available to mark the beginning and end of play" (p. 64). It should be noted that even though Glenn and Knapp did not find this criterion in all cases of play, they concluded that signaling the beginning and end of play could be taken-for-granted by participants or that their signals could be encoded to appear ambiguous to observers.

In addition to the concept of play, Armstrong (1992) argues that teasing is a form of play in that the content of teasing has qualities that are serious, but yet are not serious. In his study he also proposes three main categories of teasables or things that can be teased about:
a) overdone statements, overbuilding, stating the obvious, and transgressing; b) blunders; and c) opportunistic teases, such as spur of the moment teases, and teases from the past (Armstrong, 1993). Ultimately, teases are not intended to be "real or sincere proposals" (Drew, 1987, p. 232). Uttering overtly exaggerated versions of what could be a "serious proposal" tries to leave the teasee with the understanding that the utterance is merely tease and should not be taken seriously. However, the intention of a tease as being humorous, "may not always dictate impact" as we will see in the following section (LeBlanc III, 1998, p. 4).

Responses to Teases

Drew's (1987) study of teasing shows that there are three common properties to teases. The first is that "teases are not topic-initial utterances" (p. 233). Secondly, "they are all in some way a second, or a next, or a response to a prior turn, almost always the adjacent prior turn" (p. 233). The third property states that "prior turn is spoken by the person who is subsequently teased, in multiparty as well as two-party talk" (p. 233).
The following extract illustrates the three properties of teasing that were previously discussed. In this extract, two teenage friends are discussing when the best time is for them to get together. In lines 27 through 29, "Subject B" states that he is not able to go out with his friend "every weekend." In line 30, "Subject G" takes her turn-at-talk. Since the response is of a seemingly ridiculous nature, she uses this utterance as a platform on which to base her tease in which she utters "EVERY WEEKEND? So weekdays better?" This example supports Drew's properties of teases, which shows that teases need to be based on utterances or events that are pertinent to the situation at hand.

Example #3 [Lee: Christmas Banquet, Data Set #1]

27 B \(\Rightarrow\) ya' know it's a week after ya ain my parents
28 \(\Rightarrow\) won't like me doing everything °(every time)
29 \(\Rightarrow\) every weekend you know how parents are°=
30 G \(\Rightarrow\) EVERY WEEKEND? ((Sarcasm in Voice)) So
31 weekdays better?
32 (1.5)
33 B No
34 (.4)
In his study on teasing, Drew (1987) also observed a "continuum of responses to teases," to which includes four types (p. 221). The first is the "initial serious response," which involves a recipient of the tease being prompted by others to laugh, but ultimately reverting to a "po-faced" rejection of the tease (p. 225). Drew uses the term po-faced, or "poker-faced," to refer to the similar serious demeanor that a person has when playing a game of poker. The second type of response involves the recipient laughing simultaneously at the tease, however, ultimately rejecting its proposition. The third response involves the recipient accepting the tease by laughing, but follows it with a serious rejection. The final type of response to a tease involves the recipient "going along with the tease" or in other words, accepting the tease defending themselves (p. 225).

Through Drew's (1987) study, he found that the fourth type of response to teasing, "going along with the tease," is the most rarely used of the four types of responses (p. 225). He indicates that "even in cases where they (teasees) do respond to the tease's humor, for example by
laughing, they do so almost always either as a preliminary to or in the course of making a serious response" (Drew 1987, p. 220). This is illustrated in the following example. This extract was taken from the game show "Weakest Link" in which the host of the show, "Subject H," teases the contestant "Subject D" about his hair (see Chapter Three for an explanation of the rules of the game). In lines 5 and 6, "Subject H" produces her tease construction guised as a question in which "Subject D" responds to by smiling. His act of smiling is a possible indication that he understands the humorous aspect of the utterance. However, in lines 12 and 14, "Subject D" utters the po-faced or serious remark, "JUST FOR YOU," as a way to justify what was asked in the tease.

Example #4 [Lee: Weakest Link, Data Set #5]

5  H  →did you have your hair done for the
6              →occasion?
7
8 Audience  HAH-[HAH-HAH-HAH-]
9   D   [((Smiles as his body bows slightly forward))]
10
11 Audience  ((Continues laughing)) hah-hah-[hah-hah-hah

24
Drew notes that his study of how people respond to teasing was restricted to "close acquaintances in informal talk" (Drew, 1987, p. 220). The present study on feigned laughter in the context of FTUs is an expansion of Drew's study, in that it will take into account participants who are socially distant as well as close as well as those who are placed in formal and informal settings in order to observe how they respond to FTUs.

Politeness Theory

A key characteristic of teases is that they are inherently face-threatening-utterances (FTUs). The reason for this is that they potentially label the recipient of the tease as deviant in some way, in other words, as laughable (Drew, 1987). Laughter, on the other hand, can function as a face saving strategy, or it can be used as a face-threatening action, which can intrude on the needs of the speaker or hearers (Stewart, 1997). In order to have a better understanding of how this paradoxical relationship
functions, a discussion of the concept of politeness follows.

In Brown and Levinson's (1987) studies on politeness, they introduce the notion of "face." They state that face is something "that all competent adult members of a society have (and know each other to have) the public self-image that every member wants to claim for himself" (p. 61). This concept of face is composed of two aspects: 1) negative face - the desire not to be imposed upon and 2) positive face - the desire that an individual's self-image or personality be appreciated and approved of by others (Brown & Levinson, 1987). This concept of face plays an integral part in American culture, since it supports the notion of freedom from "disagreeables" as well as trying to establish and maintain social accord with one's surroundings (Goffman, 1967).

Although the norm in Anglo-American culture is to preserve not only the image of self, but of others as well, Brown and Levinson (1987) indicate that there are two primary ways that intrinsic face-threatening-acts (FTAs) can be used by participants during spoken discourse: FTAs may threaten the negative-face wants of the hearer and
and FTAs may threaten the positive-face wants of
the hearer and speaker.

1) Acts that threaten the negative-face of the hearer:
These are acts that threaten the addressee's
negative-face wants in that the speaker does not
want to respect the addressee's desire not to be
imposed upon (Brown & Levinson, 1978). Acts that
may threaten the negative face of a hearer are
orders and requests, suggestions and advice,
reminders, warnings and threats, offers, promises,
compliments, and expressions that exhibit strong
resenting emotions.

1a) Acts that threaten the negative-face of the
speaker: These types of situations involve acts
that are initiated by the speaker and in turn have
the potential to threaten the speaker's negative-
face wants. Such acts that may threaten the
negative face of a speaker are, but are not limited
to, thanking, making excuses, accepting offers,
responding to faux pas, and making unwilling
promises. Such acts go against the will of the
speaker. If the speaker shows his unwillingness to
do an act, it may offend the hearer, consequently causing the speaker to lose face.

2) Acts that threaten the positive-face of the hearer: These are acts in which "the speaker does not care about the addressee's feelings, wants, etc. and that in some important respect he doesn't want the addressee's wants" (Brown & Levinson, 1978, p. 66). Acts that pose a potential threat to the hearer's positive-face are disapproval, criticism or ridicule, contradictions or disagreement, challenges, expressions of violent emotions, mention of taboo topics and blatant non-cooperation.

2a) Acts that threaten the positive-face of the speaker: Such acts that pose a threat to the speaker's positive-face are apologizing, acceptance of compliments, confessing, losing emotional or physical control and humiliating oneself. They work as threatening acts in that the speaker can no longer maintain the level of "pride" that he once had.
In order to counteract the negative implications associated with face threatening acts, speakers employ what are known as face-saving-acts (FSAs) (Goffman, 1967). Face saving acts can also be a way for recipients of a FTA to maintain or preserve their own face wants and needs. This type of behavior can work as an involuntary response, which is, "habitual and standardized," since the need to maintain dignity or "face" is such an integral aspect of human nature (Goffman, 1967, p. 13). In Goffman's (1967) study on "face-to-face" behavior, he states that there are primarily two kinds of FSAs that are available for participants in any given situation that involves interaction: the avoidance process and the corrective process.

The avoidance process is a type of FSA that involves individuals avoiding situations that have face-threatening potential. If by chance individuals are involved in an encounter, strategies for defending their face include avoiding topics and activities that may incite FTAs, changing potentially face threatening topics, omitting topics that may cause embarrassment to other participants, phrasing replies with selected ambiguity in order to preserve the "face" of others, using courtesies and hedges
in order to mitigate the severity of utterances made, and employing jokes in order to mitigate tensions that may arise during talk (Goffman, 1967).

If individuals must engage in potentially offensive actions, they may offer explanations in order to prepare listening participants of the potential FTU. An example of this is an interlocutor warning his audience that he is about to tell an offensive joke. However, if for some reason individuals fail to prevent a FTA from occurring, they can employ the strategy of ignoring the FTA as if nothing has occurred, or they can acknowledge the event and treat it as if the FTA did not occur.

The corrective process is a type of FSA that is used in situations in which the participants of an encounter fail to prevent an "event that is expressively incompatible with the judgments of social worth that are being maintained" (Goffman, 1967, p. 19). When such offset of social equilibrium takes place, participants are likely to perceive it as a threat that needs to be attended to with correction. Goffman (1967) indicates three types of correction:
A) The Challenge - This type of correction involves participants assuming the responsibility of drawing attention to deviancy. This action is carried out by suggesting that "the threatened claims are to stand firm and that the threatening event itself will have to be brought back into line" (Goffman, 1967, p. 20).

B) The Offering - This type of correction involves giving the offender of a FTA an opportunity to correct the acknowledged offense and to re-establish order.

C) Acceptance or Thanks - This involves the offender openly acknowledging his mistakes and thereby attempting to re-establish the trust of participants. If the participants decide to accept the offender's "transgressions" the final step in the ritual of correction is for the offender to express thanks for allowing him to reenter as a member of the group.
The purpose of my study is to examine feigned laughter in interactions between participants of equal social status and those in which there is an imbalance of social status.

Raw data for this study was gathered from three video taped recordings of the game show "The Weakest Link," an audio taped recording of the radio talk show with Dr. Laura, who has a radio talk show therapy program on KFI 640 AM, a video taping of the television show "Real World," and an audio recording of a male and a female teenager conversing informally in a parking lot.

I selected the game show "The Weakest Link" because the host of the show, Anne Robinson, is notorious for confronting her contestants with face-threatening remarks. I have categorized the face-threatening remarks as teases since the contestants are aware that the host's remarks are only part of the game and are not meant as a direct assault against them, but are done merely as a form of play. I also chose to analyze a particular radio talk show session with Dr. Laura because she is known to insult and humiliate her callers in order for them to reach a cathartic
realization about themselves, and the caller in the case was willing to go along with many of her teases and comments.

Since the previous research on teasing has primarily been done on subjects who are socially close, this study was conducted in order to see if an imbalance in the status of speaking participants played a role in generating feigned laughter.

My next data set was composed of two participants. I chose to analyze a taped conversation between two friends in order to gain a better understanding of how feigned laughter works in "real-life" discourse. Since the participants were taped in the informal setting of a parking lot, it was my intention to observe how feigned laughter can work in an uninstitutionalized context.

I transcribed the data using the micro-transcription techniques of Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974). This system allows the researcher to examine the turn-by-turn development of interaction as well as any interesting phenomenon in the data that may not have otherwise been noticed. The following is a list of the transcription conventions based on those developed by the researchers
afore mentioned (Sacks, Scheglof & Jefferson, 1974), that are found in Hutchby, 1998.

Methods of Conversation Transcription

Symbols marked with a plus sign '+' are ones that I developed for the purpose of this particular study.

(0.5) The number in brackets indicates a time gap in tenths of a second.

(.) A dot enclosed in a bracket indicates a pause in the talk of less than two-tenths of a second.

= The 'equals' sign indicates 'latching' between utterances. For example:

S1: yeah September [seventy six = [S2: [September

S1: =it would be

S2: yeah that's right

[ ] Square brackets between adjacent lines of concurrent speech indicate the onset and end of a spate of overlapping talk.

.hh A dot before an 'h' indicates speaker in-breath. The more h's, the longer the in-breath.
An 'h' indicates an out-breath. The more h's the longer the breath.

A description enclosed in a double bracket indicates a non-verbal activity. For example ((banging sound)). Alternatively double brackets may enclose the transcriber's comments on contextual or other features.

A dash indicates the sharp cut-off of the prior word or sound.

Colons indicate that the speaker has stretched the preceding sound or letter. The more colons the greater the extent of the stretching.

Exclamation marks are used to indicate an animated or emphatic tone.

Empty parentheses indicate the presence of an unclear fragment on the tape.

The words within a single bracket indicate the transcriber's best guess at an unclear utterance.

A full stop indicates a stopping fall in tone. It does not necessarily indicate the end of a sentence.
A comma indicates a 'continuing' intonation.

A question mark indicates a rising inflection. It does not necessarily indicate a question.

An asterisk indicates a 'croaky' pronunciation of the immediately following section.

Pointed arrows indicate a marked falling or rising intonational shift. They are placed immediately before the onset of the shift.

Less marked falls in pitch can be indicated by using underlining immediately preceding a colon:

S: we (.) really didn't have a lit'v change

Less marked rises in pitch can be indicated using a colon which itself is underlined:

J: I have a red shi:rt,

Underlined fragments indicate speaker emphasis.

Words in capitals mark a section of speech noticeable louder than that surrounding it.

Degree signs are used to indicate that the talk they encompass is spoken noticeably quieter than the surrounding talk.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thought</th>
<th>A 'gh' indicates that the word in which it is placed had a guttural pronunciation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt;&gt;</td>
<td>'More than' and 'less than' signs indicate that the talk they encompass was produced noticeably quicker than the surrounding talk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→</td>
<td>Arrows in the left margin point to specific parts of an extract discussed in the text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h)</td>
<td>A 'h' within parenthesis indicates a particle of laughter that is imbedded within a word.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ (s)</td>
<td>A 's' within a parenthesis indicates a sucking sound.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ (fh)</td>
<td>A 'fh' within parenthesis indicates the onset of what appears to be feigned laughter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ (hf)</td>
<td>A 'hf' within parenthesis indicates the end of a unit of what appears to be feigned laughter.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For example:

S1: WHAT ARE:: YOU (. ) MEN:TAL?

S2: (fh) heh-heh-heh- (hf)

The laughter in this study was "profitably transcribed," which means that the particles of laughter were individually transcribed in order to see how these types of non-speech sounds function in the context of
spoken discourse (Jefferson, 1987). An example of profitable transcription is provided in the following excerpt. We can see that each particle of laughter in lines 154, 156 and 157 were transcribed in order to reveal their placement within the conversation. For instance, in line 155, we can see that "Subject G" was trying to place her utterance about six laughter particles into "Subject B's" string of laughter, consequently overlapping "Subject B's" laughter.

Example #5 [Lee: Christmas Banquet, Data Set #1]

152 G
[THA::T’S

153 FUN:NY (.)

154 B ➔ heh! .hh heh! .hh heh! .hh

155 G LAN:DON::?

156 B ➔ heh! .hh heh! .hh heh! .hh] heh! .hh heh! .hh

157 ➔ heh! .hh

158 G NO::BODY ➔ can see Landon in a gang< (.) why could she (.) "I don’t know"

159 (1.3)

160 ➔ OH THAT’S why my >ba.< back:pack: smelled like a

161 piece of chocolate
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Before we look at the analysis of feigned laughter, it is important to have an understanding of the subjects involved in this study. A total of thirty-one subjects were observed for this study. These subjects were then divided into three groups based on three criteria: whether the subjects are aware of an audience observing them, whether there is a difference in status or social power between speaking participants, and how close the subjects are to each other in terms of their relationship.

The first conversation entitled, "Christmas Banquet" involved two friends: a male teenager and a female teenager conversing informally in the parking lot of Loma Linda Academy, which is a high school where they attended. The subjects were aware that they were being recorded and gave their consent to be recorded.

The second conversation entitled, "The Real World" was taken from the television program "The Real World." This television program involves placing seven people who do not know each other in a home to live together for a length of time in which they are video taped and periodically interviewed. This particular television program was taped by Heather Memory, a fellow graduate student at Cal State San Bernardino. The subjects involved in this taping were
two friends: a young adult female of Hispanic descent, and a young adult male of Cuban descent. They were observed conversing informally in their home in San Francisco.

The third conversation is entitled, "Conundrum." This was an audio-taping of the radio program with Dr. Laura Schlesinger on KFI 640 AM. Data set #3 is the conversation that will be analyzed for the presence of feigned laughter (see Appendix C). The subjects involved in this conversation were the host of the program Dr. Laura, who is a talk show therapist, and the caller, who is a man in his thirties.

The last group of conversations, data sets #7 through 16, consist of three separate video recordings of the television game show, "The Weakest Link." The objective of the game is for the players to work as a team in order to accumulate as much money as possible by answering questions correctly. This game involves a group of eight people who are each asked a question by the host of the show until the time allotted for game play is expired. In each game there are eight rounds, with each round lasting for about one to two minutes. After the end of each round, all of the players must vote to eliminate who they consider to be the weakest player in the round. After the votes
have been counted, it is customary for the host of the show to hurl insulting remarks at the contestants if they performed poorly in each round of the game.

It should also be noted that the contestants are required to stand in front of electronic podiums that are positioned to form a semi-circle on the stage of the game show. The host is positioned in the middle of the semi-circle, and the audience can be observed in the background surrounding the podiums. Although the contestants are positioned facing the host, they can turn their bodies to see the audience if they desire. The conversations in this group were between the participants and the host of the game show. For the purpose of this study, I listened to the conversations that the contestants had with the host of the show to see if they used feigned laughter when the host of the show confronted them with an FTU. I also listened to see when the audience laughed when the FTU was uttered.

An example of audience laughter is provided in the following excerpt. In lines 5 through 7, the game show host, (H), is uttering a FTU, which works to make fun of the contestant's, (B), incorrect answer during the game. Lines 9 through 11, 13, and 15 show the audience laughing at the FTU.
Example #6 [Lee: Weakest Link, Data Set #7]

So: share with us:

this three (. ) foot (. ) wi::de (. ) Fris:bee

Audience \(\rightarrow\) ((Some audience members begin to laugh))

heh-heh[

Audience \(\rightarrow\) ((More join in soon after)) [HA-HA-HA-HA-HA-HA-]

B ((Openly smiles)) [(fh) "hehh" (hf)

Audience \(\rightarrow\) ha-ha-ha-[ha-ha-ha-ha-ha-ha-ha-ha-ha-ha-ha-ha-ha-

B [(fh) "hehhhhh" (hf)

Audience \(\rightarrow\) "ha-ha-ha-ha"

Criteria for Identifying Feigned Laughter

I have identified what I consider to be feigned laughter based on Edmonson's definition of what qualifies laughter to be natural laughter. The qualities that were taken into account when isolating feigned laughter were based on the following: the mild intensity of the laughter, the brief duration of the laugh, and the context in which the laugh was placed. Since I was not able to interview the subjects to see whether their laughter was sincere or not, when applicable, I observed the subject's facial
expressions to see if they quickly reverted to a serious demeanor possibly indicating that their laughter was not sincere. Laughter that I've categorized as feigned are marked within the transcribed excerpts with a (fh), whereas laughter that is spontaneous do not carry such indicator. In all the excerpts, the FTUs and feigned laughter have been marked with arrows to indicate their location in the transcription.

Before I present my analysis, I would like to discuss the different contexts in which feigned laughter was observed. Out of a total of sixteen instances in which feigned laughter was observed, thirteen were observed as a response to a FTU from someone who had a higher status, and three were observed as a response to FTUs from individuals who were equal in status.

Feigned Laughter Versus Sincere Laughter

Although the differences between feigned and real laughter may be difficult to distinguish at times, this section will reveal for the most part some of the key features that differentiate these mutually exclusive forms of laughter. In order for us to determine whether a recipient of a FTU is using feigned or sincere laughter, we
should have some knowledge of the participants: their personalities, their relationship with each other, their level of social status in relation to each other, as well as their age. With these factors in mind, we can determine if the recipient is laughing sincerely at a FTU, which can be depicted with the recipients smiling and showing signs of agreement, such as lightly nodding their heads, their bodies shake lightly as they produce their sting of laughter, and they appear pleasant after their sting of laughter has ended. It should also be noted that sincere laughter is usually used as a reflex to a humorous stimulus. Feigned laughter on the other hand can be depicted with the recipient usually uttering a short string of soft aspirations ((fh) hehhhh .hhhhh "hehh" (hf)), which is quickly followed with the recipient reverting to a serious demeanor.

The use of sincere laughter is depicted in the following example, which was taken from the game show "Weakest Link" (see Appendix D, Data Set #6). In lines 14 and 15, we can see the contestant, (T), laughing to a FTU that was directed to her by the host of the show, (H), in lines 8 and 9. "T's" laughter qualifies as being sincere
because it is long in duration, and she continues to show signs of amusement by smiling and laughing softly.

Example #7 [Lee: Weakest Link, Data Set #6]

3 HE was not the worst \textsuperscript{laughter}

4 (4.5) (During this time the host looks around at the different contestants.

5 After (1.6) seconds, the audience begins to laugh))

8 H \textrightarrow ((The host finally looks at Terri)) WAS he

9 \textrightarrow Terri?

10 (.2)

11 T \textrightarrow HE WA[S \textsuperscript{intonation}] ((Mild rise and fall in

12 [ intonation])

13 [HA-HA-ha-ha-ha-[ha-ha

14 T \textrightarrow [HEE-HEE-°hee-hee-hee-

15 °hee-°

16 ((Contestant remains smiling))

On the other hand, the following example, which was also taken from the game show "Weakest Link," clearly depicts the use of feigned laughter. The contestant, (B), utters a softly aspirated laugh particle, "(fh) °hehhh° (hf)" in line 24, and a soft string of laugh particles in
line 28, as a response to a FTU that was directed at him by
the host of the show, (H). "B's" laugh utterances can be
classified as feigned because they were very brief in
duration, they were very softly produced, and the recipient
quickly reverted to a serious demeanor shortly after
completion of his string of laughter.

Example #8 [Lee: Weakest Link, Data Set #10]

22 H = do you explain: to your cli:ents (.)
23 their problems: as simply [as ]you've just[ ]
24 B \[(fh) "hehhh" (hf)]
25 H expla:ined [your[ ]
26 Audience ["heh-heh" HA-HA-Ha-Ha-
27 H [vote (.).] for Terri[ ]
28 B \[((fh) "hee-hee-heehhh" (hf))(Laughs very
29 softly as he bends forward for a moment))
30 Audience ((Continued laughter)) ha-[ha-ha-ha-ha-
31 B ((Serious demeanor)) [I HAVE no
32 clients:

Another key feature that can distinguish feigned from
sincere laughter is the difference between laughter
particles. In sincere laughter, the particles of laughter
are usually consistent in their production (Edmonson,
1987). An example of this is in the following excerpt. In lines 16 and 17, the particles of laughter are consistent in production, in that the string of laughter is composed of a long series on "HA-HAs."

Example #9 [Lee: Weakest Link, Data Set #16]

16 Audience: (Continued laughter) HA-HA-HA-HA-HA-

17 HA-[HA-HA-HA-HA-HA-HA-[Ha-ha-ha-ha-ha- = [ [tha:nsks]

18 Heidi with three votes you ARE the weakest hhhhh

19 H link >\small{\textit{good-by}}<

Feigned laughter on the other hand can vary in its pattern of production. The following excerpt shows how feigned laughter differs from sincere laughter. In lines 20 and 21, we can see how feigned laughter is irregular in the stretching of laughter particles. Line 24 also shows how feigned laughter incorporates a variety of different aspirated laugh particles in the string of laughter, "(fh) HAH Hah HUH .HHhhhup (hf)." These two examples of feigned laughter are different than the particles of sincere laughter that are depicted in lines 17 and 18. Laughter in these lines are shown to have a more consistent pattern, "HAH-HAH," and do not show signs of variation.
Example #10 [Lee: Weakest Link, Data Set #13]

17 Audience → HAH-[HAH-HAH-HAH-HAH-HAH-HAH-HAH-HAH-HAH-HAH-HAH-HAH-HAH-HAH-HAH-HAH-

18 [HAH-]

19 E [((Soft laughter commenced by a strong)

20 → exhalation)) (fh) "HHHhhheee-heeee-heeee-hee

21 → .hhhhh" (hf)

22 Audience [HAH-HAH-HAH-hah-hah-hah-

23 E [YOU DON'T KNOW HOW TRUE:: ↑THAT IS:: (.)

24 → (fh) HAH Hah HUH .HHhhhup (hf) ((Quickly

25 shifts from a laughing demeanor to one of a

26 more serious nature))

Criteria for Identifying Teases

Many of the potentially face-threatening remarks made in these samples qualify as teases because they follow the guidelines as specified by Bateson, Goffman, Glenn, Knapp and Drew. In my data, I looked for the following aspects in order to determine whether a FTU could be classified as a tease. In order for a FTU to qualify as a tease, it must exhibit at least one of the following: the FTU is not meant to be taken seriously, a FTU is based on a blunder, or a prior utterance produced by the recipient of the FTU, and
the FTU is produced during a play frame (Armstrong, 1993; Drew, 1987).
In this chapter, I will describe the results of the analysis of my data for the presence of recipient feigned laughter in the context of face-threatening-utterances (FTUs). The analysis will show which criteria of feigned laughter were exhibited by the subjects observed, the placement of the feigned laughter, as well as the conditions that were necessary to invoke the production of feigned laughter. Factors that I will also take into account are the relationship between the participants, the status between the subjects, and the presence of an observable audience, such as that of a game or TV show. All of the above data helps to determine whether certain features can be said about feigned laughter that are different from spontaneous laughter.

Table 1 shows the length in minutes of each conversation. The shortest conversation is from data set #11, which lasts for approximately nine seconds. The total time of all interactions is fourteen minutes and three seconds.
Table 1. Length of Conversations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Set</th>
<th>Data Set</th>
<th>Data Set</th>
<th>Data Set</th>
<th>Data Set</th>
<th>Data Set</th>
<th>Data Set</th>
<th>Data Set</th>
<th>Data Set</th>
<th>Data Set</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>#2</td>
<td>#3</td>
<td>#4</td>
<td>#7</td>
<td>#8</td>
<td>#9</td>
<td>#10</td>
<td>#11</td>
<td>#13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00</td>
<td>0:26</td>
<td>0:26</td>
<td>4:31</td>
<td>0:10</td>
<td>0:20</td>
<td>0:16</td>
<td>0:24</td>
<td>0:21</td>
<td>0:09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Set</th>
<th>Data Set</th>
<th>Data Set</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#14</td>
<td>#15</td>
<td>#16</td>
<td>0:15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 below shows the results of the use of feigned laughter in the contexts of different FTUs as defined by Brown and Levinson (1987).

Table 2. Use of Feigned Laughter in Contexts that Threaten the Positive and Negative Face of the Recipient

Key: Male = M
Female = F

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utterances Threatening Negative Face:</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Group C</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summons</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utterances Threatening Positive Face:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criticism</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridicule</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raise Divisive Topic</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total of Male and Female Responses to FTUs</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
groups. The first group, Group A, is composed of subjects who are equal in status and are close in their relationship with each other. This group consists of three conversations. Data sets #1 and #2 are taken from the conversation entitled "Christmas Banquet," and data set #3 is taken from the conversation entitled "The Real World." The data sets have been analyzed for the presence of feigned laughter (see Appendix A and B).

The second group, Group B, is composed of subjects who are not equal in social status or power, and are not close in their relationship with each other. This group consists of data set #4, which was taken from the conversation entitled, "Conundrum," as well as three separate video recordings of the television game show, "The Weakest Link." From the game show, data sets #10, 12, and 15 will be analyzed for the use of feigned laughter (see Appendix B for the ages of the contestants).

The third group, Group C, is also composed of subjects who are not equal in social status or power, and are not close in their relationship to each other. However, the difference between Group B and Group C is that the subjects in this group laugh after an observable audience laughs. Group C consists of conversations from the television
program "Weakest Link." The data sets analyzed in this
group are #7, 8, 9, 11, 13, 14, and 16. They were analyzed
to see if the contestants involved used feigned laughter
after the audience began to laugh.

For this study, the different types of FTUs were
divided into two groups: utterances that threaten the
negative face of the FTU recipient, and utterances that
threaten the positive face of the FTU recipient. In my
analysis, I looked for utterances that threaten the
negative face of the recipient such as requests, orders and
summons (Brown & Levinson, 1987). I also looked for
utterances that threaten the positive face of the
recipient, which include criticism, ridicule, challenges,
accusations and raising divisive topics (Brown & Levinson,
1987). Examples of these two categories of FTUs that
threaten the negative face of the recipient are as follows:

The first group that will be discussed is acts that
threaten the negative face of the recipient. The three
types of FTUs that were observed in the transcribed data
were requests, orders and summons.

Requests and orders are similar in their intent in
that they indicate that the speaker wants the recipient to
do or refrain from doing some action (Brown & Levinson,
The following example illustrates how requests are used in spoken discourse. In line 1, "Subject H" is shown asking "Subject B" to tell her what his occupation is.

[Lee: Weakest Link, Data Set #7]

1  H  ➔Brian what? do you do
2   (.3)
3  B  I'm an accountant.

The following is an example of how orders are used. In line 238, "Subject G" tells "Subject B" to pick up her watch after "Subject B" accidentally dropped it on the ground. The direct nature of "Subject G's" utterance qualifies it as an order.

[Lee: Christmas Banquet, Data Set #1]

229  B  taking off your watch (though)
230   (.3)
231  G  does it FIT YOU?
232   (1)
233  B  uh huh!
234   (.6)
235  G  >"oh [yeah (.) (you're just a] natural<]
236  B  [apparently so]
237   (1.4)
The next type of utterance that threatens negative face are summons. Although not explicitly categorized by Brown and Levinson (1987), I have categorized the act of summoning as one that threatens the negative face of recipients since it has the potential to impede on their desire to be left alone. An example of this type of act is as follows. In line 1, "Subject H" is shown addressing "Subject E" by calling out her name. In line 3, "Subject E" seems reluctant to respond to the summons.

[Lee: Weakest Link, Data Set #15]

1 H ➔ E:LENA
2 (v4)
3 E ((Looks worried)) yes

The second group that will be discussed is acts that threaten the positive face of the recipient. The types of FTUs that were found in the transcribed data were criticisms, ridicules, challenges, accusations, and the raising of divisive topics.
Criticisms, ridicules, and accusations are similar in that they indicate that the speaker doesn't like or want one or more of the recipient's wants, acts, personal characteristics, goods, beliefs or values (Brown & Levinson, 1987). The following example illustrates how criticisms are used in spoken discourse. In line 27, "Subject B" is shown reprimanding "Subject G" for making a joke at another person's expense (lines 24 & 25). "Subject B's" utterance qualifies as criticism, since it shows the speaker's disapproval of the recipient's actions.

[Lee: Christmas Banquet, Data Set #2]

24  G (Hard) and John wanted to sit on ↑PA::M'S
25   L(h)A(h)P(h) "hum-.hh hum-"  
26  (.2)  
27  B →you're so mean:

The next extract indicates how ridicule is used. In line 13, Pedro is shown humorously labeling his friend, Rachael, as "a brat." This example qualifies as ridicule since it not only shows the speaker's negative evaluation of the recipient, but the content of the utterance is not meant to be taken seriously.
[Memory: The Real World, Data Set #3]

10 uhh-heh-heh .hh (.) treating me likuh (.)
11 (I'm a bratty) sister Uh-huh-huh-huh
12 (1.4)
13 Pedro \( \rightarrow \) You are a brat

The next extract shows how accusation can be used in discourse. In line 18, "Subject H" is shown charging "Subject A" with an action that she previously denied doing in line 16. "Subject H's" utterance can be categorized as an accusation since it not only goes against the wants of the recipient thereof, but in a sense places blame or responsibility of an action on the recipient.

[Lee: Weakest Link, Data Set #9]

13 H getting rid of the other women on the te:::am
14 A:manda?
15 (1)
16 A ((Casually shaking her head)) No::: not
17 (.2)
18 H \( \rightarrow \) YES::: you \( \uparrow \)Are:::

The next type of positive FTU that threatens the face wants of the recipient is the act of challenging. According to Brown and Levinson (1987), challenges indicate
that the speaker thinks that the recipient is "wrong or misguided or unreasonable about some issue."

The following example illustrates how challenges are used in spoken discourse. In lines 27 and 29, "Subject L" is shown going against "Subject R's" response in line 26. "Subject L's" utterance can be classified as a challenge since it works to question the recipient's belief, thereby marking the recipient as misguided or wrong on a certain point or issue.

[Lee: Conundrum, Data Set #4]

23 L (well) lived with her parents because?
24 R u:::m
25 (.7)
26 you know I really don't know I guess =
27 L ➔ ((high pitched tone)) hh >YOU DON'T< KNOW: (.)
28 R purity for her (.) huh (.)
29 L ➔ you don't know?: (.)

The final type of positive FTU that was observed in the data was the occurrence of raising divisive topics. The raising of divisive topics such as politics, race, religion, and women's liberation is a way for the speaker to generate a potentially face-threatening environment for
the recipient since the recipient may not feel comfortable talking about certain controversial issues (Brown & Levinson, 1987). The following extract exemplifies the raising of a divisive topic. In line 6, "Subject H" is shown asking "Subject S" if she uses drugs. This utterance qualifies as a divisive topic since drug such as recreational drug use is a tabooed subject in American culture.

[Lee: Weakest Link, Data Set #8]

3 H what do you do: :?
4 S I'm a pharmaceutical consultant
5 (.7)
6 ⇒H ⇒so you're on drugs yourself: f? =

In terms of utterances that threaten the negative face of the recipient, requests were the most prevalent type of FTU, since it was observed eleven percent of the time. It should be noted that only the male FTU recipients responded to this type of FTU with feigned laughter. In terms of utterances that threaten the positive face of the recipient, ridicule was the most prevalent type of FTU since it was observed fifty-one percent of the time.
Out of a total of nineteen instances where feigned laughter was identified, females used feigned laughter sixty-three percent, and males used feigned laughter thirty-six percent. In these data, females had a greater propensity for feigned laughter than did males.

For the purpose of this study, the age groups of the participants will now be noted. In Group A, the subjects were between the ages of ten and twenty. In Group B, the subjects were between the ages of thirty and fifty, and in Group C, the subjects were between the ages of twenty and thirty with the exception of the contestant in data set #11, who was eighteen years of age.

Table 3 shows the results of the different places in which feigned laughter can occur.

Table 3. Place of Recipient Feigned Laughter in Contexts that Threaten the Positive or Negative Face of the Recipient

Key: Recipient of FTU agrees with the claim made in the FTU = Agr
Recipient of the FTU disagrees or rejects the claim made in the FTU = Dis
Recipient of the FTU does not respond to the FTU = No
Not Applicable = N/A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Feigned Laughter</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Group C</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agr</td>
<td>Dis</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Agr</td>
<td>Dis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Before completion of a FTU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>After surrounding audience laughs</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After speaker laughs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediately after a FTU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After a pause of (.1) seconds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After a pause of (.2) seconds or greater</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Number of Responses: 7 12

In situations where there wasn't an audience, or the audience did not laugh at the FTU, such as in Groups A and B, recipients of FTUs were usually prompted to laugh by the speaker. However, in situations where an audience laughed at the FTU such as in Group C, recipients can be shown to implement feigned laughter more than (.2) seconds after the audience starts to laugh.

It is important to note that the majority of recipients who responded to the FTU with feigned laughter after the audience started to laugh, did not express agreement or disagreement with the claim made in the FTU. On the other hand, in situations where there wasn't laughter from the audience, the recipients were more
inclined to openly agree with the claim made in the FTU. In situations where there wasn't an observable audience, we can see that all of the subjects went along with the FTU by openly agreeing with its claim.

Overall, the data shows that the majority of FTU recipients prefer not to reject or agree with the claim made in the FTU, especially if the FTU was given in the form of ridicule. We can also see that FTU recipients do not disagree with the claims made in the FTUs if feigned laughter is used. The data also show that FTU recipients usually use feigned laughter if an observable audience prompts them to do so. This can indicate that FTU recipients may not find an FTU to be humorous, but that they use feigned laughter as a strategy to establish social cohesion by being one with the group or merely responding to a command (Giles & Oxford, 1970).

The results of this analysis show that feigned laughter is a common response to FTUs, such as teasing. It is important to note that even though recipients may laugh at a FTU it does not automatically mean that they perceive the utterance to be humorous. This can be seen in that sixty-three percent of the recipients did not show disagreement or agreement with the claim made in the FTU.
The data also show that recipients use feigned laughter sixteen percent more when they are prompted to laugh by others, such as with an audience. The evidence shown here supports Giles and Oxford's (1970) discussion of social laughter in that individuals in a group may laugh at a situation or something being said not because they find it humorous, but because laughter is expected by those around them.

The findings also show that feigned laughter is frequently used with FTUs that come in the form of ridicule. This indicates that the use of ridicule may not give the recipient an opportunity to counteract the negative claim stated in the FTU, thereby the use of feigned laughter may be the only response appropriate for these types of situations.
CHAPTER FIVE
DISCUSSION

In this section, excerpts from the transcribed data will be analyzed in order to identify the functions of feigned laughter in the contexts of face-threatening-utterances (FTUs).

Feigned Laughter in the Pursuit of Intimacy

The first group we will look at is "Group A," which consists of Data Sets #1 to #3 (see Appendix A and B). This group is composed of subjects who are equal in status and are close in their relationship with each other. We will now look at three extracts taken from these data to see how feigned laughter is used in situations that involve FTUs.

The following excerpts are taken from the transcript entitled, "Christmas Banquet." In the following extracts, (1) and (2), I will demonstrate how feigned laughter works in situations that involve two individuals who already have a close relationship with each other.

In extract (1), illustrates how feigned laughter can be used in situations involving requests that are face-threatening in nature.
(Extract 1) [Lee: Christmas Banquet, Data Set #1]

90  B  ➔ [Yu, >you. you should you should get some uh]

91  ➔ friends frm: uh: like La::ndon tu::h(h) go(h)

92  ➔ with(h) you(h) .hh te(h) llin’ you(h) what(h)

93  ➔ looks good on(h) you(h) .hh hh =

94  G  = Landon DID tell me what looks good on me an’ he

95  ➔ was >very very helpful< ((Stern Tone)) BUT THAT’S

96  ➔ NOT THE POINT (.) DON’T TALK ABOUT MY GAY

97  ➔ FRIENDS: OKAY::?

98    hh [heh-heh

99  B  ➔ [ (fh) heh-heh-heh-heh- (hf)

100     (1.2)

101  G  ➔ he [is< HE: IS: GAY!

102  B  ➔ [keh! heh-heh-heh-heh-heh!

In extract (1), "Subject B" is depicted constructing a tease targeting "Subject G’s" association with homosexuals. In line 90, "Subject B’s" stutter of the word "you," shows his uncertainty in the construction of his utterance. The particles of laughter that are embedded in his speech as he completes his utterance (lines 91-93) also serve to undermine the importance of what he is saying, hence acts as an indication that he is constructing a tease. The
tease serves to make fun of "Subject G’s" homosexual friend by illustrating her friend’s taste in attire.

"Subject G" latches her utterance to the end of "Subject B’s" statement (line 94) in which she responds in a “po-faced,” or serious manner. She then proceeds to downplay "Subject B’s" utterance by seeming to go along with the tease, which resembles Drew’s (1987) fourth type of response, but it is without the element of laughter. However, in lines 95 and 97, "Subject G" immediately constructs what seems at first to be a bald-on record, or direct statement, requesting that "Subject B" deter from constructing any more insults against her "homosexual" friends. The serious nature of the statement is quickly mitigated by "Subject G's" laughter at the end of the utterance in line 98. "Subject B" is shown acknowledging "Subject G's" utterance as a tease in that there is an overlap of laughter, which is first initiated by "Subject G." Jefferson (1987) notes that laughter that is initiated by the interlocutor can incite a "laughing-together," with the co-participant joining in.

"Subject B's" laughter in line 99 can be identified as feigned laughter in that it is not only short and abrupt, but it is triggered and terminated by "Subject G's"
laughter. This is clearly shown in the particles of laughter that begin almost immediately after "Subject G" begins her laugh utterance and stop shortly after "Subject G's" laughter is completed (line 98). This example shows that "Subject B" is in control of his "laugh utterance" and feigned the laughter as a way to mitigate "Subject G's" bald-on utterance. In Drew's (1987) study on teasing, he found that recipients of teases laugh at teases in order to show that they understood that an utterance was not intended to be taken seriously. This concept can also apply to "Subject B's" laughter, since it shows that he wanted "Subject G" to understand that he understood her utterance as not being serious.

The use of positive politeness can be depicted in "Subject G's" laugh sequence in its attempt to reinstate group solidarity by finding some common ground to laugh at; in this case it is the topic of homosexuality. It is important to note the (1.2) second pause in line 100, since in this particular case it serves to establish "Subject G's" response not only as a tease to "Subject B," but as a joke constructed around her homosexual friend Landon. Pregnant pauses, or pauses that are long enough to create tension in conversations such as the one in this example,
are used in order to allow the statement that is uttered to "sink in," or be fully understood by participants (Mendoza-Denton, 1995). In this case, "homosexuality" being the object of humor is intensified, and can be depicted in "Subject G's" utterance in line 101, ">he [is< HE: IS: GAY!"

Extract (2) shows how feigned laughter can be used as a response to the face-threatening act of criticism.

(Extract 2) [Lee: Christmas Banquet, Data Set #2]

1 B >Yeah if anything< I'm gonna' go get uh::: myself
2 a Lincoln hh
3 (.8)
4 "heh-heh-"°
5 (.5)
6 G ew(h):(h):(h) DON'T say [Lincoln >in front of me<
    [.hh heh:::
7 B >just been talk:ing about<]
     ]
8 G heh-heh-heh-
    ]
9 B PA::M [an(h)d th(h)e pro(h)blem(h) with(h)
     [
10 G [huh-heh-heh
11 B that(h) [car(h)::
      [
12 13 B [.hhh
In this extract, "Subject B" can be depicted trying to establish a "play frame" by inserting a brief laugh sequence (line 4) at the end of his utterance in line 1 (Bateson, 1956 & 1972). This is important since it works
to signal that what he is saying is not serious and that it is an invitation for "Subject G" to engage in play. In lines 6 through 21, both participants can be observed maintaining their frame of play through joking and laughing.

In lines 22 through 25, "Subject G" is seen making a humorous remark containing sexual undertones about the behavior of three people she knows. Line 22 shows her constructing a joking utterance in her use of exaggerated inflection in the phrase, ">\text{YES}: - I'm sure Chris\text{<...}.hh." In lines 24 and 25, she continues her turn-at-talk in which she lists two more people who want to sit on the lap of an individual named Pam. In this utterance, "Subject G" implies that the three people Chris, Hard, and John, desire to have a "sexual encounter" with Pam and hence negatively labels them as having perverse tendencies.

In line 27, "Subject B" responds to her joke in which he says, "you're so mean." Although this utterance is bald-on and face threatening, since it directly criticizes "Subject G" of being insensitive of others, it can also be characterized as a tease in that it is implemented within the confines of the play frame. It should be noted that
the teaser does not indicate that his utterance is a tease by laughing or changing the inflection of his voice when he says the negative utterance, but the teasee still responds to the FTU by going along or agreeing with its negative implications. She does this by imbedding laughter particles in her utterance when she says, "You thin:::kuh hh huh .hh "huhh- .hh huh .hh°" (lines 29 & 30). Although her utterance contains laughter particles, the particles can be perceived as feigned since they are weak in intensity, and it could be observed that she quickly reverted to a more serious deposition after completing her utterance (lines 30 & 31).

The laughter used in this sample shows that even though a FTU may not have contained elements that signaled a tease, such as the use of laughter particles, grossly exaggerated claims, or inflected intonations, it is still up to the recipient of a tease to give the final say whether to treat an utterance as a tease or not (Drew, 1987; LeBlanc III, 1998). In other words, feigned laughter can be used as a self-preserving strategy to transform a seemingly serious FTU into a tease by mitigating the seriousness thereof.
The following extract was collected from the television program, "The Real World." In this conversation, two characters from the show, Rachel, (R) and Pedro, (P), are conversing in a friendly manner about how they think that Rachel is a brat. This extract is an example of how feigned laughter can be used as a response to ridicule.

(Extract 3) [Memory: The Real World, Data Set #3]

10 uhh-heh-heh .hh (. ) treating me likuh (. )
11 (I'm a bratty) sister Uh-huh-huh-huh
12 (1.4)
13 Pedro You are a brat
14 (1.2)
15 Rachel I: know
16 (.4)
17 Pedro ➔> .hhh OH: .hh OH:: .hh OH::: you
18 ➔ADMITTED IT .hhkh .hhkh .hhkh
19 Rachel ➔ [ (fh) hehhh (hf) I'm out of the stage of
20 denial Hah-hah-hah-hah

In line 10, Rachel is shown laughing at how Pedro treats her like a "bratty sister" by not responding to her when she is talking to him. The laughter in the beginning
of the conversation is of particular importance, because it shows that the participants are displaying a friendly disposition, or one that promotes social cohesion. A friendly disposition can dictate how laughter will be perceived: either as a means to create group solidarity, or used to create tension through mockery.

Pedro takes his turn-at-talk in line 13 by saying, "You are a brat." This utterance is bald-on and face threatening, since it ridicules the recipient by labeling her as someone who is spoiled, irresponsible and childish. However, this utterance can be classified as a tease, since it was used in a joking manner and was not intended to offend the recipient.

After another pregnant pause, which lasts for (1.2) seconds (line 14), Rachel responds by agreeing with the tease. This is an example of Drew's (1987) fourth response to teasing in which a recipient of a tease goes along with the tease instead of attempting to reject the negative implications associated with it. In line 16, a TRP is indicated by a (.4) pause, which acts as an indicator for Pedro to take his turn-at-talk. This causes him to "hoot" and laugh at her response (line 17) in which he exclaims ">hhh. OH: .hh OH:: .hh OH::: you AD[MITTED IT .hhkh .hhkh
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hhkh." His excitement supports the claim that his FTU was indeed a tease, since he did not anticipate that the speaker would agree with his utterance and was uttered at the spur of the moment.

An overlap can be observed to occur in the middle of Pedro’s turn construction unit, in which Rachel begins to laugh feignedly. Her utterance in line 19, which states “[(fh) hehhh (hf) I’m out of the stage of denial Hah-hah-hah-hah-],” supports the concept of accepting the tease, in which case she does not seem to take the tease offensively, but acts to humor Pedro thereby saving his face at her expense.

Feigned Laughter in the Pursuit of Social Cohesion in Situations Involving Participants of Unequal Status

The second group we will look at is "Group B," which consists of Data Sets #4, 10, 12, and 15 (see Appendix C & D). It is composed of subjects who are not equal in social status or power, and are not close in their relationship to each other. We will now look at extracts taken from three of these data sets to see how feigned laughter was used in situations that involved FTUs.

The following extracts, (4) and (5) were taken from the transcript entitled, "Conundrum." The subjects
involved were Dr. Laura Schlesinger, (L), and a male caller, (R). In the following, I will demonstrate how feigned laughter works in situations where there is an imbalance in status. The following are examples of institutional discourse where the host plays a specific role in which she directs the conversation by asking the caller questions about himself. Extracts (4) and (5) also illustrate how feigned laughter works in situations that involve ridicule.

In this extract, Dr. Laura directly threatens the caller's face by challenging his unwillingness to divulge information.

(Extract 4) [Lee: Conundrum, Data Set #4]

23  L  (well) lived with her parents because? (.)
24  R  u:::m
25  (.7)
26  you know I really don't know I guess =
27  L  >(high pitched tone)) hh >YOU DON'T< KNOW: (.)
28  R  purity for her (.) huh (.)
29  L  >you don't know?: (.)
30  R  >(fh) °ah heh° (hf) =
31  L  = I know what part of your problem is already?
In this extract, the therapist is trying to get the caller to realize why he married the type of individual he did. In line 23, the therapist takes her turn-at-talk in which she asks a conditionally relevant utterance (CRU), or an utterance that requires a response, by saying, "(well) lived with her parents because?" (Hutchby & Woffitt, 1998). The caller immediately utters a stretched minimal response, "u:::m" (line 24). This utterance combined with the proceeding pause of (.7) seconds (line 25) can be seen as his attempt to "buy more time" to make a response. In line 26, the caller completes the CRU by saying, "you know I really don't know I guess =.

Immediately after completing the utterance, the therapist latches her utterance to the end of the caller's by saying, "= ((high pitched tone)) hh >YOU DON'T< KNOW: (.)" (line 27). This shows that the therapist is closely monitoring the caller's utterance. Even though the caller tries to give a possible explanation for why he believes his wife stayed at home until she was thirty (see Appendix B), the therapist disregards his answer by repeating her previous utterance, "you don't know:?" (line 29). It should be noted that although this utterance is not as forceful as the preceding utterance, it still contains
face-threatening elements since it questions the caller's answer as suspect.

In line 30, the caller can be heard laughing, which seems to indicate that he decided to "go along with the tease," or FTU (Drew, 1987). This laughter can be classified as feigned since it is soft and brief in nature, which indicates that the caller may be nervous about being interrogated, or that he is uncertain of what to say next. The caller's laughter may also be an attempt to end the FTU by indicating that he has nothing more to say.

The following extract is a continuation of extract (4) in which the therapist is trying to help the caller to understand the root of why he is not content with his marriage.

(Extract 5) [Lee: Conundrum, Data Set #4]

35 L = she lives with her parents for security (.) so
36 you got a little girl and she came to your house
37 and continues to be a little girl?
38 (.3)
39 R right (.)
40 L ➔sur<PRI:::::::SE↑
41 (1)
42 R  →yea (. ) (fh) huh huh (hf) [(unclear)]
43 L  [so (. ) tell me about your state of mind]

In lines 35 through 37, the therapist tells the caller a possible explanation for his dilemma. After a (.3) second pause (line 38), the caller takes his turn-at-talk by saying, "right" (line 39). Almost immediately after his utterance is completed, the therapist utters, ">sur<PRI:::::SE↑" (line 40). This utterance can be classified as a FTU since its function is to get the caller to realize that the answer to his problem is obvious, thereby labeling him as incompetent. The raised inflection and stretching of the word "surprise" works not only to intensify the word, but gives it a "mocking quality."

After a (1) second pause (line 41), the caller once again takes his turn at talk in which he utters "yea," which is followed by a brief string of laughter. This shows that the caller has decided to "go along with the tease" (Drew, 1987). The laughter in this case can be classified as feigned since it is brief, and does not seem to be as a result of a humorous stimulus. The laughter also seems to be implemented as a face saving strategy,
which tries to mitigate the negative implications of the
FTU.

The following extract was taken from the television
game show "Weakest Link." In this extract, the host of the
show, (H), teased the contestant, Elena, (E), about the how
poorly she played in the game. This extract illustrates
how feigned laughter is used in situations that involve
criticism.

(Extract 6) [Lee: Weakest Link; Data Set #12]

1  H     1°did you think°< he was the weakest link
2     (.2)
3  Da    ↑I did↓ ((Raised eyebrows))
4     (1.3)
5  H     ➔HE: WA:::SN'T the wea:kest link
6  ➔sta:tis:tical:ly (.) ➔WAS HE::
7     (.5)
8  ➔e:le:na
9     (.2)
10 E    ➔("n::I") ➔I ➔GUESS ➔NOT< (fh) .hhh
11  ➔"hheh heh" (hf) ((Eyes wide open and quickly
12 shif ting as if looking around the room. She
13 has a Cheshire cat smile))
In line 1, the host presents a CRU to the contestant, David, to see if he thought the contestant, Brian, was the "weakest link" or the worst player in the game. After a (.2) second pause (line 2), David takes his turn-at-talk in which he responds by saying, "I did" (line 3). His rise in intonation at the end of his utterance works to emphasize his affirmation to his answer.

After David completes the CRU, he gives up his turn-at-talk. This is indicated by the (1.3) second pause in line 4. This pause allows the host to regain control of the conversation, in which she asks a tag question, "Wasn't the weakest link statistically?" (lines 5-8). The question was constructed in such a way that it directly targeted the contestant, Elena, and it required her give a response. This sequential process of conversing in which two people take turns talking is known as an adjacency pair (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998). This utterance can be perceived as a tease, since it contains elements of raised intonation and
an exaggeration of many of the words in the utterance, which indicates that it should not be understood as being malicious, but was constructed to perpetuate the frame of play (Glenn & Knapp, 1987).

The intention of this type of tease is to reveal and criticize the person responsible for an action, desired or undesired, without directly accusing them of the action. Hence, the awareness of pragmatic and cultural cues are necessary in order to interpret the meaning behind this type of utterance. In this case, the tease was constructed in order to point out the person responsible for being the weakest link in the game (lines 6-8).

After the (.2) second pause in line 9, Elena takes her turn-at-talk in which she "goes along with the tease," by saying, "("n::I°) >I ↑GUESS ↓NOT< (fh) .hhh "hheh heh" (hf)" (lines 10 & 11). The stretching of her utterance "("n::I°)" was an indication that she was nervous. This is supported by her acceleration of speech in her next utterance ">I ↑GUESS ↓NOT<" (line 10). She then proceeds to produce a soft and brief string of what can be identified as feigned laughter (lines 10 & 11). Since the host did not laugh or show any signs of teasing when she uttered the FTU, the
contestant seems to produce the feigned laughter in order to mitigate the negative implications of the FTU.

Feigned Laughter in the Pursuit of Social Cohesion in Situations Involving Audience Participation

The third group, (Group C), consists of data sets #7, 8, 9, 11, 13, 14, and 16. This group is composed of subjects who are not equal in social status or power, and are not close in their relationship to each other (see Appendix D). Another factor that was taken into consideration when analyzing this group was that the speaking participants were observed by an open audience, which means that they could see and hear people around them who were not involved in their conversation. I've selected six of the ten data sets to analyze for this study in order to give a general understanding of how feigned laughter is used in this particular type of context involving FTUs.

The following extracts were taken from the television game show, "Weakest Link." These extracts were analyzed in order to see how feigned laughter is used in teasing situations in which there is a large group of people.
In this extract, the host, (H), used divisive topics
to tease the contestant, Shannon, (S), about her
occupation.

(Extract 7) [Lee: Weakest Link, Date Set #8]

1 H Shannon
2 (1.6)
3 what do you do::?
4 S I'm a pharmaceutical consultant
5 (.7)
6 H so you're on drugs yourself? =
7 Audience = ((Loud laughter)) HAH-
8 HAH-[HAH-HAH-HAH-HAh-Hah-
9 S [(fh) °.HHh
10 Audience hah-hah-°hah]-
11 S }((Sustained open smile)) Hehhhhhh° (hf)]
12 Audience hah-hah-hah-[hah-hah-hah°
13 H [you don't like Fred =
14 S }((Reverting to a serious demeanor)) OH; I
15 like Fred

In extract (7), the host leads up to her construction
of a tease by first summoning the contestant, Shannon, in
line 1 in which she says, "Shannon." Although Shannon
could have responded to the summons, she ultimately does not respond. After the host waits for (1.6) seconds for Shannon's reply (line 2), in line 3 the host once again attempts to get a response from Shannon by implementing a CRU in which she asks her what she does for a living. In line 4, Shannon replies by saying, "I'm a pharmaceutical consultant." In the next sentence the (.7) seconds pause is a place where the host is thinking of her next utterance (line 5). The pause can also be seen as a strategy that the host uses in order to generate tension in the audience.

In line 6, the host responds by asking her a question that is divisive in nature, "so you're on drugs yourself?" The question is divisive, since it works to undermine the recipient's credibility as being a drug addict. However, this utterance can also be interpreted as a tease primarily because of three factors. First, the utterance carries a potentially negative label of someone who is a drug addict. Secondly, it creates a play on concepts by associating someone who prescribes drugs with someone who uses drugs. This association is so extreme in nature that it can avoid being taken seriously (Armstrong, 1993). Third, the potentially face-threatening utterance was implemented in a
TV game show in which the comments and remarks made by the host of the show were not meant to be taken seriously.

Even though the host did not laugh when uttering her FTU, the audience in the show apparently understood the humorous aspect of her response. This is depicted in their string of laughter in lines 7 and 8. In line 9, Shannon can be depicted "going along with the tease" in which she constructs a string of laughter as well (Drew, 1987). Her laughter can be interpreted as being feigned, or insincere, since it lacks the intensity of natural laughter, and is brief in nature. Since her laughter is produced shortly after the audience begins laughing, it can indicate that she did not perceive the "tease" as being humorous, but she still went along with the tease by proceeding to laugh in order to establish group solidarity with the audience.

In extract (8), the host (H) ridicules the contestant, Amanda (A), about her inability to differentiate between the rock group U2 and the mountain K2.

(Extract 8) [Lee: Weakest Link, Data Set #9]

1 H         A::MAN::da
2            (.3)
3        ⇒U::2 (. ) K::2
In this extract, the host leads up to her tease construction by first acknowledging the contestant, Amanda, by saying, "A:MAN:da" (line 1). After a brief (.3) pause in speech (line 2), she says, "U::2 (. ) K::2 (. ) A[LL:: THE SAME to AMANDA=" (lines 3 & 4). This utterance can be identified as a tease since it follows one of Glenn and Knapp's (1987) criteria for play: exaggeration. This phenomenon occurs when the host not only raised her tone of voice but stretched out her utterances "U::2, K::2," and the word "ALL:::" in order to ridicule Amanda's incompetence for getting an answer wrong during the game.

Even though the host did not laugh during her utterance, it should be noted that before her utterance was finished, some audience members already recognized the
host's response as a humorous tease, hence mild laughter can be heard in the background. However, it isn't until the host's utterance is completed that the rest of the audience joins in laughter by latching their laughter to the end of her utterance. In lines 9 and 11, Amanda can be depicted "going along with tease" by overlapping her laughter right after the laughter produced by the audience (Drew, 1987). Amanda's laughter can be identified as being feigned since it seems to be initiated by the audience's laughter. It also does not exhibit the same intensity and duration that would be found in natural laughter, which would imply that she did not find the tease to be very humorous. From these observations, it could be deduced that Amanda's laughter was generated as a face-saving strategy in order to mitigate the negative implications that the tease assigned, as well as an attempt to establish group solidarity by trying to fit in with the audience through laughter.

The following extract is a continuation of extract (8). In this extract, the host accuses Amanda of voting the other female contestants out of the game.
In this extract, the host takes her turn-at-talk by asking Amanda a conditionally relevant utterance in lines 13 and 14 by saying, "getting rid of the other women on the \textit{team} Amanda?" This utterance contains face-threatening elements; it not only confronts Amanda about her actions, but since she is a female, it also questions her loyalty to her fellow female contestants. The (1) second pause in line 15 shows that the recipient is probably thinking of a suitable utterance to counteract the negative implications of the preceding utterance.
In line 16, Amanda could be seen casually shaking her head as she uttered, "No::: not." Her stretching of the negative response "no" can indicate that she was desperately trying to counteract the negative label that was assigned to her in the previous utterance. In line 18, the host once again takes her turn-at-talk by uttering the accusation, "↑YES:: you ↑Are:::." This assertion is bald-on and face threatening, since it implies that Amanda is a liar. However, this utterance can be considered to be a tease since it was produced during a frame of play, and was not meant to be taken seriously.

After a (.2) pause, the audience can be observed laughing at the host's utterance. Amanda goes along with the tease by overlapping her laughter with that of the audience. However, her laughter seems to be feigned since it is soft and brief when compared to the surrounding laughter. This could indicate either that Amanda did not find the host's comment to be humorous, that she did not want the host to continue teasing her, or that she wanted to establish solidarity with the rest of the audience.

If we refer back to the utterance in line 18, we can see that the question asked earlier in lines 13 and 14 did
not require an answer from the recipient, but was a device used to humiliate the recipient in order to incite laughter from the audience.

In the following extract, the host (H) builds her tease based on information given by the contestant, James (J). This extract also shows how feigned laughter is used in a situation where a request is face threatening.

(Extract 10) [Lee: Weakest Link, Data Set #11]

1 H ↑Ja::mes↓
2 (1.6)
3 rem↓i::nd↓ me what you do
4 Ja ((Begins his utterance with a small sucking sound)) (s) I'm a:: student at St.
5 Bonniger's High School (.) where I'm a
6 senior
7 (1.7) ((Host nods her head))
8 H good gra::des-?
9 (1.3)
10 Ja >reasonably<
11 (.7)
12 H HOW reason:ably
13 (1.3)
In this extract, the host summons the contestant, James, by calling his name (line 1). The host then waits for (1.6) seconds before she once again takes her turn-at-talk (line 2). The host then implements a CRU in which she says "rem\textasciitilde i::nd me what you do" (line 3). The rise and fall in intonation in the word "remind" acts as a cue to those who are familiar with the show that a tease is about
to take place. In lines 5 through 7, James fulfills his part of the CRU by telling her that he is a senior in high school. Although it is acceptable to ask others about their level of education in the American society, the host's intention of asking the contestant about his educational background was to show his inferiority since he missed many of the questions during the game.

In line 8, the host can be seen nodding her head as she waits for (1.7) seconds before taking her turn-at-talk. It is important to note the duration of the pause, since it shows that she is acknowledging the utterance as well as establishing subtle emphasis on the utterance on which to build her tease (Mendoza-Denton, 1995).

In line 9, the host continues to interrogate James about his educational career by asking him about his grades. In American culture, asking about sensitive information such as age, salary, and grades is usually taboo since it places the recipient of the question in a potentially face threatening situation. This could account for the (1.3) second pause that proceeds the utterance, which shows that the recipient is thinking about how to answer the CRU in a face saving manner (line 10). In line 11, James takes his turn-at-talk in which he utters,
"reasonably." His use of an ambiguous answer works as a face saving strategy in order not to draw too much unnecessary attention to himself (Goffman, 1967). This explains why he took (1.3) seconds to answer the question, as observed in line 10.

After a (.7) pause in line 12, the host continues to build up to her tease by asking James to clarify his definition of what constitutes a reasonable grade. Since the question being asked is potentially face threatening to the recipient, a pause of (.3) seconds can be observed to give the recipient more time to formulate a socially appropriate response (line 14). In line 15, James takes his turn-at-talk in order to answer the CRU. He begins his response by implementing the hedge, "WELL:". This is important since it works to mitigate the proceeding utterance (Goffman, 1967). The (.2) second pause in line 16 can also be interpreted as a device to mitigate his next utterance or to "buy time" to formulate his utterance.

In line 17, James states that he is at the top of his class. By saying his answer a little faster than the rest of his previous utterances, James tries not to draw too much attention to his accomplishment, thereby trying to
maintain the cultural norm by not overtly "showing off" his superiority.

Although James tried to downplay his response, it wasn't enough to avoid drawing attention to himself. This is depicted in the host's use of a pregnant pause in line 18. The pause work as a platform on which to base her tease by generating tension and suspense in the audience. In lines 19 through 21, the host finally delivers her tease, in which she says, "you must come back (.) after you've been to college °James°."

On the surface, the utterance may be understood as an invitation or request for the contestant to go back to the game show at a later time. However, if the context of the situation is taken into consideration, it is apparent that the utterance was in fact a challenge against the contestant's intelligence, meaning that he should get a higher education before attempting to compete in the game. This utterance, though face threatening in nature can be interpreted as a tease since it is not meant as a direct assault against the contestant, but merely to incite laughter from the audience at the contestant's expense.
After a (.2) pause in line 22, the audience can be heard laughing in the background. It should be noted that the contestant does not go against the tease. Instead, he laughs approximately (1) second after the rest of the audience laughs. This delay in laughter can indicate that he did not perceive the tease to be humorous. The brief duration of the laugh as well as the decline in intensity can indicate that the laughter was feigned, which means that the contestant had a purpose for laughing. The laugh was probably implemented in order to save face his face needs by trying to establish social cohesion with the audience.

In the following extract, the host ridicules the contestant, Elena, about how she misspelled the name of one of the contestants.

(Extract 11) [Lee: Weakest Link, Data Set #13]
14 H \(\Rightarrow\) SO WHICH IS THE SCHOOL:... YOU USED TO WORK
15 \(\Rightarrow\) AT?
16 (.2)
17 Audience HAH-[HAH- HAH- HAH- HAH- HAH- HAH- HAH- HAH- HAH- []
18 HAH-[
19 E [((Soft laughter commenced by a strong
In this extract, the host ridicules the contestant in lines 14 and 15 by asking, "SO WHICH IS THE SCHOOL::: YOU USED TO WORK AT?" This utterance can be identified as a tease construction, since it incorporates the elements of raised intonation, and exaggeration in order to indicate that it is not meant to be taken seriously. However, it also carries the negative implication suggesting that the contestant is going to be fired from her job as a middle school teacher because of her inability to get the answers correct during the game.

After a (.2) second pause (line 16), the audience is laughing at the host's utterance, which shows that they probably understood the humorous aspect of the utterance (lines 17 & 18). In line 20 and 21, Elena is shown to produce her string of laughter shortly after the audience
had already begun their string of laughter. This may indicate that Elena did not perceive the host's FTU as being humorous, but still continued to laugh in order to establish social cohesion with the audience. Her laughter can be classified as being feigned since it was brief and soft in nature.

In line 23, Drew's (1987) fourth type of tease response can be observed "going along with the tease." This is illustrated when Elena states, "YOU DON'T KNOW HOW TRUE:: ↑THAT IS:: (. ) (fh) HAH Hah HUH .HHhhhp (hf)" (lines 23 & 24). In this utterance, Elena highlights her statement by raising her voice. She also incorporates elements such as stretching some of her words and raising her intonation when she utters the words, "↑THAT IS::" as well as adding feigned laughter to the end of her utterance in order to show that she is not serious in her response, but is also joking or maintaining the play frame (line 23). Elena's laughter in this case can be classified as feigned since she quickly reverted to a more serious demeanor after completing the string of laughter.

In this extract, Elena may have used feigned laughter in order to mitigate the negative implications of the
host's tease, to establish social cohesion with the audience, and to maintain the play frame.

Failure of Teasee to Maintain Social Cohesion

The following extract shows how defending oneself against a potentially face threatening utterance through justification can incite a string of FTUs. In this extract the host, (H), teased the contestant, Dan, (D), about his hairstyle.

(Extract 12) [Lee: Weakest Link, Data Set #5]

1 H  DA:::N↑
2   (.2)
3 D  YE:S:
4   (4)
5 H  →did you have your hair done for the
6   → occa:sion?
7   (.2)
8 Audience  HAH-[HAH-HAH-HAH-HAH-HAH-HAH-
9   [((Smiles as his body slightly bows
10   forward))]
11 Audience  ((Continues laughing)) hah-hah-[hah-hah-hah
12 D  →                                                [JUST FOR YOU
13   (.2)
In line 1, the host summons the contestant, Dan, by calling his name. After a (.2) second pause, Dan accepts the summons by answering, "YE:S:" (line 3). In line 4, a pause of (4) seconds can be observed. The length of the pause is a possible indication that Dan had given up his turn-at-talk, and that the host was waiting to formulate her next response as well as to generate tension in the audience. After the pregnant pause, the host finally takes her turn-at-talk by asking Dan, "did you have your hair done for the occa:sion?" (lines 5 & 6).

The utterance, though constructed as a question, is in reality an attempt to make fun of Dan's hairstyle. This is supported in that it has nothing to do with the game show, but merely serves as a spontaneous response in order to point out the contestant's unique physical characteristic (LeBlanc III, 1998). After a (.2) second pause in line 7,
the audience can be heard laughing in the background (lines 8 & 11). This indicates that they understood the humorous aspect of the tease. Immediately after the audience begins laughing, Dan can be observed smiling as his body bows slightly forward. The act of bowing may be an indication that he accepted the tease.

In line 12, Dan takes his turn-at-talk in which he responds to the tease with a po-faced response by saying, "JUST FOR YOU (.2) just for you." This utterance was implemented in order to justify why he has that particular hairstyle. Dan's repeating the phrase "just for you" might be perceived as an attempt to emphasize his utterance as being sincere. After a (.8) second pause (line 15), the host regains her turn-at-talk in which she says, "PI:TY." This utterance is an attempt to downplay Dan's utterance, and can be perceived as another attempt to tease Dan by giving him a hard time.
CHAPTER SIX

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Feigned laughter, when observed in the context of teasing has more than one pragmatic function. The evidence presented in this study suggests some possible aspects as to why feigned laughter is used in the context of face-threatening-utterances (FTUs). First, the recipients of FTUs can produce feigned laughter if they do not initially "catch" or understand the humorous aspect of a FTU. A possible explanation for this is that it is a strategy that tease recipients may use in order to avoid drawing unnecessary attention to themselves. Secondly, recipients may produce feigned laughter as a way to go along with the FTU, thereby preserving their face needs and possibly that of the speaker. Third, the recipients may use feigned laughter as a strategy to mitigate the negative implications that a tease assigns or it can try to put an end to a potential string of teases. Fourth, recipients of FTUs may use feigned laughter as a way to establish group solidarity if they notice that those around them are laughing at the FTU. This does not necessarily mean that the recipients do not understand the humor of the FTU, such
as if it is given as a tease, but the act of laughing together creates a common bond between the recipient and those around them. Fifth, recipients, both male and female, usually will use feigned laughter as a response to the FTU of teasing, if it is given in the form of ridicule.

This study also serves as an expansion of Drew's (1987) research on teasing, which is a specific type of FTU. Drew's (1987) research showed that recipients of teases usually do not "go along with the teases" or if they do, they ultimately find an opportunity to counteract the tease with a po-faced response. Although this may have been the case for teasing participants who are socially close (Drew, 1987), the findings in my study show the opposite.

Out of the 41 teases that were observed in the TV show "The Weakest Link," 12 responses were po-faced in which the recipients of the teases either laughed and reverted to a serious response or responded to the tease with a serious response; 4 teases were received with no response from the teasee, and 25 of the teases incited a "going along with the tease" response from the teasee (Drew, 1987). The analysis of study indicates that if recipients of FTUs are among a group of people whom they are socially distant
with, they are probably more likely to go along with a FTU rather than counteract the threatening utterance with a po-faced response. This may be due to the fact that they would benefit more from preserving their face by laughing and going along with the FTU rather than defending their face, since defending their face would make them susceptible to another FTA from the teaser, as was seen in Dan's case (see Chapter Four). In this study, we can also see that recipients of FTUs also use feigned laughter if they are prompted to laugh by an external factor, such as if an audience laughs at the FTU.

This study also shows that even though a FTU recipient may laugh at a FTU, it does not necessarily mean that they agree or even acknowledge the FTU as humorous, but may be employing laughter as a self-preservation strategy. The use of feigned laughter in this case seems to work like Goffman's (1967) self-preservation strategy of avoidance, which mitigates the negative implications of a threatening act and acts as though it never occurred. These characteristics support the claim that laughter, and more specifically feigned laughter, is truly a complex and rarely appreciated linguistic phenomenon in terms of its different levels of pragmatic usage.
Although the sample size portrayed in this paper is relatively small in comparison to a full scale research study, the examples here illustrate the important functions that feigned laughter plays as a means for observing the "face needs" of self and others in the context of FTUs.

The observance of feigned laughter, in these transcriptions, do not serve merely as a gesture of happiness or satisfaction, but functions with the pragmatic purpose of lessening the seriousness of utterances spoken as well serving as a mechanism in order to observe the face needs of others as well as of self. Through transcription analysis, one can achieve a greater understanding into how this type of laughter works pragmatically in spoken language, as well as how one can better utilize feigned laughter in order to communicate more efficiently.
APPENDIX A

CHRISTMAS BANQUET
Data Set #1

High School Students: G-Female; B-Male

Approximately: 16 yoa 14 yoa

Location: Parking lot located on the premises of Loma Linda Academy.

1  G  heh-heh! It's so: fu(h)nny man
2    (.4)
3  but I think >we should go on this day<
4    (1.3)
5  G  [>(turning) too hot today<
6    [Ehhhh::
7  B    (. ) after Pharaoh's? um.
8  G  NO:::wuh! (. ) IT'S THE SUNDAY >AFTER THAT< (.)
9  IT'S A WEEK LATER!
10 B  no the (. ) um =
11 G = would you [heh
12    [
13 B    [BAD [it's
14    [heh-heh
15    yo(h)ur heh! heh! [heh! heh!
16    [This heh! for A(h)
17    COL(h)LEGE(h)
18    STU(h)DENT(h) heh! OF COU(h)RSE heh! IT(h) IS(h)!
19     heh-heh-heh-heh-heh-heh-heh! .hh [heh-heh-heh!
20     [heh! heh!
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20 G  [.hh heh-heh! .hh heh! .hh
21 B  heh-[heh-heh! heh-heh-heh-heh-heh-heh! ]
22 G  [heh-heh! IS THIS LA(h)UGHING(h)
23 CON(h)TAG(h)IOUS?
25 G  [OH(h) my(h) God(h) (^laugh)(h)’s (.) (h)
26 (h)>contagious°<)
27 B  ya’ know it’s a week after >an yain my parents<
28 won’t like me doing everything °(every time)
29 e:very weekend you know how parents are°=
30 G  = EVERY WE:EKEND? ((Sarcasm in Voice)) So
31 weekday:::s better?
32 (1.5)
33 B  No
34 (.)
35 G  NO [heh-heh-heh! .hh heh-heh! ]
36 B  [CHE! Heh-heh-heh-heh-heh! ] [heh-heh! ]
37 G  [.hh heh!
38 wh(h)at(h) if(h) yo(h)u wa(h)n(h)ted(h) to go(h)
39 to the mall(h) heh-heh! and you said ((Higher
40 Intonation)) ((Falsetto)) ↑ AH: that’s a good
NOW you’re like< NO:::wuh!

((Pause))

I’m not sure if I’m going to be here for another ten minutes =

= whatever we can just keep TALKING TILL WE DON'T the:n.

.hh I think I’ll start using ((Feigning Impression)) INFLECTION in my voice like miss

CHA:fey "eg uh wanted [us so° =

((Imitating Teacher)) = [INFLECTION INFLECTION
INFLECTION< O:KAY

((Continues to Imitate Teacher)) Lets use inflection while discussing our motive O:KAY?

No lets not

((.4)

Jeremy (.) when do you guys want to go?

(.5)

"I don’t know" [seems impossible
[cause I wanted to get like your whole group going
you want to get Sam n' Bobby: an' everyone? (.)

>Okay< (. ) well- I don't know(h) about Sam(h) and Bobby but- probably

>I want' to chus get a butt load of people going<

>yeh well then get° Chris Cambell to go heh! hh =

=Chris Cambell >probably well go (.) he loves the mall<

NO but I'm serious because

I want [to know what to get

[UHG::H heh-heh!

[tell him (to) get him to go<

[STOP laughing ()

heh-heh! he(h) loves the mall

(no: becaus' becaus'- plus I want ta' go a:round like (.) the banquet time cuz I can't. ku- I
don't know what I'm wearing yet so
THIS IS AN: IMPORTANT THING FOR GIRLS: YOU KNOW

hmm ((Sudden Rise in Intonation)) WOO WHAT ARE

YOU: WEARING TO THE BANQUET? [MOM ()

[so you having-

NOT A! ()

[Yu, >you. you should you should get some uh]

friends frm: uh: like Landon tu:h(h) go(h)

with(h) you(h) .hh te(h)llin’ you(h) what(h)

looks good on(h) you(h) .hh hh =

= Landon DID tell me what looks good on me an’ he

was >very very helpful< ((Stern Tone)) BUT THAT’S

NOT THE POINT (.). DON’T TALK ABOUT MY GAY

FRIENDS: OKAY::?

hh [heh-heh

[(fh) heh-heh-heh-heh- (hf)

(1.2)

>he [is< HE: IS: GAY!

[kehr! heh-heh-heh-heh-heh!

he’s VERY gay heh

(.3)

he has a Elmo backpack (.). its so c[ute though

[kek! Heh-heh-
heh-heh [heh! ...
[the cutest Elmo backpack (.) it’s fuzzy (.4)

no. but she says it (.4)

that a:: (. ) that a: gay people tell you what chu really look like =

= YES they do (1.2)

O:::ther guys just go a:::h (1.1)

IT’S TRUE! (.)

well I se’ [yeah it is but-
[ [IF I SHOWED: YOU: A PICTURE OF ME you’re like yeah that’s nice you look fine >you

LOOK FINE: DAMN-IT!< =

= heh-heh-he[h
[

[(>that guy says<) ((Feigning a “gay” Accent)) OH! NO! girlfriend: that it looks phat looks phat [on you (. )“hum-heh-heh!”

[ [Heh-heh-heh-heh-heh!

it’s so(h):: tru(h)e it(h)’s true (. ) he did::: He
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was the coolest guy (1.1)

[.hh heh-heh-heh!

I should call Landon (.). thank you for re:minding me:

poor guy

>he got kicked out of summer school cause they thought he was a gangster< Y:E:S: : LANDON(h) THE(h) GAN(h)GSTER(h) (.). A(h)LL: : RI: (h)GHT(h)!

I'LL BET' CHU' HE'S A GANGSTER!

°heh°

I'LL BET' CHU' GUYS LOVED HIM IN THEIR GANG! (.)

heh I'M SURE! =

= heh-heh-heh! ba:::re:ly

>even the teachers were (laughing)< the tea::cher laughed when they said (.). she’s like. why isn’t Landon here? >they’re like< he got kicked out cuz (.). he (.). they thought >he was in a GANG<

>an’ the teacher goes< [.hhh HA! HA! HA! [112
[huh-huh-huh]

[THAT'S]

FUN:NY (.)

heh! .hh heh! .hh heh! .hh

LAN:DON:?

heh! .hh heh! .hh heh! .hh] heh! .hh heh! .hh

heh! .hh

NO::BODY >can see Landon in a gang< (.) why could she (.) °I don’t know°

(1.3)

OH THAT’S why my >ba.< back:pack: smelled like a piece of chocolate

(.3)

SEECK! (.)

AH::!: HA! HA! HA! HA! HA!

WHO knows how long it’s been in there?

(1.2)

that’s terrible =

= that’s NASTY (.)

YEAH (.) O:kay WHAT WAS IT? hh heh-heh! =

= piece of cho[ocolate ] (.) like I said [ ]

[heh! .hh]
GO::OD for the cho:colate

[[ (Inaudible)) ]] 
[[ ]] 
[[>you have a watch?< ]] 

I:: (. ) di::d

I’m sure you do (. ) what time is it?

Almost one

I think

should be past five

no (. ) not yet (.)

°yes it is° (.)

no it’s not

(.6)

yes it is =
= bet cha' it's like five right now =
= I bet you it's not (.) I bet you it's five something (.5)
IT'S FIVE RIGHT NOW >it's< it's two minutes TILL five cause mine's five minutes fast (.5)
((School Bell Rings))
actually it's two minutes AFTER FIVE! Heh-heh! =
= no: it's five minutes fast (.5)
oh::: (.)
UH:::::::
I know [my watch ]
[ ]
[>no I wasn't<]
I wasn' taking that into account when I saw it (. ) you know (.4)
((Sounds Sarcastic)) SU:::R::E: (.) THAT must be the reason
I wasn' t- (.) when I saw it I was like oh: my goodness
want a piece of Picachu?

((Higher Intonation)) (>look at this<)

[PIECE of PICACHU! (.)]

THAT'S GROSS: heh! yeah! heh!

[() that's GR:O:<(h)SS:(h) (.)] THAT'S: (.)

Oh my goodness!

woul(h)d chu like a piece of it?=

= >NO! heh yes< I would heh! (.) heh! .hh I'm

taking off your watch (though)

(.3)

does it FIT YOU?

(1)

uh huh!

(.6)

>"oh [yeah (.). (you're just a] natural"]

[apparently so ]

(1.4)

>"stupid" PICACHU! PICK IT UP!

(3.6)
K' Jenanne. I think your Picachu’s broken
(1.4)

(cause) Justin shh sucked on it probably
(.4)

heh [heh-heh-heh-heh!
[

[>Justin-< (.) Justin BIT it (.)

((Biting Sound)) “CRUMPH!”
(.7)

heh! are WE: talking about the same thing here?

heh-heh-[heh!
[

[yeah prob[ably
[

.hh [“heh-heh!”

(.5)

WHAT?

(1.1)

SHUT UP! You’re confusing me

(1.5)

((Rustling of Snack Bag))

((“Chippy” Sounding Voice)) dor::e::toes:: =

= that was hilarious

(.6)

>wh.< color are these?
Hey give me one of those (you want those?)
(cost like) two dollars I swear =
((Chewing Noise)) =Omp!

Sound like Homer when you eat =
= CHOMP! CHOMP! CHOMP!

SHUT UP! Heh! YOU'RE confusing me

Y:E::S::: Kih-heh-heh-heh!

I know () do you want to go to the mall then? ()
YES: I think Bobby an' Sam would like to do it
too ()

I believe you

would YOU: organize your friends to go () if I
organize () my friends to go? =
= >UM! HUM!<

>they'll go<
I don't know about Sam, but Bobby'll probably go (it's jus' a little easier).

G WHO?

B Nothing-< heh-heh-heh-heh-heh! =

G = NO- who- which one of them?

B >I said< Bobby'll probably go (.) since he

G [oh] could he get a ride though?

B >the problem is rides< (.) that's always the

problem cause it's almost an hour away

B Richie Canyon

G SO:::! the PLACE is almost an hour away

B NO- (.) >he won't be able to get a ride< (.) >an

hour away< are you kidding?

G >so how are we going to get dere'<
306 B  >we're not GOING to SOUTH COAST!

307 (fh) hah-hah-hah-[hah::?

308 G  [>which is a better mall< =

309 B  = .hh hah-hah-hah::?: .hh hah-hah-hah::?: (hf)

310 [.hh

311 G  [you guys have to go with me there sometime

312 (.) FINE
Data Set #2

1 B  >Yeah if anything< I'm gonna' go get uh::: myself
2 a Lincoln hh
3 (.8)
4 °heh-heh-.°
5 (.5)
6 G  ew(h): (h): (h) DON'T say [Lincoln >in front of me<
[ [.hh heh:::
8 G  >just been tal:king about<]
9 B  heh-heh-heh-
10 G  PA::M [an(h)d th(h)e pro(h)blem(h) with(h)
[ [huh-heh-heh
12 that(h) [car(h):::
[ [.hhh
14 G  [sh(h)ut(h) up(h) a(h)bout(h) Lin(h)coln(h)
[ [heh-HEH-HEH-HA-HA-HA-°ha-ha-ha-ha-ha-° .hhh =
16 G  =((Highly Inflected Voice)) It fits eight:::
17 pe:poehhh
18 (.2)
19 .hh i(h)f(h) yo(h)u(h) ( ) >si(h)t o(h)n each
20 o(h)thers lap-<
21 (.2)
^YES: - I'm sure Chris↓< .hh
(.2)

(Hard) and John wanted to sit on ^PA:::M'S
L(h)A(h)P(h) °hum-.hh hum-.°
(.2)

B you're so mean:
(.3)

G You thin:::(fh)kuh hh huh .hh °huhh-.hh huh
.hh° (hf) ((Reverts to a serious Tone))
>true though< =

B = ((AIDS))
(.4)

Yeah eight people e(h)x(h)cep(h)t(h)

PA(h):M(h):(h):(h) heh .hhh hmmmm:: mmm: mmm:
Data Set #3

Taping recorded by Heather Memory

Television show: The Real World

Subjects: Rachael Campos: Ethnicity is Hispanic
          Pedro: Ethnicity is Cuban

Rachael: Female; age 22
Pedro: Male; age "unknown"

Location: House in San Francisco

1 Rachel Okay take each person and say (.) What your
going to miss, (.) about each person

2 (.2)

3 you know what I mean?

4 (.2)

5 and I'm just like

6 (.7)

7 hhh Pedro:

8 (.3)

9 uhh-heh-heh hh (.) treating me likuh (.)

10 (I'm a bratty) sister Uh-huh-huh-huh

11 (.4)

12 Pedro You are a brat

13 (.2)

14 Rachel I: know

15
16 (.4)

17 Pedro >.hhh oH: .hh OH:: .hh OH::: you

18 AD[MITTED IT .hhkh .hhkh .hhkh [  

19 Rachel [(fh) hehh (hf) I’m out of the stage of denial Hah-hah-hah-hah
APPENDIX C

CONUNDRUM
Dr. Laura's Radio Program.

Participants are Dr. Laura Schlesinger and the person who called the program. Caller calls himself Randy.

1  L  Ok lets start from the beginning (. ) >how long
2   have you been married?<
3  (.5)
4  R  uh:
5  (.3)
6  three year:s ah come February
7  L  and how old are you? ( .)
8  R  I'm thirty-six (.)
9  L  and she?
10  (.3)
11  R  thirty↑
12  (.4)
13  L  >kay-now< (. ) >when you met her<
14  (.6)
15  >what was she doing in life?<
16  (1)
17  R  Ah: : : : : see- she lived with her parents: : 
18  (.5)
at thirty;

(.3)

at thirty?

(.4)

(well) lived with her parents because?

u:::m

(.7)

you know I really don't know I guess =

= ((high pitched tone)) hh >YOU DON'T< KNOW: (.)

purity for her (.) huh (.)

you don't know?: (.)

(fh) °ah heh° (hf) =

I know what part of your problem is already?

(.)

maybe I don't want ah (.) really know >you know

what I'm saying< °ha ha° hh =

she lives with her parents for security (.).

you got a little girl and she came to your house

and continues to be a little girl?

(.3)

right (.)

>sür<PRI:::SE↑
R yea (. .) huh huh (hf) [(unclear)]
[so (.) tell me about your state of mind
three years ago (. .)
R >I've known her<
( . .)
for eight years =
L >tell me about< your state of mind three years ago (. .)
R Ah::
( . .)
L wh-what is it
( . .)
y-you thought you could handle in a woman
( . .)
and what is it you thought you couldn't handle?
( . .)
>this is a heavy question< so you think about it a moment before you start speaking
(1.2)
R what I thought I could handle? (. .)
and what you thought you couldn't handle in a
woman
(.3)
what I thought I could handle was the: ah:::
(1)
ah: (.) love and support and ah:
(.5)
ah caring
(.7)
and ah (.)
an what kind of woman did you think you would
most likely get it from
(1)
um (.)
Think (.) back
(.7)
don't give me: idealistic answers
>give me truth< =
= ((High Pitched Nervous Laughter)) (tru-fuh .hh)
(1.3)
it seems () >someone that< ta (.). maybe wasn't
as secure
and needed someone to: uh:

to uh:

.hh um (. ) be there for them (. ) an take care of them

Daddy?

>so you thought< you'd get womanly behavior from a girl who needed a daddy

what ma:de (. ) you: : so: insecure that you thought you needed a little girl who needed a daddy?

well: :? I guess: I'd never had

someone t:ell me that they (. ) loved me and showed me
as -°um-m-m°- th- the love as much as she did

and uh it kind of uh =

= >NO that didn't answer the question< (.)

°heh:: hh°

(.5)

.h[h:
[ [you com:>pletely went away from

the question< (.)

°ok°  (.)

.hh what made you think (.) what made you

believe (. ) that- the only place you could get

this love from a girl who >needed a daddy?<

(2)

I:: yah::: (.)

work on that one this is important: =

= .hhhhh ah:::hhhhhhhh

(.8)

ah: hhh mm I guess: (. ) a because we'd been

friends (.)

No:: (. ) don't do that

(.6)
that doesn't explain (. ) someone else would not have chose her

(1)

"right"

(.3)

so what (. ) what- (made-) made it (it-) uniquely a choice for you?: That you wanted a little girl who needed a daddy

(.7)

what make you so insecure that (. ) you thought (. ) that would be the only place to get it?

(2.2)

.hh

(.9)

well: because maybe I haven't ha:d that type of hhh love and affection

(1.9)

um

(.4)

from:

(.9)

ah:: other people
(At this point please turn the tape over)

152 R  hhhhh the bimbettes (.) and what not . uh hhh

153  you know: one nighters and uh:: hh kind of got

154  use to that

155  (.7)

156 L  mm hmmm =

157 R  = duh:::

158  (.7)

159  wasn't tah::

160  (.6)

161  u:m

162  (.4)

163  didn't really look fur::: ah (.) >good love in

164  all the right places [()

165 L  [>do you know< that's the

166  important art so .hh we went to the bimbettes .

167  san then we went to the little girl (.) .hh but

168  it's all the same thing? (.)

169 R  right (.)

170 L  it- it's all bit of a distance

171  (.3)

172 R  right (.)
so you look like a handsome stud and the other you look like daddy

R Right (.)

.hh so (. y:ou: were:: comfortable with the handsome stud part of yourself . and you're .hh comfortable with the daddy part of yourself right (.)

What happened to you being comfortable with the Randy part of yourself:

>where did that go<

(2.1)

.hhhhhh hhhhhhh thah::t ta hh

>no [think<

[that- =

= think before you speak: I want you to be real clear on this (.)

>well?<

(1.4)

.hhhhh ho:::hhhh I don't know (.) uh-

NO I don't know is not permitted here just take a
breath and say (.) so getting to know me >not
leading through:: sexuality and< not leading
through:: daddy (.) what was I scared of?
(1)
and see what comes out
(2.1)
I guess I ah I'm scared of ah not having all that
attention that I had
(.3)
I ah (.)
attention you had when from the bimbettes you
think it is only that far
back? =
= >I guess< I guess so from being able to go out
and play the field I guess I ah I ya a part of me
misses that (.) and da (.) [ah
[so you need a lot of
input (.) it can be superficial as long as
there's a lot of it (.)
yea as long as it's a lot of positive input =
= ok so you get someone who is dependent and
needy as long as it's someone who is constantly
syrupping::: over you .hh that was like the same
thing except that was from one person (.).

I guess you're right? = (.4)

= ok (.) but you know you sound?

(1)

you sound? like there's more to you?

(2.8)

well =

= that's why I'm thinking

(.3)

well I have a big heart (.)

there's yea but the big heart got stuck somewhere

>so you weren't willing to look for the woman who

wanted the heart< (.) why?
APPENDIX D

WEAKEST LINK
Data Set #5

Transcript: (Game date: 6-4-2001) Weakest Link TV show.

Participants are the host, Anne Robinson (H), and the
contestants: Dan (D); age 21, Brian (B); age 26, Fred
(F); age 61, Amanda (A); age 32, Terri (T); age 32,
Amy (Am); age 32, Shannon (S); age 31, Vaughn (V); age
31.

1 H DA:::N↑

2 (.2)

3 D YE:S:

4 (4)

5 H did you have your hair done for the

6 occa:sion?

7 (.2)

8 Audience HAH-[HAH-HAH-HAH-HAH-HAH-HAH-HAH-]

[((Smiles as his body bows slightly

10 forward))]

11 Audience ((Continues laughing)) hah-hah-[hah-hah-hah

12 D [JUST FOR YOU

13 (.2)

14 just for you

15 (.8)
Audience ((Audience laughs as Dan smiles and slightly nods his head)) hah-HAH-HAH-HAH-hah-hah
Data Set #6

1  H  STATISTICALLY
2  (1.6)
3  HE was not the worst ^player
4  (4.5) ((During this time the host looks
5  around at the different contestants.
6  After (1.6) seconds, the audience begins to
7  laugh))
8  H  ((The host finally looks at Terri)) WAS he
9  Terri?
10  (.2)
11  T  HE WAS T ((Mild rise and fall in
12  [ intonation))
13  [HA-HA-ha-ha-ha-[ha-ha
14  [HEE-HEE-°hee-hee-hee-
15  hee-°
16  ((Contestant remains smiling))
17  (.2)
18  H  DOES television (.) frighten you TERri?
19  (1.5)
20  T  n:o °heh-heh-° ((Smiling)) =
21  H  = have you done (.) television before?
I was on the Howard Stern Show =

[Continued Laughter],

What were you doing on the Howard Stern Show?

I'm friends with Boy George and I was on with Boy George.

So it was a LONG TIME ago when you were on the Howard Stern Show =

six months ago

SIX MONTHS AGO

THEY GOT ON TO TALK ABOUT A
FADING POP STAR: (.) WHO FINISHED HIS CAREER IN THE EIGH::TIES:: =

Audience = °heh-heh°-HAH-MAH-MAH-MAH-[HAH-MAH-MAH-MAH-

T [hhheh-HEH-°heh-

Audience ((Continued Laughter)) HAH-MAH-MAH-MAH-hah-

T ((Continued laughter)) heh-heh-°

Audience ((Continued laughter)) hah-hah-hah-hah-

hah-hah-hah-hah
Data Set #7

1 H Brian what? do you do

3 (.3)

3 B I'm an accountant.

4 (.6)

5 H So: share with us:::

6 (.4)

7 this three (.) foot (.) wide (.) Frisbee

8 (.)

9 Audience ((Some audience members begin to laugh))

10 heh-heh[

11 Audience ((More join in soon after)) [HA-HA-HA-HA-HA-]

12 B ((Openly smiles)) [ (fh) °hehh° (hf)

13 Audience ha-ha-ha-[ha-ha-ha-ha-ha-ha-ha-ha-]

14 B [(fh) °hehhhhh° (hf)

15 Audience °ha-ha-ha-ha°
Data Set #8

1  H   Shannon

2       (1.6)

3  S   what do you do:?:

4  S   I'm a pharmaceutical consultant

5       (.7)

6  H   so you're on drugs yourself? =

7  Audience  = ((Loud laughter)) HAH-

8  HAH-[HAH-HAH-HAH-HAH-HAH-

9  [(fh) °.HHh

10 Audience  hah-hah-°hah]-

11 S   ((Sustained open smile)) Hehhhhhh° (hf)]

12 Audience  hah-hah-hah-[hah-hah-hah°

13 H   [you don't like Fred =

14 S   = ((Reverting to a serious demeanor)) OH: I

15 like Fred

16       (1.1)

17 but he just took too::: long (.) to answer:

18 a question

19       (.3)

20  H   STATISTICALLY
21 (1.5)

22 he was not the worst \textit{player}
Data Set #9

1  H  A::MAN:da
2    (.3)
3  U::2 (. ) K::2
4  (. ) A[LL:: THE SAME to AMANDA=
5  Audience  [((Some members of the audience
6    are beginning to laugh softly))
7  = ((Majority of audience begins to laugh))
8  HAH-[HAH-
9  A  ((Very soft chuckle as she smiles)) [(fh)
10 Audience  °HAH-HAH-HAH-HAH-HAH-HAH-hah-hah-hah-hah-hah
11 A  heh-heh-hehhh° (hf)
12    (.3)
13 H  getting rid of the other women on the team
14 A:manda?
15    (1)
16 A  ((Casually shaking her head)) No:: not
17    (.2)
18 H  ↑YES:: you ↑Are:::
19    (.2)
20 Audience  [HAH-HAH-HAH-HAH-HAH-HAH-HAH-HAH-
21 A  [((Soft laughter)) (fh) °ho hee-hee-hee-hee
22 Audience  ((Continued Laughter)) hah-haah-

23 A       ((Continued Laughter)) .hhh° haah-haah (hf)
Data Set #10

1  H  ^Brie^an
2   (.9)
3  B  yes::
4   (1)
5  H  Why Terri::?
6   (.6)
7  B  it was (.) a hard call::
8   (.9)
9  H  and I jus-
10   (1.3)
11 >I just decided to vote [for Terri<
12   [SO: you DON'T (.)
13  H  know
14   (.2)
15  B  why you vo[ted for Terri
16   [NOT REALLY
17   (.3)
18 >her perfor[^mance was-^<
19  H  [TELL ME
20   (.2)
21  B  O:kay =

149
do you explain: to your clients (.)
their problems: as simply [as ]you've just
[(fh) "hehhh" (hf)]
explained [your
[
["heh-heh" HA-HA-Ha-Ha-
[vote (.) for Terri
[(fh) "hee-hee-heehhh" (hf) ((Laughs very
softly as he bends forward for a moment))]
((Continued laughter)) ha-[ha-ha-ha-ha
((Serious demeanor)) [I HAVE no
clients:
(.2)
[BUT
[I'M NOT SURPRISE
[HA-HA-HA-HA-HA-ha-ha-
((Brian shakes his head smugly as he
smiles and looks at the audience))
ha-ha-ha-ha-ha-ha-
Data Set #11

Transcript: (Game date: 6-10-2001) Weakest Link TV show.

Participants are the host, Anne Robinson (H), and the contestants: Marcus (Mc); age 45, Kira (Ki); 26, Karin (Ka); age 29, John (Jo); age 42, Renee (R); age 32, Jeff (Je); age 31, James (Ja); age 18, Mary (M); age 48.

1     H   ↑Ja::mes↓
2     (1.6)
3     rem↑i::nd↓ me what you do
4     Ja   ((Begins his utterance with a small sucking sound)) (s) I'm a:: student at St.
5     Bonniger's High School (.) where I'm a
6     senior
7     (1.7) ((Host nods her head))
8     H   good gra::des-?
9     (1.3)
10    Ja   >reasonably<
11    ( .7)
12    H     HOW reason:ably
13    ( .3)
14    Ja   WELL:: I'm a
16 (1.2)
17 >number one in my class right now<
18 (1)
19 H ((Slow speech with low intonation)) you must
20 come back (. ) after you've been to college
21 "James"
22 (.2)
23 Audience ((Background)) heh-heh-heh-[heh-heh-heh-
24 [(Loader roar of laughter and hoots)]
25 [↑WOOOAAAAHHHH
26 [HHH! ↑WOOO ↑HOO- (. ) WAAA-HAA-hah-hah-hah-]
27 Ja ((Smiles as he looks uneasily upward and
28 shifts his body around))
29 [(fh) hehhhh .hhhhh "hehh" (hf)
Data Set #12

Transcript: (Game date: 6-11-2001) Weakest Link TV show.

Participants are the host, Anne Robinson (H), and the contestants: Joe (J); age 35, Diane (Di); age 33, Heidi (He); age 34, Elena (E); age 29, David (Da); age 27, Terrence (T); age 26, Danielle (D); age 30, Brian (B); 21.

1  H  >°did you think°< he was the weakest link
2   (.2)
3  Da  ↑I did↓ ((Raised eyebrows))
4   (1.3)
5  H  HE: WA:::SN'T the wea:kest link
6   sta:tis:tical:ly (.↑WAS HE::
7   (.5)
8   ele::na
9   (.2)
10  E  (°n::I°) >I ↑GUESS ↓NOT< (fh) .hhh
11  °hheh heh° (hf) ((Eyes wide open and quickly shifting as if looking around the room. She has a Cheshire cat smile))
12   (.9)
13  H  >what do you< DO::: E:LE:NA?
((Speaks calmly)) I'm a seventh grade English teacher ((Nods her head a couple of times))
Data Set #13

1. H and we **look**: at how Terrence: **spells**: his

2. name ↑ =

3. (1.7) ((Length of host's pause as the

4. audience laughs))

5. **Audience** = °Hah-hah-hah-hah-hah-hah-hah-

6. hah-[hah-hah-hah°

7. [↑°are° you embarrassed<< or what↓

8. (.6)

9. **E** ((Her eyes look downward as her head

10. slightly nods))

11. ↑**YEAH**: (. ) I'm embarrassed (. ) >I'm<- (.3)

12. **H** SO WHICH IS THE SCHOOL: YOU USED TO WORK

13. AT?

14. (.2)

15. **Audience** HAH-[HAH-HAH-HAH-HAH-HAH-HAH-HAH-

16. HAH-

17. [((Soft laughter commenced by a strong

18. exhalation)) (fh) °HHhhheee-heeee-heee-hee

19. 20
21 .hhhhh° (hf)
22 Audience [HAH-HAH-HAH-hah-hah-hah
23 E [YOU DON'T KNOW HOW TRUE:: ↑THAT IS:: (.)
24 (fh) HAH Hah HUH .HHhhhup (hf) ((Quickly
25 shifts from a laughing demeanor to one of a
26 more serious nature))
27 (.)
28 H WHY TERRENCE:?  
29 (.6)
30 DID you think he was the weakest li: nk
31 (.5)
32 E I- I di:d
33 (1.6)
34 H why should we think (.) that: an:sw er is
35 correct (. ) since nothing EL:SE you say
36 (.) [ 
37 Audience [>°ha°-[HA-HA-HA<-[HA-HA-HA-[HA-HA-HA-HA-
38 H [tends to be 
39 E ((Stairs forward)) [(fh) °hheh-
40 heh (hf)
41 Audience ((Continued laughter)) HA-HA-HA-HA-°ha-ha-°
DA:vid

re: mind us: where you went to law school?

Audience ha-ha-[HA-HA-HA-HA-HA-HA-HA-HA-ha-ha-

[(fh) "keh-heh" (hf)

D hh

I- (. ) I went to Harvard

H "have your" pa: rents ever considered asking for a refund?

Audience HAH-HAH-HAH-HAH-[HAH-HAH-Hah-hah-

[(fh) "heh-heh" (hf)

Audience ((Continued Laughter)) hah-[hah-"hah-hah-" [THEY MAY (.)

D after they see the show (. ) (fh) "hheh" (hf)
21 .

22 Audience HAH-HAH-Hah-hah-hah-hah-hah
Data Set #15

1  H  E:LENA
2  (.4)
3  E  ((Looks worried)) yes
4  (.2)
5  (fh)  "hheh"  (hf)  ((Quickly reverts to a
6  serious demeanor))
Data Set #16

1  H  °an° HEI:DI

2  (.3)

3  the COFFEE SHOP

4  (.7)

5  MA:NA:GER

6  (1.7)

7  BA:::D TO THE LA:::ST DROP:

8  (.2)

9  Audience  HA-HA-HA-HA-HA-HA-[HA- [ [.hhuh (fh) °hehh° (hf)

10  He  [GR:EAT

11  Audience  ((Continued laughter)) HA-[HA-[ [ ((fh) heh-.hhheh

12  He  hheh (hf)

13  Audience  ((Continued laughter)) HA-HA-HA-HA-HA-[HA- [ [ (fh) heh-.hhheh

14  He  [tha:nks [hnhhhh

15  H  = Heidi with three votes you ARE the weakest

16  link °good-bye°<
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